THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIALIZATION IN HISTORY TEACHING

by

Gil Jennex, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Education,
McGill University,
Montreal.

August, 1962.

The author wishes to acknowledge his gratitude to Professor Robert Overing of MacDonald College under whose direction this thesis was prepared.

"If school is to educate for life, it appears that the department of social science is many times of greater value than that of physical science, and if this is so, a sound method for teaching history is of the first importance"---- M. Keatinge

"The roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present comes to be what it is"---- Bishop Stubbs

"A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops"---- Henry Adams

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Many authors in recent years have contended that certain education systems and teacher training institutions do not pay enough attention to the importance of high school teacher specialization. This thesis endeavours to point out the importance of specially trained teachers with emphasis on those teaching history. A history teacher at the secondary level without a good academic background in history ordinarily will not be able to do justice to his subject; the result is that the pupil, society and the teacher suffer. To the student, the teacher has to impart a knowledge of the nature of history, the value of studying history, the measurement and development of time reckoning and of the historical method, as well as the historical facts of the particular course. At the same time the teacher himself must have some grasp of the philosophies of history, the history of historical writing, the history of history teaching, and of the best methods in history teaching.

In order to achieve the desired degree of teacher specialization, not only in history, but in all the major subjects of the high school curriculum, certain necessary changes would have to be made in the present approach to the training of secondary school teachers.

All colleges of education must be relocated on the university campus in order to widen the experience of the future teacher by his association with students of other faculties and by his working in the higher academic atmosphere. All subjects, other than those of pedagogy, should be removed from the teachers' college and placed under their respective faculties; the teachers' college has the task of giving courses in pedagogy, and to this end it should be staffed and equipped. Professors of pedagogy must be excellent teachers who are capable of teaching by example as well as possess an extensive academic background in their subject specialty. Education courses, such as the philosophy of education, the history of education, educational methods, etc., should be taught from the viewpoint of the student's specialization and not through the sterile courses in general educational theory and practice that are now common in many of our colleges. Finally, greater leadership by professors of teachers' colleges and secondary school teachers must be assumed in all fields of education in order to ensure that the basic principles of education are not violated. Teachers will have to take on the responsibility of working together to control their own destiny.

CHAPTER ONE

THE NEED FOR SPECIALIZATION IN THE TEACHING OF HISTORY

With the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the mid-eighteenth century, man realized that benefits such as an increase in efficiency, the development of an acquired skill, and the possibility of matching the task to the ability of the individual could be derived from specialization. Since in industry the material gains can be so easily tabulated, the advantages of specialization are readily shown. Gradually into all spheres of human endeavour specialized co-operation has found its way, till today practically every skill is but one cog in a complex whole. Unfortunately there are isolated instances where little or no recognition is given to specialization and one of the major fields where this occurs is education. This is probably so because when an education system turns its back on specialization there is no material gain or loss evident; the results of good and bad teaching are so intangible that for years poor methods and ideologies can be followed without an awareness of the injustices being committed.

The need for teachers trained and interested

in specific subjects has long been a part of educational philosophy. Pestalozzi, who died in 1827, recognized the advantages of having separate teachers for each subject and in the schools which he established this policy was followed[1]. By the last decade of the 19th century leading educators were advocating that if history and other subjects were to achieve their place on the curriculum then specialized teachers in a subject classroom were necessary. Despite this long recognition and the excellent advances made by most contemporary systems, there are educational authorities today who ignore the great need for specialized secondary teachers and neither train nor go out of their way to hire them.

Is specialization necessary in education or should teachers be expected to go into the classroom and teach subjects for which they do not have proper preparation? One feels ridiculous asking the question because the answer is self-evident. Any teacher who finds himself in a classroom teaching a subject for which he does not have an adequate background is at a disadvantage, a disadvantage which is unfair to the teacher, the pupil and the subject. Uncertainty and unfamiliarity will lower the standard of teaching; therefore, the pupil is not receiving the teacher's

---

[1]Cubberley,E.P., The History of Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948), p. 540.

best and the subject is not being presented in its correct light. Any authority in education who encourages or maintains the idea that if a person speaks English then he can teach English composition, drama, novel and poetry, or that if he is an English teacher then there is no reason why he cannot also teach history, either does not know the fundamentals of educational theory and practice or does not care.

An argument that might be given against this emphasis on subject specialization at the secondary level is that a teacher is teaching pupils first and subjects second. This is true; the chief task of the teacher is to aid and guide in the mental and social development of the individuals under his care, but this cannot be done in a vacuum. It is chiefly through the subjects on the curriculum that this development takes place. There should be much effort, through research and trial and error, put into a curriculum in order that its subjects will best equip the pupils to face life as well-adjusted and informed adults. To what avail is a good curriculum, if it is taught by people who are unfamiliar with its subject matter? How can a teacher do his best for the student if he is unfamiliar with his medium? Ironically, this very unfamiliarity with the subject may lead to too much concentration on subject matter

with the result that the teacher may lose sight of the pupil's needs. If the teacher, either through training or experience, has a firm grasp of his subject, then he can with ease manipulate his teaching to best answer the needs of the child.

Reference to the manual skills might illustrate in another way how baseless it is to ignore the fact that a teacher needs an extensive knowledge of his subject in the same way that a carpenter needs to know the limitations of his tools as well as how to use them. As no one would put an instructor who had never used tools in front of a manual training class, so,"To turn over a class in history to be instructed by a person, who is not acquainted with the tools of the trade and has no practice in manipulating them, is an equal absurdity"[2]. Although history is the subject referred to in this quotation and is the one to be used throughout this thesis, what is said of history can be said of all aspects of the curriculum. Because of history's prominent position on the curriculum, it is probably the best subject to use for the purpose of illustrating the need for teacher specialization.

There is no subject so widely taught and on the whole so poorly taught as history[3], which by its

---

[2]American Historical Association, The Study of History in Schools, (New York, 1906), p. 116.

[3]Hall, G.S. (Editor), Methods of Teaching History, (Boston, 1902), p. ix.

nature has an important position on the curriculum. The teacher, no matter which the method used, should be trying to lay the foundation of an intelligent appreciation of history and to develop historical consciousness. How can this be done unless the teacher has wide information and understanding with which he endeavours to awaken enthusiasm? Ideally, the history teacher should have "a living sympathy with the tale", know how to bring out "the dramatic aspects of his story", know how "to awaken interest and attention", possess an "imagination fired and....enthusiasm kindled", and know "sources of historical knowledge" and the "spring of historical inspiration" as well as the "literature of history"[4]. To acquire these characteristics is a difficult task for the specialist. What can the non-specialist be expected to do? The higher educational value of history is too great to be left to the non-specialist who is often unaware of recent research, and lacks the necessary detail with which to adorn history or to make the subject real[5]. "When we reflect that what men think of the world depends on what they know of it, it is not surprising that the wider altruistic and ethical interests, which it is a special function of history to develop, rarely become strong enough to control narrower and more

---

[4]American Historical Association, The Study of History in Schools, (New York, 1906), p. 116.

[5]Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, The Teaching of History, (Cambridge, 1961), p. 9.

isolated and selfish aims in life"[6]. Is this not a plea that more attention be given to the calibre of our history teachers to ensure that men may know more of the world?

The teacher of history must be able to put life and action into what is a mere bundle of dry bones; too often history is taught as dead facts, not as a living science. As a result the pupil fails to recognize the vital connection between the past and present; he does not realize that ancient history was the dawn of a light that is still shining, nor does he grasp the essential idea that history is the growing self-knowledge of a living progressive age[7]. History should be interesting to the child because he is interested in human beings and history is the study of human beings. Since the child does not prefer fiction to facts if the facts are made interesting, a dislike for history is usually the fault of the text's author or the teacher or both[8].

How history is taught depends upon what one wishes to accomplish. The chief purpose is not to fill the child's head with a mass of material, but to get him to think, to reason, to approach events with the historical spirit[9]. Where does the non-specialist begin

---

[6]Hall, loc. cit., p. x.

[7]Ibid., p. 132.

[8]Ibid., p. 227-228.

[9]American Historical Association, loc. cit., p. 86-88.

when suddenly he is presented with a course in history? This is presuming that he is aware of the great responsibility in regard to ultimate aims which the teaching of history places upon his shoulders. If for him history is only the old chronological list of dates and places and his task is to get the pupils to commit them to memory, then in his mind at least the task ahead does not appear so great. Therefore, to ensure the greater likelihood of attaining these exacting aims, it is the duty of the educational authorities to hire the history specialist.

A history specialist, however, is not just a teacher who has taken university courses which dealt with the history of particular countries or events, but one who has made a study of the subject 'history' itself. To do an adequate job in the classroom more is necessary than just a detailed knowledge of the history of the nation being taught; the teacher should have an understanding or feeling for his subject which can only be acquired by seeing the subject in all its aspects and developments. If one realizes the nature of his subject in regards to the whole of man's knowledge and to the aims of education, then it matters little the particular nation to be taught because the teacher will always be able to relate the area to the needs of the pupil.

Unfortunately, to-day in our schools there are teachers of history with little or no understanding of history as a subject other than as a chronological list of dates and names which have to be covered in a limited time. It is the purpose of this thesis to show the great need for specialization in the teaching of history by pointing out the nature, value and place some of the basic concepts of the subject of which the teacher has to be aware if justice is to be done to it and to the pupil. With a greater understanding should come an increased appreciation and, therefore, improved teaching techniques.

CHAPTER TWO

BASIC ASPECTS OF HISTORY TO BE ACQUIRED BY THE STUDENT

There are many aspects of the subject history of which the teacher of history should be aware in order to present history to his class in its proper perspective. These aspects are separate from the straight historical facts which go to make up any history course, with which, of course, the teacher should also be thoroughly familiar. However, how these facts are presented to the high school student will be greatly determined by the teacher's own ideas concerning the definition of history, the purposes of studying history, the historical time sense, etc. All these concepts of history are not necessarily conveyed to the student directly; but all will require understanding on the part of the teacher if history is ever to be made more than just a chronological list of data. In this thesis all the facets of history are dealt with in detail in order to illustrate the extent or depth of each; in the end it should be obvious that the non-specialist is not going to be able to master these approaches to history in a few easy lessons.

It is difficult to decide which concept is the more important, indeed if any one is more important than

another, but for our aim of stressing the need for the specialized teacher perhaps the purposes of history in the curriculum should be considered first. The many reasons why history is so widely taught should convince the doubtful of the great necessity of ensuring that it is not placed in the hands of the non-specialist.

What is the purpose of teaching history? To a person writing, teaching, or studying history at a high level, the question might appear elementary and unnecessary. Since the average individual will look at his curriculum from a practical view point, perhaps he is inclined to question the purpose of history on the curriculum before any other subject. The future need for mathematics, English, French and science can readily be perceived, but not so the need for history. Unless one is going to teach or write, the materialistic, utility value of history seems slight. This is so because the values of history are elusive and difficult to measure. Three general uses of history may be noted: the utilitarian or practical; the intellectual or disciplinary; the spiritual. The practical use refers to useful knowledge and new interests; the intellectual use refers to training the imagination, making the past real and understanding the present; the spiritual use refers to moral attitudes, patriotism and social living[1]. All three of these uses

---

[1]Klapper, P., The Teaching of History, (New York, 1926), p. 25-61 and p. 105-114.

are hard to measure, overlap with the values of other subjects, and all might influence one's progress in other fields, yet none can be put to a clear practical use upon graduation. For this reason the teacher of history himself should clearly understand, and make a special effort to distinguish for the student, the values of history as a subject of study.

Today, in every culture of high development, the study of history has its place beside literature and the other humanities. In the past this has usually been so, but not to the same extent. As the conception and philosophy of history changed over the ages so have its principal uses. At one time it was considered an auxiliary to the study of the classics, later as an informational subject, and in time merely a subject that had disciplinary values. Now, history is most noted for its "sociological values with special reference to the activities of present day life as participated in by the ordinary man or woman"[2]. Although in the past one use may have been emphasized more than another, the rest, as today, had subordinate value.

The most important use of history is based on the axiom that history repeats itself, not exactly, but similarly; therefore, history has didactic or instructive value. The history teacher must always keep in mind that

---

[2]Inglis, A., Principles of Secondary Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1918), p. 545.

one can "treat happenings as precedents for actions, individual and social"[3]. Thucydides wrote that history deals with "an exact knowledge of facts which have not only actually occurred, but which are destined approximately to repeat themselves in all human probability"[4]. Hence the record of the past is "eminently practical as an instrument of action and a power that goes to the making of the future"[5]. But before one can plan for the future one must understand the present; the ideas, beliefs, attitudes and situations of this century were partially determined by the events of past centuries. For this understanding it is very important that students of history be made aware that modern civilization is "the fruit of the co-operative and cumulative efforts of many peoples working through thousands of generations"[6]. In addition, in history one sees tyranny, vulgarity, greed, benevolence, patriotism, and self-sacrifice brought out in the lives and words of men; thus history can be used to shape character and actions by demonstrating desirable and undesirable qualities in eminent figures of the past.

---

[3] Garraghan, G.J., A Guide to Historical Method, (New York, 1946), p. 13.

[4] Ibid., p. 15.

[5] Ibid., p. 16.

[6] Chapman, J.C. & Counts, G.S., Principles of Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924), p. 291.

Here we have history training the mind and character of the growing citizen by aiding the development of judgement between the just and unjust, the good and bad. Any serious contemplation of the above should bring home the grave responsibility the teacher of history owes to the present and to the future. There rests on his shoulders the task of aiding in moulding character, making the present comprehensible, and anticipating the future. It is inconceivable that anyone aware of history's position in the field of pedagogy would allow anyone but the expert to teach it.

This awareness attains even greater significance when it is realized that history can be a weapon as well as an instrument, i.e. with regards to its propaganda value. The growing mind can be moulded in accord with any subjective point of view; historically, it has usually been that of the government in order to produce patriotic citizens. Therefore, history is being used to oppress and deceive. However, the term 'propaganda' is not applicable in this sense unless the aims of the propagators are unjust or unethical, i.e. the "development of patriotism which is vainglorious and unfair to other nations"[7]. The result of a history based on falsehood and the manipulation of facts and documents is that it is absorbed as gospel by

---

[7]Inglis, loc. cit., p. 549.

children who either consider themselves as victims or as supermen[8].

The above is not to suggest that the non-specialist teacher, like the unscrupulous leaders of the past, will manipulate his teaching of history to destructive ends, but it does point out the importance of history and the use or ill-use to which it might be put. The greatest harm the non-specialist in the classroom could do would be usually of a negative nature; that is, he would fail to utilize the above benefits which can accrue from the study of history. Even for the expert it is no easy task to manipulate material so as best to achieve such advantages as the ability to utilize knowledge.

Of equal importance with the values of history as a subject of study, is for the teacher to begin each history course with a general discussion of just what history is. To be able to guide such a conversation, the teacher should be aware of all the levels at which 'history' can be defined. The pupils will inevitably bring to the class many ideas which will have to be discounted, qualified or accepted. This can only be done adequately by a teacher familiar with the past and present controversies which surround the definition of history. The origin of the word does not solve the problem because it comes from the Greek 'historia' meaning

---

[8]du Noüy, L., Human Destiny, (New York, 1956), p. 154.

'information' or 'histor' 'knowing'[9]; a broader conception from the same language is 'learning by inquiry'. However, neither of these origins indicate just what facts are involved. Another confusion encountered is that the Greek ancients, who were the first to define the study, had a different idea of the nature of their subject from the one now generally held. To them history was a form of literature; today opinion differs as to whether it is still an art form or a science.

The definitions of history in their widest sense concur that history is "all that has been said, felt, done and thought by human beings on this planet since humanity began its long career"[10]. Here the three postulates of history can be identified; man, space and time. History begins and ends with man; he may be the cause, and he is both the actor and the teller of events. Other definitions are limited in their scope because they ignore or miss the totality of man's past experience; such are the definitions which state that history is "past politics and politics is present history"[11], or that it is the story of man's increasing ability to control nature[12]. Other definitions tend to emphasize man's social life, or national,

---

[9] Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, (Springfield, 1953), p. 392.

[10] Beard, C.A., The Discussion of Human Affairs, (New York, 1936), p. 69.

[11] Freeman, E.A., Methods of Historical Study, (London, 1886), p. 148.

[12] Nevins, A., The Gateway to History, (New York, 1938), p. 291.

or racial character, but they all only tell a part of his story. Man is a political, social, scientific, national, racial, materialistic, philosophic, economic and individualistic animal, not singly, but 'en masse' all the time and so his story has to deal with this complexity. If we consider history as all events that have ever involved man from the time of his first appearance on earth, we become overwhelmed by their enormous multitude; however, an incident of the past has to come before our present consciousness to be included in history. If we are unaware of a phenomenon, then for us it does not exist; for man to be aware of the past there has to be some record, either in writing or as a relic of that far era. Thus history is not the total past which is beyond recall, but the recorded experiences of the human race, i.e. all that man has done for which there are sources of information.

To fully understand what history is, we must go one step further. The recorded experiences that make up the data of history are the impressions of an event as seen by a contemporary; therefore, they come to the present at best secondhand. The historian surveys the records, and forms from them his own impressions concerning past phenomena. Here we see the original viewer recording the event from the traces it left in his memory and the

contemporary scholar redescribing the same event from his own mental impressions. Now we can understand Collingwood's words, "History is a special form of thought"[13]. We have here the widest and most general significance of history, that is, history as thought - thought about past actualities concerning man[14]. Since an historical event can never be reproduced, all we can do is recreate the past in our minds. As it exists only as someone's (the original viewer's or the later scholar's) mental impressions, history is neither past actualities nor the recorded past, but thoughts concerning the recorded past.

We have seen above the definitions of history from three levels: all that man has done, his recorded past, and thoughts concerning his recorded past. It would take a teacher thoroughly familiar with all three of these to be able to lead pupils in discussion from one to the other. The last definition, history as mental impressions, brings in the very subtle distinction between the actual past event and our record of it. Just how much about any past event do we actually know? The teacher of history should be able to judge by the level and mental ability of the class which definitions of history should be taken. For some classes history as man's complete story might

---

[13] Collingwood, R.G., The Idea of History, (Oxford, 1946), p. 7.

[14] Beard, C.A., "Written History as an Act of Faith", American Historical Review, Vol. 39, 1933, p. 219.

suffice; other classes, in which a discussion of documents and relics takes place, will be able to understand history as the recorded past; the superior or advanced class should be able to understand the more philosophic interpretation of history as thoughts about the past. The teacher not only has to have the historical background necessary to convey to his students the three states of the definition, but has to have from the beginning a full grasp of the course in order to gauge just how detailed the definition has to be. This is certainly no task for the non-specialist who is suddenly confronted with a course in history.

Unlike the above definitions of history, the following topic dealing with the controversy of whether history is an art form or a science would not be taught as such to the secondary school student. However, it is included in this chapter and not in the next, because it is felt that the artistic and scientific aspects of the subject would have to be discussed with the class in order for the teacher to explain adequately the subjective element in history, the various definitions and the historical method.

There has existed for centuries the idea of history as an art form, i.e. a branch of literature which aimed at beauty, not truth. However, with the growth of science in the 19th century, it was soon discovered that

the pretty language concealed absurdities. The result was a critical analysis of the similarities and differences between the work of the artist, historian and the scientist. In the approach to their subject the historian and the artist differ; the latter can make his approach with no organized thought, whereas the historian must clearly work out his ideas so that his data will have a definite logic and literary form. That is, the artist need not be rational but can blend his ideas as he pleases; his is the "language of feeling"[15]. The historian and the scientist can not freely invent nor combine their facts; the artist is without this restriction since "all art-creation takes place in imagination, which needs no instrument or technique" although it is dependent upon experience[16]. If art has anything to do with history it will be at the stage where the historian communicates his results.

One definition of science is "a systematized body of general truths concerning a definite subject matter and established by an efficient method"[17]. History conforms to the above definition, so it would appear that it is a science. However, as the truths are not rigidly uniform it is not an exact science. History is a discipline which approaches its subject matter in the same spirit as science.

---

[15] Ducasse, C.J., The Philosophy of Art, (London, 1929), p. 24.

[16] Ibid., p. 49.

[17] Garraghan, G.J., A Guide to Historical Method, (New York, 1946), p. 38.

In science, however, the writing comes after the work is done whereas in history writing is the essential operation. History cannot predict or say an act was inevitable because too much depends upon free will and chance or accident; the scientist, in contrast, can state definitely that a boiler will blow at a certain pressure. The man of science can redo his experiments and can measure their factors, but how can one repeat the unique facts of history or measure the power of the brain or the strength of a revolution? Another difference between the historian and the scientist is that the former gets his facts second-hand or more, whereas the latter works on his material directly. The human element in history makes the inner drama important and allows the historian, by drawing upon his own experience, to look at the problem from within; the physical scientist can only view his work from without. Finally,history lacks that which all other branches of science have, a technical terminology.

It would appear that history is neither an art nor a science, but stands between the two; it aims at truth, but cannot achieve the certainty of science; it must communicate, so form cannot be neglected. In communicating, it must be remembered that in the definition of history the final conclusion was that history was "thoughts about the past"; therefore, since the data of

history is taken into the mind and then built up, the result is not the past but traces of it in the present. The historian cannot help adding something of his own personality to these traces; the historian can only be neutral when dealing with straight facts such as the amount of snowfall. He is painting a verbal picture and his choice in the last analysis is due to his "tastes and beliefs and feelings"[18]. Thus all history is subjective and may, if facts are greatly suppressed or distorted, also be labelled bias. It is the duty of the teacher to convey to the pupils that this situation does exist, i.e. in history the personal opinions of the writer play such a role. If the student is not prepared, he will be greatly confused when he encounters conflicting descriptions and appraisals. The student under the guidance of the teacher should then look to the historian and his sources to explain the differences. This guidance can only be given by the specialist who has experienced such confusion himself and has done some work on the subjectivity of history.

The high school student in the chemistry laboratory is not doing real research but from his work he should be acquiring an insight into how the advanced chemist works. So it is with the student in history; he should be getting from his work an idea of how the

---

[18]Rossi, M.M., A Plea for Man, (Edinburgh, 1956), p. 4.

historian goes about his task. How can this be done, if the teacher is unaware of the historian's method of research? The historian, like other professionals, has a set method of proceeding with his work. In everyday life we do not usually rely upon the word of others without question, and neither does the historian. The manner in which he attempts to evaluate and criticize his evidence for its reliability is referred to as documentary research or, since it is used so constantly by historians, the historical method. The historical method is the name given to "the process of critically examining and analysing the records and survivals of the past"[19]. However, it is usually given a wider meaning in that, besides the rules of investigation to determine if a document is historically valuable, fraudulent, etc., it includes those for the presentation of the findings.

There are three major operations in the historical method: the search for materials (the sources), the appraisal of these sources to determine their value (the criticism), and the formal statement concerning the findings (the narrative). Because the method was early abused by Leopold von Ranke and others who looked upon it as a scientific method, it received much criticism. Still the historical method has never been abandoned because it is the only way of obtaining accurate knowledge of facts,

---

[19]Gottschalk, L., Understanding History, (New York, 1954), p. 48.

persons, events and movements. It requires a more rigorous standard of accuracy, the use of original documents, and advocates a presentation that tries to avoid prejudice while retaining the right to opinion[20].

As the historian cannot rely upon personal observation for his rethinking of the past, but has to rely upon the reports of others, who have in most cases long since passed away, he must be sure that his objects of thought are reliable or as near so as they can ever be. It is his duty to apply the rules of the historical method. Like a detective he tries to reconstruct the crime by laboriously following clue after clue to locate all available sources. These sources may be divided into two general groups: records and remains. The former are ideas from the past; the latter are physical relics. Sources may also be divided into primary or immediate, which are the contemporary eyewitness reports; and the secondary or mediate, which are obtained secondhand or more. The sources may range from poetry, memoirs, newspapers,household budgets, paintings, clothing, flints, buildings, roads, etc., to human remains such as bones.

Having located this material the historian must next criticize his sources. Here, his principle task is to identify the origin of his sources and in so doing to be on the alert for forgeries. Deception may be in relation

---

[20]Williams, C.H., The Modern Historian, (London, 1938), p. 16.

to author and date or to the misrepresentation of facts. To carry out this investigation the historian may have to draw upon such related studies as palaeography, diplomatics, chronology, archaeology, philology, etc. This procedure is referred to as external criticism which in turn is followed by interpretation or internal criticism. The historian asks, "What is the author saying?" Here the historian must see through the eyes of the writer by ascertaining the meaning of words and symbols. From the literal meaning the historian tries to form his mental image of the author's conceptions. To uncover the intended meaning the historian must make himself familiar with the times of the author whom he is investigating.

The final step of the historical method is that of organization. This takes place after the historian has come to some conclusion regarding his data, i.e. after he has formed his hypothesis; then, with regard to it, documents must be arranged according to their relevance and importance. It must not be forgotten that what is considered important is a relative decision on the part of the historian. Now the material must be gathered into a paper, monograph or book. From the first step of locating the documents and remains, to the second and third steps of external and internal appraisal (which is determining the validity of the source and then what it

says), the historian has arrived at the final step, the organizing of the whole into some kind of narrative form. Dating back to Thucydides, "this method of collecting and analysing data can probably be considered the oldest form of true research."[21]

With some awareness of how the historian approaches his work, the teacher should try to introduce the student to the historical method. At the secondary school level the students should be induced to search out information for themselves, to give supporting evidence and to develop history as a literary art; all of which can be done by essays, term papers and reports, either oral or written. These provide teachers with a chance to introduce the elementary aspects of the historical method. The student of history should be learning by enquiry and the historical method is merely "to understand by means of research"[22]. This is the ideal and it should not be thought that the students will be turned loose with source material and original authorities. A start can be made by having the facts gathered secondhand which for the student has much of the value of first hand work and which for the best students will easily and frequently pass into the actual study of authorities themselves[23].

---

[21] Hillway, T., Introduction to Research, (Boston, 1956), p. 129.

[22] Hall, G.S., (Editor), Methods of Teaching History, (Boston, 1902), p. 132.

[23] Ibid., p. 236.

To the history student under proper guidance the historical method with sources becomes the history laboratory, but he is no more an historian than a child in the physics laboratory is a scientist. The student is not expected to arrive at new results, but he will learn how other men arrived at theirs and will thus know how to measure these results at their true value[24]. One learns best that to which he puts the full force of his mind; in other words, the mind should apply itself to history and this can best be done by the historical method rather than listening to lectures. Thus by introducing the historical method, the study of history should become an active instead of a passive process; however, care has to be taken that the student is not so burdened with the method that the charm and poetry is taken out of history. To ask the pupil to do original research, comparison and criticism is to ask him to run before he can walk; time is too short and the sources too long.

Thus we have noted the value of the historical method in school; but what can the student himself be expected to do in so far as the historical method is concerned? He can engage in the elementary aspects of searching, classifying, criticizing, selecting and arranging materials; he can be helped to develop skill in finding facts in documents, contemporary narratives

---

[24]Hall, loc. cit., p. 52-53.

and texts and to detect the real meaning of events and to put the secondary data together. The teacher should have on hand some collections of source material which can be read to the class. Such items as selections from Caesar and Tacitus, copies of treaties and constitutions, extracts from personal letters and diaries, and contemporary descriptions of events, people and places will give vividness, reality, background and colour. Series of extracts should be placed in the pupil's hands; they will suggest the original record upon which history rests. Any use of sources should be in connection with a good text that will make clear the sequence and relation of events. The use of sources should give a "limited contact with a limited body of material, the examination of which may show the child the nature of the historical process, and at the same time may make the people and events of bygone times more real to him"[25]. Another advantage to be achieved from the historical method is having the pupils question historical facts, i.e. having them make a distinction between the author's story and what might have been. Much can be done to achieve this if two sources on the character of a person, a battle, etc., are compared by the class; differences can be pointed out and discussed. Thus the use of the historical method gives the student the opportunity to study history as history, to see how

---

[25] American Historical Association, The Study of History in Schools, (New York, 1906), p.104.

men moved and acted, to know that history deals with the sequence of events in time[26]. There can also be developed the ability to work with accuracy and sincerity, to compare, to rationalize, to summarize and to make extracts. To put the non-specialist before a history class would be comparable to putting a teacher before a chemistry class who had no idea of the purpose of a laboratory. The bare facts could be covered but no insight into the real nature of either historical or chemical research would follow.

One of the most difficult aspects of history is to get across to the student a sense of time. Unless some idea of the passage of time can be grasped by the history student, the events and personages met in his course of study will have little continuity and therefore little real meaning. It goes without saying that unless the teacher himself has some historical sense of time, he will be unlikely to develop it in his students. What is time? How important is it to history? A dictionary definition of time is "a period during which an action continues" or "a period when something occurs"[27]. For the purpose of history time is a measure of the speed or slowness with which things happen. Time is the very basis of history. Man is an historical animal and history has its origin in man's awareness of continuity, that is in man's sense of time which is forced upon him by his

---

[26]American Historical Association, loc. cit., p. 51.

[27]Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, (Springfield, 1953), p. 889.

empirical observations concerning the succession of all occurrences. A historical observation can never be understood apart from its moment in time because a sense of historical time means a knowledge of happenings; it is necessary to know when - before, after or together with certain other events - an event did occur. "In order to comprehend historical events the reader must be able to visualize duration, a passage of time, a stream of time following on, and within it a series of connected episodes."[28] This sense of time is not inherited, but is the result of the slow acquisition of culture that is to be found where memory has been disciplined[29]. It is the teacher's duty to convey some of this "disciplined" memory to the student in such a way that he is made conscious of the extent and relativity of that memory.

The philosophic studies of time prove interesting and can be grasped by senior high school students. St. Augustine writes, "A long future is merely a long expectation of the future" and "a long past is merely a long memory of the past" and they both are present in the mind[30]. As time comes from the future and passes by way of the present into the past, we measure, not the duration of an event, but the something which remains engraved in the memory, i.e. the impress produced in the

---

[28] Gustavson, C., A Preface to History, (New York, 1955) p. 14.

[29] Shotwell, J.T., "Time and Historical Perspective", Time and Its Mysteries, (New York, 1949), p. 65.

[30] Sheed, F.J. (Translator), The Confessions of St. Augustine, (London, 1944), p. 230.

mind by things as they pass and which remain there after they have passed. Thus what we measure is not time at all but the impress of things upon the mind.[31] More modern writers agree. Droysen describes the mind as the nearest thing to eternity because it holds the past and the hopes for the future, and all are united in the present[32]. The present is the meeting point between the past and future; it is a line without thickness, but not entirely so because it contains "that portion of experienced time about which we have a feeling that it has not yet been absorbed into the past"[33]. Time for man is destroyed if the memory is destroyed because consciousness is the bridge between the two eternities (past and future)[34].

In comparison to man's stay on earth, the time sense was acquired very late. To the primitive mind the passage of time would be a series of disconnected units, not a continuous flow; day and night would be regarded separately, because there would be no concrete indication of a complete twenty-four hour unit. One counted the moons or suns, the periods of daylight or darkness, or

---

[31] Sheed, loc. cit., p. 228-229.

[32] Droysen, J.G., Principles of History, (Boston, 1897), p. 12.

[33] Renier, G.J., History, its Purpose and Method, (Boston, 1950), p. 100.

[34] Shotwell, J.T., Introduction to the History of History, (New York, 1922), p. 10.

any other division suggested by nature. A man's age might be fifty winters or harvests. There are records of the blossoming of plants, the running of salmon, the cry of the cranes or the coming of the swallow. Any more refined division would depend upon a science of astronomy. Time reckoning based on the sun or stars began in Egypt around 4236 B.C. (the earliest date); here the beginnings of the modern calendar with its 365 days appeared. However, this year was six hours short and no correction was made, and in time it got further and further away from the solar year. Babylonia and Assyria used the lunar year which involved complicated cycles and unfortunately the Greeks and Romans wasted much effort trying to make this Babylonian lunar calendar work. It was not till 46 B.C. that Julius Caesar imposed the solar year of 365 days with the leap year adjustment. However, even the Julius Calendar was 1/300 of a day out and so by 1582, when Pope Gregory XIII launched the present Gregorian Calendar, the Julian Calendar was eleven days off the solar year.

For the history student the exact dating of events from secondary sources is a reasonably simple exercise, but for the historian using original sources and encountering one or the other of the archaic dating methods the complication can be trying. He must transpose to our present system of measuring time from the supposed birth of Christ.

Even modern history can be confusing because the various nations of the world did not all adopt the Gregorian Calendar in 1582. For example in the case of Greece which did not do so till 1923, all previous dates have to be converted. Many quanderies can arise such as the fact that Cervantes and Shakespeare did not die on the same day, yet in their countries the dates of their death is April 23, 1616. An English document dated 28 June, 1620 would have been written on the same day as one dated the 7 February,1621 in France[35]. Is this important as far as the student in secondary school is concerned? Yes, because it accounts for what seem to be errors in dating between secondary sources and even texts. More important, if the student is to be introduced to source material he must know why the dates do not correspond to what he has previously learned. The non-specialist teacher is going to be very embarassed if he cannot explain why Washington's birth record reads 22 February, 1732, but his birthday is celebrated on the 11 February, 1731[36]. Another common error that can be made in counting years is the fact that there is no year zero; the calendar goes from 1 B.C. to 1 A.D.; therefore from 5 B.C. to 5 A.D. would be nine, not ten years. Next to the Gregorian Calendar, the most widely used time system is the Moslem,

---

[35] Renier,loc.cit., p. 113.

[36] Gottschalk, L., Understanding History, (New York, 1954), p. 129.

whose year one is 622 A.D. To convert from the Gregorian to the Moslem calendar one must subtract 622 and add three years for each century[37].

The student must be made aware of chronology because it is chronology that arranges significant events into their time order, fixes the intervals that elapsed between them, and thus provides the very framework of history[38]. However, it should be stressed that any division of man's past into parts is artificial because history is a continuous flow. The before and after are convenient divisions to allow the mind to attack the problems of historical organization in detail. "New ideas and new movements do not begin with the opening of the year nor cease with the closing of a century"[39]. From this continuous flow of man's events which we call history, we tend to remember only the outstanding events. We forget to emphasize that each of the centuries, decades and years was crowded with happenings, great and small, which influenced the lives of the ordinary and famous just as they do today. Limited space causes the historian to forget the mediocre, and only to record the battles, kings and heroic deeds. It is at least 300,000 years since man appeared, and millions of people have lived uneventful

---

[37] Breasted, J.H., "The Beginnings of Time and Measurement and the Origins of our Calendar", Time and its Mysteries, (New York, 1936), p. 64.

[38] Renier, loc. cit., p. 179.

[39] Mace, W.H., Method in History, (Boston, 1897), p. 48.

lives and passed into oblivion just as millions will do in the future. For the young, large numbers and long periods of time tend to have little meaning; the teacher is left with the great task of illustrating how much has gone before and of this how little is recorded history.

Graphically man's time on earth could be represented as twelve hours; if we do this, then eleven and a half hours represent those lost years of man before writing; at 11:40 the Egyptians appear on the scene. Another illustration could be made using a book of 300 pages, each of which represents 1000 years; only the last six or seven pages would be allotted to periods for which there are any kind of records of man.[40] In Iraq, the location of ancient Mesopotamia, mounds rising sixty feet dot the landscape marking the site of ancient settlements. Near the top the ruins of buildings 5500 years old can be found and if one digs to the bottom 5000 more years of history is dug through[41]. By such illustrations, coupled with the time chart, roll and clock, the first step in developing a time sense can be achieved. These devices aid in getting the facts in the right order and perspective. It is important to know that Anne comes before Victoria, and Elizabeth I before Anne. Dates do not kill interest if they are handled properly, because

---

[40] Robinson, J.H., The New History, (New York, 1916), p. 57.

[41] Childe, V.G., Man Makes Himself, (New York, 1951), p. 39.

they are the measured framework by which man has built up his ordered conception of the past and without which the student will lose himself in a maze of personal impressions and vague generalizations. Unfortunately, without realizing their error, many teachers tend to make dates the all of history. Certain dates should be memorized, such as those ending a phase or war. Discussions should be centered around why these dates are important and not others. Basically, the teacher's task is to ensure that quite unconsciously the student is led to see "that events do not simply succeed each other in time, but that one grows out of another, or rather out of a combination of many others"[42]. Can such a teaching aim be fulfilled other than by one who has himself a sense of historical time?

---

[42] American Historical Association, The Study of History in Schools, (New York, 1906), p. 22.

CHAPTER THREE

SOME BASIC ASPECTS OF HISTORY TO BE IN THE POSSESSION OF THE TEACHER

There are many controversies concerning history and the nature of its data which the teacher, if he is aware of them, would have no intention of making a part of his current history course. However, he has to be fully informed of these because the students in the course of their research and general reading will come upon them and will be sure to ask about them. One of these has already been covered - history as an art form or a science. It would be interesting to hear the answer given by a non-specialist to questions on the following topics, if one is given at all. The answers should not only involve a knowledge of how history is regarded today, but of past conceptions of history as well.

The philosophy of history would not usually be taught at the secondary level as a separate study, but the teacher should be aware of the philosophic interpretations of history throughout the ages. If one is teaching a bright class or gives assignments that require research from secondary sources, the pupil will meet comments on the philosophies and their chief advocates. There will surely follow questions in class which the

teacher should be prepared to answer, if not in detail, at least fully enough to direct the child's further reading and not to discourage his interest. Students do not expect teachers to know everything, but it must be discouraging to enquire about such an important phase of history and find the teacher of the subject can only give a blank stare.

In history as in other areas of man's knowledge, philosophy is an effort to answer the question, "Why?", to fulfil the need to find a relationship between events. Nordau writes, "The philosophy of history is an attempt to give a rational explanation of historical events"[1]. All history is written under one idea or another; the view taken has a very personal basis because one cannot help seeing the past, and the present, through tinted glasses. The social class, race, religion and nationality of the scholar will do much to determine the point from which one approaches historical events. Many have written that man is never free, as his outlook is due to the era in which he lived.

Philosophies of history can be divided into three broad groups: the theological, the humanistic and the naturalistic (or materialistic) approaches[2]. It should be noted again that the writer of historical

---

[1] Nordau, M., The Interpretation of History, (London, 1910), p. 44.

[2] Ibid., p. 60.

philosophy must have a prior conception. If not, no pattern will be evident in history. In other words, historical events are interpreted in the light of the thesis or opinion already formed. A philosophy of history, like a definition of history, must consider every aspect of man's complex existence. The historian and the historical philosopher set out on their voyage with the explanation of causation as their goal and even if history is considered a mere sequence of events, and not as cause and effect, one is still left with the problem of explaining why one sequence and not another occurred. The answer always comes back to cause, "that which makes a thing be what it is"[3]. Chance influences history, but is not a cause; it is a random factor which need have no time element and need be preceded by no thought.

Each age has had its own predominant answer to causation. To the Greeks and Romans what happened was the direct result of human will; therefore, men like Thucydides tried to reconcile the world with the nature of man. The Christian influence, led chiefly by St. Augustine, ignored man as the cause, and saw in all events the wondrous hidden ways of God. The Renaissance saw a swing away from this narrow and ascetic attitude of the medieval period and a return to man. Over the next three hundred years the approach to history continued to be through man

---

[3]Garraghan, G.J., A Guide to Historical Method, (New York, 1946), p. 350.

as either a creature of emotion or reason. Before the French Revolution, historians were concerned with a crusade against prejudices, especially religion in its narrowest sense, and they looked to the future when a rule of reason would be established. History was seen as the development from a state of savagery to "a perfectly rational and civilized society"[4]. There were also those who advocated a more emotional approach in favour of patriotism, monarchy or democracy. The 19th century saw an emphasis on progress and natural science; and two outstanding examples of this are Darwin's evolutionary theory and Marx's economic determinism. However, both err in conceiving history as possessing only one continuous thread. Progress could easily be illustrated in man's conquest of his environment, but it is questionable just how far he has come in other fields or even if he is still progressing. More recently, this doubt has been noted in a tendency to substitute the notion of 'change' for 'progress'; the latter implies things are getting better, whereas the former idea only recognizes changes in the many phases of life with no judgement as to their being better or worse. Two other approaches which flourished in the last century were the ideas that history was chaos or that it was endless cycles, i.e. history was merely a series of occurrences

---

[4]Collingwood, R.G., The Idea of History, (Oxford, 1946), p. 87.

from which no constructive moral could be drawn[5] or it was countless civilizations coming to be and falling away[6].

For each of the philosophies of history, there is evidence, but not all information will fit any one of them. Much depends upon an act of faith, a faith which is "at bottom a conviction that something true can be known about the movement of history" and that this conviction is based upon "the subjective decision, not a purely objective discovery"[7]. A teacher should be prepared to discuss a particular philosophy with the class if it is brought forward; the current history course could be used to illustrate how a specific concept can be applied to real events. The general philosophy of history of a given era is important because it will account for the events thought significant by the contemporary historian and will aid one in trying to see past action through his eyes. Therefore, the teacher should encourage and foster any interest shown in this side of historical study. To do so he must first have a general acquaintance with the subject.

Again, the following subject is more for the personal benefit of the teacher of history. A history of history is not a subject to be covered in secondary school, but such knowledge does give the teacher a wider view and

---

[5]Oman, C., On the Writing of History, (New York, 1939), p. 32.

[6]Muller, H.J., The Uses of the Past, (New York,1954), p. 68

[7]Beard, C.A., "Written History as an Act of Faith", American Historical Review, Vol. 39, 1933, p. 226.

appreciation of his field. However, a knowledge of the history of history can have some school application. If the students are encouraged to use the library, they will, while gathering material, encounter many authors. The works of some will have greater scholastic value than others and a few, because of their rare excellence, will be classics. The teacher should be aware of the more outstanding historians, know when they lived and of what period they wrote. The reason for this is the same as for the necessity of the English teacher having an awareness of the classics in English literature. An English student will not only have heard of, but will have studied or read, Shakespeare and Milton; why should not the history student have also read Thucydides and Gibbon? If he has not, it is probably because the English student has had better trained teachers than has had the history student; therefore the former is more aware of the great writers in his field than the latter. Some great literature has been turned out by historians, but they are rarely studied under the English department because it would be more apt for their works to be included in the history course. Unfortunately, with history in the hands of the non-specialist, the student often never encounters these writers.

In making a survey of the Western World's greatest historians there must be some criterion by which to discuss

and compare. Why has this historian's works survived the ages and not another? Why does one repeatedly read or hear quotes and comments concerning one man's accomplishments, but very little on another who lived and wrote at the same time? The answer can be found in what an historian has contributed to man's knowledge of his past; he has either established facts unknown before or offered sound generalizations or hypotheses. But one cannot do the above without "putting together in a logical way the evidence derived from documents and records"[8], i.e. without following consciously or unconsciously the rules of documentary or historical research. Therefore, we must note the extent to which these historians employed the historical method; this will be evident from their use of documents, external and internal criticism, objectivity, etc. The ancient writers, especially those prior to the Greeks, to a certain extent are exceptions to the above in relation to their survival and present extensive use. The place they held in contemporary life may have been minor in comparison to other historians, but they have survived merely by physical chance. Therefore they are the only sources from their period, whereas their superiors may have passed into oblivion. A detailed study of the lives of the major historians might illustrate to the students the effort, in the form of research and the application of the

---

[8]Hillway, T., Introduction to Research, (Boston, 1956), p. 130.

historical method, put into the writing of history; similarly a comparison between a good and bad writer of history might bring home the need for greater care and more objectivity on the part of the scholar.

The history of historical writing with special reference to the historical method is here given in some detail in order to emphasize its importance and to illustrate again the extent of the specialized knowledge that should be possessed by the teacher of history. First, we have the myth, which comes nearest to the historical narrative in earliest times. It precedes history. The myth is an attempt to explain the present status by reference to its past, but it differs from true history because the divine agents play a major active role. Such are the works of Homer and Vergil. The chief function of the myth is that it starts man on the road to questioning his origin, i.e. to philosophy. From the 'Why?' asked by the philosopher it is not too far to the 'What?' asked by the historian. In the past, philosophy and history have led a close existence; in some cases another name for philosophy has been history and both in turn have been regarded as a branch of literature. Only after history was separated from literature could the recovery of the past become a science as well as an art form.

After the myths came the annals of ancient

Egypt, the oldest records that came anywhere near history. The pharaohs, who were more interested in self-glorification than in past events, employed scribes to record their deeds and those of their ancestors; these scribes were not historians and their works were little more than lists. In Babylonia and Assyria, curiosity led to the presentation of records and tests, but not to criticism. Accounts, as in Egypt, were to glorify the ruler. To the Hebrews of ancient Palestine must be accorded the "honor of having first produced a truly historical narrative of considerable scope and high relative accuracy"[9]. Unfortunately, the Old Testament could never take its place as history till its divine authority was denied. It is a national library of tradition, history, proverbs, songs and prophecies and is "a social expression of a people moving up from barbarism to civilization"[10].

In Greece there could be no history till the sixth century B.C. when a break was made with the gods and an effort was made to place the cause of events in the natural world. This could occur only after historians began to look to truth as the test of historical statements and became frankly critical of the Greek myths which described creation. However, this transition was gradual because Herodotus, who died in 425 B.C., coupled a broad-

---

[9] Barnes, H.E., A History of Historical Writing, (Norman, 1937), p. 19.

[10] Shotwell, J.T., Introduction to the History of History, (New York, 1922), p. 80.

minded approach with accuracy and precision, yet "regarding the existence of the gods, (he) betrays no skepticism"[11]. Herodotus is the 'Father of History', but Thucydides is the 'Father of the Historical Method'. The latter expounded that accuracy of data must be the foundation of true historical writing and that all details should be relevant and subordinate to the forward movement of the narrative. The break with the gods had been made. The popular demand for rhetoric with its moralizing, fictitious speeches and artistic, rather than historical, genius played a major role in later Greek and Roman historical writing. Down to the second century B.C. most Roman historical literature was written in Greek; growing nationalism caused a switch to Latin, but the rhetoric of Greece still was the model.

Though Roman historical writing is criticized for its lack of originality and its subordination to rhetoric, it is higher in respect to reliability than the writing that was to follow under the influence of the Christian Church, which put history back under the spell of mythology and religious prejudice. If the documents seemed preposterous or incredible, then the Christian 'historian' would look for some hidden meaning which could only be explained by allegory and symbolism - the replacements for the historical method. Thus during the

---

[11] Robinson, C.A., Ancient History, (New York, 1951), p. 292.

Middle Ages the writing of history was in a decline; the language was Latin and the historians, monks. The principal result was the past seen as the working out of the divine plan in chronicle form. The Renaissance saw a revival of interest in an antique culture and with it naturally a stimulation of interest in ancient writers which brought back to history some of the lost techniques of the historical method. However, before the techniques of a proper historical method could be worked out by the Renaissance writers, the scholars of Europe became involved in the intellectual and emotional turmoil arising from the Reformations and Counter-Reformation. Now historical research was no longer pursued for the love of acquiring information, but to secure data to back up one side of the controversy or the other. The rules of scientific investigation were ignored and objectivity was seldom encountered.

As a result, the world does not again witness historians of the calibre of the ancients - and then not their equal - till the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when natural causes were again substituted for superstitions and theological theories of causation. Ideas and intellectual factors such as nationalism, progress and patriotism are the dominating elements in history. Yet, in their writings, the historians of these two

centuries were inclined to let emotion override reason, and to let the personal element reduce scholarship. It was in opposition to these liberties with facts, that Leopold von Ranke, who died in 1886, resolved in his works to avoid all imaginary and fictitious elements and to stick to the facts. The results placed him as the first and foremost of the nineteenth century scientific historians whose approach is known as the historical method. He believed that by fact following documented fact the reader would be led to the whole truth. However, Ranke and his followers became so enthused with facts that their works, for the average reader, were overwhelming and as a result, their histories never became popular.

There had been since the ancients a few men who advocated the study and criticism of documents, but it remained to the science conscious century of Ranke for the historical method to inflame men's minds. Unfortunately the scientific historians forgot their public responsibility in that although the writing of history is the work of the scholar, it is written not only for him, but also for the public. Historians in the twentieth century have tried to meet the public demand, but here, too, there can be a danger; the attempt to popularize can be carried to the extreme where history would require

little mental effort on the part of the public. No matter what the form or depth of the historical work, the public is often at fault when it fails to realize that the reading of history requires concentration. This concentration is especially needed today in regards to the modern trend in historical content referred to as the 'new history' which "attempts, in the broadest way, to reconstruct the history of civilization in its totality".[12]

There should be little further need to stress the importance of the teacher being aware of these trends in historical writing, not in so skimpy an outline as this, but in more detail with the various schools and the chief historians of each. Brighter classes should be assigned passages from the more noteworthy works and encouraged to discuss their opinions. A whole history course could be worked out by using the classical historians rather than a text; however this would require quite an extensive knowledge on the part of the teacher because much of the preliminary work that would lead to continuity would be his responsibility. Besides acquiring a knowledge of the required course the students would have been subjected to prose of a very high calibre.

If a history teacher has pride in his subject and his profession, he should take some interest in the history of history teaching. How has history fared over

---

[12]Barnes, loc. cit., p. 373.

the years as a curriculum subject? The answer would probably have little place in the classroom, but it is closely tied to a philosophy and history of historical writing; the answer is also indicative of the historical mindedness of a race. The stress people put on history, both for patriotic and instructive reasons, will be illustrated by the emphasis it has as a subject of study for the young. This can best be shown by a reference to Plato, who, despite his studies at the Egyptian City of the Sun, Heliopolis, where history was held in high regard, did not in his elaborate system of education for the philosopher-king in The Republic make any mention of history. This lack is doubtlessly due to the Greek contempt for tradition and the past[13].

Any account of educational progress, in general or in a particular field like history, must be in part a history of the progress of man. Out of the dimness of the past man steps forward on his upward journey and in so doing he becomes conscious of self and what he has been. Therefore, in some way history has probably been a part of instruction since the dawning of earliest man, although at first it would be little more than in the form of handing down traditions or customs from old to young[14]. In pre-literate people the past is told in elaborate ritualistic ceremonies often accompanied by

---

[13] Compayré, G., The History of Pedagogy, (London, 1907), p. 32-33.

[14] Johnson, H., Teaching of History, (New York, 1929), p. 25.

dancing and song; "One might say that the history not only of a clan but of the whole tribe is re-enacted in a dramatic way by those best versed in tribal lore"[15]. From this promising beginning, as man's institutions took shape, it would seem but a natural and simple step for history to emerge as a branch of learning. Unfortunately, this was not the case because its utility limited its use as a professional subject; therefore, there was little occasion for popular instruction. It was not till the latter half of the nineteenth century that history's true worth was recognized and it was given its proper place on the school curriculum.

Over the intervening years, from the tribe to the modern age, the path of history as a subject of instruction has been erratic, to say the least; there were times when its appearance on the course of study, even in disguise, was unthought of. History never became a formal study in Greece; only in epic poetry, which had been one of the earliest means of retelling the past, would the pupil indirectly pick up information of an historical nature. The Sophists, those radicals who taught for profit, would include history among their subjects, if the student requested it. After rhetoric gained prominence there was a greater stress on general

---

[15] Mulhern, J., A History of Education, (New York, 1946), p. 51.

knowledge subjects like history. Since the Romans wholeheartedly adopted Greek culture, this trend toward rhetoric also established history as an independent study in Rome as well. It is interesting to note that, although history was considered important in the training of the rhetorician, the Roman state did not realize its more practical aspects;in fact, it was not till late in the Empire that any state attempt was made to regulate teaching. One reason put forth for Rome's decline was her failure to establish and direct an education system to serve as a corrective of dangerous national tendencies[16]. Such is the power accredited to the proper use of the humanities in a school curriculum. "The medieval mind was not conscious of either history as an intellectual content or a method of thought"[17]. Neither the sciences, nor history, could thrive where supernatural powers were considered to be the causes of things; again, only through such other subjects as rhetoric was history studied. Education was under the control of the Church and the teachers were monks. During the last years before the Renaissance a few gifted writers saw the importance of history as an educational subject, and with their writings the revival of learning was heralded. But to what avail?

---

[16] Cubberley,E.P., The History of Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948), p. 109-110.

[17] Eby, F. & Arrowood, C.F., The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval, (New York, 1940), p. 912.

Essentially the Renaissance was an imitation and a recapitulation, an enthusiastic return to antiquity, a rebirth of ancient Greek and Latin literature. One could choose no better starting point, but the humanists never got started; they soon entered on the "downward path towards the soulless preoccupation with verbal forms"[18]. Latin grammar was the foundation of the Renaissance schools and history was studied incidentally in connection with the classics, but it was a history of Greece and Rome only, because all knowledge except that from the classics was ignored. It is easy to be critical of the humanists of the Renaissance and to forget the thousand years that preceded them. The return to the classical age as the foundation for the thirsty scholar was the only logical step for the awakening intellect, but it is to be lamented that, what for the majority should have been a means to a greater end, itself became the end. After sharpening their mental weapons on the knowledge of the Greeks and Romans, the historian should have turned them on the more immediate past and on contemporary events. The Renaissance influence on education was a lasting one and the narrow humanistic training in Greek and Latin crowded the curriculum. In Britain, for example, till the late nineteenth century, historical information had to radiate from the classics. Although history was studied by men of the highest

---

[18]Boyd, W., History of Western Education, (London, 1954), p. 197.

intellect, it was excluded from the general school instruction[19].

There began in the sixteenth century a reaction against Humanism which is referred to as Realism. Education began to be looked upon as having some practical value; therefore, the stress was placed on concrete knowledge and vocational skills, and for the first time, history was included. In 1676, Christian Weise published a book, the first part of which gave detailed instructions for the teaching of history. The second part, a textbook of 270 pages, for the first time consciously presented the idea that matters in the present should determine what to teach about the past. Unfortunately Weise's book brought no noticeable change in historical studies.[20] From 1600 to 1800 there were many reformers who established their own schools where their ideas were applied, but despite their work education in practice remained more or less unchanged. Before the Revolution in France, for example, primary education was reduced to catechism, reading and writing[21]. It would appear that the German states came into the nineteenth century with greater achievements in the teaching of history than did France

---

[19]Johnson, H., Teaching of History, (New York, 1929), p. 86.

[20]Johnson, H., Teaching of History, (New York, 1960), p. 30-31.

[21]Compayré, G., The History of Pedagogy, (London, 1907), p. 365-66.

or England. This was due in part to the influence of Fredrick the Great who encouraged the study of Prussian history after the thirteenth century[22].

The nineteenth century has been called the century of history because of the universal awakening to the awareness of the importance of history teaching and study. Previously the secondary school was designed to prepare students of upper class origin for entrance to the university and for leadership in their parents' social class.[23] As participation in the political life of the nation spread to more of the population, and as the problems of government became more and more complex, it was found necessary to add instruction in history, government and geography. For a time the conflict between conservatism with its autocratic ideals and liberalism with its new ideas of democracy and nationalism turned the field of education into an arena. However, as the century progressed and liberalism won out the idea arose that a major condition for learning was interest which must come from the physical and human worlds in the form of scientific and historical studies. Education was expected to clarify the principles covering the social relationships between persons and classes and so greater attention was paid to history, economic and

---

[22] Johnson, H., Teaching of History, (London, 1960), p. 36.

[23] Butts, R.F., A Cultural History of Education, (New York, 1947), p. 429.

literary subjects.[24]

Still, it was left to the first twenty-five years of this century to make more progress in the teaching of history than was made in the foregoing one hundred years. In varying degrees, this is true of most European countries and America. Not till 1875, for example, did history in the United States have a major importance on the school curriculum. In 1863 certain French inspectors wanted to exclude history from the elementary instruction with excuses that it was impossible to teach, useless and injurious[25]. In Britain as late as 1921, history needed to be taught only between the ages five and fourteen if the authorities saw fit.[26] History fared little better in the universities where in the United States it was assumed till the early 1880's that any classical scholar could teach Latin and Greek history, that any cultivated gentleman could teach European history, and by the way American history was handled one might think that a knowledge of it was an innate idea[27].

In general, education in America was not as well organized as it was in Europe. This was due in part

---

[24] Monroe, P., A Brief Course in the History of Education, (New York, 1924), p. 376.

[25] Johnson, H., Teaching of History, (New York, 1960), p. 43-44.

[26] Butts, loc. cit., p. 567.

[27] Hall, G.S. (Editor), Methods of Teaching History, (Boston, 1902), p. 50.

to the fact that in both Canada and the United States there was, as to-day, no central authority and in part because American schools get all, whereas European schools have to cope with only the cream of the students. To-day there is in most countries with a good education system a ten to twelve-year history program which includes courses in national, European and ancient history. They are usually written with a political bias but with social and economic aspects woven skillfully into the body of the text. There is also a growing trend toward the history for schools being a history of civilization.[28] Any teacher appointed to teach history in to-day's high schools should certainly have more than one or two history credits behind him if he is to cope adequately with the present span of the secondary history curriculum. Keeping 'one jump ahead' of the students is not a very pleasant circumstance in which to find oneself.

Three aspects of history that ought to be in the possession of the teacher have been indicated: the philosophy of history, the history of historical writing and the history of history teaching. Another aspect concerns the problem of methods. How is the teacher going to conduct the history class so as to best achieve

---

[28] Johnson, loc. cit., p. 85.

the purposes of teaching history? There are so many approaches and methods with regard to teaching history. One general approach to the study of society is to cover, in a linear fashion, its five phases or threads: the political (military), religious, educational, industrial (economic) and the social. The secondary school usually deals with one of these, the political, but the teacher of history must continually weave other aspects, such as the social, around it. Eventually, the threads of history have to be woven into a connected whole, but the one separate thread has to be studied by itself to develop the historical imagination and the historical sense; perhaps a second thread need be studied alone. The danger is oversimplification.

Whatever the thread of history being taught, one is still confronted with the method of teaching. One method has already been mentioned, that is, the historical method. It has been covered separately and in some detail because there has to be conveyed to the pupil some understanding of how the historian goes about his task. For the other methods there are no definite rules. The teacher should know and ponder many good methods with their defects and merits. The age and aptitude of the pupil, and the period and purpose of the course will determine to a large extent the method.

These are not questions to be decided by the non-specialist. The teaching of history is an individual affair and "there are as many methods of teaching history as there are teachers of history"[29]. It is imperative that the teacher become familiar with all methods, then choose and adapt according to his situation. It is now generally accepted that no one fixed method or methods should be adhered to rigidly, but rather that variety seems to produce the best results.

The core of history teaching is the oral lesson, therefore the narrative method is of paramount importance. Unfortunately it is often carried to the extreme because teachers may be too fond of their own voices. The oral approach may take the form of a question and answer development of a topic or some form of lecture or other narrative approach. The greatest drawback to the lecture is that it may be an active process only on the part of the teacher; the student may have no chance for the development of independent judgement. There is just absorption and assimilation with no scope for his creative faculty and no way to use his curiosity[30]. The purpose of the narrative method is to supplement the text, to make real in the minds of the students the

---

[29] Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, The Teaching of History, (Cambridge, 1961), p. 60.

[30] American Historical Association, The Study of History in Schools, (New York, 1906), p. 190-191.

memorized facts and events by showing why they occurred, to clarify a difficult topic, to awaken interest in unattractive topics, and to give suggestions that will aid the student in doing his own reading. It is not to be used to supply information the student can find for himself.

In searching out information the pupil should be always guided by a specific topic, either chosen by himself with the teacher's approval or assigned by the teacher. Whichever it is, the topic should have certain qualities: it must be one that can be isolated from the main body of history; it must have historical value;it must have the quality of novelty, and it must suggest questions that can be answered[31]. The subject must not be vague, confusing, trivial or unimportant. Such points are those on which only the experienced teacher will be able to make the final decision. The teacher should also give source material and a bibliography so as to prevent the waste of time on the part of the student in searching for information. This is likewise a task of the well-trained teacher.

The teacher should never concentrate on the present course and neglect what went before or fail to relate the history program to other fields or areas; for example, the teacher can relate the history of the home

---

[31] Crump, C.G., History and Historical Research, (London, 1928), p. 36.

district to the broader field of history. The study of a local industry can be taken as part of a study of the Industrial Revolution. Any other incident in local history that will liven the work and quicken the imagination should be used as it will provide the concrete detail so necessary to make general history a reality. There should be constant reference made to previously learned facts and dates during each lesson because our knowledge of history is based on the integration of a multitude of facts. The historical novel and biography can be used to this end because they give background to the period under study. History can also be related to the literature and geography programs with the co-operation of these subject teachers. The teacher of history should be ever conscious of relating the familiar to the unfamiliar, and of developing history as a core subject on the curriculum.

History will not fulfill its function as a central subject, unless every effort is made to ensure that it is vested with an air of reality. The teacher has a duty to make himself familiar with all available aids with which to bring this semblance of reality into the classroom. Such aids include the text and its illustrations, diagrams, charts, models, pictures, films, filmstrips, blackboards, posters, casts, maps and relics.

Visits to historic sights, museums, churches, etc., also aid to recapture some of the reality of the past. It must be remembered that models and pictures are aids to visualization, not substitutes for reality; therefore their use should be followed by critical discussion by the teacher and students. The duty of the teacher is to bring the right picture at the right moment; too many illustrations should not be used as they will confuse the student's impressions. It should be a foregone conclusion that for history teaching a special room is needed in order to create an atmosphere with permanent maps, pictures and models. Unfortunately, there still exists, even in new schools, the expedient policy of having the teachers move from class to class thereby reducing the historical atmosphere to almost nil.

One of the phases of history teaching that requires considerable skill is testing. Ideally, history questions should be so worded that they stimulate thought; those which merely require the reproduction of the text or notes should be avoided. Examinations must be so worded that the pupil is forced to compare, to make inferences, to give causes and results, to select essentials from masses of facts and to arrange facts in order. No more than one-third of the exam should be based on memory work; the rest should test the ability to do tasks

such as the interpretation of maps, pictures, and diagrams, the analysis of paragraphs, the finding of material, the solving of simple critical problems, the discovery of resemblance, etc.[32] The setting of examinations which will achieve these ends is not an easy endeavour and requires teachers with a good background in history.

---

[32]Johnson, loc. cit., p. 428.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS LEADING TO SPECIALIZATION

In the preceding pages the necessity of having well-trained history teachers in high school classrooms was emphasized. In this chapter there will be outlined suggestions to ensure teacher specialization, not only in the field of history, but in all secondary school subjects. No one of the suggested changes can be considered more important than another, because together they form a composite picture of education, the product of which should be the professional, specialized teacher. Due to the human element with its individual differences no outcome can be guaranteed, but the chances of moulding the history teacher portrayed in the last two chapters are more probable if the following changes were made.

It is difficult to know just where to begin in outlining a plan to improve the calibre of teachers, especially in a system where teachers are trained and employed with little regard for specialization. Probably the geographical location of the teachers' college is as good a starting point as any; it certainly is the one most difficult to change because of the financial burden involved. It seems to have been the custom in the past to place teachers' colleges in small towns or otherwise

removed from any physical connection with a university. The result has been that the intellectual atmosphere of a teachers' college may be little more than that of a glorified high school. The professors are ex-elementary and high school teachers (in some cases too long ago), the students are fresh out of high school, and the teaching focuses on children, all of which is conducive to an ingrowing point of view. In a situation such as this there is little intellectual stimulation for the student or the professor. Even if the college has the future elementary teachers for only one or two years, should they not be given some glimpse of the higher rungs of the educational ladder? Using a university library and constant association with students from other faculties could be nothing but a rewarding experience for the future teacher because he "rubs shoulders with students whose professional and vocational aims are quite different, exchanges ideas with them in lecture-hall and in student organizations, plays on the same teams and shares in the same activities"[1]. If a teacher is to bring to his students some understanding of "a scholarly outlook and a disciplined mind"[2] he must have experienced them himself. This experience and

---

[1] Peterson, L.R., "The Major Function of a College of Education", Education Bulletin, (March, 1957), p. 14.

[2] Tomkins, G.S., "A Progressive Programme of Teacher Education", The Teachers' Magazine, (February, 1962), p. 8.

outlook is often difficult to acquire from attendance at many of our teachers' colleges. J.S. Mills explains this when he writes, "In order to educate learned men and women for a learned profession, their educational experience must be had within the main system of higher learning and not in an isolated situation separated from the basic intellectual discipline"[3]. A professional education, he continues, can only be acquired by "constant contact of the student in a particular field with those in training for other professions"[4]. This "integration of teachers-in-training with the general student body of the University should be an important factor in producing well-balanced graduates"[5]. Mills goes on to say, "When we segregate our students from each other, we deny them perhaps the richest opportunity that we have for their general maturation and growth"[6].

Before continuing any further concerning how to improve teacher training by securing greater specialization, it is necessary to discuss the purpose of a teachers' college. It would seem that teachers' colleges have the responsibility of training teachers in pedagogy,

---

[3]Mills, J.S.,"Educating Teachers as Professionals", The Journal of Higher Education, (April, 1957), p.182.

[4]Ibid., p. 183.

[5]Peterson, loc. cit., p. 14.

[6]Mills, loc. cit., p. 184-185.

i.e. in the art of teaching. Their task is not to employ professors to give straight courses in history, English or the sciences. For this purpose, there exist the various faculties at the university. A teachers' college teaches, not science, but how to teach science; not literature, but how to teach literature.[7] The head of the university history department has the duty to secure good men who can lecture in a scholarly manner to students who have an interest in history as a subject of study. The history professors at large universities are scholars of a high degree and in certain cases, historians of some note. It is from them that the future teacher secures his specialized knowledge of history as an important branch of man's knowledge. This is the work of any university, but not of the teachers' college. At the latter the student should learn, besides some general principles of education, to adapt his specialized knowledge to the requirements of the classroom. In other words the professor of education merely takes over from the professors in other faculties; however, they do not further his historical knowledge, but instead present it in a new light or from a new perspective. Any educational institution which becomes involved in teaching regular arts and science subjects as well as its courses in education,

---

[7] Carmichael, P.A., "Troubles in the Pedagogical Closed Shop", The Journal of Higher Education, (January, 1959), p. 37.

will end up doing poorly one or the other or, more probably, both. When normal schools model themselves after the liberal arts colleges they compress "a wide variety of subjects and professional courses which dilute the collegiate curriculum and make it more difficult to maintain high academic standards"[8]. No educational institution can serve two masters; it is up to undergraduate colleges by their arts and science degrees to give an education in the liberal arts and to the graduate school to give the professional training. For the degreed future secondary school teachers, the education faculty or the teachers' college is the graduate school.

The student who will eventually find himself in a secondary school should not be admitted to the teachers' colleges till he has completed his specialized training, i.e. not till after he has received his degree. The only exception might be a person who has done three years of undergraduate work and who for economic or personal reasons (other than low academic standing) cannot continue at university at the present time. Such a student could be admitted to the college for his professional training with the understanding that within a limited time he would have to complete his final university year. To-day, secondary school

---

[8]Woodring, P., "The Future of the Teachers College", The Journal of Teacher Education, (September, 1960), p. 341.

teachers usually receive their academic preparation in a university and upon graduation take a one year course of professional studies in a university department or training college[9]. Not only should secondary school teachers have this firm academic background but also they should possess a study concentration, such as a major in history, in one or at most two related fields before they can be admitted to the teachers' college. It is the duty of the teachers' college to oversee the undergraduate curriculum of future teachers to ensure adequate specialization. If there is no specialization, upon what is the teachers' college going to build? To teach, one must have an understanding of what is to be taught, that is of some subject field; unfortunately, this is far from true in many parts of North America; for example, only 66% of the social-science teachers in California high schools have undergraduate majors in their teaching subjects[10]. Without this subject major, upon what does the professor of pedagogy hang his methods or techniques and theories? "A teacher, whether a school teacher or a college professor, and whether a progressive or a conservative, has the business of inculcating knowledge. This may require pedagogical

---

[9]Kandel, I.L., The New Era in Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955), p. 339.

[10]Bartky, J.A., "The School of Education and the University", The Journal of Higher Education, (May, 1955), p. 257.

techniques up to a point; but beyond that the subject must speak, and what it says, and how effectively it says it, depends heavily on the degree and character of the teacher's knowledge, for which no technique is a substitute. Where the teacher has good knowledge of his subject, it may generate a technique of its own"[11].

It is argued, by those who advocate that the teachers' college should teach future teachers their academic subjects with their professional training, that early education courses make the following courses more meaningful. This may be true, but should the subject courses be approached from any one point of view? Should they not be more liberal? In a typical teachers' college granting an arts degree, the "courses have been tailored more to the demands of graduate and professional schools than to the ends of freeing the mind and expanding the horizons"[12]. The education faculty should give only professional training, as the medical and law faculties do. If some introduction to the problems and needs of education would be advantageous to the future secondary teacher as he pursues his undergraduate work, then the education faculty could require that its future students take a course in pedagogy in

---

[11]Carmichael, loc. cit., p. 38.

[12]Woodring, loc. cit., p. 341.

their first or second years. Such a course would acquaint them with their chosen career, but for the time being would be just another academic course. Thus, an insight into a new field would be achieved without monopolizing the remainder of the undergraduate curriculum.

The chief criticisms encountered from surveys of students at teachers' colleges contain such statements as "too much theory", "something more practical", "something we can use"[13]. Just what is something that could be taught to student teachers that could be used? It would have to be of a practical application or use in the classroom. There are two obvious areas of study which will provide answers to these criticisms: subject matter and how to handle the subject matter. "It is inconceivable that a program of teacher education would not be vitally concerned with subject matter in the sense of the content which the teacher must teach to his students"[14]. As has been pointed out above, the teachers' college should show its concern for subject matter by requiring that students entering upon their professional training have a good academic background in one or two related fields. This leaves to the teachers' college

---

[13] Prewett, C., "The 'Theoretical' Versus the 'Practical' in Teacher Education", The School Review, (November, 1955), p. 480.

[14] Lieberman, M., Education as a Profession, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958), p. 207.

the task of instructing the student teachers how to handle the high school subject courses. In the classroom one has both teacher and pupils, but the relationship of one to the other comes into play chiefly through the continuous daily subject lessons. If a student is to be developed and educated the teacher's chief tool is the curriculum. It is the task of the teachers' college to "bridge the gap between the formal preparation which the prospective teacher receives and his task of teaching or guiding students"[15] within a particular area of the curriculum. The teacher must be concerned with what is taught and who is taught; the teacher who claims that he is teaching children instead of subject matter is confusing the who with the what; a teacher who does not teach subject matter of some kind would be a teacher of nothing[16]. It would appear that the subject is the means the teacher has of getting to the pupil and vice versa; it is this means which is often neglected in the teachers' colleges.

Today student teachers take such courses as the History of Education, the Philosophy of Education, the Psychology of Education, Modern Methods in Education, etc., but seldom are they given a chance to

---

[15]Fischler, A.S., "The Methods Course and Why?", The Journal of Teacher Education, (June,1961), p. 201.

[16]Lieberman, loc. cit., p. 201.

concentrate on a course such as How to Teach History in a Secondary School. Such courses as those on the philosophy, history and psychology of education are often too far removed from the classroom situation; therefore the teacher finds it nearly impossible to relate theory to practice. It is little wonder that a student complains, "I have felt the waste and senselessness of hours spent in required education courses, treating such matters as 'Building Better Bulletin Boards' - which could have been spent in history or language classes. We were repeatedly told that it did not matter what topic or area of work we chose to present to our students, so long as they were interested, so long as they learned to co-operate and work together in a group"[17]. The practical aspects of relating the academic fields to the classroom situation seem to have been forgotten in an over-emphasis on vague or irrelevant courses in methodology and general education.

Opinions concerning the theoretical and practical aspects of teacher training courses vary. Many education professors on the one hand claim it is not the lack of knowledge in the teaching field as much as the lack of understanding of the needs of the pupil that result in poor teachers; in other words the theory is

---

[17]Marsh, J.F., "A Critique of American Higher Education", Journal of Higher Education, (June, 1959), p. 316.

more important.[18] Bestor, at the other extreme, considers that, except for a course or two in teaching methods and techniques, the work in professional education is a detriment to the public school teacher[19]. Other educationalists ignore the quality of education courses and want more of them. The president of one of the South's largest teachers' colleges feels that more subject matter usually results in teaching over the children's heads[20]. Such opinions as this latter one come in for a lot of criticism from those educationalists who believe that a good teacher does have to know, and know well, the subject he teaches. There is no question that theory can and does "become so far removed from real problems that it becomes meaningless in their solution"[21]. Such courses have an added danger as pointed out by Seymour Gross of the University of Notre Dame, who writes, "It is no secret that education courses are practically devoid of subject matter, and that near-failing students can get straight A's in education courses, and that many bright students have turned away from teaching careers" because of the

---

[18] Lieberman, loc. cit., p. 199.

[19] Ibid., p. 186.

[20] Hill, E., "Have Our Teachers' Colleges Failed?", The Saturday Evening Post, (November 11, 1961), p. 31.

[21] Borrowman, M.L., The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education, (New York, 1956), p. 22.

educational requirements.[22]

What is the solution? Do the colleges stop teaching the philosophy and history of education to their future secondary school teachers and concentrate on courses dealing with the students specialization? Will theory be thrown out in favour of the more practical? The solution would seem to lie along a path which combines the theoretical and the practical. Earlier in this thesis I stated that any account of educational progress in general or in a particular field like history, must be in part a history of man's progress; a history of history teaching could not but include to some extent a history of education itself. Could not a philosophy of education be also taught through the changing philosophy of history? It would appear that the purpose of the philosophy and history of education on the college course is to give the teacher some understanding of the development of educational thought and practice; this survey would be more significant and have more lasting value to the student if it were done through his specialization.

Earlier the importance of the historical method to historians and in the classroom was pointed out; there is no reason why the history of historical writing could not be included in the above survey for the history specialist. Therefore, in the one course, which has

---

[22]Marsh, loc. cit., p. 315.

replaced at least two previous ones, the student would secure an insight into the history of history teaching, the philosophy of history, and the history of historical writing. At the same time he could not help but acquire an understanding of the various other phases of education throughout the ages. How bare seems a course in the history of education with reference to no particular subject! How much more rewarding to study the Greeks from the point of view of Plato, the philosopher, Thucydides, the historian, and the Sophists, the teachers, and so on to the present, not in different courses and without any unifying factor, but with reference to history. There is no subject for which such a procedure could not be followed. The course is not just theory divorced from the practical, because it is furthering the student's knowledge and understanding in a branch of learning for which he has already shown an interest and done extensive work. That background in history, or any other subject, is being supplied which is so important to the teacher if he is going to enter the classroom equipped with more than just a chronological table and list of events.

Another theoretical course that commonly occurs on the teachers' college curriculum is the methods course. Just what this becomes when divorced from a particular subject is hard to imagine. To try to cover all subjects

in such a course would be like trying to paint six or seven landscapes at the same time on the same surface. "Since the general methods course has been found to be of little value, at some time the future teacher must learn how to use his subjects for instructive purposes"[23]. Here lies the chief task of the staff of the teachers' college which has committed itself to training high school specialists - to have intensive methods courses for each of the major high school subjects. In training secondary school teachers it is not the task of the professor to give straight academic courses in the student's specialization, but at the same time it might be profitable to teach a methods course in history by covering the history of some period or country. The area of history would be studied for the purpose of illustrating in action the methods and techniques of teaching history. While this experience would probably increase the student's insight into historical material it would not concern itself with adding to his factual knowledge of history. If the course were related to the high school curriculum of the particular province, then during the term the student teacher would be able to collect teaching aids, bibliographies, source material, etc., that would be of great use when he takes over his first history classes. Again let it be emphasized that the chief purpose of such a

---

[23]Kandel, loc. cit., p. 327.

course is the illustration of methods. The classroom periods would be used for teaching practice, discussion, as well as the professor's lessons. The subject matter is merely the medium.

This is only one suggestion as to how the methods course could be handled so that it would provide the type of experience needed in preparation for actual classroom situations. Whatever the approach to teaching the methods course, one factor must not be forgotten - the teaching ability of the professor. George Tomkins writes of the professor of methods courses in British Columbia, "Most important of all, in his presentations, he must avoid a purely didactic lecture-type approach. In short, his own teaching methods should reflect the kind of teaching that his course advocates"[24]. It is only in this way that the methods course will not just hang in the air, but will become something the student can use.

In the methods courses, as in all classes, the professor should use only techniques which the students themselves can copy and which are intended to be examples. In any course, ranging from the specialized subject techniques to educational psychology, the professor is teaching how to teach, not in words alone, but by example. In fact the whole college program "must be consistent in

---

[24]Tomkins, G.S., "A Progressive Programme of Teacher Education", The Teachers' Magazine, (February, 1962), p. 9.

that theory, principles and practice are taught within the same framework or methodology that is promulgated for its students"[25]. In other words, the teachers' college must practice what it preaches. This is essential because, "Man is by nature an imitative being, and the college of education ought to be at least one place on a university campus where the teaching candidate experiences a type of methodology which is safe to imitate"; too often the teaching methods used by students are the poor ones, rather than the good ones learned from his teachers[26].

There remain at least two other subjects which should be included in the curriculum of the student teacher; they are educational psychology and contemporary or comparative education. The latter course could include the student's provincial educational organization and history as its core, and then branch out to include those of other provinces and countries. To this also could be added local school law and other aspects of administration. It seems unnecessary to give classes in how to fill out the class register, report cards, etc., because these anyone with common sense can do. If the student teacher does not have common sense, a course will not help anyway.

---

[25] Statler, E., "Some Principles for Teacher Education", The Journal of Teacher Education, (March, 1962), p. 17.

[26] Ibid.

This suggested college curriculum differs only in approach from those found elsewhere. Usually, the courses dealing with the history and philosophy of education are separated from the subject matter specialization; that is, they are not taught around a core subject as advocated above. However, the emphasis on subject specialization is an important part of teacher training in many parts of the world. For example, secondary school teachers in Britain, France and Russia take a methods course in their specialization; teachers to the lycées are selected by way of a competitive exam of the highest standard in the special subjects that the candidates wish to teach[27]. From the outset, it would appear that these countries feel very strongly that the prospective teacher must have a knowledge of the content area in which he will be expected to teach.

Who should be teaching teachers? The obvious answer seems to be other good teachers. There are two basic prerequisites to good teaching: knowledge of the subject matter and the ability to teach. Just how effective is a teacher who possesses great knowledge but lacks the ability to impart that knowledge to others or conversely who knows all the methods but has a shallow background in the subject matter?[28] Therefore, just

---

[27]Kandel, loc. cit., p. 352.

[28]Croskery, G. and Nason, G., ed., Canadian Conference on Education, (Ottawa, 1958), p. 516.

any high school teacher would not necessarily qualify for a post of a teacher of teachers, nor would just any degreed individual. Here is no place to discuss all the theoretical qualities of a good teacher nor the qualities necessary for good teaching, but let it be assumed that an excellent teacher in action can be recognized. No teacher of teachers should ever be considered who has not proven himself in the classroom as a good teacher; he must show that he can teach by example the best in teaching methods. Nevertheless a high degree of teaching ability is not all that is required; the professor at a teachers' college must also have a good background in some academic field such as history. No professor should be teaching in a field with which he is not thoroughly familiar. Thus everyone appointed to the staff of a teachers' college must "first be a teacher of distinction who can demonstrate efficiently with the school class in front of an observing group of students" and he must have a "meritorious academic background"[29].

At least five years in a secondary school teaching one's specialization should be a minimum requirement before becoming a teacher of teachers. Unfortunately, in Canada, out of 799 teachers college instructors reporting in a survey, 9% had had no work experience other than

---

[29] Scarfe, N.V., "The Function of Schools and Teacher Training Institutions", Education Bulletin, (March, 1957), p. 29.

in teacher training[30] and only 86% ever possessed a teachers' certificate[31]. This practical training period of five years should not be extended too long because the law of diminishing returns might come into play; the individual may not be able to adjust from teaching high school students to teaching college students. Here we have another common criticism of our teachers' colleges, but in an inverse manner: in many cases the professors have been too long out of the high school classroom and have lost contact with it. Is there any solution? If there is, it is not sending the professors back to the high school for a one or two year stint; nor is this problem solved when, as an inspector of student teaching, the professor visits a set number of schools and rates a set number of students. Just as there is co-operation with the local education authorities in having student teachers take over classrooms during set times throughout the year, why could there not be also some arrangement for the professor to work in the high school? He could lessen the regular teacher's work load or act as a substitute teacher. If education faculties follow the regular university year by beginning late in September and ending some time in May, there is ample time for the professor to work in a school classroom for three or four weeks. Teachers' colleges which follow more closely

---

[30]Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Teacher Training Institutions, (No. 62, 1953), p. 19.

[31]Ibid., p. 17.

the school calendar could arrange a professor's schedule so that a month of the term could be set aside for his high school reorientation. It is by no means suggested that this be done by each professor every year. Maybe one such assignment every five years would serve the purpose. It is highly probable that after a fifteen to thirty year gap, the professor of education is not as familiar with the classroom situation as he should be. Undoubtedly, teachers are apt, like other professionals, to fall into routine ways and to perpetuate practices without any justification other than that they have used them for a long time[32]. This might be avoided if the professors work in the high schools from time to time.

Another area where there is room for improvement is in the quality of post graduate degrees in education. These degrees are important because the chief qualification for acceptance to a teacher training institution staff is the masters or doctoral degree in education. There is very little scope for deep study in this post graduate education without overlapping into another department such as psychology. But even when this is done, since the student may have little undergraduate psychology, an extensive study is impossible. The result is a "conglomeration of formal study in how to operate a free lunch program, driver education,

---

[32]Kandel, I.L., The New Era in Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955), p. 376.

method in teaching and the supervision of janitors"[33]. High school teachers often cannot get into the graduate schools of their subjects because they do not have the qualifications. They turn to the graduate school of education and major in education administration, an area of training in which they have no interest and which is of no worth to them in so far as their job performance is concerned; therefore, the schools of education are cluttered with teachers who have no need for more education courses, but who do need a master of arts degree[34]. A solution seems to be a closer relationship between post graduate degrees in education and the teacher's specialization. In addition, there could also be a degree for those who are, or will be upon graduation, supervisors, inspectors, or administrators. To have such a degree would require the co-operation of other faculties, because the education department could not be expected to handle all the areas. The purpose of a post graduate degree, besides extending one's knowledge, should be to activate thinking. If one is going to have theories in education, or any other field, they are going to be of the most benefit and probably sounder, if they are related to a specific interest area, not just to education in general.

---

[33] Hill, E., "Have Our Teachers' Colleges Failed?", The Saturday Evening Post, (November 11, 1961), p. 94.

[34] Bartky, J.A., "The School of Education and the University", The Journal of Higher Education, (May, 1955), p. 257.

The responsibility of securing professors who are competent in teaching methods in history, and in other subjects, ultimately rests on the education faculty or the teachers' college. If with the faculty of history there is a professor who is qualified to give a course or courses in history as outlined above which involve methods and historiography, there is no reason why he cannot teach methods to student teachers. Such a professor would have to be, as has already been pointed out, a proven teacher with a good academic background and an interest in methodology and teacher training. His work would be in close co-operation with the education faculty which would co-ordinate all teacher training. However, it matters little to which faculties the specialists in pedagogy are attached; the important thing is that the students are learning from them. When no such individuals exist in the university departments or, if the college is physically removed from a university, then it is the duty of those in charge of teacher training to obtain the lacking specialists. Under no circumstances must the methods course in history, or any other subject for that matter, be given to just anyone in the history department whose timetable has the proper number of gaps or who is the unfortunate individual whose turn it is this year to carry the cross of teaching student

teachers. Unless method specialists are obtained for all the basic subjects, the teachers' college or education faculty is not a real center of teacher training, it is just masquerading as one.

Who has the responsibility of ensuring that the above recommendations are put into effect? There will never be results achieved in education to justify its importance and cost as long as anyone other than educators controls most facets of the profession, especially as regards curriculum, teacher qualification, working conditions, aims and teacher training. No matter what policy is decided upon in today's education, it is upon the classroom teacher that the responsibility to implement it rests; therefore, it is the teacher who should share in making the policy. Teachers' organizations should have a voice in the control of licensing after certification and in the determining of education programs at all levels[35]. However, this responsibility cannot be assumed as long as the teachers are not competent and their chances of competence are lessened if, to begin with, they are not properly trained. When there are faults in an education system it is often the teacher who is most aware of them and who has to try to do his job under their handicaps. Education, more than any other profession, has its destiny partly or completely out of the hands of its members.

---

[35] Croskery and Nason, loc. cit., p. 533-534.

For example, in the United States "the control of public normal schools and teachers colleges is in the hands of state boards of laymen" who are concerned with the general problems of education and personnel[36]. If there were greater co-operation between the administrators of the education systems and the teacher many of the problems could be erased. But how do political appointees on an education board and the classroom teacher see eye to eye? Upon what grounds do they meet?

It is not suggested that the financial and political networks connected with the provisional cabinets and local boards be in the hands of teachers. These areas are for experts in another field and are only the means by which the aims and principles of education are put into effect. It is these aims and principles which should be in the hands of people very closely connected with education, as should also be the supervision of the day-to-day running of the system. At a recent meeting of educators in Montreal one speaker, a Mr. Aitchison of British Columbia, made quite clear the need of teachers to take on a greater role in forming and carrying-out of educational policy. In one instance he referred to the "pious generalities" which are drafted by people at the top of the educational hierarchy and with which the

---

[36]Kandel, loc. cit., p. 362.

teacher feels no identification[37]. Many educators spend much precious time, both privately and at conferences, discussing the universal aim of educating without realizing that there cannot be a universal aim of education "since it is always adapted to the culture pattern of a community"[38]. Mr. Aitchison goes on to point out that the teachers must assume greater responsibility within their profession and stop accepting direction, especially direction which they know to be against the principles of education.

In recent years the teacher's role in education in the United States has improved because of the growing closer relations between the administration officials and teachers, which has resulted in the latter being increasingly called upon to participate in curriculum making and in determining educational policy[39]. A heightened interest in teacher education on the part of the teachers may point the way past present sterile controversies over "subject matter" versus "method", controversies which often concern the college professors much more than they do teachers[40]. If any education system

---

[37]Desbarats, P., "Pious Views Anger Teacher", The Montreal Star, (March 6, 1962), p. 23.

[38]Kandel, I.L., The New Era in Education, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955), p. 372.

[39]Ibid., p. 363.

[40]Lieberman, M., Education as a Profession, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958), p. 213.

has faults, in the last resort it remains up to the teachers to see that they are corrected, but,unless they can assume responsibility, education will continue to be dominated by individuals with no clear understanding of education's basic concepts and needs.

Alongside the classroom teachers, there are others who must bear the blame for an education system's defects and these are those educators who are on the staff of the teachers' colleges and universities. If the professors of a teachers' college have any concern for their profession and all who are in it, how can they continue year after year to work in a system which ignores some of education's most basic concepts. They see secondary school teachers sent out to high schools with no subject specialization; they know that teachers have a one to two year training span less than teachers from nearby provinces; they know that teachers are often employed by quantity with little or no regard for subject preferences or training; and so,on it goes. As long as the professors and teachers refuse to take a stand and work together to control their professional destiny, there will always be others who will gladly dictate, oblivious of their ignorance.

After all that has been said about the need for specialists, perhaps it would be appropriate to look at

some other views on the results that one might expect from well-trained teachers. "Teachers who 'know their stuff' and who are happy in their teaching are infinitely more apt to gain the respect of boys and girls and much more apt to influence pupils to take an interest in their studies than those teachers who have only a limited knowledge of the subjects they are teaching"[41], writes G.E. Carrothers. The same author continues, "When teachers are students in their teaching fields along with their pupils, they become the best deterrents to truancy and deliquency any community can command"[42]. G. Highet adds, "A teacher must believe in the value and interest of his subject as the doctor believes in health. The neglect of this principle is one of the chief reasons for the bad teaching that makes pupils hate school and universities and turn away from valuable fields of knowledge"[43]. These views may be considered extreme, but they hit directly at one neglected phase of our education today, the failure of our teachers' colleges to turn out adequately trained professional people; the teachers' colleges fail to recognize in their practice that professionals emerge only when there is developed, as a result of prolonged and specialized subject matter preparation, a

---

[41]Carrothers, G.E., "Professional Teacher Education Riding a Flood Tide", School and Society, (May 25, 1957), p. 180.

[42]Ibid., p.181.

[43]Highet, G., The Art of Teaching, (New York, 1950), p. 15.

body of knowledge on which teaching principles and techniques are based[44]. Many institutions are "graduating teachers who know all about teaching but almost nothing about what to teach"[45].

As a final summary let it be stressed that first, and most necessary of all, the teacher must know his subject. He must know what he teaches. This sounds obvious, yet it is not always practiced. It means that, if a teacher's job is teaching history, he must know history; but it is not enough for the history teacher to know just the amount of history which is taught in schools and required for the final examinations. He must really understand the subject history. Its upper regions must be clear to him, at least in outline, because one cannot understand even the rudiments of a subject without knowing its higher levels, certainly not well enough to teach it. Also, a teacher must be prepared to answer the pupil's questions, and who knows how much knowledge a child will want or to what inner depths of the subject his questions will penetrate? A teacher's limited knowledge of the material will stir few imaginations and soon will extinguish further questions. If a boy shows a gift for history,

---

[44]Kandel, loc. cit., p. 325.

[45]Hill, loc. cit., p. 31.

the specialist must be able to encourage him by throwing open window after window into the future, showing him what he can learn at university, pointing out which big problems still remain to be solved, and (this is always important) showing how the great historians of the past and present have lived and worked[46].

---

[46] Highet, loc. cit., p. 12 - 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS CONSULTED OR CITED

1. American Historical Association. The Study of History in Schools. New York, 1906.

2. Barnes, Harry E. A History of Historical Writing. Norman, Oklahoma, 1937.

3. Barnes, Harry E. An Intellectual and Cultural History of the Western World. New York, 1937.

4. Barnes, Mary S. Studies in Historical Method. Boston, 1904.

5. Bartky, John A. "The School of Education and the University". The Journal of Higher Education. XXVI, (May, 1955), pp. 254-259.

6. Barzum, Jacques and Graff, Henry F. The Modern Researcher. New York, 1957.

7. Beard, Charles A. The Discussion of Human Affairs. New York, 1936.

8. Beard, Charles A. "Written History as an Act of Faith". American Historical Review. 39, (January, 1934), pp. 219-231.

9. Bloch, Marc. The Historian's Craft. New York, 1953.

10. Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Education. New York, 1956.

11. Boyd, William. History of Western Education. London, 1954.

12. Breasted, James H. "The Beginnings of Time-Measurement and the Origins of our Calendar". Time and Its Mysteries. New York, 1936, pp. 59-94.

13. Butts, R. Freeman. A Cultural History of Education. New York, 1947.

14. Carmichael, Peter A. "Troubles in the Pedagogical Closed Shops". The Journal of Higher Education. XXX, (January, 1959), pp. 37-39.

15. Carr, Edward H. What is History? London, 1961.

16. Carrothers, G.E. "Professional Teacher Education Riding a Flood Tide". School and Society. 85, (May, 1957), pp. 179-181.

17. Chapman, J.C. and Counts, G.S. Principles of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1924.

18. Childe, V. Gordon. Man Makes Himself. New York, 1951.

19. Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History. Oxford, 1946.

20. Compayré, Gabriel. The History of Pedagogy. London, 1907.

21. Croskery, George and Nason, Gerald (ed). Canadian Conference on Education. Ottawa, 1958.

22. Crump, C.G. History and Historical Research. London, 1928.

23. Cubberley, Ellwood P. The History of Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948.

24. Desbarats, Peter. "Pious Views Anger Teacher". The Montreal Star. (March 6, 1962), p. 23.

25. Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Teacher Training Institutions. No. 62. Ottawa, 1953.

26. Droysen, J.G. Principles of History, trans. E.B. Andrews. Boston, 1897.

27. Ducasse, Curt J. The Philosophy of Art. London, 1929.

28. Eby, Fredrick and Arrowood, Charles F. The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval. New York, 1940.

29. Fischler, Abraham S. "The Methods Course and Why?" The Journal of Teacher Education. XII, (June, 1961), pp. 201-204.

30. Fisher, Herbert A.L. "Modern Historians and their Methods". The Fortnightly Review. 56, (December, 1894), pp. 803-816.

31. Fling, Fred M. The Writing of History. New Haven, 1920.

32. Freeman, Edward A. Methods of History Study. London, 1886.

33. Garraghan, Gilbert J. A Guide to Historical Method. New York, 1946.

34. Gottschalk, Louis. Understanding History. New York, 1954.

35. Hall, G. Stanley (ed). Methods of Teaching History. Boston, 1902.

36. Highet, Gilbert. The Art of Teaching. New York, 1950.

37. Hill, Evan. "Have our Teachers Colleges Failed?" The Saturday Evening Post. 234, (November 11, 1961), p. 31.

38. Hillway, Tyrus. Introduction to Research. Boston, 1956.

39. Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools. The Teaching of History. Cambridge, 1961.

40. Inglis, Alexander. Principles of Secondary Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1918.

41. Johnson, Allen. The Historian and Historical Evidence. New York, 1930.

42. Johnson, Henry. Teaching of History. New York, 1929, and 1960.

43. Kandel, I.L. The New Era in Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1955.

44. Keatinge, Maurice. Studies in the Teaching of History. London, 1910.

45. Klapper, Paul. The Teaching of History. New York, 1926.

46. Langlois, Charles V. and Seignobos, Charles. Introduction to the Study of History. London, 1898.

47. Lewis, E.M. Teaching History in Secondary Schools. London, 1960.

48. Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1958.

49. Mace, W.H. Method in History. Boston, 1897.

50. Marsh, Joseph F. "A Critique of American Higher Education". The Journal of Higher Education. XXX, (June, 1959), pp. 313-319.

51. Mills, John S. "Educating Teachers as Professionals". The Journal of Higher Education. XXVIII, (April, 1957), pp. 179-185.

52. Mulhern, James. A History of Education. New York, 1946.

53. Muller, Herbert J. The Uses of the Past. New York, 1954.

54. Nevins, Allan. The Gateway to History. New York, 1938.

55. Nilsson, Martin. Primitive Time-Reckoning. Lund,1920.

56. Nordau, Max. The Interpretation of History. London, 1910.

57. du Noüy, Lecompte. Human Destiny. New York, 1956.

58. Oman, Charles. On the Writing of History. New York,1939.

59. Peterson, L.R. "The Major Function of a College of Education". Education Bulletin of the Faculty and College of Education Vancouver and Victoria. 1, (March, 1957), pp. 13-15.

60. Prewett, C. "The 'Theoretical' Versus the 'Practical' in Teacher Education". The School Review. LXIII, (November, 1955), pp. 480-482.

61. Renier,Gustaaf. History, its Purpose and Method. Boston, 1950.

62. Robinson, James H. The New History. New York, 1916.

63. Rossi, Mario M. A Plea for Man. Edinburgh, 1956.

64. Scarfe, N.V. "The Function of Schools and Teacher Training Institutions". Education Bulletin of the Faculty and College of Education Vancouver and Victoria. 1, (March, 1957), pp. 23-31.

65. Sheed,Francis J. (trans.). The Confessions of St. Augustine. London, 1951.

66. Shotwell, James T. Introduction to the History of History. New York, 1922.

67. Shotwell, James T. "Time and Historical Perspective". Time and Its Mysteries. New York, 1949, pp.63-91.

68. Statler, Ellsworth. "Some Principles for Teacher Education". The Journal of Teacher Education. XIII, (March, 1962),pp. 12-18.

69. Thompson, James W. A History of Historical Writing. New York,1942.

70. Tomkins, George S. "A Progressive Programme of Teacher Education". The Teachers' Magazine. XLII, (February, 1962), pp. 7-10.

71. Trevelyan, George M. "Bias in History". History. 32, (March, 1947), pp. 2-15.

72. Vincent, John M. Historical Research. New York, 1911.

73. Woodring, Paul. "The Future of the Teachers College". The Journal of Teacher Education. XI, (September, 1960), pp. 340-342.

74. Williams, C.H. The Modern Historian. London, 1938.

75. Wilson, P.W. The Romance of the Calendar. New York, 1937.