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Introduction

After the Texas Board of Education proposed a revised social studies curriculum that could affect history textbooks nationwide, Texas board member Dr. Don McLeroy defended the new controversial curriculum and criticized current textbooks for being "mostly the product of the liberal establishment, and...written with the idea that our religion and our liberty are in conflict. But Christianity has had a deep impact on our system. The men who wrote the Constitution were Christians who knew the Bible."¹ The new curriculum, proposed by the Texas Board of Education in the middle of March 2010, not only changed the portrayal of modern history by increasing attention to conservative and Republican historical actors, but the curriculum also changed the portrayal of the formation of the Constitution. The revised curriculum focused on the Christian principles of the Founder Fathers, and significantly decreased attention to Thomas Jefferson's promotion of the idea of the separation of church and state.

Texas's new curriculum has been met with significant criticism. Because Texas is one of the largest buyers of textbooks, it has a considerable influence on the textbooks used in other states. It is more profitable for publishers to sell Texas's textbooks to other states than to make separate textbooks for every state with different requirements. With the use of technology, publishers may be able to cost effectively modify textbooks to meet the various needs of different states² – this may usher in a new era for textbooks where the demands from large states such as California and Texas no longer determine what students learn nationwide. Even though


the extent to which Texas's decision will impact textbooks nationwide remains questionable, some historians who are worried about the nationwide impact on textbooks criticize Texas for rewriting history in a partisan manner. One such historian is Professor Paul S. Boyer who is also an author of popular textbooks. Boyer said he is uncomfortable making some of the changes, so he is unsure whether he will modify his textbooks to Texas's liking.  

Although it is questionable as to how much Texas will affect the rest of the nation, this is not the first time that history has been changed. The recent proposal by the Texas Board of Education is just one of many cases of how external factors affect the historical content of textbooks. The Texas case shows how political, cultural, and social values, education policy and curriculum, publishers, and textbook authors all affect the content of textbooks.

Textbooks have long been the subject of criticism. James W. Loewen's *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* studied lies, misrepresentations, and omissions in twelve popular textbooks between the mid 1970s and the early 1990s. In "Monuments Between Covers: The Politics of Textbooks" David Tyack wrote about why textbooks are subject to such criticism. Tyack said, "People have generally wanted history texts to tell the official truth about the past. The search for a lowest common civic denominator has often resulted in terminal blandness, but even then critics have argued that texts did not get the public truth right."  

Critical studies of textbooks are not limited to current textbooks. Kyle Ward's *History in the Making: An Absorbing Look at How American History Has Changed in the Telling over the*  

---

3 Ibid. Boyer's textbook is used in Chapter 5 of this study.


Last 200 Years examined how textbooks have changed in their portrayal of over fifty topics ranging from Native Americans to Ronald Reagan. Ward, however, did not look at how the portrayal of the Constitution has changed. Ruther Miller Elson's Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century and Frances FitzGerald's America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century discussed how and why nineteenth and twentieth century textbooks changed over time. Fitzgerald did not discuss the portrayal of the Constitution, but Elson briefly pointed out that nineteenth century history textbooks exalted the Constitution to biblical status and failed to provide adequate explanation of the difficulties in framing and ratifying the Constitution.

Recent scholars have not taken an in depth look at how the portrayal of the Constitution has changed over time. In 1938, Daniel C. Knowlton's The United States Constitution in the Schoolbooks of the Past found inadequate treatment of the Constitution in the early nineteenth century, argued the advent of Jacksonian Democracy led to an increase in the study of American history, and determined that in the years following the Civil War the Constitution was an important part of instruction. Knowlton also found an increase in the study of the Constitution in the 1920s. Beyond discussing the extent to which the Constitution was included in textbooks, Knowlton provided little analysis of the way in which the textbooks interpreted the Constitution.

Although recent scholarship has not looked at changes in the portrayal of the Constitution, some have studied how current textbooks represent the Constitution. For example, Paul C. Cline and Anthony J. Eksterowicz studied American History and American Government

---


7 Elson, 292-293.
textbooks used in the late 1980s and early 1990s and found anti-federalists and federalists were given a balanced treatment in precollege textbooks, but in college level textbooks federalists were given twice as much space as anti-federalists.⁸

This thesis begins to fill the gap in knowledge about how textbooks have changed in their portrayal of the Constitution by examining how history textbooks have changed in their portrayal of anti-federalists, the opposition to the ratification of the Constitution. While it is predictable that textbooks have changed in their portrayals of topics such as Native Americans, slavery, and Japanese internment because these topics are controversial elements of American history, it is more surprising that textbooks would change in their portrayal of the Constitution, which Americans often think about as something central to their identity. Unlike with topics such as Native Americans, there are no anti-federalists around to fight for their story to be told. While there is no well defined group fighting for fair treatment of anti-federalists in textbooks, there are groups such as states' rights supporters who may be sympathetic to anti-federalist views.

This thesis finds that during different time periods different factors were more important than others, but the main factors affecting the content of textbooks were changes in the political, cultural, and social state of the nation, state and local control over education policy and curriculum, the publishing industry, and academia. These findings indicate that even when addressing a seemingly non-controversial issue, the ratification of the Constitution, textbooks changed to meet the needs of the time. The findings echo what Fitzgerald said about textbooks:

---

"These apparently solid, authoritative tomes are in fact the most nervous of objects." History textbooks should not be treated as unbiased, unchanging sources of historical fact.

In order to find out how textbooks used in schools changed over time, this thesis uses approximately three of the most popular textbooks for every decade. The most popular textbooks were used in order to find out what ideas about anti-federalism actually made it into the classroom. Additionally, textbooks were limited to those that would currently be considered at a middle or high school level because elementary textbooks would not be expected to have any detailed explanation of the Constitution or anti-federalists. Additionally, in order to be able to compare textbooks consistently over time, the study is limited to United States history textbooks since other social studies textbooks such as government books and geographies do not approach the ratification of the Constitution from a historical perspective.

The textbooks were grouped into five time periods – each time period represents a time when there was a common theme in the portrayal of anti-federalism. The first period is from 1820 to 1860, the second period is 1860 to 1885, the third period is 1885 to 1920, the fourth period is 1920 to 1965, and the fifth period is 1965 to 2010. While textbooks were placed in

---

9 Fitzgerald, 47.


11 1820 was chosen as the start date because before 1820 there were very few United States history textbooks. For an explanation of textbooks before 1820, see Chapter 1.
time periods based on their publication dates, textbooks are often used for many years after their publication dates; therefore, even though a textbook falls into one time period, it may still have been in use during the subsequent time period.

Each time period has its own chapter, and each chapter has a section on scholarship about the Constitution, characteristics of history textbooks, the portrayal of the Constitution in textbooks, and the portrayal of the ratification of the Constitution in textbooks. The scholarship sections summarize what professional historians, as opposed to textbook authors, wrote about the Constitution and the anti-federalists during that time period. The history textbook sections look at trends in textbooks and education, with a particular focus on changes in the publishing industry, textbook adoption policies, and the curriculum. The "Constitution in the Textbooks" section focuses on the general portrayal of the Constitution, and the amount of space devoted to it. The ratification of the Constitution section focuses on the anti-federalists; however, especially during the time periods when the ratification of the Constitution was not discussed in depth, it also discusses related topics that provide insight into their portrayal of the anti-federalists. The related topics include the portrayal of the Critical Period, Shay's Rebellion, the Constitutional Convention, and the Bill of Rights.

Because between 1820 and 1860 there was limited information about the Constitution and because textbook authors were typically clergymen, not professors, textbooks from the first period briefly discussed the Constitution, largely ignored the anti-federalists, and instead focused on the link between God and the Constitution. Because of the sectional conflicts during the Civil War, textbooks between 1860 and 1885 differed in the North and the South; Northern textbooks retained a similar interpretation to the Constitution as they did during the first period, but Southern textbooks adopted a states' rights interpretation of the Constitution and were the first to
include a discussion of the Bill of Rights. Because between 1885 and 1920 there were various movements to standardize history instruction and increase the attention to political history, textbooks increased their portrayal of the Constitution, and for the first time anti-federalists received more than passing attention. Because of the progressive and economic interpretations of the Constitution in the first quarter of the twentieth century and because of the subsequent backlash to controversial textbooks, textbooks between 1920 and 1965 initially viewed the anti-federalists as democrats opposing the Constitution, which was portrayed as revolution by wealthy aristocrats. As this period progressed and controversy over "communist" textbooks increased, textbooks recognized but did not subscribe to the economic interpretation of the Constitution. Because of new trends in scholarship on the Constitution and because of the social movements of the 1960s, textbooks between 1965 and 2010 focused on the consistent growth of nationalism and democracy out of the idealism surrounding the American Revolution. In response to the social movements of the 1960s and the subsequent calls for multicultural education, textbooks discussed how the country struggled to live up to the ideals expressed in the Revolution and Constitution. Additionally, during this final period anti-federalists saw a significant increase in attention in textbooks.
Chapter 1: 1820-1860

Introduction

Between 1820 and 1860 teaching the study of history was only beginning to develop in the schools. With little control from the publishing industry and no curricular guidelines, textbook authors determined for themselves the content of history textbooks. Few teachers were formally trained and most needed to rely heavily on textbooks for teaching. Educators stressed the importance of fostering a sense of patriotism in students, and textbook authors found history an ideal way to do this. History textbooks focused on war stories to encourage patriotism.

Despite the lack of curricular guidelines, the textbook authors were largely unanimous in their determination that students should not be bogged down with learning about the Constitution. The anti-federalist role in the debates surrounding the ratification of the Constitution was largely ignored, but this is not surprising as textbooks assigned the Constitution itself little space.

Scholarship on the Constitution 1820-1860

With the publication of the *Journals, Acts, and Proceedings of the Convention* and the publication of the notes taken by Robert Yates at the Constitutional Convention, the 1820s saw a fall in the veil of secrecy surrounding the Constitutional Convention. Additionally, the publication of Jonathan Elliot’s *Debates in the Several State Conventions* increased the available source material on the Constitution. This increase in information did not lead, however, to an immediate increase in the amount of scholarship on the framing and ratification of the Constitution. According to James H. Hutson's study of the historiography of the Constitution, Timothy Pitkin was one of the first to take advantage of the new information in 1828, but Pitkin's work did not create a trend among scholars; in fact, other books about the Constitution such as
Joseph Story’s *Commentaries on the Constitution* focused on the problems created by the Articles of Confederation and only described the Constitutional Convention in a few sentences. Textbooks of the time were similar to this scholarship because they did not incorporate much of the new source material of the 1820s and they also focused on the problems created by the Articles of Confederation.

Hutson pointed out that greater availability of source material from the 1840 publication of James Madison’s Constitutional Convention notes led to renewed interest in the framing of the Constitution but the focus of scholarly inquiry was mainly in terms of the relationship between the Constitution and slavery. Scholars of the time did not focus on disagreements over the ratification of the Constitution except when the disagreements were about slavery. Various abolitionist scholars such as Wendell Phillips began referring to the compromises over slavery as the “bloody compromise” – these new historians looked at the Founding Fathers not as “saviors of the nation” as previous historians had but as “blemished political fixers.” Unlike scholarship on the Constitution, among textbooks the publication of Madison's notes did not cause criticism of the Founding Fathers’ compromises on slavery.

**History Textbooks before 1860**

In the New Republic, American History was not commonly taught. History, however, occasionally entered the curriculum indirectly. Often history would be taught in geography and reading classes. Textbooks used in geography classes often contained a short passage of history; for example Jedidiah Morses’ *American Geography* included thirty-six pages of history written

---


13 Ibid.

by Noah Webster. Webster also compiled a reader called *An American Selection of Lessons in Reading and Speaking*, which contained some readings on historical events. Because of the limited treatment of history in geographies and readers, there was very little space to devote to the Constitution.

Americans wrote only a few history textbooks before 1820. John Nietz described John M'Culloch's 1795 *A Concise History of the U.S. from the Discovery of American till 1790* as the first history textbook. Even though he referred to it as a textbook, Nietz pointed out there was disagreement over whether or not M'Culloch's early editions were actually textbooks. There is also disagreement over precisely when history textbooks became popular. Michael V. Belok suggested that the growth of history textbooks coincided with a period of nationalism following the War of 1812, and similarly, Stuart Tipton Cooke pointed to the year 1815 as initiating an increase in the number of history textbooks. Nietz claims history textbooks became more numerous in the 1820s. Additionally, a few states began mandating history in the 1820s. However, Kyle Ward attributes the increase in U.S. History instruction to an increase in immigration during the 1830s. This study found a significant increase in the number of currently available history textbooks in the 1820s; because of this and because states began mandating history instruction in the 1820s, our study uses the 1820s as a starting point for analyzing history textbooks. The period covered in this chapter ends in 1860, right before the Civil War.

---

15 Carpenter, 197.

16 Ward, xx.

17 Belok, 220; Cooke, 1; Nietz, 269; Ward, xx-xxi.
During America's early years, textbooks were in limited supply, so schools were encouraged to reuse old textbooks - a practice which lasted until after the Civil War. Students often would share textbooks in class, or different textbooks would be used within the same class. One way students were able to share textbooks was through the memorization and recitation of passages from the textbooks - memorization was a common practice during the 1800s. A combination of untrained teachers and a shortage of textbooks made it a practical way to teach. The emphasis on memorization was reflected in the textbooks used in this study. In the prefaces of many textbooks, authors discussed the ways in which the textbook was arranged to aid memorization. For example, in his 1824 textbook Charles A. Goodrich used two sizes of text – one size was to be memorized and the other size was to be thoroughly read. The emphasis on memorization of passages of textbooks showed the importance of textbooks as educational tools during this time period. With many untrained teachers, students may not have been exposed to much, if any, other information on the debate over the ratification of the Constitution.

Charles A. Goodrich needed to make a determination on what history was important enough to memorize and what history should just be read – other textbook authors faced a similar dilemma, which they described in the prefaces to their textbooks. Many authors were well aware of the role they played in determining what history would be taught. For example, in John Frost's 1844 textbook, he chose to exclude what he felt to be irrelevant and focused on

---

18 Carpenter, 17.

19 Ibid, 16.

20 Ward, xxi.

21 This textbook went through 150 editions and sold a few hundred thousand copies. In an 1852 revision, at the recommendation of other educators, Goodrich abandoned this practice by using footnotes instead of a second size of text.
“striking features of the subject which give it vividness and character”

Even though Frost said he tried to exclude irrelevant information, Carpenter later labeled Frost as one of the last textbook authors to include so much irrelevant information. The writers of this time period had to make personal judgments on what information was important enough to include. Despite having no guidelines on what to include in the textbooks, many writers produced textbooks with strikingly similar content on the debates over the ratification of the Constitution.

History textbook authors from this period were typically New England clergymen, often with no formal training in history. As Frances Fitzgerald said of the textbook writers, “The first school historians of the United States did not lack patriotic ardor, but they seemed to lack a means of expressing it...they tended to make things up” Samuel G. Goodrich was the author of many popular history textbooks including a Peter Parley series, which contained little historical information and mostly fables and heroic tales. Samuel G. Goodrich also wrote a more traditional American history in 1844, titled A Pictorial History of the United States with notices of other Portions of America. He described the textbook as “instrumental in cultivating

---


23 Carpenter, 203.

24 One exception is Emma Willard who was from New England but was not a clergyman. Willard was a famous female educator and textbook author in the early and middle nineteenth century. Another exception is B.R. Carroll who was a southerner, but Carroll’s textbook was merely a series of questions and answers, so his textbook was not used in this study.

25 Fitzgerald, 48-49.

26 Despite their popularity, because the Peter Parley series were of an elementary level and because they contained little historical fact, the Peter Parley texts were excluded from this study.
patriotism, and a love of truth, peace and justice.“ 27 The emphasis on patriotism as described by Samuel G. Goodrich and others affected the discussion on the Constitution because textbook writers were sure to praise the Constitution and sure to not point out any weaknesses it may have had.

In addition to the focus on patriotism, the New England clergymen who wrote textbooks also focused on the connection between history and God. For example, in Egbert Guernsey’s 1851 textbook, Guernsey wrote: “Next to the Bible, no book is better adapted to teach lessons of importance, both to the heart and intellect, than a faithful history of God’s dealings with our countrymen.” 28 The focus on God caused textbook writers to describe the Constitution in divine terms.

The Constitution in the Textbooks

Textbooks from 1820 to 1860 said little about the Constitution. Sections on the Constitution ranged from half a page to three pages – of those with three pages, at least a full page was dedicated to a description of the contents of the Constitution. On average, most textbooks spent approximately one page discussing the Constitutional Convention and subsequent ratification of the Constitution. Even with the publication of Madison’s notes in 1840, there was no increase in the amount of information about the Constitution in the textbooks.


While most of the textbooks contained an explanation of the contents of the Constitution or included a copy of the Constitution in the back of the textbook, three of the twelve textbooks studied included neither (Marcius Willson’s *History of the United States, For the Use of Schools*, Augusta Blanche Berard's *School History of the United States*, and Samuel Goodrich’s *A Pictorial History of the United States with notices of other portions of America*). Of the textbooks that included an explanation of the contents of the Constitution, no textbook included an explanation of the first ten amendments to the Constitution.

The treatment of the Constitution paled in comparison to the treatment of a more popular subject in these textbooks, the Revolutionary War. On average, textbooks from this time period spent nearly 100 pages on the Revolution. This can partially be attributed to the focus on wars of textbooks from this period. Based on studies from James Rial and C.D. Jacobs, United States history textbooks between 1826 and 1865 devoted 40% to 50% of their space to war while only 16% to 18% on government and politics. Nietz explained the focus on war by saying source materials were abundant; additionally, he said it was easy to encourage patriotism, nationalism, and heroism through war stories. When looking at the amount of information about war in comparison to the Constitution, it can be seen that ideals expressed in the Constitution are less valued than the heroic fight for similar values in the Revolutionary War.

---

29 If any edition did not include a copy or explanation of the Constitution, the entire textbook was included as one of these three.

30 Willson added a copy of the constitution in an 1854 revision of this textbook of a different title, *History of the United States, from the Earliest Discoveries to the Present Time*.

31 In an 1871 revision of this textbook, Goodrich added a copy of the Constitution to the appendix.


33 Ibid, 250.
Despite the relatively brief treatment of the Constitution, many authors recognized the importance of the Constitution. The Constitution was often mentioned in the prefaces of the textbooks or in a chapter title. The authors often praised it as a great triumph that gave Americans their liberty and that allowed the country to be successful. The praise was often coupled with an explanation of how the Constitution related to God. For example, the preface of Noah Webster’s 1832 textbook said that, “[t]he brief exposition of the constitution of the United States, will unfold to young persons the principles of republican government; and it is the sincere desire of the writer that our citizens should early understand that the genuine source of correct republican principles is the Bible.”

This type of comment was not exclusive to the Constitution; other authors such as Egbert Guernsey in 1851 attributed everything positive in America’s history to God. Many textbooks extended the connection of the Constitution to God further by describing Benjamin Franklin’s plea to the Constitutional Convention for daily prayers. The textbooks did not mention that the daily prayers never took place, but they still attributed the ability of the framers to compromise readily to the mythical daily prayers. The best example of this was Charles A. Goodrich who in 1835 spent a full page on Franklin’s request, and concluded by saying “This suggestion, it need scarcely be said, was favorably received by the convention…As might be expected, greater harmony prevailed - the spirit of concession pervaded the convention.”

Although the Convention never carried through on Franklin's

---

34 Noah Webster, History of the United States to which is Prefixed a Brief Historical Account of Our [English] Ancestors, from the Dispersion at Babel, to their Migration to America and of the Conquest of South America, by the Spaniards (New Haven: Durrie & Peck, 1832), http://books.google.com/books/download/History_of_the_United_States.pdf?id=jGcAAAAAYAAJ&output=pdf (accessed January 6, 2010), 1.

35 Guernsey, 349.

request for daily prayer, textbooks do not mention this because the story does not fit into the narrative of the Constitution as a divine creation.

Even though the textbooks praised the Constitution as a great creation by God, the Constitution received little substantive attention. Knowing that textbooks spent little space on the Constitution, makes it understandable that the textbooks had little sophisticated discussion on the debates surrounding the ratification of the Constitution. Additionally, knowing that the Constitution was praised for its divine greatness, makes it understandable that no voice was given to the anti-federalists.

**The Ratification Debates in the Textbooks**

Because textbooks from this era said so little about the Constitution, it is important to also look at their treatment of the Articles of Confederation in order to develop an understanding of the authors' interpretation of the debates surrounding the ratification of the Constitution. This entire discussion on the Articles of Confederation lasted, on average, one to three pages. When the textbooks mentioned the creation of the Articles, they typically only briefly described the Articles and its weaknesses, and with few exceptions there was little harsh criticism. That all changed, however, when describing what would now be known as the Critical Period.

Many textbooks had a hostile view of the Article’s role in the economic difficulties of the Critical Period. The only positive attributed to the Articles was that some textbooks said they led the country through the war. Charles A. Goodrich’s 1852 textbook when describing the Articles stated, “True, they had that, and under that they went through the war. But it proved, as it was called, ‘a rope of sand’.”

37 The textbook authors, however, do not mention that the Articles were only ratified months before the end of the Revolutionary War. Aside from erroneously saying the

---

37 Charles Goodrich, 214.
Articles led the country through the war, there is no mention of the positives of the Articles. Every textbook focused on the economic and commercial problems attributed to the Articles. They discussed in detail the debt and credit problems, trade difficulties, and problems paying soldiers. When describing economic problems, most textbooks referred to the problems as “evils.” A few textbooks mentioned that economic difficulties would be expected following a Revolution, but these textbooks still attributed the problems to the Articles and to selfishness on the part of the states. The textbooks gave examples of instances where the Congress failed to pass legislation because of opposition from only one state - the textbooks used this as a way to describe the weaknesses of the Articles. For example, Samuel Goodrich talked about how the government tried to impose a tax on imports, but two states objected, causing the national debt to remain unpaid. By portraying the Articles in such a strongly negative manner, the textbooks gave the impression that there was no option but to overhaul them; thus, anyone opposed to a complete overhaul might be seen as unwise.

The textbooks also mentioned a growing dissatisfaction among the people during the Critical Period. They all mentioned Shay's Rebellion, which at the time, the textbooks referred to as Shay’s Insurrection. Every textbook writer expressed a very negative view of those participating in the Rebellion. In 1844 Samuel Goodrich said they “were willing, in 1786, to go to war with the government, rather than pay their share of the expenses which the contest with Great Britain had occasioned.” In addition to the negative view of the insurgents, they also mentioned how they were easily overpowered. Authors focused as well on the military’s role in subduing the rebels. The emphasis on Shay’s Rebellion was similar to the emphasis of the textbooks on war in general. While the textbooks mentioned the cause of the Rebellion, the textbooks did not attribute calls for a more powerful government to the Rebellion; in fact, the

38 Samuel Goodrich, 238.
textbooks praised the militia for easily suppressing the rebellion. The description of the Rebellion contributed to the negative view of the Critical Period, but the textbooks did not link the Rebellion to the calls for a stronger government; however, the need for a new system of government was implicit in the descriptions of the various problems during the Critical Period.

After criticizing the deficiencies of the Articles, the textbooks discussed the Constitutional Convention. Before 1840 nearly all textbooks mentioned the Philadelphia Convention was held behind closed doors. A few of the authors mentioned the prominent people who were at the Convention; John Frost, for example, mentioned the prominent anti-federalist Patrick Henry, but did not mention that he opposed the ratification of the Constitution. In part because of limited source material about the disagreements at the Convention and in part because of a lack of space devoted to the Constitution, textbooks before 1840 did not describe the disagreements at the Convention itself.

After Madison's notes were published in 1840, some authors slowly incorporated more detail into the section on the Convention. While most of the textbooks after 1840 mentioned there was some disagreement in the Convention, as mentioned earlier, many attributed the resolution of the disagreements to Benjamin Franklin's speech encouraging the group to pray. By the 1850s textbooks began to present a slightly more complicated picture; textbooks began to describe the disagreements instead of merely saying they were resolved by Franklin's prayer request. They mentioned disagreements between small and big states, differences between those who wanted more federal power and those who wanted to protect state power, and differences between the North and South. Textbooks clearly began using a limited amount of information from Madison's notes; however, unlike the scholars of the time, most textbooks did not use Madison's notes to take a hostile view of the compromises over slavery. In fact, the compromises
of slavery are not discussed in detail. The emphasis on encouraging patriotism and the emphasis on God’s role in the creation of the Constitution can partially explain this discrepancy between scholarship and textbooks. An exception is Emma Willard’s 1844 textbook, which described what she called the most dangerous disagreement at the Convention, the debate over how slaves should be counted with regard to representation in Congress. Willard warned this was a dangerous dispute because it divided people based on geographical lines.39

All textbooks mentioned the opposition to the Constitution when it was put up for ratification by the states. A few textbooks referred to the opposition as violent, and others referred it as strong. The authors pointed out that whether the Constitution would be adopted remained questionable. Despite all textbooks recognizing opposition existed, only approximately half identified the supporters as federalists and the opposition as anti-federalists. Of the textbooks that mentioned the two groups, some of them used only one or two sentences to describe their differences; typically, the authors described the difference between the two groups as supporters of a strong national government and opposition to a strong national government. Textbooks from this era did not give less attention to anti-federalists than federalists; instead, the textbooks gave equally little attention to both groups. Often the textbooks only mentioned the federalists and anti-federalists in footnotes.

Because so little was said about the federalists and anti-federalists, one way of understanding how textbooks treat the two groups is by looking at what information was left out of the textbooks. Aside from lacking a clear description of the differences between the federalists and anti-federalists, the textbooks also lacked any description of the Bill of Rights. The most space allotted to the first ten amendments to the Constitution was two sentences; however, most

textbooks either did not mention there were any amendments to the Constitution or they spent half a sentence mentioning the Constitution was amended. No textbook attributed the Bill of Rights to the anti-federalists; however some textbooks said that the adoption of these amendments eliminated all opposition to the Constitution. No textbook referred to the amendments as the Bill of Rights, and no textbook described the contents of these amendments; thus, if a student did not read the Constitution in the back of the book (which was not available in all textbooks), and if the teacher did not bring in outside information (which was unlikely because teachers were untrained), the student would likely have no knowledge of the rights guaranteed to American citizens. The reasoning for not describing the Bill of Rights likely was because the Bill of Rights had not been used extensively and they had yet to be applied to the states. Even though the intentions of not describing the Bill of Rights were not to attack the anti-federalists, students would not be aware of the major contribution to the Constitution by the anti-federalists.

In addition to a brief mention of federalists and anti-federalists during the paragraph describing the ratification of the Constitution, textbooks mentioned the two groups again when discussing the development of the party system. Textbooks did not differentiate between the federalists who supported the ratification of the Constitution and the Federalist Party. Additionally, textbooks often referred to the anti-federalists as the predecessors to the Republican Party. The erroneous connection between anti-federalists and the Republican Party remained common among both textbooks and history scholarship until the twentieth century.

**Conclusion**

Because of the limited primary and secondary source material of the early 1800s on the Constitution, textbook authors would have had difficulty in providing detailed analysis of the
Constitution. Because textbooks did not describe the Constitution in depth, textbooks, predictably, did not describe the anti-federalists in depth.

The content of history textbooks was also influenced by the goals of history textbooks of the time. History textbooks from this era were intended to encourage patriotism; however, instead of encouraging patriotism through a nuanced description of the country's form of government, the textbook authors encouraged patriotism through war stories. Even though the textbooks did not dwell on the Constitution, they all recognized the importance of the Constitution. Because many textbook authors were clergymen, they drew connections between God and the Constitution, which gave the Constitution a biblical status. The apparent biblical status of the Constitution discouraged sophisticated analysis of the framing and ratification of the Constitution.
Chapter 2: 1860-1885

Introduction

The Civil War era led to a split between Northern and Southern textbooks. Even though the South was unable to publish many textbooks, they did publish three successful textbooks between the end of the Civil War and 1885. The Southern textbooks were the first to introduce the Bill of Rights into textbooks. The Southern textbooks also took a states' rights interpretation of the Constitution. Northern textbooks, however, ignored the Bill of Rights and continued to only provide a brief description of the Constitution. Anti-federalist ideas continued to be largely ignored in textbooks.

Scholarship on the Constitution 1860-1885

After the publication of Madison’s notes in 1840, scholarship surrounding the Constitutional Convention focused on the compromises, specifically the compromises over slavery. As the discussion of the compromises on slavery continued over the next few decades, a new interpretation also emerged – the idea that the Constitution was a counterrevolution to the Declaration of Independence. Abolitionists such as Horace Greeley and Henry Wilson viewed the counterrevolution as one against the civil liberties professed in the Declaration of Independence. Other historians, however, viewed the counterrevolution in socioeconomic terms, not in terms of the moral question of abolition. Henry B. Dawson was perhaps the most outspoken of the counterrevolution historians in the early 1870s. Dawson argued the Critical Period was not as bad as some suggested, and it was a “trick played on the ‘masses’” in order to overthrow the republican principles upon which the country was founded. Dawson's argument

---


41 Ibid, 467-468
that the Constitution encouraged the “victimization of blacks and masses of average whites – was at striking variance with the unrestrained admiration lavished on the document by the public of the Gilded Age.”42 The idea of a counterrevolution was a precursor to the thinking of progressive era historians in the early 1900s. However, not all scholars of the time adopted such a critical view of the Constitution.

At the same time that some post-Civil War historians began viewing the Constitution as a counterrevolution, other historians began to harshly criticize the anti-federalists. Before the Civil War, scholars typically praised the federalists, but withheld criticism of the anti-federalists.43 However, with the coming of the Civil War, many historians lashed out against the anti-federalists. Historians criticized the anti-federalists as insincere, said their opposition to the Constitution was similar to the Southern view of states’ rights in the Civil War, and said that because the Constitution is so great, the anti-federalists must have been fools to oppose it.44 During the last thirty years of the nineteenth century, those who criticized the anti-federalists, ardently praised the Constitution.45 The praise given to the Constitution by some scholars of the time is reminiscent of the praise given to the Constitution by the textbooks between 1820 and 1860.

Scholarship on the Constitution between 1860 and 1885 was not monolithic - some criticized the Constitution as an abandonment of republican ideals, while others criticized the anti-federalists for opposition to the great Constitution. This study finds that no history textbooks

42 Ibid, 467.
44 Ibid, 341.
between 1860 and 1885 gave credence to the idea of the Constitution as a counterrevolution, and some Northern textbooks took a critical view of anti-federalism.

**History Textbooks 1860-1885**

Unlike from 1820 to 1860 when many textbooks cited patriotism as a reason to study history, the textbooks studied between 1860 and 1885 did not explicitly mention patriotism as a reason.⁴⁶ Along with the decreasing emphasis on patriotism came a decreasing emphasis on God's role in American history. The decreasing emphasis on God can partially be attributed to changes in the backgrounds of the textbook authors. During the early 19th century, many textbook authors were clergymen,⁴⁷ but the majority of the authors between 1860 and 1885 were either professors or educators (mainly principals).

A major development in textbooks during this era came from textbook author William Swinton who ushered in an era of textbooks that eliminated frivolous information.⁴⁸ Others followed Swinton’s lead, which caused textbooks to become more organized with numerous headings in a chapter (in some cases every paragraph had a heading), the bolding of important names, and/or italicizing of important concepts. In their prefaces many authors such as G.P. Quackenbos and Benson Lossing mentioned their attempts to cut down on irrelevant history and to use as few words as possible in a well organized textbook. As will be discussed later in this chapter sections discussing the ratification of the Constitution decreased to a bare minimum - possibly a result of the focus on eliminating unimportant history. Without guidelines to the
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⁴⁶The only textbook that used the preface to mention patriotism as a reason to study history was Joel Steele, *A Brief History of the United States*, 2.

⁴⁷Fitzgerald, 48-49.

⁴⁸Carpenter, 204.
curriculum, it was up up to each author to make a decision on the content, so some authors strayed from the norm and had a longer section on the ratification of the Constitution.

By the late 1800s, textbooks accounted for a significant portion of a publisher's sales - in some cases, only the Bible sold more copies than the textbook. With the expanding textbook market, competition between textbook publishers intensified. Publishers replaced the bookstore middlemen by sending agents to local school boards. Agents would pay off teachers and board members in order to gain more sales; some agents would set up an "even exchange" to replace all competitor's books for free with the expectation that the school would buy textbooks from the agent in the future. Moreau described this process of bribing school board members by saying "An honest school board member, one agent is reputed to have said, is one that once bought, stays bought."\(^{49}\)

The competition between textbook publishers helped to convince authors to make their textbooks appeal to a wider range of people. For example, during this time some states began mandating that copies of the Constitution appear in the appendix, so predictably, the vast majority of textbooks (and all of the textbooks used in this study) contained a copy of the Constitution so that their textbook would be marketable in those states. Another aspect of appealing to a wider audience was to "create a loose consensus on the national past...[because] controversy only threatened sales."\(^{50}\) In order to be profitable, textbooks needed to find a way to appeal to a larger audience.

In an attempt to appeal to a wider audience, most authors mentioned that they tried to remain nonpartisan in their description of history. They mentioned that their goal was not to impose any opinion on the students. For example, in the 1871 A Condensed School History of the

\(^{49}\) Moreau, 68.

\(^{50}\) Ibid, 67.
United States, Constructed for Definite Results in Recitation, and Containing a New Method of Topical Reviews William Swinton wrote “A tone of treatment free from partisan bias of sectionalism, politics, or religion – a tone of treatment as completely as possible American.” Swinton desired to expand the marketability of his textbook by making it acceptable to all sections of America. John Clark Ridpath, a professor at Indiana Asbury University, wrote a textbook in 1874 that was printed not only the North East, but also the far West and the South. In order to appeal to schools across the country, authors needed to try to keep sectionalism out of their writings. For example, in 1871 the heirs of Samuel Goodrich published a new edition of his popular Pictorial History of the United States with Notices of Other Portions of America under a new title Pictorial History of the United States with Notices of Other Portions of America North and South; most of the textbook remained the same, except they brought the textbook up to date. Attempts to remain nonpartisan were met with limited success; textbook writers from the South criticized Northern textbooks for their Northern bias. Even though Southerners wanted to rid themselves of the Northern bias, Southern textbook writers had the same mantra of remaining nonpartisan. One Southern textbook stated it provided "a mere statement of all the facts, without selecting and arranging them with a view to propagate certain opinions." Despite claims from a multitude of authors (in both the North and the South) that they were non partisan, many textbooks took a stance against the anti-federalists.


At the same time that textbook authors tried to appeal to a wider audience, Southern and Northern educators desired to tell different historical narratives. Before the Civil War most textbooks were published in the North, which left the South to rely on Northern textbooks with Northern perspectives.\(^{54}\) When the Civil War broke out, many Southerners expressed a desire to publish their own textbooks; however, this desire met with mixed success.\(^{55}\) Despite the high demand for Southern textbooks, no history textbook was published exclusively in the South during the Civil War. The late 1860s and early 1870s saw a substantial increase in the number of American history textbooks, but only one American history came from the South.\(^{56}\) The first Southern history textbook was *A Southern School History of the United States of America, From the Earliest Discoveries to the Present Time* by William Nayer McDonald and J.S. Blackburn in 1869. By 1885, only two more well known United States history textbooks were written by Southerners (Joseph T. Derry and Alexander H. Stephens). Ruth Miller Elson's research shows that even with all of the calls for textbooks written from a Southern perspective, the Southern textbooks were very similar to Northern textbooks in all aspects except for the treatment of slavery.\(^{57}\) Unlike Elson's research, this study finds significant differences between Southern and Northern textbooks in terms of their treatment of the ratification of the Constitution.

**The Constitution in Textbooks**

---

\(^{54}\) Elson, 7-8.

\(^{55}\) Elson, 100 criticizes Confederate textbooks as “few and physically poor in quality;” however, Laura Elizabeth Kopp, "Teaching the Confederacy: Textbooks in the Civil War South." MA diss., University of Maryland, 2009. In Digit Repository at the University of Maryland, http://www.lib.umd.edu/drum/bitstream/1903/9375/1/Kopp_umd_0117N_10436.pdf (accessed December 31, 2009), 1 claims 136 Southern textbooks were published during the Civil War era, but none of those textbooks were history textbooks.
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Sections on the Constitution ranged from half a page to twelve pages. The two textbooks that spent the most space on the Constitution were both Southern textbooks - one spent eight pages, while the other spent twelve. The only other Southern history textbook from this time period, spent four and a half pages, which was still more than the majority of the Northern textbooks, which averaged two pages on the Constitution. With the exception of Southern textbooks, textbooks typically did not discuss the contents of the Constitution, but every textbook had a copy of the Constitution in the appendix. In some cases substantial explanatory notes accompanied the Constitution. On average there was a slight increase in the treatment of the Constitution from the previous period among Northern textbooks, but as in the previous period, war stories, particularly stories dealing with the Revolutionary War dominated the text – between 1866 and 1885 nearly 49% of content in history textbooks dealt with war.58

Even with minimal treatment of the Constitution in textbooks during the 1820 to 1860 period, textbooks attributed the greatness of the Constitution to a divine power. In the textbooks between 1860 and 1885, the Constitution lost its biblical status. This decrease in emphasis on God is not unique to the Constitution; the textbooks from this period no longer devote part of their prefaces to discussing God’s role in the history of the United States. Even without the biblical status, the Constitution was still highly regarded.

The Southern textbook authors offered a states' rights interpretation of the Constitution. They argued that the Constitution and particularly the 10th amendment were designed to protect the rights of states. One Southern history textbook pointed out that when ratifying the Constitution some states reserved the right to secede from the Union. The states rights view was a common view in the South during the time of the Civil War; in fact, Alexander H. Stephens, a
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Southern textbook author who was also the Vice President of the Confederate States wrote a book titled *Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States*. A states’ rights interpretation of the Constitution was central to the justification of the South’s secession.

Some scholars during this time began to look at the Constitution as a counterrevolution to the Declaration of Independence, but many textbooks took the opposite view. Benson J. Lossing’s 1860 *A Pictorial History of the United States for Schools and Families* said of the adoption of the Constitution, “Thus was consummated the last act in the War for Independence.”59 Other authors also made similar references to the Constitution as the logical conclusion of the Revolutionary War, not an aberration of the republican principles upon which the war began. The textbooks from this time period, for the most part, sided with the scholars that criticized the anti-federalists, not with the scholars that promoted the idea of the Constitution as a counterrevolution.

**The Debates over Ratification**

Textbooks in this period treated the Articles of Confederation in a similar manner to the textbooks in the previous period. Like the previous period, the textbooks on average devoted between one and two pages on the Articles of Confederation and the Critical Period. The differences between the two periods mostly emerged from the differences between Southern and Northern textbooks.

While there was still a negative view of the Articles, most textbook authors began to take a slightly less hostile view of the Articles by no longer referring to the Critical Period as evil. Two of the three Southern textbooks (Stephens and Derry), however, referred to the evils the country experienced under the Articles. No author attributed anything positive to the Articles of Confederation.

---

Confederation, but one author mentioned the acquisition of the Northwest Territory, which he ranked only second in importance to the ratification of the Constitution. The acquisition of this territory was not characterized as a success of the Articles as later textbooks did. Textbooks from 1820 to 1860 praised the Articles for leading the country through the war, but almost every textbook pointed out that the Articles of Confederation were not ratified until 1781, meaning the Articles were barely in effect before the war ended.

While the Northern textbooks continued to blame the economic problems on the Articles for giving too many rights to the states, Southern textbooks took a different approach. The Southern textbooks did not deny the problems with a limited national government, but instead of describing the problem by saying the states had too much power, they blamed the Articles for not giving the federal government power to "act directly on the people." In addition to blaming the division of power under the Articles, textbooks also blamed the economic problems on selfish states, which were "jealous of congress’s power".

Unlike the previous period when textbooks focused on the militia's tactics in response to Shay's Rebellion, textbooks such as Quackenbos' 1864 textbook said Shay's Rebellion was a sign
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61 However, Lossing, 212 says the Articles produced “vastly beneficial results for the remainder of the struggle.”


that a stronger government was needed to control any uprisings. The textbooks linked Shay's Rebellion directly with the call for the Constitutional Convention. When discussing the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, nearly all Northern authors merely said they met behind closed doors for four months, but the texts did not discuss any of the disagreements they had.

One case in which some textbooks mentioned disagreement was the disagreement over Franklin's request for the Convention to pray. Unlike previous textbooks all the textbooks that mentioned this request, pointed out that they never ended up praying. Of the other textbooks that mentioned disagreement in the Convention, most talk about the small and large state disagreement. As Ruth Elson pointed out, Southern textbooks primarily differ from Northern textbooks in their treatment of slavery; two of the three Southern textbooks from this time period devoted an entire page to discussing the disagreements over slavery at the Constitutional Convention.

Many scholars of the time focused on the compromises of the Constitution, and likewise, the textbooks that mentioned disagreement, mentioned compromise as a central aspect of the Constitution. Even though some textbooks mentioned the disagreements and compromises, the majority of textbooks did not mention disagreements at the Convention because they typically only had a couple sentences describing the Convention. One such example is David B. Scott's 1876 textbook. The entire passage on the Convention was two sentences, which said "In May, 1787, delegates from all the states met in convention at Philadelphia, and George Washington
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was unanimously chosen as its president. Instead of revising the Articles of Confederation, they, after a few months' deliberation, agreed on a Constitution, which was sent to the states for their approval.⁶⁵

The majority of the textbooks mentioned the Constitution was met with strong opposition when put up to the states for a vote. Textbooks no longer described the debate over the Constitution as “violent” as some of the textbooks from the 1820-1860 era did. Benson J. Lossing's 1865 textbook did not mention any opposition or violent disagreements; instead it mentioned that a warm discussion took place on the Constitution.⁶⁶

In the textbooks in which opposition to the ratification of the Constitution was discussed, both the federalists and the anti-federalists received limited treatment. For example, Joel Steele's 1885 textbook only said "After much deliberation, an entirely new constitution was adopted (September 17, 1787)" and confined any mention of the federalists and anti-federalists to a footnote.⁶⁷ When discussing the ratification debates, most textbooks provided more attention to the federalists than the anti-federalists. When discussing the federalists, textbooks focused on the Federalist Papers, which the textbooks praised for answering all of the concerns of the anti-federalists. The amount of praise for the federalist arguments showed a bias against the anti-federalist arguments. As in the previous era, anti-federalist arguments were not clearly defined – anti-federalists were just known for advocating states rights. Clearly, opposition to the Constitution was not part of the central narrative textbook authors wanted to tell; therefore, the

⁶⁵ Scott, 221.

⁶⁶ Lossing, 194.

anti-federalists were part of the irrelevant history excluded from the textbooks in the attempts for more concise and efficient textbooks.

While discussing the Constitution, only one Northern textbook mentioned that the Constitution was subsequently amended, but it did not say what it was amended to say or when it was amended. No Northern author described the contents of the Bill of Rights. Southern authors, however, were the first textbook authors to describe any of the contents of the Bill of Rights. Southern textbook authors focus on the 10th amendment, which reserves rights for the states. Thus, the anti-federalists were not known for the Bill of Rights, which was one of their accomplishments.

As in the previous period, textbooks did not differentiate between federalists and the Federalist Party nor did they differentiate between Anti-Federalists and Republicans. In fact, some textbooks used the terms anti-federalists, Republicans, and Democrats interchangeably. Most textbooks attributed the development of political parties to the split over the Constitution; however, one textbook stated that the political divide started during Washington's Administration.

**Conclusion**

The scholarship on the Constitution during this period did not have a significant effect on the portrayal of the Constitution. Textbooks did not adopt the counterrevolution interpretation of the Constitution, nor did textbooks harshly criticize the anti-federalists as some scholars did. Instead of harshly criticizing the anti-federalists, the anti-federalist arguments were never fully explored because many textbooks spent so little time on the Constitution and so much time on military history.
Unlike changes in scholarship, changes in textbook authors led to a change in textbook content. Textbook authors from this period were either precollege educators or college professors – they were not clergymen as they were in the previous period. This shift from religious to academic authors caused the Constitution to lose its biblical status. Textbook authors focused on keeping textbooks concise, and in order to eliminate frivolous information, textbooks no longer talked about Franklin's prayer request at the Constitutional Convention.

The changes in the textbooks during this period were mostly the result of the political and social changes within the United States. Textbooks, like the country, were split between the North and South. The political and social needs of the time determined the historical content of the textbooks. The South needed to justify its secession from the United States, so Southern textbooks often spent numerous pages describing their states' rights interpretation of the Constitution.
Chapter 3: 1885-1920

Introduction

The period between 1885 and 1920 was a period of intense change in history and social studies education. There were various movements that tried to standardize history instruction across different school districts in order to better prepare students for college. Along with this professionalization of history came a change in textbook authors – during this period many famous textbook authors were professors from notable universities. The committees that helped to standardize history called for a more adequate treatment of political issues and a decrease in military history. Because during this era textbook publishers were trying to significantly increase their market share, publishers wanted to comply with committee recommendations, so textbooks increased their treatment of Constitution. Along with increased attention to the Constitution, anti-federalist arguments were beginning to be explored in more depth than they were in the previous two periods.

Scholarship on the Constitution 1885-1920

Up until 1910 scholars emphasized the compromises of the Constitution (specifically the slavery compromises), but the Progressive historians of the early twentieth century separated the Constitution from the slavery compromises and the abolitionist interpretation. Progressive historians instead embraced the idea of the Constitution as a counterrevolution. Progressives were interested in having the government regulate corporate power, and they saw the Constitution as an obstacle to this regulation. Charles Beard, a notable Progressive historian, wrote *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* in 1913, which studied the Constitution in terms of economic interests. The Constitution, Beard argued, was designed to protect the property and economic interests of its supporters. According to James Hutson,
Progressive historians had a “taxonomical impulse to differentiate Anti-federalists from Federalists…on the basis of property ownership.” The economic differentiation between federalists and anti-federalists was not completely new to historians – between 1883 and 1912 historians John Bach McMaster, John Fiske, Edward Channing, and others (McMaster, Fiske, and Channing in addition to being scholars were popular textbook writers of the time) differentiated between the farming interests of the anti-federalists and the commercial interests of the federalists.

In addition to differentiating between the federalists and anti-federalists in terms of economic interests, according to Hutson, Progressive era historians argued “the Constitution was an antidemocratic counterrevolution, organized by disaffected aristocrats.” By attacking the Constitution for its aristocratic origins, the Progressive historians adopted a positive view of the anti-federalists who they referred to as democrats. The Progressive historians differed from the post-Civil War historians who took a very negative view of the anti-federalists.

**History Education and Textbooks 1885-1920**

With little state or national control over the curriculum, according to Ronald Evans, by the late 1800s "school programs were chaotic and not uniform, predictable or comparable...transferring credits from one high school to another was...sometimes nearly impossible...it was difficult for colleges to evaluate candidates in their preparation for college.” The National Education Association (NEA) formed the Committee of Ten in 1894 in order to make recommendations on the entire school curriculum to address the problem of inconsistent
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curriculums. The Committee recommended an eight-year study of history. American history would be taught twice - once in the third year in combination with "elements of civil government" and once in the seventh year without the civil government component. The Committee also proposed a condensed six-year program where students would only study American history and civil government once in the sixth year. In 1896 the NEA requested the American Historical Association (AHA) to develop college entrance requirements in history because of the variety of requirements at different colleges. In 1899 the AHA formed the Committee of Seven\(^2\), which recommended four blocks of history, the fourth of which would be American history. Similar to the Committee of Ten recommendation, the year of American history was to be combined with the study of civil government.

The recommendations of the two committees affected the history curriculum through the 1930s.\(^3\) The committee's recommendations also affected the way in which authors wrote textbooks. For example, in the preface to his 1898 textbook *A Student's History of the United States*, Edward Channing referenced the Committee of Ten's recommendations and noted how his history textbook was designed for the second American history class.

Up until 1890, there were numerous publishers competing for an expanding textbook market and agents often engaged in unscrupulous methods to ensure they earned contracts with school districts. In 1890, as part of this intense competition for higher profits, five major textbook publishers (A.S. Barnes; Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor and Company; D. Appleton; Van Antewerp, Bragg and Co; and Harper and Brothers) combined to form the American Book Company (ABC), which George A. Gates, President of Iowa College in 1897, said controlled
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\(^2\) Albert Bushnell Hart, a professor and author of two textbooks used in this study, was a member of the Committee of Seven.

\(^3\) Evans, 16.
75% to 85% of the textbook industry nationwide and had a stronger monopoly than Standard Oil.\textsuperscript{74} According to Gates, ABC had considerable political weight in local communities and schools. For example, if a teacher spoke out against ABC’s textbooks, ABC would be able to get the teacher fired.\textsuperscript{75}

The combination of the corrupt agents in the post Civil War era and the control of ABC over schools led to public dissatisfaction with the textbook publishing industry. According to Joseph Moreau, the South linked ABC with ”Northern commercial exploitation and Republican political domination”\textsuperscript{76} The dissatisfaction with the textbook industry led some states to adopt specific textbooks - some states such as California went as far as publishing their own textbooks. This did not happen without resistance - ABC and teachers' associations opposed statewide textbook adoption.\textsuperscript{77} The combination of ABC's monopoly and the beginning of statewide adoption and publication of textbooks meant increased control over the content of textbooks.

Before this period, textbook authors typically only needed to meet the approval of teachers and local board members, but now textbook authors needed to meet the approval of ABC or one or more states.

The period between 1885 and 1920 saw a significant rise in the number of history textbook authors who were history professors. No longer were history textbook authors just clergymen and educators. This shift came because of calls from the publishing industry. For example, John Fiske, a Harvard University instructor and Washington University professor,


\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{77} Moreau, 70.
wrote his 1894 *A History of the United States for Schools* after solicitation from "half a dozen publishing houses to write a school-book...from a professional hand instead of the mere compilations formerly in use."\(^{78}\) Fiske initially did not write a history textbook, but after the success of one of his other books, there were renewed calls from the publisher Houghton, Mifflin & Co., which was when he gave in. The demand for academic textbook authors continued, and over the next few decades some of the most popular textbooks from this era came from Ivy League professors. Edward Channing and Albert Bushnell Hart were both professors at Harvard University, David Saville Muzzey was a professor at Columbia University, and John Bach McMaster was a professor at University of Pennsylvania.

With more academics in the textbook industry, there was an increase in attacks on previous textbooks. Even textbook authors such as Edward Eggleston who was not a professor, stated that his 1888 textbook *A History of the United States and Its People for the Use of Schools* left out "well-worn fables, which have served more than one generation of American school-children for historic facts... [because] it does not seem worth while, however, to keep...statements which every sound historical scholar rejects."\(^{79}\) As part of an attempt to eliminate inaccurate information, a few textbooks began to provide citations, but most textbooks instead provided references for additional related readings. Authors stressed that any good history course requires readings outside of a textbook. The Committee of Seven echoed the call for more readings, but reaffirmed the importance of using a textbook. Not only were textbook
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authors dissatisfied with previous textbooks, but they also expressed reservations about an over reliance on textbooks.

The popular textbooks between 1885 and 1920 were written by only one author, but some of the authors referenced school teachers and administrators who assisted with various parts of the textbook. For example, the former head master of the English High School in Cambridge and Mechanic Arts High School in Boston helped John Fiske with topical analysis, questions for students, and directions for teachers. Such collaboration pointed to the future. By the 1920s groups of researchers were working together on textbooks.

Susan Pendleton Lee was the only popular textbook author from the South between 1885 and 1920. Similar to the textbook authors in the South during Reconstruction, by writing the *New School History of the United States* in 1900, Lee hoped to "supply the want, so often expressed in the South, for an *unprejudiced* and *truthful* history of the United States."80 Most of textbook authors came from the Northeast.81 Even though textbook authors were primarily located in the Northeast, they had to write their textbooks for a national, and in some cases an international audience. For example, in Albert Bushnell Hart's 1905 textbook, he said "All sections of the Union have helped to make the Union; and all sections, North, South, West, and far West, have been included in the plan of this volume."82 By appealing to all sections of the country, the publisher would be able to make the textbook more profitable on a national scale. Although
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81 Two exceptions are John Fiske, an instructor at Harvard, eventually became a professor at Washington University in Missouri, and Edward Eggleston lived in Indiana, although he eventually moved to New York.

Hart's 1918 textbook did not print outside of the United States, he pointed out that he gave attention to the United States' European background and other influences from abroad. Other textbook authors had to begin to appeal to an international audience - D.H. Montgomery and David Saville Muzzey both were printed by Ginn & Company in both London and American cities.

**The Constitution in the Textbooks**

This merger between academia and textbook writing, in part, led to a change in the focus of textbooks. In the prefaces, many textbook authors criticized previous textbooks for inadequate descriptions of constitutional, political, and industrial development. Additionally, the AHA Committee of 7 and the NEA Committee of 10 recommended the combination of United States history with civil government. This shift in emphasis is apparent in textbook content. Between 1886 and 1925, war content ranged from 20.4% to 26.8%, while government and politics ranged from 29% and 35%. This is down from approximately 50% war content in the early 1800s and up from under 20% government and politics content. Edward Channing's 1898 textbook *A Students’ History of The United States* was one of the books that shifted the emphasis toward political history – he omitted the details of aboriginal and colonial history, and he particularly eliminated the details of military history because "the great successes of the American people have been won in the field of peace, not in those of war."83

Even though textbooks began shifting from military to political history, some textbook authors expressed apprehension about whether the youth were able to understand the complexities of the Constitution. After briefly describing the ratification of the Constitution, John Fiske wrote that he did not expect students to understand everything in those few brief
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paragraphs. Other authors echoed this concern that the Constitution is too complicated for children of particular ages. For example, D.H. Montgomery mentioned that his textbook for older students contained much more political and constitutional history than his textbook for younger students. 

Despite the concerns about whether students would be able to understand enough of the Constitution, textbooks significantly increased the attention they gave to the Constitution. Although a couple of the textbooks before the turn of the century devoted under five pages to the Constitution, most textbooks spent about ten pages on the Constitution, a significant increase from previous years.

**Ratification Debates in the Textbooks**

Most textbooks devoted approximately four pages to the Articles of Confederation and the Critical Period, but when including the Northwest Ordinance, the number of pages doubles. While the textbooks from this era continued to tell of the same problems with the Articles of Confederation, the textbooks took on a new focus - the West. Between the "closing of the frontier" and the desire for textbooks to be more marketable to all parts of the country, textbooks described the Northwest Ordinance in detail. The desire to talk about the West went beyond mere marketability of the textbook; the 1911 textbook *An American History* by David Muzzey stated that “it is a relief to be able to point to one piece of statesmanlike and constructive work done by the poor tottering government of the Confederation in these dismal years, fitly called ‘the critical period.’”

No longer was the portrayal of the Critical Period wholly negative.

---


When describing the Constitutional Convention, most of the textbooks spent a significant amount of time describing the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. For example in his 1894 textbook John Fiske praised the men at the Convention as "some of the wisest and most patriotic men, who felt the greatness of the danger [of the Critical Period]." Fiske not only praised the men at the Convention but also said they felt most of the danger, which indicated that he believed they had the most at stake in creating the Constitution. Even though Fiske implied that the members of the Convention were out to end the dangers that threatened them during the Critical period, Fiske did not interpret this to be a selfish, economic act. With all of the praise the textbook authors gave the Founding Fathers, the textbook authors did not dare question the economic motives of the Founders as Charles Beard did.

An influence from the scholarship from the past few decades was the focus on the compromises of the Constitution. Unlike previous textbooks, the textbooks from this era often spend at least a couple pages on the three "great" compromises. These compromises are viewed in a positive light unlike some scholarship which refers to the compromises over slavery as the bloody compromises.

When describing the ratification of the Constitution, the textbooks point out that the ratification processes was contrary to the amendment process under the Articles of Confederation. Susan Pendleton Lee's 1900 textbook goes as far as saying "the Constitution had been illegally adopted." Some textbook authors also referred to the ratification of the Constitution as a peaceful revolution against the Articles of Confederation. Most scholars of the
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time who looked at the Constitution as a revolution saw at it as a revolution against the Declaration of Independence, not the Articles.

As in the previous periods, the anti-federalist arguments were not clearly outlined, but the anti-federalist interpretation became more acceptable in these textbooks because of the focus on the illegal ratification process. The anti-federalist's specific beliefs about the problems with the Constitution were not fully explored. Anti-federalists were still primarily known as those who opposed the Constitution and central government. Typically the textbook authors did not describe how anti-federalists were related to the adoption of the Bill of Rights, but as textbooks increasingly began to describe the rights guaranteed in the first ten amendments, some writers began attributing these first ten amendments to the anti-federalists.

Because of the focus on the illegal ratification process of the Constitution, the anti-federalist argument became more understandable. Edward Channing’s 1898 textbook went as far as directly attacking historians who criticized the anti-federalists; Channing stated “For many years, it was customary for historical writers to ridicule the arguments put forward by the opponents of ratification…more recently, there has been a disposition to study the history of this memorable epoch in a fairer spirit, and to do justice to the patriotism and ability of these leaders of public opinion”88 Following this statement Channing proceeded to point to some deficiencies of the Constitution, but in order to not be seen as critical of the Constitution, Channing concluded this section by saying "when all has been said, however, the Constitution remains the most marvelous written political instrument that has ever been formulated."89 This excerpt from

88 Channing 274.
89 Ibid, 275.
Channing, however, was not the norm. While textbook writers did not ridicule the arguments of the anti-federalists, most writers, including Channing, did not fully explore their arguments.

There was also a slow shift away from the traditional view that the anti-federalists were the predecessors to the Republican party. Most textbooks began attributing the split between the Republican and Federalist party to differences in their constitutional interpretations of a national bank. The shift away from relating the Republicans to the anti-federalists would continue through the twentieth century.

**Conclusion**

The main influence on textbooks from scholarship came from the previous focus of historians on the compromises of the Constitution. While historians did not always look at the compromises in a positive light (some severely criticized the slavery compromises), textbooks focused on how great the Founders were for being able to compromise. Although the past scholarship influenced the textbooks, the Progressive and economic interpretations of the Constitution did not find their way into textbooks until after 1920. The Progressive historians did not dominate the scholarship on the Constitution until the 1910s and 1920s, so it was a little early for textbooks to already adopt Progressive interpretations of the Constitution. One link between the Progressive historians and textbook writers was they both looked positively at the anti-federalists. Not all textbook authors praised the anti-federalists, but some such as Edward Channing criticized those who were critical of the anti-federalists.

Between 1885 and 1920 the content of textbooks was mostly influenced by changes in education. The Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven attempted to standardize history instruction, and in this process they both called for the inclusion of political history in traditional United States history courses. By recommending the inclusion of political history, the
Committees caused textbooks to increase attention to politics and the government. The increase in attention to politics and the government led to more attention to the Constitution, but this did not equate to an adequate description of anti-federalists. Even though anti-federalist arguments were still not fully explored, anti-federalists were treated in a positive light by some textbook authors.
Chapter 4: 1920-1965

Introduction

A flurry of scholarship on the Constitution resulted from Charles Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution. The debate over the economic origins of the Constitution infiltrated history textbooks between 1920 and 1965. A few textbooks sided with the economic interpretation and concluded that the ratification of the Constitution was a counterrevolution by wealthy aristocrats against the anti-federalists who were the advocates of democracy. After backlash to radical, controversial textbooks, textbook authors toned down the rhetoric. Textbooks in the 1940s and 1950s continued to mention economic differences between the federalists and anti-federalists, and the textbooks mentioned that some scholars questioned the integrity of the Founders, but the 1940s and 1950s textbooks typically disagreed with these arguments.

Scholarship on the Constitution 1920-1965

The early 1900s were dominated with Progressive and economic interpretations of the Constitution – these interpretations served as the framework for scholarship on the Constitution for the next few decades. Some scholars rejected Charles Beard's arguments as Marxist, while others defended his economic interpretation. Despite the debate over Beard’s argument, the Progressive notion that the anti-federalists were part of a democratic movement continued into the 1950s, relatively unchallenged.

The first extensive look at the anti-federalist ideas was in 1955 by Cecelia M. Kenyon’s article “Men of Little Faith: The Anti-Federalists on the Nature of Representative Government,” which refuted Beard’s interpretation and the Progressive notion that anti-federalists were
democrats.\textsuperscript{90} She argued they criticized the Constitution because of their political philosophy not because of the fear that the Constitution was designed to protect the wealthy. Kenyon effectively ended the idea of anti-federalists as democrats. In addition to Kenyon, other consensus historians also dominated the 1950s; Robert Thomas and Forrest McDonald said that both the anti-federalists and the federalists had the same economic interests. In spite of the rise of the consensus historians, some Progressive interpretations continued. For example, Merrill Jensen argued there were two opposing groups between 1763 and 1789: radicals and conservatives. Jensen argued the conflict between the two groups ended in the Constitution, which was a “conservative counter-revolution.” Additionally, Jensen continued to view the anti-federalists as democrats.\textsuperscript{91}

**History Textbooks 1920-1965**

The trend started by the American Book Company in 1890 continued during this period with large publishers buying up small publishers. Along with large publishers came mass-production and mass-marketing.\textsuperscript{92} After the dissatisfaction (particularly in the South) with the publishing industry during the late 1800s states began state wide adoption policies, and during the 1950s many more states began to consider and implement statewide textbook adoption policies.\textsuperscript{93}

Groups of editors replaced the single author texts of the past. In many cases the authors and editors were from various parts of the country, so they represented diverse interests. Textbook writers were split between academic backgrounds and education backgrounds. For

\textsuperscript{90} Hutson, "Country, Court Constitution," 346.
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example Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti's 1961 *Rise of the American Nation* had a team of five editorial advisers and assistants. The advisers and assistants included Isidore Starr, a history teacher in New York City; Ralph H. Gabriel, an emeritus Professor at Yale; Paul Ledbetter, a history teacher in Dallas, Texas; Robert D. Torrey, a Director of Curriculum and Instruction in Larkspur, California; and Helen Yeager, a supervisor of Social Studies in Cincinnati, Ohio. The variety of backgrounds and the variety of locations (including large states such as California and Texas) helped to make Todd and Curti's book marketable. Additionally, sometimes the names of the people linked with textbooks never actually made significant contributions to the textbook – the name was just included because of the prominence of that person.94

The twenties and thirties saw progressive textbooks that "carried at least some slight strain of dissent from prevailing institutions" and the left leaning textbooks of the 1930s "reflected a hazy kind of Socialism...[which] were designed to promote social reform by indoctrinating children with tolerance, cooperation, and other social-democratic virtues."95 Harold Rugg was both one of the most popular and one of the most widely attacked textbook writers of the time. Following attacks on Rugg’s textbooks by the National Association of Manufactures and other attacks during World War II "there were no more dissenting books on the market."96 The textbooks during WWII and the 1950s emphasized government and looked at democracy "not as a call to social action but simply the name of the American system, and the
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opposite of Fascism and Communism." Following World War II, textbooks did not significantly change until 1965.  

The Constitution in Textbooks

Between 1925 and 1942 history textbooks had 18% war content and 26% government and politics content. Although this is the lowest percentage government and politics content since the time of the Civil War, textbooks increased their coverage of the Constitution during this period. Sections on the Constitution ranged from seven pages to thirty pages; those that devoted thirty pages to the Constitution were typically those which described the contents of the Constitution in depth. Textbooks with long descriptions of the contents of the Constitution did not necessarily explain the framing and ratification of the Constitution in more depth. Most textbooks devoted just over ten pages to the Constitution.

The increase in attention to the Constitution can be attributed to an increase in scholarship on the Constitution. During this time period constitutional scholars debated the economic origins of the Constitution. The progressive and economic interpretations of the Constitution made their way into history textbooks, and although most authors did not adopt this interpretation, this interpretation often framed their discussion of the Constitution. Two textbook authors who used a form of the economic interpretation were Willis Mason West in 1920 and Harold Rugg in 1931. Both West and Rugg took a critical stance on what they believed to be an aristocratic, undemocratic Constitution. A 1940 article by Orlen K. Armstrong in the American Legion Magazine criticized Rugg for "casting aspersions on our Constitution and our form of

97 Ibid.
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government, and shape opinions favorable to replacing them with socialistic control." Even though West and Rugg questioned the democratic nature of the Constitution, other textbook authors did not take a risky, controversial stance. Most textbooks continued to praise the Constitution. While many authors mentioned that some scholars interpreted the Constitution as an aristocratic document, they often explained the checks and balances of the Constitution in detail to help ensure students understood that the Constitution protected people from an aristocratic government.

The Ratification Debates in Textbooks

The textbooks described the Articles of Confederation, the Constitutional Convention, and the debate over ratification in terms of class and economic differences. Not all textbooks agreed that these differences had a substantive effect, but nearly all textbooks recognized that some historians looked at the Constitution in terms of economics. There is a clear connection between the scholarly treatment of the Constitution and the textbooks' depiction of the Constitution. Following Charles Beard's famous economic interpretation, scholarship was dominated by Progressive historians who supported Beard's thesis and other historians who questioned the merits of such an interpretation. Beard framed the scholarly debate over the origins of the Constitution. Although not all textbooks agreed with Beard's interpretation, their discussions of the Constitution were framed around Beard's analysis. Throughout their descriptions of the Articles and Constitution, textbooks were replete with references to class and economics.

When describing the Articles of Confederation and the Critical Period, textbooks discussed the differences between the debtor classes and the wealthy classes. Textbooks often
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talked about how the wealthy classes wanted a stronger government in order to protect their property. Shay's Rebellion was used as a prime example of the conflict between debtors and the wealthy. After the Rebellion, it was the wealthy that called for a strong central government. Even though textbooks pointed out the wealthy desired a strong central government, the textbooks argued the strong central government would help everyone, including the debtor classes. A few textbooks pointed out that a stronger central government was needed not just to be able to suppress a rebellion but also to be able to prevent the conditions leading to the rebellion. Rugg took the argument about a central government helping everyone further by saying that all classes wanted a stronger government. Rugg argued investors wanted their investments to be safe, land speculators wanted the western lands to be safe, and the poor wanted a sound currency.

The class conscious interpretation of the Critical Period carried over to the descriptions of the Constitutional Convention. Textbooks pointed out that the delegates at the Convention were all educated, wealthy elites. While a few textbooks questioned the motives of the Founding Fathers, most textbooks mentioned the class of the delegates and pointed out that some people question their motives because of this, but ultimately their decisions helped everyone. The textbooks of the 1940s and 1950s, which were significantly less radical than the West and Rugg textbooks of the 1920s and 1930s, adopted this argument that the Constitution was good for everyone.

The class conscious interpretation not only continued from the Critical Period to the Constitutional Convention but also to the ratification of the Constitution. The textbooks described the anti-federalists as poor debtors. The federalists were characterized as wealthy merchants. As evident in the references to class throughout the discussion of the formation of the Constitution, the textbooks adopted a consistent class conscious interpretation of the
Constitution. Not all textbooks agreed the economic class of the Founders unfairly helped the wealthy and hurt the poor, but nearly all textbooks recognized there were class differences. Charles Beard, the original proponent of the economic interpretation, wrote a textbook in 1922, but in the textbook he did not mention the economic interpretation. Interestingly, out of the textbook writers between 1920 and 1965, Beard discussed the role of class on the Constitution the least.

Textbooks not only described the Constitution as a creation of the wealthy class, but some textbooks also described it as a revolution against the principles in the Declaration of Independence. These textbooks looked at the aristocratic nature of the Constitution and charged that the Founders were opposed to democracy. Some textbooks argued the Founders wanted an even more aristocratic government. In Willis Mason West's 1920 textbook, he makes this argument by saying "The Convention would have liked a much more aristocratic Constitution; but the members saw that if the Constitution were clearly less democratic than a given State constitution, it would be hard to secure ratification in that state."101 By saying the Constitution was an aristocratic revolution against democratic principles, the textbooks painted the anti-federalists in a positive light. The anti-federalists became the democrats fighting against the aristocrats.

Not only did some textbooks characterize the anti-federalists as democrats, some textbooks argued that if the anti-federalists were given adequate representation, they would have won against the federalists. The textbooks say the anti-federalists outnumbered the federalist opponents but because many of the anti-federalists did not own property or lived on the frontier,

they did not receive representation. Although the textbooks argued the anti-federalists represented the majority of the people, the textbooks did not describe their arguments in any detail. The anti-federalist arguments were limited to three arguments: the Constitution was an aristocratic overthrow of the Articles, the central government would have too much power, and the Constitution lacked a Bill of Rights. Typically, those three arguments were not described in any more detail, although particularly in later textbooks the Bill of Rights were described in more detail. One exception to not describing the anti-federalist arguments was a 1961 textbook, which described the anti-federalist arguments in detail, which foreshadowed the content of the textbooks between 1965 and 2010.  

The connection between anti-federalists and Republicans and federalists and the Federalist Party continued to fade during this period. Some, such as Eugene C. Barker, William E. Dodd, and Henry Steele Commager's 1934 textbook, said the anti-federalists changed their name because Thomas Jefferson wanted to describe the groups principles, not just their opposition to the Constitution.  

Others textbook authors such as Willis Mason West argued in 1920 that it was absurd to say that Jefferson was an anti-federalist. Henry W. Bragdon and Samuel P. McCutchen in their 1954 textbook said there were three different Federalist groups: Federalists before the Constitutional Convention, Federalists during the ratification debates, and the Hamiltonian Federalists. Textbooks do not present a unified idea as to the connection or


104 West, 330.

lack of connection between the anti-federalists and Republicans or the federalists and Federalist Party.

Conclusion

Progressive scholarship on the Constitution significantly influenced the content of textbooks between 1920 and 1965. Not all textbooks adopted the economic interpretation of the Constitution, but nearly all textbooks were influenced by this interpretation. Textbooks consistently pointed out economic differences, mentioned some historians believed the Founders were primarily interested in their own economic advancement, and mentioned that some historians believed the anti-federalists were democrats. Although in the 1950s consensus historians rejected the notion of anti-federalists as democrats, some textbook authors continued to point out that some people believed the Constitution was a counter-revolution to the democratic principles of the American Revolution. Textbooks after 1965 adopted a form of the consensus historian approach.

Changes in the political and social state of the nation also played a role in the content of the textbooks during this time period. Because of World War II and fears of Communism, many people grew concerned with radical textbook authors such as Harold Rugg. After widespread criticism of Rugg and after his textbooks were banned in various school districts, textbooks became more neutral in their treatment of various issues, including the Constitution. The change in textbooks not only resulted from demands from the publishing industry and local school districts, but the change also reflected the needs of a nation at war.
Chapter 5: 1965-2010

Introduction

Textbooks between 1965 and 2010 adopted a new interpretation of the Constitution. The discussion of the Constitution was no longer framed around the questionable motives of the Founders, rather the textbooks attempted to reconcile what they viewed as the democratic ideals during the revolutionary and constitutional period with the realities of discrimination in the United States. When discussing this new interpretation of the Constitution, textbooks increased their explanations of anti-federalist ideas. The anti-federalists, finally, gained their place in the story of the ratification of the Constitution.

Scholarship

In the 1960s consensus historians continued to look at the Constitution in terms of its continuity with the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution was not seen as a counterrevolution, and the anti-federalists were not seen as democrats. The consensus interpretation of the Constitution as democratic was quickly disputed by Gordon Wood and others. 106

Writing in 1969, Wood stated the framers of the Constitution intended “to confront and retard the thrust of the Revolution with the rhetoric of the Revolution…[there were] partisan and aristocratic purposes that belied the Federalists’ democratic language…[the Constitution] was intrinsically an aristocratic document designed to check the democratic tendencies of the period.” 107 Wood also claimed that anti-federalists were democrats and federalists were aristocrats; according to Hudson, however, the evidence for this part of his argument was less
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convincing. By combining the Progressive notion of the Constitution as an aristocratic document and the consensus notion of continuity between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, Wood was able to dominate scholarship on the Constitution.

**Education**

The social upheaval of the 1960s entered the textbooks. Fitzgerald pointed out that "the texts of the sixties contain the most dramatic rewriting of history ever to take place in American schoolbooks."\(^{108}\) By the 1970s these textbooks were full of descriptions of the problems in the United States.

Independent publishers often were bought up by corporate conglomerates. For example, the largest textbook company, Pearson, acquired Prentice Hall, Addison-Wesley, Longman, Allyn &Bacon, Benjamin Cummings, and Scott Coresman.\(^{109}\) In addition to control by corporate conglomerates, some media conglomerates currently own major publishers, for example Viacom owns Simon & Schuster and Vivendi owns Houghton Mifflin. Kyle Ward argued there are currently four major publishers that dominate the textbook industry: Pearson, Vivendi Universal, Reed Elsevier, and McGraw-Hill.\(^{110}\) The increasingly large publishers led to textbooks having to go through a long chain of command with cautious decision making at every level because publishers fear taking risks because of censorship or attack.\(^{111}\)

In addition to large publishers, the staff working on any individual textbook grew in size. For example, Paul Boyer's 1998 textbook has thirty nine content reviewers, eight contributors,
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and seven educational reviewers in addition to an executive editor, managing editor, and an entire editorial staff.\textsuperscript{112} Boyer's textbook was not an exception. Textbooks typically had massive teams working on the project.

As of 2005, 20 states have state wide adoption policies (one of those states, California, only selects textbooks for elementary, not secondary, schools).\textsuperscript{113} The other states allowed schools or local agencies to choose the textbooks. The adoption process is different for every state. Textbooks have acquisitions editors whose job it is to make the textbooks reflect what is taught in most schools.

Because of the large size of California and Texas and because both states have textbook adoption processes, textbooks over the past few decades have often been written and marketed with their interests in mind. Because of the power of California and Texas, publishers will often yield to the demands of special interest groups in those states. Essentially, "what is deemed as 'historically accurate and appropriate' in these two states usually then affects what the rest of the country learns about U.S. history."\textsuperscript{114}

\textbf{The Constitution in Textbooks}

Between 1965 and 2010 history textbooks were approximately one thousand pages long because of the amount of history needed to be covered. Despite the need to cover an increasing amount of history, textbooks continued to devote significant space to the Constitution. Typically fifteen pages were used to describe the Constitutional Convention, the ratification debates, and the contents of the Constitution. The fifteen pages is separate from any additional explanation of
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the Constitution the textbooks may have when they include a copy of the Constitution in the index (typically textbooks have substantial explanatory notes that accompany the Constitution).

While the amount of space devoted to the Constitution remained the same as in the 1920 to 1965 period, the textbooks in this period shifted away from an aristocratic interpretation of the Constitution. Because scholars largely rejected Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution, textbooks either reject or ignore the idea of the Constitution as an economic or aristocratic document. Instead of debating Beard's thesis, textbooks describe how the idealism of the Constitution related to the realities of discrimination in American history. This shift also resulted from various curriculum standards. For example, California's 1998 social studies curriculum guide required students by grade eight to have "analyze[d] the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution and the success of each in implementing the ideals of the Declaration of Independence" and "Evaluate the major debates that occurred during the development of the Constitution and their ultimate resolutions..." In order to appeal to a large state such as California, textbooks would need to address the Constitution in relation to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence, and textbooks would need to address the debates over the Constitution.

**The Ratification Debates in Textbooks**

Textbooks rejected the notion of the Constitution as a revolution against the Declaration of Independence. The Constitution was seen as a continuation of the idealism of the Revolutionary period. Textbooks were fond of quoting Dr. Benjamin Rush who said "The American war is over, but this is far from the case with the American Revolution. On the
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contrary, nothing but the first act of the great drama is closed"\textsuperscript{116} Textbooks were dominated by the notion of continuity between the Revolution, Articles of Confederation, and the Constitution. Textbooks stressed this continuity by describing the themes of the growth of nationalism and the growth of democracy during this time period.

Textbooks looked at the Revolutionary War as an act of nationalism, the Articles of Confederation as evidence that the people wanted unity even though they feared having a powerful government, and the Constitution as the fulfillment of the country's desire for nationalism. For example, John A. Garraty's 1966 textbook said "The nationalism spawned by the Revolution grew so rapidly that large elements in the population soon began to resent the constraints imposed by the Articles of Confederation...the country was clearly ready to take another step toward centralized government; agreement on the length of the step or the method of taking it was another matter."\textsuperscript{117}

Textbooks also looked at the theme of the country trying to fill its democratic ideals. Textbooks discussed the notions of equality in the Declaration of Independence, they discussed slight improvements to the status of women and slaves during the Critical Period, they praised the Western Ordinance for expanding democracy in the West (by prohibiting slavery in the West and for ensuring public education), and they praised the democratic ideals found in the Constitution. Textbooks, however, pointed out that the country failed to live up to these ideals. In 1998 Boyer wrote,

\begin{quote}
Why did the democratic values that gave rise to the fight for independence not find full expression in the Constitution...the republican spirit that fueled the Revolution called into...
\end{quote}


question many traditional social patterns. The convention delegates had to walk a fine line between the old order and a new order that was still emerging...as the antislavery and women's movements would show, the radical promise of the Constitution was not lost on those excluded from power.\(^\text{118}\)

As seen here there was a sense of consistency in the ideals of the time period, but also there was the failure to live up to the ideals. Although Boyer also wrote the Convention delegates did not "wish to grant political power to all members of society [because] such a move would at once overturn long-standing social conventions and decentralize political and economic power," Boyer also said the Constitution had "revolutionary implications"\(^\text{119}\). When describing the revolutionary implications of the Constitution, he was not saying that the Constitution was a counterrevolution against the ideals expressed in the times, rather he was saying the Constitution eventually enabled Americans to live up to the ideals expressed during the times. This textbook came out at the same time as California's 1998 curriculum. Boyer was able to incorporate California's curriculum by discussing how the Constitution related to the ideals of the Declaration of Independence.

By emphasizing the consistency of the growth of nationalism and democracy, textbooks rejected the notion that the Constitution was an aristocratic counterrevolution. Textbooks did not talk about how economic differences may have influenced the Founding Fathers. For example, when David M. Kennedy and Lizabeth Cohen revised the deceased Bailey's famous *American Pageant* in 2006, they did not change much in the Constitution section, but they did replace Bailey's statement that "Unfriendly critics of a later era have charged the Founding Fathers with having deliberately set out to feather their own nests" with "the delegates hoped to crystallize the last evaporating pools of revolutionary idealism into a stable political structure that would
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endure” Other textbooks talked about how the delegates all came to the Convention with different perspectives because of their backgrounds; thus, there was no attempt to paint the delegates with a broad stroke by saying they all came from the wealthy classes, so they all had the same interests. Instead, the delegates are seen as continuing the revolutionary idealism, not conducting a counterrevolution to it.

The previous period regarded the anti-federalists as democrats, but textbooks from this period regarded the Constitution as a democratic, not aristocratic document; thus, the anti-federalists no longer were the ones advocating for democracy. The anti-federalists do, however, receive more attention than they did in past textbooks. For example, the Bill of Rights received significant attention from textbooks in this period, and the anti-federalists were credited with this achievement. In addition to the traditional arguments about the Bill of Rights and the central government, other anti-federalist arguments were explored. While not all textbooks pointed out all of their arguments, textbooks pointed out some arguments not found in previous eras such as the anti-federalists did not believe a republican form of government would work in such a large country, the anti-federalists disagreed with the way the president and senators were elected because it made them too distant from the people, and the anti-federalists criticized the secret nature of the Convention.

Textbooks from the previous period speculated that the anti-federalists would have defeated the Constitution if they were adequately represented. Textbooks from this period, however, said the anti-federalists were unable to defeat the Constitution in part bases of political
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121 Textbooks in the 1970s often sided with the anti-federalists on the issue of the secrecy of the Constitutional Convention. The Sunshine Laws of the 1970s attempted to open up government meetings and records to the people. Textbooks argued that opening up government meetings was in the best interest of the people, so it was wrong for the Founders to meet in private.
tactics used by the federalists. Many textbooks described the Pennsylvania federalists who quickly voted on the Constitution after forcing enough anti-federalists into the room to maintain a quorum.

Although the index of the textbooks typically differentiated between the federalists and the Federalist Party, the chapters on the Federalist Party did not explicitly differentiate between the two. No connection was drawn between the anti-federalists and Republican Party. Textbooks did not appear to draw connections between the federalists and anti-federalists and the first political parties of the country, but the textbooks did not attempt to explain the differences between them.

Conclusion

The various social movements in the 1960s led to a demand for a more multicultural education. Textbooks responded to the nation's need for the incorporation of minorities in history. Textbooks looked at the democratic ideals of the revolutionary and constitutional period and compared the ideals to the treatment of women and blacks. The textbooks concluded that the nation consistently attempted to live up to the ideals that were displayed in the Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

Cecelia Kenyon's original studies of the anti-federalists increased attention to anti-federalists and their arguments. Scholars no longer merely assumed that anti-federalists were democrats because they opposed a seemingly aristocratic constitution. Because of this increase in the scholarly treatment of anti-federalists and because of the inclusion of anti-federalists in various state curriculums, textbooks increased attention to the anti-federalist perspective. Unlike previous periods when the anti-federalists were mentioned but their ideas were not fully
explored, textbooks between 1965 and 2010 described, in depth, the various anti-federalist arguments.

Additionally, various requirements by state curriculums helped to shape the content of textbooks. The curriculum of a large state such as California is particularly important because many textbooks will try to adapt to their demands, which is why it was understandable for textbooks to discuss the relationship between the Constitution and the idealism of the Declaration of Independence. Because many states required textbooks to discuss the debates surrounding the Constitution, textbooks were sure to include detailed descriptions of the federalist and anti-federalist arguments.
Conclusion

From 1820 to 2010 the portrayal of the Constitution went from an ancillary tale to a central story in American History. Along with the change in the portrayal of the Constitution came a change in the portrayal of anti-federalism. Anti-federalists grew out of the footnotes of the nineteenth century textbooks into democrats in textbooks from the first half of the twentieth century and finally into central figures in the ratification debate in the current textbooks. The portrayal of the anti-federalists changed over time as a result of changes in the political, cultural, and social state of the nation, state and local control over education policy and curriculum, the publishing industry, and scholarly interpretations of the Constitution.

The political, cultural, and social state of the nation affected Southern textbooks during the time of the Civil War. Southern textbooks during the Civil War era discussed the Constitution in terms of states' rights. The Southern textbooks were the first textbooks to describe the contents of the Bill of Rights, and they only did this because the tenth amendment fit into their states' rights argument. The state of the nation also influenced textbooks in the 1940s and 1950s because the communist fear of the times led to criticism of supposedly communist textbooks; therefore, textbooks in the 1940s and 1950s, although still framed around Beard's thesis, they were critical of those who accepted his economic interpretation. The state of the nation also influenced textbooks in the 1960s when various social movements led to an increase in attention to minorities in textbooks. For the next half century textbooks compared the political ideals of the Revolutionary and Constitutional period to the realities of discrimination in America.

State and local control over education policy and curriculum along with various reports from the National Education Association and American Historical Association influenced
textbooks between 1885 and 1920 to increase the coverage of political and constitutional history and decrease the coverage of military history. The state and local control led to the demise of radical books such as Rugg's textbooks because local districts began banning controversial books. State and local control played a significant role in textbooks between 1965 and 2010 because states have curriculum, and approximately twenty states have statewide textbook adoption policies. Curriculum's of large states such as Texas and California played a big role in shaping the specific discussions on the Constitution.

Trends in the publishing industry influenced textbooks throughout United States history. Between 1820 and 1860, publishers were typically small outfits and authors were typically clergymen. The number of clergymen in the textbook business led to textbooks drawing connections between God and the Constitution. Between 1860 and 1920 publishers competed for an expanding textbook market, so they had professional historians write their textbooks. They tried to appeal to a mass market by incorporating histories of all sections of the United States. Between 1880 and 2010 there was consolidation of publishing companies so currently only a few conglomerates dominate the industry. Additionally, textbooks are now worked on by a large team of authors, editors, and consultants. The combination of the large publishing companies and the large number of people working on a single textbook means that textbooks pass through numerous hands, so it is less likely for textbooks to contain radical ideas about the Constitution.

Scholarly interpretations of the Constitution also have influenced the content of textbooks. Between 1820 and 1840 there was little source material about the Constitution so there was little scholarship on the Constitution, and thus little information in textbooks on the Constitution. In the early twentieth century Charles Beard's economic interpretation of the Constitution impacted both scholarship and textbooks for decades. Although not all scholars or
textbooks agreed with the economic interpretation, they were nearly all framed around his interpretation – either they supported or opposed him, there were no other interpretations of the Constitution in textbooks. Influenced by consensus historians, textbooks from 1965 to 2010 focused on the continuity of nationalist and democratic themes in the Revolutionary and Constitutional period.

This thesis looked at the portrayal of the Constitution through the lens of anti-federalism. More research is needed to study how textbooks change in their portrayal of other aspects of the Constitution. Additionally, more research would be needed to figure out what students actually learned about anti-federalism – this study only looked at what textbooks tried to tell students.

While many teachers use textbooks as the central tool in their classroom, students may not read the textbook, and some teachers either supplement or supplant the textbook with other materials.

As evident in the numerous changes to the portrayal of anti-federalism, textbooks are not sources of fixed knowledge. While past research has shown that textbooks change in their portrayal of controversial issues, this research shows that textbooks even change on topics such as the Constitution, a document valued by many Americans. Textbooks change to meet the needs of the time, and when using textbooks as the main teaching tool in the classroom, educators and students should be aware of the changing nature of textbooks. Kyle Ward, author of History in the Making began teaching in 1992 and was given a 1974 textbook to teach from – Ward reflected back on this by saying "When I questioned the superintendent about the opportunity to update these texts, I was informed that since history never changes, neither should our textbooks." Historical interpretations change, and textbooks change with history.

Many historians have criticized Texas’s recent curriculum change that emphasizes Republicans over Democrats and emphasizes the role of Christianity in the nation's founding, but
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this is nothing new. History changes with the political, cultural, and social values of the time. Whether or not it is good for history to change in this manner is a question of whether the goal of education is to reinforce the values of the time or whether the goal of education is to open the mind to new perspectives.
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