COMPETING CONCEPTIONS OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: THOMAS JESSE JONES AND CARTER G. WOODSON

PAULETTE PATTERSON DILWORTH

Educational result is even more necessary for the Negro than for the white, since the Negro's highly emotional nature requires for balance as much as possible in the concrete and definite.

-Thomas Jesse Jones

The extent to which such education has been successful in leading the Negro to think, which above all is the chief purpose of education, has merely made him more of a malcontent when he can sense the drift of things and appreciate the impossibility of success envisioning conditions as they really are.

-Carter G. Woodson

As the words of Thomas Jesse Jones and Carter G. Woodson suggest, the educational needs of African Americans were highly contested terrain, but were critical to improving the economic, social, and political status of blacks during the early decades of the twentieth century.[1] On the surface, the alternative perspectives of Jones, a European American, and Woodson, an African American, suggest that their educational concerns extended far beyond mere instruction. Jones argues that education should address what he viewed as the intrinsic emotional deficits of African Americans. Woodson's comments emphasize providing African Americans with the intellectual foundation needed to escape their status as second-class citizens; that is, he focused on structural rather than personal deficits. In general, contemporary education historians have shown that early twentieth-century African American and white scholars and educators, just as in the case of Jones and Woodson, differed significantly in their thinking about the social and educational needs of black people.[2]

In the first decades of the twentieth century, black scholars like Carter G. Woodson began to articulate a vision of African American education that emphasized survival and resistance rather than victimization and oppression. At the same time, white educators like Thomas Jesse Jones established and supported educational programs opposing that vision of resistance in favor of compliance and reinforcing the narrative of racial deficit rather than racial equivalency. Social studies literature shows that in the United States, education for democratic citizenship and education for social containment have held competing positions in the public school curriculum.[3] The latter conceptualization is based on assumptions of continuing second-class status for blacks and other disenfranchised groups. The various perspectives presented by social studies scholars provide useful information for understanding traditional approaches to curriculum and instruction.[4] However, without greater attention to the particularized citizenship education experiences of different groups, only a partial view of the persistence of racialized and discriminatory practices is presented.

In the United States, citizenship education has been heavily influenced by historically defined political and social contexts. Yet, social studies scholars and researchers writing about the origins of the social studies rarely focus on the context-distinctive nature of citizenship education and its implication for African Americans. Similarly, in that most education historians and social studies scholars have been Eurocentric in position and perspectives, the views of African Americans and other disenfranchised groups are silenced in much of the historical and contemporary research on citizenship education. One exception, in his influential study *The Education of Blacks in the South*, African American scholar James Anderson writes:

It is crucial for an understanding of American educational history, to recognize that within American democracy there have been groups of oppressed people and there have been essential relationships between popular education and the politics of oppression.[5]

By locating the education of African Americans in a broader historical context, whether in the South or North, Anderson's work reveals that the educational objective of white Americans was to maintain social control and order. Anderson argues that those objectives were shaped by the political and social ideologies of white educators and northern philanthropists. Similarly, William Watkins, in his historical inquiry *The White Architects of Black Education*, illustrates how black education, indeed public education, was organized and built upon the ideology of the emerging industrial capitalists.[6] In the United States, the prevailing racist ideology that served to structure education for African Americans can provide a stark portrait of the persistent tension-filled relationship between educating for full and equal participation and democracy and education based on blacks assuming a lesser citizenship role. The historical roots and meanings of these competing conceptions of democratic citizenship education have not been fully explored. Social studies historians substantiate that citizenship education is the most endorsed undertaking of public education in the United States, yet little research has focused on the complex history of African American citizenship education. In order to provide a more accurate portrait of citizenship education for blacks, it is important to examine conflicting historical educational perspectives.

In this article, I synthesize a collection of scholarship done by, and on, Thomas Jesse Jones and Carter G. Woodson as a source for understanding historical conceptions of citizenship education for African Americans. I contend that Jones and Woodson played central roles in constructing competing conceptions of citizenship education for African Americans. Woodson's scholarship served a broader political purpose that encouraged black people to recognize the existence of oppression in their lives and helped to clarify the kind of citizenship knowledge and skills that were needed to challenge their subordination. In contrast, the paternalistic and racist approach to African American citizenship education developed by Jones was neither aimed at their overcoming second class citizenship nor was it universally accepted by the black community. I conclude the article by discussing how the political and historical scope of Jones's and Woodson's work has much relevance to present-day discussions on education for citizenship in a pluralistic democracy. Although questions can be raised about the significance of examining such historical connections, I maintain that because of the continuing divide that exists concerning the ideals of democratic citizenship education, there is value in understanding the nature of this history. In this article, I focus on a critical period in the history of social studies education from the African American perspective.

Social studies scholars and historians tend to minimize the significance of the professional interactions that occurred between Jones, a white educator, and Woodson, an African American history scholar and educator. However, examinations of their biographies suggest that because of their professional activities, the two were destined to interact during the course of their work.[7] Jones is most often discussed in the context of his work in 1916 as Chairman of the Committee on Social Studies. He has been acknowledged as one of the founding fathers of the social studies. However, the connection of Jones's work to the citizenship education of African Americans is often overlooked. On the other hand, Woodson is usually discussed only in the context of his scholarship on African American history but not on citizenship education. Writers of contemporary historical inquiries in social studies rarely focus on the implications of Jones's and Woodson's scholarly activities or the educational agenda that defined citizenship education for African Americans. Social studies researchers tend to overlook the fact that the professional relationship between Jones and Woodson was defined by conflict. Nor do they attempt to understand how that tension, shaped by their conflicting views of African Americans, framed two different citizenship education perspectives.

Defining Education for Democratic Citizenship

Citizenship and citizenship education have been discussed widely in the social studies literature. Indeed, development of citizens may constitute the major rationale for social studies in the public and professional mind. However, social studies scholars and researchers continue to debate historical and normative definitions of citizenship and citizenship education. How these terms are defined depends upon the particular ideological stance. For example, conservative ideologies would likely emphasize compliance and conformity to laws and the Eurocentric protestant work ethic aspects of citizenship. Liberal ideologies might insist on developing a critical consciousness and promoting social activism among the masses, particularly with historically oppressed groups. How citizenship is defined, in relation to ideology, affects how citizenship education is approached in schooling.[8]

The history of United States citizenship is complex and includes a vision of both democratic and undemocratic traditions.[9] Rogers Smith, writing in his book *Civic Ideals,* questions whether true social equality was ever intended by the form of democracy that took root in the Unites States. According to Smith, distinct patterns of constitutional rules have always prevailed in determining the meaning of citizenship in the United States. Smith concludes that those patterns tend to reflect the institutionalized civic visions of dominant political elites. From the founding of the United States, the idea of citizenship has been a contested concept, with conflicting and contradictory meanings. For African Americans, those varied conceptions of citizenship have been restricted by legal and ideological interpretations of their social and political status in relation to European Americans.

Social studies scholars assert that the concept of citizenship education has generally been understood in terms of three perspectives on citizenship: cultural transmission, reflective inquiry into social science knowledge, and democratic transformation.[10] Each of these three approaches fosters a different aim of citizenship. Cultural transmission involves passive political participation, an uncritical acceptance of knowledge and government structures, and a commitment to loyalty and patriotism. Reflective inquiry into social science knowledge as an approach to citizenship education rests on the practice of uncritical exploration of traditional values and beliefs, and decisions about what knowledge is worth knowing, as determined by those in power positions. The democratic transformation approach attempts to engage people in the process of critical thinking, decision making, and social action so that they can improve the quality of their lives and their communities. Social studies scholars insist that this view rejects the cultural transmission and reflective inquiry into the social sciences approaches to citizenship as inadequate, because both methods tend to suggest that democracy is a fixed quality rather than an ongoing process for equality and social justice.[11]

For the purposes of this article, the author's preference is citizenship education which aligns with the democratic transformation approach and refers to an ongoing process by which individuals acquire the knowledge and skills needed to execute new forms of political behavior and socialization. This preference is consistent with other black educators and scholars who use thinking and writing as political acts, and recommend socializing African Americans toward a critical cultural consciousness and an oppositional cultural transmission stance regarding oppressive citizenship education that results in second class citizenship.

Background and Historical Context

The significance of the roles of Jones and Woodson in constructing competing conceptions of citizenship education must be understood within the historical context of their time. The following is an abbreviated discussion intended as background for understanding the political and social tensions and contradictions that defined the historical context for Jones and Woodson.

During the early decades of the twentieth century, African Americans were subjected to social, economic, and political oppression in the North and South. Following the Civil War and Abraham Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation, African Americans were restricted and isolated socially by Jim Crow laws in the South and de facto segregation and discrimination across the country. Significantly, the type of education that was "best suited" for African Americans was the focus of

discussions about the "race problem." For both black and white scholars, however, the "problem" was defined distinctively by each group. For example, in 1901, W.E.B. Du Bois writing in the *Souls of Black Folks* recounts the history of race relations after the Civil War, and calls "the Negro Problem" a "concrete test of the underlying principles of the great republic." At that time, Du Bois declared that white people are afraid to ask directly what they really want to ask, namely "How does it feel to be a problem?"[12] In the United States, African Americans were placed in the position of constantly evaluating the value of their political and social presence as well as their citizenship status.

Historians have outlined the relationship between education and the quest for social justice of the African American community.[13] Contemporary historical writings have established that in the early twentieth century, a number of African Americans engaged in vigorous debates about the kind of knowledge and skills needed by oppressed groups to shape their collective civic fates. In particular, a number of black activists, educators, and scholars including Mary McLeod Bethune, Anna Julia Cooper, W.E.B. Du Bois, Mary Church Terrell, Booker T. Washington, Carter G. Woodson, and others were thinking and writing about the educational needs of African Americans.[14] The views of these black activists and scholars supported a range of educational philosophies rooted in a social justice platform. Civic and community progress defined their educational agenda.[15] Foremost on their minds was the development of educational opportunities for the formation of black political leadership. In general, the political stance of African American educators and scholars tended to acknowledge the centrality of education in the social uplifting of black people. Throughout most historical accounts of teacher training, especially for civics education, the quests of African Americans for educational equality were framed around the struggle for racial uplift. African American scholars articulated a community ethos for citizenship education that was filtered through the lens of equality of opportunity and social justice. At the same time, there was not necessarily a consensus about how to facilitate racial uplift even among black educators. For instance, Du Bois advocated for a culturally grounded emancipatory educational experience that would yield tangible economic, social, and political power.[16] Like Du Bois, Woodson focused on the meaning of social justice for black people. In contrast, others like Booker T. Washington espoused the accommodationist ideology, meaning that blacks would advance by conforming to a cultural transmission form of citizenship education.

Education historians describe the efforts of pioneering African American educators to gain the participatory citizenship status they deserved.[17] Collectively, African American activists, educators, and scholars formed an intellectual counter-public who through their thinking and writing engaged whites and blacks in imagining a different citizenship status for African Americans. This history also reveals Northern and Southern European Americans' efforts to blatantly repress these education efforts and to disenfranchise African Americans.

Given this historical context, for African Americans, what conceptions of citizenship education were manifested in Jones's citizenship education program and Woodson's scholarly activities? In the next section, Jones's agenda for African American citizenship education and the relevance of Woodson's scholarship on black history in advancing a different vision will be discussed.

The Problem of Nation Building and Cultivating a History

The biographies of Jones and Woodson have been discussed broadly by social studies scholars and education historians. What evolves from those details suggest that both men possessed active minds and determined spirits.[18]

Education historians have established that the social studies curriculum developed by sociologist and theologian Thomas Jesse Jones (1873-1950) at Hampton Institute was designed to respond to the educational needs of freed slaves and their children.[19] In developing the social studies curriculum at Hampton, Jones focused on the educational mission of the school. Read together, the mission of Hampton and the goal of the social studies curriculum were intended to train future teachers to teach African American students to be better and more accepting civic workers. According to Jones, the goal of the social studies was to train the students to more accurately understand the world they were about to enter.[20]

Through the use of carefully selected textbooks, government published census materials, and their own lived experiences, Hampton students were being educated to teach in their own communities. Herbert Kliebard writes that this historical insight is an instructive moment in the history of African American education in the United States.[21] The goal of the Hampton social studies curriculum was to legitimate and perpetuate the status of African Americans as second-class citizens who would make up an obedient workforce. Stephen Correia examined Jones's work in detail and concluded that the Hampton social studies curriculum was not concerned with educating students to be "intelligent and participating members of society." Correia writes that "the ends of this course was to help to educate a group of future teachers who would, in turn, teach their students a passive, accepting type of citizen involvement in society."[22] The Hampton social studies curriculum focused on teaching students "what" to think as opposed to teaching them "how" to think. Essentially the Hampton social studies curriculum was void of intellectual criticism and thought and laid the foundation for teaching students to understand and accept their second-class citizenship status.

Michael Lybarger maintains that the social studies at Hampton "existed in the context of a debate between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois over the appropriate response of black people to discrimination and oppression by whites."[23] The Hampton social studies were the educational counterpart of Booker T. Washington's accommodationist strategies found in the curriculum at Tuskegee Institute. However, Du Bois and Washington were not alone in thinking about what knowledge and skills were suitable to the educational needs of African Americans. Carter G. Woodson emerged to become a distinctive voice in the African American intellectual, counter-public initiative to oppose educating African Americans to simply appreciate and accept second-class citizenship.

Despite the goals of the Hampton model, African Americans were able to move far beyond the expectation that they would learn to be willing and compliant citizens. Indeed, the history of African American education illustrates the irony of extraordinary triumph in the face of tremendous human tragedy. To some degree, African American educational and political thought and intellectual traditions contributed to a counter movement against education for second-class citizenship. A number of African American educators and intellectuals were eager to respond to the Hampton model of educational practices reflecting the values and interests defined by white men. At the same time, some white educators displayed a persistent tendency to be intolerant and dismissive of African American educators and scholars talking and writing about their own social and political interests. To counter white racist scholarship, Woodson asserted that the study of African American history was relevant to the educational needs of blacks and whites. As it will be illustrated, Woodson devoted his professional career to countering what he believed to be the "mis-education" of African Americans and whites.[24]

Woodson (1875-1950) was born in New Canton, Virginia. At the age of thirty-seven, Woodson received his Ph.D. from Harvard University under the direction of Edward Channing, professor of Ancient and Modern History. Although Woodson's academic credentials qualified him for "inside" status, racism and discrimination placed him on the "outside" of white male-dominated professional, historical associations.[25] Woodson taught at several African American institutions in the North and South. Eventually, becoming disillusioned by the academic politics, he abandoned teaching in higher education, vowing never to return. Woodson's skepticism of white leadership of African American education was reflected in a letter he wrote to Dr. Jesse E. Moorlan who was at that time Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and a member of the Board of Trustees at Howard University. Woodson wrote:

> You have the weakness for good-for-nothing white people because of your [broken-down] theory that in the Negro schools the best of two races may be united. This has never been true and will never be until the Negroes have made such progress as to be recognized as the equals of whites. Immediately after the Civil War teachers of the missionary spirit went South to elevate the Negro and their work was noble and glorious. These teachers, however, were not the best of the white race but having the task of merely laying the foundation most of them did well. This same group of teachers, fall now far below the standard for the reason that they cannot carry the Negroes forward into the broader realms of reconstructed education … for they are teachers of yesterday unknown to the work of scientifically trained instructors in charge of white schools. It is all but criminal, therefore, for educational authorities to impose such medieval misfits on Negro institutions

when these positions can be admirably filled by scientifically trained Negroes. As it now stands, you are largely responsible for subjecting the superior to the inferior.[26]

Quite clearly, Woodson believed that African Americans were best suited to carry out the aims of educating black people. He wrote:

When the Negro finished his course in one of our schools, he knows what others have done, but he has not been inspired to do much for himself. If he makes a success in life, it comes largely by accident …. The time has come for all Negro schools to be turned over to the Negroes.[27]

At some point, Woodson decided that his most likely chance for a professional career as a historian required that he develop a separate means for researching, writing, and publishing the history of African Americans. In 1915, Woodson formed the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) and later, in 1916, he established the *Journal for Negro History*.

Woodson described the purpose of the ASNLH to be the "scientific study of the neglected aspects of Negro life and history." Foremost, Woodson thought that the researching and teaching of African American history should serve a dual purpose. He maintained that African American history should help to shape the character and moralities of blacks and, at the same time, to provide the means to establish their legitimate presence in historical and contemporary settings. Woodson writes:

While the Association welcomes the cooperation of white scholars in certain projects…it proceeds also on the basis that its important objectives can be obtained through Negro investigators who are in a position to develop certain aspects of the life and history of the race which cannot be otherwise treated.[28]

In advocating for a medium to publish the history of African Americans, Woodson expressed the belief that:

What can be learned from current controversial literature, which either portrays the Negro as a persecuted saint or brands him as a leper of society, the people of this age are getting no information to show what the Negro has thought, felt, or done. The Negro is in danger of becoming a negligible factor in the thought of the world.[29]

Woodson along with other African American scholars hoped to use their scholarship to advance the social cause of black people. Jacqueline Goggin noted that without the *Journal* and annual meetings of the Association, few African American scholars would have had the opportunity to publish their work and articulate their ideas.[30]

To accomplish his goal, Woodson needed funding. Consequently, Woodson's efforts to secure funds for his work led him to cultivate relationships with several white philanthropists and officers of the Carnegie Foundation, the Julius Rosenwald Foundation, and the three Rockefeller Trusts—the Rockefeller Foundation, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, and the General Education Board. A number of Woodson biographers note that Woodson's relationship with these organizations was never truly pleasant.[31] Although these foundations provided much of the financial backing for his work, Woodson consistently refused to honor their wishes or suggestions. Like Du Bois and other black scholars who were writing and speaking out about the structure of African American education, Woodson understood that the proper education for oppressed groups had a critical purpose.

However, Woodson tended to overlook the political implications of his work and attempted to distance his efforts from the social and civil rights struggles of the African American community. Woodson thought that by becoming more involved politically, the objectivity of his scholarship would be compromised. Woodson referred to his scholarship as "The Cause."[32] He conceived it to be a public education program committed to historical accuracy and truth. Interestingly, Woodson did not acknowledge that writing and doing history is a political act and that "education was always and everywhere a political undertaking."[33] Clearly, Woodson's oppositional stance toward white leadership of African American education placed him in the political fray. These tensions over white leadership would grow even more intense for Woodson when his relationship with Jones was ended by political controversy.

Two Perspectives Collide: Jones and Woodson

Thomas Jesse Jones left Hampton Institute in 1909. Jones assumed a position with the United States Census Bureau where he was responsible for the Negro Census for 1910, and, from 1910 to 1913, taught sociology part-time at Howard University.

By 1912, Jones had developed a reputation as a leader in matters pertaining to the educational needs of African Americans. Although Jones worked for the federal government in the Bureau of Education, the Phelps-Stokes Fund paid his salary. It was during the time when Jones was associated with the Phelps-Stokes Fund that Woodson acted publicly to advance his ideas about white leadership in African American education.

Woodson's leadership of the ASNLH and the *Journal* was indicative of the strategic thinking and methods he used to accomplish his goal of creating and promoting scholarship about African Americans. Consequently, Woodson made appointments to the ASNLH board that included historians, educators, and wealthy and socially prominent whites. Woodson realized that in order to secure the necessary financial base to support his efforts he needed to maintain a "carefully selected and assiduously courted" relationship with white philanthropists. By 1912, Jones was serving as the Education Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and Woodson selected him to serve on the ASNLH Executive Council. However, at some point, Jones was not willing to play the subordinate role that Woodson defined for Council members. He questioned and criticized Woodson's inflexible control of the organization. Over time, a major controversy erupted between Jones and Woodson. By 1924, Woodson accused Jones of engaging in a campaign to discredit the work of the ASNLH. Woodson wrote a letter to the *Freeman* that was published on April 12, 1924. In that letter, Woodson alleged that Jones was attempting to interfere with the work of the ASNLH. Woodson writes:

> For five years, beginning in 1916, the Phelps-Stokes Fund gave our work annually $200, the usual amount they give agencies, not adequate to provide substantial aid, but sufficient to justify meddling.[34]

In retaliation for his removal from the Council, Jones publicly accused Woodson of restructuring the ASNLH "to place radicals in charge" and "to stir up prejudice rather than promote scientific study."[35] Darlene Clark Hines provides a clear sense of the controversy that erupted between Jones and Woodson; she writes:

> Woodson declared heatedly that "an investigation will show that Dr. Jones is detested by ninety-five percent of all Negroes who are seriously concerned with the uplift of their race. 'Furthermore, he asserted that blacks hated Jones because Jones was "the self-made white leader" of the Negroes, exercising the exclusive privilege of informing white people as to who is a good Negro and who is a bad one, what school is worthy of support and what not, and how the Negroes should be helped and how not.' Woodson justified the removal of Jones from the Executive Council as an act of political expediency, "it had become unpopular to retain him in that position."[36]

The controversy between Jones and Woodson resulted in the ASNLH losing the financial support of the Phelps-Stokes Fund and the Carnegie Corporation. In 1920, however, the ASNLH was appropriated $25,000 by the Carnegie Corporation.[37] Despite the loss of support from certain corporations, throughout the 1920s, the ASNLH and the *Journal* would continue to thrive. Woodson and his colleagues would publish scores of articles and books on African American culture and history.

A significant outcome of Woodson's efforts to establish the scientific study of African American history was the training and critical placement of many excellent black historians on the history and social science faculties of the major black educational institutions.[38] By training African American historians to challenge mainstream accounts of black history, Woodson's efforts helped to strengthen the rise of a black counter-public. Not only did Woodson challenge the mainstream of white thinking on African American history with the scholarship he published, but he also established an affirmative history of black people. Consequently, African American educators and historians were able to offer a different perspective, a challenge to the consensus view. Instead of focusing on how the African American quest for democratic citizenship might upset whites and disrupt the social order, this new perspective focused

on how an oppressed group might use history to critique the past and act to change the course of their history.

This section has illustrated how the tension that existed between Jones and Woodson was related to their conflicting perspectives on the educational needs of African Americans. As the connection between Jones and Woodson illustrates, that tension emerged because of black opposition to white leadership in making decisions about what knowledge and skills were most suited for educating African Americans.

Competing Conceptions of Citizenship Education

As we have seen, conceptions of citizenship education for African Americans have been defined by conflict and contradictions both in theory and among actual historical figures. During the early decades of the twentieth century, the meaning of citizenship education for African Americans was defined by the prevailing white ideology of second-class citizenship as well as the oppositional thought of a black intellectual counter-public. By using knowledge of African American history, the individual efforts of Woodson and his colleagues functioned to counter-socialize African Americans to assess their citizenship status.

What were the essential differences in the two conceptions of citizenship education emerging from Woodson's scholarship in African American history and the program Jones developed at Hampton Institute? As previously discussed, contemporary conceptions of citizenship education have been defined by social and political contexts. For African Americans, conceptions of citizenship education were defined by the Hampton model of cultural transmission originated by Jones and the oppositional approach of critical historical consciousness as democratic transformation advanced by Woodson.

Woodson's conception of citizenship was based on the premise that African American cultural traditions had historical value. In this vein, Woodson considered the study of history as critical to African American citizenship education. A general principle guiding Woodson's thinking was that a critical historical consciousness would contribute to civic competence.

Due in part to Woodson's vision, generations of African American educators and historians were disabused of notions of black inferiority and educated in the reality of their accomplishments. By acting upon his beliefs about the value of African Americans' history, Woodson demonstrated that education for democratic citizenship is embedded in helping people to think critically about the past and that they are not only free to read their history but also to make it as well. The Hampton model of cultural transmission developed by Jones set a much different goal, focusing on compliance and accommodation.

For African Americans during the early twentieth century, the socialization process was rooted in a political ideology of *accommodation* advanced by the work of Thomas Jesse Jones and Booker T. Washington.[39] The accommodationist philosophy was institutionalized in the form of an industrial education curriculum. Accommodationist thought dictated that African Americans accept the social order as it existed. That the educational philosophy and scholarship of an African American provided the perspective to frame the educational agenda for subjugated members of society is significant. However, with regard to citizenship education, what is more revealing is how some African American educators and scholars used their thinking and writing to resist the hegemony of whites.

Recently, political science scholars have focused on exploring ideology as a meaningful way of understanding African American political behavior and thinking.[40] Michael Dawson argues that, historically, political ideologies rooted in African American cultural and intellectual traditions have worked to challenge the premises of conventional American political thinking and actions. More importantly, this body of work shows that these understandings are tied to a history of African American intellectual tradition that can inform contemporary tactical thinking about education for democratic citizenship.[41] A closer examination of this work helps to explain how, historically, African Americans' counter-public has always operated beyond the reach of powerful whites, and that the work being done in that counter-public is distinct from the hegemonic work of the elite discourse.[42] As citizenship education historians and researchers, we must take a closer look at this counter-public if we are to fully understand

the complex dimensions of citizenship education and its relevance to African Americans and other disenfranchised groups. More important, contemporary citizenship education should focus not only on the rights and responsibilities of citizens but also on the meaning and conflicting interpretations that have shaped its history and practice in the United States.

NOTES

1. In this article, the author uses the terms *black* and *African American* interchangeably; I view each as a legitimate and accurate name for persons of African ancestry in the United States. Likewise, *European American* is used interchangeably with *white* and is viewed as a legitimate and accurate name for persons of European descent in the United States.

2. James Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

3. Michael Lybarger, "Origins of the Modern Social Studies: 1900–1916," *History of Education Quarterly* (Winter, 1983): 455–68. David W. Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 16–18.

4. Robert Barr, James Barth, and Samuel Shermis, *Defining the Social Studies* (Arlington: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977).

5. Anderson, 1.

6. William H. Watkins, *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865-1954* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001).

7. See for example, Stephen T. Correia, "For Their Own Good: An Historical Analysis of the Educational Thought of Thomas Jesse Jones" (Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1993); Biographical accounts of Carter G. Woodson are available from many sources. See for example, Darlene Clark Hine, "Carter G. Woodson, White Philanthropy and Negro Historiography," *The History Teacher* 19 (May 1986): 405–25.

8. David Kerr, "Citizenship Education: An International Comparison across Sixteen Countries," *The International Journal of Social Education* 17 (Spring/Summer 2002): 1.

9. Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

10. George W. Chilcoat and Jerry A. Ligon, "Developing Democratic Citizens: The Mississippi Freedom Schools as a Model for Social Studies Instruction," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22 (Spring 1994): 128–75.

11. Chilcoat and Ligon, 129. See also Walter Parker, "Toward Enlightened Political Engagement." in W. B. Stanley, ed., *Critical Issues in Social Studies Research* (Greenwich: Information Age, 2001), 97-118.

12. W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, "Strivings of the Negro People," *The Atlantic Monthly* (August 1897).

13. See for example, Anderson; Vanessa Siddle Walker, *Their Highest Potential: An African American School Community* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

14. V.P. Franklin, "'They Rose and Fell Together:' African American Educators and Community Leadership, 1795-1954," *Journal of Education* 172 (Spring 1990): 39-60.

15. Ronald E. Butchart, "Outhinking and Outflanking the Owners of the World: A Historiography of the African American Struggle for Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 28 (Autumn 1988): 333–66.

16. Derrick P. Aldridge, "Conceptualizing A Du Boisian Philosophy of Education: Toward A Model for African-American Education," *Educational Theory* 49 (Summer 1999): 359–79.

17. See for example, Anderson and Walker.

18. See for example, Correia, Watkins; and Jacqueline Goggin, "Countering White Racist Scholarship: Carter G. Woodson and the Journal of Negro History," *Journal of Negro History* 68 (Autumn, 1983).

19. Lybarger, 455–68.

20. Thomas Jesse Jones, *Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum* (Hampton: Hampton Institute Press, 1906; Reprint, *The Southern Workman*): 5–6.

21. Herbert Kliebard, "That Evil Genius of the Negro Race: Thomas Jesse Jones and Educational Reform," *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision* 10 (Fall 1994): 5–20.

22. Stephen Correia, "Thomas Jesse Jones—Doing God's Work and the 1916 Report," in Murray Nelson, ed., *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* (ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1994), 102–03.

23. Lybarger.

24. Carter G. Woodson, *The Mis-education of the Negro* (Washington: Associated Publishers, 1933).

25. Goggin, 355–75.

26. Sister Anthony Scally, "Phelps-Stokes Confidential Memorandum for the Trustees of the Phelps-Stokes Fund Regarding Dr. Carter G. Woodson's Attacks on Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones," *Journal of Negro History* 76 (Winter-Autumn, 1991): 57–59.

27. Woodson.

28. Goggin, 355–75.

29. Charles Harris Wesley, "Recollections of Carter G. Woodson," *Journal of Negro History* 83 (Spring, 1998): 143-49.

30. Goggin.

31. See for example, Goggin and Hine.

32. Examples of Woodson's use of the term "The Cause" are found in formal letters in the Benjamin G. Brawley Papers, the Archibald H. Grimke Papers, the Francis J. Grimke Papers, the Harriet Gibbs Marshall Papers, and the Carter G. Woodson Papers at Howard University.

33. Hine.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. Anderson.

40. Michael C. Dawson, *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

41. Melissa Harris-Lacewell, *Barbershops, Bibles, and B.E.T.: Everyday Black Talk and the Development of Black Political Thought* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, in press).

42. Dawson.