Teaching History

A Journal of Methods

Volume 46 • No. 1 • Spring 2021

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 and Emporia 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 46 | No. 1 | Spring 2021

Articles

FIRST AS TRAGEDY, THEN AS TELEVISION SERIES: TEACHING THE PRESENTATION OF HISTORY IN *A FRENCH VILLAGE* ***2***
Donald Reid, University of North Carolina

VALUING PROCESS OVER PRODUCT: USING WRITING TO TEACH HISTORY IN THE UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY CLASSROOM ***10***
Genesea M. Carter, Colorado State University
David Korostyshevsky, Colorado State University and the University of Denver

THE HISTORIAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FUTURE: RECORDING COVID-19 FOR THE NEXT GENERATION ***23***
Joe P. Dunn, Converse College

Special Section

TEACHING HISTORY FORUM: *THE AMATEUR HOUR*

INTRODUCTION ***26***
Sarah Drake Brown, Ball State University
Richard Hughes, Illinois State University

BOOK REVIEW: Zimmerman, *The Amateur Hour: A History of College Teaching in America* ***27***
Robert L. Hampel, University of Delaware

TIME TO GET SERIOUS: TRAINING GRADUATE STUDENTS IN TEACHING ***29***
Catherine J. Denial, Knox College

ARE WE REALLY *THAT* CLUELESS? ***30***
David A. Gerber, University at Buffalo (SUNY)

A BREAK WITH THE PAST OR RESURGENCE OF AMATEURISM? PLACING OUR PANDEMIC ERA IN THE HISTORY OF COLLEGE TEACHING ***32***
Jessamyn Neuhaus, SUNY Plattsburgh

CREATING THE CONDITIONS FOR GOOD COLLEGE TEACHING ***34***
Keith Pluymers, Illinois State University

Book Reviews

Resor, *Exploring Vacation and Etiquette Themes in Social Studies: Primary Source Inquiry for Middle and High School; Investigating Family, Food, and Housing Themes in Social Studies; Discovering Quacks, Utopias, and Cemeteries: Modern Lessons from Historical Themes* **36**
Jared McBrady, SUNY-Cortland

Gorton, *Citizen Reporters: S.S. McClure, Ida Tarbell, and the Magazine that Rewrote America* ***37***
Richard Hughes, Illinois State University

Miller, *This Radical Land: A Natural History of American Dissent* ***39***
Robert Fitzgerald, University High School, Illinois State University

Treuer, *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present* ***40***
Linda M. Clemmons, Illinois State University

FIRST AS TRAGEDY, THEN AS TELEVISION SERIES: TEACHING THE PRESENTATION OF HISTORY IN *A FRENCH VILLAGE*

Donald Reid

University of North Carolina

Americans and Europeans increasingly look to the television drama series for their historical education, whether about Chernobyl or the struggle to pass the Equal Rights Amendment.[1] We have long shown documentaries to students and fact-checked docudramas and dramatic films set in the past, but the television drama series offers new opportunities and challenges. The extended viewing time and the sustained involvement the audience has with a television drama series distinguishes it from documentaries, docudramas, and dramatic films. While there is an extensive literature on the presentation of history in film, much less scholarly analysis exists on the television drama series and how it communicates ideas about the past.[2] The feuilleton quality of episodes and hiatus between them (unless binge-watched on a streaming service) leaves viewers to think through the narrative of the series itself as they wait for the next episode. Edgar Reitz's *Heimat: A Chronicle* (1984) presented continuity and change in a twentieth-century German village over several generations, but Frédéric Krivine and his team's *A French Village* (2009-2017) has a different ambition: to permit viewers to interpret a particular historical event—the German occupation of France during World War II—in ways they had not before. Can a television series present the complexities of this history and the issues it raises? Can it convey these debates to a large audience? What impact does this form of presentation have on viewers' understanding of the past? A diverse group of first-year students addresses these questions in a seminar I teach on *A French Village*.[3] Students learn about the occupation of France during the Second World War, and they study postwar debates about its history and memory. However, the primary goal of the course is to develop students' abilities to analyze the presentation of history outside of books or documentary films by examining a work in a genre that most of them engage with more often and perhaps more deeply, the television drama series. Students ask when imagination could (or could not) enable an audience to see what happened in the past in revealing new ways.

Controversy and Context: The Development of *A French Village*

In 2006, Jonathan Littel published *The Kindly Ones*, a novel that explored the mind of an SS officer. Claude Lanzmann, the director of *Shoah* (1985), thought that those born after the war like Littel should not make its horrors the subject of fiction. The resister, novelist, and scriptwriter Jorge Semprun disagreed. He praised Littel's novel and thought that the creative efforts of later generations were necessary to keep the French interested in the wartime experience and the issues it raised.[4] The team that produced *A French Village* made a nod to Littel in their presentation of the SS officer Heinrich Müller, a character as complex as he is cruel.[5] Krivine introduced in France the creative practices of American shows like *The Wire* and *Breaking Bad* to make a series set in Villeneuve, a fictional town in the Jura situated on the line that initially divided defeated France between the

[1] Johan Renck, *Chernobyl* (2019); Davhi Waller, *Mrs. America* (2020).

[2] On the presentation of history in movies, see Robert Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History*, 3rd edition (New York: Routledge, 2017). There are many studies of the historical past in individual films. For the period under consideration, a good guide is Leah D. Hewitt, *Remembering the Occupation in French Film: National Identity in Postwar Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

[3] *A French Village* is available on Amazon and other streaming sites. I would like to take this opportunity to thank my students, my collaborators and resisters in this project.

[4] "Lanzmann juge *Les Bienveillantes*," *Le Nouvel Observateur*, September 21, 2006, 27; Jorge Semprun, "Le Big Bang Littell," *L'Express*, November 9, 2006, 126.

[5] The historical figure Heinrich Müller was the SS officer in charge of the Gestapo. The SS officer Heinrich Müller in *A French Village* shares his name, but not his biography. The series gives its Heinrich Müller a life after the war, whereas the historical Heinrich Müller disappeared at the war's end, leaving only a string of hypotheses and unverifiable sightings.

© 2021 Reid. Free to copy and share for education and scholarship under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License.

region governed by the Vichy regime and that under direct German control. In 72 episodes of 45-50 minutes, broadcast over nine years, a large, faithful viewing audience in France followed the lives of inhabitants of Villeneuve and their relations with the German army and the Gestapo stationed in the city, and later with the American army, from 1940 to 1945. A final season examines the afterlives of characters in light of their wartime experiences.[6]

A French Village devotes particular attention to what Jean-Pierre Azéma, a leading historian of the occupation and adviser to the series, refers to as the "gray zone" constituted by the French making decisions about identity and survival throughout the war.[7] Students find this concept particularly helpful and introduce it into their analyses of subjects not explicitly addressed in these terms by Azéma. After the war, the French, broadly speaking, saw themselves as having been a "people in resistance" during the occupation. However, in the 1970s, the first postwar generation came to see occupied France as a nation of collaborators, deeply complicit in the deportation of Jews. While historians have developed more nuanced understandings of the lived experience of the French in occupied France, the French as a whole have clung to a categorization of the population as collaborators, resisters, and fence sitters.[8] In *A French Village*, the showrunners present the often troubling ambiguities of people living in difficult times, who may not have fallen into solely one of these groups, and to the extent that they did, it may not have been for the reasons given by postwar generations. The series has been well received by historians of occupied France.[9] Viewing, discussing, and writing about *A French Village* with these issues in mind develops students' abilities as historians and as analysts of the possibilities and limitations of presentation of the past in a genre whose complexities they both know and do not know well.

Teaching *A French Village*: The Purpose and Context of the Course

My course on *A French Village* is a seminar with twenty-four first-year students. I have offered it a couple of times and will continue to do so. It is a general elective, and few students in the class plan to be history majors. Most are embarked on studies in business, medicine, and computer science. At the beginning of the class, their knowledge of the history of twentieth-century France, like the knowledge of history that most viewers bring to historical drama, is sketchy.

Over the course of the semester, I give more than a dozen short lectures on the political history of the period and topics addressed in the series like the school system, the children born to German-French couples, the prosecution of rape cases by the American army, and the Vichy Syndrome to provide the students with context and to introduce them to recent historical work on the occupation and on the collective memory of the period. Students read selections from primary documents by Marc Bloch, Marshall Pétain, and Jean-Paul Sartre, among others, and from secondary works by Julian Jackson, Chris Millington, Robert Paxton, Henry Rousso, and Olivier Wieviorka to give them the grounding to assess the choices made by Krivine and his team in *A French Village*. In addition, students discuss selections from two documentaries: Marcel Ophuls' *The Sorrow and the Pity* (1969) and Claude Chabrol's *The Eye of Vichy* (1993), whose script was written by Azéma and Paxton. Students realize they are looking for a different sense of "truth" in documentary and dramatic films, although the genres borrow techniques from one another. They also view and discuss the postwar Resistance epic by René Clément, *The Battle of the Rails* (1946) and Louis Malle's *Lacombe Lucien* (1974), whose iconoclastic treatment of the occupation clearly influenced *A French Village*.

---

[6] When broadcast, the audience averaged close to 3.5 million viewers; many later watched the series on DVD or by streaming. Barnard Papin, *Un Village français. L'Histoire au risque de la fiction* (Neuilly: Atlande, 2017), 142.

[7] In 1986, the Holocaust survivor Primo Levi introduced the term "the gray zone" for prisoners who collaborated in one way or another with the camp authorities. Primo Levi, *The Drowned and the Saved*, trans. Raymond Rosenthal (New York: Vintage, 1989), 36-69.

[8] Pierre Laborie, *Le chagrin et le venin. La France sous l'Occupation, mémoire et idées reçues* (Montrouge: Bayard, 2011).

[9] For the history and reception of the series in France, see Donald Reid, "*Un Village français*: Imagining Lives in Occupied France," *French Cultural Studies* 30, no. 3 (August 2019): 220-231.

Fifteen-minute lectures and short readings assure that students have the time to view the series carefully and to discuss it thoroughly in class. Five-to-ten minute bonus files composed of a brief presentation by Azéma and extracts from oral histories relating to the subject he discusses accompany the series. Viewing these is not a substitute for lectures and readings on the period. However, discussing what they see in the oral histories in light of contemporary historical scholarship and of the presentation of the occupation in the series allows students to analyze sources. These oral histories, generally focused on individuals' families, accentuate the positive, in the form of acts that led to survival. While *A French Village* examines the collaboration of mayors with the German occupiers, a number of the oral histories discuss mayors' acts of resistance, like the provision of fake IDs and ration cards, subjects absent from the series.

Scriptwriters are a particular kind of storytellers, and the series is a medium that encourages the telling of several stories at once or one story in several ways. Events in *A French Village* have a basis in the historical record, but the ways they are put together in a single community presents challenges the students explore. We address important elements of screenwriting like synchronicity, and we examine the presentation of a common theme in a diversity of situations in one episode to lead the viewer to recognize unexpected relationships or parallel situations that have different consequences. Nowhere is this more evident than in the love lives of characters. As a rule of thumb, heterosexual marriage between individuals of the same nationality and religion lack amour, whereas homosexual liaisons and illicit heterosexual relationships between French citizens and those who are not, and between Jews and non-Jews, are more romantic as well as sites where the personal is necessarily the political. *A French Village* is a soap opera, and some of the best discussions come when students ask themselves whether this kept them more engaged with the series at the expense of understanding the historical situation, or whether this, in fact, leads them to understand better and more fully the stresses and demands placed on the French during the occupation. The goal is not for students to repress their emotional responses, but for them to see that involvement as an element of the success of the series and to analyze the particular historical interpretations that this encourages and discourages. It is also important that students explore the possibilities that different choices in filming allow. Close study of individual scenes, with discussion led by students, is particularly rewarding. Given a vocabulary to express their ideas, students are good at this task.[10] They are, for instance, particularly aware of how the community of Villeneuve confronts the unknown when introduced to desperate groups from the exterior, like the Spanish Civil War refugees seeking shelter in the church or the trainload of Jews housed in the school. Camera angle and the shared perspective—of the viewer and Villeneuve residents at some points and the outsiders looking at the inhabitants of Villeneuve community at other times—involves viewers emotionally in the chaos and inhumanity that characterized these historical situations.

Historians are trained to support arguments with evidence, but not to present seemingly extraneous details like those that make individuals human, a necessity in a television drama series. I encourage students to think of themselves in the role of showrunners. How can they construct a narrative that conveys understandings of history without seeming to do so, and that audiences which do not watch the show with the intention of learning about the past, will embrace? In a limited amount of screen time, what are the goals in terms of history and story and of emotional impact, and how well are they realized? To address these questions and engage students in considering them, I organize some classes as working groups called to review episodes in which selected students act as writers and as directors. To take one example, the series begins with the German invasion in 1940. Historians usually say such an event was traumatic and leave it at that, interested primarily in the long-term consequences of collective trauma. The first episodes of *A French Village* immerse viewers in the confusion and the diversity of experiences that were repressed or erased when the invasion was compressed into a collective trauma. Some of the best working group presentations concern this issue in the final season of the series. Students come up with creative ways to deal with the dialectic of apparent absence and invisible omnipresence inherent

[10] A good place to start is "The Basics of How to Read a Film." http://clevelandmediaclass.weebly.com/uploads/4/5/4/8/4548166/opening_act_film_language.pdf

in characters marked by traumatic memory of the occupation. Throughout the semester, students keep viewing notebooks that I review each week. Using what I learn from these, I put students in different break-out groups each week, composed of students I know are interested in a particular problem. I have the group formulate the issue as a thesis supported by evidence that they then present to the class as a whole for discussion. This helps students in turn think of historical texts and the television series not as collections of facts and scenes but as the basis of arguments constructed so as to make a point.

Teaching *A French Village*: Students as Historians and as Showrunners

The primary writing assignment for the semester is a research paper on a concept or subject in the series. Under my guidance, individual students familiarize themselves with historiographic debates on interpretation of the particular topic they choose. Students use this historiography as a starting point to examine the ways that the issue is addressed in the series. It is rare that as researchers, we are in a group in which all are deeply familiar with our major primary source. Having all viewed the series, students serve as knowledgeable critics and a receptive audience of one another's work.

By examining the findings of the students on subjects like collaboration, resistance, the Jewish experience, liberation, and the memory of the war, we can see how they become better and more daring practitioners of historical interpretation. They learn to treat the series as do research historians, who use documents for purposes other than those that apparently guided their creation. Students ask questions the showrunners had not intended to pose and take as evidence what the director and writers may not have understood they were telling viewers. In the *show, don't tell* manner of the series, viewers engage with the complex nature of collaboration in occupied France. In their papers, students develop typologies of the "gray zone" of collaboration. Daniel Larcher is called on to be mayor as the Germans arrive in Villeneuve. He is a sympathetic character who seeks to protect the population, but by the time he leaves office in 1942, the audience realizes that he had undertaken a fool's errand. If Daniel Larcher collaborates out of noblesse oblige, others do so with personal ambitions in mind. Raymond Schwartz and his wife Jeannine are business people who collaborate by doing business with the Germans, but later throw in their lot with the resistance. Raymond does so out of love for the resistance leader, Marie Germain, and Jeannine provides the resistance with funds and information as insurance should the Axis lose the war. Philippe Chassagne, Larcher's replacement as mayor, more easily fits the image of a collaborator.[11] He is a social climber, as well as an ardent anti-Semite and anti-Communist who promotes more extreme policies than the Germans themselves. The French state collaborator is embodied by the sub-prefect Luc Servier, whose primary goal was not to protect the people or to forward an ideology, but to secure a role for the French state and for himself by doing the Germans' bidding. Viewers see as well that the bureaucracy that managed collaboration, represented by Vichy officials who sought to keep businesses taken from Jews in French hands, created significant opportunities for corruption.

Other students are attuned to the particular attention *A French Village* pays to policing. In a diversity of ways students pursue what they understand to be the *Alltageschichte* project of assessing how the everyday practices of the forces of order and responses to them could shape and alter, strengthen and weaken, police power.[12] Students take this project in a number of directions, once again formulating and critiquing categorizations of a concept, in this case of policing. One student who worked on the police said that he liked some variant of "there are three forms of" in a lecture or text, but he had not realized all of the compromises and conflations that preceded such comforting affirmations until he did them himself (and analyzed how the scriptwriters had done them as well). The police commissioner Henri de Kervern, inherited by the Vichy regime from the Third Republic, believed that the French police should not take on the investigative work of the German occupiers:

[11] Historians would refer to Chassagne as a collaborationist because his fascist political views separate him from the collaborator out of necessity, Daniel Larcher.

[12] See Alf Lüdtke, ed., *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, trans. William Templer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

The job of the French police is such that they should appear to work hard, but make sure that they fail to find those who heckled Pétain and Hitler at the movie theatre. Jean Marchetti, who replaced de Kervern as head of the police in Villeneuve, has no such republican sensibility that would interfere with his duties to the new state. However, Marchetti is not an ideologue either. His authoritarian personality feeds on dominating people, but, in turn, like the SS officer Heinrich Müller, he is endowed with human foibles—Marchetti falls in love with a Jewish refugee, Rita de Witte, and has a child by her. That he does not personify the banality of evil makes him more accessible, but not more likeable.

The Milice was the paramilitary force established by the Vichy government in 1943 to combat the resistance. Viewers see that individual police agents could on occasion offer some limited protection to the resistance—a gendarme gives the resister Jules Bériot three hours to move a hidden printing press—and the police agent Vernet, talented at not coming up with Jews he is sent to round up, joins the Témoignage Chrétien resistance movement. As the tides of the war turned, the police as a whole show less enthusiasm for tracking down resisters. A Milice leader replaces Marchetti as police chief. In a melodramatic scene, the Milice make Vernet recite lines from Charles de Gaulle's moving speech of August 1944 in liberated Paris that the audience has already heard on a radio broadcast in the police station. The Milice then executes Vernet, his wife, and his young children.

The Milice are also the subject of what the students find to be the clearest example of the dramatic taking precedence over historical verisimilitude. As the American army approaches Villeneuve, the Milice and their families go to the station to catch a train to take them to shelter in Germany. Jews, including Rita de Witte, are there as well, awaiting a train to take them to their death. When the commanding German officer Schneider tells the Milice to shoot the Jews, the Milice leader refuses because the families of the Milice are present. As Schneider prepares to shoot the Jews himself, Marchetti shoots him—the second time he has killed a German soldier to defend Rita—and the Milice shoot the German troops who are with their officer. To make a Vichy police officer and the Milice responsible for a good portion of the deaths of German soldiers in the series is shocking and appears driven by the needs of the plot, not an effort to develop the audience's understanding of collaboration or the Milice. This incident is problematic, but students' exploration of such scenes in their papers and in discussion assures that they remain critics of what they were seeing, recognizing the uneasy relationship of history and drama.

As with collaboration, viewers see that entering the resistance, whether Gaullist, Communist, or that of the young men in the maquis who are escaping labor service in Germany, results from a confluence of personal, material, political, and ideological factors. The first resister the audience meets is a sex worker who gets information to relay to London from pillow talk with a German officer and passes it on to another client who is in the resistance. To enter the resistance, it is said that one had to know someone. With the exception of the Communist party, resisters did not work in organizations that had existed before the war. Resistance itself was a practice that resisters had to make up as they went along. If students are initially confused by resistance activities they see, they recognize that this is an instance when being unsure helps them to understand the past better. Discussion of the resistance gives students ample opportunity to assess the personal and social experience of life in the underground and to debate the moral and strategic decisions made by unprepared fighters. Although the resistance is credited with few accomplishments in the series, its presence, even if few resisters in the series join primarily out of loyalty to the nation and the republic, does temper the blanket condemnation of the French in occupied France as collaborators. The French were not the people in resistance that de Gaulle evoked, but there were people in resistance whose heterogeneity the series illustrates well. Students began the class with a dictionary definition of resistance, but as they recognize, resistance inhabits a "gray zone" of its own. Several students analyze acts of resistance not performed by a resister, like that of the schoolteacher Lucienne, or develop and defend in their papers and before the class typologies of resistance rooted in social histories of the lives of resisters.

The experience of Jews is a central question in debates over Vichy France. There would have been few Jews in a town in the Jura at the outbreak of the war. The audience knows of only two who live in Villeneuve before

1940, both of whom moved to the town as adults, a servant of Czechoslovak origin and the director of the school. In perhaps the most dramatic set of episodes in the series, a trainload of Jews being sent to Drancy in July 1942, at the time of the Vel d'Hiv roundup, are stuck in Villeneuve when their train breaks down. While these Jews are largely Central European refugees, the primary story lines concern Jews in Villeneuve who are arrested and confined with them. A Gaullist resister breaks with the leadership of the group in an effort to save a Jewish girl, but only because she is the daughter of a fellow resister. Hortense Larcher, the mayor's wife, changes places with her husband's Jewish mistress, Sarah, and only narrowly escapes deportation; she herself is the mistress of the SS officer Heinrich Müller, whom she had earlier gotten to take care of problems with Sarah's papers. These scenes reveal important facets of Hortense's character, deepening a central element of the drama, but they also challenge the limits of the historical imagination. This prompts a good discussion of the relation of storytelling to the telling of history. Students develop the idea of historical imagination as a means to deepen their understanding of the past by taking them from what happened and why to the questions of what was possible and impossible in a particular historical situation and why.[13] Having entered an imagined world in *A French Village*, students have some of their most sustained debates about imagining the past as a means of accessing what historians may not be able to see in the past as it existed and why.

No place is the showrunners' effort to make viewers rethink their understanding of the past clearer than in episodes devoted to Villeneuve after the Germans depart. A couple of officials of the Third Republic had initially retained their positions after the arrival of the Germans, but then went rogue and entered the national resistance movement. They return to Villeneuve at liberation in positions of importance in the new regime. These officials immediately begin cutting deals to allow them to keep their power while preserving a veneer of the political and social justice for which the resistance fought. The town hosts a party to celebrate liberation, but it takes place in the midst of a trial of Milice members, who are held in a pen in the center of town during the festivities. Trial deliberations are themselves confined by the need to balance the new government's demand for severity with the American desire to see a trial that appears fair. The unity of the resistance is lost, and some resisters take it upon themselves to render justice, culminating in the lynching of a number of Milice members. An angry crowd condemns Hortense Larcher for horizontal collaboration and shaves her head.[14]

The trial of Daniel Larcher is presented in such a way as to make the audience rethink their understanding of collaboration. The series audience sees his collaboration as involving efforts to defend the population, but in the trial these acts become apparently damning accusations against him. Events are remembered in a new context. Flashbacks to previous episodes of the show become the evidence that refutes, for the viewers, a witness's adamant denial that French gendarmes separated Jewish children from their parents in Villeneuve, saying only the Germans did this. Like the best microhistories, *A French Village* works on several levels.[15] It recognizes that there are different kinds of knowledge about the occupation operating in postwar France. In addition to acts open to interpretation as collaboration in trials and by crowds, the world of illicit behaviors the occupation nurtured and required created suspicions and hidden records that individuals use after liberation to get their way with others who need what happened in the occupation to stay in the occupation.

Thinking as showrunners as well as historians, students confront the question of how one ends a series and debate the choices made in *A French Village*, in which the fates of the major figures are a function of the legacies of the occupation and how these are given meaning in new contexts. French participation in the Holocaust was the unspoken of the first decades after the war. The Holocaust comes up in several ways in the final episodes of the series. When Hortense Larcher recounts to her husband that an Auschwitz survivor came to tell him that his mistress Sarah died in the camp, he does not believe his wife, who has been exhibiting paranoia since she

---

[13] Vivienne Little, "What is Historical Imagination?," *Teaching History* 36 (June 1983): 27-32.

[14] In what feels like an editorial comment by the scriptwriters, one of the most-hot headed of the resisters stands back from the assault, saying that fascists during the Spanish Civil War had shorn female Republicans.

[15] Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István M. Szijártó, *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice* (Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge, 2013).

was publicly humiliated. Although the audience knows Hortense is telling the truth, he has her committed to an asylum, where the patients are treated cruelly, and the food rations are kept at occupation-era levels. It is not a concentration camp, but the showrunners want the audience to know that the end of the camps did not mean the end of inhumanity.[16]

Jean Marchetti is executed, but his love, Rita de Witte, and Ézechiel Cohn, a Jewish refugee in Villeneuve, form a couple and go to Palestine. There they are killed by Arab fighters, who call out Deir Yassin, as they attack. When Ézechiel tells Rita that this is a Palestinian village where Jewish fighters killed women and children, she responds, "We're like them now." Once again, the showrunners are reminding viewers that inhumanity and injustice continued in the lives of survivors of the occupation. However, suggesting a relationship of the Jews in Palestine to the Germans during the war sparks an important discussion among students, who wonder if this works to lessen French responsibility for participation in the Holocaust with an everyone-does-it argument. Three decades after the end of the war, Daniel Larcher arranges for the cultural center in Villeneuve to show his wife Hortense's paintings. Jewish activists attack the exhibit of the SS officer's mistress, and it is closed. Hortense can only say that Jews were not like this in her day.

If the original repressed memory of the occupation was the nature and extent of collaboration with the Germans, in *A French Village* this takes the form of the life-changing loves of both Hortense and the schoolteacher, Lucienne, for Germans in the occupation forces. After the war, they stay loyal to these loves but cannot speak of them. The showrunners suggest that there are other forms of collaboration than those of the mayors, state officials, and business people that the French still do not fully recognize. It is represented in the series by Lucienne's daughter, Françoise, one of the one hundred thousand children who were born to French women and German fathers during the war. She takes her mother to visit her father's grave but is told neither that he was German nor that he was her father. Students explore the blind spots that personal and collective memory can reinforce in one another.

Although a lie told by the local Communist leader to the authorities creates the opportunity for the party to win the postwar election in Villeneuve, taking power that it holds for decades, it also leads to the death of a striking worker. The postwar history of the Communists is presented as the beginning of the end. The activist Suzanne leaves the party after learning about the leader's dishonesty and becomes a feminist who appears on television decades later supporting a woman's right to choose. Her daughter leaves the party, too, and works in a women's health clinic. Both find fulfillment in feminism, one of the new social movements that takes the place of the party for many activists in the 1970s. Those who remain in the party are lost souls. Max, a Communist resister sent to the Oranienburg concentration camp, had been liberated by Soviet troops and spent seven months in the Soviet Union where he learned of the horrors of Stalinist rule. Yet he cannot leave the party on his return to France; he quotes a Soviet poet: "My house is sick, but it is my house." Gustave, the orphan of a Communist resister executed by the Germans, is stuck in the past, delighting at the opportunity in 1975 to hear a comrade sing Stalinist ditties. American students bring a post-Cold War indifference to interpreting Communists in the series. If many French would put the Communists in a "gray zone," the students recognize that their sympathy for Communist characters as individuals can never extend to their commitment to the party.

Conclusions

What do students take from a semester talking and writing about a television series? They confront directly the viewers' sense that they "know" this history because they have seen it and have, in a sense, lived through it. They better understand what they see in a television drama series by thinking about the many decisions about history as well as aesthetics that showrunners make. Audiences have always sought the "you were there" experience in film; this course leads students to recognize that to understand that feeling, they need to imagine they were

[16] Jean-Pierre Azéma wrote a report of the treatment of patients in psychiatric hospitals during the war at the request of the French state when it was considering a memorial to mental patients and their horrific experiences during the Occupation, October 2015. See https://solidarites-sante.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport-azema_20102015.pdf

there at the meetings to review scripts and to watch rushes, and to decide what "there" they want the audience to experience and how to achieve it. Students, in turn, are aware that the term "audience" homogenizes groups whose reception of the series differs. In particular, they recognize that male and female students interpret the individuals and events in the series and their place in history differently. One student wrote an exceptional paper on this, using class discussion as her source. The course enables students to see that the dramatic presentation of history is not simply a question of accuracy and verisimilitude. By engaging constantly with difficult decisions showrunners necessarily make, they come to see the ways story could be used to bring history to a wider public, while in turn exploring their own understandings of the political, cultural and moral life in occupied France.

As with all documents, students need to recognize when and why a series was created and, in turn, the effects of the environment in which they interpret it. Their historically-situated response to the Communists provides one example. Their reflection on Marie Germaine, the character they found most sympathetic, provides another. What did they take from their twenty-first century appreciation of her? She appears to enjoy sex as more or less an equal with her partners, whereas being dominated is appealing to other major female figures like Hortense (by Heinrich Müller) and Jeannine (by Philippe Chassagne). When Marie realizes that a woman has an unwanted pregnancy, she arranges an abortion, in the clearest act of sisterhood and evidence of a prewar underground in the series. Marie, in fact, seems to be a twenty-first century character living in the 1940s. She is the leader of the Gaullist resistance in Villeneuve. Men compete among themselves and though they would normally unite in keeping women in their place, they could also unite under an exceptional woman because she was exceptional and because she was not a dominant male. She feels like a present-day heroine in her navigation of personal relationships and her rise within the new public sphere of the resistance. Her story resonates with a contemporary form of resistance—feminism. She makes the historically-situated story of resistance meaningful to an audience today. Marie dies a martyr not to the resistance, but to feminism, by antagonizing Marchetti with a challenge to his virility. Did the showrunners, students asked, want to finish her off so as not to leave the audience disappointed that there was no place for a Superwoman in France in the years following liberation?

The class closed with students exploring other historical events whose ambiguities and interpretive debates that they believed dramatic recreation could bring to the public. The public changes, so success itself is historically situated. Some had seen the television series *Holocaust* (1978), directed by Gerald Green. They appreciated its importance in revealing a repressed history when it was first screened, but now saw it as wooden and dated, lacking an engagement with the complexities of history.[17] However, there are other possibilities. Inspired by *A French Village*, Brian de Palma is working with Frédéric Krivine on *Newton 1861*, a television series set in a town in Kentucky during the Civil War.[18] We look forward to being challenged and to challenging the result.

---

[17] *A French Village* is not the first series mobilized to explain the wartime world to the French. Networks in France did not initially express interest in broadcasting *Holocaust*. However, in response to the emergence of a current of Holocaust denial, a public television chain screened the series in 1979. Nadine Fresco, *Fabrication d'un antisémite* (Paris: Seuil, 1999), 53.

[18] Pierre Langlois, "Exclusif: Brian De Palma prépare une adaptation américaine de la série *Un Village français*," *Télérama*, April 9, 2019. https://www.telerama.fr/series-tv/exclusif-brian-de-palma-prepare-une-adaptation-americaine-de-la-serie-un-village-francais,n6207199.php

VALUING PROCESS OVER PRODUCT: USING WRITING TO TEACH HISTORY IN THE UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY CLASSROOM

Genesea M. Carter

Colorado State University

David Korostyshevsky

Colorado State University and the University of Denver

> History is as much a writing field as literature, yet few historians are trained in how to teach writing, as graduate students in literature usually are. Most required composition courses are taught by English departments and are explicitly interdisciplinary. This often leaves history instructors scrambling to find ways to address writing in our own discipline-specific ways with little direct training or curriculum space devoted to it.
>
> —Katherine Pickering Antonova[1]

Katherine Pickering Antonova's *The Essential Guide to Writing History Essays* is a favorite recommendation among historians on Facebook and Twitter. While there has been growing research and guidance offered about teaching K-12 students how to write in the history classroom, Antonova's work fills an important gap for how to teach the essay in the undergraduate and graduate history classroom.[2] Antonova's *Essential Guide* represents the latest within the genre of history writing guides that have always focused exclusively on essay writing, such as end-of-term research papers and midterms.[3] While many history faculty might be inclined to predominantly assign essay-writing guides like Antonova's, this method alone is not sufficient to teach students to think about complex new information and express their ability to interpret historical information at the university level.[4]

[1] Katherine Pickering Antonova, *The Essential Guide to Writing History Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), xv.

[2] See especially Chauncey Monte-Sano, "Qualities of Historical Writing Instruction: A Comparative Case Study of Two Teachers' Practices," *American Educational Research Journal* 45, no. 4 (2008): 1045-1079; Chauncey Monte-Sano, "Beyond Reading Comprehension and Summary: Learning to Read and Write in History by Focusing on Evidence, Perspective, and Interpretation," *Curriculum Inquiry* 41, no. 2 (2011): 212-249; Chauncey Monte-Sano et al., *Reading, Thinking, and Writing About History: Teaching Argument Writing to Diverse Learners in the Common Core Classroom, Grades 6-12* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2014); Chauncey Monte-Sano, "Argumentation in History Classrooms: A Key Path to Understanding the Discipline and Preparing Citizens," *Theory Into Practice* 55, no. 4 (October 1, 2016): 311-319; Chauncey Monte-Sano and Amina Allen, "Historical Argument Writing: The Role of Interpretive Work, Argument Type, and Classroom Instruction," *Reading and Writing* 32, no. 6 (June 1, 2019): 1383-1410.

[3] For example, see William Kelleher Storey, *Writing History: A Guide for Students*, 6th edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020); Mary Lynn Rampolla, *A Pocket Guide to Writing in History*, 10th edition (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2020); Richard Marius and Melvin Eugene Page, *A Short Guide to Writing about History* (Pearson, 2015).

[4] Over the last several decades, university history pedagogy has moved from an emphasis on teaching historical content to teaching that history is an endeavor, a shift that renders history as an interpretive act that a historian does, not an objective record of events that the historian discovers. On these pedagogical trends, see "AHA History Tuning Project: 2016 History Discipline Core," https://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/tuning-the-history-discipline/2016-history-discipline-core; Lendol Calder, "Uncoverage: Toward a Signature Pedagogy for the History Survey," *Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (March 1, 2006): 1358-1370; Michael Coventry, et al., "Ways of Seeing: Evidence and Learning in the History Classroom," *Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (March 1, 2006): 1371-1402; Joel M. Sipress and David J. Voelker, "From Learning History to Doing History: Beyond the Coverage Model," in *Exploring Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*, ed. Regan A. R. Gurung, et al. (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2008), 19-35; Elizabeth Belanger, "How Now? Historical Thinking, Reflective Teaching, and the Next Generation of History Teachers," *Journal of American History* 97, no. 4 (March 1, 2011): 1079-1088; Joel M. Sipress and David J. Voelker, "The End of the History Survey Course: The Rise and Fall of the Coverage Model," *Journal of American History* 97, no. 4 (March 1, 2011): 1050-1066; David J. Voelker and Anthony Armstrong, "Designing a Question-Driven U.S. History Course," *OAH Magazine of History* 27, no. 3 (July 1, 2013): 19-24.

© 2021 Carter & Korostyshevsky. Free to copy and share for education and scholarship under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License.

Indeed, the essay itself, a fundamental genre of historical writing, is not always the best way for students to grapple with new, complex, and controversial material. Rather, we urge history faculty to adopt what we call "a writing process mindset" and prioritize teaching history through the writing process rather than through cumulative assignments, such as research papers and midterms.

The concept of teaching history through the writing process is not new. University history faculty have advocated for the writing process since the 1990s.[5] In this article, we extend these arguments by drawing from our twenty years of combined experience teaching writing in the composition and rhetoric and history classrooms to offer four recommendations for how university historians might teach history through the writing process: (1) through daily or weekly process writing (also called informal writing or low-stakes writing) to help students process their learning and questions; (2) through metacognitive writing assignments that ask students to reflect on their learning; (3) through faculty's primary grading emphasis on students' content rather than their grammar; and (4) through grade distribution. We make these recommendations with undergraduate history courses in mind, but they can be adopted across majors and non-majors courses as well as graduate history courses.

We recognize readers may feel some resistance at the idea of teaching history through the writing process and may respond with "I am a historian—not an English professor."[6] However, this line of thinking discounts the research showing learning, and by extension writing, must be treated as a process. Teaching and learning scholars Susan A. Ambrose, Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPierto, Marsha C. Lovett, and Marie K. Norman write, "Learning is a process that leads to change, which occurs as a result of experience and increases the potential for improved performance and future learning."[7] When faculty across the disciplines adopt a writing process mindset, it directly contributes to students' learning through the development of their cognitive growth, analytical skills, close reading, and idea development, among other skills critical to their success in the history classroom and beyond.[8]

What the Field of Rhetoric and Composition Offers Historians

There are many university historians who are unfamiliar with the field of rhetoric and composition; therefore, we offer a very brief literature review of the field. Rhetoric and composition, also interchangeably referred to as "writing studies," focuses on "teaching [the] writing process and a commitment to writing pedagogy"[9] and

[5] Stuart Greene, "The Problems of Learning to Think like a Historian: Writing History in the Culture of the Classroom," *Educational Psychologist* 29, no. 2 (March 1, 1994): 89-96; Stuart Greene, "The Question of Authenticity: Teaching Writing in a First-Year College History of Science Class," *Research in the Teaching of English* 35, no. 4 (2001): 525-569; Coventry, et al., "Ways of Seeing"; Linda Adler-Kassner, John Majewski, and Damian Koshnick, "The Value of Troublesome Knowledge: Transfer and Threshold Concepts in Writing and History" 26 (Fall 2012), https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php.

[6] Paula Sutter Fichtner, "When Writing Comes across the Curriculum to History," *Perspectives on History, American Historical Association*, November 1, 2000, https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/november-2000/when-writing-comes-across-the-curriculum-to-history.

[7] Susan A. Ambrose, et al., *How Learning Works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* (San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010), 3.

[8] "Why Include Writing in My Courses?," The WAC Clearinghouse, accessed February 17, 2021, https://wac.colostate.edu/resources/wac/intro/include/; Janet Emig, "Writing as a Mode of Learning," *College Composition and Communication* 28, no. 2 (1977): 122-28; Sondra Perl, "The Composing Processes of Unskilled College Writers," *Research in the Teaching of English* 13, no. 4 (1979): 317-336; Linda Flower and John R. Hayes, "A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing," *College Composition and Communication* 32, no. 4 (1981): 365-387; Council of Writing Program Administrators, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Writing Project, "Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing," January 2011; Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle, eds., *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015); Linda Adler-Kassner, et al., "Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing," *Conference on College Composition and Communication*, March 2015, https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting.

[9] Kathleen Yancey, Introduction to Adler-Kassner and Wardle, *Naming What We Know*, xvii.

"the study of composed knowledge."[10] At its core, the field is concerned with "what students should learn about writing, how they should learn those things, and how those things should be taught and assessed."[11] Faculty in rhetoric and composition are interested in:

> What composed knowledge looks like in specific contexts; how good and less-than-good qualities of composed knowledge are defined, by whom, and with what values associated with those definitions and qualities; how to help learners compose knowledge within specific contexts and with what consequences for learner and context; the relationships between technologies and processes for composing knowledge; connections between affordances and potential for composing knowledge; and how completed knowledge can be best accessed and why.[12]

Rhetoric and composition is a field that has been researching and teaching the writing process for over sixty years, and historians have much to gain by partnering with rhetoric and composition scholars in several ways, such as applying writing studies research to:

- develop writing assignments that are aligned with course outcomes and goals and match students' writing abilities.
- design writing assessment tools that measure students' learning.
- apply efficient but meaningful grading and feedback strategies.
- integrate writing instruction into the history classroom without sacrificing content.

As Antonova notes, many historians have "little direct training" in writing instruction.[13] However, it does not need to remain this way. We believe a partnership between history and rhetoric and composition can help close that gap.

Recommendation #1: Using Process Writing to Facilitate Learning

The first major reassessment we propose is a shift from regarding student writing as an end product, most commonly represented through end-of-the-term essays, to teaching the writing process as iterative. In Donald Murray's seminal article, "Teaching Writing as a Process and Not Product," he explains the writing process is "the process of discovery through language. It is the process of exploration of what we know and what we feel about what we know through language. It is the process of using language to learn about the world, to evaluate what we learn about our world, to communicate what we learn about our world."[14] It is with this emphasis in mind we offer the following recommendations to university faculty.

Weekly Online Discussion Thread Posts

We recommend faculty balance—or replace entirely, depending on the goals of the course—historiographical or research essays with daily or weekly online discussion posts. Daily or weekly online discussion posts teach students to process complex concepts and sources in a low-stakes environment in ways that high-stakes writing assignments, such as research essays or midterms, do not. As well, discussion posts provide the space for students to grapple with the course content, to track their learning over time, and to transfer their learning

[10] Adler-Kassner and Wardle, *Naming What We Know,* 1.
[11] Adler-Kassner and Wardle, *Naming What We Know,* 2; Linda Adler-Kassner, et al., "Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing."
[12] Adler-Kassner and Wardle, *Naming What We Know*, 1.
[13] Antonova, *The Essential Guide to Writing History Essays*, xv.
[14] Donald M. Murray, "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product," *The Leaflet*, November 1972, 4.

across modalities.[15]

I assign weekly discussion posts in which students react to the readings in a 500-word post before a more detailed in-class discussion (Appendix A).[16] For example, in my 200-level Disease in Early America course at the University of Denver, I asked my students to "describe how the conditions of slavery caused or exacerbated disease," using sources to support their claims (Appendix A). Student 1 wrote,

> I think that the conditions of slavery can also expand to apply beyond physical diseases and validate other areas of their society as contaminated – including ideologies imposed by the terribly skewed perception of slave owners. For example, I was particularly stricken by this idea that there is a disease that causes slaves to run away – highlighted in the Cartwright reading. He notes that "the cause…is as much a disease of the mind as any other species of mental alienation" (Cartwright, 707). I found it truly ironic that such individuals are unable to comprehend the savagery of their own actions and instead blame biological disease as the catalyst for running away.[17]

Student 2 wrote,

> What I found most interesting about this article was Savitt's description of how and why slave owners worked to improve these conditions. Savitt details the measures taken to prevent outbreaks of disease within slaves' living quarters, one of those being refraining from hiring out slaves to temporary or urban sites, as the spread of disease was much more common there (Savitt, 82). He explains the basic logic of infection within slave quarters, how it spread quickly from individuals to family and between families. Once there was an epidemic amongst slaves on a plantation, the odds were high that the slave owner or his family would come in contact with the disease. Additionally, a sick slave is not a productive worker, and having multiple slaves out of work would damage the slave owner's profits. So, slave owners were forced to improve the living conditions of their slaves not because they cared for their wellbeing, but because they were worried about their profit margin and the potential of their families getting sick. This is sad and horrifying, but I also think that it fits with the way many White Americans, particularly white slave holders, viewed Black Americans. Not as what they were humans with feelings, thoughts, dreams, relationships, etc., but solely as commodities and tools to increase their own wealth and success.

These examples show how students practice applying their learning, course readings, and personal understanding to course content. Open-ended critical thinking prompts like this one "invit[e] people to wonder," SOTL scholar Stephen D. Brookfield explains. "Wondering, of course, can then lead to all kinds of alternative possibilities being envisioned."[18] Giving students time to regularly engage with difficult course material through regular writing teaches them to organize their thoughts clearly and to reconsider their preconceived ideas or previous learning about a topic. And the lengthier word count teaches them to develop their ideas, which prepares them to write longer, sustained writing assignments.

Discussion posts, as one possible example of the writing process, are an accessible way for students to process their ideas and course content in a format that allows them to own their reactions, confusions, and questions without fear of "making a mistake," "getting it wrong," or "getting a bad grade," which students have

---

[15] Whitney Blankenship, "Using Online Discussion Forums to Engage Students in Historical Inquiry," *Social Education* 7, no. 3 (2009): 4.

[16] When the text shifts to first-person, we are referring to David's work in the classroom.

[17] All student excerpts are truncated but unedited.

[18] Stephen D. Brookfield, *Teaching for Critical Thinking: Tools and Techniques to Help Students Question Their Assumptions* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012), 196.

told us stifles their writing and learning. Compositionist Heidi Estrem writes, "Understanding and identifying how writing is in itself an act of thinking can help people more intentionally recognize and engage with writing as a creative activity, inextricably linked to thought. We don't simply think first and then write….We write *to* think."[19] Similarly, Herbert A. Simon, one of the founders of cognitive science and a Nobel Laureate, explains, "Learning results from what the student does and thinks and only from what the student does and thinks. The teacher can advance learning only by influencing what the student does to learn."[20] We encourage history faculty to consider how they might adopt discussion thread posts as homework to complement in-class discussions, to teach critical thinking, and to learn through the writing process.

Regular In-Class Writing

Another approach to teaching history through the writing process is through regular in-class process writing, such as five to ten minutes every class period. Regular writing is necessary for writers to improve. According to compositionist Kathleen Blake Yancey, "What we practice is who we are; if we want to be writers, we need to write. And in the practice of writing, we develop writing capabilities, among them the ability to adjust and adapt to different contexts, purposes, and audiences."[21] As students regularly write in-class and out-of-class, faculty will notice improvement in students' comprehension and retention of course material, which is often lacking in final term papers.[22] I will often ask an open-ended question prompting application and reflection that students will answer through in-class writing. For example, in my 200-level Disease in Early America course, I ask students to spend 5 minutes answering the question, "What are some similarities or differences between the 1832 cholera outbreak and the Covid-19 pandemic?" Student 3 focused on the ways in which blame for contagious disease is assigned to marginalized communities:

> I think it is interesting how people [in 1832] focused on the idea that "Cholera was sent by God as punishment." It is interesting that people tend to feel much better when they have an apparent source of the problem to blame. Unfortunately, not everyone accepted the fact that this was simply divine intervention, and turned to blaming the poor for how they lived. Of course, the poor were not at fault, as they did not have proper resources/education to practice proper sanitation. It is especially terrible to see people doing this with COVID-19, as they blame Asian people for "creating" the virus.

Student 4 noticed that differences between the two outbreaks nevertheless demonstrated continuities and similarities:

> I think it is especially interesting to think of how transport and technology helped spread cholera. The lack of knowledge and understanding of disease helped facilitate its spread through initially unchecked travel and the poor sanitary conditions. Yet today, the Covid-19 disease spread rapidly though the world in its most technologically advanced nations, and people were made to organize themselves to limit transmission of the disease—yet despite the widespread publication of the risks of the disease, many people want to ignore the scientific evidence and go back to business as usual—even though the disease apparently spread like wildfire when there was business as usual.

Open-ended questions that students write about in class reinforce the material while giving them a chance to

---

[19] Heidi Estrem, "Writing Is a Knowledge-Making Activity," in *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, ed. Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015), 18.
[20] Herbert A. Simon, quoted in Ambrose, et al., *How Learning Works*, 1.
[21] Kathleen Blake Yancey, "Learning to Write Effectively Requires Different Kinds of Practice, Time, and Effort," in *Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies*, ed. Linda Adler-Kassner and Elizabeth Wardle (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2015), 64.
[22] Yancey, "Learning to Write Effectively Requires Different Kinds of Practice, Time, and Effort.

gather their thoughts for discussion. Ultimately, such writing stimulates student engagement with the material, helping them notice the significance of new material to their own personal experience and future.

Scaffolding Final Assignments with Process Writing

For faculty who require final writing assignments like historiographical or research essays, we encourage faculty to emphasize the writing and learning process through assignment scaffolding. Rather than merely assigning a final essay and leaving it up to the students to complete it by the deadline, we recommend faculty integrate important intermediate milestones in the writing process into the curriculum. These can include the proposal, the annotated bibliography, the outline, discussion thread posts, and/or a rough draft accompanied by peer review. Scaffolding process writing pieces ensure students do not procrastinate through the research and writing process and provides a generative space for students to practice and refine their arguments and analysis. As Murray urges, "Instead of teaching finished writing, we should teach unfinished writing, and glory in its unfinishedness. We work with language in action."[23] A writing process mindset allows faculty and students to experience (and hopefully enjoy!) the learning process through the writing process.

For example, in my 300-level Antebellum America course at Colorado State University, I assign a museum exhibit as a final project in addition to process writing. To scaffold the museum exhibit assignment, I also assign a project proposal, a primary and secondary source annotated bibliography, a rough draft, and peer review before the final exhibit is due. Each of these assignments is graded for completion according to the instructions, giving students a chance to accumulate points in a way that encourages them to stay on track rather than wait until the very end of the semester to complete the project. To reinforce the learning and writing process as iterative, I make sure to teach students how to conduct research and to evaluate sources throughout the course. Students thus have a chance to practice, to make mistakes, to refine, and to revise, which supports their learning in ways that hastily researched and written final projects do not.

Recommendation #2: Teaching the Writing and Learning Process Through Metacognition

For faculty who find themselves asking questions like "What are students learning in my classes?", we recommend adopting metacognitive reflection throughout the term or as an end-of-the-term assignment.[24] Asking students to participate in metacognition, defined as thinking about thinking, is critical to the learning process because it asks them to articulate what they are learning or have learned.[25] Yancey calls reflection "a mode of *behavior* indicative of *growth of consciousness*" and defines three processes necessary for reflection: (1) "goal-setting, revisiting, and refining"; (2) "text-revising in the light of retrospection"; and (3) "the articulation of what learning has taken place, as embodied in various texts as in the processes used by the writer."[26] As an integral part of the learning and writing process, metacognitive writing teaches students to take ownership for their learning. In this section, we offer two ways faculty might incorporate reflection into their classrooms.

Daily or Weekly Reflection

Faculty can integrate reflection-based process writing into the day-to-day classroom activities, such as two- or three-minute free writes at the beginning of class or at the end of class, in which students articulate the most salient point or lingering question they have about the course lecture or reading. For example, faculty might ask students, "What do you still find confusing about today's lecture?" and have students turn in their reflections at the end of the class period. Or faculty might ask students, "How might you apply what you learned from this week

[23] Donald M. Murray, "Teach Writing as a Process Not Product," 4.

[24] Wondering what students have learned in their classroom is a recurring concern among history faculty. For example, see Gary J. Kornblith and Carol Lasser, "Beyond Best Practices: Taking Seriously the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," *Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (March 1, 2006): 1356.

[25] Aimee A. Callender, Ana M. Franco-Watkins, and Andrew S. Roberts, "Improving Metacognition in the Classroom through Instruction, Training, and Feedback," *Metacognition and Learning* 11, no. 2 (August 1, 2016): 216.

[26] Kathleen Blake Yancey, *Reflection in the Writing Classroom* (Logan: Utah State University Press, 1998), 5, 7.

to your other classes, to your personal life, and/or to your professional interests?" or "What similarities are you seeing between the news and the 1832 cholera outbreak?" However faculty choose to have their students reflect, we recommend faculty regularly collect their students' reflection writing to see what connections students are making, to inform upcoming lectures, and to fill gaps in students' comprehension or application.

Replacing Exams and Final Research Papers with Reflection

In general, we recommend replacing traditional evaluations like blue book exams, scantron tests, or essays with reflection-based assignments (Appendix B). Reflection assignments, which can be assigned at the end of every unit, as a midterm, or as a final exam, teach students to take ownership for their learning and provide valuable feedback to faculty about what questions students still have and/or what course content was the most salient. End-of-the term or midterm reflection prompts might include any number of tasks:

- students describe what they have learned and explain the personal significance of this newfound knowledge.
- students engage with the course outcomes, such as identifying which course outcomes they grappled with or which course outcomes they feel taught them the most.
- students reflect on the specific, salient readings that shifted their perspectives, worldviews, or ideologies.
- students explain connections they see between current events and course content.
- students articulate how they can or will apply what they have learned in their personal lives, their professional lives, or in their other coursework.

To illustrate examples of how reflections support student growth, we include the following student excerpts from two courses I taught at the University of Denver in the spring quarter of 2020. The first two examples are from a non-major 200-level "Disease in Early America" course where I asked students to complete the quarter by writing an end-of-the-quarter reflection (Appendix B). Student 5 first reflected on the newness of their recently acquired knowledge:

> [Learning about] smallpox and the relations between Europeans and Native Americans was very eye-opening to me because it exposed a side of history I had little to no knowledge about before. As I was learning about not only smallpox, but also the beginnings of colonization, I felt that my education up until this point had failed me. I was not aware of how smallpox affected the Native American population, and more generally, I had no clue that the Europeans were so cruel to the Native Americans.

Similarly, Student 6, also enrolled in "Disease in Early America," continued by reflecting on the significance of learning this new material in light of present-day events:

> Taking this class during the Covid-19 pandemic was especially helpful in my understanding of the pandemic. I was able to understand more about disease and why we react the way we do in a pandemic. The readings in this class for smallpox and cholera epidemics showed that the public has not changed much in their reaction to disease. We have always reacted with denial and panic, resulting in blaming groups based on racial/socio-economic differences.

Finally, Student 7, enrolled in the 200-level non-major "History of Alcohol, Drugs, and Addiction" course, reflected on the role of their own positionality in their ability to process new information and knowledge:

> Undoubtedly the consequences of the issue of race, in relation to mass incarceration and the development of the war on drugs took on more meaning in the last week of the course.… As a non-

> American white European attempting to understand the seemingly unique dilemma that exists in the US, it was…easier to understand through focusing [on] the readings from the course, in the context of the shooting of Breona Taylor, in a botched narcotics no-knock raid, that took place on March 13th [2020] in Kentucky.

The final course reflection gave students an opportunity to consciously grapple with difficult historical questions regarding gender, race, and class, many of which they were encountering for the first time. Both courses were taught against the backdrop of the Covid-19 pandemic and George Floyd's murder and subsequent protests, and students were able to draw connections between course content and current events. Through such process writing as end-of-the-term reflections, faculty can learn about students' learning and reflect on their own teaching methods and course design.

Regardless of the form that metacognition takes in faculty' classrooms, as the term progresses, faculty will notice many students will intuitively begin to demonstrate a cumulative understanding of the material by engaging with themes and readings from earlier in the course. We encourage faculty to use students' reflections to inform their curriculum and calendar for the following term. Teaching students to engage in metacognition through writing positions them as co-creators of their knowledge and not passive recipients, which has positive effects on student retention, persistence, and academic success.[27]

Recommendation #3: Teaching the Writing Process By Focusing on Content

As students engage with the complex concepts and skills in the history classroom, faculty will see students struggle with grammar, sentence structure, idea development, and organization while they are processing and remembering new terminology, methodologies, and skills. However, this is not a reason to stop integrating writing into the classroom, and it is not a reason to grade students' writing severely. These errors are a natural part of how the brain processes new information. According to educational psychologists Fred Paas, Alexander Renkl, and John Sweller, "*Working memory*, in which all conscious cognitive processing occurs can handle only a very limited number—possibly no more than two or three—of novel interacting elements."[28] As students work through their learning of new information, previously learned skills will be forgotten within the moment, including spelling, grammar, and word choice. With this in mind, we provide specific grading recommendations for faculty to mitigate the burden of grading while also remaining true to the spirit of the writing process as messy and iterative but invaluable.

Giving Full Credit and Minimal or Zero Comments to Support Students' Learning Process

Psycholinguist Frank Smith writes in "Myths of Writing" that writing is not just "for the transmission of information" but to "create experiences and to explore ideas."[29] Similarly, Peter Elbow in "High Stakes and Low Stakes in Assigning and Responding to Writing" explains, "The goal of low stakes assignments is not so much to produce excellent pieces of writing as to get students to think, learn, and understand more of the course material."[30] Faculty may need to pivot their thinking about the writing process as always polished and perfect to the messiness of the writing process and adopt a writing process mindset.[31] In a writing process mindset, faculty

[27] Andria Young and Jane D. Fry, "Metacognitive Awareness and Academic Achievement in College Students," *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 8, no. 2 (May 2008): 1-10; Matthew Kaplan, et al., eds., *Using Reflection and Metacognition to Improve Student Learning: Across the Disciplines, Across the Academy* (Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing, 2013).

[28] Fred Paas, Alexander Renkl, and John Sweller, "Cognitive Load Theory and Instructional Design: Recent Developments," *Educational Psychologist* 38 (June 8, 2010): 2.

[29] Frank Smith, "Myths of Writing," *Language Arts* 58, no. 7 (1981): 792.

[30] Peter Elbow, "High Stakes and Low Stakes in Assigning and Responding to Writing," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 1997, no. 69 (1997): 5.

[31] Melissa Hudler, "The Messy and Unpredictable Classroom," *Faculty Focus*, October 14, 2013, https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/the-messy-and-unpredictable-classroom/.

focus on students' learning through the writing process. Students' ideas, primary and secondary source use, source analysis, etc., not sentence structure or grammar, should take precedent in this process. It is important for faculty to remember that process writing will be, as popular writer Anne Lamott likes to say, "a shitty first draft" as all first drafts will be.[32]

We draw our grading recommendations from compositionists Peter Elbow and Richard R. Haswell's decades-long research on grading and commenting on students' writing. For the lowest stakes of writing, such as process writing, Elbow recommends assigning a grade with no response from the faculty. He explains, "Most students come to appreciate the chance to write with the knowledge that they will be *heard* but will not have to deal with my response. In fact, many teachers require *some* low stakes writing that they don't even read. Students can appreciate and benefit from the freedom of this private writing."[33] Similarly, Haswell adopts a "minimal marking" approach to grading low-stakes writing, which "relegates what I consider a minor aspect of the course to a minor role in time spent on [grading]."[34] In the zero response or minimally marked approach, faculty grade based on how well students meet the assignment objectives, including idea development, engagement with sources, organization of ideas, etc. Another approach would be for faculty to give all students credit for their process writing if students put in a good faith effort.

Commenting on Content Rather Than Grammar

For faculty who want to comment on students' writing, which is especially important for key pieces of process writing that lead to final drafts or on the final drafts themselves, we understand responding to student writing can be tedious for faculty. The intellectual, emotional, and cognitive labor of grading writing is often reported as the least enjoyable part of academic work and reasons why faculty do not assign more writing in their courses.[35] Furthermore, students often cannot process all of the comments faculty leave on their writing and, in their own frustration, stop reading or do not incorporate comments into their revised drafts.

When providing feedback on students' process and high-stake major writing assignments, we take what Elbow calls "a supportive response," where faculty give students positive feedback about what is working well and, thereby, what students should continue doing in their writing. We also take "a redirected yet supportive response," where faculty make one or two comments that redirect students' thinking about an idea or correct misinterpretation within a supportive response.[36] These two approaches free faculty from spending an exorbitant amount of time wrestling with grades and nitty-gritty feedback.

When responding to students' process writing, we take a minimal feedback approach to support students' learning without overwhelming them while they are in the midst of processing. My comments focus on reminding students of important assignment parameters (see Appendix A for example parameters) like "make sure you include citations in your next post" to teach students to engage with sources and properly attribute the work of others and "remember to break up multiple ideas into separate paragraphs" to teach clear organization. I also offer comments like "I'm not sure what you mean by X. An additional example or two will support your main argument" to teach idea development and supporting the main argument with clear and relevant examples.

When grading final writing assignments, we recommend faculty focus their feedback on two or three main

[32] Anne Lamott, *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*, 2nd edition (New York: Anchor, 2019), 20.

[33] Elbow, "High Stakes and Low Stakes in Assigning and Responding to Writing," 9.

[34] Richard H. Haswell, "Minimal Marking," *College English* 45, no. 6 (October 1983): 603.

[35] Deborah J. Cohan, "Advice for Grading More Efficiently," *Inside Higher Ed*, February 11, 2020, https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/02/11/advice-grading-more-efficiently-opinion; John Tierney, "Why Teachers Secretly Hate Grading Papers," *The Atlantic*, January 9, 2013, https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/01/why-teachers-secretly-hate-grading-papers/266931/.

[36] Elbow, "High Stakes and Low Stakes in Assigning and Responding to Writing"; Richard H. Haswell, "Minimal Marking"; Richard Haswell, "The Complexities of Responding to Student Writing; or, Looking for Shortcuts via the Road of Excess," *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, Learning and Academic Writing,* https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/atd/articles/haswell2006.pdf.

areas, such as idea development, organization, analysis, use of sources, and genre conventions, among other global recommendations.[37] If faculty are writing marginal and end comments, we recommend all comments focus on the same two or three main areas of feedback to ensure consistency and to reduce overwhelming and confusing students. To close the loop on major writing assignment feedback, we recommend faculty encourage students to apply their feedback to future drafts or future homework with phrases like "In the next assignment, I want you to focus on developing your thesis with evidence and analysis" or "When you write your next forum post, work on developing clear and specific topic sentences that connect back to your thesis." Such feedback shows students that faculty's comments should be applied to future writing assignments and are not simply in defense or support of a grade.

This grading approach does not mean I never respond to factually incorrect information. For example, I once graded a discussion post in a 300-level Civil War course at Colorado State University in which the student confused the Union and the Confederacy when describing the Battle of Shiloh. In a discussion post that otherwise met the assignment requirements, I wrote a short comment correcting the mistake without deducting any points for it. My approach showed the student I understand they are in the midst of learning. I reduce the stigma of mistakes—a stigma that often prevents students from fully engaging in course material, building relationships with faculty, and asking questions or asking for help—by signaling I understand that mistakes and confusion will happen as a part of the learning process.

Identifying Grammar and Writing Style Choices that Can Be Taught

We recognize some faculty worry their students' writing will falter if they do not comment or grade on grammar and punctuation. Moreover, some faculty may worry that process writing gives students free reign to write "badly." We acknowledge these concerns. A writing process mindset necessarily deemphasizes grammar because the emphasis is on learning through content development. In writing process tasks like discussion posts, in-class free writes, and other informal writing assignments, the writing is often impromptu and, therefore, less polished than high-stakes assignments, such as a midterm reflection. When faculty predominantly focus on students' grammar and writing style rather than their ideas, students also shift their focus from learning to grammar.[38] As social studies teacher Tony Winger writes, "If higher-order thinking matters most, then that is what our grades must assess, record, report, and reward."[39] Finally, focusing on the content rather than the grammar and writing style frees students to write freely. Our experience teaching thousands of undergraduate students has shown us students' preoccupation with (and fear of) style and grammar contributes to writers' block, procrastination, and dislike for writing. Ultimately, a writing process mindset shifts faculty and students' attention away from grammar and back to students' learning. However, for faculty who want to respond to grammar and writing style, we have two primary recommendations.

First, we recommend faculty teach grammar and writing style in accordance with audience expectations and genre conventions. [40] For example, if faculty have assigned a historiography essay, we recommend faculty take the time in class to discuss writing style and genre conventions expected by historians, as audience expectations and genre conventions often shift across disciplines. When faculty grade high-stake writing assignments, we recommend they comment on one or two areas where students need to revise their writing style to match the audience expectations. Additionally, to reduce the workload of writing the same comment on all students'

[37] "Commenting on and Grading Student Writing," The WAC Clearinghouse, accessed February 18, 2021, https://wac.colostate.edu/resources/teaching/guides/commenting/.

[38] "Commenting on and Grading Student Writing"; Joseph M. Williams, "The Phenomenology of Error," *College Composition and Communication* 32, no. 2 (May 1981): 152-168; Nancy Sommers, "Responding to Student Writing," *College Composition and Communication* 33, no. 2 (1982): 148-156.

[39] Tony Winger, "Grading What Matters," *Educational Leadership* 67, no. 3 (November 2009): 75.

[40] Laura R. Micciche, "Making a Case for Rhetorical Grammar," *College Composition and Communication* 55, no. 4 (June 2004): 716; Williams, "The Phenomenology of Error," 152; Deborah Dean, *Genre Theory: Teaching, Writing, and Being* (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 2008).

writing, faculty might identify one or two grammatical errors all students struggled with in a particular writing assignment and teach them as a class how to identify those errors in their writing.

Second, we recommend faculty do not cross out or line edit students' writing. Crossing out or line editing students' writing does not teach students to identify and revise their own writing errors, which are both integral skills to the writing process. As well, crossing out or line editing causes students to feel their writing has been written over by their professors, which causes students to lose confidence in their writing.[41] For students whose writing impacts reading comprehension, we recommend encouraging students to visit the university Writing Center. Leaning on the Writing Center in this way frees faculty to focus their energy on students' content, comprehension, and critical analysis. However faculty decide to grade and comment on grammar and writing style, students need continual practice identifying and fixing grammar and writing style issues on their own.[42]

A final note on grading, grammar, and writing style: Grammar can be hard to teach (and hold students accountable for) because the English language is always changing and because English language speakers do not always agree on grammatical correctness or grammatical error.[43] This does not mean faculty should completely disregard teaching, commenting on, and grading grammar. But it does mean when faculty attend to their students' grammar and writing style, they should be cognizant that "good," "correct," and "clear" grammar and writing style are not universally agreed upon across faculty, departments, and English-speakers.

Recommendation #4: Valuing the Writing Process in the Grade Distribution

To truly value the writing process as an integral extension of the learning process, faculty need to value the writing process in their grade distributions. Whether faculty are teaching at an institution that assigns traditional letter grades or are teaching at an institution that does not assign grades, students need to know their writing matters. For faculty teaching in-person, we recommend devoting 10% to upwards of 30% of their total course grade for the writing and learning process. Faculty who teach online might weight process work as high as 50% of the final course grade, especially if students are producing 500-1000 words a week through discussion thread posts, drafts, outlines, etc. Furthermore, we recommend a "Process Work" grade category, which includes homework, in-class writing, peer review, etc., which shifts the emphasis away from "homework" or "quizzes" and affirms the importance of the writing and learning process. Over the course of the term, faculty can destigmatize the messiness of the learning and writing process by explaining why process work is integral to students' learning. For faculty who want to learn more about process work grade weight and distribution, we recommend meeting with your institution's Writing Center faculty, writing program faculty, or teaching and learning center faculty.[44]

Conclusion

We agree with Antonova's call for university historians to professionalize themselves in the teaching of writing in the history classroom. Because writing is a life-long learning process, teaching writing should

[41] Constance Weaver, "Teaching Grammar in the Context of Writing," in *Lessons to Share on Teaching Grammar in Context*, ed. Constance Weaver (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1998), 54-55.

[42] Richard H. Haswell, "Minimal Marking"; Dana Ferris and Barrie Roberts, "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be?," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 3 (August 1, 2001): 161-184.

[43] Williams, "The Phenomenology of Error"; Misty Adoniou, "Grammar Matters and Should Be Taught – Differently," *The Conversation*, April 16, 2014, http://theconversation.com/grammar-matters-and-should-be-taught-differently-25604.

[44] Stephen Tchudi, ed., *Alternatives to Grading Student Writing* (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1997); Barbara E. Walvoord and Virginia Johnson Anderson, *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment in College*, 2nd edition (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2009); John C. Bean, *Engaging Ideas: The Professor's Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*, 2nd edition (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011); Asao B. Inoue, *Labor-Based Grading Contracts: Building Equity and Inclusion in the Compassionate Writing Classroom* (Fort Collins, CO: CSU Open Press, 2019).

be the responsibility of all faculty across the university.[45] Even if universities require one or two English or writing courses as part of the general education curriculum, what students learn in one or two courses must be expanded and extended across their undergraduate education. Teaching discipline-specific writing is all of our responsibilities, and we hope readers are inspired and encouraged with practical ways to use the writing process to teach history.

While faculty may apply our recommendations differently across courses, we argue that no matter what form it takes, process writing is an essential pedagogical component that history faculty can use to help students take ownership of their education, learn to express their own unique voices and perspectives, and process complex ideas. Students need to write early and often to develop critical thinking skills, retain course content, and engage thoughtfully with troubling or controversial subjects. Ultimately, students who engage in process writing develop a sense of intellectual grit; the ability to grasp multiple, often competing points of view; and exercise their individual agency to become self-directed, life-long learners. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, incorporating process writing and metacognition into the undergraduate history classroom does not mean that grading writing needs to be laborious or mentally exhausting. History faculty no longer need to scramble to find ways to meaningfully incorporate writing in their classrooms. A writing process mindset liberates faculty to act as co-creators of learning and knowledge with their students.

[45] Ellen Goldberger, "Why All Faculty Need to Consider the Teaching of Writing Their Responsibility," *Inside Higher Ed*, April 24, 2014, https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2014/04/24/essay-why-all-faculty-need-consider-teaching-writing-their-responsibility.

Appendix A: Weekly Online Discussion Post, 200-Level Disease in Early America Course

In approximately 500 words, describe how the conditions of slavery caused or exacerbated disease. Make sure you use examples of specific diseases in your answer. The post should include YOUR point of view, such as a distinct argument about the readings, a reflection on a course theme, or analysis of a specific source. Make sure you provide a detailed evaluation of the content you are posting about, not merely summarizing the readings. Draw on ideas and arguments in the readings as evidence to support your claims. Any ideas or direct quotes from the readings need to be explicitly cited using a parenthetical citation (Author, Pg. #). Example: (Rosenberg, 3). Let me know if you have any questions about these instructions.

Discussion thread posts will be graded out of ten points according to the following criteria:

- 10 points = Above average: student expertly synthesizes and expands upon ideas and texts. Writing and organization is nearly flawless.
- 7 points = Average: student works with ideas and texts proficiently. There are some organizational, style, and/or clarity issues.
- 5 points = Below average: key ideas and citations are missing. There are multiple organizational, style, and/or clarity challenges that impede understanding.
- 3 points = Post is incomplete.
- 0 points = No post.

Discussion thread posting that are off-topic, rambling, misogynistic, sexist, racist, politically charged, etc., will be graded as a zero.

Appendix B: Final Learning Reflection, 200-Level Disease in Early America Course

In at least 500 words, reflect on what you learned in this course. This assignment asks you to engage in metacognition, defined as thinking about thinking. Researchers on metacognition say we have better memory, transfer of knowledge, and engagement when we participate in metacognition.

Therefore, instead of a final exam, the final learning reflection asks you to think about what you have learned this quarter, select specific examples of your growth, and explain the significance of this learning to how you understand the topics and/or the world around you.

In your reflection:

- Describe what you have learned.
- Explain the importance or significance of this new knowledge to you personally.
- Include at least THREE specific readings from the syllabus that stood out or spoke to you.

You are welcome to write a narrative or an essay. Whatever genre you choose, your reflection should include specific examples and analysis to illustrate your learning this quarter.

Your reflection should have an introduction, body paragraphs, and a conclusion (as we have been doing all quarter). This genre is not a research article or short analysis essay, so your writing style can be more informal. Think of it as being similar to your weekly discussion thread posts. The main thing is, I want to hear YOUR voice. If you want to read more about narrative features, head over here: https://leo.stcloudstate.edu/acadwrite/narrative.html.

Focus your learning reflection on any of the following themes:

- How diseases like smallpox shaped encounters between Native Americans and Europeans.
- The relationship between changing concepts of disease, epidemics (such as cholera), and the emergence of public health institutions.
- The experiences of women and enslaved people.
- Controversies regarding historical interpretation.
- Mental health, asylums, and the Civil War as a medical event.
- The difficulties of learning about these themes in a time of Covid-19.

THE HISTORIAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FUTURE: RECORDING COVID-19 FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

Joe P. Dunn

Converse College

Articles on Covid-19 are everywhere. I propose a different slant. As a historian with an interest in global politics, I teach students how to view and interpret the past but also how we understand the present in context and how to document the present for the future. The latter is as important as the former. I often pontificate, "Because your grandchildren may ask you about living through an event or time, you need to be attuned to the history being made around you." That history now is Covid-19.

I joke that my life constitutes a living document at center stage of recent history. I have been conscious of that most of my years, and I have recorded and written about my interplay with the more important events of the times—long before I knew the magnitude of them. I was born only days after the end of World War II. I won't claim that I remember that event, but I was at the front edge of the baby boomer generation and all that entailed. I have witnessed a lot of political, social, and cultural change over the decades. I touch on just a few here as demonstration.

An uncle shot down and missing in action in the Korean War hung over family events long after the conflict. Although I was quite young, I heard the secretive, hushed conversations over the rumors that he might still be alive in captivity and about the charlatans who attempted to bilk my aunt to provide her "proof." It began a career-long fascination with POWs about which I have written. During first-grade recess we played war, Chinese Communists vs. Americans rather than cowboys and Indians.

In the fourth grade, I was in one of the first schools to integrate in my state immediately after *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the first two black students, who lived just across the field in rural Southeast Missouri, got on and off the bus in front of my house. We played together after school. My father was on the school board that integrated the school. From my Arkansas relatives, I heard their somewhat different views on the events at Little Rock Central High School in 1957. In junior high, I cheered the initial black athletes at my high school and played with the next group on the freshman basketball team. I saw in person the segregated eating arrangements on our away-games and even witnessed two high school basketball team lineups—one all-black that started our home games and one all-white for schools that would not accept black athletes at their places. I had some minor roles in desegregation actions during high school.

When I was a college freshman, I knew the first black athlete at my institution because he was from a rival high school. That same year, I remember every detail of the events of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, which occurred just as I came out of my freshman American history course that Friday afternoon. At the service station where I worked during college, I filled the tank a couple of times for a prominent civil rights activist who stopped there (for the cheapest gas in the region) while coming and going from Mississippi during Freedom Summer 1964.

In my first semester in graduate school, through a wrong exit, I found myself in the center of the protests in East St. Louis following the assassination of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. And Bobby Kennedy had just visited my undergraduate institution days before his death, where a former girlfriend of the time provided logistics for the visit.

Vietnam interrupted my idyllic life in my Ph.D. program. I thought it an inconvenient and potentially destructive interlude on my way to my academic career. I returned to graduate school planning not to think about Vietnam again. Had I known better, I would have been more astute while there. Partly through the natural instinct as a historian, I did chronicle the experience (for my family) through writing a letter virtually every day that I was not in the field. Thirty years later those letters were the basis of my memoir about the war. I never

© 2021 Dunn. Free to copy and share for education and scholarship under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License.

thought that I would be teaching the subject, but it came to pass. One of the hard experiences of my academic career was teaching a course on the war in April 1975 on a U.S. Air Force base in Germany while I followed on television the last battle before the Fall of Saigon—at Xuan Loc where I served during the war; I knew the terrain intimately.

As an itinerate professor teaching on military bases in Europe in the mid-1970s, I had Greek students in my class in Athens whose politics changed overnight when dictator Georgios Papadopoulos was deposed. I graded papers on the floor by candlelight in a closed bathroom during blackouts on a Turkish-sovereignty NATO base during the Cyprus War. One of my students, whose plane crash-landed while electronically spying on the conflict, still showed up in class that evening. I was in Spain when General Franco died, and I witnessed the change in mood and atmosphere. I was about ready to announce that if one wanted a dictator gone, just send me into the country. Maybe I should schedule a Russia or China trip.

In Europe, I missed the trauma of the Arab oil boycott in 1973-1974; but back in the U.S. during the 444 days of the American hostages' captivity in the American embassy in Teheran in 1979, the Iranian female student in my class morphed from a Shah apologist to a Khomeini devotee with her wardrobe and hair covering heralding the change. Hair styles and clothing often denote politics. However, the event that ranks among the most painful, both personally and professionally, was 9/11. I walked into their first college class session for my freshmen students in September 2001 minutes after the plane flew into the World Trade Center Tower, and I exclaimed impromptu, "Today a new world began for you that will mark the rest of your life." Inside the Pentagon that day, my brother survived the attack there.

One prays that Covid-19 falls far short of the Influenza Pandemic of 1918-1919. But whatever its length and severity, the Covid period leaves a historical mark. Our department has addressed this historical event in two ways. In academic classes, we offered a freshman honors seminar course this fall on the history of pandemics. My American foreign policy course looked at the impact of Covid-19 globally. I assigned student teams to study national security issues that the new presidential administration would face at the beginning of 2021. Each team was assigned to a specific region and produced a lengthy paper (approximately 40+ pages) on the major issues to address in their designated region. At various points, the teams conducted briefings, and we held debates between the teams on specific questions. The first briefing for all the teams was on the impact of Covid-19 in their region, placed in historical context. Not surprisingly, in the final reports, Covid-19 ranked as an issue of high concern for each region, and students made policy recommendations on how to address this problem. The quite interesting reports drove home the point of the truly global nature of the issue with implications for policy decisions, particularly how the pandemic might affect actions with countries such as North Korea and Iran.

In my Islamic and Middle East course, one of our topics was the hajj and the transmission of global diseases from the Middle Ages through more recent outbreaks. For this class, I drew on the senior thesis research of one of my students a few years ago, a major in history, politics, and biology. While a student, she presented her paper at an academic conference, and it played a role in securing her present position with the Centers for Disease Control.

These courses in our department draw students from other disciplines, including from healthcare-related fields. Students realized the importance of the study of history for pursuing other areas of inquiry. The approach on this topic and other ventures has resulted in a number of double majors with our department, which is important at a time when selling our major in the current environment is challenging. We are proud to claim a significant number of history majors going to graduate school in policy programs of various types.

Equally, if not more importantly, on the issue of documenting the present, I am having my students, in all my classes, at all levels and majors, write about how Covid-19 has affected their young lives. Other departments should consider this as well to discern possible differences among various majors. The prompt questions are quite simple: Explain how Covid has impacted this year of your college life. For upper-level students, how did college change and how have you reacted to it? What do you think will be the legacy for you from this experience? For freshman students: How is what you have experienced different from how you envisioned the

college experience? How have you responded? What impact do you see for your future?

Responses vary from terse to lengthy, from sad to humorous. I have not collected enough testimonies yet for anything more than preliminary, brief assessments. For freshmen, clearly it is not what they imagined for their first semester of college. Both class discussions and the first round of essays reveal a degree of frustration, consternation, miasma, and Covid/Zoom fatigue. However, there is not a monolithic viewpoint. Individuals obviously had different experiences. Some politics surface. South Carolina is a very conservative state with a percentage of Covid deniers. It will be interesting to see if responses change as students live with the impositions on their lives for a longer period and if vaccinations and the hopes for an ending time change perceptions. Even the change in presidential administration may affect the results. Finally, does the fact that we are a women's college play a role in responses versus a coed institution? Obviously, this is fertile ground for further analysis, and I hope to write on the subject at a later point when I have more documents.

In any case, I will keep these testaments and deposit copies in the college archives. In my own research, I attest to the great pleasure of discovering an unexpected treasure trove of participant memories. I am reminded of letters my mother wrote when she was a college student during the Great Depression and later on her life during World War II.

But the more important result is that I ask students to save these essays and other remembrances from this experience so that they can reflect on them decades later as first-person documents of the time. This is what being a historian and teaching history is about. We have an obligation to show our students how to think and act like historians on a day-to-day basis and to see the connection between the past, present, and future. The Covid-19 interlude provides a good opportunity, and the possibilities for future research exist. Some military opportunists proclaim, "Don't waste a war; there are benefits to be gained." Less cynically, "Don't waste this pandemic; there is much to be learned." My career mantra to students has been: Live your life, be attuned to it, strive to understand it, and record it for those in the future. This is what historians do. Everyone should. We all have a responsibility for future generations. Students, your grandchildren may thank you, and you might be more cognizant of how your seemingly unextraordinary life fits into history.

TEACHING HISTORY FORUM: *THE AMATEUR HOUR*

INTRODUCTION

In 2004, David Pace's seminal paper, "The Amateur in the Operating Room: History and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," appeared in the *American Historical Review*.[1] In this essay's opening paragraphs, Pace distinguished between two imagined historians: One had access to "state-of-the-art knowledge" and designed lectures that were part of a "collective enterprise" to which generations of experts had contributed; the other worked almost completely in isolation, relying on "folk beliefs about the subject" and "impressionistic" uses of evidence. His quick revelation to readers that these two historians were actually the same individual and his recognition that "the transition from amateur to expert that occurred long ago in the realm of research had not yet been completed in that of teaching" set the stage for Pace to identify, over the course of the essay, a vision for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in History and to make specific suggestions for research in History-SoTL.

The eminent historian of education, Jonathan Zimmerman, recognizes the chasm Pace identified in the discipline of history and places it in the larger context of college teaching in his 2020 book, *The Amateur Hour: A History of College Teaching in America*. In this special section of *Teaching History*, we asked fellow historian of education, Robert Hampel, to review Zimmerman's book. We then provided Hampel's review and Zimmerman's monograph to four historians whose scholarship incorporates the teaching of history, asking them to comment on how Zimmerman's work might have an influence on their teaching today. The contributions by Cate Denial, David Gerber, Jessamyn Neuhaus, and Keith Pluymers articulate the continuing complexity and challenges of college teaching and—importantly—demonstrate that scholarly teachers need not feel alone. As members of a growing community that increasingly draws upon evidence to inform its practice, these historians provide readers of *Teaching History* with practical examples, realistic appraisals of existing conditions, calls for purposeful support, and inspiring resources from which all teachers of history can draw.

Sarah Drake Brown & Richard Hughes, Editors

The editors extend our sincere thanks to David Gerber for making the suggestion that we organize a forum to discuss Zimmerman's work.

[1]David Pace, "The Amateur in the Operating Room: History and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," American Historical Review 109, no 4 (October 2004): 1171-1192.

© 2021 Drake Brown, Hampel, Denial, Gerber, Neuhaus, & Pluymers. Free to copy and share for education and scholarship under a Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License.

Book Review

Jonathan Zimmerman. *The Amateur Hour: A History of College Teaching in America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020. Pp. 291. $34.95

Does Jon Zimmerman ever sleep? This is his eighth book in twenty-one years. There could have been more except for his reliance on archival sources. To ransack fifty-nine libraries for *The Amateur Hour* reflects his lifelong devotion to primary sources. And, it took time to transform his notes into remarkably well-written books. Memorable examples, clear arguments, and wry humor enliven his histories of small schools, sex education, culture wars, and now college teaching.

In *The Amateur Hour*, Zimmerman once again combines meticulous research and graceful writing. The title suggests how he made sense of so much material. As teachers, college professors were amateurs. The hallmarks of a profession—extensive preparation, technical knowledge, peer review, sanctions for malpractice, rewards for excellence—rarely marked college teaching. What mattered most was the instructors' personality. Good teaching allegedly stemmed from immutable dispositions and habits. Rather than teach old dogs new tricks, the best strategy to improve instruction was recruitment. Recruit doctoral students and hire new faculty with the right character, and they would do just fine in class.

Not everyone agreed with that point of view. Maybe the old dogs could learn new tricks, especially if they stopped sneering at schools of education. Over time there were more and more efforts to evaluate, improve, and honor teaching. But most of those initiatives fell short, and most professors continued to be classroom amateurs and research professionals, a contrast sustained by the abundant rewards for peer reviewed publications—early tenure, faster promotion, external grants, doctoral students, national visibility, and other incentives to write.[1]

If that sounds depressing, life in classrooms before the emergence of research universities was no paradise. The 19th century reliance on recitations was "a toxic blend of angst and ennui" (24) as instructors quizzed students rather than discuss the assignment. Teaching was testing, and for high grades, a good memory was essential. Faculty were usually aloof and austere; personal charisma counted less than diligence in determining if students were working. It was the same no-nonsense pedagogy used in most elementary and secondary schools.

The rise of the university replaced the ordeal of recitations with the passivity of lecture halls. The core curriculum everyone studied in small 19th century colleges gave way to majors, electives, much higher enrollments, and the financial benefits of large classes. Performance at the podium varied widely, and early 20th century critics looked for better ways to connect students and faculty. Rather than abandon lectures, they supplemented them with one-on-one tutorials, small group *preceptorial* sessions, comprehensive examinations, and honors programs. Well-endowed colleges could afford those expensive innovations; most campuses could not.

Each decade saw fresh attempts to improve college teaching, and Zimmerman offers thumbnail sketches of student course evaluations, televised instruction, and fellowships for "first-class human beings" to pursue the Ph.D. (three major philanthropies funded those drives to recruit seniors who were not "narrow and limited scholar types").[2] Zimmerman also profiles the creation in the late 1960s of a new degree, the Doctor of Arts, to prepare college teachers. The D.A. pioneers knew that most Ph.D. programs neglected teaching, hoping that service as a teaching assistant would suffice. But the research on college teaching was meager and inconclusive. "A shared definition of good teaching continued to elude scholars…no method appeared to be more effective

---

[1] The time available for teaching was also eroded by the widespread need to supplement modest salaries. For the most detailed record of a historian's extracurricular work, see Ray Allen Billington, *Frederick Jackson Turner: Historian, Scholar, Teacher* (Oxford University Press: New York 1973).

[2] George Pierson to Richard Carroll, March 7, 1960, in Yale University Experimental Program of Teaching Fellowships, Box 892, Folder 3, Carnegie Corporation Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

than any other."[3] The traditional prestige of a conventional Ph.D. was hard to challenge, and for every D.A. awarded in the 1970s and 1980s, there were 350 Ph.Ds.

The eight pages on the late 1960s suggest another source of reform: significant changes in American culture. Shifts in the prevailing notions of authority, for instance, altered perceptions of what faculty should and should not do. In the tumultuous late 1960s, some professors sought more egalitarian relationships in class, and several dozen experimental colleges committed themselves to the same democratic goals. The enthusiasm for utopian enclaves diminished quickly in the 1970s, but the brief ferment raised an enduring question: Why not be less aloof in class? From the mid-1960s on, many faculty (especially younger faculty) were less remote and more caring. Amorphous notions of how young and old should get along may be just as important as well-defined reforms in altering teaching.

In the final sixteen pages, Zimmerman considers the past 40 years. He sees many signs of progress—more coaching of doctoral students, prizes for instructional excellence, centers for teaching effectiveness, course evaluation results in promotion dossiers, compelling research on best practices, and other commitments to instructional improvement. Add to that list the rapid growth of undergraduate research projects, the appointments of "professors of the practice" focused on teaching, and accreditation requirements mandating active learning by aspiring nurses, teachers, physical therapists, and so on. So the challenge ahead is sustaining the momentum, heeding what Zimmerman said about his book: "It's a long plea to give a damn."[4]

You will finish this book eager to know more. With one-third of higher education enrollments, the community colleges deserve more attention. So does the rapidly expanding for-profit sector. It would be valuable to examine graduate and professional school instruction. And did college teaching in other nations resemble our history, or is there something distinctively American in our emphasis on personality as the key to good teaching? The history of college teaching deserves more work. Thanks to the indefatigable Jon Zimmerman, we now have a very solid foundation on which to build.

University of Delaware Robert L. Hampel

[3] Scott Gelber, *Grading the College: A History of Evaluating Teaching and Learning* (Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 2020), 31.
[4] History of Education Society annual conference, November 5, 2020.

TIME TO GET SERIOUS: TRAINING GRADUATE STUDENTS IN TEACHING

Catherine J. Denial
Knox College

In late August, 1994, I walked into a classroom in the basement of Holton Hall on the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's campus and began my career as a college-level instructor of history. I had a stack of books in my arms to project a façade of expertise and had dressed up for the occasion. Since I was flatly terrified of teaching, I had wondered to myself who might do a stellar job in front of a class full of American undergraduates. I landed upon the character of Dana Scully from the X-Files, and—in my own head—pretended to be her for the entire duration of class.

I was, as the title of Jonathan Zimmerman's book suggests, an amateur. Responsible for six discussion sections per week, containing twenty students apiece, I had received one week of training on how to teach, exactly none of which I remember now. My memories of that first semester of teaching are mostly of the truly daunting stack of blue books I had to grade at midterm, and how everyone failed on my first pass because I didn't understand that points were a stand-in for certain letter grades, and not something you docked one-by-one.

UWM was not especially bad at teaching people to be teachers—it's simply that, as Zimmerman suggests, the department was set up to create researchers. It did that job well. I learned a historian's craft in my Master's program at that institution, my skill set improving by leaps and bounds over what it had been as an undergrad. In this, I was like many thousands of other brand-new graduate students in the fall of 1994. I was on the road to becoming a thoughtful, careful scholar, but I was teaching because it was what you did along the way.

Too many graduate students still weather this experience. While there have, as Zimmerman notes, been improvements in the way that incipient and ongoing instructors are taught to think about their teaching, it is still not a primary focus of history graduate education, even as graduate students are on the front lines of teaching at almost every institution. Teaching is assumed to be something a person can intuit, or perhaps do because they have learned from model teachers themselves. But as Zimmerman points out, this problem has been around for more than a century. We cannot reflexively look to senior academics to learn how to teach; they lacked models, too.

Teaching is a profession; it is the subject of serious inquiry and scholarly research; it defines the experience of every undergraduate at every institution of higher learning in the country; and it deserves respect. That respect must translate into serious pedagogical instruction in history graduate programs. Graduate students are educators, and deserve to know about the rich scholarship of teaching and learning that is available to them. They deserve professional development that equips them to be insightful, active, reflective, and compassionate instructors; they deserve targeted disciplinary support beyond what centers of teaching and learning (all hail!) provide. While many graduate students seek out opportunities to learn about teaching themselves, this should not be an extra burden they shoulder, but rather a standard provision of the programs we build.

Not all graduate students will become professors, not least of all because of the profound inequalities in our current education systems and the whittling away of tenure-track lines. But all graduate students are, I think, likely to be life-long educators, no matter what career path they take. Learning to express complex ideas in accessible language, to facilitate growth, to think about the neurology and psychology of how we learn and retain new ideas, to inject fun into intellectual labor, to lead—these are truly transferable skills.

Graduate students should expect to be championed and valued as the standard bearers of historical learning. We should all feel equipped to teach confidently, as secure in our abilities in the classroom as in our work in the archives. As historians, we need to do better by one another, and commit to the principle of transforming new instructors into well trained, supported, and appreciated professionals. To do any less is to abdicate responsibility for the lifeblood of history education.

ARE WE REALLY *THAT* CLUELESS?

David A. Gerber
University at Buffalo (SUNY)

Jonathan Zimmerman has written a smart book that sparkles with sly humor and clever, articulate observation. How could he fail? His material is a bonanza, and many of his intended audience of academic professionals are eager to receive it. He has traced over 150 years of complaints about poor teaching in American colleges and universities, and he has found that from one era to the next the complaints sound at their core much the same. Throughout, many students have been bored, sarcastic and cynical, and their instructors have remained variously clueless, defensive, indifferent, frustrated, confused, and helpless.

Here we have, from the standpoint of formal education, the smartest people in the country seeming to fail again and again, and their insights into how to improve their teaching frustrated and ultimately laid aside, until picked up again, often to be explained in a different critical vocabulary that is down through time philosophical, or behaviorist, or experiential. It's like those related, oft-proposed revisions we are all familiar with in the undergraduate curriculum, prompted by the felt-need for adjustment in the values or knowledge we are trying to impart and by the ever-intrusive bottom line, whether that budgetary "pie" is expanding or, as more often the case, fixed or contracting. You know, the ones in which, if you have been around long enough, you find yourself saying, "Didn't we try this already?" And you watch your younger colleagues, who can't know what you're talking about, buy in enthusiastically. Zimmerman memorably summarizes the situation, writing of a faculty veteran responding to the establishment of a "Center for Learning and Instruction" on his campus by saying something to the effect, "Isn't that what the college itself is supposed to be?" Such wicked ironies expressed by such smart people are the self-referential parody of our pretensions which delight many faculty.

While I value what Zimmerman has done for its wit and often keen observations into academic foibles, I cannot go the distance with him. I am critical of his largely offhand and vague invocations of "professional standards," best practices, and scientific knowledge of how learning is accomplished that provide the illusive background by which the amateurs are supposed to be separated from the professionals (Ken Bain has done the work of attempting to spell out best practices – *what works* – in plain language in *What the Best College Teachers Do*[1]). Zimmerman himself seems to throw up his hands toward the end of his book, and say, as he observes repeatedly generations of faculty observers have said, "You either have it or you don't!" In other words, some adults are blessed with the illusive combination of charisma, engagement, humility and chutzpah, patience, charm, humor, and abilities to clearly summarize, analyze, and explain that make it possible to effectively instruct American adolescents. The best practices seem to come naturally to these people. They may not even have to think much about what they are doing. Others, for want of that awesome list of traits, or because they are simply too distracted by private concerns, or because they are preoccupied with research and publishing—i.e., what it is that we really get known for among peers and gets us promoted and our salary increased—seem to find them illusive. Some don't care about achieving them. Fortunately, most of us keep trying.

I also need to see from Zimmerman more attention paid to a series of practical, related differences in teaching situations that call for finer conceptual distinctions in figuring out what we mean when we speak of good and poor teaching. There are, of course, many teaching situations. For example, there is the wide variety of disciplines present in colleges and universities. As the freshman engineering students, whom I have been teaching, as a historian, for years about Supreme Court First Amendment decisions, have told me again and again, my class engages them at a level at which they are challenged as citizens, and hence "makes them think." I seem to care about what they believe about what Ken Bain refers to as the "big question" that captivate many

[1] Ken Bain, *What the Best College Teachers Do* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004). Maggie Berg and Barbara K. Seeber, *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016) amplify Bain's analysis and point to growing institutional constraints, resulting from the corporatization of higher education, on establishing an atmosphere conducive to becoming engaged in teaching and inviting students to accompany you.

student minds—and in my case, justice in all of its many dimensions. Their engineering professors don't to do that as much or in the same way, and they have to work a lot harder at balancing certification requirements and necessary technical disciplinary knowledge future bridge-builders, for example, need with the thinking citizens are challenged to do. I tell those students to listen to their engineering professors carefully, even as the whiteboard fills up with equations and calculations at 8:00 AM, if only because I don't want them building the sort of bridges that get hopelessly caught in a wind storm and sway those unfortunate enough to be on top of them and themselves to death. Related are the challenges we face in teaching large lecture courses that have to impart foundational information, as is the case in surveys like those history departments do from broad continental and chronological perspectives, and the upper division seminars that require the students to explain to us what they think and how they have come to think it. And related to that finally is one of the ultimate questions, to which Zimmerman seems to allude when he writes here and there about the state of our knowledge about the receptivity of students to learning. The students we confront in their first year are hopefully, and I think it is fair to say in my own experience definitely, not the same individuals when we encounter them as seniors. Their malleable brains have matured, and their behavior is more restrained and disciplined. As they contemplate their futures and prepare for the world beyond the campus, questions of identity and aspiration, as well as anxieties and apprehensions about what might become of them if they don't pay attention, have created a greater thoughtfulness and an openness to becoming engaged in learning. How we teach the 18-year-old and how we teach the 22-year-old must raise different questions for us, something for which those of us who have raised our own adolescents at home may well have a special sensitivity.

My own experience of long-struggling to improve my teaching is different than the sort Zimmerman suggests in focusing generally on formal, institutional efforts. In neglecting the examples posed by the individual instructor in the context of longtime, daily relations with colleagues in academic departments, he also neglects one of the principal ways in which instructors learn to improve themselves: casually, from one another. He does analyze departmental review processes of the sort that accompany promotion and tenure, which in my experience do not even count for much in those evaluations of individuals, though they do add to the anxieties of that process. They certainly do not improve anyone's teaching. Instead, I am thinking of the largely impromptu conversations among departmental colleagues about the common endeavor in which they are involved in creating a curriculum, working to refine it, and arguing about how to make it effective, and in teaching the same students, as individuals and as members of generational cohorts, through their four years in their courses. Not necessarily informed by any scientifically based knowledge about how students learn, but guided mostly by pragmatic adaptations about what works, this ongoing intradepartmental tutorial was, for me, the source of much practical knowledge. It also served as a means to collectively surmount, through mutual encouragement, the frustrations and failures that inevitably are a part of teaching day-in and day-out, week after week, semester after semester, year after year. I learned a great deal by thinking about what my colleagues, senior and junior alike, told me they were doing and had stopped doing. It came occasionally as a painful recognition of my limited imagination and laziness when repeating the same approaches, even when I didn't much like them and was aware that they didn't work very well in stimulating student engagement.[2]

But we shouldn't be too hard on ourselves. After all, though the world beyond the campus is hardly aware of it, instruction at the college and university level is hard work. Therefore, we might begin—while laughing with Zimmerman at how its challenges occasionally bring down the most bloated egos among us and mock our pretensions to be the masters of the universe—by acknowledging those difficulties inherent in the task, while putting our faces into the wind and attempting to improve.

---

[2] Berg and Seeber, "Collegiality and Community, pp. 71-90, in *The Slow Professor*, raise the issue of the ways in which the widely observed decline in collegiality in academic departments, which they attribute to the increasingly corporatization of universities and colleges, takes away the possibilities for precisely this sort of productive, informal interaction.

A BREAK WITH THE PAST OR RESURGENCE OF AMATEURISM? PLACING OUR PANDEMIC ERA IN THE HISTORY OF COLLEGE TEACHING

Jessamyn Neuhaus
SUNY Plattsburgh

Since March 2020, everyone in higher education has heard the word "unprecedented" far too often. Yet this is an accurate adjective for college teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic. A nationwide emergency pivot to remote instruction never happened before. To be sure, some faculty navigating the new normal already possessed online teaching expertise. However, the proliferation of teleconferenced, webcam-enabled classrooms posed entirely new pedagogical problems.[1] The question, "How do we implement technology in the college classroom?" didn't originate in 2020.[2] But the question, "How do we implement technology in the college classroom during a global pandemic, in an era of political turmoil, economic devastation, social distancing, 'alternative facts,' and no childcare or in-person schooling while also getting camera-ready for professional Zooming from our couch?" was utterly—wait for it—*unprecedented*.

Anyone trying to ascertain what the pandemic era may mean to college teaching can look to Jonathan Zimmerman's *The Amateur Hour: A History of College Teaching in America*. His analysis suggests both the potential for a break with the past as well as ways the powerful pull of history may lead to lost opportunities for improving teaching, post-pandemic. Zimmerman argues that in contrast to intellectual work and research, academia doggedly refuses to professionalize the labor of college teaching, instead relying on a cult of personality and occasional ad hoc reform efforts. But, as Robert Hampel notes in his review, "most of those initiatives fell short, and most professors continued to be classroom amateurs and research professionals."

Every educational developer and instructional designer encounters this deep-seated resistance to professionalizing college teaching. Programming aimed at helping faculty increase their teaching efficacy, even at institutions with robust, well-funded teaching centers, meets persistent resistance among academics to the idea of spending one's time and mental resources on pedagogical learning. Notwithstanding flourishing scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and increased pedagogical training for graduate students, college teaching is still largely a solitary, closed-door profession, with few systemic opportunities for openly sharing teaching ideas and problems. Zimmerman points out that not much has changed since 1965, when one college president remarked: "As a group, college teachers have been loftily contemptuous of courses in education and absurdly vain about their innocence of any formal instruction in curriculum design, testing techniques, and formal classroom procedures" (9).

However, in the wake of the 2020 emergency pivot, faculty disdain for educational development and their "absurd vanity" about teaching amateurism wavered. As I said in a June 2020 interview with *Inside Higher Ed* about serving as the interim director of my college's teaching center that semester: "For the first time, college instructors became novice learners in so many ways. For the first time, it was acceptable, even desirable, for smarty-pants experts to say, 'I need some assistance; I'm not sure how to teach this right now.' It became culturally acceptable for people to just admit, 'I'm not totally sure how to do this.' That is so huge."[3] Zimmerman's historical analysis puts into perspective exactly *how* huge it was, helping us further recognize the significance of that moment.

Discouragingly, he also demonstrates the endurance of amateurism in college teaching. Knowing exactly how long-lasting "the amateur hour" has been, it's hard to foresee a permanent revolution in academics' approach to

[1] For resources on Zoom-based teaching, see https://geekypedagogy.com/zoom.
[2] See for example Derek Bruff, *Intentional Tech: Principles to Guide the Use of Technology in the College Classroom* (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2019).
[3] Doug Lederman, "Crisis and Opportunity for Faculty Development," *Inside Higher Ed*, June 3, 2020, https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2020/06/03/how-new-one-person-teaching-center-navigating-moment-peril-and.

teaching being brought about by the crisis conditions of the pandemic era. In fact, those same working and living crisis conditions are creating the threat of serious burnout among college educators, which is directly linked to disinterest in teaching and indifference to student learning.[4] And it's important to note that burnout and other burdens of pandemic era teaching are not evenly distributed among college educators. Systemic racism, ableism, sexism, and homophobia ensures that the challenges of college teaching, including mitigating student biases, fall more heavily on some instructors than others. Zimmerman writes that "the lack of tangible career-related returns on teaching remains the central barrier to improving it" (233). I would add that women, BIPOC, non-binary, disabled instructors, women of color, and contingent faculty all face numerous additional obstacles to "career-related returns on teaching."

Furthermore, the deeply ingrained amateurism of college teaching before the pandemic will lead to lost opportunities in recording and documenting new pedagogical insights. Zimmerman notes that "the amateur status of teaching has meant that it is rarely documented—or recorded, or authenticated—in the ways that a truly professional practice would be" (11). While I agree with those who have cautioned against treating traumatized students like lab rats in a pandemic learning maze, rigorous study, wisdom of practice, and deliberate, systemic reflection are all vital parts of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. SoTL is one of our best weapons in the fight to improve pedagogical learning among college instructors but the threat of lost wisdom looms large today.

In this way, historians may be particularly well-suited to ensure that the pandemic era marks a break with college teaching's problematic past. Zimmerman's book is an example of how we wield the tools of our discipline to increase our understanding of why things are the way they are today, including how we teach. The global pandemic context and the Zoom-based classroom are new but the amateurish, individualistic approach to college teaching is anything but. Cultivating a pedagogical community of practice, knowing that *you are not alone*, is the cornerstone of the best educational development and SoTL. Because you are reading *Teaching History*, you already know the value of published work that helps us build our pedagogical content knowledge. *Teaching History* and other conferences offer additional, invaluable opportunities to increase productive discourse around college history teaching. As Zimmerman's works suggests, unless we actively seize these opportunities and disrupt "the amateur hour," the "dead hand of tradition" (164) will continue to write our curriculum and proscribe our pedagogy today and post-pandemic.

[4] Rebecca Pope-Roark, "Professor Burnout: How do You Identify and Destigmatize Faculty Burnout?" POD Network Annual Conference (2020).

CREATING THE CONDITIONS FOR GOOD COLLEGE TEACHING

Keith Pluymers
Illinois State University

On February 9, 2021, American Historical Association Executive Director James Grossman discussed the "paradox" of history's "seemingly lost status in higher education" at the same moment as controversies over historical memory dominate the headlines.[1] For Grossman, the solution is for historians to commit to civic and public engagement, a refrain that has echoed widely across the discipline recently. Left unmentioned, however, were any calls to rethink the act through which academic historians have our most sustained contact with a wide audience and through which we most shape historical consciousness—teaching.

Now is an urgent moment for college historians to reconsider what we do in the classroom. In addition to public calls to re-evaluate history curricula, faculty and students have been forced to rethink teaching and learning to rapidly adapt to conditions brought on by the Covid-19 pandemic. Rather than a return to an already unstable "normal," it seems far more likely that this combination of factors will result in new challenges, controversies, and demands to reform college teaching. This, as Jonathan Zimmerman's *The Amateur Hour* shows, would be in keeping with ongoing processes and patterns developed since the end of the Second World War. Politicians, administrators, college faculty, students, and the public have asked how college teaching serves democracy, how it might advance equality, and how content and modes of instruction might serve those ends. How might college history teachers put Zimmerman's analysis to use as we face another intensified period of questions about the purpose, content, and methods of college teaching?

The Amateur Hour demonstrates the need to understand the history of college teaching and to situate our own practices within it. For many students, whether majoring or minoring in history or taking a course as part of a General Education requirement, the rationale of those courses is mysterious or expressed through learning/course objectives. Their sense for what history is often differs sharply from ours. Why not instead take the opportunity to historicize our own actions and treat the classroom as a subject of historical inquiry with our students rather than just the venue for it? Doing so will help encourage our students to see history not simply as a set of facts to be learned but rather a process of analysis that can and should be applied broadly. It will also challenge us to reflect collectively with our students on content, modes of delivery, and assessment. In doing so, we can take an opportunity to revisit the spirit of experimentation that Zimmerman describes from the 1960s and 1970s with democratic, less-hierarchical classrooms not dominated by "objective" alphanumeric grades. But we can do so while grounding students' critiques of the material and our pedagogical choices in historical thinking, reinforcing the importance of our discipline in the process.

We can and should push this approach beyond our classrooms, assessing degree requirements and course offerings historically and inquiring whether the conditions that informed those past decisions still hold true. Even if we took these approaches, however, Zimmerman's work still challenges us to ask exactly how they should be implemented.

A paradox is at the core of *The Amateur Hour*. "Teaching," Zimmerman notes, "is a deeply personal and even spiritual act that defies rational organization," (234) and the bureaucratic and administrative structures of many universities today threaten that. The pervasiveness of amateurism, he argues, has limited efforts to subject faculty to aggressive supervision and to standardize teaching. It has preserved those qualities before the university's current phase and into it, even as it allowed "some truly appalling and unjust outcomes" (233-234). How then, do we "keep alive the mystique" (234) while moving away from ossified or harmful traditions?

Throughout *The Amateur Hour*, Zimmerman writes sympathetically about assessment as a tool for improving teaching, appearing most favorable towards efforts at peer review, though by the book's conclusion, he seems to

[1] James Grossman, "A Paradox: History without Historians," *Perspectives on History*, 9 February 2009, https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/march-2021/a-paradox-history-without-historians

suggest that only a few "true believers" (227) encouraged it. But making assessment—even peer review—formal, regular, and a condition of employment requires that judgment about "a "deeply personal and even spiritual act" (as Zimmerman describes teaching) be rendered bureaucratically knowable, an act of translation more likely to produce what anthropologist David Graeber called "bullshitization" than meaningful improvement.[2] Rather than lament that "most faculty development happened out of sight" (206) and seek to make it administratively visible, why not instead recognize that the most helpful and useful conversations about teaching happen informally and require a set number of informal peer observations and feedback sessions in which the discussions were wholly separate from evaluation processes? The path away from the most harmful aspects of amateurism may require trusting faculty as professionals capable of work outside the administrative gaze.

Finally, any meaningful discussion of college teaching requires addressing the changing nature of the professoriate. In the 1990s, as Zimmerman notes, contingent faculty (then 40% of the profession) taught under immense time pressure and without access to campus resources or the job protections of tenured and tenure-track faculty. They now make up an even greater share of faculty working in the US. Fixed syllabi and assignments over which contingent faculty have minimal or no control offer few of the opportunities for personality (as Zimmerman defines it) and sharply limit experimentation. After all, knowing the long history of conflicts over assessment and grading or attempts to find alternatives matter little for contingent faculty whose renewal or ability to pick up more courses depends on their ability to deliver set syllabi and follow established assessment procedures. This is but one example. Without significant improvements to the working conditions, wages, and job security and without full, compensated inclusion in collective decision-making and planning around curricula and pedagogy, any efforts to improve college teaching risk leaving out the majority of faculty or adding another weight to already overburdened academic workers.

The Amateur Hour offers a rich, useful history and should provoke many discussions about college pedagogy. The key task will be creating the conditions in which all college teachers can have those conversations.

[2] David Graeber, *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2018), 263-265.

Cynthia Williams Resor. *Exploring Vacation and Etiquette Themes in Social Studies: Primary Source Inquiry for Middle and High School*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. Pp. xvii, 115. Paper, $32.00.

Cynthia Williams Resor. *Investigating Family, Food, and Housing Themes in Social Studies*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017. Pp. ix, 127. Paper, $34.00.

Cynthia Williams Resor. *Discovering Quacks, Utopias, and Cemeteries: Modern Lessons from Historical Themes*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2019. Pp. xii, 139. Paper, $40.00.

In this series, Cynthia Williams Resor draws on her experiences as a middle and high school social studies teacher, a trained historian, and a professor of social studies education to curate primary source sets designed to inject more social history into the study of the past. Her intended audience for these teaching resources is middle school or high school teachers, although the themes she works with (and her selected primary sources) could also enrich elementary or undergraduate history courses. Resor makes two arguments across these volumes: first, for the inclusion of more social history into middle and secondary classrooms; second, for teaching that social history in thematic units.

Resor argues, convincingly, for the pedagogical value of social history as both a mechanism for student engagement and as an important analytical framework students should use to examine the past. Teachers will find in Resor's series considerations of daily life not often covered in more traditional middle school or secondary curricula, and teachers unfamiliar with key concepts in the study of social history will find a brief but helpful introduction in the first volume. Certainly, considering cultural history, popular culture, social class, sex and gender, and generational change (among other social history topics) leads to a fuller understanding of the past. Considering home life, dating, vacations, funeral practices, and other moments in the lives of "ordinary people" also has the added benefit of enticing students to draw connections between the past and their own lives, and in doing so, assess change and continuity over time.

Resor's first volume opens with an introduction to thematic teaching and closes with guidance for teachers who wish to research and create their own thematic lessons and units. Resor uses these principles of thematic instruction in her own organization of primary source sets according to various themes, indicated by each volume's title. Some of Resor's themes closely connect (such as those pertaining to the domestic sphere in her second volume), while others are more tenuously linked (notably medical quackery, real and imagined utopian communities, and various ways of memorializing the dead in the third volume). However, all of Resor's social history themes have the potential to both hook students' attention and draw them into making comparisons between historical actors and their own lives.

Each of Resor's themes follows a similar structure. First, Resor provides commentary on the context and historiography of the theme. Second, Resor includes suggestions for teaching the theme, including compelling questions that frame inquiry into the primary sources that follow, suggested activities for introducing students to the theme, and graphic organizers for students to use while evaluating the primary sources. Finally, Resor includes the primary sources themselves. Resor casts a wide net for different types of primary sources. Selections from medieval epics, etiquette columns on proper courtship, estate appraisal documents, scrapbooks, and recipes from a 1796 American cookbook represent just some of the genres of primary sources included in these volumes. These primary source texts have been excerpted and occasionally lightly edited, including some brief contextualizing headers introducing the source and footnotes defining some challenging vocabulary. Numerous black and white reproductions of photographs, advertisements, and other visual sources round out these collections.

Although collections of related primary sources always have some value for teachers, the most important feature of these books is Resor's excellent contextualizing and historiographical commentary for each theme.

This commentary prefaces every primary source set. The well-researched introductions provide teachers with the content knowledge necessary to teach on the themes found within the primary source set. Resor's commentaries situate the primary sources into a wider context and chronology, as well as provide an overview of how historians have considered, conceptualized, and studied these themes over time. The notes and additional sources that follow these commentaries provide a treasure-trove of additional resources teachers can use to further deepen their content knowledge for teaching. Resor's engaging tone transforms what could be seen as mundane or ordinary topics (such as road trips, evening dinner, or over-the-counter medicines) into fascinating historical studies, unearthing the captivating, and at times, surprising or shocking, pasts of these commonplace ideas.

These volumes do face some publishing limitations. None of the visual sources are printed in color, and both the primary sources and the graphic organizers lack the whitespace necessary to make student copies directly from the book. However, the connected website at www.teachingwiththemes.com provides full color images, editable digital versions of the graphic organizers, and additional primary sources to supplement the printed books. While some of the content on this website requires a passcode from the printed books, most is freely available to all.

Teachers with significant autonomy over the content and scope of their social studies courses – including interdisciplinary, project-based learning, or history elective courses – could easily adapt the sources and materials contained in these volumes into rich instructional units. For teachers in more traditional courses, the units in these volumes would require more heavy adaptation and supplementation. Resor draws her primary resources only from the United States and Europe, a major limitation she acknowledges. This geographic spread of content would fit naturally within a course on Western Civilization; world history teachers, however, would need to incorporate other regions of the globe. Teachers of either United States history or European history may find themselves incorporating only some of the included sources in their courses. Teachers wishing to follow a chronologically-based sequence of units would have difficulty teaching these thematic units, as each unit crosses decades and centuries examining their particular theme. However, these themes and their sources could still provide a historical framework or an enduring issue that could be revisited at multiple points throughout a course. The themes of domestic life in the second volume, in particular, could easily form an enduring issue to revisit again and again in chronological units. Across teaching context, this series both justifies and exemplifies enlivening social studies curricula through social history.

SUNY-Cortland Jared McBrady

Gorton, Stephanie. *Citizen Reporters: S.S. McClure, Ida Tarbell, and the Magazine that Rewrote America*. New York: Harper Collins, 2020. Pp. 368, $28.99.

In 1873, Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner authored *The Gilded Age: A Tale of Today*, a novel that used satire to define the late nineteenth century in the United States as shaped as much by unbridled greed and corruption as dramatic economic progress. As Americans read the novel, the global economy, as if to acknowledge the book that gave the era its name, had deteriorated into what became known as the Panic of 1873, the largest global financial crisis until the Great Depression. Twenty years later, as Americans once again faced what became known as the Panic of 1893, readers first encountered a subversive new magazine entitled *McClure's* which aimed to use investigative reporting, rather than humor, to uncover the era's most pressing political, economic, and social issues. Stephanie Gorton's *Citizen Reporters: S.S. McClure, Ida Tarbell, and the Magazine that Rewrote America* provides accessible biographies of two of the magazine's primary figures to illustrate *McClure's* seminal role in creating Progressive Era journalism.

Along with economic growth and instability, the decades after the Civil War also brought a more literate American population and the rapid increase in popular magazines – 575 in 1860 to around 5,000 in 1895. An impoverished Irish immigrant whose mercurial personality was responsible for both his successes and failures, Samuel S. McClure was an unlikely candidate to create one of these magazines that at one point had over

400,000 subscribers and, as Gorton claims, "defined the muckraking movement" (3). McClure did not author any of the magazine stories, but *Citizen Reporters* suggests that he had an uncanny eye for discerning the issues, and words, that resonated with Americans. He also recruited and supported tenacious investigative reporters such as Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, and Ray Stannard Baker whose articles exposed many of the social ills that later came to define the challenges of Progressive Era reform. At the same time, *McClure's*, which initially cost only 15 cents an issue, also published the work of such literary figures as Rudyard Kipling, Jack London, Thomas Hardy, Henry James, Arthur Conan Doyle, and Willa Cather.

If McClure was an unpredictable and often unrealistic visionary whose personal problems ultimately led to the demise of the magazine, Tarbell served as the anchor that held much of *McClure's* together during its peak between 1893 and 1906. Born in the Pennsylvania oil region and witness to the unprecedented success and social costs of Standard Oil Company's monopoly, Tarbell started with biographies of such historical figures as Napoleon and Abraham Lincoln before authoring, after years of research, the groundbreaking series, "The History of Standard Oil." Tarbell rejected convention that restricted middle class women to marriage, teaching, or nursing and instead traveled to Paris to write and, upon accepting McClure's offer to join his staff as a full-time journalist, forged a career investigating the countless economic and political injustices of a rapidly modernizing America. Although Tarbell's ambivalent stance toward feminism and women's suffrage deserves far more attention, Gorton's portrait is clear as to Tarbell's commitment to using the pen to fight the increasingly problematic role of wealth and power. The Gilded Age may have been fodder for humor for writers such as Twain, but for Tarbell, the period was, as she declared years later, "dripped in blood" with clear lines between the forces of good and evil (57).

In contrast to standard historical surveys and recent books such as Doris Kearns Goodwin's prize-winning, *The Bully Pulpit: Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and the Golden Age of American Journalism* (2013), *Citizen Reporters* illustrates the rise of Progressive reform from the perspectives of the writers and editors themselves. Gorton includes the role of Roosevelt, John D. Rockefeller, and other elites, but the best parts of the book explore the commitment of McClure, Tarbell, and their talented colleagues to craft an unprecedented form of journalism that combined rigorous field research, analysis, and activism for a new age. Gorton's account reminds teachers of the Progressive Era of the value of having students examine the accessible digital archives of *McClure's*. For example, the 1902 volume alone included the first chapter in Tarbell's scathing portrait of Standard Oil, a piece from Lincoln Steffens on political corruption in St. Louis that he later published as a book entitled, *The Shame of the Cities* (1904), and an account of the lengthy coal strike in Pennsylvania from John Mitchell, the president of the United Mine Workers. Other volumes of the period included Ray Stannard Baker's insightful and often intimate reports on familiar topics such as the nationwide Pullman Strike, Coxey's Army, and the Spanish-American War. Baker's 1905 series, "What is a Lynching? A Study of Mob Justice, South and North," remains a groundbreaking case study of community, culture, and racial violence in Georgia and Ohio that both challenged persistent assumptions about race and region and foreshadowed many of the race riots of the next decade.

Many instructors will find the last portion of *Citizen Reporters*, as Gorton describes the demise of the magazine and the later years of McClure and Tarbell, less valuable and, at times, frustratingly incomplete. Both McClure and Tarbell lived during the Great Depression, yet Gorton provides little hint as to how these two pivotal reformers interpreted the New Deal and its challengers. Regardless, the book's well-written account of the pinnacle of muckraking journalism will enrich familiar classroom discussions of the battles of Progressive Era reform. As Tarbell wrote in her first installment of the history of Standard Oil,

> …this history of the Standard is enough to show that although written from documents and with entire fidelity to facts, it is more than a mere record, that it is a great human drama, the story of thirty years of bitter, persistent warfare between the advocates of the two great commercial principles of our day – competition and combination. … It is a story of daring action, of bold projects ably realized, of

> heart-breaking tragedies – a story in which the shape of new conditions of business life in America are illustrated as in no other of which we know (*McClure's*, Volume 19, November 1902, p. 592).

Despite the limitations of biography to capture the complexity of social forces that shaped the era, *Citizen Reporters* provides students and teachers of history with an unique and instructive sense of the "great human drama" and "persistent warfare" that lay behind both the most vexing of the period's social problems and the unprecedented efforts of writers to right the wrongs of a modernizing America.

Illinois State University Richard Hughes

Daegan Miller. *This Radical Land: A Natural History of American Dissent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018. Pp. 318. $30.00.

Daegan Miller's *This Radical Land* is a critical and enchanting analysis of the tradition of progress in America and what he calls the "bruising legacy of domination" (9) connected to a continuous desire and effort to master the landscape. Centered around the idea of the witness tree, Miller's book is divided into four acts, each highlighting a historical moment where human interaction with the environment might best be described as a living moment profoundly effecting the world in which we now live. Familiar with the testimonies of the human story regarding progress and advancement across America, Miller instead focuses on the trees and asks us as readers to listen with him to their stories and "to read what is written on their leaves, to get down on paper those lessons once-living metaphors might still hold for today" (12). Definitely not your father's history book, it is a refreshing tale of environmental resistance and the radical way in which the land has expressed dissent to our persistent and unrelenting usage and exploitation of this most precious gift.

This Radical Land rightfully begins with Thoreau and his time surveying on the Concord River. His joy in setting out to "spend time with one of his muses,"(29) Miller explains, soon turned to disillusionment as evidence of the advancement of capitalism could be seen in the irregularity of its ebb and flow. It is this advancement and the increasing impact of the market that makes Miller's book read as a passionate eulogy to the ever-changing and manipulated landscape. Turning next to the Adirondacks, it highlights the efforts of what Miller labels the "utopian agrarianism" (60) exemplified in the work of black abolitionists to carve a modest and communal livelihood out in the Great Northern Wilderness – Timbuctoo as it were. Like Thoreau's river, the surrounding forest, too, became a breeding ground for intense capitalization as lumber mills, tanneries, and charcoal forges rapidly depleted the area while removing near one million logs a year by 1870.

Act Three of Miller's book concerns the 1000 Mile Tree in Utah's Weber Canyon which witnessed the Union Pacific's laying that length of track in 1869. Starting the chapter with a beautifully descriptive account of photographer A.J. Russell's capturing what Miller calls "a richly gold-toned image of a beautiful mystery" (109) in the moments immediately after the rail was hammered down, the chapter draws upon the power of imagery in helping tell the story of America's changing landscape. From the paintings of Thomas Cole to the photography of Ansel Adams, image has been used to both protect and profane nature. And photography in particular tells a story that needs listening to, especially in the images captured concerning America's expansion westward and their usage to fan the flames of nationalism and ecological dominion.

In the final act of Miller's work, the reader is introduced to the Karl Marx tree, one of the great sequoias found in the Sierra Nevada Mountains aptly named by the Kaweah Colony of socialists who had settled there in the 1880s. Now known as the General Sherman tree and located in Sequoia National Park, Miller tells the story of how the efforts of the communalists also fell victim to the advancement of capitalism, this time in the form of the Southern Pacific Railroad. Here Miller's passion is honestly expressed in his account of the intentions behind the enlargement of the Yosemite land in which the Kaweahans had settled – "Though there is no smoking gun, the motive…was not preservation at all – or rather it was, preservation of the Southern Pacific's wealth; preservation of capitalism" (205).

For history teachers looking to bring into their curriculum oft ignored tales of the effects of expansion rather than simply repeating the long-told story of American progress, *This Radical Land* will not disappoint. Miller's avidity for environmental justice is appreciated as is his honesty in putting much of the blame for the incessant dominion of the American landscape squarely on the shoulders of capitalism. For the modern history teacher trying to make sense of the impact of progress, Miller's book is a great resource.

University High School, Illinois State University Robert Fitzgerald

David Treuer. *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee: Native America from 1890 to the Present.* New York: Riverhead Books, 2019. Pp. 512. $28.00.

The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee, by Ojibwe author and anthropologist David Treuer, explicitly sets out to challenge Dee Brown's iconic *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1970). Brown implied that Lakota history (and Native American history in general) tragically ended following the massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890. Overall, Brown's narrative described a story "of diminution and death" (1). Treuer, however, wanted to write a "counternarrative" that focuses on "Indian life rather than death." According to Treuer, Wounded Knee was both "an end, and a beginning" (1;11). Native American life, in the past and especially in the present, is more than a legacy of loss, pain, and defeat. As Treuer bluntly notes, "our cultures are not dead and our civilizations have not been destroyed" (17). Whereas Brown stopped in 1890, Treuer wants to take 1890 as his starting point to illustrate that survival and hope did not end on the wintery plains of Wounded Knee.

While Treuer states in his introduction that he mainly wants to focus on the 128 years after Wounded Knee, he takes about two hundred pages to get to that point. Part 1,"Narrating the Apocalypse: 10,000 BCE to 1890," spans one hundred pages and marches through thousands of years of Native American history. Part 2, titled "Purgatory: 1891-1934," likewise covers the key events of Native American history during that time period. These sections are well-written and provide an overview of the key events of Native American history during this long timeframe but provide little that is new in terms of content or analysis.

While still chronological and centered on events, Parts 3 through 7 provide new information that proves Treuer's thesis of native resilience and survival. In terms of events, the author covers Native American service in both world wars, urbanization in the 1950s and 1960s, the American Indian Movement of the 1960s and 1970s, and the development of Indian gaming. Most important, Treuer adds in eclectic interviews that he conducted with Native American family members, friends, and acquaintances from tribes across the nation. He visits with a cousin who is an MMA fighter, an Ojibwe man who lives off the land, the James Beard winning "Sioux Chef" Sean Sherman, an Ojibwe woman who started a women's running group on her reservation, a tribal president in Washington state who plans to open a marijuana dispensary, and many others who illustrate survival and resistance in very different ways. While acknowledging that problems remain both on and off reservations, all of these vignettes illustrate that Native Americans have found various ways to "strengthen their communities from the inside" (402).

Overall, Treuer's work is beautifully written and free of jargon. He is a consummate storyteller, as illustrated by his past publication of novels and his engaging recent memoir, *Rez Life: An Indian's Journey through Reservation Life* (2013). Despite the book's hefty page length, the chapters never feel long or drawn out. His section on "Digital Indians: 1990-2018" was especially original and illustrated how various Native activists are using technology and other innovations to promote economic development and healthy lifestyles, among other issues that have plagued reservations and Native Americans in general.

The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee is somewhat difficult to categorize as it is many things at the same time: a traditional chronological history covering the main events of Native American history from pre-contact to the present day, a primary source reader (the author includes various full primary sources in many of his chapters), and oral histories of his meetings with contemporary Native American men and women across the nation. The

fact that this book is hard to categorize, however, makes it all the more useful for teachers. *The Heartbeat of Wounded Knee* can be used in multiple ways to help construct lessons; teachers can either read the book in its entirety for a sweeping overview of Native American history or use parts for more targeted lesson plans on, for example, early colonial tribes in Virginia. Either way, the book will help teachers to place Native Americans at the center of American history.

In sum, Treuer has written an indispensable book for experts and non-experts alike who are interested in Native American history, especially into the modern day. Despite the tragedy of Wounded Knee and other atrocities forced on Native Americans since 1492, authors like Treuer, and hundreds of other Native American activists, have survived to make and to tell their own history.

Illinois State University Linda M. Clemmons

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 (2002-2020)