Want to feel really inspired about the work we do as social studies professionals? I invite you to join us for the CCSS Spring Social and Awards Dinner on Thursday, May 22nd at Connecticut’s Old State House in Hartford. The program starts at 4:00 with a Connecticut history activity in a place where Connecticut history was made. Following the activity will be a social (with a wine and beer cash bar), a very brief meeting (15-20 minutes), a buffet dinner and the award presentations.

Two awards are presented for Excellence in Social Studies Education – one to a K-8 teacher and one to a high school teacher. The John Stedman Passion for the Social Studies Award is presented to a teacher who has been nominated only by his/her student or students. New this year, we are honoring two soon-to-be social studies teachers with Pre-Service Teaching Awards for their college class work and excellence during student teaching and/or intern work. The CCSS Service Award is presented to a non-teaching or retired educator for his/her continued efforts to further the goals of CCSS. The Bruce Fraser Friend of Social Studies Award is presented to a non-teaching professional who is dedicated to the teaching of social studies in Connecticut.

Last, but certainly not least, the Addazio Honor Award is presented to a person who has been a professional leader and made significant contributions to our profession. Nominations for and selection of the Addazio Honor Award recipient are made by (continued on page 2)

Over the last few issues I have professed optimism about the direction of social studies in a state still beguiled by STEM. That optimism remains. The search for a State Department of Education social studies consultant is moving forward. Likewise Steve Armstrong’s committee is continuing to work on a Social Studies Framework and has produced drafts for several grade levels and is proposing some summer workshops to present their work. Keep the faith!

This issue is the largest we’ve ever offered and it’s loaded with interesting articles. Not all are listed here; you will need to explore the following pages. But just to whet your appetite.....

- We have lots of announcements of summer conferences, workshops starting on page 16 – be sure check application deadlines as some of them will be coming up very soon. Among the workshops is one co-sponsored by CCSS: “The Things They Taught: English Teachers, Social Studies Teachers, and the Vietnam War”. See the promo on page 16.
- On pages 8 and 9 I have juxtaposed two comments on the current educational scene, one by Thomas Friedman of the New York Times extolling Arne Duncan and the other from the Washington Post by a woman who left teaching for the law, and has some pretty harsh words for all the “experts” who claim to know what’s best for teachers and education.
- You will find three items of interest to historians – material on both world and American history. The 100th year anniversary of the start of World War I – aka “the Great War” – is fast approaching. The BBC offers a brief synopsis of ten historians’ views of that imponderable question: who was at fault? (It starts on page 12) Did you ever wonder what Lincoln really said at Gettysburg? Turns out even he wasn’t sure! Check out page 16 to see what happens when there is no U-Tube video or tape-recorder to record an event. The last of these items is one of those things that came
Editor’s Note continued

in “over the transon”: the use of the game Monopoly to assist POW’s in the European theatre of World War II should they seek to escape. See page 3.

Finally, several reminders:
• Register for and attend NERC in Sturbridge on April 7-9. A brief description of the conference can be found on page 4 and you can get information on line at http://www.masscouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/preview-bookNERC45b.pdf
• In his message, CCSS President Dan Coughlin urges you to attend the Spring Social and Awards Dinner on May 22. I second that motion. Connecticut’s Old State House always has a great program; you don’t want to miss it. See page 5 for a registration form.
• And while you are considering conferences, don’t forget that the NCSS National Convention will be in Boston this fall - November 21-23. The convention is not likely to get geographically closer than this in the next decade – no airfare or taxis, just Mass-Pike tolls and Boston parking fees. Many of us have the possibility of coming up for the day and saving hotel costs! By comparison with attending a conference in San Diego, Houston, Seattle or even Washington DC, that’s “chump-change”! So put it on your calendar now, tell your administrator and urge him/her to join you for a day. No telling what s/he might learn!

Now, put another log on the fire, curl up on the couch or in front of the computer and read on. Spring is coming and Social Studies is “coming on”!

Tim    thomas.weinland@uconn.edu

President’s Message continued

a committee of past awardees. If you would like to nominate someone for one of the other awards, specific criteria and online nomination forms are available at the CCSS website, www.ctsocialstudies.org. But please act soon; the nomination deadline is March 15th.

The award winners are certainly not the only people making outstanding contributions, but they represent the amazing work social studies professionals, and those who support the social studies, are doing every day throughout the state. They are representatives of excellence and CCSS takes pride in honoring them. To me, hearing colleagues praise their work and the awardees’ comments about teaching and the social studies, is moving and motivating. Please complete and return the registration form on page 5 and join us for an evening that will make you feel proud to be a social studies teacher.

Dan Coughlin
Framework and Consultant Update

The Framework Writing Committee is still hard at work. There are several almost complete drafts at a couple of grade levels, and more review sessions should be announced soon. The Framework Committee is using the new C3 document published by the National Council for the Social Studies as its guide.

You can learn about C3 and download a free PDF at www.socialstudies.org/c3

NEW Framework Introduction Sessions
June 30 - July 3 and August 11-14

We are working hard to meet deadlines so that the State Board of Education will approve the new CT Social Studies Framework this academic year. With that in mind, we have scheduled the above two workshops to help the state's Social Studies community implement the Framework.

Follow the link above for more information on the summer sessions.

The SDE is well into the process of hiring a new Social Studies Consultant. As you know, we've been working on this for a long time, so it is great to see progress.

Monopoly - I Did Not Know This!

Starting in 1941, an increasing number of British Airmen found themselves as the involuntary guests of the Third Reich, and the Crown was casting about for ways and means to facilitate their escape... Now obviously, one of the most helpful aids to that end is a useful and accurate map, one showing not only where stuff was, but also showing the locations of 'safe houses' where a POW on-the-lam could go for food and shelter. Paper maps had some real drawbacks -- they make a lot of noise when you open and fold them, they wear out rapidly, and if they get wet, they turn into mush.

Someone in MI-5 (similar to America’s OSS) got the idea of printing escape maps on silk. It's durable, can be scrunched-up into tiny wads, and unfolded as many times as needed, and makes no noise whatsoever. At that time, there was only one manufacturer in Great Britain that had perfected the technology of printing on silk, and that was John Waddington, Ltd. When approached by the government, the firm was only too happy to do its bit for the war effort.

By pure coincidence, Waddington was also the U.K. Licensee for the popular American board game, Monopoly. As it happened, 'games and pastimes' was a category of items qualified for insertion into 'CARE packages', dispatched by the International Red Cross to prisoners of war. Under the strictest of secrecy, in a securely guarded and inaccessible old workshop on the grounds of Waddington's, a group of sworn-to-secrecy employees began mass-producing escape maps, keyed to each region of Germany, Italy, France or wherever Allied POW camps were located. When processed, these maps could be folded into such tiny dots that they would actually fit inside a Monopoly playing piece.

As long as they were at it, the clever workmen at Waddington's also managed to add:
1. A playing token, containing a small magnetic compass
2. A two-part metal file that could easily be screwed together
3. Useful amounts of genuine high-denomination German, Italian, and French currency, hidden within the piles of Monopoly money!

British and American air crews were advised, before taking off on their first mission, how to identify a 'rigged' Monopoly set -- by means of a tiny red dot, one cleverly rigged to look like an ordinary printing glitch, located in the corner of the Free Parking square. Of the estimated 35,000 Allied POWS who successfully escaped, an estimated one-third were aided in their flight by the rigged Monopoly sets. Everyone who did so was sworn to secrecy indefinitely, since the British Government might want to use this highly successful ruse in still another future war. The story wasn't declassified until 2007, when the surviving craftsmen from Waddington's, as well as the firm itself, were finally honored in a public ceremony.

It's always nice when you can play that 'Get Out of Jail Free' card!
NERC 45 Update
June Coutu, Executive Secretary, MCSS and NERC Conference Coordinator

NERC 45 is well on its way to being reality. The Previews were mailed in October. However, as hard as we try, we know that these books do not reach everyone. So pass the word.

NERC 45, “Social Studies in the Balance”, will be held April 7-9, 2014 at the Sturbridge Host Hotel in Sturbridge Massachusetts. Monday consists of full day workshops. These include:: Building the Profession: Common Core Materials and Strategies for the New Social Studies Teacher, by Mimi Stephens; Differentiated Instruction in the Social Studies, by Christine Hoyle; The Civil War: Compelling Resources from America’s Library, by Suzanne Judson-Whitehouse; Changes to the Test (US AP), by Tracey Wilson; and Painless: A Survival Guide to the Dreaded History Project, by Annie Davis (presented in Waltham, MA at the National Archives. If you have been in sessions run by these women before, you know that you are in for a fabulous presentation. Monday will also feature a key note address by Dr. Vernon Domingo of Bridgewater State University entitled “Advocating for the Social Studies.”

Tuesday’s morning speaker will be Jonathan Green, author of “Murder in the High Himalaya.” His topic is “Discussing Human Rights Issues in Social Studies Classes.” At the NEHTA luncheon, Walter Woodward, Kidger Award winner from the University of Connecticut will speak. Later in the day John Knudsen, the recipient of the Teacher/Educator Kidger award will speak at the NEHTA Reception which is open to all conference attendees. And finally, Vernon Domingo will lead a Policy Forum on Geography Education at 7 p.m.

Wednesday offers Ken C. Davis, of “Don’t Know Much About” fame to the conference. This day will offer a special session for supervisors, and the first ever NERC New England Placement Job Fair. And, of course, both Tuesday and Wednesday feature an exhibits hall filled with commercial vendors, not-for-profits, museums, university outreach, and Earth View (the traveling globe).

Three days packed with new ideas, new materials, camaraderie, and networking. What’s not to love about NERC?

CONNECTICUT COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

PLEASE JOIN US FOR OUR ANNUAL

Spring Social & Awards Dinner

• Recognize and be inspired by the accomplishments of some of our outstanding colleagues.
• Participate in a Connecticut history activity where important Connecticut history was made.
• Socialize with social studies professionals from across the state.
• Be informed about CCSS activities.

Thursday, May 22, 2014
Connecticut’s Old State House
800 Main Street, Hartford

Nearby parking in Constitution Plaza South and State House Square Garages – Tickets validated for $5.00 fee.
4:00 – 6:00 – Welcome and Connecticut history activity
6:00 – 6:30 – Social time– Connect with colleagues from throughout the state and meet this year’s award winners. Wine and beer cash bar
6:45 – 8:00 – Dinner and Award Presentations (Excellence in Social Studies Education, Friend of Social Studies, CCSS Service Award, John Stedman Passion for the Social Studies Award, Addazio Honor Award, Pre-Service Teacher Awards)

Name: _____________________________ Member of CCSS? ______________
Address: ________________________________
________________________________________
Email: _________________________ Phone: __________________________

The cost of the Dinner and Program is $30. Please make checks payable to CCSS and mail payment and registration form by May 1 to:
Max Amoh, CCSS Treasurer, 10 Clark St – Apt. 2, New Haven, CT 06511-3802
The Teacher With a Thousand Faces

By Guest Blogger on February 4, 2014 8:18 AM

In *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, Joseph Campbell describes the archetypical protagonist who feels compelled to embark on a quest. Over the course of the journey, there are many challenges, as well as support, assistance, and successes. Ultimately, after enduring and overcoming a supreme ordeal, the hero undergoes a form of resurrection because of the life-changing power of the experience. It is a universal formula for transformative stories across cultures and generations.

As with Campbell’s archetype, teachers are drawn to a special journey. Indeed, most teachers see their job as a calling and they feel a sense of mission in their work. There are many trials and pitfalls, along with enriching experiences of joy and reaffirmation. Unfortunately, many teachers contend with numerous challenges to their profession, and ultimately, to their morale, motivation, and sense of identity. The comparatively low status of the teaching profession is the nemesis to be slain, and teachers are left with minimal power in the confrontation. For many teachers, the next stage of the hero’s epic adventure fails to materialize because they do not possess the proper tools to surmount the many obstacles they face.

Nothing short of a drastic overhaul of societal attitudes toward the purpose of education and the role of teachers will precipitate genuine, enduring educational reform. There are three key ways to engender this revolution. First, an understanding of how morale, motivation, and self-efficacy interact to shape teachers’ professional identities is crucial. The second step is through the emergence of teacher leadership, which derives from, is reflective of, and contributes to, teacher morale, motivation, and efficacy. Lastly, validation and recognition of teachers’ work and efforts can augment teacher efficacy, motivation, and morale, providing the teacher as hero with greater strength to succeed in the struggle and to cultivate teacher leadership. Empowerment, validation, and teacher leadership can be transformational experiences that provide teachers with the leverage and capacity they need to strengthen their collective voice and influence.

In societies that have made significant educational changes, the professionalization of teaching has been at the center of reform efforts. Among other approaches, trusting teachers’ perspectives and valuing them as professionals have bolstered teacher morale and have enhanced the status of the teaching profession in these nations. Ironically, as much as pundits insist on international comparisons with educational systems like Finland’s and South Korea’s, we have yet to more fully embrace the elevated status of teachers as paramount to educational reform endeavors.

In the United States, the general lack of teacher involvement in policy decisions and disregard for their insight, values, and knowledge reflect the limited professional status of teachers and their constrained sense of autonomy. Conversely, for teacher professionalization to positively evolve, teacher leadership must become a reality, and teachers’ expertise, experiences, and perspectives must be solicited and valued. Teacher organizations such as the National Network of State Teachers of the Year aim to uplift the teaching profession and offer guidance to policymakers and teachers to more fully realize the value of sustainable teacher leadership and professional growth.

In Campbell’s monomyth, failure to overcome the ordeal or to return without a transformational experience dooms the hero to repeat the adventure time and time again. Metaphorically, this sounds remarkably like education reform efforts dating back to the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983. We have not made significant changes because we have yet to make teacher professionalization a fundamental priority. Rather than reinforcing intransigent views of the teaching profession reflective of the status quo, a new archetype can emerge. Creating appropriate and meaningful teacher leadership structures, validating and recognizing teachers’ work, and genuinely valuing teachers’ experiences and perspectives will boost teacher morale and motivation, elevate the teaching profession, provide teachers with the necessary means to triumph over current challenges, and truly transform education.

--Dave Bosso

[http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2014/02/the_teacher_with_a_thousand_faces.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2014/02/the_teacher_with_a_thousand_faces.html)
History: Taught Poorly or too Little?
by Lisa Hansel   January 13th, 2014

It’s one of those days when Jaywalking, Leno’s bit on the street that often pokes fun at ignorance, is worrying me. I have to remind myself that he probably has to stop a lot of people to get those silly answers to basic questions like “What is the name of the ship the Pilgrims came over on?”; that people must be nervous, and that the bit would not be funny if the audience (i.e., millions of people) did not know the answers. Still, why does the bit resonate? Because there are far too many people who really don’t know basic facts. It’s easy to chuckle, but hard to stop worrying about them and their children.

Apparently readers of Education Week are worried too. As I was catching up on my end-of-year reading, I was surprised to see that a piece on students’ lack of history knowledge was #2 in a list of the 10 most-viewed Ed Week commentaries of 2013. The author, Vicky Schippers, claims that we’re teaching history wrong—as “a litany of disconnected names, dates, and events to be memorized before an exam” instead of as “a study of struggles, setbacks, and victories.” If that’s true, it’s a shame. I see history as a fascinating web of stories, and I’ve purposefully memorized key names, dates, and events to help anchor those stories in time and place—and to reveal connections.

Schippers, who tutors students, focuses on a dedicated young man struggling to pass the history regents’ exam in New York so he can get his diploma:

“What astonishes me about Tony, as it does about any of my students, is how little he knows about the world. The five or six blocks he travels between his home, school, and work circumscribe his entire life…. When we first started to study together, Tony, like all my students, had no sense of U.S. presidents, the sequence of wars in which the United States has been involved, the U.S. Constitution and the structure of government, and the central issues over which our democracy has struggled since we separated from England more than two centuries ago. He knew the name Abraham Lincoln, but drew a blank when I asked him which war Lincoln was associated with. He was unfamiliar with Adolf Hitler and the Holocaust. Segregation and civil rights were not concepts he could articulate.

Is that Lincoln crossing the Delaware? If your exposure were limited to the six blocks around your home, how would you know? It could be that all of Tony’s history classes consisted of terribly boring facts that Tony decided not to memorize. But I’d guess that at least some of Tony’s teachers delivered the facts along with the struggles and stories—and I’d guess that Tony’s listening and reading comprehension were too limited to follow along. Rather than making a spectacle of himself with strings of clarifying questions, Tony probably sat in the back of the class, with confusion understandably leading to disengagement.

With Schippers tutoring him, in contrast, Tony asks questions. Schippers doesn’t have a full class to handle; she answers each question directly, making connections between Tony’s life and the content he needs to learn. She’s clearly helping him—but we should ask: What could have been done to prevent Tony from needing a tutor? Schippers could be right that Tony got very unlucky with his history teachers. But I have reason to believe that there’s more than one cause of his devastating lack of knowledge. I’d bet that Tony received little to no history instruction in elementary school, leaving him with little to no historical knowledge and vocabulary, and little to no chance of comprehending history classes in later grades.

Consider this table from the Report of 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grades K-3</th>
<th>Grades 4-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Report of 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education, Chapter 4, Table 4.2, page 54.)

One to two hours per week on social studies between kindergarten and sixth grade?! That’s shockingly low—but Tony could have had even less since these are averages.

In the 2010 NAEP Civics assessment, teachers of fourth graders were asked how much time they spent on social studies each week. Three percent reported spending 30 minutes or less per week; another eighteen percent reported 30 – 60 minutes per week.

So maybe Tony doesn’t know any history not because it wasn’t taught well in secondary school, but because it wasn’t taught at all in elementary school.

http://blog.coreknowledge.org/2014/01/13/history-taught-poorly-or-too-little/

Like this issue? Email a copy to colleagues and encourage them to join CCSS [ And if you didn’t like the issue, email the editor and suggest how to improve it ]

Obama’s Homework Assignment, Thomas Friedman

PRESIDENT OBAMA will deliver his State of the Union address on Jan. 28, but, for my money, his secretary of education, Arne Duncan, already gave it. Just not enough people heard it.

So instead of Obama fishing around for contrived ideas to put in his speech — the usual laundry list that wins applause but no action — the president should steal Duncan’s speech and claim it as his own (I won’t tell) because it was not a laundry list and wasn’t a feel-good speech. In fact, it was a feel-bad speech, asking one big question. Are we falling behind as a country in education not just because we fail to recruit the smartest college students to become teachers or reform-resistant teachers’ unions, but because of our culture today: too many parents and too many kids just don’t take education seriously enough and don’t want to put in the work needed today to really excel?

Is this the key cause of income inequality and persistent poverty? No. But it is surely part of their solutions, and it is a subject that Obama has not used his bully pulpit to address in any sustained way. Nothing could spark a national discussion of this more than a State of the Union address.

I’ll get to Duncan’s speech in a moment, but, if you think he’s exaggerating, listen to some teachers. Here are the guts of a letter published recently by The Washington Post from a veteran seventh-grade language arts teacher in Frederick, Md., who explained why she no longer wants to teach. (She asked to remain anonymous.)

After complaining about the “superficial curriculum that encouraged mindless conformity,” she wrote: “I decided that if I was going to teach this nonsense, I was at least going to teach it well. I set my expectations high, I kept my classroom structured, I tutored students, I provided extra practice and I tried to make class fun. ... I quickly rose through the ranks of ‘favorite teacher,’ kept open communication channels with parents and had many students with solid A’s. It was about this time that I was called down to the principal’s office. ... She handed me a list of about 10 students, all of whom had D’s or F’s. At the time, I only had about 120 students, so I was relatively on par with a standard bell curve. As she brought up each one, I walked her through my grade sheets that showed not low scores but a failure to turn in work — a lack of responsibility. I showed her my tutoring logs, my letters to parents, only to be interrogated further.

“Eventually, the meeting came down to two quotes that I will forever remember as the defining slogans for public education: ‘They are not allowed to fail.’ ‘If they have D’s or F’s, there is something that you are not doing for them.’ What am I not doing for them? I suppose I was not giving them the answers. I was not physically picking up their hands to write for them. I was not following them home each night to make sure they did their work on time. I was not excusing their lack of discipline. ... Teachers are held to impossible standards, and students are accountable for hardly any part of their own education and are incapable of failing.” ....

Now you have some idea why Duncan gave this speech to the National Assessment Governing Board’s Education Summit for Parent Leaders. Here’s an excerpt:

“In 2009, President Obama met with President Lee of South Korea and asked him about his biggest challenge in education. President Lee answered without hesitation: parents in South Korea were ‘too demanding.’ Even his poorest parents demanded a world-class education for their children, and he was having to spend millions of dollars each year to teach English to students in first grade, because his parents won’t let him wait until second grade. ... I [wish] our biggest challenge here in the U.S. was too many parents demanding excellent schools.

“I want to pose one simple question to you: Does a child in South Korea deserve a better education than your child?” Duncan continued. “If your answer is no ... then your work is cut out for you. Because right now, South Korea — and quite a few other countries — are offering students more, and demanding more, than many American districts and schools do. And the results are showing, in our kids’ learning and in their opportunities to succeed, and in staggeringly large achievement gaps in this country. Doing something about our underperformance will mean raising your voice — and encouraging parents who aren’t as engaged as you to speak up. Parents have the power to challenge educational complacency here at home. Parents have the power to ask more of their leaders — and to ask more of their kids.”

Citing Amanda Ripley’s new book — “The Smartest Kids in the World, and How They Got That Way” — Duncan said, “Amanda points a finger at you and me, as parents — not because we aren’t involved in school, but because too often, we are involved in the wrong way. Parents, she says, are happy to show up at sports events, video camera in hand, and they’ll come to school to protest a bad grade. But she writes, and I quote: ‘Parents did not tend to show up at schools demanding that their kids be assigned more challenging reading or that their kindergartners learn math while they still loved numbers.’ ... To really help our kids, we have to do so much more as parents. We have to change expectations about how hard kids should work. And we have to work with teachers and leaders to create schools that demand more from our kids.”

Now that’s a State of the Union speech the country needs to hear — and wouldn’t forget.

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/19/opinion/sunday/friedman-obamas-homework-assignment.html?_r=0
You think you know what teachers do. Right? Wrong.


You went to school so you think you know what teachers do, right? You are wrong. Here’s a piece explaining all of this from Sarah Blaine, a mom, former teacher and full-time practicing attorney in New Jersey who writes at her parentingthecore blog, where this first appeared.

By Sarah Blaine

We all know what teachers do, right? After all, we were all students. Each one of us, each product of public education, we each sat through class after class for thirteen years. We encountered dozens of teachers. We had our kindergarten teachers and our first grade teachers and our fifth grade teachers and our gym teachers and our art teachers and our music teachers. We had our science teachers and our social studies teachers and our English teachers and our math teachers. If we were lucky, we might even have had our Latin teachers or our Spanish teachers or our physics teachers or our psychology teachers. Heck, I even had a seventh grade “Communications Skills” teacher. We had our guidance counselors and our principals and some of us had our special education teachers and our study hall monitors.

So we know teachers. We get teachers. We know what happens in classrooms, and we know what teachers do. We know which teachers are effective, we know which teachers left lasting impressions, we know which teachers changed our lives, and we know which teachers sucked.

We know. We know which teachers changed lives for the better. We know which teachers changed lives for the worse. Teaching as a profession has no mystery. It has no mystique. It has no respect. We were students, and therefore we know teachers. We denigrate teachers. We criticize teachers. We can do better than teachers. After all: We do. They teach.

We are wrong.

We need to honor teachers. We need to respect teachers. We need to listen to teachers. We need to stop reducing teachers to arbitrary measurements of student growth on so-called objective exams. Most of all, we need to stop thinking that we know anything about teaching merely by virtue of having once been students.

We don’t know.

I spent a little over a year earning a master of arts in teaching degree. Then I spent two years teaching English Language Arts in a rural public high school. And I learned that my 13 years as a public school student, my 4 years as a college student at a highly selective college, and even a great deal of my year as a master’s degree student in the education school of a flagship public university hadn’t taught me how to manage a classroom, how to reach students, how to inspire a love of learning, how to teach. Eighteen years as a student (and a year of preschool before that), and I didn’t know anything about teaching. Only years of practicing my skills and honing my skills would have rendered me a true professional. An expert. Someone who knows about the business of inspiring children. Of reaching students. Of making a difference. Of teaching.

I didn’t stay. I copped out. I left. I went home to suburban New Jersey, and a year later I enrolled in law school. I passed the bar. I began to practice law at a prestigious large law firm. Three years as a law student had no more prepared me for the practice of law than 18 years of experience as a student had previously prepared me to teach. But even in my first year as a practicing attorney, I earned five times what a first-year teacher made in the district where I’d taught.

I worked hard in my first year of practicing law. But I didn’t work five times harder than I’d worked in my first year of teaching. In fact, I didn’t work any harder. Maybe I worked a little less. But I continued to practice. I continued to learn. Nine years after my law school graduation, I think I have some idea of how to litigate a case. But I am not a perfect lawyer ….

The people I encounter out in the world now respect me as a lawyer, as a professional, in part because the vast majority of them have absolutely no idea what I really do.

All of you former students who are not teachers and not lawyers, you have no more idea of what it is to teach than you do of what it is to practice law.

All of you former students: you did not design curricula, plan lessons, attend faculty meetings, assess papers, design rubrics, create exams, prepare report cards, and monitor attendance. You did not tutor students, review rough drafts, and create study questions. . . . You did not struggle to teach your students how to develop a thesis for their essays, and bask in the joy of having taught a successful lesson, of having gotten through to them, even for five minutes. You did not struggle with trying to make SAT-level vocabulary relevant to students who did not have a single college in their county. You did not laugh — because you so desperately wanted to cry — when you read some of the absurdities on their final exams…..

You did not. And you don’t know. You observed. Maybe you learned. But you [students] didn’t teach.

The problem with teaching as a profession is that every single adult citizen of this country thinks that they know what teachers do. And they don’t. So they prescribe solutions, and they develop public policy, and they editorialize, and they politicize. And they don’t listen to those who do know. Those who could teach. The teachers.
NCHE members have recently taken notice of the newly published “C3 Framework: The College, Career and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies State Standards.” This document was crafted by a wide variety of individuals from all over the country, including classroom teachers, district and state curriculum coordinators and representatives of a wide variety of organizations representing different ideas in social studies, including my participation representing NCHE. A consensus document, the final product brings together ideas of history teaching with ideas in teaching geography, economics, and civics. For those like myself passionate about the centrality of history in the schools in general and in social studies classrooms in particular, there is much that is puzzling and even problematic in the 128 page document. Yet there is also much to applaud, and, importantly, I believe the document deserves our attention and support, because unless those that support education in history, geography, economics and civics speak with a unified voice, there is no chance whatsoever of our subjects remaining centrally important in the twenty-first century classroom.

First, let me debunk misunderstandings about the C3 framework. C3 is not a standards document...the word “framework” is purposeful and meaningful. The idea is for states, districts and schools to take the ideas of the framework to help frame their own standards and curriculum requirements. Those of us who worked on the document were very conscious to avoid dictating standards and requirements, standards and requirements that we knew full well might be acceptable in some places and not others. Second, the C3 framework is not part of the Common Core, although this is not for lack of trying. The bottom line is that anything connected to history and social studies standards is the third rail of the standards movement, and in the end the Common Core folks wanted nothing to do with our subject area. As I will discuss later, this is indeed the real problem—educational reform leaders want to turn their back on history and social studies, and this is a problem we need to overcome. Further, this document was not written by a cadre of social studies devotees in the backrooms of NCSS. Instead, it was crafted by a large committee of writers, including prominent historians and history educators recommended by NCHE and our fellow history educators from National History Day, The American Historical Association and the World History Association. Finally, the C3 framework is not part of any assessment regime. Because it is only a framework, the ideas within it cannot be tested.

As for the content of the framework, it is first critical to note that this document does not promote teaching a general and vague social studies curriculum. Instead, it explicitly focuses on teaching disciplinary thinking in four delineated content areas: history, geography, economics and civics. Some NCHE members have commented that they feel the document is too “civics heavy,” and I will confess that I share many of these concerns. Even the title seems to trumpet civics as the heart of the document. Yet the title is meant to delineate purpose of studying the social studies disciplines from the rest of schooling. The “Common Core” focuses on preparing students for “College and Career.” I think NCHE members would strongly agree that history and social studies classrooms do more than this, and the term our large and unwieldy committee landed on to describe this “something extra” was “civic life,” although I believe that term to be too narrow.

To me, some criticism of the document is mere quibbling, and misses the positive and revolutionary heart of the enterprise. For at its core, this document looks like few standards-related documents that have preceded it. It does not list of names, dates and facts that students should memorize, as some standards documents in the past have done. Nor does it suggest that history and social studies classrooms become a mere appendage to Language Arts classrooms, teaching pre-packaged reading and writing strategies. Rather, the C3 framework begins by insisting that history and classrooms begin with inquiry, with questioning. This idea is at the heart of NCHE, as we see in one of History’s Habits of Mind: “Interrogate texts and artifacts, posing questions about the past that foster informed discussion, reasoned debate and evidence-based interpretation.” As a matter of fact, much of the history section in the C3 document looks very much like History’s Habits of Mind. To provide just one example, here is the C3 discussion of historical context: “Evaluate how historical events and developments were shaped by unique circumstances of time and place as well as broader historical contexts”, which connects to this History Habit of Mind: “Perceive past events and issues as they might have been experienced by the people of the time, with historical empathy rather than present-mindedness.” In some ways, NCHE should be celebrating the release of the C3 document, because the ideas that shaped our organization from the beginning have now become centrally accepted by all within the social studies community as important aspects of the social studies classroom.

Does this mean the document is perfect? Of course not. As one example, some of my fellow NCHE Board members took special exception to one of the sections within Dimension 4 of the document, a section that recommends “taking informed action” as an important aspect of a social studies classroom. I and others at the C3 meetings agreed with this concern, and this section has been toned down from its original conception, yet in the end we all accepted compromise, because a significant number of the C3 writers and participants believed this idea to be critical in social studies education. I remain concerned that a vague and overambitious focus on “taking action” will overwhelm the ideas of disciplinary thinking in the framework, and I hope everyone that reads this essay also reads the essay in this edition of History Matters! by Sarah Drake Brown about how NCHE members can keep the (continued on page 11)
I’d like to conclude by focusing on this very act of compromise and its connection to “civic life.” As we have recently seen so clearly and unfortunately, the idea of compromise seems to have disappeared from public discourse. Reaching the greater good demands both principled belief and willingness to compromise. This is especially true in democratic societies ruled by majority will, where small minorities should not insist on forcing their will upon the majority. In the case of the C3 document, there were times when I conceded to the will of the majority in order to compromise for the greater good.

The greater good in the case of the C3 framework is fighting for the centrality of history and social studies education in the k-12 classrooms across America. We all know that most educational “reform efforts” of the past two decades ignore history and social studies, be they Republican or Democrat, whether “No Child Left Behind” or “Race to the Top.” Those of us who care deeply about the erosion of teaching time for history and social studies must stay together and fight together, because in the world of educational policy, we are weak to begin with. If that means those of us who believe in the centrality of history must occasionally compromise with those who believe in the centrality of civics, so be it. In the end, most members of NCHE teach history and geography and economics and civics-- we don’t pick and choose. We are all working toward the same goals, goals that we must continue to fight for as the educational world of the twenty-first century takes shape.

**Education historian Ravitch believes education support is a civic responsibility**

Education historian Diane Ravitch knocked American education reformers who she said have fostered a bleak culture by over-testing students, lowering standards for teachers and draining taxpayer money from many public school districts for the proliferation of charter schools. “I believe testing has to be used wisely ... it should not be used to rank and rate and discourage children,” Ravitch said Saturday, speaking to some of the nearly 1,000 school board members and superintendents who converged on Louisville’s Galt House from around the state for the annual conference of the Kentucky School Boards Association.

Ravitch — a 75-year-old New York University research professor in education, education historian and former assistant secretary at the U.S. Department of Education — believes the federal government puts too much emphasis on testing. Ravitch said no other country tests students in all grades. “We are the most over-tested nation in the world,” she said. This, in turn, has led some school districts to narrow their curriculums to focus on test subjects in lieu of art, music and other programs. And judging teachers on students’ test scores,” Ravitch said, is “just about as good as rolling the dice or flipping a coin.”

Instead, she encourages educators, parents and lawmakers to think as citizens rather than consumers when it comes to education. Ravitch’s vision for education reform starts at ground level with each person supporting public education as a civic responsibility. Kentucky, meanwhile, is “a very lucky state,” to have a state government that supports public education efforts, she said, pointing out that public school districts in neighboring states with charter schools like Indiana, Ohio and Tennessee haven’t been as lucky.

Education reform is more than just improving test scores, which Ravitch believes is the only thing that seems to matter to the federal government and many states. She pointed out that many large, nonprofit charters schools in Indiana and Ohio makes large political contributions to key state and federal campaigns. She urged the KSBA to stand up to the “power brokers inside the Beltway,” calling education “the civil-rights issues of our time.”

Ravitch will return to Louisville in April to accept the 2014 University of Louisville Grawemeyer Award in Education for her 2010 book, “The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education.” The book, which appeared on the New York Times’ nonfiction bestseller list, chronicles Ravitch’s decades-long journey from reform advocate to critic and encourages schools to return to a curriculum that values art, literature, creativity and problem-solving.

World War One: 10 interpretations of who started WW1

As nations gear up to mark 100 years since the start of World War One, academic argument still rages over which country was to blame for the conflict. Here 10 leading historians give their opinion.

Sir Max Hastings - military historian  Germany

No one nation deserves all responsibility for the outbreak of war, but Germany seems to me to deserve most. It alone had power to halt the descent to disaster at any time in July 1914 by withdrawing its “blank cheque” which offered support to Austria for its invasion of Serbia.

I’m afraid I am unconvinced by the argument that Serbia was a rogue state which deserved its nemesis at Austria’s hands. And I do not believe Russia wanted a European war in 1914 - its leaders knew that it would have been in a far stronger position to fight two years later, having completed its rearmament programme.

The question of whether Britain was obliged to join the European conflict which became inevitable by 1 August is almost a separate issue. In my own view neutrality was not a credible option because a Germany victorious on the continent would never afterwards have accommodated a Britain which still dominated the oceans and global financial system.

Sir Richard J Evans - Regius professor of history, University of Cambridge  Serbia

Serbia bore the greatest responsibility for the outbreak of WW1. Serbian nationalism and expansionism were profoundly disruptive forces and Serbian backing for the Black Hand terrorists was extraordinarily irresponsible. Austria-Hungary bore only slightly less responsibility for its panic over-reaction to the assassination of the heir to the Habsburg throne.

France encouraged Russia’s aggressiveness towards Austria-Hungary and Germany encouraged Austrian intransigence. Britain failed to mediate as it had done in the previous Balkan crisis out of fear of Germany’s European and global ambitions - a fear that was not entirely rational since Britain had clearly won the naval arms race by 1910.

Bosnian Serb Gavrilo Princip assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria

The generally positive attitude of European statesmen towards war, based on notions of honour, expectations of a swift victory, and ideas of social Darwinism, was perhaps the most important conditioning factor. It is very important to look at the outbreak of the war in the round and to avoid reading back later developments - the German September Programme for example (an early statement of their war aims) - into the events of July-August 1914.

Dr Heather Jones - associate professor in international history, LSE  Austria-Hungary, Germany and Russia

A handful of bellicose political and military decision-makers in Austria-Hungary, Germany and Russia caused WW1. Relatively common before 1914, assassinations of royal figures did not normally result in war. But Austria-Hungary’s military hawks - principal culprits for the conflict - saw the Sarajevo assassination of the Austro-Hungarian Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife by a Bosnian Serb as an excuse to conquer and destroy Serbia, an unstable neighbour which sought to expand beyond its borders into Austro-Hungarian territories. Serbia, exhausted by the two Balkan wars of 1912-13 in which it had played a major role, did not want war in 1914.

Broader European war ensued because German political and military figures egged on Austria-Hungary, Germany’s ally, to attack Serbia. This alarmed Russia, Serbia’s supporter, which put its armies on a war footing before all options for peace had been fully exhausted.

This frightened Germany into pre-emptively declaring war on Russia and on Russia’s ally France and launching a brutal invasion, partly via Belgium, thereby bringing in Britain, a defender of Belgian neutrality and supporter of France.  

(Continued on page 13)
John Rohl - emeritus professor of history, University of Sussex  
*Austria-Hungary and Germany*

WW1 did not break out by accident or because diplomacy failed. It broke out as the result of a conspiracy between the governments of imperial Germany and Austria-Hungary to bring about war, albeit in the hope that Britain would stay out.

After 25 years of domination by Kaiser Wilhelm II with his angry, autocratic and militaristic personality, his belief in the clairvoyance of all crowned heads, his disdain for diplomats and his conviction that his Germanic God had predestined him to lead his country to greatness, the 20 or so men he had appointed to decide the policy of the Reich opted for war in 1914 in what they deemed to be favourable circumstances.

Germany’s military and naval leaders, the predominant influence at court, shared a devil-may-care militarism that held war to be inevitable, time to be running out, and - like their Austrian counterparts - believed it would be better to go down fighting than to go on tolerating what they regarded as the humiliating status quo. In the spring of 1914, this small group of men in Berlin decided to make “the leap into the dark” which they knew their support for an Austrian attack on Serbia would almost certainly entail.

The fine-tuning of the crisis was left to the civilian chancellor Theobald von Bethmann Hollweg, whose primary aim was to subvert diplomatic intervention in order to begin the war under the most favourable conditions possible. In particular, he wanted to convince his own people that Germany was under attack and to keep Britain out of the conflict.

Gerhard Hirschfeld - professor of modern and contemporary history, University of Stuttgart  
*Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia, France, Britain and Serbia*

Long before the outbreak of hostilities Prussian-German conservative elites were convinced that a European war would help to fulfil Germany’s ambitions for colonies and for military as well as political prestige in the world. The actual decision to go to war over a relatively minor international crisis like the Sarajevo murder, however, resulted from a fatal mixture of political misjudgement, fear of loss of prestige and stubborn commitments on all sides of a very complicated system of military and political alliances of European states.

In contrast to the historian Fritz Fischer who saw German war aims - in particular the infamous September Programme of 1914 with its far-reaching economic and territorial demands - at the core of the German government’s decision to go to war, most historians nowadays dismiss this interpretation as being far too narrow. They tend to place German war aims, or incidentally all other belligerent nations’ war aims, in the context of military events and political developments during the war.

Dr Annika Mombauer - The Open University  
*Austria-Hungary and Germany*

Whole libraries have been filled with the riddle of 1914. Was the war an accident or design, inevitable or planned, caused by sleepwalkers or arsonists? To my mind the war was no accident and it could have been avoided in July 1914. In Vienna the government and military leaders wanted a war against Serbia. The immediate reaction to the murder of Franz Ferdinand on 28 June 1914 was to seek redress from Serbia, which was thought to have been behind the assassination plot and which had been threatening Austria-Hungary’s standing in the Balkans for some time. Crucially, a diplomatic victory was considered worthless and “odious”. At the beginning of July, Austria’s decision-makers chose war.

But in order to implement their war against Serbia they needed support from their main ally Germany. Without Germany, their decision to fight against Serbia could not have been implemented. The Berlin government issued a “blank cheque” to its ally, promising unconditional support and putting pressure on Vienna to seize this golden opportunity. Both governments knew it was almost certain that Russia would come to Serbia’s aid and this would turn a local war into a European one, but they were willing to take this risk.

Germany’s guarantee made it possible for Vienna to proceed with its plans - a “no” from Berlin would have stopped the crisis in its tracks. With some delay Vienna presented an ultimatum to Serbia on 23 July which was deliberately unacceptable. This was because Austria-Hungary was bent on a war and Germany encouraged it because the opportunity seemed perfect. Victory still seemed possible whereas in a few years’ time Russia and France would have become invincible. Out of a mixture of desperation and over-confidence the decision-makers of Austria-Hungary and Germany unleashed a war to preserve and expand their empires. The war that ensued would be their downfall.

Sean McMeekin - assistant professor of history at Koc University, Istanbul  
*Austria-Hungary, Germany, Russia, France, Britain and Serbia*

It is human nature to seek simple, satisfying answers, which is why the German war guilt thesis endures today. Without Berlin’s encouragement of a strong Austro-Hungarian line against Serbia after Sarajevo - the “blank cheque” - WW1 would clearly not have broken out. So Germany does bear responsibility.

But it is equally true that absent a terrorist plot launched in Belgrade the Germans and Austrians would not (Continued on page 14)
have faced this terrible choice. Civilian leaders in both Berlin and Vienna tried to “localise” conflict in
the Balkans. It was Russia’s decision - after Petersburg received its own “blank cheque” from Paris - to Europeanise the Austro-Serbian
showdown which produced first a European and then - following Britain’s entry - world conflagration. Russia, not Germany, mobilised
first.

The resulting war, with France and Britain backing Serbia and Russia against two Central Powers, was Russia’s desired outcome, not
Germany’s. Still, none of the powers can escape blame. All five Great Power belligerents, along with Serbia, unleashed Armageddon.

Prof Gary Sheffield - professor of war studies, University of Wolverhampton Austria-Hungary and
Germany

The war was started by the leaders of Germany and Austria-Hungary. Vienna seized the opportunity presented by the assassination
of the archduke to attempt to destroy its Balkan rival Serbia. This was done in the full knowledge that Serbia’s protector Russia was
unlikely to stand by and this might lead to a general European war.

Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph I and Germany’s Kaiser Wilhelm II were allies

Germany gave Austria unconditional support in its actions, again fully aware of the likely consequences. Germany sought to break up
the French-Russian alliance and was fully prepared to take the risk that this would bring about a major war. Some in the German elite
welcomed the prospect of beginning an expansionist war of conquest. The response of Russia, France and later Britain were reactive
and defensive.

The best that can be said of German and Austrian leaders in the July crisis is that they took criminal risks with world peace.

Dr Catriona Pennell - senior lecturer in history, University of Exeter Austria-Hungary and Germany

In my opinion, it is the political and diplomatic decision-makers in Germany and Austria-Hungary who must carry the burden
of responsibility for expanding a localised Balkan conflict into a European and, eventually, global war. Germany, suffering from
something of a “younger child” complex in the family of European empires, saw an opportunity to reconfigure the balance of power in
their favour via an aggressive war of conquest.

On 5 July 1914 it issued the “blank cheque” of unconditional support to the crumbling Austro-Hungarian Empire (trying to reassert
dominance over the rebellious Serbia), despite the likelihood of this sparking war with Russia, an ally of France and Great Britain.
However, Austria-Hungary’s actions should not be ignored. The ultimatum it issued to Serbia on 23 July was composed in such a way
that its possibility of being accepted was near impossible. Serbia’s rejection paved the way for Austria-Hungary to declare war on 28
July, thus beginning WW1.

David Stevenson - professor of international history, LSE Germany

The largest share of responsibility lies with the German government. Germany’s rulers made possible a Balkan war by urging Austria-
Hungary to invade Serbia, well understanding that such a conflict might escalate. Without German backing it is unlikely that Austria-
Hungary would have acted so drastically.

They also started wider European hostilities by sending ultimata to Russia and France, and by declaring war when those ultimata were
rejected - indeed fabricating a pretext that French aircraft had bombed Nuremberg.

Finally, they violated international treaties by invading Luxemburg and Belgium knowing that the latter violation was virtually certain
to bring in Britain. This is neither to deny that there were mitigating circumstances nor to contend that German responsibility was sole.

Serbia subjected Austria-Hungary to extraordinary provocation and two sides were needed for armed conflict. Although the Central
Powers took the initiative, the Russian government, with French encouragement, was willing to respond.

In contrast, while Britain might have helped avert hostilities by clarifying its position earlier, this responsibility - even disregarding the
domestic political obstacles to an alternative course - was passive rather than active.

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-26048324
Rewriting the Gettysburg Address


Abraham Lincoln did not give the Gettysburg Address on Nov. 19, 1863 — at least, not the one engraved on the Lincoln Memorial, the one memorized by millions the world over. Lincoln actually wrote the words recognized today as the Gettysburg Address months after the cemetery dedication, during a full and complete revision of his speech that he finished in February 1864. Lincoln’s revisions added about 14 percent more words to his original delivery text, the so-called Nicolay Draft, adding several key passages. But no addition was more important than the words “under God”: Lincoln had spoken those words, and others that were not in the delivery manuscript, in the inspiration of the moment, when he stood on the speaker’s platform and dedicated the nation to “a new birth of freedom.”

Influential observers, from Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to the editors of Harper’s Weekly, had immediately recognized the beauty and power of Lincoln’s speech as it was reported in the press. Soon it was being recited at funerals and quoted in political speeches, and the next year it began to appear in schoolbooks and handbooks of rhetoric. Even the featured speaker at the ceremony, Edward Everett, whose underappreciated speech was overshadowed by the president’s short address, later praised Lincoln’s words. Lincoln later told his old friend James Speed “that he had never received a compliment he prized more highly.”

Yet, the attention given his speech created a problem for Lincoln. In late January 1864, Everett asked Lincoln for “the manuscript of your dedicatory remarks,” so that it could be sold at a charity fair. Sending the delivery text would, however, publicize a text that differed markedly from the newspaper reports. According to Lincoln’s secretary John Nicolay, who was directly involved, “Lincoln saw” that the newspaper accounts of his spoken words were “imperfect,” but also that, when compared with those reports and with his own recollection of what he had said, the delivery manuscript “seemed incomplete.”

Lincoln’s difficulty is our fortune, however, because rather than choose one text or the other, Lincoln created a new, revised version to send to Everett. The great care Lincoln took in creating the revised “Everett” version reveals that he recognized that this speech, these words, had undeniable power and meaning at that crucial moment in the Civil War.

Lincoln’s first step in creating this new version was to write out a copy, not of his delivery manuscript, but of one of the published accounts of the words he had reportedly spoken. This was a sign that, for Lincoln, the additions and changes that he made while speaking at the ceremony were vital elements of his evolving thought, building and enlarging upon the foundation provided by the delivery text. The published version of his words that Lincoln chose as the foundation text of his revision was close at hand: it was the version in the “authorized” report on the Gettysburg ceremony published by Edward Everett, which was in turn essentially a reprinting of the version originally published in The New York Tribune the day after the dedication. Everett had sent the “authorized” edition to Lincoln within a day or two of his request for “the manuscript” of Lincoln’s remarks, and Lincoln mentioned having it in his cover letter for the revised manuscript that he sent to Everett dated Feb. 4, 1864.

Lincoln’s handwritten copy included a few changes and is known as the “Hay Draft” in honor of Lincoln’s secretary John Hay. For over a century the “Hay” text puzzled and confused those seeking to understand how Lincoln wrote the Gettysburg Address, and over the years it has been held up as the first draft, the delivery text, or even a souvenir copy made for John Hay. But it seems certain now that Lincoln wrote and edited the “Hay” when he first set about reconciling the delivery manuscript and the reports of his spoken words.

In the second stage of revision, working from the basis of the edited “Hay” copy, Lincoln wrote a new, clean manuscript to send to Everett that included additional, mainly stylistic, changes. Expressing Lincoln’s choice of his spoken words as the foundation for his revisions, the final “Everett” revised manuscript incorporated his spoken “under God” in the passage of his delivery text that had originally read, “that the nation, shall have a new birth of freedom.”

Lincoln’s revised manuscript also retained other spoken innovations, like twice repeating, with slight variation, the phrase that in the delivery text read, “It is rather for us, the living.” This allowed Lincoln to retain in the revised “Everett” text a wholly new phrase he had added while speaking — “… be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have thus far so nobly carried on” — in addition to the single phrase of his manuscript delivery text, “… be dedicated to the great task remaining before us.” Five times, Lincoln’s delivery manuscript used variations of the word “dedicated,” and Lincoln made sure that his revised version incorporated his sixth, spoken use of the word, affirming and reaffirming his own commitment, and ours, to the “the great task” and to “the unfinished work” of preserving and extending the promise of a nation born in the struggle for freedom and equality.

But Lincoln’s revised “Everett” manuscript also reverted to the wording of his original delivery manuscript at some points where it differed from the published accounts of what he had reportedly said. Most important, the revised version included the words “… and that government of the people, by the people, for the people” that are found in the delivery text, even though the reports of his spoken words all included “and” for the people.

Similarly, reports of his spoken words agree that Lincoln twice repeated the words “we are met,” but in the revised manuscript Lincoln returned to the wording of the original “Nicolay” delivery text, which has instead “we are met” and “we have come.” Lincoln’s choices here and in other examples underscore the extent to which, throughout both the composition and the revision of his speech, he sought to combine both sound and sense, poetry and policy, in words he knew were widely considered both meaningful and beautiful.

The extent of the changes to the original delivery manuscript, even months after the event, reveals that Lincoln (Continued on page 16)
himself was striving toward a clearer understanding of his vision of the Civil War, and of the American experiment that he had expressed on that brilliant November day. Abraham Lincoln did give a speech at the Gettysburg cemetery on Nov. 19, 1863, but it was Lincoln’s revisions after returning to Washington, and our own national re-vision and renewal of the ideals he proclaimed, that continue to give us our Gettysburg Address.


Martin P. Johnson is assistant professor of history at Miami University and the author of “Writing the Gettysburg Address,” the co-winner of the 2014 Gilder Lehrman Lincoln Prize.

http://opinionatorblogs.nytimes.com/2014/02/21/rewriting-the-gettysburg-address/?_php=true&_type=blogs&ref=opinion&_r=0

Validate your scholars’ achievements in a new way…

Start a Rho Kappa Chapter Today!

RHO KAPPA National Social Studies Honor Society is the only national organization for high school juniors and seniors that recognizes excellence in the field of social studies. Membership in RHO KAPPA is an honor bestowed upon students by a local chapter for accomplishments in social studies and overall academic achievement. Any accredited high school can apply to start a chapter, through which students will be inducted into the RHO KAPPA Social Studies Honor Society.

For more information visit rhokappa.socialstudies.org or call 301-588-1800 x 107 or e-mail at rhokappa@ncss.org.

“The Things They Taught: English Teachers, Social Studies Teachers, and the Vietnam War”

• Thursday, April 10, 4:00 pm-8:00 pm, CCSU
• Prof. John Tully, co-editor of Understanding and Teaching the Vietnam War, and Prof. Steve Ostrowski of CCSU’s Department of English

Ever wonder what they talk about in your students’ English class about the Vietnam War? Want to work with a colleague in English to create a dynamic unit on the Vietnam War? This is for you!

For information, email John Tully at tullyj@ccsu.edu.

IMPORTANT TEACHER-TRAINING & TRAVEL SUPPORT NEWS:

2014 STUDY CANADA

Summer Institute for K-12 Educators – A Capital View of Canada: Nations within a Nation

June 26-July 1, 2014 in Ottawa, ON (3N) and Montréal, QC (2N), Canada

$600 Registration Cost – Travel Support Available

Visit: http://www.k12studycanada.org/scsi.html

Registration is now open to participate in “STUDY CANADA“, a 3 quarter credit/40 clock hour professional development course offered by Western Washington University that provides teachers with an excellent foundation for teaching about our northern neighbor. For the past 35 years, teachers, librarians, social studies supervisors and education faculty from across the U.S. have attended this renowned program to develop a better understanding of Canada, gain global perspectives of civic issues, and receive numerous resources for curriculum development.

The program’s subtitle, “A Capital View of Canada: Nations within a Nation”, reflects the 6-day workshop’s special focus on multiculturalism and its location in Canada’s capital, Ottawa, and the country’s second largest city, Montréal. Participants will not only learn from distinguished faculty and government officials but also experience Canada’s culture, history and environment through unique activities not possible through regular tourism.

The registration cost includes tuition for credits/clock hours (if needed), instruction, 5 nights’ hotel accommodation, breakfast daily, most course activities and one-way transportation from Ottawa to Montréal, Quebec.

The draft agenda, a detailed program guide and feedback as well as photos from previous workshops can be viewed online. To register, simply download the registration form and mail it with full payment to Western Washington University as instructed online. Check your eligibility for a $200 travel award as well and, once you have registered, apply separately as instructed.

Contact tina.storer@wwu.edu for a personal response to program and financial support inquiries.
Choices Program - Brown University

Turkey: Exploring Current Challenges
Brown University, Providence, RI
July 7-11, 2014
Using the Choices Program’s forthcoming curriculum unit on modern Turkey as the content focus, participants will examine instructional strategies for engaging secondary students in the study of contested international issues, share best practices with other dedicated and innovative teachers, and explore methods for conducting effective professional development.
For application, see [http://choices.edu/pd/institutes/institute-2014.php](http://choices.edu/pd/institutes/institute-2014.php)

Thinking Geographically about International Issues
Brown University, Providence, RI
June 24-27, 2014
Secondary-level geography teachers, as well as teachers who incorporate a significant amount of geography in their teaching, are invited to apply to the 2014 Geography Leadership Institute. The content focus will be *China on the World Stage: Weighing the U.S. Response*. Participants will use a geographic lens to explore multiple viewpoints on issues that top U.S.-China relations in the twenty-first century.

Understanding Fiscal Responsibility
Here at Teachers College Columbia University, through a grant from the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, and led by Professor Anand Marri, a group of faculty members and graduate students have developed a curriculum about the federal budget, national debt and budget deficit called **Understanding Fiscal Responsibility**.
The 24 free lessons from the curriculum connect students to the current public policy dilemmas about the federal budget, national debt, and budget deficit that confront the United States and its citizens. These 1-2 day lessons are not interdependent and are appropriate for students ranging from grades 9–12 in Civics/Government, Economics, U.S. History/Geography, World History/Global Studies/Geography, and Mathematics.

The lessons engage students in these critical dilemmas and include the resources students will need to deepen their understanding of the complex issues the dilemmas raise.
The curriculum is nonpartisan and invites participants from all points of view to ask:

- What do the decisions we make about the federal budget, national debt, and budget deficit say about who we are as a people?
- How should we address our nation’s fiscal challenges now and in the future to assure that our decisions are consistent with our values and traditions?

On the curriculum’s website, educators can create an account to download all the lessons, its respective resources and supporting documents. Additionally, with a UFR account, educators can create a site for their classroom in the UFR Network ([teachufr.org/network](http://teachufr.org/network)).

Demetri S. Lales, Innovation Fellow
Edlab | Teachers College, Columbia University  dl2577@columbia.edu  646-732-4558

National WWII Museum Monthly Education eNEWSLETTER
The National WWII Museum’s Education Department sends out a monthly eNEWSLETTER, *Calling all Teachers*, which highlights our curriculum and programs, including our award winning Virtual Field Trips, traveling artifact trunks, primary source materials and lesson plans and other great teacher and student resources (including an essay contest for middle and high school students with monetary prizes).
Laura Sparaco, K-12 Curriculum Coordinator
The National WWII Museum
945 Magazine Street  New Orleans, LA 70130
Phone (504) 528-1944, ext. 264  Fax: (504) 527-6088  [http://www.nationalww2museum.org/](http://www.nationalww2museum.org/)
The Rochester Reform Trail

Greetings from Rochester, New York! The Rochester Reform Trail is a National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Landmarks of American History and Culture Workshop for K-12 School Teachers, hosted by the College at Brockport, State University of New York, and the State University of New York Research Foundation. We are hosting two week-long workshops in July of 2014 exploring the antebellum reform movement. Landmark visits include an Erie Canal packet-boat cruise; field trips to Seneca Falls Women’s Rights Historic National Park, the Susan B. Anthony House and Museum, and local sites associated with long-time Rochester resident Frederick Douglass (including Frederick Douglass and Susan B. Anthony’s gravesites at Mt. Hope Cemetery). NEH summer scholars receive a stipend to offset travel and accommodation expenses. Please see the website below for more information. Hope you will join us!

See our webpage: https://www.brockport.edu/rocreformtrail
Like us on Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/RochesterReformTrail
Follow us on Twitter: https://twitter.com/RochesterReform
Jose Torre Associate Professor of History The College at Brockport http://www.brockport.edu/rocreformtrail/index.html

Concordia International School

Concordia International School Shanghai offers a unique educational opportunity. Two high school teacher/student pairs will be selected to take part in a travel-study program examining key events of 19th and 20th century China. The travel-study program visits Shanghai, Nanjing, and Changsha to examine leadership in many forms, including the Taiping Rebellion, Sun Yat-sen’s revolution, the development of the Chinese Communist Party, the role of Shanghai in China’s re-emergence, and much more. Participants will meet with local students to discuss history, culture, and current events.

The focus of the trip aligns with the National History Day’s 2014-2015 theme “Leadership and Legacy in History,” providing students a unique opportunity to create an NHD project. Additionally, university credit is available through the University of Wisconsin system. Eligibility: This opportunity is available to High School Students and Teachers (Prior knowledge of Chinese history or language is not required); if you are not a high school teacher, please pass this opportunity on to your colleagues. Trip dates: September 18 - 27, 2014 Application Deadline: April 7, 2014 Costs: Concordia International School Shanghai will pay for all trip-related expenses within China; participants selected to take part are responsible for travel arrangements and costs to get to and from Shanghai. Contact: historycontest@concordiashanghai.org For more information on this opportunity, the application process and past study trips, please visit: https://www.concordiashanghai.org/parents/high-school/history-

Dream of a Nation

The Dream of a Nation free & open-sourced book and materials provide key information for teachers and students which address the most pressing issues of our time including: citizen engagement, waging peace, getting beyond partisanship, conservation and environmental stewardship, constructive media, ending poverty, strengthening community, and much more. This content, authored by visionaries who tackle these issues today, offer viable solutions that engage students in issues that matter to them in a constructive way.

The book and materials are geared for grades 8-12 and are filled with diagrams, pictures and charts that encourage visual literacy in economics, civics and math, as well as narratives which deepen social and historical understanding. The resources available on our website (http://dreamofanation.org/educators) include ready to implement lesson plans, standards alignment material, and discussion guides for the book as well as links for students to get involved. Dream of a Nation is available in totality in the Solutions gallery on our website. Hard-copies are available as well. Let me know if you would like a copy.

Eliza Volk, Dream of a Nation Outreach Coordinator
Eliza@dreamofanation.org | (914) 494-6527

Smithsonian American Art Museum

Summer Institutes: Teaching the Humanities through Art
June 23 - 27 and July 28 - August 1, 2014
Calling all social studies, history, and English/language arts teachers!

We are now accepting applications for our 2014 Summer Institutes: Teaching the Humanities through Art. These week-long institutes offer an exciting opportunity to explore connections between American art and your curricula with colleagues from across the country. We welcome applications from core subject teachers for grades 6 - 12 as individuals or as part of a team. Priority will be given to social studies, history, and English/language arts teachers.

The deadline to apply is Monday, March 31, 2014. For more information about the Institute and the application, visit: http://americanart.si.edu/education/dev/institutes/.
Registration is $200 per participant. Graduate credits, scholarships, and low-cost housing accommodations are available. Questions? Please email AmericanArtInstitutes@si.edu or call 202-633-8387.
NCTA Summer Institutes
Announcing NCTA 2014 Summer Institutes on University of Colorado Campus. The Program for Teaching East Asia announces two NCTA-sponsored summer institutes, one for elementary and one for secondary teachers. Each institute is limited to 20 eligible teachers to be chosen through a selective application process. Participants will receive travel allowance, room and board, materials, and stipend.

Citizens, Society & the State: Adaptation and Transformation in Contemporary China
July 7-11, 2014. Application deadline: March 21, 2014. This four-day residential program will examine the rapidly changing social and political dynamics of contemporary China, with special attention to the emerging roles of citizens, including ways in which individuals and groups respond to and enable social and political change through protests, political participation, and self-organization. See complete details and application at http://www.colorado.edu/cas/tea/ncta/downloads/China_SI14_online_app.pdf.

Texts and Contexts: Teaching Japan through Children’s Literature,
June 22-26, 2014. Application deadline: March 14, 2014. Using children’s literature, elementary teachers can guide students in explorations of other cultures while helping them develop literacy skills and knowledge of their world. This institute for K-5 teachers will introduce several exemplary works of children’s literature as building blocks for teaching an integrated unit on Japan. Participants will have a unique opportunity to work with scholars of Japanese culture and children’s literature. See complete details and application at http://www.colorado.edu/cas/tea/ncta/downloads/TCJPSI2014appfillable.pdf.

Supreme Court Summer Institute
Street Law, Inc., and the Supreme Court Historical Society will sponsor two sessions of the annual Supreme Court Summer Institute, June 19-24, 2014, and June 26-July 1, 2014. The Institute is open to secondary-level social studies teachers and supervisors, who will spend six stimulating days on Capitol Hill and inside the Supreme Court learning about the Court, its past and current cases, and how to teach about them from top Supreme Court litigators and educators. Participants will also be in the Court to hear the justices announce the final decisions of the term and attend a private reception at the Court. The application deadline is March 17, 2014. Learn more, http://www.streetlaw.org/en/events/CalendarEvent/113/2014_Supreme_Court_Summer_Institute_for_Teachers, or contact kenneth.relihan@doe.nh.gov

Professional Opportunities

American Antiquarian Society
Suffragists, Teetotalers, and Abolitionists: Social Reform in the Nineteenth Century
Lead scholar: Thomas Augst, New York University
In this workshop, participants will learn about the wide array of social reform movements that were so integral to nineteenth-century society with a special focus on temperance, abolition, and women’s rights. These three movements affected wide swaths of the American population and, while remaining distinct, often intersected in interesting ways. Thomas Augst will discuss his latest work on temperance lecturer John B. Gough and how nineteenth-century mass media impacted reformers and their causes. Gough, one of the most famous reformers of the nineteenth century, first took the pledge in Worcester and later resided in Boylston. This workshop will also feature materials by and about Abby Kelley Foster. Foster, also a resident of Worcester, was an extremely influential figure in both the antislavery and women’s rights movements. She was inducted into the National Women’s Hall of Fame in 2011. The American Antiquarian Society holds a significant collection of Kelley’s correspondence and papers and these, along with a collection from the Worcester Historical Museum, have now been digitized. These materials are available through AAS’s digital image archive, GIGI, at gigi.mwa.org/res/sites/AKFoster.
Saturday, March 29  9 a.m. - 3 p.m.
Cost: $65 AAS members and K-12 educators; $75 general admission
This includes morning refreshments, lunch, and educational materials.
Registration: http://www.americanantiquarian.org/hands-history-suffragists-teetotalers-and-abolitionists
Membership in CCSS entitles you to:

• Reduced Registration for the CCSS Fall Conference
• Reduced Registration for the Northeast Regional Conference for the Social Studies (NERC)
• Convenient access to the Yankee Post, the CCSS online newsletter
• Opportunity to apply for ‘mini-grants’ of up to $500 for innovative curriculum in social studies and other special projects
• Opportunity to meet colleagues and develop a network of professional friends and associates
• Ability to keep up-to-date with developments in the social studies.

If you have always wanted to become a member of NCSS, now is the time to act. New membership subscriptions to NCSS will also give you membership benefits from Connecticut Council for the Social Studies for one year—a $20 savings. This offer applies to only new NCSS Regular or new Comprehensive members only who send in their form to CCSS. Joint member benefits include:

• All CCSS benefits
• Regular and Comprehensive membership in NCSS includes a subscription to Social Education or Social Studies and the Young Learner
• NCSS Comprehensive membership also includes all bulletins published during the membership year.

Please complete membership form. Make checks payable to CCSS and mail this form to CCSS, P.O. Box 5031, Milford, CT 06460.

Name______________________________________email_________________________________
Home Address___________________________City_________________State_______Zip_____
School Name_____________________________________________________________
School Address__________________________City__________________State_______Zip_____
Home Phone_____________________Cell Phone________________Work Phone_________________
Position____________________________Level of Instruction_____________________________
Areas of Special Interest____________________________________________________________

CCSS Membership (July 1- June 30) NEW NCSS Membership
_____Regular $20 _____Regular* $69
_____Student $10 _____Comprehensive* $83
_____Retiree $10
*Choose one:
___Social Education
___Social Studies and the Young Learner