



Teaching History

A Journal of Methods

Volume 45 • No. 2 • Fall 2020

TEACHING HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF METHODS

openjournals.bsu.edu/teachinghistory

Editor: Sarah Drake Brown, Ball State University

Assistant Editor/Book Reviews Editor: Richard Hughes, Illinois State University

Publication Director: Chris Lovett, Emporia State University

Editorial Board

Brian Anton, Purdy R-II Schools, Missouri

Thomas Armstrong, Former President, Georgia Association of Historians

Charles Banner-Haley, Colgate University

Greta Bucher, United States Military Academy

C. David Dalton, College of the Ozarks

Elizabeth Lawrence, Augustana College

William Mugleston, Austin Community College

Laura Musselwhite, University of New Mexico at Valencia

Donn Neal, Retired Historian

Philip Nicolosi, West Morris Central High School, New Jersey

Pamela Riney-Kehrberg, Iowa State University

Randi Storch, SUNY Cortland

Advisory Board

Mark Konnert, University of Calgary

Oscar Lansen, University of North Carolina-Charlotte

Jodie Mader, Thomas More College

Ralph Menning, Kent State University at Stark

Russell Olwell, Merrimack College

R.B. Rosenburg, Clayton State University

Raymond Screws, Arkansas National Guard Museum

Julie Anne Taylor, University of Michigan-Dearborn

Additional support from Ball State University Libraries

About the Journal

Founded in 1975 by Stephen Kneeshaw, Loren Pennington, and Philip Reed Rulon and first published in 1976, *Teaching History's* purpose has been to provide teachers at all levels with the best and newest ideas for their classrooms. The journal is published twice yearly, in the spring and in the fall, and receives financial support from Ball State University.

Visit the website to submit a manuscript or to contact the editors. Authors retain copyright to their contributions but agree to license published content under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivates 4.0 License. **ISSN 0730-1383**

Volume 45 | No. 2 | Fall 2020

Articles

PREPARING TEACHERS TO TEACH THE LANGUAGE OF HISTORY 2

Stephanie Garrone-Shufan, Merrimack College

POLICY WRITING SIMULATIONS: PEDAGOGY, LEARNING OBJECTIVES, AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN THE CANADIAN HISTORY CLASSROOM 18

Thirstan Falconer, Independent Scholar & Zack MacDonald, St. Jerome's University

A Review Essay

DECOLONIZING THE CORPS OF DISCOVERY:
A COLLABORATIVE REVIEW OF *TEACHING CRITICALLY ABOUT LEWIS AND CLARK* 42

Richard Hughes, Illinois State University, Kelly Cornale, Minooka Community High School (IL), Amanda Nies, Longfellow Middle School (OK), & Evan Wilson, Maple Middle School (IL)

Book Reviews

Sam Wineburg, *Why Learn History (When It's Already on Your Phone)*
Fritz Fischer 50

Rafe Blaufarb and Liz Clarke, *Inhuman Traffick: The International Struggle against the Atlantic Slave Trade: A Graphic History*

Anthony Crubaugh 52

Nina Willner, *Forty Autumns: A Family's Story of Courage and Survival on Both Sides of the Berlin Wall*

Trevor Shields 55

David W. Blight and Jim Downs, eds., *Beyond Freedom: Disrupting the History of Emancipation*

Ron Gifford 57

Lynn Dumenil, *The Second Line of Defense: American Women and World War I*

Raymond D. Screws 60

George Takei, et al., *They Called Us Enemy*

Richard Hughes 62

PREPARING TEACHERS TO TEACH THE LANGUAGE OF HISTORY

Stephanie Garrone-Shufran

Merrimack College

“Language is not a garden tool for acting on inanimate objects but a medium for swaying minds and changing opinions, for rousing passions or allaying them.”

Samuel Wineburg¹

According to Robert Bain, history teachers “misunderstand and underestimate the comprehension challenges their students face” in interpreting the varied types of historical texts present in secondary classrooms, while devoting little time to actually teaching them how to engage with these texts.² History teachers’ perception of their identities as content area specialists may inhibit the incorporation of language instruction into their teaching practice.³ The responsibility for teaching language is seen as belonging solely to the previous year’s teachers or the faculty of the English department.⁴ This belief persists despite the move toward a more distributed responsibility for literacy instruction illustrated in the Common Core Standards.⁵ Educational linguists

1 Samuel Wineburg, “On the Reading of Historical Texts: Notes on the Breach Between School and Academy,” *American Educational Research Journal* 28, no. 3 (Fall 1991): 519.

2 Robert B. Bain, “Using Disciplinary Literacy to Develop Coherence in History Teacher Education: The Clinical Rounds Project,” *The History Teacher* 45, no. 4 (August 2012): 516.

3 Christianna Alger, “Engaging Student Teachers’ Hearts and Minds in the Struggle to Address (Il)literacy in Content Area Classrooms,” *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 50, no. 8 (May 2007): 620.

4 Bain, “Using Disciplinary Literacy,” 517.

5 George C. Bunch, Amanda Kibler, and Susan Pimentel, “Realizing Opportunities for English Learners in the Common Core English Language

suggest that content teachers, who are experts in their discipline, should view their students as apprentices who require training in all disciplinary practices, including language use and literacy skills.⁶

If history teachers will be responsible for the teaching of the language of history, then they will require training in how to do so. This training in the literacy practices of history needs to become an integral part of the preparation of preservice history teachers.⁷ This article uses case studies to describe the experiences of two aspiring history teachers as they considered how to teach the language of history, and it calls for concerted efforts among language/literacy experts, history educators who specialize in content methods, and historians.

Disciplinary Language

Preparing teachers of history to incorporate instruction in the language of history into their teaching practice is challenging. History teachers, both pre-service and in-service, are not aware of either how language functions to create meaning in texts or how language proficiency may inhibit access to the content taught in school. These challenges are not unique to preparing history teachers but apply to teacher preparation across the grade spans and disciplines. Since American schools no longer incorporate a systematic study of the English language in the K-12 curriculum, students enter post-secondary education with little foundational knowledge about the functions and features of language.⁸

Arts and Disciplinary Literacy Standards,” paper presented at the Understanding Language Conference, Stanford, CA, January 2012.

6 Zhihui Fang and Mary Schleppegrell, *Reading in Secondary Content Areas: A Language-Based Pedagogy* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2008), 9.

7 Bain, “Using Disciplinary Literacy,” 521.

8 Lily Wong Fillmore and Catherine E. Snow, “What Teachers Need to Know about Language,” (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 2000), 30.

Additionally, teachers in the United States tend to come from middle class, native English speaking homes; their educational experiences were never limited by their language proficiency, and their exposure to academic language in their homes accelerated their ability to use and understand the language of school.⁹

When students are learning history, they are being introduced to a new disciplinary language. The language of the history classroom is used to convey ideas about time, cause and effect, the interaction of present and past, and the relationships among people and their contexts.¹⁰ Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza identified language features used to create these meanings in history texts.¹¹ By analyzing the action verbs, as well as identifying the agents and the receivers of the actions, a reader can determine what events took place, who was involved in them, and what sorts of power dynamics were at play. Connectors, conjunctions, and temporal prepositional phrases are used to organize the text, setting up sequential or causal relationships.

Historians regard texts as parts of an argument, and as such, all texts are expected to be read critically to evaluate the argument's validity.¹² Evaluating the argument(s) of the text is accomplished through the processes of sourcing, contextualizing,

9 Alger, "Engaging Student Teachers' Hearts and Minds in the Struggle to Address (Il)lteracy in Content Area Classrooms," 621.

10 Suzanne Eggins, Peter Wignell, and J.R. Martin, "The Discourse of History: Distancing the Recoverable Past" in *Register Analysis: Theory and Practice*, ed. M. Ghadessy (London: Pinter, 1993), quoted in Mary Schleppegrell, *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004), 125.

11 Mary J. Schleppegrell, Mariana Achugar, and Teresa Oteiza, "The Grammar of History: Enhancing Content-Based Instruction through a Functional Focus on Language," *TESOL Quarterly* 38, no. 1 (Spring 2004): 87.

12 Cynthia Shanahan, Timothy Shanahan, and Cynthia Mischia, "Analysis of Expert Readers in Three Disciplines: History, Mathematics, and Chemistry," *Journal of Literacy Research* 43, no. 4 (2011): 419.

and corroborating.¹³ Sourcing involves evaluating the author's perspective and the evidence presented by the author. In contextualizing, historians situate texts as products of their time; the prevailing theories and controversies in the field at that time are also considered as the text is read. Corroborating texts requires that the reader compares evidence from multiple texts and considers the similarities and differences found. In order to successfully "think historically," students must recognize the features of language that create these intended meanings and use discipline-specific ways of interpreting these texts. In considering the points of view included in a text, locating the verbs that indicate saying, thinking, or feeling and analyzing who are the "sayers," "thinkers," or "feelers" provides information on the opinions expressed and whose opinions these are.¹⁴ Further examination of the messages included with these verbs allows a reader to compare the views and opinions expressed and to determine the multiple viewpoints presented on an event, issue, or theory.¹⁵

Training in Identifying the Language to Teach

As a doctoral student, I was asked to take charge of the design and implementation of a training module for preparing preservice teachers in a secondary education program to identify and teach the language of their disciplines. In these two-hour workshops, teacher candidates were taught a process for identifying the features of academic language present in their content area lessons and taught to name specifically in their lesson plans how they would teach the identified features to students. Due to the low numbers of teacher candidates seeking secondary education degrees, the workshops were designed to be delivered to teacher candidates in history, English, math, and the sciences at the

13 Wineburg, "Historical Texts," 510.

14 Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza, "The Grammar of History," 87.

15 Ibid.

same time. The workshops were conducted with small groups of teacher candidates so that they could receive individualized attention from the instructor.

Teacher candidates were instructed to bring to the training session a lesson plan which they had previously planned and taught. I modeled the process for identifying the language demands of their lessons using a sample lesson plan. First, we classified each instance in which students were asked to use or understand language in their lesson plans as a listening, speaking, reading, and/or writing demand. After determining the two most important language demands in the lesson, we named the language functions (such as *explain*, *describe*, *define*, and *compare*) that best described the tasks. Teacher candidates then decided what language features at the word, sentence, and discourse-level needed to be used in completing those tasks.¹⁶ Word-level features were categorized into two types: general academic words used across content areas and technical words used in a specific discipline. To describe sentence-level structures, teacher candidates engaged in a brainstorm to think about some of the features that are important to writing a correct sentence. Typical responses included verb forms or tenses, nouns, article use, commas, and periods. Discourse-level structures were defined as the amount and quality of language as well as coherence. The example provided was the typical paragraph structure taught to students: a topic sentence, three sentences that support the topic, and a concluding sentence. Finally, to reinforce the idea that teacher candidates were responsible for teaching these language features to students, they were shown both how to create specific language objectives naming these required features and how to explicitly describe how they would teach the features of language they identified in the lesson procedure section of their lesson plan.

¹⁶ WIDA, “2012 Amplification of the English Language Development Standards,” <https://wida.wisc.edu/resources/2012-english-language-development-standards>

While the training was not discipline-specific, teacher candidates practiced identifying features of academic language in lesson plans they had previously created; therefore, the history teacher candidates were engaging with language specific to teaching and learning in history classrooms.

To collect data on the impact of the training, I sought participants for a study on teacher candidates' identification and instruction of language features in various disciplines. While I did not set out to explore the impact of the training on history teachers specifically, four of the eight participants in the sample were aspiring history teachers. The teacher candidates consented to being observed teaching one lesson at their placement site and being interviewed about the planning and teaching of that lesson. They also submitted the lesson plan and related materials. The lesson planning materials, the implementations of the lessons, and the teacher candidates' reflections in the interviews were brought together to describe what features of the language of history they identified and how that language was taught to students during the lesson. Watching those four teacher candidates teach their lessons and then reflecting with them on their planning and teaching process confirmed for me the importance of teaching the language of history and provided me with insight on the challenges they faced in teaching that language.

Jill was a junior beginning her second of three required fieldwork experiences before she would begin her practicum. Hunter was a senior completing his third and final pre-practicum fieldwork experience. These case studies were chosen because they met two criteria. First, these teacher candidates reported planning their lessons on their own. One of the other history participants was not included because he admitted that he taught a lesson planned entirely by his supervising practitioner. The second criterion was that the teacher candidate taught a lesson in which the language of history was required for understanding or producing texts. The fourth history teacher candidate did teach

vocabulary words, but his lesson did not require that students understand or produce texts. The two case studies included in this article illustrate the important role that language plays in “doing” history and the difficulties encountered by the teacher candidates as they attempted to identify and incorporate the language of history in their lesson plans.

Jill: Analyzing World War I Poetry

Jill taught a lesson on identifying the tone and message of World War I poems. Her placement classroom was at a large suburban high school where over a third of the student population were classified as First Language Not English (FLNE). Jill reported receiving no help from her supervising practitioner; he told her to create a lesson on World War I poetry but offered no further guidance in planning the lesson. She planned for students to work in small groups to read and answer questions about one World War I poem and then share their answers with the whole class. Although there were different sets of questions for each poem, all groups were expected to name the tone of the poem, whether it was pro-war or anti-war, and what point of view the poem was told from. Other questions asked students to determine what message readers were meant to take away from the poem and whether that message was valid and reliable based on the author’s point of view.

Jill began her implementation of the lesson plan by showing the students a painting, then reading one poem with the students and asking them the types of questions that they would later answer in their groups:

So what do you think the poem is trying to say or the painting trying to say or the two of them together? These are two totally separate artists....So remember these are all points of view coming from different people in the war. So you’ll see as you read later on in class they’re not just soldiers. They’re people in families and people that had different positions in

war so keep that in mind. Keep point of view in mind when you're reading the poems.

She did not present the terms *validity* or *reliability* in this discussion or at any time during the lesson. The word *valid* appeared on one of the question sheets: "Given the poet's reputation for his feelings towards the war, do you think this poem is a valid representation of how most other people felt about the war?" Other questions hinted at the ideas of *validity* and *reliability*, asking students to evaluate whether a poem's message was "an accurate description of Americans' feelings" or whether the point of view expressed in a poem affected the audience's understanding.

In her reflection on the lesson, she said that students had difficulty determining if the poem was a "valid source." She recounted discussing with one student whether or not a poem written by doctor would be regarded as a valid source and how she wanted the student to understand that a doctor, as a respected member of society, would have been believed by others whether or not he was being honest. In reporting this conversation with the student, she cited the student's lack of understanding of how doctors are viewed in society as the root cause for his confusion. She did not seem to connect the student's difficulty in understanding the language, the use of the terms *valid* and *reliable* in this context, to the ability to appropriately answer the questions she had posed.

Hunter: Responding to the Attack on Fort Sumter

In Hunter's lesson, eleventh-grade students listened to a lecture on the events leading up to the attack on Fort Sumter. Then they were asked to write an executive memorandum in which they assumed the role of Abraham Lincoln and explained to the Cabinet the action that would be taken in response to the attack. Hunter struggled to identify any specific features of academic language to be used in these activities. He named

the language they needed to use “persuasive writing” and he described persuasive writing as “words or phrases that indicate their opinion on the subject.” Hunter admitted that he did not know what to identify as academic language. “You saw my ellipses, my dot, dot, dot. Even in my own head, like, ‘I don’t know what I’m doing here.’”

Early in his fieldwork placement, Hunter asked his supervising practitioner what she knew about academic language and found that it “was not as much her wheelhouse. Not really any support on that.” Conversely, he said that his university supervisor, a doctoral candidate with whom I had previously collaborated on research related to teacher candidates’ development of knowledge about language, was “a lot more in tune with academic language.” Hunter’s supervisor had provided him with detailed feedback on how to incorporate specific features of language into his lesson plan, asking for specific sentence stems or vocabulary words students should use to persuade. In the end, Hunter did not incorporate his supervisor’s suggestions into his lesson plan, because, as he explained, there was no accountability.

After the lecture, Hunter described the persuasive writing activity to students: “You’re going to take the position of the Cabinet member that I’m going to give you, and you are going to write [a] memo as if you are President Lincoln saying what action you’re going to take.” Hunter then presented two different sample memos. The first he showed on a Power Point slide. Using this memo from Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Hunter pointed out that a memo has “important things like where is it coming from, the date, the word *memorandum*, who’s it going towards, and then just specifically what we’re talking about and, of course, a nice signature at the bottom.” Then he wrote an example of a memo on the whiteboard. It was addressed to himself from “everyone” and it reminded him to move on to the activity because he was running out of time.

When Hunter assessed the memos that the students created,

he discovered that overall the groups had included the necessary elements; he attributed students' success to looking at the sample memo in the Power Point and also the fact that students had experience writing letters and emails, which contain some of the same elements as a memo. Evaluating the writing that the students had produced during the lesson helped Hunter to explain during his interview what he meant by "persuasive writing" in this context. "So persuasive writing in their memos - they're having to use evidence." He provided examples from the student work he had collected to demonstrate what he meant by using evidence to be persuasive: "Here's the example: 'Advice came to me by way of Mr. Chase, Secretary of the Treasury, who argued that' and then they did quote 'Fort Sumter should in my judgment be reinforced.' And then another one: 'I agree with Mr. Smith when he says, 'believing Fort Sumter can not be successfully defended, I agree its evacuation is a necessity.'"

The groups who were not as successful in their persuasive writing chose to paraphrase. According to Hunter, "That would probably necessitate a discussion to say that there are better ways. If you actually use someone's actual words, that's more powerful than paraphrasing their words." Hunter wanted students to use direct quotations and integrate them into their writing using a particular format, but he seemed unable to specifically name those features prior to teaching the lesson. Instead he focused on teaching them the structural elements of memos. Reflecting on the student work he collected and talking about what the good examples looked like provided him with an opportunity to dig deeper and think about the features of language that he believed made up "persuasive writing" in this instance.

Incorporating the Language of History into Teaching Practice

Jill and Hunter both engaged students in activities that required the understanding and use of the language of history.

Students were not being asked to recall and restate facts but instead interact with their peers to complete targeted reading and writing tasks that involved historical texts. The language demands of these two lessons did illustrate the importance of sourcing, contextualizing, and corroboration in doing history. Jill's analysis of World War I poetry asked students to evaluate sources and, when groups discussed the different poems, they would discover whether evidence to support claims was present across multiple sources. Hunter's memo writing activity asked students to place themselves in a specific historical context and to consider the arguments made in that time and place by the historical figures involved.

However, their experiences also illustrate the challenges that history teachers face when asked to teach the language of history. While Jill required students to engage with primary sources—a painting and poems from the time period—she provided students with little guidance on how to interpret the texts. In order for students to determine what she referred to as “reliability” and “validity” of the poems, the students would need to know what those terms mean and how they should be applied in the context. As she admitted, students were not sure what they were being asked to determine and so were not necessarily successful in their analysis. In addition, her lesson did not clearly focus on uses of language that were discipline-specific. While analyzing multiple sources is valued in history, Jill's activity on poetry did not necessarily reflect the way in which a *historian* might conduct this sort of analysis. The terminology she used is one aspect that illustrates this issue. Her use of the terms *validity* and *reliability*, which are more related to the scientific disciplines, seemed out of place in a history lesson. While she included the word *viewpoint* in some questions, she did not focus on using this or other terms that would have been more appropriate choices for the discipline, such as *source* or *evidence*. Also, the analysis of poetry that the students engaged in looked very similar to an English lesson.

Her choice of questions about the poems did not engage students clearly in historical thinking, instead focusing on concepts such as *tone*, more indicative of a literary study. Her lesson would have benefitted from a more direct focus on analyzing specific features of texts, such as analyzing who the “sayers,” “thinkers,” or “feelers” of each text were and what messages they were conveying.¹⁷ Conducting analyses in this way might have helped the students make clearer evaluations about the authors of the works and their points of view.

Hunter made a similar choice in terms of language. Although he did teach language to students, the feature he chose to teach was not specifically a feature of the language of history. Hunter spent quite a bit of time on the structure of memos, but he did not teach any features of what he believed to be the necessary “persuasive” language to students for use in the memos: the integration of direct quotations into the written text. The ability to integrate evidence from sources in writing is an important skill in the discipline of history. Hunter clearly wanted a specific type of structure for introducing the direct quotations—the use of saying, thinking, or feeling verbs—a similar structure to what is often found in history texts.¹⁸ Yet in his lesson he did not model or describe this feature to students, and he was not able to name this feature in his reflection on the lesson. Teaching this use of language would have benefitted students both in that specific lesson and beyond.

Both Hunter and Jill designed tasks in which students were asked to recognize that there are multiple viewpoints on the same historical event and to begin to compare these perspectives to think about how perspective impacts belief; it seems that they wanted students to engage in sourcing, contextualizing, and corroborating. However, the language that students would need to use to present and compare these viewpoints was never made

17 Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza, “The Grammar of History,” 87.

18 Ibid.

explicit to them. Students were not required to use the language of the discipline in meaningful ways. It is also important to note that neither Jill nor Hunter received any guidance on teaching the language of history from their supervising practitioners. The topic Jill's supervising practitioner assigned to her was completely dependent upon using language to make meaning, yet he offered no clear suggestions on how she should teach students to engage with the texts. Hunter's supervising practitioner had told him that she was not comfortable talking about language, indicating that she likely did not integrate language or literacy instruction into her own lessons. Although Hunter's university supervisor asked him to name actual features of persuasive language, it became clear in Hunter's interview that he needed more support to be able to name specific features of language. It seems unrealistic to expect that these preservice history teachers will enact effective instruction in the language of history without both receiving substantial assistance from experienced mentors and observing good examples of language and literacy instruction in history classrooms. It also begs the question: Were they exposed to this language in their undergraduate history courses?

This approach to providing teacher candidates with training in identifying and teaching language in the disciplines was too fragmented to be successful. These findings support Bain's statement about teacher preparation programs in which teacher candidates are expected to gather knowledge and experience from various sources (e.g. history content courses, education courses, and field experiences) and "the person *least* equipped to do so has the job of coordinating these into a meaningful and useful whole."¹⁹ The teaching candidates participating in this research wanted their students to "do history," as they had likely learned about in their coursework, yet they did not have enough training in teaching the language and literacy skills necessary to assist students in completing the tasks they assigned. A more integrated

19 Bain, "Using Disciplinary Literacy," 515.

study of the history content and disciplinary language, focused directly on the specific language features used in history texts and how to name, teach, and discuss those features with students, would have benefitted these teacher candidates as they planned and implemented lessons in real classroom contexts.

Recommendations

A complete redesign of the module for preparing secondary teachers to teach disciplinary language features is necessary in order to meet the aforementioned goals. The first, and most important change, would be the creation of separate modules for each content area. The history module should be designed by an expert in language and literacy who is also familiar with the disciplinary demands of history. Working with instructors in the history department to learn more about the content and texts teacher candidates encounter there as well as with the instructors of methods courses to determine what types of language and literacy skills are discussed would be a necessary element of the planning of a history module. One starting point to consider in designing such a training would be the elements of history language from Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza.²⁰ The ways in which students are expected to use and understand these features in reading and writing history texts could be used as the focal point of a module with practice in identifying, naming, and talking about these language features in various types of history texts—primary sources, textbooks, and student writing. Example lesson plans that incorporate teaching of the language features, as well as videos of history teachers teaching this language, would be incorporated to provide models of how language teaching in history can be both planned by teacher candidates and enacted in their field experiences.

While integrating instruction on disciplinary literacy in teacher preparation programs seems like a necessary step, teacher

20 Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza, “The Grammar of History,” 87.

educators must also consider the role of in-service history teachers in modeling literacy instruction in their classrooms. The teacher candidates in this study did not report seeing any language being taught in their fieldwork placement classrooms. Teacher candidates need real-life experiences in which the history teachers they observe integrate teaching the language of history into their lessons. With that in mind, the question shifts to include not just what methods best prepare pre-service teachers to teach discipline-specific language, but also how to assist in-service history teachers in bringing language teaching into their classrooms. Just as collaboration among experts in the fields of language and history would be necessary to prepare pre-service teachers to teach the language of history, the same joint endeavor would benefit in-service history teachers. Historians, as experts in the discipline, can provide insight on reading and writing in history and how the language should be used or understood. Language specialists can assist history teachers in identifying specific features to be taught to students and in designing activities in which these features are practiced by students. The spirit of collaboration between disciplinary experts, language teachers, history teacher education programs, and the mentors who work with teacher candidates in their fieldwork experiences, seems to be a crucial element of teacher preparation.

Conclusion

Bain wrote that “literacy instruction in history classrooms should not be an add-on, but rather is inherently connected to studying the past.”²¹ The way language is used and interpreted in history texts is a reflection of historical thinking. When students do not learn and use the language of history, it is likely that they do not learn the elements of historical thinking reflected in the linguistic choices either. For students to learn the language of history, they must be guided by experts who use and understand

21 Bain, “Using Disciplinary Literacy,” 520.

that language fluently. To ensure that the language of history is taught in every history classroom, all who work to prepare history teachers in university classrooms and fieldwork placements need to share an understanding of the role language plays in doing history and a commitment to teaching that language.

Through quality social studies education, students “are helped systematically to understanding [the world], to take care for it, to think deeply and critically about it.”²² However, it is not just a focus on the content that builds that foundation for engagement with the world. Students of history need to learn the language necessary to evaluate claims, compare viewpoints, and make judgments about the issues and ideas of the world around them. Learning to “think deeply and critically”²³ does not rely solely on knowledge of the contexts and people involved in the events of the world but relies on close reading of documents and the ability to respond appropriately in both speech and writing. Understanding and using the language of history is an essential component of quality social studies education, education which prepares students to be informed and engaged citizens.

22 Walter C. Parker, “Social Studies Education eC21,” in *Social Studies Today: Research and Practice*, ed. Walter C. Parker (New York: Routledge, 2010), 3.

23 Ibid.

POLICY WRITING SIMULATIONS: PEDAGOGY, LEARNING OBJECTIVES, AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN THE CANADIAN HISTORY CLASSROOM

Thirstan Falconer

Independent Scholar

Zack MacDonald

St. Jerome's University

Introduction

Historians have the important task of preparing students for life after a history degree.¹ We frequently fight the popular perception that our practice of discerning meaning from the past renders our students ill-equipped for success. Perhaps this is because history degrees do not lead directly into a profession, other than those small few who become professional historians or work in related fields.² The reality is that students who complete history undergraduate and graduate programs are amongst the most prepared for a successful career in a diversity of professional fields. In particular, an undergraduate history degree provides its graduates with a strong skillset for the professional job market.³ History majors have successful careers in communications, teaching, the military, international relations, journalism, politics,

1 This paper is inspired by a post the authors wrote for <http://activehistory.ca> in the spring of 2018 and by a paper they presented at the Universities Art Association of Canada annual conference at the University of Waterloo (Waterloo, ON, 26 October 2018).

2 Paul B. Sturtevant, "History Is Not A Useless Major: Fighting Myths With Data," *Perspectives on History: The News Magazine of the American Historical Association*, 1 April 2017, <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/april-2017/history-is-not-a-useless-major-fighting-myths-with-data>.

3 Ibid.

law, and archaeology, among many other fields and professions.⁴ This is unsurprising because a history degree offers its holders well-defined and definite benefits: writing skills, research skills, critical-thinking skills, and an ability to speak knowledgeably of the past.⁵ This success is nurtured in the university classroom by history instructors who encourage students to be creative and effective at research and analysis.⁶ Undergraduate students in particular are well-prepared, from a skills perspective, for life after their degree program.⁷ Nonetheless, as historians, we have an obligation to do more for our students by facing down the difficult questions that plague our discipline. These questions must be addressed by departments and instructors across our vocation.

Writing about Sam Houston State University's history department, Brian Domitrovic explains that faculty rejuvenated their program by capturing their students' "natural interest in history."⁸ In other words, they sought the core of what made history interesting and fun. Part of their department's rejuvenation efforts included situating students in historical

4 Canadian Historical Association, "What Can You Do With a History Degree? Many Things | Que Faire Avec Un Diplôme En Histoire? Plein De Choses!" <https://historydegreediplomehistoire.blog>.

5 Jason Steinhauer, "Fewer Students Are Majoring in History, But We're Asking the Wrong Questions About Why," *Time*, 6 December 2018, <https://time.com/5472828/history-majors/>.

6 Jessica Shortall, "It's time to start ignoring people who question your 'impractical' degree," *Forbes*, August 22, 2016, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jessicashortall/2016/08/22/its-time-to-start-ignoring-people-who-question-your-impractical-degree>.

7 Katharine Brooks, "Why Major in History? Is there value in a history major these days?", *Psychology Today*, August 5, 2012, <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/career-transitions/201208/why-major-in-history>.

8 Brian Domitrovic, "Major Renovations: Reviving Undergraduate History at Sam Houston State," *Perspectives on History*, November 2017, <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/november-2017/major-renovations-reviving-undergraduate-history-at-sam-houston-state>.

places. The department organized monthly trips to relevant local historical sites and to theatres to watch historically relevant movies as a history community.⁹ These are positive initiatives that inspire duplication – but they necessitate department-wide cooperation. What can one history instructor do to take students to historical places without leaving the classroom?

Simulations that emphasize and build upon skills that history departments proudly champion in their students are an adaptive way for history instructors to situate students in historical places. Incorporating simulations as experiential learning practices into undergraduate history classrooms is both fun and challenging. Simulations, particularly those that emphasize policy writing, situate students within historical places and sharpen the skills that history majors utilize for success outside universities. The 1956 Suez Canal Crisis provides an opportunity for historians to engage students in a simulation that situates them in historical places, requires students to demonstrate writing skills, and prepares them for diverse professional experiences after graduation. In this paper, we articulate the value of simulations and experiential learning, provide an example of a simulation related to the 1956 Suez Canal Crisis, and discuss writing options and general strategies to be used when incorporating simulations in your teaching.

Simulations and Experiential Learning

Simulations are an innovative method of teaching, learning, and assessment for undergraduate students pursuing a degree in history. A simulation is a “device for replacing some aspect of reality for purposes of experimentation, prediction, evaluation, or learning.”¹⁰ Dean S. Dorn contends that simulations “provide teachers ... with an alternative to traditional and conventional

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ J. Barton Cunningham, “Assumptions Underlying the Use of Different Types of Simulations,” *Simulation & Games*, 15, no. 2 (1984): 215.

modes of classroom instruction.”¹¹ While Dorn emphasizes that simulations are games that are inherently adversarial with winners and losers,¹² we suggest that simulations can enable groups of students to accomplish goals through collaboration and teamwork.

Substantial literature attests to how student learning is enhanced through simulations.¹³ In particular, simulations combine several High-Impact Educational Practices (HIPs) into one activity. George D. Kuh argues that HIPs facilitate student learning and retention because they demand time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, promote meaningful interactions between faculty and students, foster collaboration, and necessitate feedback.¹⁴ Simulations necessitate a writing intensive course, facilitate undergraduate research for the instructor, demand collaboration between students for

11 Dean S. Dorn, “Simulation Games: One More Tool on the Pedagogical Shelf,” *Teaching Sociology* 17 (1989): 1.

12 *Ibid.*, 3.

13 James E. Stice, “Using Kolb’s Learning Model to Improve Student Learning,” *Engineering Education* 77 (1987): 291-296; M.A. Boyer, R.A. Denemark, E.C. Hanson, S.L. Lamy, “Visions of International Studies in a New Millennium,” *International Studies Perspectives* 1 (2000): 1-9; J. Patrick McCarthy and Liam Anderson, “Active Learning Techniques Versus Traditional Learning Styles: Two Experiments from History and Political Science,” *Innovative Higher Education* 24, no. 4 (2000): 290-291; Stephen M. Shellman, “Active Learning in Comparative Politics: A Mock German Election and Coalition-Formation Simulation,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, no. 4 (2001): 833; Brian Frederiking, “Simulations and Student Learning,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 1 (2005): 392; Stephen M. Shellman and Kürsard Turan, “Do Simulations Enhance Student Learning? An Empirical Evaluation of an IR Simulation,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 2 (2006): 29-30; Mary Pettenger, Douglas West, and Niki Young, “Assessing the Impact of Role Play Simulations on Learning in Canadian and US Classrooms,” *International Studies Perspectives* 15 (2014): 504.

14 For a deeper discussion on the benefits of the eleven established High Impact Practices, see George D. Kuh, *High-Impact Educational Practices: What They Are, Who Has Access to Them, and Why they Matter* (AACU, 2008); George D. Kuh, *Ensuring Quality & Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale*, (AACU, 2013).

assignments, and offer diverse learning opportunities. They can provide a solid mechanism for teaching about the state, particularly when instructors adopt a role-playing simulation that assigns students a place within the political process and demand that they act “like real political actors.”¹⁵ Simulations ground students in the course material and, according to Jeremy Youde, force them “to adopt and defend a world view which may not comport with their own.”¹⁶ Simulations also offer a refreshing break from the regular lecture-driven classroom model for both students and instructors.¹⁷

Abundant literature on simulations exists in political science, sociology, and international relations. Nina Kollars and Amanda Rosen draw attention to the substantial time it takes to create the simulation experience, and they suggest that professors design portable simulations that work within frameworks for different subjects, classes, and disciplines.¹⁸ It is important the simulation design be considered alongside proper methods of assessment. Chad Raymond and Simon Usherwood have highlighted the equal importance that assessment in simulations shares with the design of scenarios and gameplay. They argue that the learning objectives need to be established from the outset and the course itself requires that assessment be integrated from the start and be informed by those objectives.¹⁹ The simulation itself also needs to

15 Elizabeth T. Smith and Mark A. Boyer, “Designing In-Class Simulations,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 29, no. 4 (1996): 691.

16 Jeremy Youde, “Crushing Their Dreams? Simulations and Student Idealism,” *International Studies Perspectives* 9 (2008): 355.

17 Rebecca A. Glazier, “Running Simulations without Ruining Your Life: Simple Ways to Incorporate Active Learning into Your Teaching,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 7 (2011): 376-377.

18 Nina Kollars and Amanda Rosen, “Bootstrapping and Portability in Simulation Design,” *International Studies Perspectives* 17 (2016): 203.

19 Chad Raymond and Simon Usherwood, “Assessment in Simulations,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 9 (2013): 164. This argument is also made in Timothy Wedig, “Getting the Most from Classroom Simulations: Strategies for Maximizing Learning Outcomes,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43, no. 3 (2010): 548.

critically engage with the course material. Therefore, it is essential that simulations are not conducted for the sake of doing them; they need to be relevant to course content.²⁰

Universities across Canada are encouraging their faculties to introduce experiential learning practices in their courses. In the summer of 2017, the Ontario government's Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development issued *Guiding Principles for Experiential Learning*, indicating a commitment to ensure every Ontario student in a publicly funded post-secondary institution graduate with at least one experiential learning activity. This is a key aspect of the province's plan to create a "highly skilled workforce."²¹ Carleton University, Dalhousie University, McMaster University, Queen's University, the University of Guelph, the University of British Columbia, and the University of Saskatchewan, among many others, have all instituted university-wide experiential learning initiatives to various degrees. Canadian provinces and universities are part of a broader movement emanating from the United States that has also emphasized the benefits of experiential learning.²² The Beek Center for Social Impact and Innovation at Georgetown University, for example, brands itself as an "experiential hub" for training students²³ while the Center for Law, Engagement, and Politics at Sam Houston State University (LEAP) enriches students through experiential learning opportunities.²⁴ At the University

20 Wedig, "Getting the Most from Classroom Simulations: Strategies for Maximizing Learning Outcomes," 547.

21 Ontario, Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development, "Published Plans and Annual Reports 2017-2018," June 29, 2018, <https://www.ontario.ca/page/published-plans-and-annual-reports-2017-2018-ministry-advanced-education-and-skills-development>.

22 Janet Eyster, "The Power of Experiential Education," *Liberal Education* 95, no. 4 (2009): 24-31; Learn Through Experience, "Colleges and Universities," <http://learnthroughexperience.org/program-types/colleges-universities/>.

23 The Beek Center for Social Impact and Innovation, Georgetown University, "What is the Beek Center?" <https://beekcenter.georgetown.edu/>.

24 Center for Law, Engagement, and Politics (LEAP), Sam Houston State

of Waterloo, the Faculty of Arts piloted its *Arts First Initiative* in 2018 which “builds students’ foundational competencies in communication and analysis in their first year in small course settings.” The initiative, which was fully adopted across the university’s Arts Program in 2019-2020, utilizes both active and experiential learning practices to improve students’ abilities in comprehension, conceptualization, and contextualization of ideas and knowledge.²⁵ Thus, the framework this article proposes is a welcome approach to history programs across Canada and the United States.

Simulating the Suez Crisis

The 1956 Suez Canal Crisis provides an opportunity for a historical simulation. In 1956, the last of British forces, which had been stationed at the Suez Canal, left the region after Prime Minister Anthony Eden negotiated promises of goodwill from Egyptian dictator Gamal Abdel Nasser. However, the Suez Canal remained the property of British and French investors. After failed attempts to negotiate an American and British development loan to build a dam at Aswan on the Nile, Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal. Eden, furious and betrayed, preferred military action to overthrow Nasser and restore British prestige. The British, French, and Israeli governments met in secret to concoct a plan for the invasion of Egypt. Israel attacked Egypt, and Anglo-French forces prepared to enter the canal zone to secure it under the claim of neutrality. Eden testified that the Anglo-French intervention was a “police action,” but the Americans were furious with the Israelis, the French, and the British for their actions. Similarly, the new and recently decolonized members of the British Commonwealth, led by India, sympathized with Egypt. Canada was in a difficult position – clearly offended by the British actions, but also uncomfortable with the American position. There was a genuine

University, <https://www.shsu.edu/centers/leap/>.

25 University of Waterloo, “About Arts First,” <https://uwaterloo.ca/arts-first/about>.

concern that a split would occur in the relationship between the United Kingdom, France, and the United States – Canada’s principal allies in the Cold War. There were also domestic political considerations for the Canadian government to consider. Liberal Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent’s government was nearing its fourth year, and an election was on the horizon.²⁶

The simulation tasks students with recognizing and addressing the difficult position that Canada found itself in at the beginning of November 1956. Lester Pearson, Canada’s Secretary of State for External Affairs, was encouraged by U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and petitioned member countries of the United Nations on the creation of a United National Emergency Force (UNEF). Students are placed in the same situation that Pearson and St. Laurent found themselves: accept a deal with India that would lead to the creation of a peace force at the cost of supporting India’s motion demanding the immediate withdrawal (thus condemning) of the British, the French, and the Israelis; or reject it and let the alliance potentially falter.²⁷ Using primary documents provided by the instructor, students assume the role of Canadian Department of External Affairs employees writing a one-page action memorandum to Prime Minister St. Laurent before he enters Question Period in the House of Commons.²⁸

26 For a summary of the Suez Crisis from Canada’s perspective, see Robert Bothwell, *Alliance and Illusion: Canada and the World, 1945-1984*, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007), 124-132.

27 India was balancing its long-standing and evolved relationship with the United Kingdom and the rest of the British Commonwealth, as well as its diplomatic ties to the Afro-Asian countries who looked to India for leadership and who believed the UK and France were taking advantage of Egypt. See Zorawar Dault Singh, “India’s Role During the 1956 Suez Crisis: Between Peacemaking and Postcolonial Solidarity,” *India Review* 17, no. 5 (2018): 456-475.

28 Question Period in Canada occurs each day that the House of Commons sits. Members of Parliament direct questions to the government that are typically answered by the relevant government minister or their parliamentary secretary. The questions are not submitted in advance, and they typically are relevant to the major news of the day. The prime minister does not have to attend, but they often do. The Official Leader of the Opposition usually asks the first several questions,

They are tasked with independently dividing the documents amongst their group, triaging the important information, and writing the four relevant sections of the action memorandum: background, options, considerations, and recommendation.²⁹ It is not important that students follow the same course of historical events as 1956; rather, it is essential that they demonstrate an aptitude for dissecting the primary documents and disseminating an opinion through a written policy document in a specific allotment of time. Thus, it is central for the instructor to select the right documents but also to frame the assignment in a specific way that articulates the simulation's priorities. Here is an example of the scenario provided to students for the Suez crisis:

It is 4 November 1956, and the world is engulfed in crisis with Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal, the Israeli invasion of Egypt, and the planned British/French seizure of the canal zone. Diplomats at the Canadian Department of External Affairs have worked tirelessly with their American, French, and British allies to avoid hostilities between them. Canadian External Affairs Minister Lester Pearson has struck an agreement to create a United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) to enforce a ceasefire in the canal zone. However, Canada needs the support of India and other aligned states to support the motion. India has agreed to support Canada's motion in exchange for Canada's vote condemning the British, French and Israeli actions at the United Nations. Your team, who work as advisors to Pearson, must advise Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent with a 1-page action memorandum on whether or not they should support the Indian motion demanding the immediate withdrawal of invading forces

and thus an exchange between the prime minister and his principal foe occurs.

See Scott Piroth, "A Bilingual Legislature? Question Period in Canada's House of Commons," *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 18, no. 2 (2012): 161-183.

²⁹ See Adam Chapnick, "The Action Memorandum: An Assignment with a Promising Future," *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal* 5, no. 3 (2012): 1-12 for an explanation of how to write an action memorandum.

(thus publicly condemning the British, French, and Israelis) and allowing for the creation of the UNEF. The UNEF will not be created without India's support. What options does Canada have at this point, and what considerations must Canada keep in mind? Finally, you must make a reasonable recommendation for the St. Laurent government to follow. Advise the prime minister. Remember, the Opposition are on the heels of the government, and a wider war amongst Canada's allies is possible in the region. It is imperative that your knowledge and analysis of the events are clear. Your memorandum must be supported by the facts provided by the instructor, address the seriousness of the situation, and protect Canada's national interest. The prime minister requires this note today before Question Period commences.³⁰

The scenario outlines the specific expectations for the assignment, its boundaries, as well as its purpose and final objective. Using a package of primary documents, groups are expected to triage their contents and create a concise one-page memorandum. Each group is tested on their skills for collaboration, policy writing, research, and analysis in an experiential setting that reaffirms how dire and complex the crisis was.

This simulation utilizes primary documents from volume twenty-two, 1956-1957 Part 1, of Global Affairs Canada's "Documents on Canadian External Relations" and the *Globe and Mail*. These documents trace the major developments of the crisis over the course of four days. The first several documents establish the Canadian government's position from the outset of the Israeli invasion into Egypt. Students read of the Canadian government's negative reaction to the invasion with communication between Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs to the Canadian Ambassador in the United States (volume 22 – document 107), their frustration with the United Kingdom's position

30 From author's course assignment.

and actions (volume 22 – documents 108 & 113), as well as the United Kingdom Prime Minister Anthony Eden’s justifications to Prime Minister St. Laurent (volume 22 – document 110). The subsequent documents outline Lester Pearson’s canvassing for a negotiated and acceptable solution to the hostilities for the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Israel, and Egypt (volume 22 – documents 118, 120, 125, & 128). These official diplomatic cables are also supported by public reporting found in the *Globe and Mail* over the same period. These English Canadian press reports provide relative historical context, reaffirm the opposed positions of the major western allies on the crisis, and detail how Pearson’s negotiations were being received abroad.³¹

Regardless of what simulation instructors choose to design, there are an abundance of primary sources at their disposal to generate experiences like the Suez Crisis exercise. Whether their instructors provide documents from their own collection of private materials or make use of the many archival collections that have been published or digitized online, undergraduate history students have the opportunity to experience a near endless array of simulations that enhance their classroom experience through experiential learning. Instructors can make ready use of the “Documents on Canadian External Relations” which have been released in twenty-nine volumes that are available at many university libraries. Furthermore, volumes twelve to

31 Moshe Brilliant, “France Supports Action: Israel Invades Egypt,” *Globe and Mail*, October 30, 1956; Philip Deane, “London Considering Net Step in Israel-Egypt Case,” *Globe and Mail*, October 30, 1956; Leonard Ingalls, “Washington and U.K. Deeply Worried Over Israel’s Action; Cabinet Meets Twice,” *Globe and Mail*, October 30, 1956; Philip Deane, “Brand Britain, France As Aggressors: U.S.,” *Globe and Mail*, October 31, 1956; George Bain, “Canada Opposes Plan of Britain and France to Intervene in Egypt,” *Globe and Mail*, October 31, 1956; Osgood Carthurs, “U.K., France Veto U.S. Ceasefire Plan,” *Globe and Mail*, October 31, 1956; David Spurgeon, “Canada Backs U.S. in UN Vote,” *Globe and Mail*, November 2, 1956; Clark Davey, “PM Uncertain on Suez Case; Scolds Press,” *Globe and Mail*, November 2, 1956; David Spurgeon, “Canada Makes Police Plan Bid: Canada Would Contribute Men to UN Force,” *Globe and Mail*, November 3, 1956.”

twenty-nine have been digitized for the period between 1946 and 1963 and are accessible on Global Affairs Canada's website.³² Global Affairs Canada also has key documents pertaining to the Canadian North digitized for the periods between 1874 and 1949.³³ In fact, documents on the Canadian North are readily available. Scholars from the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies at the University of Calgary and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism at St. Jerome's University have released twelve volumes in its *Documents on Canadian Arctic Sovereignty and Security* (DCASS) series.³⁴ These volumes present a wide

32 Global Affairs Canada, "Documents on Canadian External Relations," <http://www.international.gc.ca/history-histoire/documents-documents.aspx?lang=eng>.

33 Ibid.

34 Ryan Dean, P. Whitney Lackenbauer, and Adam Lajeunesse, *Canadian Arctic Defence Policy: A Synthesis of Key Documents, 1970-2013*, DCASS volume 1, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2014); Peter Kikkert and P. Whitney Lackenbauer, *Legal Appraisals of Canada's Arctic Sovereignty: Key Documents, 1905-1956*, DCASS volume 2, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2014); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and K.C. Eyre, *Unfurling the Air Force Ensign in the Canadian Arctic*, DCASS volume 3, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2015); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Daniel Heidt, *The Advisory Committee on Northern Development: Context and Meeting Minutes, 1948-1966*, DCASS volume 4, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2015); Adam Lajeunesse, *Ice Islands in Canadian Policy, 1954-1971*, DCASS volume 6, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2015); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Ryan Dean, *Canada's Northern Strategy under the Harper Conservatives: Key Speeches and Documents on Sovereignty, Security, and Governance, 2005-2015*, DCASS volume 6, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2016); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Peter Kikkert, *Lessons in Arctic Operations: the Canadian Army Experience, 1945-1956*, DCASS volume 8, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2016); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Kristopher Kinsinger, *Arctic Show Trial: The Trial of Alikomiak and Tatamigana, 1923*, DCASS volume 9, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism,

array of simulation experiences for students studying Canadian history. Depending on their university's licensing agreements, instructors may also have access to the National Film Board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's Digital Archives for additional primary source materials.³⁵ They can also make use of their home university library's microfilm collections of newspapers or access Library and Archives Canada's digitization of Cabinet Conclusions, which provide tremendous insights into the deliberations and decision-making of Canadian cabinets.³⁶ In addition, there are distinct opportunities for branching into American history. The United States' Department of State in the Office of the Historian has digitized a series of documents on American external relations from 1861 through to 1988. The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series is readily available

2017); Richard Goette and P. Whitney Lackenbauer, *Northern Skytrails: Perspectives on the Royal Canadian Air Force in the Arctic from the Pages of the Roundel, 1949-1965*, DCASS volume 10, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2017); Adam Lajeunesse and Rob Huebert, *From Polar Sea to Straight Baselines: Arctic Policy in the Mulroney Era*, DCASS volume 11, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2017); P. Whitney Lackenbauer and Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, "*One of the Great Polar Navigators*": *Captain T.C. Pullen's Personal Records of Arctic Voyages, Volume 1: Official Roles*, DCASS volume 12, (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2018); Adam Lajeunesse, *Documents on Canadian Arctic Maritime Sovereignty: 1950-1988*, DCASS volume 13 (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2018); and Peter Clancy and P. Whitney Lackenbauer, *Shaping Arctic Policy: The Minutes of the Eskimo Affairs Committee, 1952-62*, DCASS volume 14 (Calgary and Waterloo: Centre for Military and Strategic Studies and the Centre on Foreign Policy and Federalism, 2019).

35 Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, "CBC Archives," <https://www.cbc.ca/archives>; National Film Board, "Welcome to the National Film Board of Canada," <https://www.nfb.ca>.

36 Library and Archives Canada, "Cabinet Conclusions," <https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/politics-government/cabinet-conclusions/Pages/cabinet-conclusions.aspx>.

online for consultation.³⁷ They can also join Barnard College's *Reacting to the Past*, which supports members with historical role-playing games for engaged classroom learning with a variety of learning outcomes.³⁸

Policy Writing in the Classroom

Policy writing is the process by which “government employees and non-governmental organizations create written documents for lawmakers and policy professionals to read.” It is an effective skill that history instructors should teach their students for life after their undergraduate degree. Policy documents can be a variety of lengths, ranging from short-briefings to lengthy reports.³⁹ In the course model proposed in this article, students learn policy writing while they also continue to develop valuable history-related skills such as research and analysis, creativity, and critical-thinking. Victor Asal has argued that “the best way to get educational mileage out of a simulation is to treat it as an interactive case where learning takes place before, during, and after the simulation.”⁴⁰ Assigning an independent policy writing assignment in place of the traditional undergraduate research essay in conjunction with the live simulation has significant benefits for student learning. The Suez Canal Crisis simulation policy writing exercise gives students first-hand experience working collaboratively with one another in a political decision-making setting.

Students are introduced to policy writing during an instructor-led workshop that details the purpose of policy writing,

37 United States of America, Department of State, Office of the Historian, “Historical Documents,” <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments>.

38 Reacting to the Past, Barnard College, “Role-playing Games for Engaged Learning,” <https://reacting.barnard.edu/>.

39 Andrew Pennock, “The Case for Using Policy Writing in Undergraduate Political Science Courses,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44, no. 1 (2011): 141.

40 Victor Asal, “Playing Games with International Relations,” *International Studies Perspectives* 6 (2005): 362.

its different formats, and how to effectively write one in the course's selected format. The workshop communicates the criteria of the major policy writing assignment and the live simulation in a structured environment. This includes defining the simulation's explicit rules. In this proposed simulation, for example, students cannot use primary sources that existed after 4 November 1956, the beginning of the Suez Canal crisis simulation. The ideal time to clearly communicate the assignment's ground rules is when the instructor discusses its criteria in detail with context. In the context of the Suez Canal simulation, the major purpose of the workshop is to teach students *how* to write an action memorandum. Thus, it is critical for the instructor to break down the four sections of the action memorandum: background, options, considerations, and recommendations so that students have a firm understanding of the simulation's expected outcomes.⁴¹ To help facilitate student understanding in our particular workshop, student teams are given three memorandums and asked to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of each. Each team is required to break down each section on a white board while the instructor observes and engages with the groups. Throughout the workshop, the instructor should frequently field active exchanges with the class during the initial presentation and follow up the dialogue with a hands-on practice exercise where students practice their understanding of each section.

Instructors with large classes may choose to adopt this workshop in a tutorial meeting time slot and run it several times for smaller groups. An alternative approach to the in-class activity requires the students to submit a short one-page breakdown explaining each section, how sections differ, and what the critical functions of each is prior to the next class. The size of the classroom and the number of students will change how the workshop can be adopted, but instructors can adopt one of

41 See Chapnick, "The Action Memorandum: An Assignment with a Promising Future," for more a detailed breakdown of each section.

or several of these components. If instructors are attempting this assignment for the first time, they can use the example created by Chapnick in his article in *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, or they can connect with colleagues for other suggestions.⁴² In subsequent courses, instructors can also utilize the best examples from their students who provide them permission to do so. Students may also benefit from long-term access to these examples outside of the workshop through the duration of the course.

This approach is supported by other history instructors who have departed from the traditional research paper in their course assignments in exchange for alternative assignments that also demand creativity, as well as effective research and analysis skills. Daniel J. Sherman and Israel Waismel-Manor argue that “course syllabi that limit themselves to [traditional term papers] neglect an entire range of assignments that can bring students a deeper understanding of the political subject matter.”⁴³ Some instructors have innovated this practice by assigning a written briefing note or action memorandum assignment in the place of the traditional research paper. Though the briefing note is more frequently seen in the political science classroom, some historians have utilized this assignment in their history courses. Adam Chapnick, a trained historian and Professor in the Department of Defence Studies at Royal Military College, utilizes an action memorandum assignment in his undergraduate classes. Chapnick argues that the assignment is an effective learning and assessment tool, inspires critical thinking, and is difficult for students to plagiarize.⁴⁴ Yet

42 Chapnick’s example tackles “How the Canadian delegation to the Imperial Conference of 1921 should respond to the British proposal to renew the Anglo-Japanese Alliance.”

43 Daniel J. Sherman and Israel Waismel-Manor, “Get It In Writing: Using Politics to Teach Writing and Writing to Teach Politics,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36, no. 4 (2003): 755.

44 Chapnick, “The Action Memorandum,” 2-3; P.E. Bryden, Norman Hillmer, P. Whitney Lackenbauer, and Ryan Touhey have all employed policy writing

there are other benefits. These assignments force students to confront the difficult decisions of professional life. Fabrico H. Chagas-Castos and Sean W. Burges argue that a briefing note is effective because it “involves hard choices about what to include and what to exclude.” They also argue that it forces students to “confront their own assumptions and ... use the selectivity inherent in composing a briefing note to guide the reader towards a specific understanding of an issue.”⁴⁵ In other words, policy writing assignments challenge students in a professional setting and force them to make difficult, evidence-based decisions. It also forces students to make choices on courses of action they may have mixed moral values with and in so doing, provides them with an understanding of how difficult a historical moment in decision-making actually was. The difficulty of decision-making in the policy process can be easily misunderstood and understated through traditional classroom lectures. In particular, a policy writing assignment can “serve to teach about various topics” because it “gives students the opportunity to familiarize themselves with potentially any real-world issue or context.”⁴⁶ Policy writing connects students to the political process “like real political actors.”⁴⁷

To prepare students for the policy writing simulation and integrate it into the entirety of the course, another option is to replace the course’s typical major research paper with an independent long-form policy writing assignment. For best results, the assignment should replicate the format that the

assignments in their classrooms. Undoubtedly there are others.

45 Fabrico H. Chagas-Bastos and Sean W. Burges, “The ‘Briefing Note’ as a Pedagogical Tool for Teaching Politics and International Relations,” *Journal of Political Science Education* (2018): 8-9.

46 Vincent Druliolle, “There is No Debriefing Without Prior Briefing: Writing a Briefing Memo as a Preparatory Activity to Make the Most of the Pedagogical Potential of Simulations,” *Journal of Political Science Education* 13, no. 3 (2017): 362.

47 Smith and Boyer, “Designing In-Class Simulations,” 691.

students are expected to write in their collaborative group simulation. Like a standard history research paper, the action memorandum assignment necessitates skill-building in research and analysis, creativity, and argumentative writing. Though the format is different, combined with a workshop and a clear description in the course syllabus, the independent action memorandum writing assignment offers students additional practice to execute the format in the context of their own research topic. Ryan Touhey, a colleague of ours at St. Jerome's University, provides his students with a list of historical scenarios to write their action memorandum assignments on. These examples are easily attached to the course syllabus or shared through the course's digital online portal. Touhey offers his students examples from the nineteenth through to the twenty-first century. While this assignment fulfills the same learning objectives that a major research paper does, it also prepares students for the simulation by helping them understand the policy writing assignment before they begin the simulation. Ideally, instructors should set their deadlines early enough in the semester to ensure that they can provide students with written feedback prior to the execution of the simulation. The ideal result of this preparation is that students focus on preparing for several historical events because they already understand the four sections and their purpose. While established knowledge of the historical scenario is helpful, it is not a prerequisite. It is far more critical that students have an active understanding of the four action memorandum sections.

Rethinking Traditional Course Structures

The key to establishing a successful simulation is structuring the course in a way that optimizes student success. It is imperative to explain to students at the outset the expectations for the simulation. This simulation assumes that students have practiced skills in conducting research and analysis, preferably established through course experience in history, political science, legal

studies, or sociology. In other words, it is not ideal that students undertake this simulation without a demonstrated success in an equivalent field. It is also reasonable that the instructor has expectations that students arrive in the class with a particular set of skills and knowledge, regardless of whether or not simulations are being used. It is also crucial for the instructor to establish clear learning objectives that articulate the skills and knowledge students are expected to develop throughout the course.

In this simulation on the Suez crisis, students are anticipated to cultivate skills for collaboration and policy writing, as well as further their preexisting skills in creative-thinking, research and analysis. For this simulation model it is also expected that students develop an understanding of Canadian external affairs throughout the semester. In this sense, the near end of the course is the ideal moment to situate the simulation, as students will have had time to learn and refine those skills and their knowledge base throughout the entirety of the course. Yet, students should not be expected to approach the live simulation without any prior experience. In fact, it would be unsurprising if as soon as students learn that they will be tasked with writing something other than the traditional research paper and that they will be participating in a group-based simulation, that the instructor would be met with nervous looks and second thoughts. It is important that the instructor reinforce to students that they will not be left to figure out this challenge on their own. That is why courses that employ live simulations should include instructor-led workshops that explain the specific kinds of policy writing the course demands, and replacing the traditional research paper with an independent policy writing assignment.

Instructors also need to consider the relationships between the students. As students are expected to work together in the simulation, the instructor should impose measures that produce comradery and collaboration in the classroom environment. In order for the simulation to be successful, students will have to

establish relationships with one another, as well as expectations that they can work together in a collaborative way. An innovative method to achieve this is to encourage students to give themselves and their peers grades out of ten for regular tutorial or discussion group meetings, as well as during the simulation itself. These grades should also be accompanied with explanations that make the student accountable to the grade that they assigned each of their peers. This technique prevents students from randomly assigning perfect scores to their colleagues who may not have earned them. The grades themselves are unimportant for the instructor during the tutorial meetings (where they are making their own assessments) but they may be critical to understanding how the group dynamics functioned during the simulation. Using this process throughout the course creates accountability between the students, who must rely on one another during the simulation. Thus, learning occurs before, during, and after the course components.

Scaffolding a simulation exercise in the history classroom engages students in multiple HIPs that increase student engagement and learning. It is a recognized HIP when students write and revise in a variety of different forms for interchangeable audiences.⁴⁸ In particular, writing intensive courses critically engage students with the information they consume to synthesize knowledge and articulate their ideas concisely. The simulation relies on the incorporation of research as another effective HIP. By engaging students through primary research material to the ends of incorporating undergraduate research, student learning is significantly enhanced. This learning is especially impactful if the research is incorporated into the instructor's own research

48 Kuh, *High-Impact Educational Practices*, ACRL, "High-Impact Educational Practices: A Brief Overview," <https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>; University of Waterloo Centre for Teaching Excellence, "High Impact Practices (HIPs) or Engaged Learning Practices," <https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/support/integrative-learning/high-impact-practices-hips-or-engaged-learning-practices>.

projects.⁴⁹ Instructors who encourage their students to engage with documents from their own primary research are actually facilitating knowledge mobilization to unprecedented degrees. Not only does this HIP have the opportunity to enhance the instructor's research agenda in a collaborative environment that promotes student engagement, but it also conceptualizes the importance of student contributions in faculty research. Collaborative assignments are also a recognized HIP. Students must work collectively to solve problems and sharpen their own understanding by communicating their work to their peers.⁵⁰ Thus, a collaborative live simulation of this nature exposes history students to four HIPs in a single assignment and classroom experience. So long as students are provided adequate guidance and time to reflect on the learning process, frame-working HIPs can significantly enhance student learning.⁵¹

Collaboration is an essential skill in most professional and scholarly environments.⁵² In a professional environment, collaboration is even more important where coworkers bring diverse backgrounds, ideas, and skillsets into the workplace. Thus, history instructors have an obligation to meet this challenge. While this article has emphasized the importance of preparing students for life after an undergraduate degree in a professional environment, collaboration is just as important for those students destined for academia as well. Collaborations between researchers and scholars within and across disciplines is becoming more common and lucrative. The Government of Canada recently announced four billion dollars in research

49 Kuh, *High-Impact Educational Practices*.

50 Ibid.

51 John E. Bands, Juan José Gutiérrez, "Undergraduate Research in International Settings: Synergies in Stacked High-Impact Practices," *Council on Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (2017), 25.

52 Marc Hurwitz and Samantha Hurwitz, *Leadership is Half the Story: A Fresh Look at Followership, Leadership, and Collaboration* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015).

funding grants that emphasize interdisciplinary international collaborative research projects.⁵³ This new stream of research grants adds to the major government funding options focused on partnerships and collaboration such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Partnership Grants.⁵⁴ Imbedding collaboration into undergraduate classrooms is a vital professional skill, but it is also becoming increasingly relevant for emerging scholars. As the next generation of historians progress from undergraduate history programs through graduate studies and into the academy, collaboration, both within and between disciplines, is fundamental to a marketable research agenda. Historians must seize on these opportunities early.

This simulation exercise inherently requires a student-centered, active learning environment that is ripe for history courses. Active learning, like HIPs, has been employed across disciplinary boundaries to improve student engagement and learning.⁵⁵ Active, student-centered learning is one of many terms

53 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, "Government of Canada launches new research fund to push beyond the frontiers of Canadian science," <https://www.canada.ca/en/social-sciences-humanities-research/news/2018/12/government-of-canada-launches-new-research-fund-to-push-beyond-the-frontiers-of-canadian-science>.

54 Some examples include: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, "Partnership Development Grants," http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programmes-programmes/partnership_development_grants-subventions_partenariat_developpement-eng.aspx; Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation, "A CMHC-SSHRC Joint Initiative: Collaborative Housing Research Network," <https://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/nhs/a-cmhc-sshrc-joint-initiative>.

55 Robin Bell, "The Continuing Search to Find a More Effective and Less Intimidating Way to Teach Research Methods in Higher Education," *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 53, no. 3 (2016), 287; Sang Joon Lee, Robert Maribe Branch, "Students' Beliefs About Teaching and Learning and Their Perceptions of Student-Centred Learning Environments," *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55, no. 5 (2018): 585-593; J.W. Neumann, "Developing a New Framework for Conceptualizing "Student-Centered Learning," *The Educational Forum* 77 (2013): 161-175.

including authentic, situated learning, where the *it* is the learner's active participation, rather than instructor lecturing, that is the focus of the classroom that ultimately leads to the generation of new knowledge.⁵⁶ For example, students can be told how dire the Suez crisis was in 1956, but they will not necessarily understand why. A live simulation exercise that forces students to consider all of the domestic and foreign policy considerations in the context of the moment will make clear just how tense, complex, and fragile the events were. It will also require students to consider the other course material in new and engaging ways. This is exactly the kind of student learning that history is positioned to facilitate because it mimics the complexity of real-life bureaucratic political decision-making.

Conclusion

Simulations and policy writing in Canadian history undergraduate courses offer students an opportunity to learn course content and experience writing documents they may encounter in professional positions. Incorporating multiple HIP into the simulation assignment and frame-working the course with introductory workshops and foundational content ensures students are prepared to grapple with the complexities of the exercise. The collaborative course structure and transparent assessment process incrementally prepares students to succeed in the simulation and the workplace challenges they imitate. Simulation assignments require students to synthesize research materials and their knowledge of course content into a single cohesive document that incorporates the themes of the course.

This article does not propose a radical departure from

56 Debra D. Burke, "SCALE-UP! Classroom Design and Use Can Facilitate Learning," *The Law Teacher* 49, no. 2 (2015), 190; Erik Driessen and Cees Van Der Vleuten, "Matching Student Assessment to Problem-Based Learning: Lessons from Experience in a Law Faculty," *Studies in Continuing Education* 22, no. 2 (2000): 235-248.

traditional training for history undergraduates; rather this is a new approach for history instructors to assist students in building important professional skills. Policy writing encourages collaboration and allows students to explore how to apply their creativity, critical thinking, and research and analysis in a professionalized setting. Student reflection is a vital final step to the simulation experience. An instructor-facilitated reflection on the knowledge synthesis process and skills required to complete the synthesis allows students to connect their course work and simulation exercise to their academic achievements and professional aspirations. It is imperative not to overlook the opportunity for reflection as student learning happens before, during, and after assignments.

The policy writing simulation outlined here has been executed in the classroom, but it requires additional practice. Further research is needed to quantify the extent to which the simulations impact student engagement, learning, and professionalization.⁵⁷ History class simulations would also benefit from further work comparing different simulation structures and formats for primary analysis learning. The goal of these future studies should focus on improving the simulation delivery as well as the outcome assessments.

⁵⁷ Future use of this simulation will coincide with clearance from the Office of Research Ethics and follow-up interviews with students. Unfortunately, this data is currently unavailable.

DECOLONIZING THE CORPS OF DISCOVERY: A COLLABORATIVE REVIEW OF *TEACHING CRITICALLY ABOUT LEWIS AND CLARK*

Richard Hughes

Illinois State University

Kelly Cornale

Minooka Community High School (IL)

Amanda Nies

Longfellow Middle School (OK)

Evan Wilson

Maple Middle School (IL)

In 1911, American high school students encountered *An American History*, a new textbook written by historian David S. Muzzey. The book was the first of many editions that millions of students read over fifty years and led the *New York Times* to claim in 1965 that Muzzey had “perhaps as much influence as any modern writer on the American conception of history.”¹ Muzzey’s account of “The New Republic” and the presidency of Thomas Jefferson addressed the 1804 expedition of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean in one short paragraph that detailed the origins of the expedition. Muzzey succinctly credited Lewis and Clark with “making important studies... of the natural features of the country and the habits of the Indian tribes.”² In a later edition in 1943, Muzzey also included a few details about the scientific nature of the expedition and then added a line, “It seemed not to trouble the President much that the expedition, after passing the Rockies,

1 “Dr. David Muzzey, Historian, Is Dead,” *The New York Times*, April 15, 1965, 33.

2 David S. Muzzey, *An American History* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1911), 210.

would be trespassing on territory beyond the western boundary of the United States.”³

The fact that neither of Muzzey’s accounts even considered the experiences and perspectives of Indigenous peoples reflects the ways in which dominant historical narratives have long framed the role of the Corps of Discovery in shaping American history. While *An American History’s* racist, Eurocentric lens appears deeply problematic today, his last line about the precarious legality of the expedition also hints at the irony that Muzzey faced a litany of attacks from conservative groups in the twenties. Organizations such as the Sons of the American Revolution and the American Legion labeled the textbook as a “treason text” that was “subversive” and “un-American” because Muzzey dared to acknowledge the flaws of colonial Americans during the American Revolution and was not sufficiently critical of the British.⁴ Muzzey faced numerous and well-publicized calls to ban his textbook for being far too progressive as part of what a historian at the time identified as a “revival of intolerance, racial prejudice, nationalistic egotism, and the desire to enforce conformity” that emerged in the years after World War I.⁵ Muzzey had no shortage of enemies, complete with cartoons in Hearst newspapers that depicted him as a large rat chewing on a school building, and yet apparently no one ever objected to his troubling accounts of the Corps of Discovery.⁶

More than a century after Muzzey’s first edition, *Teaching Critically about Lewis and Clark: Challenging Dominant Narratives*

3 David S. Muzzey, *A History of Our Country* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1943), 225.

4 Charles G. Miller, *Treason to American Tradition: The Spirit of Benedict Arnold Reincarnated in United States History Revised in Text Books*, Sons of the American Revolution in the State of California, Los Angeles, 1922; Harold Rugg, *That Men May Understand: An American in the Long Armistice* (New York: Doubleday, 1941), 136-139.

5 Harold U. Faulkner, “Perverted American History, *Harper’s Magazine* 152 (February 1926), 344.

6 “Dr. David Muzzey, Historian, Is Dead.”

in *K-12 Curriculum*, written by Alison Schmitke, Leilani Sabzalian, and Jeff Edmundson, argues that a “medieval white supremacist Doctrine of Discovery” lay at the heart of the Lewis and Clark expedition and its historical significance.⁷ The book’s thoughtful introductory chapters highlight the intersection of history, social justice, and pedagogy as the authors aim to “frame colonization and indigenous dispossession as an ongoing legacy” that Indigenous peoples continue to resist.⁸ In contrast to most U.S. history textbooks and curricula, from Muzzey’s account to recent publications, the bulk of the book includes fourteen lesson plans for both elementary and secondary students that foreground the importance of “Indigenous perspectives and contemporary issues.”⁹ The lessons reflect a larger anticolonial framework that emphasizes the historic and contemporary role of place, the presence and perspectives of Indigenous peoples, identity and “political nationhood,” as well as the potential of partnerships between schools and Indigenous peoples to enrich historical understanding.¹⁰ The lessons pay specific attention to the goal of promoting historical thinking, and a great deal of the resources for secondary students are applicable to college survey courses. The authors’ efforts to empower students, as both scholars and citizens, to learn and then reconceptualize dominant narratives of exploration and discovery will undoubtedly make the book an invaluable and controversial contribution to contemporary battles over history education.

Teaching Critically about Lewis and Clark centers its discussion of the expedition in 1804 on the role of the Doctrine of Discovery, a legal legacy of a process in which Christians in medieval Europe, often armed with Papal decree, justified taking the lands and

7 Alison Schmitke, Leilani Sabzalian, and Jeff Edmundson, *Teaching Critically About Lewis and Clark: Challenging Dominant Narratives in K-12 Curriculum* (New York: Columbia Teachers Press, 2020), 2.

8 Ibid., 3.

9 Ibid.

10 Ibid., 4-5.

religious freedoms of non-Christians. Embedded in the larger context of European imperialism and, in terms of the expedition, transferred from France and Spain to the United States as part of the Louisiana Purchase, the Doctrine of Discovery was enshrined in American law in the U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823). The doctrine fueled the idea of Manifest Destiny and, as the authors and other scholars have argued, has served as the foundation of federal policy toward Indigenous peoples ever since. The book's use of the doctrine helps teachers frame westward expansion, Native American subjugation, and other developments such as African enslavement as part of a larger trend of imperialism rather than unique historical moments. Challenging students to rethink the idea of "discovery," the doctrine allows teachers to flip the traditional narrative in order to explain how the Louisiana Purchase was so much more than 827,000 square miles sold to the United States for \$15 million. The implications of this purchase have extended far beyond the notion of any single real estate transaction.

Part of the transformative nature of the anticolonial curriculum stems from the author's attention to the role of language in reifying traditional narratives. To the authors' credit, many teachers will find themselves reflecting on their own academic background and use of existing curriculum materials as the book capitalizes on the recent work of scholars such as Dolores Calderon, Jean O'Brien, and Emma LaRocque to address the sometimes explicit but often subtle ways that language "naturalizes colonial curriculum."¹¹ The authors, in a feature that will be especially valuable to novice teachers, describe specific examples such as "settler grammars," "firsting and lasting," and a "civ/sav dichotomy" that have long been common in both

11 Dolores Calderon, "Uncovering Settle Grammars in Curriculum," *Education Studies* 50(4), 313-318; Joan O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); Emma LaRocque, *When the Other is Me: Native Resistance Discourse, 1850-1990* (Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press, 2010).

primary and secondary sources. For example, Native Americans “wander” and Europeans “explore” while traditional narratives often identify Europeans as having “discovered” an “uncharted” or seemingly empty West. Other examples include references to European settlers as the “first” to accomplish a feat or language in both educational materials and historical evidence that suggest to students “Indian inferiority and Western superiority.”¹² Such discussion in *Teaching Critically about Lewis and Clark* serves multiple purposes as careful attention to the nature and power of language helps students understand the origin and impact of the Doctrine of Discovery while also providing both teachers and students with the “anticolonial literacy” to critique additional historical narratives.¹³

The authors, all of whom have experience in K-12 classrooms and higher education, integrate their subversive approach to understanding and teaching about Lewis and Clark into fourteen ambitious lesson plans for elementary and secondary students. While teachers may find some of the lessons lacking in terms of using online links rather than including supporting materials in print, all fourteen of the lessons are student-centered and promote opportunities for student inquiry via valuable primary sources. The lessons, consistent with emerging efforts to promote historical inquiry and encourage informed action, often include the scaffolding of essential skills and ask students to evaluate multiple and often conflicting perspectives as part of both learning and challenging normative narratives. The seven elementary lessons include varied activities such as card games, one-pagers, and historical investigations. These activities are designed to build historical empathy and teach young students to analyze, infer, and consider the perspectives of Native Americans. For example, lesson #3 is centered on the Jefferson Peace Medals

12 Schmitke, Sabzalian, and Edmundson, 27.

13 Ibid., 32.

that Lewis and Clark bestowed on Indigenous leaders as part of asserting military and political power in the West. Students focus on the historical perspectives of Indigenous peoples, part of the [Tribal Legacy Project](#), as they encountered the medals as tangible expressions of the Doctrine of Discovery. The fourth elementary lesson also promotes the skills of historians as students reexamine ubiquitous historical references to Sacagawea, the Indigenous woman often described as an invaluable interpreter and guide for the expedition. The lesson highlights the problematic efforts of historians to draw conclusions about her life from limited and conflicting evidence as students learn historical methods and challenge the simplistic narratives of recent U.S. history textbooks.

The seven lessons for secondary students also include valuable historical investigations, especially the third lesson in which students examine the U.S. Supreme Court case, *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823) and participate in multiple activities to unpack the meaning and enduring impact of the Doctrine of Discovery on both American legal and intellectual traditions. Another lesson (#6) uses a role-playing teaching strategy as secondary students collaborate, despite the varied perspectives of different stakeholders, to design a bicentennial public history exhibit. The seventh lesson uses an innovative application of the four themes of [Teaching Hard History: American Slavery](#): freedom, enslavement, resistance, and families to reexamine the life of York, an African American slave owned by William Clark who participated in the expedition. Students explore personal letters from Clark that illustrate York's important contributions to the effort, his experiences as an enslaved person in Kentucky, and York's lengthy efforts at emancipation. The lesson is especially effective in helping students analyze the role of power and race in antebellum America. Finally, the emphasis on empowering students as both historians and citizens is apparent in *Teaching Critically about Lewis and Clark's* creative effort to link the past

with the present. The first lesson for secondary teachers, “The Stories Maps Tell,” asks students to compare maps from Too Né, an Arikara, and Clark from the early nineteenth century (1804, 1814) to maps and demographic data from the last ten years. The purpose of the comparison is to engage students in exploring the dispossession of Native homelands over time. Another effective lesson entitled, “Standing Rock and the Larger Story,” is framed as a mystery in which students examine the nature and legacy of the Corps of Discovery through the lens of recent activism by Indigenous people regarding the construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. The result is an appreciation of how colonial logics continue to shape both public policy and Indigenous resistance in the United States.

Together with informative chapters on the impact of the Doctrine of Discovery and additional resources such as a book review and essays on art and public history, the fourteen lesson plans integrate history and civic education in powerful ways that are consistent with recent calls for anti-racist education, teaching hard history, and decolonizing the curriculum. A hundred years after David Muzzey’s popular U.S. history textbooks sparked a conservative backlash, such efforts have led most recently to renewed calls for history education as the promotion of American patriotism. In the early 1920s Judge Wallace McCament, the chairman of the Sons of the American Revolution’s “Committee on Patriotic Education,” proclaimed that “The chief purpose to be subserved in teaching American history is the inculcation of patriotism.”¹⁴ This fall President Donald Trump promised the audience at the Republican National Convention that he would “fully restore patriotic education” as an effort to fight “left-wing indoctrination,” and he held a “White House Conference on American History” in the Rotunda of the National Archives on Constitution Day to announce plans to create a “1776

14 Faulkner, 340-343.

Commission” to promote a “pro-American Curriculum.”¹⁵ This latest battle in the long cultural war over history and the schools only underscores the importance and potential of the authors’ stance that “teaching about histories and legacies of conquest, Indigenous displacement, paternalism, and colonialism is necessary in order to teach a more complex, accurate, honest, and critical account of this shared history.”¹⁶

15 Moriah Blingit and Laura Meckler, “Trump Alleges ‘Left-Wing Indoctrination’ in School, Says He Will Create National Commission to Push More ‘Pro-American’ History,” *Washington Post*, September 17, 2020. The American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians issued statements on this conference on September 24 and September 25, respectively. See the AHA Statement [here](#) and the OAH Statement [here](#).

16 Schmitke, Sabzalian, and Edmundson, 3.

Book Reviews

Sam Wineburg. *Why Learn History (When It's Already on Your Phone)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 2018. Pp. 241.

In discussing the role of his most recent project in history education, Sam Wineburg insists “nor can I say as we approach six million downloads that our work has ‘changed the field’”(137). All of us who teach and research in the field of history education would beg to differ. Wineburg’s seminal work on historical thinking over the past three decades has changed how we think about teaching history. Over his lengthy and productive career, Professor Wineburg has changed the field, and for the better.

His most recent book, *Why Learn History (When It's Already on your Phone)*, provides a “greatest hits” examination of his work. Some chapters rework his previous writings, while others move into new territory. Such an organizational choice results in a choppy structure. While many chapters illustrate Wineburg’s insights, others ironically reflect his weakness as an historian. Despite its flaws, the book provides important new insights in the field of history education.

Wineburg’s discussions of his most recent projects at Stanford are informative and fascinating. He provides thought-provoking ruminations on the valuable websites, “[Reading Like a Historian](#)” and “[Beyond the Bubble](#).” His mind-bending analysis of the differences between science and history education posits that the past, unlike science, “bequeaths jagged fragments that thwart most attempts to form a complete picture.” He concludes that “parsimony in historical explanation often flirts with superficial reductionism”(109). Such articulate nuggets, sprinkled throughout *Why Learn History*, force the reader to put the book down for valuable self-reflection.

Wineburg is at his best when providing windows into new thoughts on teaching and learning in history. One example comes in Wineburg’s examination of newly popular quick-fix courses in media literacy as the antidote to “fake news.” Arguing that such

courses are insufficient, Wineburg insists on “a fundamental reorientation of the curriculum.” He then poses a number of brilliant and provocative questions, concluding that if we are to avoid the victory of tyranny, students must have a deep understanding of how to ask and answer historical questions (158). The book’s biggest strength is Wineburg’s ability to push the envelope regarding the purposes and methods of teaching history in the K-12 curriculum.

However, in this book Wineburg acts as a historian and at times falls short. The early chapters recount a variety of battles over history education in the past 30 years, battles in which Wineburg himself has been a consistent historical actor. In discussing the testing and standards movement, Wineburg recounts many of his earlier criticisms to great effect. In his chapter, “Committing Zinns,” Wineburg rightly criticizes Howard Zinn for lack of context, ahistorical cherry picking, and asking “yes-type” questions. My book, *The Memory Hole: The U.S. History Curriculum Under Siege* (2013), criticizes Zinn for the same failings.

Yet in other chapters Wineburg returns to earlier topics but fails to live up to his own standards. Wineburg commits his own “Zinn” in the chapter on the Teaching American History (TAH) professional development program. Wineburg begins with the supposition that the TAH program failed—a view reflecting his initial opposition to the program due to its political roots in outdated dogmas about learning history. He concludes with the argument that the program had “no national impact” (47).

The formal assessment programs for TAH were a disaster, and some of the programs failed. But Wineburg’s outline is incomplete and inaccurate. In fact, many of the programs moved far beyond the “sit and get” model of historical content knowledge he criticizes. I participated in more than two dozen professional development workshops for the National Council for History Education (NCHE) that went far beyond “putting the knowledge

into the heads of teachers who would in turn pour it in the heads of students”(37). Teachers were not typically “left alone to work amongst themselves” (44). They engaged in multiple discussions and interactive activities—often based on Wineburg’s own work. These programs changed the way they taught and the way their students learned. Wineburg knows about these very programs—he was on the Board of NCHE—but neglects to discuss them. Wineburg ignores too much and asks too many “yes-type questions” that support his conclusion that the program was an utter failure.

Wineburg also fails to explore the TAH program’s impact on professional development goals in history education. He rightly commends the work of a committee convened by the American Historical Association in 2002 that crafted the “Benchmarks for Professional Development in History Education“ (48), but does not consider that those who wrote that document (myself included) drew ideas from work in the TAH program.

We also owed our ideas to the work Sam Wineburg. Uneven as it may be, this book provides an invaluable reminder of the value of historical thinking and of the ways in which this thinking might help students navigate a challenging civic landscape. In the end, Wineburg’s work always forces the reader to think and reflect on how to improve the teaching and learning of history. In a world where so much that is written on education is not helpful to teachers, his insights make this book a valuable read.

University of Northern Colorado

Fritz Fischer

Rafe Blaufarb and Liz Clarke, *Inhuman Traffick: The International Struggle against the Atlantic Slave Trade: A Graphic History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. Xxix + pp 198. \$19.95.

Fueled by the success of Trevor Getz’s award-winning *Abina and the Important Men*, Oxford University Press has signaled

its commitment to the genre of “graphic history” by publishing six works in the series bearing that name. In *Inhuman Traffick*, the eminent French revolutionary and Atlantic historian, Rafe Blaufarb, teamed with the talented illustrator, Liz Clarke, to produce a remarkable example of how graphic history can engage students by combining the undeniable power of images as a form of storytelling with traditional components of a valuable pedagogical tool.

Inhuman Traffick revolves around the *Neirsée* incident in 1828-29, a complex tale hitherto unknown before Blaufarb’s skillful archival research. A slaving vessel of indeterminate nationality, the *Neirsée* was captured off the African coast as part of the British Navy’s suppression of the Atlantic slave trade. After retaking the ship, slavers sailed it to the Caribbean islands where they released Europeans at British Dominica and sold African passengers into slavery at French Guadeloupe. Because the latter group included not only the 280 survivors among the 309 original slaves but also several African Krumen (Royal Navy personnel) and Sierra Leoneans (British subjects), authorities in the UK demanded from French officials the freedom of its British African subjects. In return, the French objected to both British violation of French territory on Guadeloupe and the original confiscation of the *Neirsée*, which (falsely) flew under the French flag and was theoretically off limits to searches by British warships. Thus, the *Neirsée* incident precipitated a diplomatic imbroglio in 1829.

Although the incident resulted neither in war nor a bilateral antislaving breakthrough between France and Britain, Blaufarb’s essay and Clarke’s illustrations argue for the affair’s significance; Blaufarb contends compellingly that it “opens a panoramic view on the spatial, temporal, and human dimension of the Atlantic world in the early nineteenth century” (38). Spatially, *Inhuman Traffick* depicts the interconnectedness of the Atlantic world, as the *Neirsée* incident played out on the coast of Africa, in the American plantation complex, and in ministries in Paris and

London. Temporally, the book sheds much light—in the graphic history section itself as well as the accompanying primary source collection—on the nature and problems of 19th-century communication when news travelled at the speed of sailing ships. The work is especially brilliant in capturing the “human dimension” of Atlantic history. Thanks to the effectiveness of visual images, *Inhuman Traffick* brings vividly to life issues ranging from the dangers of seafaring to the drama of the antislavery movement, from the horrors of the Middle Passage to the tragedy of enslavement. Readers will be moved if not sickened by the story of Sarah George. Despite frantic efforts of her husband, Thomas, and British authorities, this free woman from Sierra Leone was the only British subject never found and liberated after having been enslaved on Guadeloupe. Presumably, she shared the traumatic fate of the *Neirsée*'s 280 enslaved captives—and 10.7 million other humans. Literally and figuratively, Blaufarb and Clarke put a human face on the Atlantic commerce in flesh.

Inhuman Traffick constitutes an outstanding teaching tool on several levels. First, high school and college instructors might assign Parts I (“The Historical Context”) and II (“The Graphic History”) as an excellent means of introducing students to Atlantic history. Blaufarb’s concise yet rich contextual section offers an admirable précis of such themes as the Atlantic slave trade and abolitionism. The graphic history then re-presents various themes in a gripping combination of text and pictures: chapter 1 depicts international anti-slave trade efforts; chapter 2 covers the capture and retaking of the *Neirsée*; the third chapter follows the Middle Passage and the sale of Africans into slavery; a fourth chapter treats the international conflict; a final and unexpected chapter, “From Happening to History,” shows the actual process of document preservation and archival research that allowed Blaufarb to discover the *Neirsée* incident and recreate its history.

While providing a history of the Atlantic slave trade, Blaufarb simultaneously explains the process of doing history. Thus, on a

second level, *Inhuman Traffick* will function as a welcome text in courses on historical methodology. The preface tells how the project came to fruition and how the authors collaborated to create approximately 300 “cells.” Part III contains 37 primary sources. After reading them, students can reflect back on the graphic history to assess how the authors transformed ship dispatches and diplomatic missives into a cohesive story. Part IV (“The Questions”) requires students not only to contemplate issues related to the content of Atlantic history but also to think about how history is written (and drawn). For example, the authors invite criticism of the “biases and weaknesses” of their script and images; in another place, Blaufarb challenges students to identify where “gaps and silences” in the primary sources necessitated his use of knowledge and imagination to make educated guesses.

Utterly compelling and visually stimulating, *Inhuman Traffick* is an impressive achievement that will convince any skeptic—including this reviewer—of the immense classroom potential of graphic history.

Illinois State University

Anthony Crubaugh

Nina Willner. *Forty Autumns: A Family’s Story of Courage and Survival on Both Sides of the Berlin Wall*. New York: HarperCollins, 2016. Pp. 391. \$15.99.

On June 26, 1963, President John F. Kennedy, on a visit to West Berlin, eloquently lamented, “The [Berlin] Wall is...an offense not only against history but an offense against humanity, separating families, dividing husbands and wives and brothers and sisters, and dividing a people who wish to join together.” All too often, the humanity of those impacted by the events of the Cold War gets lost in the background of the larger narrative of communism versus democracy—the Soviet Union versus the United States. Nina Willner’s work, *Forty Autumns: A Family’s Story of Courage and Survival on Both Sides of the Berlin Wall*

(2016), successfully and vividly injects much needed humanity into the Cold War.

Written as primarily a family memoir, *Forty Autumns* tells the story of just one of the families divided by the Berlin Wall. Willner's book chronicles the life of her mother, Hanna, and grandparents, Erna and Karl (Willner regularly only refers to Erna and Karl as Oma and Opa, or Grandma and Grandpa.) The book, which is divided into roughly four sections, begins with several maps of Europe during the Cold War. From there, one of the greatest features of the book appears, a family and historical chronology as Willner pairs the events of the Cold War physically right alongside their impact on her family. Seeing the history of the Cold War linked to the impacts of particular historical events on real people makes the vivid narrative of *Forty Autumns* difficult to put down. In 1946 the Soviets occupied East Germany and imposed Soviet law. That same year, Opa, who fought for the Germans during WWII, was forced to begin teaching Soviet doctrine to his many students in East Germany.

The Cold War had more physically terrifying consequences on the people of East Germany than being forced to learn and love communism. Not wanting to take any chances of people inciting dissent, many East Germans were thrown into prison with little idea why they had been arrested. The Hoheneck Castle, which was known around the world for its Gothic and Renaissance architecture, was converted to house women. In eloquent yet terrifying prose, Willner paints the picture: "There, skin to skin, in total darkness, with no room to sit, they were made to stand in knee-deep freezing water for days on end in dank, poorly ventilated chambers until they simply passed out" (72). The inhumanity of what happened at Hoheneck Castle, although known to historians, is often missing from more traditional narratives. Since *Forty Autumns* was written in such an accessible way, more people today will understand the realities of life behind the Iron Curtain.

Willner's book could be used in the classroom in a variety of ways. The most obvious, though, would be to use the story of her family to both introduce and to potentially teach the entirety of the Cold War. This would be particularly doable since Willner interjected the major events of the Cold War throughout the many pages of *Forty Autumns*. On the family level, for example, East German authorities harassed Opa at the same time the Warsaw Pact was being formed and dissent was being silenced. *Forty Autumns* definitely brings to life the impact of many Cold War developments on both individuals and Germany as a whole.

While not all of Millner's family lived to see Germany reunified in 1990, all the individuals discussed helped make true a few of President Ronald Reagan's words: "What is right will always triumph" (324). Although much of *Forty Autumns* detailed the horrors of life under communism in East Germany, it ended on a positive note, with Willner's extended family reuniting in a united Germany in 2013. Anyone interested in learning more about the Cold War or about one family's brave attempt at enduring the unthinkable should give *Forty Autumns* a read. Beyond that, in a more contemporary moment where construction of a wall is regularly discussed as a way to make life better for so many, the history within *Forty Autumns* should be seen as a foreboding tale.

Minooka High School

Trevor Shields

David W. Blight and Jim Downs, eds. *Beyond Freedom: Disrupting the History of Emancipation*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 2017. Pp. 190. \$24.95.

Students of Emancipation need no better reason to pick up *Beyond Freedom* than it emerged from a 2011 conference held at the Gilder-Lehrman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance, and Abolition, of which David Blight is now the director, and has chapters by a veritable who's who in Emancipation Studies. It is also a thoughtful reminder that historians are continually

grappling with what freedom was in the nineteenth century, who defined it, and whether it was enough to make a difference in African Americans' lives.

The title might seem misleading to many readers, as the book is entirely about emancipation; however, the subtitle clarifies that historians are trying to disrupt the "freedom paradigm," which focused on freedom in zero sum fashion, by emphasizing the painful process of emancipation, and in the process abandoning the traditional periodization and adopting different lenses to analyze the citizen's relationship to the state. In sum, the authors remind us, emancipation was messy, it was never preordained to end in perfect freedom, and Black voices, freed and enslaved, still offer the best avenue to revise our understanding of emancipation, its promises, and its limits.

The collection is organized in three parts, though one could argue there should only be two: those pieces written in a traditional academic format and those written as ruminations on how historians have failed to adequately interrogate the sources, at best, or have ignored or misused the terror and suffering Black people faced in the nineteenth century. Parts one and two, "From Slavery to Freedom" and "The Politics of Freedom," take the more traditional approach and emphasize a process of emancipation that was not restricted to the period following the Civil War and was anything but progressive. According to Richard Newman, Black emancipation and responses to it during Reconstruction took place in the wake of earlier emancipations, in and beyond the United States. As a result, Black and White Americans alike were familiar with the "grammar" of emancipation and understood this was not a story with a preordained conclusion. As a result, we need to apply different lenses that challenge the when, where, and how emancipation happened. More importantly, we need to recognize Black people—enslaved and free, male or female, adult or child—as "fully realized political people" (27). If we do so, a more complex and less celebratory portrait of emancipation

emerges. Part three, "Meditations on the Meaning of Freedom," deviates from the traditional format, possibly to avoid the lack of "human touch" that may characterize for laymen the problems with academia, but is a welcome glimpse into historians reflecting upon their craft and taking seriously Susan O'Donovan's claim, "if [B]lack lives matter today, then so should the whole of the [B]lack past"(29). As a result, readers will find greater attention paid to the circumstances and actions of African Americans, specifically women and children, and the political nature of their torture, suffering, and grief.

In general, *Beyond Freedom*, will be a valuable tool for faculty and graduate students interested in a refresher concerning the state of the conversation concerning emancipation. The books the contributors have produced in the last decade constitute an essential reading list for scholars of the period. At the undergraduate level, this volume would be a good edition to a seminar, in which students fashion independent theses within the context of a larger conversation, employ primary sources in some fashion, and question the epistemological problems associated with a vague concept like freedom. Jim Downs's focus on "the Ontology of the Freedmen's Bureau Records" is an apt reminder that sometimes the "records [and historians] assign a particular narrative logic to a process that lacks order and efficiency," and, as a result, "What freedom meant to freed people has only been partially told" (175). Even in that context, however, the volume will require a skilled teacher, already familiar with the existing historiography, to make sense of it for students. If there is any criticism, it might be the omission of any focus on emancipation beyond the United States, except in the preface by Foner.

As historians come to grips with the suffering, abuse, and terror Blacks faced, emancipation, as Thavolia Glymph notes, has the potential to "break your heart" (132), but this collection may also give students the hope that by abandoning the traditional periodization or models we so often rely upon and paying

attention to the voices of those long ignored, they too can add to our understanding of how power, belonging, and emancipation are connected.

Illinois State University

Ron Gifford

Lynn Dumenil. *The Second Line of Defense: American Women and World War I*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2017. Pp. 360. \$39.95 cloth, \$38.99 e-Book.

When considering American women's role during a large twentieth century war, many do not think of the First World War. Outside of the Red Cross or the YWCA, the story many of us learned about the Great War does not include women. We do not have that powerful image of Rosie the Riveter of World War II to connect us to the strong woman of World War I. But Lynn Dumenil closes that gap of knowledge in her outstanding book, *The Second Line of Defense: American Women and World War I*.

Dumenil is careful not to use "American Women *in* World War I," (emphasis mine) in the subtitle because she covers so much more than American women *in* the war. For example, she effectively weaves the women's suffrage movement into the larger context of the story. Women's involvement in the war effort was not only beneficial to a country at war, but also impeccably important to women's suffrage and women's rights in general, and the image of women in America less than two decades removed from the end of the nineteenth century. Dumenil is masterful in her coverage of the suffrage movement and the Great War in the first chapter. So this book is so much more than a study about American women working in the war industry, although that is a crucial element as well.

In a general sense, Dumenil succeeds in addressing the social and political climate of a century ago in the United States with war as a backdrop while also in the forefront, and how women

were both plagued by American gender norms in the late teens, and how women shaped the country during a difficult time for them. But she is especially sharp in her coverage of African American women during World War I throughout *The Second Line of Defense*. Of course, African American women had to fight harder than white women, and organizations such as the YWCA, and the National American Woman Suffrage Association, among many others, discriminated against them. Overall, White women were just as prejudiced against African Americans as White men.

The book covers women's issues, roles, and the war domestically and in Europe. Dumenil also includes the wonderful chapter, "Visual Representations of Women in Popular Culture," in which she evaluates war posters and the cinema. The book's epilogue places women's gains during the war years into the larger context of the 1920s. There is most assuredly something missing, but it does not feel that way. If there is one criticism, it is that Dumenil includes too much. But that is also the book's strength. She embraces several areas of a complex topic encompassing a number of organizations, characters, and issues, while effortlessly meshing them into a singular story.

Dumenil's research is broad and inclusive, with many vital primary sources cited including papers from the organizations covered in the book. She also lists a plethora of secondary sources in the bibliography. Those teaching undergraduate and graduate students should find *The Second Line of Defense* valuable in class, including survey courses. In introductory courses, the book can be used as a valuable tool to explain women's roles in war, instead of the more traditional World War II studies. But it can also be utilized in American history classes from freshman courses to graduate seminars so students gain a deeper understanding of the women's suffrage movement during the touchy and sensitive years of the First World War. And, of course, it is valuable as a study about American society during the first twenty years of the twentieth century and how women challenged the status quo in

the era of the Great War.

The Second Line of Defense adds to the library of an outstanding scholar, in which she introduces new insights from her impressive use of primary and secondary sources. But it is much more than that. Dumenil provides an enriched understanding of what might be considered the beginning of the modern women's movement. That can be debated, but there is little doubt, as Dumenil so keenly illustrates, that American women during the First World War played a richly crucial role in the war effort and utilized their role to gain the constitutional right to vote.

Arkansas National Guard Museum

Raymond D. Screws

George Takei, et al. *They Called Us Enemy*. Marietta, GA: Top Shelf Productions, 2019. Pp. 205. \$19.99.

In 1946, Miné Okubo, a Japanese American from California who spent much of World War II in the Topaz Relocation Center, an internment camp in Utah, published *Citizen 13660*. An accomplished artist, Okubo included almost 200 black line drawings in her memoir which she described as a rare glimpse of daily life inside an internment camp. *Citizen 13660* debuted just 12 months after Japan's surrender and, while many American readers may not have been ready to face the disturbing realities of American wartime decisions, the book review in the *New York Times* described the memoir as an "objective and vivid" account of the impact of "hysteria that finally led the Federal Government into acceptance of racial discrimination as an instrument of national policy."

George Takei, most well-known as an actor on the television show *Star Trek*, was only four years old when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Seventy-eight years later, Takei, along with Justin Eisinger, Steven Scott, and artist Harmony Becker, provides a comparable visual memoir to *Citizen 13660* in the form of a powerful graphic novel entitled, *They Called Us Enemy*. While Takei struggled as a

young man to find any information about Japanese internment in his formal education, much has changed since Okubo's memoir. The last fifty years have included a growing historiography on internment, the creation of the Japanese American museum in Los Angeles, and the inclusion of the history of Japanese Americans during the war in textbooks, content standards, documentary films, art exhibits, and even children's literature. In 1988 the same federal government that enforced Executive Order 9066 in 1942 formally apologized for the internment camps through the Civil Liberties Act which included minimal restitution to surviving victims such as Okubo and Takei.

Despite the age of its author during the war, *They Called Us Enemy* provides a surprisingly comprehensive account of the experiences of Japanese Americans during the period. Takei's father was an *Issei*, born in Japan before immigrating to California, while his mother was a *Kibei*, a Japanese American born in the United States but, in part due to the realities of racial discrimination in California at the time, educated in Japan. Born in Los Angeles, George and his younger brother and most individuals sent to camps were *Nisei* and therefore American citizens. Takei's accessible family history takes the reader from life in Los Angeles in the 1930s, a feature often missing from wartime narratives, to temporary housing at a makeshift assembly center at the Santa Anita racetrack, where George started first grade in 1942. After a long train ride across the West that thrilled the children while their parents and other adults remained terrified, the Takei family arrived in Camp Rowher in Arkansas only to return to California in 1944 as inmates at the Tule Lake War Relocation Center. Along the way Takei illustrates some of the period's unique cultural conflicts through families who faced additional challenges because family members taught Japanese language or served as a Buddhist minister.

Two specific aspects of *They Called Us Enemy* are especially valuable to students in understanding how Japanese Americans

navigated the dangers and unknowns of war, race, and persecution. First, George's parents were labeled "No-Nos" in 1944 because they refused to volunteer for U.S. military service or to renounce any allegiance to the Japanese emperor. This decision led to the family's forced reassignment to Tule Lake in northern California and a community that included an array of political positions ranging from principled nonviolent resistance in the face of American hypocrisy to the dramatic role of protesters, some of whom completely rejected the United States and Takei describes as "radicals." Fearful of postwar violence, George's mother even renounced her American citizenship in the hope of keeping the family relatively safe in the camps and, after deportations started, joined other internment survivors in successfully reversing the decision and reclaiming their American citizenship. All of these and other features of the graphic novel provide students with a more diverse portrait of the many ways Japanese Americans navigated the period.

Second, not unlike Art Spiegelman's groundbreaking graphic novel *Maus* which explored the history and legacy of the Holocaust, Takei's family history sheds light on enduring generational conflicts within Japanese American communities. In contrast to many histories that focus exclusively on the war years, Takei's narrative, not unlike the documentary film *Rabbit in the Moon* (1999), includes important later discussions between George and his father as the family attempts to deal with the trauma of internment. George's father dealt with personal guilt over his relative passivity during the ordeal while George used his formative experiences to shape a larger activism that included sharing the stage with Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. at a civil rights rally in 1961. George and his family's struggles with cultural assimilation, identity, and social change in the years after 1945 provide an accessible complement to both *Citizen 13660* and many of the issues raised in Greg Robinson's *After Camp: Portrait in Midcentury Japanese American Life and Politics* (2012).

Of course, Takei's memoir is incapable of addressing all the issues that have emerged in the historiography. There is no hint of the important political discussions from California to Washington, D.C. between Pearl Harbor and February 1942, nor does Takei address the significant political divisions associated with the Japanese American Citizens League. Although the graphic novel includes brief references to historic documents such as Executive Order 9066, evacuation posters from California, and the controversial loyalty oath in 1944, failing to fully include these seminal primary sources in the book is a lost opportunity for students and teachers. Elsewhere, readers may find themselves wishing for more historical context in such as areas as the larger history of conscientious objectors or, because *They Called Us Enemy* includes an intriguing image of African Americans sitting near the railroad tracks in Arkansas, a broader discussion of internment and race that includes the Jim Crow South. Regardless, *They Called Us Enemy* succeeds in providing a compelling graphic narrative of life in the internment camps and the ongoing journey, of both Takei and his nation, to make sense of the complex intersection of race, public policy, and historical memory.

Illinois State University

Richard Hughes

Teaching History: A Journal of Methods

Founded in 1975

First Issue Published in 1976

Founders:

Stephen Kneeshaw, College of the Ozarks

Loren Pennington, Emporia State University

Philip Reed Rulon, Northern Arizona University

Editor:

Stephen Kneeshaw, College of the Ozarks (1976-2016)

Sarah Drake Brown, Ball State University (2016-present)

Book Review Editors:

Ronald Butchart, SUNY College at Cortland (1976-1981)

William Mugleston, Georgia Highlands College (1981-1991
and 1993-2004)

Bullitt Lowry, University of North Texas (1992-1993)

Robert Page, Georgia Highlands College (2005-2013)

C. David Dalton, College of the Ozarks (2014-2015)

Richard Hughes, Illinois State University (2016-present)

Publication Directors:

Loren Pennington, Emporia State University (1976-1980)

Samuel Dicks, Emporia State University (1981-2002)

Christopher Lovett, Emporia State University (2002-present)