May 1985

Bases of Character Education in the United States, 1607-1983

Beverly L. White
East Tennessee State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

White, Beverly LaBelle

BASES OF CHARACTER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1607-1983

East Tennessee State University Ed.D. 1985

BASES OF CHARACTER EDUCATION
IN THE UNITED STATES
1607-1983

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Supervision and Administration

East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Beverly White

May, 1985

APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Graduate Committee of

BEVERLY LaBELLE WHITE

met on the

25th day of March, 1985.

The committee read and examined her dissertation, supervised her defense of it in an oral examination, and decided to recommend that her study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education.

Chairman, Graduate Committee

Edward J Dwyer

Floyd H. Edwards

J. Howard Bowers

Signed on behalf of the the Graduate Council

Richard A. Custer

Associate Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

BASES OF CHARACTER EDUCATION

IN THE UNITED STATES 1607-1983

by

Beverly LaBelle White

The purpose of this study was to determine some of the bases of character education in United States public schools from 1607 to 1983. Research was conducted concerning persons, organizations, and movements to determine bases for character education. Teaching materials representing a variety of philosophies were also studied.

The various bases of character education were grouped under four categories--religious, societal, specific traits, and individually determined. The history of each area was traced in a separate chapter. An attempt was made to include educators and materials representing various philosophies. The summary included some of the trends related to each base, major proponents, and materials.

It was concluded that society-based character education has been the most prominent, even among educators who claim to have other bases for their character education. Bible-based character education has also been prevalent, but less so in recent years. Independent thinking as a base for character education has increased in popularity in recent years but is often, in reality, based on society. The trait approach is an approach used mainly in relation to other bases.

It was also determined that character education in the United States has changed from mainly a biblical emphasis to more diversified bases. As society has become more pluralistic, a greater diversity of bases has become more acceptable. In addition, few educators adhere strictly to a single base. Most seem to combine bases in varying degrees to arrive at some sort of personalized base for their own philosophy of moral education.

Some recommendations for further research and study were given.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is greatly indebted to her doctoral committee for their support, encouragement, and advice given during her study. Special thanks is given to Dr. Charles Burkett, committee chairman, for his professionalism and ability to ask questions until the "bottom line" is reached.

The names of the many others who have helped with advice, materials, and encouragement could not be included, but to Wayne, Angela, and Candi I can only say, "Thank you for your love, support, and patience."

CONTENTS

Page

Page

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

". . . The youth may be piously educated in good manners. . . ."[1]

Development of character has been one of the major objectives of education in the United States throughout its history. The Puritans wanted their children to read the Bible so they could learn to live a virtuous life. George Washington spoke of morality and religion in his farewell address. One of the reasons stated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 for providing education was the maintenance of morality. Horace Mann, proponent of the common public school, also considered the school an important transmitter of Christian morals. Robert Church, writing in 1977, maintained that study of the history of American education revealed a cycle: public pressure on educators to teach a common morality, a reaction from a pluralistic society, attempts at "value-free intellectual training," and a return to pressure for a common morality.[2]

---

[1] One of the goals of William and Mary College, cited by Glen Chambers and Gene Fisher, United States History (Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1982), p. 79.

[2] Robert Church, "Moral Education in the Schools," in Morality Examined, eds. Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977), pp. 58-59.

The Problem

The problem was to determine some of the bases of character education in United States public schools from 1607 to 1983.

Importance of the Study

Character education has consistently been one of the important functions of the public school. In her study of nineteenth century textbooks, Ruth Miller Elson concluded that the main goal of those textbooks was "to train citizens in character and proper principles."[3] According to Marvin J. Taylor, in the 1960's many were expressing increased concern over the need for moral training in the school as schools were becoming more secular.[4] Even today, with emphasis on intellectualism and an apparent commitment to keep religion out of the schools, there is still pressure to include "moral education" in the school curriculum. In addition, public polls rank moral or character education near the top of lists of goals for the schools in periodic surveys.[5]

A preliminary study of the history of character education indicated a diversity of philosophies and methods, as well as disagreement concerning the relationship of religion and morality, including whether or not morality can even be taught. Current controversies over values

---

[3] Ruth Miller Elson, Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 1.

[4] Marvin J. Taylor, Religious and Moral Education (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), p. vii.

[5] Donald H. Peckenpaugh, "Moral Education: The Role of the School," in The School's Role as Moral Authority, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977), p. 32.

clarification, the Bible and prayer in the schools, and appropriateness of absolute standards only re-emphasize this lack of consensus.

The past often reveals much to persons attempting to solve problems of the present. A study of bases of character education will indicate what the focus has been in the past and should be a resource for present-day educators to develop programs for the future.

Significance of the Problem

In the Foreword to The Philosophy of Christian School Education, Tim LaHaye stated, ". . . morals, and character building are no longer a part of education. In fact, the public schools no longer major on education; they seem bent on demoralizing our youth."[6] In response James Braley wrote a set of character education materials, which he claimed were based on character traits found in the Bible, specifically for private Christian schools. Walter Fremont, in a personal interview, indicated he believed character education had evolved from being based on Bible principles, to patriotism, to character traits.[7] On the other hand, some modern educators criticized what they called the "moralizing" approach to the teaching of values[8] and the "modeling"

---

[6] Paul A. Kienel, ed. The Philosophy of Christian School Education (Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978), *n.p.*

[7] Personal interview with Walter Fremont, 15 February 1983.

[8] Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirchenbaum, Values Clarification (New York: A & W Visual Library, 1978), pp. 15-16.

approach,[9] preferring the "process of valuing"[10] based on work by Louis Raths.

Are these criticisms valid? Are the public schools responsible for a decline in the character of American young people? Although it is not the purpose of this paper to answer these questions, the information compiled should aid a better understanding of the problems and conflicts involved.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Character education, or lack of it, affects students.
2. Character education is an important function of the school.
3. Character education in the United States has had a number of bases, including Bible principles, successful living in society, character traits, and independent decision making.
4. This variance of bases is responsible for many of the conflicts over religion and morality in the public schools.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study were stated in the interrogative form:

1. What have been the most prominent bases of character education in the literature?

---

[9] Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, pp. 17-18.

[10] Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, p. 19.

2. Has character education in the United States changed from mainly a Biblical emphasis to more diversified bases?

Limitations

1. The study was limited to bases of character education in the United States public schools from 1607 to 1983 as indicated by a representative sample of available character education literature and materials.
2. The study did not include determination of which bases were correct or best.

Definitions of Terms

Bible Principles

Bible principles are guides for behavior which "distinguished between right and wrong according to what is stated in the Bible."[11]

Character

The character of a person is what he really is[12] as evidenced by his reactions to life's situations.[13]

Character Education

Character education is training in how to react to life's

---

[11] David L. Hocking, "The Theological Basis for the Philosophy of Christian School Education," in The Philosophy of Christian School Education, ed. Paul A. Kienel (Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978), p. 26.

[12] George Derr Beckwith, The American Home and Character Trends (Butler, Indiana: The Higley Press, 1941), p. 29.

[13] Walter G. Fremont and Jim R. Biddle, Teaching Bible Action Truths (Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1974), p. 4.

situations. For the purpose of this paper, character education refers to training within the formal school environment as contrasted with that given by the home, church, and society. It is understood, however, that character education in the school has been greatly influenced by the other institutions mentioned above.

Character Traits

Character traits are distinguishing qualities or characteristics which determine conduct,[14] such as honesty, dependability, or joy.

Moral Education

Moral education is training for the development of character. The term is often used as a synonym for character education.

Morality

For the purpose of this paper, morality is defined as "conformity to the rules of right conduct."[15] To some persons right conduct is determined by an absolute authority, while to others it is determined by the situation or the feelings of the individual.

MVE (Moral Values Education)

Moral Values Education is a general term for a philosophy of character education which attempts to make students independent in

---

[14] Mark A. May, "What Science Offers on Character Education Building Character (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 38-39.

[15] Joe Park and R. William Barron, "Can Morality Be Taught?" in Morality Examined, eds. Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977), p. 3.

their decision making. Some approaches included under this term are Values Clarification, Kohlberg's Moral Reasoning, and Beck's Reflective Values.[16]

Situation Ethics

Situation ethics is an attempt to set aside rigid moral standards by emphasizing the uniqueness of each situation; whether a decision is right or wrong is determined by the "terms of the specific situation" rather than by set guidelines or standards.[17]

Values

Values are beliefs, ideals, or "philosophy of life" upon which a group or persons base their actions.[18]

Valuing

Valuing is the process people use as they "come to hold certain beliefs and establish certain behavior patterns."[19] Louis Raths has been credited with formulating the approach.[20]

---

[16] Kathleen M. Gow, Yes Virginia, There Is Right and Wrong! (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980), pp. 69, 81.

[17] Arthur I. Melvin, "Cross-Cultural Moral Values," in Morality Examined, eds. Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977), pp. 46-47.

[18] Frances Cole McLester, Achieving Christian Character (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1927), p. 261.

[19] Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, p. 19.

[20] Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, p. 20.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into seven chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction to the problem, statement of the problem, importance of the study, significance of the problem, assumptions on which the study were based, and the hypotheses of the study. Also included in this chapter are the limitations of the study, definitions of terms, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 includes the procedures of the study.

In chapters 3 through 6 the bases of character education in the United States are presented, with each chapter concerned with a different base:

Chapter 3	Character Education Based on the Bible
Chapter 4	Character Education Based on Living in Society
Chapter 5	Character Education Based on Character Traits
Chapter 6	Character Education Based on Independent Decision Making

Chapter 7 includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER 2

Design of the Study

The problem of this study was to determine some of the bases of character education in the United States from 1607 to 1983. Preliminary interviews were conducted with Walter Fremont and Gene Elliot, both involved with character education research, who provided background information and suggested resources.

Since the history of character education is related to general educational history, preliminary research was conducted, based primarily on secondary sources, which provided an overview of both American educational history and the development of character education. This review, which aided in establishing a background for the study, was accomplished using reference volumes of the Charles E. Sherrod and Mack libraries, including Education Index, Dissertation Abstracts, card catalog, and published bibliographies.

A working bibliography of both primary and secondary sources was developed while conducting the preliminary study. Materials were then located through visits to numerous libraries, including those at East Tennessee State University, Bob Jones University, William and Mary College, Washington College Academy, the Citadel, Tennessee Temple University, the Chicago Public Library, and the Library of Congress.

During the preliminary study a list was compiled of Americans mentioned in the literature as having influenced character education.

Research was then conducted concerning the following persons to determine bases for character education: William Bradford, John Cotton, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, Michael Wigglesworth, William Penn, Lyman Beecher, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Noah Webster, Horace Bushnell, William Holmes McGuffey, Catharine Beecher, Catherine Maria Sedgwick, Robert Baird, Horace Mann, William E. Channing, H. Stanley Hall, Henry Barnard, William H. Ruffner, Charles de Garmo, William T. Harris, Frances Wayland Parker, William James, William H. Kilpatrick, Nicholas Butler, John Dewey, Harold O. Rugg, Milton Bennion, E. E. White, Clifford A. Barnes, George A. Coe, W. W. Charters, Hugh Hartshorne, Mark May, Edwin Starbuck, William Clayton Bower, Henry Emerson Fosdick, John S. Brubacher, Lawrence Kohlberg, Clive Beck, Louis Raths, Sidney B. Simon.

Resources considered pertinent and vital to this study included, but were not limited to, the following: legislation related to religion and the schools, Congressional discussion of the Bill of Rights, Horace Mann's twelve annual reports, NEA Proceedings since 1870, Education in the United States: A Documentary History, Engel v. Vitale, Abingdon School District v. Schempp.

Teaching materials considered pertinent and vital to this study included, but were not limited to, the following: hornbook, catechism, New England Primer, Webster's Speller, McGuffey Readers, courses of study developed during the 1900's, and MVE materials.

Interviews were conducted by telephone with Margaret Wolfe and the secretary of Norman Vincent Peale.

In his book Traditions of American Education, Lawrence Cremin traced the development of American education. According to Cremin, New England between 1607 and 1783 had a paideia (vision of life) commonly described as "early American Puritanism."[1] The 1830's and 1840's exemplified an American (Protestant) paideia in an attempt to create "a new republican individual of virtuous character, abiding patriotism, and prudent wisdom."[2] Later John Dewey promoted an educational philosophy based on reliance on the scientific method, resulting in an emphasis on pragmatism, and related to character education, scientific study of character traits and how to teach them. During the second half of the twentieth century, the scope of character education broadened to "valuing," with an emphasis on the self, the individual.

For the purpose of this paper, the various bases of education were grouped under four categories--religious, societal, specific traits, and individually determined. The bases determined by the research were delineated under these four categories, while the history of each area was traced in a separate chapter. An attempt was made to include educators representing various philosophies.

The summary includes some of the trends related to each base, major proponents, and materials.

---

[1] Lawrence Cremin, Traditions of American Education (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 19.

[2] Cremin, p. 49.

Chapter 3

Character Education Based on the Bible

In the Bible God charged parents with the responsibility of teaching their children appropriate behavior:

> And thou shalt teach them [God's commands] diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.[1]

For most of history, character education based on the Bible was attempted through moralizing, appeal to reasons, and indoctrination. Americans have endeavored to transmit these values to their children through the family, the church, society, and, as it developed, the school.

Colonial Period

The first settlers to America attempted to follow the biblical command but did so in a variety of ways. Education in the southern colonies consisted mainly of teaching in the home for the wealthy and apprenticeships required by law for the poor.[2] Though not necessarily religiously motivated, most of the schools were under Anglican control, while the "public" schools were mainly charity schools for the poor.[3]

---

[1] Deut. vi. 7.

[2] Clarence Benson, History of Christian Education (Chicago: Moody Press, 1943), p. 101; D. Bruce Lockerbie, The Way They Should Go (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), p. 13; Marvin J. Taylor, Religious and Moral Education (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), p. 3.

[3] Taylor, p. 3.

In the middle colonies churches controlled most of the education through parochial schools.[4] Governor William Berkeley of Virginia expressed satisfaction with this situation when he said, "There are no free schools, nor printing, and I hope we shall not have them these hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world. . . . [italics in original]"[5] Public control of schools was very limited, with slight control in New York and Pennsylvania. The Quakers had school systems with their meeting houses and, with their reputation for tolerance, attracted many religious groups.[6] The Bible, catechism, and theological documents constituted the majority of the curriculum in the middle colonies, and the academic quality of the schools was often quite poor, according to Benson.[7] In Puritan New England the basic philosophy was that "education was essential to religion and that religion was the end of man."[8] The church school was also the community, public school. To most religious groups in colonial America, the Bible was God's inspired

---

[4] Benson, p. 102; Taylor, p. 3.

[5] William Berkeley, Henning's Laws of Virginia, Appendix, cited by Robert Baird, Religion in the United States of America (London: Duncan and Malcolm, 1844), p. 327.

[6] Lockerbie, p. 14.

[7] Benson, p. 102.

[8] Benson, p. 102.

will; however, to the Puritans the Bible was a "civic and social authority as well."[9] Sandford Fleming illustrated this reliance on the Bible with a quote from The Family Instructor:

> Child, the Bible is your rule of life. Though the Spirit is the secret instructor, the scripture is the key of instruction. There you are to learn how God is to be worshiped; how to order your conversation aright; how to perform your duty, and "what it is the Lord thy God requires of thee." [quotations in origina] [10]

The Puritans

According to Fleming, Puritan belief was based on five essential doctrines. Of these, three were closely related to character education. The doctrine of divine sovereignty was the "foundation of morality itself."[11] Things were moral because God said they were, and the Bible was God's Word, His way of communicating His will. The doctrine of total depravity required a low view of human nature, while the doctrine of human helplessness decreed man's "moral inability" to save or improve himself.[12]

The religious emphasis of Puritan education is well-documented. In Massachusetts the laws of 1642 and 1647 included provisions to make sure children were taught religious principles. The character of Harvard

---

[9] Joseph Gaer and Ben Siegel, The Puritan Heritage: American's Roots in the Bible (New York: New American Library, 1964), p. 27.

[10] The Family Instructor (Bridgeport: n.p., 1814), p. 49, cited by Sandford Fleming, Children and Puritanism: The Place of Children in the Life and Thought of the New England Churches (1933; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times New American Library, 1964), p. 78.

[11] Fleming, pp. 51-52.

[12] Fleming, p. 56.

College, which was founded by the Congregationalists in 1636, included the goal of "training in knowledge and godliness."[13] One of the purposes of King's College (now Columbia) was "to train in virtuous habits."[14] King was dedicated to teaching "principles of Christianity and morality generally agreed upon."[15] In fact, according to Lockerbie, every colonial college except the College of Philadelphia, now the University of Pennsylvania, was intended at its founding to prepare young men for the ministry. Yale (1701) and Dartmouth (1769) were founded by the Congregationalists. William and Mary (1693) and Columbia College (1754) were Church of England. Princeton (1746, then the College of New Jersey) was Presbyterian. Brown (1764, formerly Rhode Island College) was Baptist, and Rutgers (1766) was Dutch Reformed.[16]

According to Gaer and Siegel, the Puritans had two goals for education: knowledge of God through the Bible and development of proper conduct.[17] Taylor maintained that Puritan education was dependent on religion for its purpose, financial support, and curriculum.[18] Education was needed because literacy was the first step toward

---

[13] James J. Veltcamp, "A History of Philosophical Patterns of Thought," in The Philosophy of Christian School Education, ed. Paul A. Kienel (Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978), p. 164.

[14] Benson, p. 106.

[15] Gaer and Siegel, p. 113.

[16] Lockerbie, p. 11.

[17] Gaer and Siegel, p. 111.

[18] Taylor, p. 3.

understanding the Bible, and understanding of the Bible was necessary for salvation and development of Christian character, as Cotton Mather emphasized.[19] Thus the Bible was the center of the curriculum and the major textbook in Puritan schools.

Raymond B. Culver explained the relationship between Puritan beliefs and character education. Implicit in Puritan belief was the necessity for developing good character and getting rid of selfishness so man would be deserving of God's grace. Selfishness was considered the major cause of bad character; thus man had to work hard to eliminate selfishness. The Puritans emphasized the development of good character through hard work, discipline, and suppression of the depraved nature.[20] Because of this close relationship between Puritan beliefs and education, Puritan leaders such as John Cotton, William Bradford, Michael Wigglesworth, Cotton Mather, Jonathan Edwards, and Lyman Beecher exerted a strong influence on character education.

John Cotton. John Cotton (1584-1652) was the son of Roland Cotton, a lawyer in Derby, England. He attained a Master of Arts degree at Emmanuel College, a Puritan institution, and experienced a conversion experience in 1609, as related by Everett H. Emerson in his study of Cotton's literature.[21] Cotton participated in plans for the

---

[19] Cotton Mather, Essays to Do Good, ed. George Burder (reproduction; Boston: Lincoln and Edmonds, 1808), p. 86.

[20] Raymond B. Culver, Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools (New York: Arno Press, 1969), pp. 4-5.

[21] Everett H. Emerson, John Cotton (New York: Twayne Pub., 1965), p. 11.

Massachusetts Bay Colony and was chosen teacher of the Boston church when he arrived in America in 1633. Larzer Ziff, in his biography of Cotton, maintained of Cotton that "to his death he remained New England's most prominent preacher because his constant refrain was an insistence upon the power of grace and the passivity of the believers."[22]

Few of Cotton's writings are accessible today. However, Emerson included a reproduction of Cotton's catechism, Milk for Babes. Drawn Out of the Breasts of both Testaments. Chiefly, for the spiritual nourishment of Boston Babes in Either England: But may be of like use for any children (1646), in his book. Written in catechism form, Milk for Babes dealt with doctrines pertaining to God, creation, depravity of man, the Ten Commandments, sin, salvation, judgment, and the church and its ordinances. Writing of his grandfather in Magnalia Christi Americana, Cotton Mather stated, "The children of New England are to this day most usually fed with his excellent catechism, which is entituled [sic] 'Milk for Babes.'"[23]

William Bradford. William Bradford (1590-1657) was one of the Mayflower Pilgrims, governor of Plymouth for thirty-three years, and writer of the history Of Plymouth Plantation. Cotton Mather wrote of

---

[22] Larzer Ziff, The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1962), p. 251.

[23] Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana; or the Ecclesiastical History of New England, II (1697; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1852), p. 280.

him in Magnalia Christi, but both Samuel Eliot Morison and Bradford claimed no other biography was written of him until 1951.[24]

There were no public schools in Plymouth Plantation during Bradford's lifetime, though parents such as Bradford did teach their children at home.[25] However, Bradford mentioned and quoted the Bible throughout his History, and the settlement based many of its moral laws on Bible commands. Bradford listed 1642 as a year in which "Wickedness Breaks Forth" and included some moral offenses and the biblical injunctions for their punishments in his record.[26]

Michael Wigglesworth. Michael Wigglesworth (1631-1705) came to New England from England at the age of seven, graduated from Harvard in 1651, and became pastor in Malden, Massachusetts, in 1656. Cotton Mather was one of his students. According to Kenneth B. Murdoch, editor of the reprint of Wigglesworth's book, Day of Doom, Wigglesworth received inspiration for the book from a dream he had in 1653.[27] The full title of the book was The Day of Doom: or a Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment. With a short Discourse on Eternity. It was first published in 1662 and went through numerous editions, six

---

[24] Samuel Eliot Morison, ed. Of Plymouth Plantation, by William Bradford (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), p. xxix; Bradford Smith, Bradford of Plymouth (New York: Lippincott, 1951), p. 9.

[25] Smith, pp. 265, 277.

[26] Bradford, pp. 316-22.

[27] Kenneth B. Murdoch, ed., The Day of Doom or a Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment, by Michael Wigglesworth (1929; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966), p. iii.

before 1701.[28] According to World Book Encyclopedia, it was the "most popular literary work of colonial times."[29] Fleming claimed it was "second only to the [New England] primer in its wide use by children."[30] Robert B. Downs selected it as one of fifty books which he believed had significant roles "in shaping the American world of today."[31]

The book itself consisted of 224 stanzas of eight lines each. It painted a vivid picture of the total depravity of man, the need for salvation through Christ, and the awful punishment which even children would suffer if they did not get saved.

Cotton Mather. Cotton Mather (1633-1728) was born in Boston. His father, Increase Mather, was pastor of North Church in Boston and a president of Harvard; John Cotton was his grandfather. According to George Burder, editor of the 1808 reproduction of Essays to Do Good, Mather "constantly read fifteen chapters of the Bible in a day" and adopted as a maxim "that a power and an opportunity to do good, not only gives a right to the doing of it, but makes the doing of it a duty."[32]

---

[28] Murdoch, p. iii.

[29] James E. Miller, "American Literature," World Book Encyclopedia, 1973 ed.

[30] Fleming, p. 82.

[31] Robert B. Downs, Famous American Books (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), p. xiii.

[32] George Burder, ed., Essays to Do Good, by Cotton Mather, p. vi.

Mather believed that good was needed in this world so that God and Christ could be known, served, and glorified.[33] Man was to be good to please God, not for salvation.[34] Mather was also concerned that there were "thousands" ready to serve the devil for every one ready to serve God.[35] To him moral law should be the "rule" of the life of every Christian.[36]

Burder described the method and schedule which Mather developed to train himself in doing good. There was an emphasis for each day of the week on doing good to a particular person or group: Sunday, church; Monday, family; Tuesday, relations abroad; Wednesday, church of the Lord; Thursday, societies to which he belonged; Friday, "subjects of affliction" and "objects of compassion"; Saturday, "What more have I to do for the interest of God in my heart and life?"[37] Mather then kept a diary with the entry "G.D." meaning "Good Devised" written when good, according to his daily schedule, had been accomplished.[38]

Essays to Do Good was originally published in 1710 as Bonifacuis. On the title page was printed, "To do good, and to communicate, forget not. Hebrews xxx 16." In the book Mather not only enumerated ways to do good in all situations but also gave specific ideas for teachers.

---

[33] Mather, Essays, p. 25.

[34] Mather, Essays, p. 28.

[35] Mather, Essays, pp. 31-32.

[36] Mather, Essays, p. 35.

[37] Burder, Essays, p. vii.

[38] Burder, Essays, p. viii.

The schoolmaster's chief interest should be that children "may so know the holy scriptures as to become wise to salvation."[39] He recommended at least weekly exercises in catechising in the "most edifying, applicatory, and admonitory manner" and encouraged daily praying.[40] Teachers could "inculcate the lessons of piety" by praying and discussing sermons.[41] Other recommendations for teachers included promoting the fear of God in older students; reading less fiction and pagan literature, more books about scripture; copying "worthy" sentences; translating useful passages into Latin; and using rewards more than punishments.[42] Mather emphasized good reading so

> that instead of learning vain fictions, and filthy stories, they may become acquainted with the word of God, and with books containing grave sayings, and things which may make them truly wise and useful in the world.[43]

Mather wrote other books which pertained to character education. One was the New England portion of Token for Children, published in 1700. James Janeway wrote the original Token, which Monica Kiefer called the "most popular history of pious children who died early deaths."[44] The following was written on the title page of Token:

---

[39] Mather, Essays, p. 86.

[40] Mather, Essays, p. 86.

[41] Mather, Essays, p. 86.

[42] Mather, Essays, pp. 87-88.

[43] Mather, Essays, p. 87.

[44] Monica Kiefer, American Children Through Their Books 1700-1835 (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1948), p. 81

> A token for children, being an exact account of the conversation, holy and exemplary lives, and joyful deaths of several young children, by James Janeway, minister of the gospel. To which is added a token for the children of New England or some examples of children in whom the fear of God was remarkably budding before they died; in several parts of New England. Preserved and published for the encouragement of piety in other children.[45]

In A family Well-Ordered; or, an Essay to Render Parents and Children Happy in One Another, Mather described what he considered important for education:

> Tis very pleasing to our Lord Jesus Christ, that our children should be well formed with, and well informed in the Rules of Civility, and not be left a Clownish, and Sottish Dishonour to Religion. And there are many points of a good education that we should bestow on our Children; They should Read, and Write, and Cypher, and be put into some agreeable Calling: not only our Sons but our Daughters should also be taught such things as will afterwards make them useful in their Places. Acquaint them with God and Christ and the Mysteries of Religion, and the Doctrines and Methods of the Great Salvation."[46]

Mather also wrote a book entitled Early Piety which was based on the life of his brother Nathanael; it was included in the Magnalia. Another Mather book was Memorials of Early Piety Occurring in the Holy Life and Joyful Death of Mrs. Jerusha Oliver. According to Fleming, Mather's books all gave "evidence of the same morbid fear . . . and the same anxiety over original sin."[47]

---

[45] Fleming, p. 85, citing James Janeway, Token for Children (n.p.: n.p., n.d.).

[46] Kiefer, p. 8, citing Mather, A family Well-Ordered (n.p.: n.p., n.d.).

[47] Fleming, p. 93.

Jonathan Edwards. Jonathan Edwards (1704-1758) entered Yale when he was about twelve years old.[48] He began a twenty-three year ministry at Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1727 when he was twenty-four. He was probably best known for his sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," which Harold P. Simonson claimed was the "most famous sermon ever preached in America."[49] In that sermon, Edwards emphasized the depravity of man and the sovereignty and wrath of God. The end of Edwards' ministry at Northampton was tarnished by dissension and disagreements. After leaving the church, Edwards became a missionary to the Indians and pastor of a local church in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, until 1758 when he assumed the presidency of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton). However, he died three months later of smallpox.

According to Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson, Edwards fought for the doctrines of total depravity, freedom of the will, and grace.[50] In "The Nature of True Virtue" Edwards defined virtue as "the beauty of the qualities and acts of the mind, that are of a moral nature . . . attended withdesert or worthiness of praise or blame

---

[48] Edward Williams and Edward Parsons, eds., The Works of President Edwards, I (1817); rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 11.

[49] Harold P. Simonson, ed., Selected Writings of Jonathan Edwards (New York: Frederick Unger Publishing, 1970), p. 17.

[50] Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson, eds., Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography and Notes (Atlanta: American Book, 1935), p. xv.

[italics in original]."[51] He maintained that virtue was based on love, with self-love or "love of his own happiness" the basis for actions.[52] Benevolence supported self-love, while malevolence caused pain or pressure and thus was detrimental to self-love.[53] However, total depravity hindered man from being truly benevolent. Thus Faust and Johnson summarized Edwards' doctrine of virtue as "Man is . . . given over wholly to self-love. Virtue . . . consists wholly in benevolence. Grace bridges the gap."[54]

Williams and Parsons quoted from an uncited manuscript in which Edwards had made sixty-seven resolutions concerning character and behavior. The resolutions began, "Resolved, that I will do whatsoever [italics in original] I think to be most to God's glory and my own good, profit and pleasure, ON THE WHOLE [capitals in original] . . . ."[55] Edwards mentioned these resolutions in his diary and attempted to incorporate them into his life.[56]

---

[51] Jonathan Edwards, "The Nature of True Virtue," in Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography and Notes, eds. Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson (Atlanta: American Book, 1935), p. 349.

[52] Edwards, "True Virtue," pp. 351, 358.

[53] Edwards, "True Virtue, p. 370.

[54] Faust and Johnson, p. xciii.

[55] Jonathan Edwards, uncited manuscript, in The Works of President Edwards, I, eds. Edward Williams and Edward Parsons (1817; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 13.

[56] Jonathan Edwards, uncited manuscript, in The Works of President Edwards, I, eds. Edward Williams and Edward Parsons (1817; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), pp. 16-17.

Lyman Beecher. Though Lyman Beecher (1775-1863) preached during the 1800's he was a product of and spokesman for the Puritan theology. After the July 11, 1908, duel in which Aaron Burr killed Alexander Hamilton, Beecher was so upset he could not sleep. He subsequently wrote, preached, and published the sermon, "The Remedy for Duelling." Later his synod unanimously passed a resolution against duelling.[57] While Beecher pastored at Litchfield, he became upset at clergy intemperance; he later claimed credit for a temperance movement which spread all over New England and "beyond."[58]

To Beecher the pastor's duty was to "explain and enforce the laws of the divine moral government contained in the Bible."[59] He encouraged independent thinking, as long as it did not disagree with his interpretation of the Bible, and considered it part of the education he wanted his children to receive.[60] He was also a man of unusual energy and determination.[61] However, though a number of his children became famous in their own right, Beecher was not able to keep them in the Puritan theology which he believed; both his children and his denomination succumbed to the Unitarian beliefs he had fought.

---

[57] Lyman Beecher, Autobiography, I, ed. Barbara M. Cross (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 105-08.

[58] Beecher, Autobiography, I, pp. 180-84.

[59] Beecher, Autobiography, I, p. 258.

[60] Beecher, Autobiography, I, pp. 98, 259.

[61] Lyman Beecher, Autobiography, II, ed. Barbara M. Cross (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press), 1961, p. 356.

Early Textbooks

The Hornbook. As previously mentioned, the Bible was the major textbook in Puritan schools. The other textbooks were not only religiously oriented but also emphasized character development. Of these, the hornbook was probably the earliest type of textbook used. Andrew Tuer, in his History of the Hornbook, cited a Funk and Wagnall Standard Dictionary definition of the hornbook:

> Hornbook, a child's primer, as formerly made, consisting of a thin board of oak and slip of paper with the nine digits, the alphabet and Lord's prayer printed on it, covered with a thin layer of transparent horn and framed; hence any primer or handbook. . . .[62]

According to Laird V. Glasscock, hornbooks also sometimes contained the catechism, Psalms, and other religious materials, including portions of the Bible.[63]

The Pilgrims may have brought hornbooks from Europe. Tuer was unable to uncover evidence that hornbooks were ever made in America, but he did cite several references to their use.[64] Even with the help of Alice Morse Earle, who had made a study of Customs and Fashions of Old New England, Tuer was unable to find but one original hornbook.[65]

---

[62] Andrew W. Tuer, History of the Hornbook (n.p.: n.p., 1896), p. 132.

[63] Laird V. Glasscock, "The History of Character Education," Educational Method, 11 (March 1932), 353.

[64] Tuer, pp. 132, 133, 135, 136.

[65] Tuer, pp. 7, 135.

Catechism. The catechism was a popular way to teach children, even though they were not usually written at the child's level. Some of the popular catechisms included John Cotton's Milk for Babes, which was in some editions of the New England Primer; Baxter's Mother's Catechism, which was used in Cotton Mather's home; Mather's The A.B.C. of Religion; The Young Children's Catechism by Isaac Watts; and the Westminister Catechism, which was also in some editions of the New England Primer.[66]

New England Primer. It was the New England Primer which probably had the greatest influence of any early textbook. According to Paul Ford, in his reprint edition of the Primer,

> in prose as bare of beauty as the whitewash of their churches, in poetry as rough and stern as their storm-torn coast, in pictures as crude and unfinished as their glacial-smoothed boulders, between stiff oak covers, which symbolized the content, the children were led. . . .[67]

Called the "Little Bible of New England,"[68] with approximately 87 percent of its selections from the Bible,[69] the New England Primer was used to teach millions of children to read so they could read the Bible and be catechized.[70] First published between 1687 and 1690 by Benjamin

---

[66] William Kailer Dunn, What Happened to Religious Education? The Decline of Religious Teaching in the Public Elementary School, 1776-1861 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1958), p. 19; Fleming, p. 110.

[67] Paul Ford, ed., New England Primer (1897; rpt. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1962), p. 1.

[68] Ford, p. 1.

[69] Benson, pp. 108-09.

[70] Ford, pp. 3-4.

Harris, an Englishman moved to Boston, the Primer was similar to some books published in England. Ford estimated that more than three million copies of the Primer were sold over a period of 150 years.[71] No original editions are known to remain.[72]

The Primer itself contained eighty four inch by three inch pages. The content included letters of the alphabet, various phonic sounds and syllables, a graduated list of words containing from one to as many as six syllables, twenty-four couplets with pictures, a poem and picture of the martyrdom of John Rogers (probably fictionalized), and the catechism. Not only did Bible words, principles, and stories occur throughout the Primer, particularly in the couplets, but some editions also included the Lord's Prayer, Ten Commandments, and the books of the Bible. The poem "Now I Lay Me Down to Sleep" was also in the 1781 edition.[73]

The poems may have been written by Harris, but only the couplet for A has never been changed, as they were often rewritten to fit religious and political beliefs.[74] According to Fleming, in the earliest known edition nine of the couplets were biblical, while six others had "a religious tone"; in the 1762 edition twenty of the rhymes were religious, and all four of the others had "a religious tone."[75] The early

---

[71] Ford, p. 19.

[72] Ford, p. 16.

[73] Ford, pp. 26, 32-37.

[74] Ford, p. 25.

[75] Fleming, p. 80.

couplets were often sombre, such as

The Dog will bite, A thief at Night.	The Deluge drown'd The Earth around.
An idle Fool, Is whipt at School.	The Judgment made Felix afraid.[76]

Kiefer cited an example of a couplet changed from a religious to political content:

Whales in the Sea God's voice obey.[77]	By Washington Great deeds were done.[78]

According to Ford, by the eighteenth century the couplets were more on a child's level, but the Puritans were not comfortable with those later editions and rarely used them.[79]

Ford claimed the major function of the New England Primer was to drill and teach children "to believe what they were to think out for themselves when the age of discretion was reached."[80] He also claimed that early court records showed that lawlessness, immorality, and "total depravity" were common in Puritan society, making the Puritan emphasis on hell seem appropriate.[81] However, he noted that by the

---

[76] Ford, p. 30.

[77] Kiefer, p. 16, citing New England Primer (Boston: n.p., 1749), n.p.

[78] Kiefer, p. 16, citing New England Primer (Hartford: n.p., 1800), n.p.

[79] Ford, p. 31.

[80] Ford, pp. 3-4.

[81] Ford, pp. 52-53.

editions of the late 1700's, the emphasis had changed from hell and salvation to reminders to be good rather than bad.[82]

Franklin Primer. According to Ruth S. Freeman, the first reader for beginners was the Franklin Primer.[83] As stated in an Introduction to a Franklin Primer, the Franklin Primer was "a substitute for the old Primer which has of late become almost obsolete."[84] The content of the primer was listed as "containing a new and useful selection of Moral Lessons adorned with a great variety of elegant cuts calculated to strike a lasting impression on the Tender Minds of Children."[85] The book also contained a picture of Ben Franklin and text illustrations of Bible scenes.[86]

Webster's Spelling Book. Another popular textbook was Webster's Spelling Book. It has been said the Spelling Book "taught millions to read, and not one to sin."[87] Noah Webster, who believed in the total depravity of man,[88] summarized his attitude toward the building of

---

[82] Ford, p. 47.

[83] Ruth S. Freeman, Yesterday's School Books: A Looking Glass for Teachers of Today (Watkins Glen: Century House, 1960), p. 31.

[84] Freeman, p. 31, citing an unidentified Franklin Primer.

[85] Freeman, p. 31, citing an unidentified Franklin Primer.

[86] Freeman, p. 31, citing an unidentified Franklin Primer.

[87] Ford, p. 53.

[88] Noah Webster, "A Letter to the Honorable Daniel Webster," in his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects (1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 269.

character in a letter to Daniel Webster:

> Intelligence alone then has not yet saved any republic. . . . The virtue which is necessary to preserve a just administration and render a government stable, is Christian Virtue, which consists in the uniform practice of moral and religious duties, in conformity with the laws both of God and man. This virtue must be based on a reverence for the authority of God, which shall counteract and control ambition and selfish views, and subject them to the precepts of divine authority. The effect of such a virtue would be, to bring the citizens of a state to vote and act for the good of the state, whether that should coincide with their private interest or not [italics in original].[89]

In a "Letter to a Young Gentleman Commencing His Education," Webster stated that a pure life is the result of "an entire complacency in his [God's] character and attributes, and unqualified approbation of his law, as a rule of life."[90] He also emphasized the importance of keeping the Ten Commandments: "Let it [Ten Commandments] then be the first study of your early years, to learn in what consists real worth or dignity of character [italics in original]."[91]

Webster reaffirmed his reliance on the authority of the Bible for morality in the "Form of Association for Young Men":

> We, firmly believing the revealed will of God, as delivered in the Scriptures, to be the standard of moral rectitude, and moral recitude to be the only basis of true honor and dignity of character. . . .[92]

---

[89] Webster, "A Letter to the Honorable Daniel Webster," p. 270.

[90] Noah Webster, "Letter to a Young Gentleman Commencing His Education," in his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subject (1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 296.

[91] Webster, "Letter to a Young Gentleman," pp. 296-98.

[92] Noah Webster, "Form of Association for Young Men," in his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects (1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968), p. 305.

The Spelling Book itself, first published in 1783, was, according to both Benson and Downs, fashioned after Dilworth but "more secular . . . more American."[93] In the Preface of the March, 1818, edition was the claim that already more than five million copies of the book had been sold.[94] The stated object of the book was the "teaching of the first elements of the language, spelling, and reading."[95] The book began with an "Analysis of Sounds in the English Language," "Key to Pronunciation," and phonics tables and exercises. These exercises included the alphabet, consonant/vowel blends, one syllable words, easy two syllable words, three syllable words according to accent, four syllable words, and irregular words. The "Lessons of easy words, to teach children to read, and to know their duty" which followed included verses about God, being good, salvation, and church. Additional words and lessons emphasized character, how to behave, maxims, proverbs, stories and Bible verses. Some stories ended with a moral. The final portion of the Spelling Book Speller was "A Moral Cathecism." Following are two of the questions concerning morality:

---

[93] Benson, p. 115; Downs, p. 58.

[94] Noah Webster, The American Spelling Book: Containing the Rudiments of the English Language for the Use of Schools in the United States (1824; rpt. Gatlinburg: Marion R. Mangrum, J.P., 1964), Preface to 1818 edition.

[95] Webster, Spelling Book (1824), p. 3.

> Question. What is moral virtue?
> Answer. It is an honest upright conduct of all our dealings with men.
>
> Question. What rules have we to direct us in our moral conduct?
> Answer. God's word, contained in the Bible, has furnished all necessary rules to direct our conduct. [italics in origina] [96]

Further catechism questions covered humility, mercy, peace-makers, purity of heart, anger, revenge, justice, generosity, gratitude, truth, charity, avarice, frugality, industry, cheerfulness.

In a comparison of the 1824 and 1866 editions, a number of differences were noted. The title was changed to The Elementary Spelling Book, being an Improvement on the American Spelling Book. The 1866 edition introduced sentences earlier. However, the major difference was the introduction of non-biblical content such as "Eels swim in the brook."[97] The fables remained, with emphasis on character qualities such as honesty, but the cathechism was gone. The newer edition was not as moralizing as the earlier one; neither did it emphasize God and doing good as much.

Other early textbooks. Another early American textbook was Dilworth's New Guide to the English Tongue, published in England in 1740 and used in the colonies. It contained graded word lists and sentences, then progressed to paragraphs. According to Benson, it would be described as religious, but there was some secular content;

---

[96] Webster, Spelling Book (1824), pp. 4-168.

[97] Noah Webster, The Elementary Spelling Book, being an Improvement of the American Spelling Book (New York: American Book, 1866), p. 30.

he claimed the book was the "entering wedge" as far as introducing secularization was concerned.[98] Caleb Bingham's American Preceptor (1794), a graded reader for advanced students, and the Columbian Orator (1806), with declamation selections, were two other common texts. As these books came into use, they gradually replaced the Bible as a reading textbook.

Quaker Education

According to Thomas Woody in his study of early Quaker education, Quaker schools were begun more for moral and spiritual protection than for direct Bible teaching.[99] As stated at the 1690 London Yearly Meeting,

> It is our Christian and earnest advice and counsel to all Friends concerned (so far as they are able or may be capable) to provide schoolmasters and mistresses who are faithful Friends, to teach and instruct their children, and not to send them to such schools where they are taught the corrupt ways, manners and fashions of the world and of the Heathen in their authors and manners of the heathenish gods and goddesses. . . .[100]

However, the Bible was a textbook in the schools. It was to be read at least three times a week, as were Penn and Barclay.[101] Other textbooks used by the Quakers included spelling books, Penn's writings, The Franklin Primer, New England Primer, Dilworth, Barclays' catechism,

---

[98] Benson, p. 115.

[99] Thomas Woody, Early Quaker Education in Pennylvania (1920; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969), pp. 20-21.

[100] Woody, p. 29, citing Min. London Yearly Mtg., 1690, 4-9, 11.

[101] Woody, p. 197.

Mather's essays, and Beecher's Suggestions Respecting Improvments in Education (1829).[102]

Founding of a New Nation

Although education and God were not mentioned in the Constitution, religion was; and the meaning of the First Amendment statement concerning the relationship between the state and religion has been debated since its writing. Herbert M. Kliebard, in his compilation of Constitutional records, claimed that part of the problem was there were no complete records of the debate on the amendment.[103] Gaer and Siegel suggested that education was not included in the Constitution because at that time education was religious.[104] Thomas Jefferson did not write the phrase "building a wall of separation between church and state" until he was President in 1802.[105] Even then, it was only his opinion, as he had been in France at the time the amendment was written.

Regardless, with the founding of the new nation came the philosophy that an educated public was necessary for a successful democracy. Political reasons for education, including character education, were

---

[102] Woody, pp. 192-94; Thomas Woody, Quaker Education in the Colony and State of New Jersey (1923; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969), pp. 317-19, 331.

[103] Herbert M. Kliebard, Religion and Education in American: A Documentary History (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook, 1969), p. 58.

[104] Gaer and Siegel, p. 123.

[105] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Nehemiah Dodge and Others, 1 Jan. 1802, in The Portable Thomas Jefferson, ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York: Viking Press, 1975), p. 303.

added to religious ones. During the 1800's the Bible would still be a base for character education, but the emphasis and style had begun to change.

Benjamin Franklin

Although Benjamin Franklin was well known for his character education emphasis on traits and habits, a letter he wrote to Samuel Mather, son of Cotton Mather, showed the effect his Puritan heritage had on the development of his philosophy:

> Permit me to mention one little instance, which, though it related to myself, will not be quite uninteresting to you. When I was a boy, I met with a book, entitled "Essays to do Good," which I think was written by your father. It had been so little regarded by its former possessor, that several leaves of it were torn out; but the remainder gave me such a turn of thinking, as to have an influence on my conduct through life; for I have always set a greater value on the character of a doer of good, than any other kind of reputation; and if I have been, as you seem to think, a useful citizen, the public owes the advantage of it to that book.[106]

Thomas Jefferson

Thomas Jefferson often quoted the Bible, but his basis for morality was doctrines on which everyone could agree.

> The moral precepts, innate in man, and made part of his physical constitution, as necessary for his social being . . . the sublime doctrines of philanthropism and deism taught us by Jesus of Nazareth, in which we all agree, constitute true religion.[107]

---

[106] Benjamin Franklin, Letter to Samuel Mather, 10 Nov. 1779, in Dr. Franklin's Works, III (n.p.: n.d., n.d.), p. 478, cited by Burder, p. xi.

[107] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to John Adams, 5 May 1817, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, XV, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 109.

Jefferson was for religion but against sectarian dogma, stating that religious dogma could even make men immoral.

> On the dogmas of religion as distinguished from moral principles, all mankind, from the beginning of the world to this day, have been quarreling, fighting, burning, and torturing one another, for abstractions unintelligible to themselves and to all others, and absolutely beyond the comprehension of the human mind.[108]

Thus Jefferson promoted the idea that morality was separate from Bible teaching. His was a morality based on individual determination[109] and what was necessary for valuable contributions to society. In fact, in Notes on Virginia, Query 14, he discouraged using the Bible with young children because they were not mature enough.[110] However, he did agree that older students could study religion in the original languages.[111]

The 1800's--A Period of Secularization

Lockerbie referred to the time between the War for Independence and the Civil War as a "transition, both politically and spiritually, from

---

[108] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Matthew Carey, 11 Nov. 1816, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XII, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: Putnam, 1904), p. 456.

[109] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Francis Hopkinson, 13 March 1789, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, V, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: Putnam, 1904), p. 456.

[110] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on Virginia, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, I, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 204.

[111] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, 10 Aug. 1787, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, VI, ed. Albert Allery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 248.

"a Colonial theocracy to the American democracy."[112] Gaer and Siegel mentioned a secularization as early as the 1700's related to rationalization, skepticism, and deism, claiming that by 1776 only one in ten persons were officially affiliated with a church organization.[113] Paul Blanshard stated that seven out of eight Americans did not formally belong to any church during the late 1700's, and that many of the political leaders were deists, skeptics, and unchurched.[114]

The change from the Bible to secular texts and the promotion of a nonsectarian public school probably contributed to the secularization. In Lancastrian schools religious instruction became secondary, giving way to efficiency of academic learning. However, book content and teacher requirements were still religious.[115] In the Infant Schools, patterned after Robert Owens' school in Scotland, moral instruction was given through biblical materials, with the New Testament stressed the most.[116] Writing a history of religion in the United States in 1844, Presbyterian minister Robert Baird stated that all teachers then could teach "general moral instruction" and read portions of scripture, but only religious teachers should do more than that. Equating moral

---

[112] Lockerbie, p. 11.

[113] Gaer and Siegel, p. 122.

[114] Paul Blanshard, Religion and the Schools (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 11.

[115] Benson, pp. 141-43.

[116] Benson, pp. 143-44.

education with "fundamental truths of the Bible," he thought there would be no complaints if teachers taught only that.[117]

Secularization in Virginia

During the nineteenth century Virginia experienced a struggle over religion in the public schools. As summarized by Robert Michaelsen, the conflict there resulted in a compromise--the teaching of a "common Christianity chiefly through the use of the Bible, and to avoid anything more obviously sectarian."[118]

A number of prominent Virginians had presented their opinions on the use of the Bible in the public schools. Thomas Jefferson had advocated separation of religion from the schools, while Alexander Campbell, founder of Bethany College, spoke of a "common Christianity" which included the Bible for moral insturction.[119] Henry Ruffner, a president of Washington College, wrote a "Proposed Plan for the Organization and Common Schools in Virginia" in 1841 while president of the College. In the proposal he stated that a schoolmaster must have

> an unblemished moral character and sound principles of Christian piety. If not in full communion with a Christian church, he should at least be free from religious infidelity and profaneness of language or sentiment, and be well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures.[120]

---

[117] Baird, p. 329.

[118] Robert Michaelsen, Piety in the Public School (New York: Macmillan, 1970), p. 81.

[119] Michaelsen, p. 81.

[120] Edgar W. Knight, ed., Educational Theories and Practices, Vol. V of A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860 (Chapel Hill: Univ. of N.C. Press, 1953), p. 100.

According to Sadie Bell, the University of Virginia illustrated the secularization conflict in that state. Thomas Jefferson had encouraged the founding of the University with the goal of making it a "civil university," and there were numerous accusations that the University was irreligious.[121] Yet Bell claimed that by 1841 there was a somewhat "religious atmosphere" on the campus.[122] In 1845 William H. McGuffey became the new professor of moral philosophy.[123] He and William H. Ruffner, later Virginia's first State Superintendent of Schools, and John B. Minor, chief professor of law, promoted a religious emphasis for morality.[124]

According to Bell, concern for teacher morality was evident in Virginia during this entire period as was an emphasis on the importance of morality: ". . . use of rules, moral lessons drawn from readers, and scriptural readings and prayer were employed."[125] She claimed the use of the Bible had been promoted by the favorable emphasis of the Bible Society and the Sunday School movement.

The Educational Association of Virginia included at its 1866-1867 meetings addresses concerning "moral and physical training" and the need

---

[121] Sadie Bell, The Church, the State, and Education in Virginia (1930; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), pp. 336, 375.

[122] Bell, pp. 380-81.

[123] Stanley W. Lindberg, The Annotated McGuffey: Selections from the McGuffey Eclectric Readers 1836-1920 (Atlanta: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976), p. xix.

[124] Bell, p. 385.

[125] Bell, p. 343.

for Bible teaching.[126] In 1870 the theme of the opening address was "The Necessity and Best Method of Bible Instruction in the Schools of Virginia."[127] William H. Ruffner, the new State Superintendent of Schools, wanted the Bible included, as stated in one of his reports and in the Virginia Educational Journal.[128] Benjamin M. Smith of Union Theological Seminary encouraged "the forbidding of all sectarian interference in the control of public schools."[129]

To Ruffner, as superintendent, eventually was given the responsibility of defining the position of the schools concerning the Bible and religion. In an article in the Virginia Educational Journal he gave his opinion that "religious exercises" should be allowed "where it is agreeable to those concerned," with final decisions to be made by "local authorities."[130] In other words, as Bell summarized the policy, there was to be cooperation without "any entangling legal alliance."[131]

---

[126] Bell, p. 411, citing Minutes of The Educational Association of Virginia, 1866, pp. 6, 8; 1876, p. 7.

[127] Bell, p. 418, citing Minutes of The Educational Association of Virginia, 1870, p. 14.

[128] Bell, p. 420, citing Circulars, Doc. No. 6, Rep't Sup't Pub. Inst., 28 March 1870, p. 4; Bell citing Virginia Educational Journal, 1, Doc. No. XIII.

[129] Bell, p. 421, citing Benjamin M. Smith, "Merits and Defects of Common School Education in the United States, "Virginia Educational Journal, 1 (Aug. 1870), pp. 318-29.

[130] Bell, p. 426, citing William H. Ruffner, "Religious Worship in the Public Schools," Virginia Educational Journal, 2 (March 1871), 197.

[131] Bell, p. 431.

Secularization in Massachusetts

Another conflict involved Horace Mann and his experience in Massachusetts. That state had a state-supported church until 1833; however, according to Culver, there had been long hard strife between the Unitarians and the Congregationalists.[132] Public concern at the "alarming absence of moral and religious training" led to a law in 1827 requesting moral training in the schools.[133] Mann, often proclaimed the father of public education,[134] believed that education had vast potential for solving society's moral problems but also believed that religious instruction, though necessary for moral education, should be nonsectarian.[135]

In 1837 Frederick A. Packard, editor for the American Sunday School Union, wanted some books selected by the Union put into the public school libraries.[136] Mann felt the books were sectarian and refused to place them.[137] As a result, Packard attacked Mann publicly. Then in

---

[132] Culver, pp. 16-18.

[133] Culver, pp. 42-43; Horace Mann, Go Forth and Teach; an Oration Before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4, 1842 (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937), p. 107.

[134] Eleanor Craven Fishburn, "He Gave Us Schools," NEA Journal, 26 (Nov. 1937), 257.

[135] Mann, Go Forth, p. 44; Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1849), p. 111.

[136] Neil Gerard McCluskey, Public Schools and Moral Education (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1968), p. 55.

[137] Horace Mann, Letter to Frederick A. Packard, 18 March 1838, in Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools, by Raymond B. Culver (New York: Arno Press, 1969), Appendix A, p. 241.

1846 Matthew Smith, a former Universalist minister who turned against Universalist doctrine,[138] attacked both Mann and the State School Board. In a sermon preached in Boston, Smith chastised them for taking the Bible and religious instruction out of the schools and for prohibiting corporal punishment.[139] Mann's major defense was his advocacy of Bible reading in the schools. In his Twelfth Annual Report he reiterated this belief:

> Our system earnestly inculcates all Christian morals; it founds it morals on the basis of religion; it welcomes the religion of the Bible; and, in receiving the Bible, it allows it to do what it is allowed to do in no other system--to speak for itself [Italics in original].[140]

Secularization in Cincinnati

In the Massachusetts and Virginia conflicts society put pressure on the public school. Some elements wanted their specific Bible doctrine taught as had been done in the colonial schools; others were striving for a common religion which, it was hoped, would appeal to the entire spectrum of a pluralistic society by ignoring sectarian differences. To this group the Bible became the basis for the teaching of religion and morality.

However, in Cincinnati, the inclusion of the Bible itself in the curriculum became the focus of a controversy from 1869 to 1873. In an

---

[138] Matthew Smith, Universalism not of God: An Examination of the System of Universalism; Its Doctrine, Arguments, and Fruits (n.p.: American Tract Society, 1847).

[139] Matthew Smith, The Bible, the Rod, and Religion, sermon preached in Boston, 19 Oct. 1846, cited by McCluskey, pp. 83-84.

[140] Mann, Twelfth Annual Report, pp. 116-17.

attempt to encourage the Roman Catholics to use the public school system, Samuel A. Miller presented, and the Board of Education passed on November 1, 1869, a resolution prohibiting "religious instruction and the reading of religious books, including the Bible."[141] A court injunction preventing implementation of the resolution and stating that the action of the board was "against public policy and morality" was sought by thirty-seven citizens and filed November 2, 1869.[142] In a 2-1 decision the Cincinnati Superior Court made the injunction permanent; Bible reading would be allowed in the Cincinnati schools. Alphonso Taft, the only dissenter, wrote an opinion of the case that provided precedent for the 1963 Supreme Court decision on Bible reading. However, in 1872 the Ohio Supreme Court overturned the lower court decision and thus supported a secular view of education by eliminating Bible reading. The conflict was between those who wanted to use the public school and the Bible to spread a common religion and those who wanted the public school to be secular. There was growing opinion that all religion, including the Bible, was sectarian and belonged in the churches, not in any part of the government, including the public school.

For the plaintiffs, W. M. Ramsey claimed, "Religion is to be taught in the schools; and it is to be taught to the end that the

---

[141] John D. Minor et. al., The Bible in the Public Schools (1870; rpt. New York: DeCapo Press, 1967), p. 10.

[142] Minor, pp. 5, 6, 9.

pupils may become intelligent and virtuous citizens."[143] George R. Sage stated,

> The morality of the Bible is the morality of the Constitution. Religion first, morality second, and knowledge third, and declared to be essential to good government, and therefore schools and the means of instruction are to be encouraged.[144]

Rufus King summarized the case for the plaintiffs with nine points in which he emphasized the belief that public schools were established in part to instruct in morality, religion and morality were derived from the Bible, and the Bible was the foundation of morality.[145]

Speaking for the defense, Stanley Matthews claimed that religion did not belong in the public schools.[146] J. B. Stallo refuted the idea that Christianity was the only source of morality, claiming that, in fact, Christianity had sometimes gone against morality. He stated that "to make the Bible a proper vehicle for sound religious and moral instruction" was unnecessary.[147] Furthermore, "the standards of morality are by no means all of Christian erection."[148] Stallo concluded that ". . . the state can not teach religious truth and can not inculcate morality as such."[149] George Hoadley also questioned

---

[143] Minor, p. 52.

[144] Minor, p. 191.

[145] Minor, pp. 346-48.

[146] Minor, p. 209.

[147] Minor, pp. 65, 98.

[148] Minor, p. 99.

[149] Minor, p. 103.

the idea that morals came from the Bible when he said, "Morals existed before the Bible. . . . [M]orals existed before the world."[150] In addition, Hoadley rejected the idea that morals were based on God's will.[151]

In his "Opinion" of the case, Judge Hagans summarized the importance of the Bible in teaching character:

> It is not claimed, anywhere, that the Holy Bible does not impress on the children of the common schools, the principles and duties of morality and justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love of country, humanity, universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, chastity, moderation, temperance, and all other virtues, which are the ornaments of human society; and that these principles and duties are not in entire conformity with the demands of the Constitution and the necessities of the State. Nor is it claimed, seriously, that the Bible is adverse, in any translation, to any of these virtues, as proper to be inculcated. On the contrary, its sublime morality furnishes those teachings best fitted to develop the morals, and promote the virtues, that strengthen and adorn both the social and the public life.[152]

Secularization and Other Conflicts

Blanshard summarized three other conflicts affecting use of the Bible. In 1843 the Philadelphia School Board decided to allow Catholics to read from Catholic Bibles. During the following controversy there were mob riots, and two Catholic churches and some schools were burned. In 1840-41 New York City endured a conflict involving funding. At that time, the Protestant Public School Society, which received

---

[150] Minor, p. 138.

[151] Minor, p. 142.

[152] Minor, p. 371.

public funds, ran the schools. Prayer, hymns, and the King James Version of the Bible were used in the school program. Bishop Hughes wanted funding for the Catholic private schools. Then in 1842 the schools were made public, and a secular state school system took over their responsibility. However, the conflict over aid to Catholic schools continued until 1894 when the New York state constitutional amendment prohibited aid to any school under any amount of denominational control. Elsewhere, in Boston, Catholic school children were expelled from school for refusing to participate in religion services, and a student was flogged for refusing to read from the Protestant Bible.[153]

Other court cases in the nineteenth century also related to the Bible. In Donahoe v. Richards, a student who had been expelled for refusing to read the King James Version of the Bible lost his case against the Superintending School Committee.[154] In Weiss v. The District Board of Edgerton, there was a successful challenge of Bible reading in public schools. The court ruled that the school should be secular like other state institutions and have secular purposes.[155] A similar successful challenge was made in People ex. rel. Ring v. Board of Education.[156]

---

[153] Blanshard, pp. 17-18; also Michaelsen, p. 88; Taylor, p. 5.

[154] 38 Maine 279 (1854).

[155] 76 Wisconsin Reports 177 (1890).

[156] 245 Illinois Reports 334 (1910).

Secularization in Children's Books

Textbooks. Although the Bible lost its secure place in the public school as the center of the curriculum and as the major textbooks, the textbooks of the nineteenth century were basically Bible-centered and Bible-integrated. Ruth Miller Elson, after analyzing one thousand textbooks of the century, concluded that the authors were a "by-product" of New England Puritanism.[157] Schoolbooks prior to the Civil War integrated Bible teaching into all subject areas. The Biblical view of creation was mentioned in numerous texts. Mathematics students determined how many seconds it had been since the creation. Geography books relied on the biblical version of creation for the explanation of the beginning of the earth. Elson stated, "Schoolbooks before the Civil War accepted without question the Bible history of the world and the creation of man."[158] By the end of the century, however, Darwin's theory of evolution began to take precedence over the Bible model in some texts. Other trends included a change in religious emphasis from theology to ethics, even though the ethics did center around God, and the inclusion of more secular stories in the readers. Elson claimed that as early as the 1830's there were more secular stories than Bible stories in the readers.[159]

---

[157] Ruth Miller Elson, Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 7.

[158] Elson, p. 17.

[159] Elson, pp. 41, 43.

McGuffey Readers. The changes in editions of the McGuffey readers illustrated secularization in textbooks of the nineteenth century. It was estimated that over 120 million copies of the various editions of those readers were sold between 1836 and 1920, seven million before 1850.[160] In 1890 it was the basic reader in thirty-seven states.[161]

William Holmes McGuffey (1800-1873) was a Presbyterian minister. According to John Westerhoff, he was a strong Calvinist who considered the purpose of education to be both moral and spiritual and for that reason included Bible stories, passages, and principles in his books.[162] However, he was responsible for only the first four readers of the McGuffey series, and no edition after 1857. Westerhoff concluded that the Calvinistic theology and ethics, with their emphasis on salvation and piety, were missing in the later editions, 1879 and after; what remained was a middle class morality and value system.[163]

Stanley W. Lindberg edited a book which reprinted some stories from various editions of the readers. There were some Bible stories, but the majority were children's stories with a didactic flavor. For example, in "Boys at Play" from the 1836 and 1841 first readers, seven lines were about playing, eleven lines about behavior, and six lines told the student to not use bad words but do what the Bible said

---

[160] John H. Westerhoff III, McGuffey and His Readers (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), p. 14.

[161] Westerhoff, p. 15.

[162] Westerhoff, pp. 17-18.

[163] Westerhoff, p. 19.

because it was God's Word.[164] The God of McGuffey was omniscient, recording the good and bad of the character.[165] Rewards and punishments were usually immediate, with heavenly rewards described also.[166] By the 1843 edition, the Preface claimed that the books were non-sectarian.[167] However, anti-Catholic references were still included.[168] Other changes included more dialogue, less emphasis on punishment for wrongdoing, and lowered reading levels. By the time of the extensive 1879 revision, the McGuffey readers were greatly secularized.

Fiction. Based on her study of children's fiction 1820 to 1860, Anne Scott MacLeod stated, "The chief target of fictional instruction was the moral character of the young."[169] She described the books as containing "relentless moralizing," with much emphasis on right and wrong, good and bad, wickedness, and punishment for sin.[170] However, she also described the stories as being more "moral" than "religious"

---

[164] "Boys at Play," in Stanley W. Lindberg, The Annotated McGuffey: Selections from the McGuffey Readers 1836-1920 (Atlanta: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976), pp. 2-3.

[165] "The Little Chimney Sweep," in Lindberg, pp. 16-17.

[166] "The Idle Schoolboy," in Lindberg, pp. 30-31.

[167] "Preface" (1843), cited by Lindberg, p. 13.

[168] 1857 Fifth Reader, cited by Lindberg, p. 13.

[169] Anne Scott MacLeod, A Moral Tale: Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820-1860 (Hamden, Ct.: Archon, 1975), p. 24.

[170] MacLeod, p. 15, 23.

and more optimistic than those during the 1700's with its emphasis on the total depravity of the child.[171]

Secularization and the National Education Association (NEA)

In 1869, the same year the Cincinnati School Board passed the resolution prohibiting Bible reading, the National Teacher's Association passed a resolution approving Bible study in the public schools, although it did denounce sectarian teaching.[172] After the National Teacher's Association became the National Education Association in 1870, speakers at the annual meetings repeatedly approved, and in some instances demanded, that effective moral education include religious teaching in the schools. According to David B. Tyack, the three most often recommended methods for teaching correct behavior at this time were "ceremonial reading of the Bible," "recitation of prayers," usually the Lord's Prayer, and the singing of hymns.[173] Tyack also claimed that anyone who opposed nonsectarian teaching of the Bible was in the minority and definitely "on the defensive."[174]

At the 1876 annual NEA meeting, W. H. Ruffner, while calling for a scientific approach to teaching ethics, nevertheless stated that God's

---

171 MacLeod, P. 141.

172 1869 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings, pp. 18-21, cited by Index of NEA Proceedings 1857-1906 (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907), p. 19.

173 David B. Tyack, "Onward Christian Soldiers: Religion and the American Common School," in History and Education: The Educational Uses of the Past, ed. Paul Nash (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 223.

174 Tyack, p. 221.

will was absolute authority in moral matters. He proposed that educators appeal to God as an authority but not necessarily tell students how to determine God's will. He expressed the opinion that

> deference for eccentricities of religious opinion will have become an intolerable vice when any [italics in original] school teacher hesitates to acknowledge the existence of the authority of the blessed God and Father of us all.[175]

Ruffner also wanted the "moral code" of the Bible systematized. "Let the Church give men right principles, and let the school systematize them. . . ."[176]

At the 1888 meeting John W. Cook, while speaking on the failure of schools to teach morality, reaffirmed the sentiment that in getting rid of dogma, educators had eliminated much good teaching. He stated, "All that is finds its true explanation and meaning in its relation to God."[177]

Zalmon Richards also expressed concern that the Bible, prayer, and moral instruction had been taken out of the schools.[178] However, a few years later he said, "The Bible is the basis of all moral principles,

---

[175] W. H. Ruffner, "The Moral Element in Primary Education," in 1876 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Salem, Ohio: NEA, 1876), pp. 39, 41.

[176] Ruffner, "The Moral Element," p. 43.

[177] John W. Cook, "The Schools Fail to Teach Morality or to Cultivate the Religious Sentiment," in 1888 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Topeka: NEA, 1888), p. 41.

[178] Zalmon Richards, "Moral Training in Elementary Schools," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1892), p. 321.

but it is not absolutely necessary to use the Bible in teaching morals."[179]

In a discussion of character education at the 1892 annual meeting, H. A. Fischer of Wheaton College advocated the use of the Bible when he gave three parallels: teach unselfishness by teaching Christ; teach obedience by teaching "authority supreme"; teach morals by teaching the Bible, "the best textbook on morals known."[180]

E. E. White of Columbia emphasized the need for moral training in the schools in 1895 and stated his reliance on authority for moral code, the Bible in particular. He did not advocate teaching religion as an end but rather as a means to the end of "effective moral training. . . ."[181] In his opinion, ritual was probably not very effective, but religion could be used in public schools "so far as may be necessary to make moral training efficient, and for this purpose."[182]

Secularization and Theology

Horace Bushnell (1802-1876) exemplified the theology of ministers who still used the Bible but did not emphasize dogma. He was a Congregationalist preacher but did not adhere to all Puritan beliefs.

---

[179] Zalmon Richards, "Discussion," in Proceedings of the International Congress of Education of the World's Columbian Exposition (New York; NEA, 1895), p. 445.

[180] H. A. Fischer, "Discussion," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1892), p. 116.

[181] E. E. White, "Religion in the School," in Proceedings of the International Congress of Education of the World's Columbian Exposition (New York: NEA, 1895), p. 296.

[182] White, pp. 296, 299.

Rather than believing in a technical conversion experience, he believed Christian education began with nurture and cultivation. The parents' Christian life and spirit would "flow" into the child: "They shall beget their own good within him [the child]."[183] He called this an "organic connection of character between the parent and the child."[184]

Bushnell considered Christian teaching important when given correctly. He advocated using basic scripture, including memorization of the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles Creed, but not dogma or catechism, which he considered sectarian. Especially with young children he emphasized the importance of the teacher being a living example.[185]

To Bushnell the public school was a means of nurturing children:

> Common schools, then, are to be Christian schools . . . in the same sense that our government is Christian. . . . That is, in the recognition of God and Christ and providence and the Bible. . . . In most of our American communities, especially those which are older and more homogenous, we have no difficulty in retaining the Bible in the schools and doing every thing necessary to a sound Christian training.[186]

Secularization Summarized

In summary, the public schools in the 1800's began with the Bible and other Protestant religious material and teachings as an accepted

---

[183] Horace Bushnell, Christian Nurture (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 10.

[184] Bushnell, p. 31.

[185] Bushnell, pp. 367-70.

[186] Bushnell, pp. 188, 190.

part of the character education curriculum. As Catholics and other minorities grew in number, however, a trend towards a more common religion occurred, sometimes based on the Bible, sometimes based on democratic ideas. Yet even though sectarian teaching had been eliminated in most schools, Bible reading was still common; the Bible and Bible reading were still an integral part of textbooks and the typical public school day.

The 1900's--Continuing Controversy

A continuing controversy during the 1900's was whether moral education, one of the goals of education, could be taught without the Bible.

Turn of the Century

William O. Bliss identified four views concerning the relationship of religion and the Bible in the schools at the turn of the century. One group wanted to confine religion to the church and home, eliminating it from the school. However, this group did "not admit this prevents ethical and moral teaching in the school."[187] A second group maintained that morality could be taught effectively only with definite sectarian religious teaching. Since that teaching could not take place in the public schools, parochial schools were needed. A third group would teach morality through a nonsectarian religion;

---

[187] William O. Bliss, The Encyclopedia of Social Reform (1897; rpt. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 1182.

they were for religion, against secularization. The fourth group represented those who were working for compromise.[188]

William T. Harris. William T. Harris was an influential educator who disagreed with teaching even a common religion in the public schools. At the 1903 NEA annual meeting, he presented a speech on "The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes." In this speech he concluded that the public school could not "successfully undertake religious instruction" because it was a "secular" institution, and Christian doctrines could not be taught secularly.[189] He differentiated between religious and secular instruction:

> The principle of religious instruction is authority; that of secular instruction is demonstration and verification. . . .[T]oo much authority in secular studies prevents the pupil from getting at the vital points. He cultivates memory at the expense of thought and insight; for the best teaching of the secular branches requires the utmost exercise of alertness and critical acuteness of the intellect.[190]

What Harris considered necessary for moral education was that the state have students of all religious persuasions "mingle in the common school and learn to know and to respect and love one another."[191]

---

[188] Bliss, pp. 1182-83.

[189] William T. Harris, The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes," in 1903 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1903), p. 346.

[190] Harris, p. 353.

[191] Harris, pp. 354-55.

George A. Coe. George A. Coe described his opinion of the relationship of religion and character education in the schools in his book, Education and Religion in Morals:

> It is just as possible for the public school to build character upon the religious instruction that the child receives at the church as for the Sunday School to utilise [sic] the instruction in reading that the child receives in the public school.[192]

In other words, Coe wanted religion without dogma. To him "virtue must be learned by practice."[193] As for the Bible, he was not concerned that it was "outlawed"; once there was a national purpose involving the Bible, it would be reinstated."[194]

In 1911 Coe lauded John W. Carr's character education report at the NEA annual meeting "because no mention of religion occurs in it."[195] He stressed that "religious instruction belongs to the church and the home. No part of it should be given by the school."[196] At the same meeting Coe stated, "I do not desire any recognition of the religious bases of morals. What I hope for is a recognition that life, as far as it is truly successful, is social thru and thru."[197] He was

---

[192] George A. Coe, Education and Religion in Morals (New York: Revell, 1904), p. 354.

[193] Coe, p. 349.

[194] Coe, p. 359.

[195] George A. Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues: A Study of Method in the Teaching of Morals," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), pp. 418-19.

[196] Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues," p. 419.

[197] Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues," p. 419.

not concerned if the Bible and worship were used but urged reliance on the organization and conduct of the school, the teacher's personality, and a definite teaching scheme for the teaching of morals.[198]

Other NEA Speakers. At the 1906 NEA annual meeting, W. O. Thompson said that truth was the basis of all education and recognition of authority was essential. He based some of his ideas on the Bible, while also encouraging moral education for the sake of democracy.[199]

At that same meeting Thomas A. Mott continued the discussion of the relationship between morality and the Bible: "The moral phases of life are closely related to religious life, but the two are quite separate."[230] Yet he stated that God and religion were at the base of all successful moral systems. His conclusion was that the Bible should have a place in public school character education, but some parts should be excluded.[201]

In 1908 Clifford W. Barnes stated that educators should accept the secular school as part of God's providence and do their best within those confines. He included five ways religion could be part

---

[198] Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues," p. 419.

[199] W. O. Thompson, The Effect of Moral Education in the Public Schools Upon the Civic Life of the Community," in 1906 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1906), pp. 44, 45, 47.

[200] Thomas A. Mott, "The Means Afforded by the Public Schools for Moral and Religious Training," in 1907 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907), p. 44.

[201] Mott, p. 42.

of public school education: acknowledge the religious bases on which morality rests; use biographies to show how religion played an important part; have a formal worship time once a day; keep a "pure," "undefiled," nonsectarian religious atmosphere; and allow only religious persons to teach.[202]

John W. Carr presented a plan of character education at the 1911 NEA annual meeting.[203] During the discussion that followed, William H. Black stated, "Ethics is a matter of character. Morals is a matter of conventionality."[204] Yet he listed three imperatives he considered the materials for building character: belief in God, immortality of soul, and one great textbook of principles, the Bible.[205]

1920's and 1930's

Committee on Character Education. The Committee on Character Education was appointed after the 1920 NEA annual meeting.[206] At the 1922 meeting Milton Bennion stated in the Committee report that love of

---

[202] Clifford W. Barnes, "Relation of Moral and Religious Training," in 1908 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), p. 44.

[203] J. W. Carr, "Moral Education Thru the Agency of the Public Schools," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), pp. 454-56.

[204] William H. Black, "Discussion," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), p. 415.

[205] Black, p. 415.

[206] Milton Bennion, "Preliminary Report of the Committee on Citizenship and Character Education," in 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), p. 345.

God and love of fellow men were bases for moral life.[207] The 1923 report was a character education plan dependent on "native ability, general education, moral character, and professional training of the teaching staff," with emphasis on scientific method and little mention of God, the Bible or religion.[208]

Character Studies. Some character studies did not support a correlation of Bible knowledge with good character. In a study of 3,316 pupils in grades seven through twelve, P. R. Hightower found no significant relationship between biblical knowledge and the memorization of verses of the Bible with any phase of character.[209] Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth came to a similar conclusion.[210]

After analyzing some character education programs in which religious sanctions were involved, Edward R. Bartlett concluded that

---

[207] Milton Bennion, "Report of Progress Committee on Character Education--the Sanctions of Morality," in 1922 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), p. 345.

[208] Milton Bennion, "Report of Committee on Character Education," in 1923 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1923), p. 250.

[209] P. R. Hightower, "Biblical Information in Relation to Character and Conduct," in University of Iowa Studies in Character, III, cited by Edwin C. Broome, "Let the Schools Do It," School and Society, 53 (17 May 1941), 619.

[210] Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth, Studies in the Organization of Character, Vol. III of Studies in the Nature of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 153-68.

the Bible was no longer in "chief place" in character education programs, but that

> this fact need not imply that it is held in less esteem than in modern days . . . but rather that, with the passing of the religious aim of early education, the textbook of religion also passed from the center of the curriculum.[212]

Bartlett admitted that many did feel Bible knowledge "gives stability to character."[212] He also noted that in the 1920's the Bible was still commonly used in the public school but doubted whether Bible reading or extramural courses were beneficial to character education.[213]

The Scopes Trial. Though not directly related to character education, the Scopes v. Tennessee trial did affect the acceptance of the Bible as the source of truth. According to Michaelsen, Charles Hodge of Princeton represented the group who believed in an infallible, inerrant Bible, while B. J. Lowenburg led the group to unite religion and evolution and allow values to be determined by experience.[214] Though the decision of the trial allowed the anti-evolution law to remain,[215] nonetheless, the deterioration of the Bible as a base for morality continued, partially because of the highly publicized debate between Clarence Darrow and Williams Jennings Bryan.

---

[211] Edward R. Bartlett, "The Character Education Movement in the Public Schools," in Studies in Religious Education, ed. Philip Henry Lotz (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931), pp. 463-64.

[212] Bartlett, p. 464.

[213] Bartlett, p. 465-56.

[214] Michaelsen, pp. 161-62.

[215] 154 Tennessee 105, 289 SW 363 (1927).

1940's to the Present

Since 1940 a number of events have taken place which affected or challenged the use of the Bible as a base for character education. They indicated that use of the Bible as a base had not been eliminated but had been altered.

Released Time. Released time was a method to allow religious instruction in the public schools. Believing that Bible reading and Sunday School were not enough to preserve the religious heritage, in 1905 the Inter Church Conference on Federation had requested that 8 percent of the school day be used for Bible teaching under the auspices of the church. Gary, Indiana, was usually listed as the first system to have a formal released time program; 619 students attended nine different churches for one hour each week while the remaining students played.[216] By 1947 it was estimated that as many as two million students in 2,200 communities participated in released time.[217]

At the 1924 NEA annual meeting, Mathilde C. Gecks and Margaret Knox uraged NEA support for released time.[218] Gecks indicated that the school must provide time and place for moral and religious education.

---

[216] Michaelsen, p. 174.

[217] Michaelsen, pp. 175-76, citing figures reported in the 1947 Yearbook of the International Council of Religious Education accepted by Associate Justice Frankfurter in McCollum v. Board of Education of School District No. 71, 333 U. S. 203 (1948).

[218] Mathilde C. Gecks, "Moral and Religious Education," in 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1924), pp. 140-44; Margaret Knox, "Our Children's Neglected Inheritance," in 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1924), pp. 155-57.

Knox was concerned that regular classroom teachers were not effective in character building, but released time would allow trained teachers to work with the children. Another encouragement for released time was given by John J. Tigert at the 1929 NEA annual meeting.[219]

However, in 1948 the Supreme Court, in an 8-1 decision, ruled in McCollum v. Board of Education that church personnel could not hold classes in the public school buildings.[110]

After the McCollum decision, J. Graham Garrison, in his report on "The Role of the Public Schools in the Development of Moral and Spiritual Values" to the NEA 1948 Representative Assembly, stated that the "McCollum case does not [italics in original] throw moral and spiritual values out of the schools; it only forbids sectarianism."[221] Ten spiritual values that could be taught in the public schools included unification of society, worth of the individual, personality and ethical character, a cooperative spirit, community life, truth, reverence and awe, love for the beautiful, hatred for wrong, and recognition of the greatest force in life--the power of God.[222] No mention of the Bible was made. A recommendation was made in the report, and subsequently passed, for the NEA to establish a commission

---

[219] John J. Tigert, "Character Education from the Standpoint of the Philosophy of Education," in 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929), p. 774.

[220] McCollum v. Board of Education of School District No. 71, 333 U. S. 203 (1948).

[221] J. Graham Garrison, "The Role of the Public Schools in the Development of Moral and Spiritual Values," in 1948 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1948), p. 169.

[222] Garrison, p. 170.

"to foster and promote the development of moral and spiritual values in the public school."[223]

Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. In 1944 the John Dewey Society published its seventh yearbook entitled The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, edited by John S. Brubacher. In it Brubacher stated the committee considered morals to be natural rather than supernatural. The learning of values was dependent on experience and living, while the Bible was no longer authority:

> But a wider knowledge of other cultures, the doctrine of evolution, a study of comparative religion, the "higher criticism" of the Bible, and a closer study of comparative moralities have brought an increasing conviction that the ideas and standards of human thought and action have a long cultural history and are to be studied as one whole piece, a seamless web of human effort.[224]

The American Council on Education. Disagreeing with Brubacher and his committee over the assumption that "spiritual values embody the full, valid content of religion,"[225] in 1947 the American Council on Education stated that the current moral and spiritual emphasis in education was inadequate; the study of religious values was needed. No

---

[223] Garrison, p. 171.

[224] John S. Brubacher, ed., The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1944), p. 53.

[225] Brubacher, p. 128.

mention was made of the need for the Bible to teach moral and spiritual values.[226]

Educational Policies Commission. In 1951 the Educational Policies Commission published Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools to affirm "the primacy of moral and spiritual values among the objectives of public education in the United States."[227] In the book the Commission concluded that religion, but not religious values, should be taught. Moral education should be integrated with various subjects rather than Bible-based.[227]

Abingdon v. Schempp. In 1963 the question of directly using the Bible to teach character in public schools was answered legally in Abingdon School District v. Schempp and Murray v. Curlett. Although the defense lawyers attempted to show that Bible reading had moral value separate from its religious emphasis, the Supreme Court ruled that daily Bible reading was not to take place in public schools.[229]

---

[226] The American Council on Education, Committee on Religion and Education, The Relation of Religion to Public Education (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1947), pp. v, vi.

[227] William G. Carr, "Educational Policies Committee Report," in 1951 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951), pp. 203, 300.

[228] Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951), pp. 60, 80.

[229] Abingdon School District v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).

Summary

Most character education based on the Bible appeared to have its roots in the Puritan ethics and philosophy of the colonial time period. Puritan preachers such as John Cotton, Cotton Mather and Lyman Beecher were not only religious leaders but also dominated the civil and moral lives of the people as well. The major textbooks were also Bible-based, as exemplified by the New England Primer. The McGuffey Readers of the eighteenth century also began as Bible-based textbooks. This Puritan emphasis continued through the mid-1800's; however, by 1850 a secularization, due mainly to the growing pluralization of the American people, had begun. Eighteenth century conflicts over the Bible and religion in the schools served to draw attention to the wide range of philosophies prevalent among the American people concerning the use of the Bible in public schools.

By the end of the eighteenth century most Americans either believed, or accepted, that the public schools, and thus character education, would be secular and not based on the Bible. This did not end the controversies, however. Discussions on how to include religion and the Bible in character education without infringing on separation of church and state or basing morality on Bible sanctions continued. By 1947, when the American Council on Education published its book to explain how religion could be included in the schools, the conflict was more over religion than the Bible itself. Yet the Bible was still an issue, as evidenced by Abingdon v. Schempp, the court case which formally removed the Bible as a basis for character education from the schools.

CHAPTER 4

Character Education Based on Living in Society

R. Freeman Butts defined character education as "any teaching or training intended to improve conduct and guide behavior toward desirable social and moral goals."[1] He added that

> many public schools in the United States teach democratic citizenship and moral and spiritual values through student self-government and the school curriculum. . . . Good character is formed by living under conditions that demand good conduct, and that exercise and reward good conduct.[2]

V. T. Thayer defined morality based on relationships in society as

> common ways of thinking, feeling, and acting in relation to people which long experience has confirmed as necessary and desirable in order progressively to better the quality of these interrelationships.[3]

Character education based on society and its numerous relationships has taken a number of forms in the United States. This chapter will present various beliefs of society and their effects on character education.

Puritan Theocracy

Public education in Puritan New England, as previously discussed, was based on the need for literacy to be able to read the Bible.

---

[1] R. Freeman Butts, "Character Education," World Book Encyclopedia, 1982 ed.

[2] Butts, "Character Education."

[3] V. T. Thayer, The Attack upon the American Secular School (Westport, Ct.: Glenwood Press, 1951), p. 212.

Government leaders passed laws which required Bible training for children, such as the 1647 Old Deluder Satan Act. Puritan society, however, also considered civil and spiritual authority to be appropriate together; government had a spiritual purpose as well as a secular one. In other words, Puritan education was based on society, a society controlled by the church.

Roger Williams was an early advocate of separation of church and state in America. In The Bloudy Tenant, of Persecution, for cause of Conscience, discussed, in A Conference between Truth and Peace 1644, he defended his belief that the state was secular and the church was spiritual; therefore, civil officers should not become involved in spiritual decisions.[4] John Cotton, on the other hand, wrote in his rebuttal, The Bloudy Tenant of Persecution, Washed and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe 1647, "it is a carnall [sic] and worldly, and indeed, an ungodly imagination, to confine the Magistrate's charge, to the bodies, and good of the subject, and to exclude them from the care of their souls."[5] Cotton continued to explain that both civil and church leaders should be concerned for the total man and should

---

[4] Roger Williams, The Bloudy Tenant, of Persecution, for cause of Conscience, discussed, in A Conference between Truth and Peace 1644), in Vol. III of The Writings of Roger Williams (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), pp. 161-62, 372-73, 389-99, cited by Irwin H. Polishook, Roger Williams, John Cotton and Religious Freedom: A Controversy in New and Old England (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall), pp. 60-61.

[5] John Cotton, The Bloudy Tenant of Persecution, Washed and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe (1647) (1647; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1972), pp. 67-68.

cooperate with each other.[6] The subsequent banishment of Williams from Massachusetts and the publishing of letters, arguments and rebuttals by Cotton and Williams on the subject foreshadowed the secularization of the state that followed later.[7]

Quaker Philosophy

The Quaker emphasis on education for their society was obvious in the following extract from a school character preamble:

> Whereas, the prosperity and welfare of any people depend in great measure upon the good education of youth, and their early instruction in the principles of true religion and qualifying them to serve their country and themselves, by breeding them in writing and reading and learning of languages, and useful arts and sciences, suitable to their sex, age and degree; which cannot be effected in any manner or so well as by erecting public schools for the purpose aforesaid. . . .[8]

According to Thomas Woody, in his study of Quaker education, the Quakers were concerned that schools provide a safe environment for their children. They wanted the children taught by members of their own faith and "not to send them to such schools where they are taught the corrupt ways, manners and fashions of the world and of the Heathen in their authors and manners of the heathenish gods and goddesses. . . ."[9] Teachers were to be Friends and have a good moral

---

[6] Cotton, pp. 68-70.

[7] Polishook included arguments from both sides in his book.

[8] Thomas Woody, Early Quaker Education in Pennsylvania (1920; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969), p. 30, citing Friends Library, 5, p. 208.

[9] Woody, p. 20, citing Minutes London Yearly Meeting, 1690, 4-9, 11.

influence by being examples of strict rules.[10] Books were also censored to keep morals high.[11]

Quaker schools were often called public schools, receiving state funds in New Jersey until 1866. However, according to Woody, they were not really public but parochial; nevertheless, the transition to become public free schools was relatively easy.[12]

Education for a Successful Democracy

With the founding of the United States came the philosophy that education was necessary for successful democracy. Morality was to be developed for the patriotic purpose of enhancing and promoting the democratic society. Thomas Jefferson articulated this philosophy well. In a letter to Peter Carr, Jefferson wrote,

> Man was destined for society. His morality therefore was to be formed to this object. He was endowed with a sense of right and wrong merely relative to this. This sense is as much a part of his nature as the sense of hearing, seeing, feeling. . . . It may be strengthened by exercise, as may any particular limb of the body.[13]

In the Rockfish Gap Report, Jefferson emphasized the purposes of education in the primary grades:

---

[10] Woody, p. 174.

[11] Thomas Woody, Quaker Education in the Colony and State of New Jersey (1923; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969), p. 315.

[12] Woody, Education in Pennsylvania, p. 270; Education in New Jersey, p. 366.

[13] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, 10 Aug. 1787, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, VI, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 257.

> To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties;
> To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him, by either . . .
> And, in general [teach him to] [brackets in original] observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed. . . .[14]

Morality, to Jefferson, was a means of being successful in society. Writing to Thomas Jefferson Randolph in 1808 he said, "A determination never to do what is wrong, prudence, and good humor, will go far towards securing you the estimation of the world."[15] Public opinion was important to Jefferson because he considered it "the safest guide and guardian of public morals and welfare."[16]

However, Jefferson put more importance on morality than mere means for success. Again writing to Peter Carr he advised, "Give up money, give up fame, give up science, give up the earth itself and all it contains rather than do immoral acts."[17] He added that since virtue

---

[14] Thomas Jefferson, Rockfish Gap Report, in Early History of the University of Virginia as Contained in the Letters of Thomas Jefferson and Joseph C. Cabell, ed. Nathaniel F. Cabell (Richmond: n.p., 1865), p. 434, cited by Robert M. Healey, Jefferson on Religion in Public Education (1962; rpt. of dissertation. New Haven: Archon Books, 1970), p. 149.

[15] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, 24 Nov. 1808, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XI, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 79.

[16] Thomas Jefferson, "Report of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia," 4 Oct. 1819, in Cabell, pp. 459-60, cited by Healey, p. 180.

[17] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, 19 Aug. 1785, in The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, VIII, ed. Julian Parks Boyd (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1955), p. 406.

was like a muscle which needed exercise, the more Carr would practice virtue, the more it would become part of his life.[18]

An educated citizenry was so important to Jefferson that he wanted local government to control education.[19] He submitted a plan in Virginia for the reorganization of education and proposed a number of bills to further his goal of an educated citizenry. In 1779 he wrote the Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge, the same year his Bill for Amending the Charter of William and Mary was passed. He was concerned with improving William and Mary to endow "the future guardians of the rights and liberties of their country" with "science and virtue."[20] According to Sadie Bell, Jefferson made in these bills "no reference to education as being directed in the interests of a state concern for religion; but, wholly in the interests of a state concern for liberty. . . ."[21]

Secularization

Clarence Benson claimed that the secularization of American education was "gradual and almost imperceptible."[22] He concluded it was a

---

[18] Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, 19 Aug. 1785, p. 406.

[19] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to John Tyler, 26 May 1810, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XI, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 143.

[20] Thomas Jefferson, "Bill for Amending the Charter of William and Mary," in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, II, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 233.

[21] Sadie Bell, The Church, the State, and Education in Virginia (1930; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), p. 164.

[22] Clarence Benson, History of Christian Education (Chicago: Moody Press, 1944), p. 113.

result of immigration, denominational loyalty and politics.[23] The immigration of the 1800's had resulted in an influx of Americans who were not Protestant in their religion. As ethnic groups grew in size and number, the Puritan influence diminished and America became a more pluralistic society. The resultant trend toward secularism and a common morality had a great effect on the teaching of character.

This secularization was reflected even in the educational platforms of the political parties in the mid-1800's. According to Benson, in 1841 the Whigs opposed all church schools, while in 1842 the American Party promoted the Bible in the public schools but advocated separation of church and state. The Know-Nothing Party was for public, not religious, schools in 1855 but still wanted the Bible in all the schools.[24]

Secularization in Virginia

Sadie Bell claimed that from the founding of the Virginia colony until 1776 Virginia was in a period of "integration of church and state."[25] The Anglican Church was the established church, with church and state united.[26] In 1724 James Blair sent a questionnaire concerning educational and religious conditions to the ministers of the various parishes in Virginia. They reported that at that time the

---

[23] Benson, p. 113.

[24] Benson, p. 113.

[25] Bell, p. 1.

[26] Bell, p. 90.

schools existing in Virginia included "'one public school,' the grammar school of William and Mary, five 'endowed schools' and a limited number of private schools."[27]

Bell termed the period between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars the "separation of church and state."[28] Thomas Jefferson advocated keeping church and state separate.[29] In his Notes on Virginia, written in 1781, Jefferson wrote that "the legitimate powers of government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others, not rights of conscience."[30] He specifically stated that he was against imposing beliefs on others, what he termed "tyranny of the mind."[31]

According to Bell, the founding of the University of Virginia provided a way for Jefferson to have an "ideal, civil university";[32] he encouraged the founding of a university in which religious groups could meet but were "independent of the University and of each other."[33] In a letter to William Roscoe, Jefferson said,

---

[27] Bell, p. 27.

[28] Bell, p. 148.

[29] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Nehemiah Dodge and Others, 1 Jan. 1802, in The Portable Thomas Jefferson, ed. Merrill D. Peterson (New York: Viking Press, 1975), p. 303.

[30] Thomas Jefferson, Notes on Virginia, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, I, ed. Albert Allery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 221.

[31] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Benjamin Rush, 23 Sept. 1800, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, X, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 175.

[32] Bell, p. 366.

[33] Bell, p. 375.

> This institution will be based upon the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is left free to combat it.[34]

According to Bell, during the years 1811 to 1860 there was a continuing struggle over denomination or secular control of education. Bell quoted a number of persons who expressed concern with problems of morality which they associated with the absence of religious training in the public schools.[35]

In 1822 the school commissioners of the state of Virginia were required to report "information concerning the moral character of teachers and moral instruction of pupils."[36] Concern for teacher morality was evident as was an emphasis on the importance of morality. Bell summarized the methods for teaching morality during this period: ". . . the use of rules, moral lessons drawn from readers, and spiritural readings and prayer were employed."[37]

Horace Mann and Secularization

Horace Mann, as discussed earlier, wanted the schools to teach a common morality based on the beliefs of a pluralistic society for the good of society. In his Twelfth Annual Report he stated,

---

[34] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to William Roscoe, 27 Dec. 1820, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, XV, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 303.

[35] Bell, pp. 244, 251-84.

[36] Bell, p. 340, citing Acts of assembly, 24 Feb. 1823, 50-51.

[37] Bell, p. 343.

> that government should do all that it can to facilitate the acquisition of religious truth; but shall leave the decision of the question, what religious truth is, to the arbitrament, without human appeal, of each man's reason and conscience. . . .[38]

He agreed with the 1827 Massachusetts law which required the teacher to inculcate

> the principles of piety, justice, and a sacred regard to truth, love to their country, humanity and universal benevolence, sobriety, industry, and frugality, chastity, moderation, and temperance, and those other virtues upon which a republican constitution is founded.[39]

Mann was concerned that existing schools were not meeting the government's need for "intelligence and virtue."[40] When he accepted the position as Secretary to the Massachusetts State Board of Education he wrote, "I have abandoned jurisprudence, and betaken myself to the large sphere of mind and morals."[41] In his oration, Go Forth and Teach, he admitted his concern at lack of morality in the country and the amount of crime, as well as concern at the number of atheists and false teachings such as Mormonism, Millerism, and Perfectionism.[42]

---

[38] Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1849), p. 111.

[39] Mann, p. 123.

[40] Horace Mann, Go Forth and Teach: An Oration Delivered Before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4, 1842 (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937), p. 12.

[41] Mary Tyler Peabody Mann, Life of Horace Mann (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937), pp. 82-83.

[42] Mann, Go Forth, pp. 55-58, 82, 88.

For Mann, a nonsectarian education in the common school was the answer to the problem of moral education. He encouraged, ". . . let there be one instituion, at least, which shall be sacred from the ravages of the spirit of party, one spot, in the wide land, unblasted by the fiery breath of animosity."[43] It was the duty of educators,

> as friends and sustainers of the Common School system . . . to keep them [the pupils] unspotted from the world, that is, uncontaminated by its vices; to train them up to the love of God and the love of man; to make the perfect example of Jesus Christ lovely in their eyes; and to give to all so much religious instruction as is compatible to parents and guardians.[44]

Common schools, with morality based on a common religion, would "Create . . . a purer morality" that would affect democracy.[45] Universal education would meet all needs, solve all problems; crime would go down, health would improve.[46] Since values and a republican education were intertwined, universal education would bring equality and wealth.[47]

---

[43] Horace Mann, Life and Works, V, eds. Mary Peabody Mann and George Combe Mann (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1891), pp. 36-37, cited by Neil Gerard McCluskey, Public Schools and Moral Education (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), p. 52.

[44] Horace Mann, "Baccalaureate Address of 1857," in Horace Mann at Antioch, by Joy Elmer Morgan (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1938), pp. 322-23.

[45] Horace Mann, Seventh Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1844), p. 84.

[46] Horace Mann, Sixth Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1843), p. 56; Horace Mann, Eleventh Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1848), pp. 87, 113, 135.

[47] Horace Mann, Ninth Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1846), p. 75; Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report, p. 59.

Mann reacted to claims the schools were godless and anti-Christian. In his Twelfth Annual Report he argued,

> Are not these virtues and graces part and parcel of Christianity? In other words, can there be Christianity without them? While these virtues and these duties towards God and man, are inculcated in our schools, any one who says that the schools are anti-Christian or un-Christian, expressly affirms that his own system of Christianity does not embrace any of this radiant catalogue; that it rejects them all, that it embraces their opposites![48]

Yet Mann was selective in what Bible portions he would use in the schools. Though he wanted the Bible in the schools, it was not the basis for his morality. He emphasized this when he described the kind of schools he wanted:

> The principles of morality should have been copiously intermingled with the principles of science. Cases of conscience should have alternated with lessons in the rudiments. The multiplication table should not have been more familiar, nor more frequently applied, than the rule to do to others as we would that they should do unto us. The lives of great and good men should have been held up for admiration and example; and especially the life and character of Jesus Christ as the sublimest pattern of benevolence, of purity, of self-sacrifice, ever exhibited to mortals. In every course of study, all the practical and preceptive parts of the Gospel should have been sacredly included; and all dogmatic theology and sectarianism sacredly excluded. In no school should the Bible have been opened to reveal the sword of the polemic, but to unloose the dove of peace.[49]

In fact, Mann put more reliance on his own "consciousness" than on the Bible.[50]

---

[48] Mann, Twelfth Annual Report, p. 123.

[49] Mann, Go Forth, pp. 44-45.

[50] Horace Mann, Life and Works, I, eds. Mary Peabody Mann and George Combe Mann (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1892), p. 51, cited by Neil Gerard McCluskey, Public Schools and Moral Education (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), p. 87.

Secularization in Textbooks

In her study of one thousand textbooks of the nineteenth century, Ruth Miller Elson concluded they were no longer Bible-based but rather "created and solidified American traditions" and were "a compilation of the ideas of the society."[51] Nationalism "permeated" all books, and patriotism was the "cornerstone of virtue."[52] Word perfect recitations were the major teaching method, with students memorizing values as well as facts.[53]

Textbooks also reflected the social trends of the century. Anti-Catholicism, with its lack of religious toleration, and anti-Jew and anti-black sentiments were prevalent. White superiority was promoted, even though most of the books were anti-slavery.[54] Heroes were praised because of moral greatness or patriotic achievements, not intellectual accomplishments. The stereotypic hero was the "practical, moral, hard-working man. . . ."[55] Loyalty to country, even to willingness to die for it, was highly praised.[56]

---

[51] Ruth Miller Elson, Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964), pp. vii, 1.

[52] Elson, pp. 41, 282.

[53] Elson, p. 9.

[54] Elson, pp. 63-100.

[55] Elson, pp. 227-28.

[56] Elson, pp. 282-83.

Elson also noted an emphasis on the "self-made man," with a corresponding reliance on Puritan values and the need to improve one's situation in life or else one had sinned.[57] Thus, though secularization was taking place, the Puritan heritage was still evident.

Ruth Freeman concluded that after the Civil War there was a trend of "underplaying of religious themes and an absence of pointed moralizing. The first readers were no longer aimed at learning of a catechism in preparation for the life hereafter"; rather the emphasis was on nature, pets, life, and having fun.[58]

Perhaps more than any other textbooks, the McGuffey Reader series exemplified the nineteenth century philosophy that textbooks were powerful teachers of character. In his book on the readers, John H. Westerhoff III cited numerous successful Americans, including Henry Ford, who credited McGuffey with teaching them "character building qualities" and "moral principles."[59] Yet even the McGuffey series was secularized by 1879. Westerhoff concluded that in the 1879 edition the salvation, righteousness, and Calvinistic theology, ethics, and piety were missing and what remained was a middle class morality with lots of patriotism added.[60]

---

[57] Elson, pp. 216-17.

[58] Ruth Freeman, Yesterday's School Books: A Looking Glass for Teachers of Today (Watkins Glen, N.H.: Century House, 1960), p. 103.

[59] John H. Westerhoff III, McGuffey and His Readers (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), p. 14, citing Henry Ford.

[60] Westerhoff, p. 19.

The Common School

The American common public school was a product of nineteenth century society. Horace Mann has been credited with being the father of the common school; however, numerous other Americans had a part in the campaign for a common school which would meet the needs of a pluralistic society and would solve many of society's problems, including that of character education.

Henry Barnard

Henry Barnard (1811-1900), though younger than Mann, was his contemporary in promoting what Vincent P. Lannie called the "gospel of public education."[61] Each worked with great zeal to produce a quality public school system in his own state, Mann in Massachusetts, Barnard in Connecticut. Their correspondence evidenced a reliance on each other for encouragement and motivation.[62]

Barnard also was concerned about moral education, stating it was often "overlooked."[63] He wanted the Bible to be used in a way that it would inspire respect and teach principles,[64] but he also wanted to

---

[61] Vincent P. Lannie, ed., Henry Barnard: American Educator (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974), p. 27.

[62] Correspondence between Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, in Lannie, pp. 43-97.

[63] Henry Barnard, Third Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board (1841) (Hartford: Case, Tiffany, and Burnham, 1841), rpt. in Vincent P. Lannie, ed., Henry Barnard: American Educator (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974), p. 116.

[64] Barnard, Third Annual Report, p. 116.

keep away from "denominational preferences" in the teaching of morals.[65] He believed that "patriotism and the love of learning, and every principle of good citizenship, to say nothing of the laws of Christian kindness," would overcome difficulties in morality.[66]

Horace Bushnell

Horace Bushnell (1802-1876) emphasized the importance of parents in the development of character. According to Bushnell, when the child was born he lay "within the moral agency of the parent, and passing out, by degrees, through a course of mixed agency, to a proper independency and self possession."[67] Thus the "parent exercises himself in the child, playing his emotions and sentiments, and working a character in him, by virtue of an organic power."[68] This was what Bushnell considered Christian nurture. Virtue was a "state of being" rather than "an act or series of acts."[69] Accordingly, character was not to be taught as "self-regulation."[70]

---

[65] Henry Barnard, "Editorial Introduction," American Journal of Education, 1 (1855-56), 137-40, rpt. in Vincent P. Lannie, ed. Henry Barnard: American Educator (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974), pp. 148-49.

[66] Barnard, "Editorial Introduction," p. 149.

[67] Horace Bushnell, Christian Nurture (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), pp. 29-30.

[68] Bushnell, p. 30.

[69] Bushnell, p. 30.

[70] Bushnell, p. 375.

Preaching in 1853, Bushnell claimed that Puritan schools were a thing of the past, and the Protestant common school was coming to an end.[71] In that sermon he defined common schools as

> schools for the children of all classes, sects and denominations of the people; so far perfected in their range of culture and mental and moral discipline, that it shall be in the interest of all to attend, as being the best schools in which can be found. . . . Common, so that the experience of families and of children under them, shall be an experience of the great republican rule of majorities--an exercise of majorities, of obedience to fixed statutes, and of moderation and impartial respect to the right and feelings of minorities--an exercise for minorities of patience and of loyal asset to the will of majorities. . . .[72]

Rush Welter claimed this discourse was a "landmark in the development of American attitudes toward the common school."[73]

William Ellery Channing

William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) was minister at the Federal Street Church in Boston from 1803 until his death. Lawrence A. Cremin credited him with delivering the sermon which marked the beginning of the Unitarian denomination.[74] Channing based his theology on his ideas of God and man:

---

[71] Horace Bushnell, "Common Schools: A Discourse on the Modifications Demanded by the Roman Catholics," delivered in North Church, Hartford, 25 March 1853 (Hartford, Ct.: n.p., 1853); rpt. in Rush Welter, ed., American Writings on Popular Education: The Nineteenth Century (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971), p. 179.

[72] Bushnell, "Common Schools," p. 180.

[73] Welter, p. 174.

[74] Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education: The National Experience 1783-1876 (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), p. 30.

> The idea of God, sublime and awful as it is, is the idea of our own spiritual nature, purified and enlarged to infinity. In ourselves are the elements of the Divinity. God, then, does not sustain a figurative resemblance to man. It is the resemblance of a parent to a child, the likeness of a kindred nature.[75]

According to Cremin, Channing "campaigned for an expanded common school system in which better-trained teachers would employ more benevolent methods to encourage self-held and self-culture."[76] For Channing, "The science of morals should form an important part of instruction."[77] He advocated that ethics, citizenship, and patriotism be required by law, with moral education integrated with other subjects, such as studying moral conditions of countries while studying geography.[78]

Emma Willard

Emma Willard (1787-1870) was the founder of Tony Seminary for Women and a staunch advocate of improved educational opportunities for

---

[75] Cremin, p. 32, citing Services in Memory of Rev. William E. Channing (Boston: John Wilson and Son, 1867), p. 27, and The Works of William E. Channing (new ed.; Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1886), p. 293.

[76] Cremin, p. 33.

[77] William Ellery Channing, "Remarks on Education," Christian Examiner, 15 (Nov. 1833), n.p.; rpt. in Rush Welter, ed., American Writings on Popular Education: The Nineteenth Century (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971), p. 53.

[78] Channing, pp. 52-53.

women and children.[79] She also encouraged the use of Scripture to teach children what to do; Scripture was to be used as an authority for teaching right and wrong.[80] Because of her dedication to the "education and advancement of her sex," Henry Barnard selected her as an outstanding teacher for mention in the American Journal of Education.[81]

Catharine Beecher

Catharine Beecher (1800-1878), daughter of Lyman Beecher, believed like Bushnell that nurture was more important than conversion in shaping the character of the child. In 1843 she initiated a campaign to begin seminaries for the purpose of training women to affect character through teaching. Kathryn Kish Sklar claimed that Mann, Barnard, and Catherine Sedgewick supported Beecher and her plan as she travelled around the country from 1843-1847.[82]

Beecher explained her educational plan in "An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers." Concerned that the country was in a moral crisis, she claimed there was a

---

[79] Henry Fowler, "The Educational Services of Mrs. Emma Willard," American Journal of Education (n.d.), n.p.; rpt. in Henry Barnard, ed., Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, and Promotors and Benefactors of Education, Literature and Science, I (1861; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), p. 145.

[80] Emma Willard, "A Letter to the Willard Association for the Mutual Improvement of Female Teachers," cited by Fowler, p. 159.

[81] Barnard, Memoirs, pp. 124-68.

[82] Kathryn Kish Sklar, Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1973), p. 176.

> want of a system of moral and religious education at school, which shall have a decided influence [italics in original] in forming the character and regulating the principles and conduct of future life. . . .[83]

To solve the problem, parents should voluntarily send their children to school, the Bible and Bible study must be included in the curriculum, and schools must "enforce a system of moral and religious instruction."[84] In addition, adequately trained teachers were needed, and to meet this need Beecher wanted men of "patriotism and benevolence" to endow her schools so she could train female teachers to teach children both intellectually and morally.[85] There was also a need for publicly endowed schools. That way, "Those who have the highest estimate of the value of moral and religious influence, and the most talent and experience for both intellectual and moral education" could be trained.[86] In other words, Beecher turned to education to solve the moral problems.

Francis W. Parker

Francis W. Parker (1837-1902) was a descendent of John Cotton who, according to Jack K. Campbell, led "a revolution of children against the artificial restraints and educational impositions of their

---

[83] Catharine Beecher, An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers (New York: Van Nostrand and Dwight, 1835); rpt. in Willystine Goodsell, Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States: Emma Willard, Catherine [sic] Beecher, Mary Lyon (1931; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970), p. 177.

[84] Beecher, pp. 175, 177, 181.

[85] Beecher, p. 184.

[86] Beecher, pp. 184-85.

elders."[87] An educator in Quincy, Massachusetts, and Chicago, Parker promoted education for social reasons "to enable them [children] to fight life's battles, to be thoughtful conscientious citizens, and to prepare them for all that may come thereafter."[88] He believed children were basically good and with guidance would be moral; drill and grades, rewards and punishments were detrimental to development of improved character. Yet habits, because they formed character, were important and needed to be developed through the school environment and atmosphere.[89]

Not only did Parker consider improved character to be the real test of progress in a school,[90] but he also was looking to the common school for solutions to society's problems. In 1895 he proclaimed that a day would come when preachers would preach the "doctrine of the common school" and would applaud the "evolution of human character."[91] In fact, for Parker, "The common school system is the one central means by which the great problem of human liberty is to be worked out."[92]

---

[87] Jack K. Campbell, Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), p. 7.

[88] Francis W. Parker, Notes of Talks on Teaching, reported by Lelia E. Patridge (New York and Chicago: E.L. Kellogg, 1889), p. 182.

[89] Parker, pp. 167-68, 172-77.

[90] Campbell, p. 118, citing Francis Parker, "An Account of the Work of the Cook County and Chicago Normal School from 1883 to 1889," Education Report, 1901-1902, U. S. Office of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1902, p. 254.

[91] Francis Parker, "The Training of Teachers," in 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (St. Paul: NEA, 1895), p. 972.

[92] Parker, "The Training of Teachers," p. 972.

William T. Harris

William T. Harris (1835-1909) was a firm believer in the secular common school. United States Commissioner of Education from 1889 to 1906, he was against teaching even a common religion in the public schools. He explained his views on the nature of man in an article written in 1871:

> By nature he [man] is totally depraved; he is a mere animal, and governed by animal impulses and desires, without ever rising to the ideas of reason. . . . Out of the savage state man ascends by making himself new nature, one above the other; he realized his ideas in institutions and finds in these ideal worlds his real home and his true nature.[93]

Harris did not believe "free-thinking" should be the basis for morality.[94] In fact, he considered religion to be the "primary foundation, not only of morality, but also of the school and even of the state itself."[95] Yet Harris was adamant that religion should be kept separate from the public school; the public secular school could teach morals without religion while indirectly supporting religious standards. To Harris, "The principle of religious instruction is authority; that of

---

[93] William T. Harris, unsigned article, "Nature vs. Human Nature, or the Spiritual," American Journal of Education 3 (Jan. 1871), pp. 4-5, cited by Neil Gerard McCluskey, Public Schools and Moral Education (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), p. 120.

[94] William T. Harris, "Thoughts on the Basis of Agnosticism," Journal of Speculative Philosophy, 15 (April 1881), p. 144, cited by McCluskey, p. 117.

[95] William T. Harris, "The Present Need of Training in the Public Schools," Journal of Education, 33 (March 1888), p. 131, cited by McCluskey, p. 125.

secular instruction is demonstration and verification."[96] The two could not be together.

Harris also considered the public school system indispensable to moral education. He claimed,

> It is better for the state to have the children of the community mingle in the common school, and the barriers of religious caste should be broken down so that a universal spirit of toleration shall come to exist. Children of all confessions should mingle in the common school and learn to know and to respect and love one another. This is necessary to moral education.[97]

As far as Harris was concerned, the parochial school created a caste system.[98]

Darwinism

In 1859 Charles Darwin published his Origin of Species. Even though his theory did not become evident in textbooks and curriculum until later in the century, its effect on philosophy came sooner.

G. Stanley Hall was excited about Darwin and his theory, for it coincided with many of his ideas, including that of the improving child.[99] Charles S. Peirce was interested in the theory's effect

---

[96] William T. Harris, "The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes," in 1903 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1903), pp. 353, 360.

[97] Harris, "The Separation of the Church from the School," p. 354.

[98] Harris, "The Separation of the Church from the School," p. 355.

[99] G. Stanley Hall, Life and Confessions of a Psychologist (New York: Appleton, 1923); rpt. in Charles E. Strickland and Charles Burgess, eds., Health, Growth, and Heredity: G. Stanley Hall on Natural Education (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), p. 29.

on human behavior.[100] William James considered Darwinism to have replaced theism in the scientific areas.[101] Summarizing the importance of Darwin's theory, Nicholas Murray Butler stated in 1896, "The doctrine of evolution has illuminated every problem of human thought and human action."[102] Relating evolution specifically to morality, Butler emphasized, "Moral life is the gradual growth of development that includes all that we call the knowledge or acquirement or culture of the educated man."[103]

In the preface to the 1951 edition of his Philosophy of Education, William H. Kilpatrick gave a tribute to Darwinism when he claimed his indebtedness to "that second generation who sought to digest Darwin's Origin of Species to life and thought, most definitely to C. S. Peirce, William James, and John Dewey. . . ."[104] Later in the book he not only claimed that evolutionary philosophy elevated man and showed man could achieve and progress, but he also stated that "change was now

---

[100] Charles S. Peirce, Pragmatism and Pragmaticism, Vol. V of Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, eds. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1965), p. 7.

[101] William James, The Works of William James: Pragmatism (Cambridge, Ms.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975), p. 29.

[102] Nicholas Murray Butler, "An Address Before the Liberal Club of Buffalo, New York, Nov. 19, 1896," in his The Meaning of Education (1915; rpt. Freeport, New York: Book for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 14.

[103] Butler, p. 15.

[104] William H. Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1963), preface to 1951 ed.

explicitly asserted."[105] In addition, Kilpatrick related the resulting social responsibility with democracy:

> It appears possible that . . . there may arise a new devotion to ethics founded on the way that moral principles work themselves out inductively in life rather than on mere obedience to an authoritative code.[106]

Pragmatism

In his book on American pragmatism, Edward C. Moore defined pragmatic theory as

> a compromise between two extremes. At one end is the position of the absolutist. According to this view there is absolute truth now; we can know it; we can know that we know it. At the other extreme is the sceptic. According to his view there is no absolute truth; if there were, we couldn't know it; if we did know it, we couldn't know that we know it. According to the pragmatic view, there is absolute truth only in the future; we can know it; we can only know it then. The pragmatist rejects the absolutist view on the gounds that it is dogmatic. It is asserted, but no reasons are given for believing it. The sceptical position is rejected because it is irrational. It blocks the way to inquiry; one who accepted it would not be motivated to try to find any truth that might exist. The empirical view is only a hope, but it is the kind of hope that so far in the history of mankind has proven fruitful in providing that control and understanding of the natural world which are the basic motives in our search for truth.[107]

William James proposed that pragmatism had "no prejudices whatever, no obstructive dogmas, no rigid canons of what shall count as proof. She [pragmatism] is completely genial . . . will entertain any hypothesis,

---

[105] Kilpatrick, pp. 65-67.

[106] Kilpatrick, pp. 67-68.

[107] Edward C. Moore, American Pragmatism: Peirce, James, and Dewey (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1961), p. 180.

will consider any evidence."[108] Relating pragmatism to education in the twentieth century, John L. Childs described it as empirical in that it "accepts ordinary human experience as the ultimate test of all knowledge and values"[109] and is a "democratic value . . . to think experimentally, that is, to think reflectively."[110] Outstanding American pragmatists included Charles S. Peirce, William James, and John Dewey.[111]

Charles S. Peirce

Charles S. Peirce (1839-1914) has been credited with the founding of pragmatism and with introducing the term into philosophy.[112] His science and mathematics background provided a philosophical basis for an experimental method, pragmatism, which he defined as "a method of ascertaining the meanings of hard words and of abstract concepts."[113] He claimed that pragmatism began with a group which met in Cambridge, many of whom were interested in Darwin and his theory's effect on "moral aspects of human behavior."[114] This reliance on Darwin was evidenced

---

[108] James, p. 43.

[109] John L. Childs, American Pragmatism and Education (New York: Henry Holt, 1956), p. 3.

[110] Childs, p. 24.

[111] Childs, title page; Kilpatrick, preface to 1951 ed.

[112] James, p. 28.

[113] Charles S. Peirce, "Pragmatism in Retrospect: A Last Formulation," in Philosophical Writings of Peirce, ed. Justus Buchler (New York: Dover Publications, 1955), p. 271.

[114] Peirce, Pragmatism and Pragmataicism, p. 7.

in Peirce's definition of character: "a structure of more or less permanent and integrated modes of interacting with the world of things and persons."[115] He also emphasized habits and instinctive behavior.[116]

William James

William James (1842-1910) was a psychologist and philosopher who wrote Pragmatism, described by H. S. Thayer as the best book written to explain the pragmatic philosophy.[117] In Pragmatism James defined the pragmatic method as "a method of settling metaphysical disputes."[118] It was like empiricism but "more radical . . . less objectionable" and not as materialistic.[119] Deploring what he called "old fashioned theism . . . with its notion of God as an exalted monarch," James claimed Darwinism "has once for all displaced [theistic] designs from the minds of the 'scientific,' theism has lost that foothold."[120]

In 1899 James published Talks to Teachers, which was originally a series of lectures. In it he described education as the "organization

---

[115] Peirce, "Pragmatism in Retrospect," p. 284.

[116] Charles S. Peirce, Scientific Metaphysics, Vol. VI of Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, eds. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1965), pp. 151-52.

[117] H. S. Thayer, "Introduction," in The Works of William James: Pragmatism, by William James (Cambridge, Ms.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975), p. xxv.

[118] James, p. 28.

[119] James, pp. 31, 40.

[120] James, p. 39.

of acquired habits of conduct and tendencies to behavior [italics in original]."[121] Believing "virtues are habits as much as our vices,"[122] and character "consists in an organized set of habits of reaction," James emphasized education of the will and instructed teachers to "build up a character [italics in original] in your pupils."[123]

John Dewey

John Dewey (1859-1952) has been called the most influential American educational philosopher and the main force behind progressive education.[124] He was associated with the University of Chicago from 1894-1904 and with Columbia University from 1904 until his retirement in 1930.

Dewey's pragmatic philosophy was shown in his conclusion that moral acts were built upon learning from previous acts and understanding of the consequences of acts; human experience was the basis for morality.[125] He also defined morality in terms of society when he defined morals as "the interaction between intrinsic human behavior on

---

[121] William James, Talks to Teachers on Psychology (New York: Henry Holt, 1929), p. 30.

[122] James, Talks to Teachers, p. 65.

[123] James, Talks to Teachers, p. 184.

[124] Jonas F. Soltis, "John Dewey," The Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed.

[125] John Dewey and James H. Tufts, Ethics (New York: Henry Holt, 1908), pp. 261-62.

the one hand and social customs and institutions on the other"; morals were an interaction between the individual and his environment.[126]

Dewey also emphasized the importance of science in determining morals. He declared that the school

> must contest the notion that morals are something wholly separate from and above science and scientific method. It must help banish the conception that the daily work and vocation of man are negligible in comparison with literary pursuits, and that human destiny here and now is of slight importance in comparison with some supernatural destiny. It must accept wholeheartedly the scientific way, not merely of technology, but of life in order to achieve the promise of modern democratic ideal.[127]

Dewey's pragmatism and reliance on the school resulted in his promotion of education for social progress and the Progressive Education movement:

> I believe that education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform. All reforms which rest simply upon the enactment of law, or the threatening of certain penalties, or upon changes in mechanical or outward arrangements, are transitory and futile. . . . By law and punishment, by social agitation and discussion, society can regulate and form itself in a more or less haphazard and chance way. But through education society can form its own means and resources, and thus shape itself with definiteness and economy in the direction in which it wishes to move. . . . Education thus conceived marks the most perfect and intimate union of science and art conceivable in human experience.[128]

---

[126] John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct (New York: Holt, 1922), pp. viii-ix.

[127] John Dewey, "Challenge to Liberal Thought," in Problems of Men, cited by McCluskey, pp. 241-42.

[128] John Dewey, John Dewey on Education, ed. Reginald D. Archambault (New York: Modern Library, 1964), pp. 437-38.

Role Models

Reliance on teachers to teach character by being role models was evident in colonial times. Both the Puritans and Quakers wanted the teachers of their children to exhibit character qualities they considered important.[129] This emphasis continued into the nineteenth century. Braxton Craven described proper practices for teachers in 1849: "Teachers should not indulge in the plays and sports of the scholars, for by such course moral influence is greatly influenced if not lost."[130] He also considered "moral influence" to be "the great instrument of school order and obedience" and recommended that teachers read the Bible to their classes each morning.[131]

In an article in The Massachusetts Teacher in 1856, an anonymous author concluded that if children were to be taught morality, teachers must do it, "not by lecturing on ethics, but by an upright example . . . by a pure life . . . and by improving favorable opportunities for the practical inculcation of moral truth."[132]

---

[129] Cotton Mather, Essays to Do Good, ed. George Burder (reproduction. Boston: Lincoln and Edmonds, 1808), pp. 87-88; Woody, Education in New Jersey, p. 315; Woody, Education in Pennsylvania, pp. 20, 174.

[130] Braxton Craven, "Braxton Craven, Founder of Trinity College, Around which Duke University was Established, Describes Proper School Practices, 1849," in Educational Theories and Practices, Vol. V of A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860, ed. Edgar W. Knight (Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. C. Press, 1953), p. 239.

[131] Craven, p. 242.

[132] "Moral Education and the Mission of the Teachers, 1856," The Massachusetts Teacher, 9 (Feb. 1856), 104-07, rpt. in Michael B. Katz, School Reform: Past and Present (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), p. 96.

In 1892 Delia Lathrop Williams listed five ways teachers should be an example for character development. These included being consistent in conscience, understanding the nobility of their calling, valuing childhood, seeing life from the child's point of view, and keeping a brave and cheerful spirit.[133] E. E. White also emphasized that the teacher must have a model character.[134]

Literature of the 1800's also emphasized role models. Anne Scott MacLeod claimed that children's literature used role models to illustrate both good and bad examples of character, with George Washington being the most popular hero. She also noted that children were encouraged to be role models themselves.[135]

Catherine Maria Sedgwick was a writer who used role models in her novels. Her books included A New England Tale, Redwood, Hope Leslie, and Clarence, a three volume story with a heroine who, according to Gladys Brooks, was the perfect role model and followed a "pattern of virtue unscathed."[136]

---

[133] Delia Lathrop Williams, "Ethical Culture in Elementary and Secondary Schools," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1892), p. 107.

[134] E. E. White, "Discussion," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1892), p. 115.

[135] Anne Scott MacLeod, A Moral Tale: Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820-1860 (Hamden, Ct.: Archon, 1975), p. 72.

[136] Gladys Brooks, Three Wise Virgins (New York: Dutton, 1957), pp. 181-92.

Herbartianism

The National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching was formed at the 1895 NEA annual meeting, the same year W. T. Harris wrote his article on "Herbart's Unmoral Education."[137] The executive council for the Society included Charles and Frank McMurray, Charles de Garmo, C. C. Van Liew, Nicholas M. Butler, John Dewey, Elmer E. Brown, Wilbur S. Jackman, and Levi Seeley.[138]

In an article on Herbatians, N. Ray Hiner explored the impact Herbart's theories had on character education at the beginning of the twentieth century. Herbart, who died in 1841, considered development of virtue or "ethical character" the main purpose of education, while the will was the "chief element of morality."[139] Because moral education was based on ideas which affected the will, and the will was developed by thought, a curriculum which introduced ethical ideas would lead to the development of good character. Thus history and literature were the best subjects to teach character, and the most important subjects.[140]

---

[137] W. T. Harris, "Herbart's Unmoral Education," Education, 16 (Nov. 1895), 180, cited by McCluskey, p. 133.

[138] Charles A. McMurray, "Round Table of National Herbart Club," in 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (St. Paul: NEA, 1895), p. 959.

[139] N. Ray Hiner, "Herbatians, History and Moral Education," School Review, 79 (Aug. 1971), 590-91.

[140] Hiner, p. 591.

Hiner also claimed that Herbartianism caused the definition of morality to change fron individualistic terms to "social connotations."[141] A result of this transition to define morality and character in social terms was the acceptance of the importance of the school in the development of character.

Charles de Garmo

Charles de Garmo (1849-1934) promoted the idea of morality in social terms and was often a spokesman for Herbartian ideas. He emphasized that "childhood is the period for the authoritative inculcation of habits in home and school"[142] and claimed that "ideals of conduct and character grow naturally out of social conditions."[143] He believed ideals changed as social conditions changed.[144] In addition, he believed that children needed literature

> to appreciate and to desire more and more a progressive series of groups of social pleasures whose combined attractiveness is so great that the isolated pleasures growing out of sensuousness, selfishness and pride shall be forgotten or easily discarded.[145]

---

[141] Hiner, p. 593.

[142] Charles de Garmo, Ethical Training, Vol. III of Principles of Secondary Education (New York: Macmillan, 1910), p. 62.

[143] de Garmo, p. 48.

[144] de Garmo, p. 51.

[145] Charles de Garmo, "The Value of Literature in Moral Training," in 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894), p. 394.

De Garmo also criticized methods which ". . . give the children systematic lesson on morals from little books on ethical instruction . . . an inadequate method . . . an accentuation of our fondness for imparting maxims," preferring reliance on curriculum content, correlated with fundamental ethical virtues.[146] He inferred criticism of Puritan character education methods when he stated, "Few children are scared or allured into permanent goodness" and referred to the Old Testament as "primitive literature."[147]

Social Progress

To many, morality is based on rules and guidelines demanded by our society and culture, and to most people, the school is the obvious vehicle by which to promote these rules and guidelines and make them part of the culture. In other words, the school is society, the school teaches society, and the school can change society. As A. P. Marble stated it, "Ethics is the science of duty--morality; the knowledge of rules for human guidance that have developed with the race and that contain the results of human experience."[148] Much of the character education since the Civil War has been based on needs and wants of society.

---

[146] de Garmo, "The Value of Literature in Moral Training," pp. 390-92.

[147] de Garmo, "The Value of Literature in Moral Training," pp. 393-94.

[148] A. P. Marble, "The Ethical Element in Patriotism," in 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (St. Paul: NEA, 1895), p. 146.

Individuals

A. D. Mayo. During the last half of the nineteenth century there was much concern that morality was declining, and it was the public schools that would be asked to help solve the moral problems. A. D. Mayo proclaimed this feeling at the 1880 NEA annual convention:

> and to the noble army of solid masters, wise superintendents and sane school-committee men, is the country indebted for sheltering the children. . . . The terrible revelations of public dishonesty, the growing curse of youthful depravity in great cities, the ominous rumblings of communism under the very foundations of society, the wild and reckless theories of social and private obligation blurted out in thousands of platforms by the new lights of the "new morality," the corruption of parties and politics which always holds the country on the edge of a new civil war, the condition of several millions of utterly unschooled children and youth, the appearance of another million of school children, in the south, all born in a revolution that laid society in eighteen states in ruins, half a million of the children of emancipated slaves, has thoroughly aroused the country until everywhere we hear the call for the more thorough moral instruction and discipline of children, especially in the public schools.[149]

George A. Coe. George A. Coe was a professor at Union Theological Seminary. For him education was not for the individual but for society; both religion and education adjusted the individual to society.[150] In his book Education and Religion in Morals, Coe stated, "Everybody knows that the moral health of society and the progress of religion depend

---

[149] A. D. Mayo, "Object Lessons in Moral Instruction in the Common School," in 1880 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Salem, Ohio: NEA, 1880), pp. 8-9.

[150] George A. Coe, "Contributions in Modern Education to Religion," in 1903 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1903), p. 342.

largely, if not chiefly, upon the training of the young in matters that pertain to character."[151] Stating that "virtue must be learned by practice," Coe believed that most American teachers considered the school a "training place for character."[152]

In 1911 Coe said he assumed that "moral character is altogether a matter of man's relations to society. . . . What I hope for is a recognition that life, as far as it is truly successful, is social thru and thru."[153] He then advocated an emphasis on the social rather than on traits; instead of emphasizing virtues, teachers should emphasize what men do. Moral value is not in the curriculum but in how the curriculum is studied.[154]

Nicholas Murray Butler. As president of Columbia University and founder of Teachers College, Columbia University, Nicholas Murray Butler exerted great influence on American education. In addition he was active in Republican politics and shared the 1931 Nobel Peace Prize with Jane Addams.

In 1895 Butler was president of the NEA. In the Presidential Address he stated that he believed character was based on "the moral

---

[151] George A. Coe, Education and Religion in Morals (New York: Revell, 1902), p. 5.

[152] Coe, Education and Religion in Morals, p. 349.

[153] George A. Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues: A Study of Method in the Teaching of Morals," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), p. 419.

[154] Coe, "Virtue and the Virtues," pp. 420-23.

order seen through the medium of an individual nature."[155] On another occasion he claimed that moral education belonged to the "institutional aspect of civilization."[156] A believer in the gradual progress of man,[157] he differentiated between moral education and religion; religion could be immoral.[158] In his biography of Butler, Albert Marrin summarized Butler's beliefs: Butler's religion was not based on the Bible but on reason; he was skeptical of traditional religion; he believed science must be guided by moral principles; and unlike Dewey, he did not want to use the school to reconstruct society but to promote patriotism and the development of character qualities.[159]

John Dewey. John Dewey defined morality in terms of society when he wrote that "customs in any case constitute moral standards."[160] He also believed that "to be moral is to live in accord with the moral

---

[155] Nicholas Murray Butler, "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth," in 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (St. Paul: NEA, 1895), p. 79.

[156] Nicholas Murray Butler, "Religious Instruction and Its Relation to Education," Address at St. Martholomew's Church, New York, 14 Oct. 1899, in his The Meaning of Education (1915; rpt. Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 193.

[157] Nicholas Murray Butler, "An Address Before the Liberal Club of Buffalo, New York, 19 Nov. 1896, in his The Meaning of Education (1915; rpt. Freeport, N.H.: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 14.

[158] Butler, "Religious Instruction and Its Relation to Education," p. 193.

[159] Albert Marrin, Nicholas Murray Butler (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976), pp. 60-61, 70-71.

[160] Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 75.

tradition of one's country."[161] In The School and Society he criticized previous attempts at character education:

> Our conceptions of moral education have been too narrow, too formal, and too pathological. We have associated the term ethical with certain special acts which are labeled virtues and and are set off from the mass of other acts, and are still more divorced from the habitual images and motives of the children performing them. Moral instruction is thus associated with teaching about the particular virtues, or with instilling certain sentiments in regard to them. The moral has been conceived in too goody-goody a way.[162]

Dewey was against separating the spiritual and physical aspects of life,[163] just as he was against separating moral education from academics because that reduced moral instruction to mere catechism or lessons:

> Moral education in school is practically hopeless when we set up the development of character as a supreme end, and at the same time treat the acquiring of knowledge and the development of understanding, which of necessity occupy the chief part of school time, as having nothing to do with character.[164]

The problem of separation was overcome when learning came from activities with social aims when the school

> has a chance to affiliate itself with life, to become the child's habitat, where he learns through directed living, instead of being only a place to learn lessons having an abstract and remote reference to some possible living to be done in the future. It gets a chance to be a miniature community, an embryonic society.[165]

---

[161] Dewey and Tufts, Ethics, p. 225.

[162] John Dewey, The School and Society (rev. ed. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1915), pp. 42-43.

[163] John Dewey, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916), p. 402.

[164] Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 411.

[165] Dewey, School and Society, p. 18.

Thus education not only taught morals, but it was also moral in itself:

> Discipline, culture, social efficiency, personal refinement, improvement of character are but phases of the growth of capacity nobly to share in such a balanced experience. And education is such a life. To maintain capacity for such education is the essence of morals.[166]

In Moral Principles in Education Dewey presented his ideas that character education was in "all the agencies, instrumentalities, and materials of school life."[167] He then added, "The moral responsibility of the school . . . is to society."[168] Claiming that the common citizenship approach to social education was too narrow, he wanted the school to "enable the child intelligently to recognize all his social relations and take his part in sustaining them," broadening the idea of citizenship so it included being a "thoroughly efficient and serviceable member of socity."[169] However, the only way the school could do this was to use methods that appealed to the "child's active powers, to his capacities in construction, production, and creation."[170]

As stated earlier, Dewey concluded that morals were a result of human experience[171] and could be studied scientifically.[172] He stated

---

[166] Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 417.

[167] John Dewey, Moral Principles in Education (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), p. 4.

[168] Dewey, Moral Principles in Education, p. 7.

[169] Dewey, Moral Principles in Education, pp. 8-9.

[170] Dewey, Moral Principles in Education, p. 26.

[171] Dewey and Tufts, Ethics, p. 343.

[172] John Dewey, Experience and Nature (republication. New York: Dover Publications, 1958), p. 127.

this in Human Nature and Conduct:

> Honesty, chastity, malice, peevishness, courage, triviality, industry, irresponsibility are not private posessions of a person. They are working adaptations of personal capacities with environing forces. All virtues and vices are habits which incorporate objective forces. They are interactions of elements contributed by the make-up of an individual with elements supplied by the out-door world. They can be studied as objectively as physiological function, and they can be modified by change of either personal or social elements.[173]

Thus he wanted schools where children were free to interact, to learn from each other and from their own creative efforts, without the inhibitions of the traditional school environment.

Hugh Hartshorne. In 1919 Hugh Hartshorne, while Assistant Professor of Religious Education at Union Theological Seminary, wrote in the preface to Childhood and Character that he was indebted to Thorndike, Dewey, and especially Coe for his ideas.[174] At this time he emphasized the importance of character education, for people were becoming

> captivated by the vision of the New Democracy, the coming, not the old social order, super-national, super-ecclesiastical, whose motive is love, whose ideal is the brotherhood of man, and whose destiny is the commonwealth of God.[175]

According to Hartshorne, nineteenth century education was child-centered, but in the twentieth century the child "must take his proper place

---

[173] Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 16.

[174] Hugh Hartshorne, Childhood and Character (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1919), p. vi.

[175] Hartshorne, p. 3.

as a citizen with increasing rights and duties in a democracy."[176] Hartshorne was concerned with a religious education based on society rather than on God and the Bible.[177] To him character was ". . . physiological. It is an equipment as well as a purpose. It implies that a person can do what he would do."[178] Character and democracy were "two aspects of the identical thing," with character being individual and democracy being social.[179] He was concerned that character be described in quality terms rather than abstract names.[180] Hartshorne foresaw trends of defining character "in terms of the intelligent control of social activity" and efforts to measure character achievement.[181]

In 1924 Hartshorne and Mark A. May began their studies on the nature of character. They were later joined by Frank K. Shuttleworth. The first study was a study of deception, and the second studied the use of tests of moral knowledge and attitude. At that time they found a "disheartening lack of method [italics in origina] in research."[182] After completing their research they concluded that talking and

---

[176] Hartshorne, p. 4.

[177] Hartshorne, p. 6.

[178] Hartshorne, p. 18.

[179] Hartshorne, p. 320.

[180] Hartshorne, pp. 170, 239-41.

[181] Hartshorne, p. 239.

[182] Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth, Studies in the Organization of Character, Vol. III of Studies in the Nature of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 3.

studying about traits and practicing traits, with rewards given for good deeds, did not seem to aid honesty, nor did religious activities or Sunday School attendance. However, the researchers did emphasize the need to analyze specific situations when dealing with character and the need for understanding of the situations.[183]

Then in 1932 Hartshorne wrote Character and Human Relations. By then he noted that interest in science had affected education and promoted an "avalance of books, articles, and tests having to do with character."[184] He maintained there were no longer moral certainties, so old methods would not work. "Only through genuine moral experience can this new morality develop, and genuine moral experience is all but impossible under prevailing school conditions."[185] Environment and participation were important for successful moral education: "To the extent that children share in the purposing and achieving of adults as well as of other children, do they acquire character."186

Clifford W. Barnes. Clifford W. Barnes, chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Committee on Moral Training, believed not only in the importance of the schools in building morality, but he also advocated a religious aspect of morality. He maintained that in

---

[183] Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth, pp. 340, 413-14.

[184] Hugh Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. v.

[185] Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, p. 5.

[186] Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, p. 23.

colonial times "moral training was not intentionally neglected, but it was considered such a natural and inevitable resultant of religion that it received little attention."[187] However, in 1907 urbanization and immigration had changed that, and the school had to broaden its scope.[188] Barnes accepted secular public schools as part of "God's providence" but still wanted only religious persons allowed as teachers.[189] He suggested integrating moral training into the various school subjects and school life, with nonsectarian religion and daily formal worship part of the school program.[190]

Milton Fairchild. At the 1917 annual NEA meeting, Milton Fairchild announced a "Character-Education-Methods Competition." An anonymous donor had offered a $5000 reward to the writer of the most outstanding children's moral code. The businessman had concluded that the "fundamental need of the nation is the character-education of her children and youth. . . ."[191] The competition would take place through the

---

[187] Clifford W. Barnes, "Relation of Moral and Religious Training," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), p. 453.

[188] Clifford W. Barnes, "Moral Training Thru the Agency of the Public School," in 1907 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907), p. 373.

[189] Barnes, "Relation of Moral and Religious Training," pp. 454, 456.

[190] Barnes, "Moral Training Thru the Agency of the Public School," pp. 374-75; "Relation of Moral and Religious Training," pp. 454-55.

[191] Milton Fairchild, "Character-Education-Methods Competition," in 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917), p. 763.

National Institute for Moral Instruction, of which Fairchild was chairman. Seventy code writers, at least one per state, had been selected to work from February 22, 1916, to February 22, 1917; additional writers would be needed, however, to give assistance and advice. When fifty of the writers had finished their codes, the codes would be submitted and judged.

Defining morality as "the wisdom of human experience, religious experiences as well as secular," Fairchild charged that the NEA had "never attackt [sic] the problems of character education with the determination to solve them. . . ."[192] Now was the opportunity to meet the challenge.

Fairchild added that the same businessman would be offering $20,000 for the best plan for teaching character education in the public schools. However, more details on this would be given at a later date.[193]

At the 1926 annual meeting of the NEA, Fairchild, now president of the Character Education Institution, summarized the results of the two competitions.[194] The project for the $5000 prize had resulted in "Hutchins' Children's Morality Code," which included eleven laws the good citizen would follow. The accompanying pledge for elementary

---

[192] Fairchild, pp. 764-65.

[193] Fairchild, p. 765.

[194] Milton Fairchild, "Character Education," in 1926 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1926), pp. 401-04.

students also focused on good citizenship.[195] Twenty-five thousand dollars had been spent to verify the Hutchins' Code. Then $20,000 had been awarded for the Iowa Plan for Character Education, Edwin Starbuck, chairman. This plan included a curriculum and was designed to help teachers provide an environment in which children could develop personal values.[196] Now the Character Education Institution was hoping to have $15,000 a year available for research work. They were collecting information to form a plan for character education in elementary schools which would be called "The Five Point Plan," and one thousand teachers were needed to work with the plan. Fairchild also outlined the points in the plan: classroom organization (moral leadership); Children's Morality Code (wisdom); character projects (habits); character motives and personal influence (guidance); and character charts and school records (strengths and weaknesses of the child).[197]

Edwin D. Starbuck. Edwin D. Starbuck was an educator who wanted character education to be child-centered and society-centered; he believed religion would eventually appear superstitious and be replaced by the public school.[198] Speaking at the 1924 NEA annual meeting, he

---

[195] Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, pp. 69-74.

[196] Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, pp. 65-68; Edwin D. Starbuck, et. al., A Guide to Books for Character, II (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 15.

[197] Fairchild, "Character Education," pp. 404-06.

[198] Edwin D. Starbuck, "Character Education Seen in Perspective," in Building Character, ed. Mark A. May (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 46-55.

recommended that teachers quit teaching about morality and begin teaching to do, that virtues should be replaced by objectives and situations, and that the entire school program be used for character training, with a wider range used for what was meant by morality.[199]

That same year, Starbuck spoke on "Tests and Measurements of Character," claiming that at that time at least 150 persons were attempting to analyze character, and all but four were confident it could be done.[200] He described eleven character analysis techniques used at that time: direct observation of individual cases; psycho= analysis; association tests; genetic and developmental studies; self= analysis and self-measurement; scale ratings; objective methods; preference judgments; expressional reactions other than judgmental, such as handwriting tests; experimental methods; and study of character types by all the above methods.[201]

Starbuck summarized his philosophy of character education as follows:

> Moral life is a dynamic somewhat. It cannot be created; it may be elicited and stimulated. Morals cannot be taught; like diseases they are caught. . . . Commands repel; images attract. Prohibitions arouse defiance; symbols awaken the sympathies. Punishments brutalize; spontaneous choice of values brings grace and strength.[202]

---

[199] Edwin D. Starbuck, "Fundamentals of Character Training," in 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924), pp. 161-65.

[200] Edwin D. Starbuck, "Tests and Measurements of Character," in 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924), p. 357.

[201] Starbuck, "Tests and Measurements, " p. 357.

[202] Starbuck, et. al., p. 15.

Starbuck and others connected with the Iowa Plan of Character Education and the Institute of Character Research wrote A Guide to Books for Character in two volumes. In analyzing fiction, the Guide included "lists of best books of fiction for children" based on "scientific control of the judgments concerning the relative worth of selections, the grade placing, and the moral situations to which the stories apply."[203] Emphasizing the importance of society, they stated, "It isn't so needful to do anything to the morals of children as to provide right cultural sustenance [italics in original]."[205] According to the authors, the book was an "outgrowth of the conviction that it is possible to bring scientific technique to bear upon the selection of children's fiction."[206] The book included ratings of children's fiction by grade and value for teaching character.

Fred M. Gregg. At the 1928 NEA annual meeting, Fred M. Gregg conducted a symposium to discuss the "Nebraska Plan." The Nebraska 1927 law requiring schools to adopt a course of study in character education was also discussed. Gregg reminded the audience that the school could not undo society. However, there was a need for scientific

---

[203] Starbuck, et. al., p. vii.

[204] Starbuck, et. al., p. 5.

[205] Starbuck, et. al., p. 6.

[206] Starbuck, et. al., p. 8.

investigation in character education.[207] In presenting the two-hundred page course of study and manual, Gregg said he rejected three things: the miracle of redeeming lost souls, biological fatalists who relied on natural selection only, and extreme behaviorists.[208] He claimed the course of study was based on the premise that both heredity and environment were important, as well as both mental and spiritual values.[209]

In the course of study, Gregg described morals as being relative, changing, and the result of an evolutionary process.[210] He believed that character could be shaped by building "sentiments," or habit-complexes of emotions."[211] Methods he recommended included using behavioral techniques to turn character traits into habits and supplementary reading of such books as the McGuffey Readers and those recommended in Starbuck's Guide.[212]

---

[207] Fred M. Gregg, "Symposium on Citizenship Training--The Nebraska Plan," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929), p. 69.

[208] Gregg, p. 69.

[209] Gregg, pp. 70-71.

[210] Fred M. Gregg, A Course of Study in Character Education for School and Home (Lincoln, Nebraska: Lincoln School Supply Company, 1930), pp. 23-24.

[211] Gregg, Course of Study, p. 36.

[212] Gregg, Course of Study, pp. 39-67.

William Heard Kilpatrick. In "Reminiscenses of Dewey and His Influence," William Heard Kilpatrick, a student and follower of Dewey, described some of the processes Dewey worked through to develop his personal philosophy, a philosophy which had great impact on Kilpatrick. Kilpatrick claimed Dewey had been Hegelian at one time

> But now I found that Dewey, stressing the conceptions of process, the continuity of nature, and the method of inductive science, had built an entirely new philosophy, later called Experimentalism.[213]

Claiming he also turned to this philosophy, Kilpatrick then described the origin of Dewey's ideas:

> He did say, in another connection, that he had got held in his educational thinking from Francis W. Parker. . . . As to the origin of Dewey's philosophy of life (and consequently, of education), he himself makes it clear that he got his psychology from William James. This means, as Dewey later brought out, that he and James were both deeply indebted to Darwin's "Origin of Species." It seems probable that from this source Dewey derived the conceptions of process, continuity of nature, and the method of inductive science referred to earlier.[214]

Thus the influence of Darwin, James, and Dewey on Kilpatrick was documented.

Childs also claimed that Kilpatrick read Darwin and rejected "ritual connected with the worship of God."[215] Leaving a teaching

---

[213] William Heard Kilpatrick, "Reminiscenses of Dewey and His Influence," in John Dewey: Master Educator, eds. William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (1959; rpt. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1975), p. 5.

[214] Kilpatrick, p. 15.

[215] Childs, p. 185.

position at Mercer because of his "non-fundamental beliefs,[216] Kilpatrick then studied under and with Dewey at Columbia Teachers College, where he "won fame as teacher, writer, and lecturer" during his twenty-eight years of service.[217]

Deploring older methods of education based on content, authoritarianism, lecture, textbooks, memory, and belief in total depravity, Kilpatrick wanted a method which "centers attention on behavior and on character building," with emphasis on the "whole child."[218] Because Darwin's theory had shown that man could achieve and make progress, man must accept a social responsibility for his actions:

> It appears possible that . . . there may arise a new devotion to ethics founded on the way that moral principles work themselves out inductively in life rather than on mere obedience to an authoritative code.[219]

Thus morality was learned by living.

> The problem of morality is potential in every life situation; and that the way we face each situation will determine the moral character we build. For good or ill, each act and each decision leaves its moral effect on character [italics in original].[220]

---

[216] Childs, p. 186.

[217] Galen Saylor, "William Heard Kilpatrick," World Book Encyclopedia, 1973 ed.

[218] William H. Kilpatrick, Modern Education and Better Human Relations (U.S.A.: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1949), pp. 13-14; William H. Kilpatrick, "The Future of Education," NEA Journal, 26 (Nov. 1937), 255.

[219] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, p. 68.

[220] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, p. 109.

In Philosophy of Education Kilpatrick devoted an entire chapter to character building, defining character as "tendencies to regular and predictable behavior," including habits, dispositions, and tendencies.[221] The aim of character education was "to build a character which by its conscious choices brings the good life ever more effectively both for itself and for civilizations."[222] Character was not inborn but individually achieved; one grew in character as he had opportunity to choose behavior.[223] Seven principles of character building were described: the child must live the trait; the individual must develop character on his own; adult attitudes must foster character development; the child needs to learn why; clearness to act even with difficulties must be developed; meeting of a need enhances learning, and the child may need help to resolve his conflicts.[224] In addition, it was the responsibility of the school to provide opportunities for character development, and teacher guidance was essential.[225]

---

[221] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, p. 356.

[222] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, p. 364.

[223] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, pp. 358, 360.

[224] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, pp. 366-67.

[225] Kilpatrick, Philosophy of Education, pp. 367-68.

National Education Association

Teachers have had a continual concern that effective character education for social reasons take place in the public school. In 1884 Eva K. Kellogg claimed Americans were lacking in docility, teachableness, diligence, reverence, and respect for authority.[226] In 1887 Robert Allen emphasized the importance of motives and sanctions in the training of character and recommended that reverence and obedience to authority be the first priority in character education.[227] J. W. MacDonald defined ethical or moral education as "all the moral obligations due to one's self, to his neighbor, and, including both, to God. . . ."[228] Speaking in 1888, J. L. Pickard reviewed the past emphasis on morality and declared that "the school of the future must emphasize character. . . . This cannot be done by the prison bar or by the halter. It must be accomplished through the school. . . ."[229] In the 1892 NEA report of the Committee on Moral Education, Joseph

---

[226] Eva D. Kellogg, "Needs in American Education," in 1884 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Boston: NEA, 1885), p. 134.

[227] Robert Allen, "The Importance of Religious Motives and Sanctions in Moral Training," in 1887 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Salem, Ms.: NEA, 1887), pp. 390-91.

[228] J. W. MacDonald, "Educating the Whole Boy," in 1888 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Topeka: NEA, 1888), p. 418.

[229] J. L. Pickard, "What Lessons Does the Ordinance Teach in Regard to the Future Educational Policy of Our Government," in 1888 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Topeka: NEA, 1888), p. 132.

Baldwin noted the cultural aspect of moral education when he said, The world's moral heroes teach us all the moral virtues."[230]

Concern over character education led to a forum at the 1894 NEA annual meeting. J. L. McLellan emphasized the importance of character education to the state when he said, "Noble character is the high aim of the American teacher . . . character which contributes most richly to the welfare of the individual and the home and to the stability of the state."[231] He described the school as "preparation for the state," and added that "obedience to just authority is the beginning of moral conduct."[232] Other speakers, such as Francis Bellamy, editor of Youth's Companion, focused on teaching character through various subjects. Bellamy claimed, for example, that the only way to teach history was to "present it in its moral aspects."[233] Charles M. Andrews proposed that the "moral influence of a subject can be sought for only when that subject is treated as a whole."[234]

---

[230] Joseph Baldwin, "Practical Culture of the Moral Virtues," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Saratoga Springs, N.H.: NEA, 1892), p. 760.

[231] J. A. McLellan, "The Ethical Element in Literature, and How to Make the Most of It in Teaching," in 1894 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park. N.J.: NEA, 1894), p. 71.

[232] McLellan, p. 73.

[233] Francis Bellamy, "Discussion," in 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894), p. 411.

[234] Charles M. Andrews, "History as an Aid to Moral Culture," in 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894), p. 398.

Also at the 1894 forum, de Garmo admitted that the public school had probably not done enough to develop character, but he drew a distinction between being religious and being moral: "A man is religious when he bears the right relations to his Maker. He is moral when he bears the right relations to his fellowmen."[235] De Garmo also emphasized the importance of the teacher in producing students who would aid society. With good teachers

> the public schools can produce a type of moral character, which, if not precisely that to which tradition accustoms us, will yet be in harmony with the social or institutional morality that must exist in our highly complicated society, where men, through cooperation, have such tremendous power for harm as well as for good.[236]

Using the term "institutional morality" again in 1896, de Garmo correlated it with "civic morality."[237] He was convinced that "a civilized country will . . . develop a character that can work efficiently in a civilized state of society" where "institutions are the universal rule."[238] He spoke of "primitive conditions of society" before the "great municipalities" were around; non-social

---

[235] Charles de Garmo, "Moral Training Through the Common Branches," in 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894), p. 394.

[236] de Garmo, "Moral Training Through the Common Branches," p. 173.

[237] Charles de Garmo, "Concentrations of Studies as a Means of Developing Character," in 1896 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1896), p. 310.

[238] de Garmo, "Concentrations of Studies," p. 310.

individualism" was out-of-date.[239] Promoting a civic rather than a national patriotism, De Garmo believed those "primitive non-social instincts must be supplemented by social or civic instincts."[240]

Speakers during the first part of the 1900's continued this emphasis on the school providing moral education for social reasons. Reuben Post Halleck believed that "obedience to moral law will become more and more necessary as the pressure of population increases."[241] W. O. Thompson stated that truth was the basis of all education, yet he admitted that schools tended to reflect middle class morality. He was concerned that schools give students opportunity to fail; otherwise it was impossible to determine if the school had been successful in teaching the child morality.[242] In 1908 Margaret E. Schallenberger went so far as to claim that "social efficiency is the meaning of all education."[243] In fact, "Definite training for social efficiency should have a place on the school program of each

---

[239] de Garmo, "Concentrations of Studies," p. 312.

[240] de Garmo, "Concentrations of Studies," pp. 313-14.

[241] Reuben Post Halleck, "The Value of English Literature in Ethical Training," in 1900 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Chicago: NEA, 1900), p. 165.

[242] W. O. Thompson, "The Effect of Moral Education in the Public Schools Upon the Civic Life of the Community," in 1906 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1906), pp. 43-46.

[243] Margaret E. Schallenberger, "The Function of the School in Training for Right Conduct," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), p. 234.

school in our country."[244] Reed B. Teitrick added that the state had the right to expect moral training from its institutions, particularly public schools, for the "public school in the state's chief instrument for character-building."[245] Henry G. Williams repeated the need for "social efficiency," but he considered the school to be just one of the means for developing character.[246] R. R. Reeder considered children the "state of tomorrow" and urged that "character by culture thru public-school education instead of by-laws and penalties should be the aim of the state."[257] John W. Abercrombie looked to education as the only answer to the problems of society, since the home, church and press were not meeting the need.[248] Walter F. Lewes demanded that the public schools "become the great institution in character-building."[249]

---

[244] Schallenberger, p. 246.

[245] Reed B. Teitrick, "The School as an Instrument of Character-Building," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), p. 247.

[246] Henry G. Williams, "The School as an Instrument of Character-Building," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), pp. 249-51.

[247] R. R. Reeder, "Moral Training an Essential Factor in Elementary School Work," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), p. 563.

[248] John W. Abercrombie, "Ethics in Civic Life," in 1909 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1909), pp. 85-87.

[249] Walter F. Lewes, "Discipline as Affected by Differences in Moral Responsibility," in 1910 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1910), p. 178.

Concern was still present in 1916 when Sarah Helena Fahey stated, "Unless the schools give positive moral training the formation of character will be left to accident, and will be determined by the habits and ideals of those with whom the child associates in his leisure hours."[250]

After reading Hawthorne's "Great Stone Face," M. A. Cassidy concluded that character must be implanted and cultivated, and the law of suggestion was invaluable in character education.[251] Using a plan suggested by that story, she had her classes spend ten to fifteen classroom minutes daily to "treasure in the mind the good deeds and noble impulses which they may discover and recite them to their companions."[252] The students were to spend time looking for good. Cassidy reported that by following that plan she had seen "marked improvement, year by year, in the tone and conduct of the youth of Lexington."[253]

In his annual reports on the Committee on Character Education, Milton Bennion reinforced NEA concern with society-based character education. In the 1922 report he stated that the "basis of moral

---

[250] Sara Helena Fahey, "Moral Education--What the School Can Do," in 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916), p. 639.

[251] M. A. Cassidy, "Golden Deeds in Character Education," in 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920), p. 523.

[252] Cassidy, p. 524.

[253] Cassidy, p. 524.

self-determination" was determined by "love of God and love of fellow-men."[254] At the 1923 meeting Bennion outlined a plan for teacher training based on character traits which involved "knowledge of human nature and of all the means that science has developed for the more complete analysis of character and the means of influencing it for good."[255] In 1924 Bennion was still proclaiming that the "chief problem of character education is how to develop socially-minded personalities."[256]

Department of Superintendence Tenth Yearbook. The importance of school life in the development of character was the focus of the Department of Superintendence Tenth Yearbook subtitled Character Education. Basing the book on the premise that "any good curriculum is a character education curriculum," the writers emphasized they did not intend to identify "the way" to teach character education.[257]

A. L. Threlkeld, chairman of the NEA Character Education Commission, presented the Yearbook at the 1932 NEA annual meeting, emphasizing that the Yearbook did not present specific plans for

---

[254] Milton Bennion, "Report of Progress Committee on Character Education--the Sanctions of Morality," in 1922 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1922), p. 458.

[255] Milton Bennion, "Report of Committee on Character Education," in 1923 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1923), pp. 251-55.

[256] Milton Bennion, "Report of Committee on Character Education," in 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924), p. 279.

[257] Department of Superintendence Tenth Yearbook: Character Education (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932), pp. 5-6.

character education. The point of view taken was that any good curriculum was character education curriculum; any good method was character education method; any good teacher was a character education teacher; any good school provided character education.[258] Summarizing the purpose of the Yearbook, he stated, "The objective remains the discovery or creation of a way of living which conserves and produces as many values as possible, for as many persons as possible, over as long a time as possible."[259]

At the same meeting Mrs. John K. Norton discussed the Yearbook, stating that character education was not a "program" but an "outcome."[260] She praised the Yearbook because it

> centers attention not on some traits to be expressed, not on some rules of conduct, or on some ideal of truth or beauty, but on the situation. The need for character is all bound up in the situation that one is facing at the moment.[261]

Patriotism and Citizenship

Thomas Jefferson and other leaders had promoted the philosophy that character education was necessary for a successful democracy.

---

[258] A. L. Threlkeld, "Introducing the Report of the Character Education Commission," in 1932 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932), p. 546.

[259] Threlkeld, p. 547.

[260] Mrs. John K. Norton, "Character Education and the Life of the School," in 1932 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932), p. 552.

[261] Norton, p. 552.

This concept was often repeated during the nineteenth century. However, the early twentieth century, with its World War, heralded a resurgence of the belief that schools were to train good citizens and patriots. An example of this was the competition which resulted in Hutchins' Code and the accompanying pledge which stated,

> I am a citizen of the United States of America.
> I pledge myself to Uncle Sam,
> To life in loyalty to my Nation, its Constitution,
> and its laws.
> In the spirit of justice, I will do my best to
> establish peace, goodwill and happiness
> And to increase the benefits of civilization to
> all humanity.[262]

Writing in 1919, Hugh Hartshorne promoted the idea that education should develop students with the character to be good citizens.[263] Edwin Cornelius Broome and Edwin W. Adams repeated the same theme, equating character and citizenship in the preface to their 1926 book. Conduct and Citizenship:

> The person with the highest ideals, with the best principles of life and conduct, who is best disposed towards his neighbors, will be the best citizen. . . . Who is the good American Citizen? In substance the answer is that a good citizen is a well-behaved person--one who is obedient, honest, trustworthy, sympathetic, loyal, considerate of others, dutiful, industrious, reverent, provident, an active force for good. . . . It follows, therefore, that character= education and training for citizenship are identical processes.[264]

---

[262] Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations, p. 74.

[263] Hartshorne, Childhood and Character, pp. 3-4.

[264] Edwin Cornelius Broome and Edwin W. Adams, Conduct and Citizenship (New York: Macmillan, 1926), preface.

In 1941 Broome still considered "good citizenship is good character in action," also stating, "Good citizenship is the result total of all civic, educational, religious, social and political agencies working together."[265]

National Education Association

As early as 1884 the NEA was including an emphasis on citizenship in its program. That year T. W. Becknell, president of the NEA led a "Citizenship and Education" rally at the annual meeting.[266] At the same meeting J. L. M. Curry spoke on "Citizenship and Education, proclaiming that education is a universal right, a prime necessity of man, and it is the duty of the state to provide it. . . ."[267] In 1917 Anna Laura Force spoke on "The Public School the Laboratory for Citizenship." She considered the school the place to prepare children for future responsibilites and good citizenship, stating, "Habits of truthfulness, honesty, and loyalty acquired in schools and home strengthen the moral fiber and build up a citizenship that will be able to assume the future responsibilities of the nation."[268] At

---

[265] Edwin C. Broome, "Let the School Do It," School and Society 53 (May 17, 1941), p. 620.

[266] 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings, Part I (Boston: NEA, 1884), pp. 5-14.

[267] J. L. M. Curry, "Citizenship and Education," in 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings, Part II (Boston: NEA, 1884), p. 12.

[268] Anna Laura Force, "The Public School the Laboratory for Citizenship," in 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917), p. 76.

that same meeting John F. Sims promoted equating character training and patriotism: "It is the sacred obligation of the schools to instill the love of country into the hearts of the growing generation, when the roots of habit, and therefore character, sink deep into the plastic mold of youth."[269]

Citizenship was again emphasized at the 1920 annual meeting. At that meeting F. B. Cooper defined good citizenship as

> recognition of the rights of others, of the rights of property, for obedience, for trustworthiness, for self-control, for moral courage, and for generosity. It stands for cooperation and for a willingness to fulfill one's duties.[270]

L. P. Benezet described the program in the Evansville public schools in which grades four through eight received weekly lessons in citizenship, often correlated with other subjects or with holidays. An additional aspect of the program was an unsupervised "Senior Honor Room" used to promote student self-government. Benezet claimed, "The school of the future will be judged by the citizenship of its product."[271] W. D. Lewes also spoke, saying he considered teaching citizneship "the most

---

[269] John F. Sims, "Patriotism in the Schools," in 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917), p. 170.

[270] F. B. Cooper, "How Are We Training for Citizenship in Our Public Schools?" in 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920), p. 63.

[271] L. P. Benezet, "How Are We Teaching Citizenship in Our Schools?" in 1920 Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920), pp. 64-66.

fundamental task of the public school to develop in our boys and girls the right attitude toward civic problems."[272]

In 1921 Milton Bennion distingushed between citizenship and character education, stating that they must each include the other. He also recommended that a permanent committee on character education be formed to work with the Committee on Democracy in Education.[273] The result of his recommendation was that the committee was named the Committee on Character Education.[274]

Three speakers correlated citizenship and character education at the 1928 annual meeting. A. G. Crane presented the relationship of citizenship and character education when he said, "The sum total of a man's reactions determine his citizenship. His character, personality, his attitude toward public welfare, are all parts of his citizenship."[275] He maintained that the two mistakes made in citizenship training were defining it too narrowly and putting too much emphasis on intellectual knowledge which resulted in "preachment." Instead the school needed to offer opportunities to acquire good

---

[272] W. D. Lewes, "Teaching Citizenship," in 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920), p. 531.

[273] Milton Bennion, "Preliminary Report of the Committee on Citizenship and Character Education," in 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), p. 344.

[274] Bennion, "Report of Progress Committee on Character Education--the Sanctions of Morality," p. 458.

[275] A. G. Crane, "Psychology of Citizenship Training," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), p. 64.

habits.[276] L. Daisy Hammond described student pageants, presented every two weeks, which she claimed developed obedience, responsibility, and leadership. According to Hammond, "Acts make habits--habits make character."[277] James E. Rogers presented the theme that physical education could help develop citizenship, contributing to the qualities of good health, vocational efficiency, wise use of leisure time, sportsmanship, and teamwork and loyalty.[278]

Speaking at the 1931 annual meeting, Louis G. Lower proclaimed,

> No service is greater than that which equips the youth of the nation for the responsibilities of citizenship, which stimulates it to lofty endeavor, and which imbues it with high ideals. In this field character-building organizations are not merely serviceable--they are necessary.[279]

In 1937 Helen Gibson Hogue integrated the ideals of character, culture, and citizenship. She was a mental hygienist who felt that the three concepts could not be taught unless "the whole atmosphere and approach of the school is permeated with understanding of the

---

[276] Crane, pp. 64-65.

[277] L. Daisy Hammond, "Character Training by Means of Patriotic Pageants," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), pp. 405-07.

[278] James E. Rogers, "Citizenship and Physical Education," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), pp. 547-48.

[279] Louis G. Lower, "Organizing Youth for Character Building," in 1931 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1931), p. 73.

importance of the raw material with which the schools works, viz., the personalities of the children themselves."[280]

Promoting education for citizenship, Francis T. Spaulding stated at the 1941 annual meeting,

> Public schools in America exist for one primary purpose--to give American boys and girls the educational equipment that each one of them will need if he is to become the best possible member of this republic.[281]

Also correlating citizenship with character and values was E. T. McSwain when he said,

> The moral function of the school is to help boys and girls learn how to live more adequately with others. Building the desire and procedures to seek continuous improvement in social living is, as I see, it, citizenship. We cannot teach citizenship by the direct method.[282]

The school provided "social experiences out of which each child interprets, learns, and applies the values in democratic citizenship," while teachers were to help "children conceive the school to be a social family in which the welfare of all members is as important as the welfare of individuals.[283]

---

[280] Helen Gibson Hogue, "The Three C's of Education--Character, Citizenship, and Culture," in 1937 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937), p. 291.

[281] Francis T. Spaulding, "What Is Right with the Secondary Schools," in 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941), p. 253.

[282] E. T. McSwain, "The Modern School--A Workshop in Democratic Citizenship," in 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941), p. 447.

[283] McSwain, pp. 447-48.

Plans and Programs

The emphasis on character, citizenship, and patriotism during the early 1900's resulted in a proliferation of contests, plans, and programs for teaching and developing character during the 1920's and 1930's. Even though the plans were not identically based, many did rely on the ability of the school to affect society. Three representative plans included the Boston Plan, the Norfolk Plan, and the Pathfinders.

The Boston Plan. In 1926 Leonard M. Patton, speaking on citizenship training, reported to the NEA on Boston's plan, "Citizenship Through Character Development." According to Leonard, the Boston school system had done an extensive survey on what was currently being done in character education. From their research they had developed their plan. They published a journal to get and keep the teachers excited and wrote a detailed course of study for grades one through eight. The pamphlet they produced included information on development of fundamental virtues, adjustment of life work to natural abilities, and development of capacity for the right use of leisure.[284] Referring to the Boston course of study in 1928, Jeremiah E. Burke described its use of definite daily time allotments for practice and exercise of virtues.[285]

---

[284] Leonard M. Patton, "Training in Citizenship--A New Approach," in 1926 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1926), pp. 741-51.

[285] Jeremiah E. Burke, "Entrance Requirements for Citizenship," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), p. 687.

The Norfolk Plan. Edith B. Joynes presented the Norfolk Plan at the 1928 annual NEA meeting. The plan was based on the philosophy that "the development of character is a matter of growth day by day in all the situations of life,"[286] while the emphasis was that the school was the world. First the desirable traits to be taught had been determined, then methods to integrate character education into the program and to measure character training and citizenship. The concept of citizenship was built around the social studies by making historical characters seem real, through clubs, and by "molding" thoughts and habits.[287]

The Pathfinders. J. F. Wright, executive secretary of Pathfinders of America, presented the Pathfinder Club program at the 1928 annual NEA meeting. The clubs met in the classrooms once a month for thirty minutes with a trained Pathfinder instructor in charge. At the meeting students received a sheet to take home and discuss with their parents. Two weeks later they met to discuss the material with their teacher. Afterwards they were to write a letter to the instructor telling what concept meant the most to them and how they could use it.[288]

---

[286] Edith B. Joynes, "Citizenship in the Making," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), p. 87.

[287] Joynes, pp. 88-90.

[288] J. F. Wright, "Education for Citizenship--A Human Engineering Problem," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), pp. 149-51.

Moral and Spiritual Values

By the 1940's the emphasis on traits had diminished and the reaction to indoctrination and absolutes was more accepted. Yet Americans were concerned that students be taught morality, and many still wanted a spiritual basis for their morality. Thus began over twenty years of character education revolving around the terms "moral and spiritual values."

John Dewey Society

In 1944 the seventh yearbook of the John Dewey Society, entitled The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, was published. The committee who wrote the book included John S. Brubacher, Samuel M. Brownell, John L. Childs, Ruth Cunningham, William H. Kilpatrick, Marion Y. Ostrander, William J. Sanders, and A. L. Threlkeld. Representing a spectrum of personal philosophies, the committee attempted to arrive at consensus on all chapters of the book except two; these two specifically represented either a secularist or supernaturalist point of view toward "spiritual" values.

The book was based on the premise that public schools existed to improve people so democracy could prosper.[289] Spiritual values were defined as behaviors "necessary to any satisfactory civilization," with "no reference to religious or divine authority or sanction."[290]

---

[289] John S. Brubacher, ed., The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1944), p. 1.

[290] Brubacher, pp. 7-8.

In other words, spiritual values "are not exclusively supernatural" but "natural."[291] Traits were explained as "spiritual values conditioned by community such as kindness, generosity, sacrifice."[292]

John L. Childs represented the secularist point of view. It was his idea that ". . . we regard the public school, in spite of its present inadequacies, as one of the most powerful spiritual resources American democracy has on its side in this difficult period of social upheaval and transition."[293] As a member of the John Dewey Society, he considered the most important test of a policy to be "that its present probable consequences are judged best to promote the common good."[294] Summarizing the idea of social democracy as ". . . institutions are means; individuals are ends,"[295] Childs claimed the value of an institution was based on its worth to society. He believed it was possible to keep "freedom of thought" only in a secular school which had no allegiance to any religion.[296] His morality was based on experience, with inductive reasoning taking priority over

---

[291] Brubacher, p. 15.

[292] Brubacher, pp. 16-23.

[293] John L. Childs, "The Spiritual Values of the Secular Public Schools," in The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, ed. John S. Brubacher (New York: Harper and Row, 1944), pp. 59-60.

[294] Childs, pp. 59-60.

[295] Childs, p. 75.

[296] Childs, p. 78.

dogmatism.[297] Religion was to be a private affair, thus requiring that all moral education in the public school be secular.[298]

The supernaturalist view was presented by William J. Sanders in the chapter, "Spiritual Values and Public and Religious Education." Sanders differentiated between natural and supernatural virtues. Supernatural virtues were faith, hope, and charity, while the major natural virtues included temperance, justice, fortitude, intelligence, knowledge, wisdom, and prudence.[299] Sanders believed private schools were detrimental to community spirit. On the other hand, the public school

> in building a common culture, teaches loyalty to the state that maintains the common good, and teaches the responsibility of the state for protecting its citizens in the exercise of their rights and privileges. . . .[300]

Sanders also relied on experience to teach values:

> The natural experiences children have in the school should have a high spiritual value in so far as they should give the child the feeling of exaltation and gratification that accompanies growth in control of his environment and of his own powers through proper direction of his activities.[301]

He concluded his chapter by re-emphasizing the importance of education in the forming of values:

---

[297] Childs, pp. 69, 70, 76.

[298] Childs, p. 78.

[299] William J. Sanders, "Spiritual Values and Public and Religious Educators," in The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, ed. John S. Brubacher (New York: Harper and Row, 1944), p. 82.

[300] Sanders, p. 83.

[301] Sanders, p. 89.

> Spiritual development, it seems, can be brought about through the public school system as it liberates children from ignorance and makes it possible for them to pursue their purposes, and as it helps them to acquire the virtues of courage, temperance, justice, and prudence in the pursuit.[302]

Overall, Brubacher and his committee asserted that the learning of values was dependent on experience and living. They also correlated "spiritual" with every teacher and all aspects of character: every teacher has a "spiritual effect on his pupils."[303] In addition, "Moral fibre . . . is an aspect of every character justly called spiritual."[304]

The American Council on Education

Disagreeing with Brubacher and his committee concerning the assumption that "spiritual values enbody the full, valid, content of religion,"[305] in 1947 the American Council on Education, Committee on Religion and Education published The Relation of Religion to Public Education. Defining religion as "an ultimate reality to which supreme allegiance must be given, they claimed religion was related to culture, was social, and tended to manifest itself in many various forms.[306]

---

[302] Sanders, p. 100.

[303] Brubacher, p. 123.

[304] Brubacher, p. 128.

[305] American Council on Education, The Relation of Religion to Public Education (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1947), p. 19.

[306] American Council on Education, p. 11.

While they claimed that progressivism had led to a philosophy of "to be educated does not mean to have been taught what to think, but it does mean to have learned what to think about [italics in original] and to have acquired definite convictions with respect to values,"[307] they also assumed that what the "community has a right to look for in the graduates of its schools is a positive attitude toward the values that religion represents in the culture."[308] To them the idea of a "common core" had resulted in a "watering down."[309] The committee was definitely against excluding religion completely from the public school; in fact, they maintained that secularization had caused problems because teachers had been concerned they must eliminate all religion to keep from offending.[310] Some suggestions they made for including religion in the schools were studying religious classics, studying religion in culture such as the fine arts and humanities, and studying "contemporary religious institutions and practices" in the social studies.[311]

Educational Policies Commission

In 1948 the Representative ASsembly of the NEA heard a report on "The Role of the Public Schools in the Development of Moral and

---

[307] American Council on Education, p. 13.

[308] American Council on Education, p. 15.

[309] American Council on Education, p. 15.

[310] American Council on Education, p. 49.

[311] American Council on Educaton, pp. 30-35.

Spiritual Values." In his report J. Graham Garrison reacted to the McCollum decision and claimed, "McCollum Case does not [italics in original] throw moral and spiritual values out of the schools; it only forbids the teaching of sectarianism."[312] He wanted a program, initiated by the NEA, to acquaint the public with what was being done about moral and spiritual values in the schools. A motion was passed to establish a commission "to foster and promote the development of moral and spiritual values in the public schools" and to publish the report.[313]

Then in 1951 William G. Carr, secretary of the Educational Policies Commission, announced that Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools, published by the Commission, had been prepared in response to the 1948 NEA action. The one-hundred page book "affairms the primacy of moral and spiritual values among the objectives of public education in the United States."[314] Carr asked schools to "increase their effectiveness in meeting the task of moral reconstruction which now confronts the American people."[315] According to Carr, the book "identifies specific and widely accepted values

---

[312] J. Graham Garrison, "The Role of the Public Schools in the Development of Moral and Spiritual Values," in 1948 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1948), p. 169.

[313] Garrison, p. 171.

[314] William G. Carr, "Educational Policies Committee Report," in 1951 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951), p. 300.

[315] Carr, p. 300.

and offers concrete suggestions for teaching them . . . within the framework of the American tradition of separation of church and state."[316]

The Commission had determined that values could not be divided between moral and spiritual, thus using the term "moral-spiritual."[317] They based their report on nine assumptions:

1. A "core of accepted moral-spiritual-values is essential to any social order."

2. Our democracy was based on a "body" or moral-spiritual values.

3. Values were drawn from culture, including art, literature, music, religion, science, and day-to-day living.

4. Moral-spiritual values were "potentially present in every personal experience"; they were not "abstract generalizations."

5. "Maturation" was a goal.

6. Ruling out "authoritarian philosophy," the "organism learns as a whole . . . learns by doing."

7. There was a need for a democratic program involving students. parents, and the community.

8. The home was the "fundamental social institution."

9. "Children and young people are educated by their whole environment."[318]

---

316 Carr, p. 300.

317 Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951), p. xiii.

318 Educational Policies Commission, p. 1.

Beginning with those assumptions, the commission defined moral and spiritual values as "those values which, when applied in human behavior, exalt and refine life and bring it into accord with the standards of conduct that are approved in our democratic culture."[319] They recommended a school policy which was "hospitable to all religious opinions and partial to none of them"--common values.[320]

The Committee's list of common American values included three: the importance of every human being to "have every possible opportunity to achieve by his own efforts a feeling of security and competence in dealing with the problem arising in daily life," moral responsibility for the consequences of personal conduct, and considering institutions as the "servants of man."[321]

The suggested methodology relied mainly on social-based experiences. These included experience and example, subject integration, guidance and counseling, special projects and assemblies, hobbies and clubs, and sports.[322]

In 1952 Henry H. Hill, Chairman of the Educational Policies Commission (EPC), stated,

---

[319] Educational Policies Commission, p. 3.

[320] Educational Policies Commission, p. 4.

[321] Educational Policies Commission, p. 18.

[322] Educational Policies Commission, p. 60.

> Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools is a clear and definitive statement of what our public schools may properly do to build character and decent conduct and to inculcate by precept and by daily school living those spiritual values to which all recognized religions in America give allegiance.[323]

He refuted the charge that the schools were godless by claiming that most teachers were religious. His major theme was "the good or godly teacher has a quality--let us call it moral and spiritual values--which will 'rub off' on her associates wherever she is."[324] At the end of his report, Hill made the recommendation, which was then passed, that teacher training stress methods to teach "fundamental moral and spiritual values and that research be done so they could be taught more effectively."[325]

The Kentucky Program

The Kentucky Program was an example of a program based on teaching moral-spiritual values. It began with the 1946 appointment of a committee to explore and make recommendations. In 1948 an advisory committee, headed by William Clayton Bower, was formed which met in October at the University of Kentucky and adopted basic philosophy and procedures. The program involved six sponsoring institutions, six pilot schools, and workshops.[326]

---

[232] Henry H. Hill, "Educational Policies Commission Report," in 1952 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1952), p. 141.

[324] Hill, pp. 142-43.

[325] Hill, p. 159.

[326] William Clayton Bower, Moral and Spiritual Values in Education (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1952), p. 22.

William Clayton Bower was the major consultant for the Kentucky program. He had concluded that the principal factor in the exclusion of religion from the public schools was due to "secularianism," and that as a result there was concern in America over moral and spiritual values. This concern had been more evident since the Report of the Superintendence in 1932.[327]

Bower outlined the basic beliefs on which the program was based in his book Moral and Spiritual Values in Education: (1) separation of church and state, (2) personality development through experience, (3) education through creative experience, (4) functional relationship of values to experience, (5) potential of value training in school experiences, and (6) integrated program, not new courses.[328] He was emphatic that "values must be experienced [italics in original]," while critizing the trait approach, which he was "verbalizing about [italics in original]."[329]

Ellis Ford Hartford was also actively associated with the Kentucky Program, a member of the first advisory committee, coordinator between the University and one pilot school, and leader of twenty-one workshops on campus and on the field.[330] He highly acclaimed the Educational Policies Commission's "model position of America's public

---

[327] Bower, pp. 5, 10.

[328] Bower, pp. 37-85.

[329] Bower, p. 62.

[330] Ellis Ford Hartford, Moral Values in Public Education: Lessons from the Kentucky Experience (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. x.

school teachers" concerning character education.[331] According to Hartford, the Kentucky Program "has developed consistently in the direction of a verification or testing of the position by the Educational Policies Commission [italics in original]. . . . The two positions are in substantial agreement."[332] He claimed the Kentucky Program began what he termed "the Kentucky Movement," an "informal label for an emphasis upon moral and spiritual values in public education. . . ."[333]

Hartford considered the program a "program of emphasis . . . consistent effort to discover the most appropriate occasions and potential opportunities for the teaching of values."[334] There were no syllabi, outlines, or definite subject matter to cover; rather the program was based on solutions to problems in life, related to democracy.[335] The problem solving was based on work by Dewey and Kilpatrick.[336] Emphasizing a better school life, the program put most importance on the value of respect for human personality.[337]

---

[331] Hartford, p. ix.

[332] Hartford, pp. x-xi.

[333] Hartford, p. 1.

[334] Hartford, p. 41.

[335] Hartford, pp. 41-42.

[336] Hartford, p. 57.

[337] Hartford, p. 68.

National Education Association Resolutions

The NEA passed resolution in 1952, 1953, and 1954 recommending that teacher training emphasize how to teach moral and spiritual values.[338] However, moral and spiritual values were not mentioned in the Indexes of the NEA Proceedings again until 1964, the major emphasis being on teacher citizenship and participation in voting and politics.[339] In 1964 a resolution was passed which did renew an emphasis on moral and spiritual values:

> The members of this Association recognize that the future will demand of our citizens a moral fiber seldom required of any society. The complex and difficult problems which they now face will require a strength of character and a set of values which alone can supply the power and the courage to hold steadfastly to those ideals and spiritual concepts on which this nation was founded. We believe that the public schools should play an important part in building values.
>
> To this end we urge our members to take the lead in developing programs of education which highlight the moral and spiritual foundations of our American way of life and encourage a deep and genuine respect for freedoms and diversities.
>
> Further, to this end we take a strong stand to support parents, teachers, and school administrators in their efforts to find and promote motion pictures and television and stage productions which improve and enhance the principles of morality, truth, justice, and patriotism for our youth, to perpetuate and safeguard our American way of life.[340]

---

[338] 1952 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1952), p. 152; 1953 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1953), p. 152; 1954 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1954), p. 125.

[339] Indexes of NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1955-1963).

[340] "Moral and Spiritual Values," Resolution 25, 1964 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1964), p. 449.

The resolution was changed and modified, until in 1972 it was titled "Moral and Ethical Values" and stated,

> The National Education Association believes that an understanding of the American heritages and the traditional values of the American way of life is a primary goal of teaching and learning in the public schools.
>
> The Association recommended that all educators emphasize, through their professional activities inside and outside the classroom, the application of our moral and ethical values.
>
> The Association also urges that schools make every effort to develop in school-age citizens, through curriculum, program, and activities, a capacity for moral judgment and a sense of responsibility in both the public and the private spheres.[341]

Thus the emphasis was still on morality and society, but not on the spiritual. Americans still wanted the schools to prepare the children to have good character for the good of society.

This emphasis was still evident in Lawrence Kohlberg's moral reasoning approach. He believed that students needed participation in society to develop character through a "process of participatory democracy in the school.[342] By 1980 his goal for his approach was a stage four "commitment of being a good member of a community or a good citizen."[343]

---

[341] "Moral and Ethical Values," Resolution C-17, 1972 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1972), p. 682.

[342] Lawrence Kohlberg, "High School Democracy and Educating for a Just Society," in Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development, ed. Ralph L. Mosher (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980), pp. 34-35.

[343] Kohlberg, p. 28.

Summary

Society based character education has taken many different facets: Puritan theocracy, Quaker separation, education for a successful democracy, the secular society, campaigns for the common school, Darwinism with its emphasis on development and improvement, pragmatism with its emphasis on experience, role models, Herbartianism, social progress, citizenship, and moral and spiritual values. Major spokesmen for this base included Thomas Jefferson, Roger Williams, Horace Mann, Charles S. Peirce, William James and John Dewey. Many textbooks such as the McGuffey Readers attempted to teach patriotism and good citizenship, and during the early 1900's numerous groups and programs supplemented the public school in its efforts to produce good and profitable members of society.

There did not appear to be conflicts concerning whether or not society should be a base for character education. Rather, different educators tended to emphasize a particular approach, method, or aspect. The public also has been insistent in requiring public schools to produce students of good character, and educational organizations have spent much time and money proving that they were, in fact, teaching character and moral education. Even today, with some attempts at individual determination, such as Lawrence Kohlberg's moral reasoning, society has been a major focus of the character education emphasis.

CHAPTER 5

Traits as the Basis of Character Education

Regardless of philosophical basis, Americans have often used character traits or qualities as a basis for character development, sometimes defining character as the unique qualities or traits of the individual.[1] Americans may have differed in methodology and philosophy, but many have looked for development of traits or "virtues" as evidence of successful character education.

The Colonists

Emphasis on traits was strong during the colonial period. The Puritans were convinced that good character would be the result of hard work, discipline, and suppression of the depraved nature. Thus they emphasized those traits with their children. Preaching, punishment, and biblical injunctions were often used to encourage children to develop diligence, goodness, piety, and other related character traits.[2]

The early American textbooks emphasized traits in character. Some of the couplets in the New England Primer described both good and bad traits and included admonitions to follow the good.[3] Webster's speller

---

[1] "Character," Christian Student Dictionary (Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1982).

[2] Raymond B. Culver, Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools (New York: Arno Press, 1969), pp. 4-5; see chapter 3 of this dissertation, pp. 14-25.

[3] Paul Ford, ed., New England Primer (1897; rpt. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1962), pp. 25-30.

included fables to teach character qualities such as honesty, hard work, and good behavior. Traits were also emphasized through maxims, proverbs, stories, and Bible verses.[4] Even the Catechism in the speller covered humility, mercy, purity, anger, revenge, justice, generosity, gratitude, truth, charity, greed, frugality, industry, and cheerfulness.[5] Sometimes negative traits were explored and attacked, as in a story in The Child's Guide. The story was entitled "The Idle School Boy" and presented the bad consequences of practicing idleness.[6]

William Penn also emphasized character traits in many of his writings. For example, in Advice to His Children he urged development of diligence and frugality:

> Diligence . . . is a discreet and understanding application of oneself to business. . . . Be busy to a purpose; for a busy man and a man of business are two different things. . . . Consider well your end, suit your means to it, and diligently employ them, and you will arrive where you would be. . . . Frugality is a virtue too, and not of little use in life, the better way to be rich, for it hath less toil and temptation. . . . I would have you liberal, but not prodigal; and diligent but not drudging; I would have you frugal but not sordid.[7]

---

[4] Noah Webster, The American Spelling Book: Containing the Rudiments of the English Language for the Use of Schools in the United States (1824; rpt. Gatlinburg: Marion R. Mangrum, J. P., 1964), pp. 43-90.

[5] Webster, pp. 156-168.

[6] Ruth Freeman, Yesterday's School Books: A Looking Glass for the Teachers of Today (Watkins Glen, N.Y.: Century House, 1960), p. 34, citing "The Idle School Boy," The Child's Guide, (n.d.), n.p.

[7] William Penn, Advice to His Children in Vol. of Tracts, II, p. 20, cited by Thomas Woody, Early Quaker Education in Pennsylvania (1920; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969), p. 29.

Benjamin Franklin was concerned with traits in his personal life. In "Plan for Future Conduct," he focused on frugality, truth, industry, and speaking good.[8] After numerous efforts at self-improvement, he arrived at a "bold and arduous project of arriving at moral perfection," which included development of thirteen virtues: temperance, silence, order, resolution, frugality, industry, sincerity, justice, moderation, cleanliness, tranquallity, chastity, and humility.[9] His plan was to emphasize each trait for one week per quarter until all thirteen were habit to him; then his life would exemplify the traits he considered important.

Thomas Jefferson was also concerned with trait formation. In a letter to Martha Washington, he recommended using repetition and life's opportunities to develop traits; practice should be constant.[10] The idea of practice and exercise was again mentioned in a letter to Peter Carr:

---

[8] Benjamin Franklin, "Plan for Future Conduct," in Benjamin Franklin's Autobiographical Writings, ed. Carl Van Doren (New York: Viking Press, 1943), pp. 25-26.

[9] Benjamin Franklin, "A Plan for Moral Self-Improvement," in Benjamin Franklin on Education, ed. John Hardin Best (New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1962), pp. 28-33.

[10] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Martha Washington, 7 April 1787, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, IV, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: Putnam, 1904), pp. 375-76.

> Above all things lose no occasion of exercising your dispositions to be grateful, to be generous, to be charatible, to be humane, to be true, just, firm, orderly, courageous and &c [sic]. Consider every act of this kind as an exercise which will strengthen your moral faculties, and increase your worth.[11]

Jefferson reaffirmed his belief in the importance of character traits when he wrote P. S. Du Pont de Nemours, "I believe with you that morality, compassion, generosity are innate elements of the human constitution. . . ."[12]

Nineteenth Century Americans

Traits, or virtues, were evident in much of the character education in the 1800's. Horace Mann himself endorsed their teaching in the public school system:

> Are not these virtues and graces part and parcel of Christianity? In other words, can there be Christianity without them? While these virtues and these duties towards God and man, are inculcated in our schools, any one who says that the schools are anti-Christian or un-Christian, expressly affirms that his own system of Christianity does not embrace any one of this radiant catalogue; that it rejects them all; that it embraces their opposites![13]

---

[11] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, 10 Aug. 1787, in the Writings of Thomas Jefferson, VI, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 258.

[12] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to P. S. Du Pont de Nemours, 24 April 1816, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, X, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: Putnam, 1904), p. 24.

[13] Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report (facsimile ed., Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1849), p. 123.

Children's Literature

An area where the trait emphasis was noticeable was children's literature. Both Ruth Miller Elson and Anne Scott MacLeod identified an emphasis on traits in nineteenth century books. Elson concluded that "Puritan values" such as industry, thrift, frugality, perseverance, self-denial, patriotism, piety, deference, honesty, and diligence were promoted, while idleness was considered the most "nonproductive sin."[14] MacLeod particularly noted the emphasis on obedience, especially obedience to parents.[15]

An article in the May, 1848, Massachusetts Teacher focused on teaching industry and perseverance. Methods included exciting the children's curiosity and sharing a love of approval and a love for knowledge. Also involved were an obligation to self and fellow human beings.[16]

Alexander Gow wrote a textbook in 1873 on morals and manner which included separate chapters on various traits such as cleanliness, hatred, courage, and chastity. Each chapter contained definitions

---

[14] Ruth Miller Elson, Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska, 1964), pp. 217, 251.

[15] Anne Scott MacLeod, A Moral Tale: Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820-1860 (Hamden, Ct.: Archon, 1975), p. 73.

[16] "Reformist Views on Motivation, 1848," The Massachusetts Teacher, 1 (May 1848), pp. 129-35, cited by Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968), pp. 131-32.

of the trait, examples of practicing the trait, anecdotes, maxims, and quotes for teaching and reinforcing each trait.[17]

National Education Association Addresses

A number of NEA speakers presented their ideas on the teaching of character with an emphasis on traits.

In 1876 W. H. Ruffner proposed that a science of the laws of character be established as a branch of psychology and be called "ethology." Under this science the laws under which character was formed would be studied. One branch would be called "ethics"; it would reduce principles about how an individual ought to behave to a few simple rules of conduct.[18] Then the school would be able to systematize the rules, or traits, and incorporate them into the curriculum:

> and when through all the grades of education the work upon character becomes as systematic and thorough as the work upon intellect, it may fairly be expected that the material magnificence of the present will be far surpassed by the moral glory of the future [italics in original].[19]

This was a beginning of the movement to scientifically reduce character education to traits and thus be able to scientifically solve character problems through education.

---

[17] Alexander Gow, Good Morals and Gentle Manners (New York: American Book), 1873.

[18] W. H. Ruffner, "The Moral Element in Primary Education," in 1876 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Salem, Ohio: NEA, 1876), pp. 39-41.

[19] Ruffner, p. 46.

Traits were emphasized in the 1883 Report of the Committee on Moral Education to the National Council of Education:

> The so-called discipline of the school is to primordial condition, and is itself a training in habits essential to life in a social whole, and hence is itself moral training. . . . A whole family of virtues are taught the pupil and taught him so thoroughly that they become fixed in character . . . obedience, punctuality, regularity, silence and industry. . . . Moral education must begin in merely mechanical obedience and develop gradually out of this stage toward that of individual responsibility.[20]

At the 1884 annual NEA meeting, T. W. Becknell, then NEA president, noted the trend in modern society to rely on the school to teach "self-control in matters of regularity, punctuality, and silence and industry; obedience to the direction of the superior, courtesy towards equals. . . ."[21]

Zalmon Richards reaffirmed the importance of obedience in a discussion at the 1892 annual meeting, advancing the idea that the first element of human character was obedience. According to Richards, children must be first taught obedience, then love.[22]

---

[20] "Report of the Committee on Moral Education to the National Council of Education," in 1883 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (n.p.: NEA, n.d.), n.;., cited by E. B. Castle, Moral Education in Christian Times (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958), p. 329.

[21] T. W. Becknell, "President's Address," in 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Boston: NEA, 1885), p. 47.

[22] Zalmon Richards, "Discussion," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1893), p. 117.

At the same meeting Joseph Baldwin presented the Report of the Committee on Moral Education entitled, "Practical Culture of Moral Virtues." He emphasized that there were moral virtues which should be taught. For him, ethics was the "art of promoting growth of moral virtues."[23]

Charles de Garmo, at the 1894 NEA annual meeting, listed what he considered the fundamental ethical virtues: truthfulness, prudence, good will, regard for property, requittal for good and bad actions, and promoting self through service to others. He suggested using role models, or characters to admire, to teach the traits.[24]

Twentieth Century Americans

At the turn of the century, character education was still as major emphasis of American educators. In fact, Thomas A. Mott considered the child and his relationships to be the center of all education: "The end [italics in original] must ever be character, based upon true habits or moral conduct, and a strong religious faith."[25] He continued, "Moral training consists primarily in the

---

[23] Joseph Baldwin, "Practical Culture of the Moral Virtues," in 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (New York: NEA, 1893), pp. 760-62.

[24] Charles de Garmo, "The Value of Literature in Moral Training," 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894), pp. 391-92.

[25] Thomas A. Mott, "The Means Afforded by the Public Schools for Moral and Religious Training," in NEA Fiftienth Anniversary Volume 1857-1906 (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907), p. 35.

practicing of the moral virtues and the development of rich moral habits."[26]

In 1908 J. W. Carr prescribed the foundation that the public school could lay in developing character. First the child must form ideas, then moral habits. In order to do this, the school must first decide which character traits to teach and then provide an environment where the traits could be learned. Carr emphasized the need for a moral atmosphere and teachers who were competent, moral, unselfish, sympathetic, kind, and just.[27]

By 1909 educators were reporting results of experiments and research in character education. Frank Chapman Sharp presented his ideas on training in specific character traits. Under his program, student leaders chosen by their peers were responsible for maintaining proper classroom behaviors. Other aspects of the program included studying biographies and current events to develop traits. Carr cited books he recommended for developing moral thoughtfulness in children as they realized the effects of right and wrong actions.[28]

---

[26] Mott, p. 37.

[27] J. W. Carr, "The Treatment of Pupils," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), pp. 450-51.

[28] Frank Chapman Sharp, "Some Experiments in Moral Education," in 1909 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1909), pp. 142-45.

Another popular plan during this period was the Brownlee or "Word-a-Month Plan." Under this plan a particular trait was studied in some way every day of the month.[29]

At the 1910 NEA annual meeting, Horace H. Cummings analyzed both negative and positive traits and gave specific ideas on how to develop the will to do right. According to Cummings, the school needed to give opportunity to practice and form habits by providing appropriate situations.[30]

In 1911 the Committee on a System of Teaching Morals in the Public Schools, with Nicholas Murray Butler as president and Clifford W. Barnes as secretary, presented its report to the NEA. The conclusion was that to teach virtues or habits, educators must know about them and know how to train them as habits. Emphasizing the importance of the teacher, they described the need for the school to provide instruction and opportunity to develop character traits.[31]

That same year J. W. Carr presented a method for teaching character traits. Emphasizing that character education should take

---

[29] Jane Brownlee, "A Plan for Moral Training," in 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908), pp. 251-52; Walter F. Lewes, "Discipline as Affected by Differences in Moral Responsibility," in 1910 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1910), p. 179.

[30] Horace H. Cummings, "Methods of Reducing Moral Truths to Practice," in 1910 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1910), pp. 180-82.

[31] Committee on a System of Teaching Morals in the Public Schools, "Introduction and Recommendations," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), pp. 353-45.

place each day, he suggested methods for the various grade levels. For kindergarten through fourth grade he suggested some specific character traits and a few methods, including story telling. He expanded on this for grades five through eight, presenting recommended outlines for teaching which included quotes, biographical examples, literary examples, community examples, discussion ideas, and applications. Three means were given for character instruction in high school: school activities, character study through history and literature, and an outline which described moral relations of the individual to some of the major social institutions. Carr included a detailed outline for each high school year. He then listed five aspects of moral training: an attractive, moral, enthusiastic environment; well-supervised social program; good discipline and routine procedures; course of study, the "chief means of moral instruction in the public schools"; and, to him the most important, the personality of the teacher.[32]

It was this plan of Carr's which had sparked the controversy over the use of the Bible in character education. George A. Coe not only lauded the fact that religion was not mentioned in the plan, but also later complained that too much attention had been given to lists

---

[32] J. W. Carr, "Moral Education Thru the Agency of the Public Schools," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), pp. 354-76.

of virtues and too little to virtue itself in most other character education plans.[33]

The state of Virginia also promoted the trait emphasis during this period. In 1906 the Virginia Assembly passed an act that "moral instruction should be given in the public schools, to be extended throughout the entire course," and textbooks covering various character traits were to be used for "inculcating the virtues of a pure and noble life."[34] A course of study for moral instruction was published in 1907; again traits were specified, with a trait assigned for each grade. However, in 1911 Bruce R. Payne of the University of Virginia reported to the Religious Education Association that only half the schools in Virginia were actually teaching morals, but "the moral tone of these schools is all that could be desired, and morality in many incidental ways is taught and applied."[35] By 1923, however, Virginia's prescribed course of study did not list moral instruction separately and seemed to rely more on citizenship training through the social studies programs, according to Sadie Bell.[36]

---

[33] George A. Coe, "Discussion," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), pp. 418-19; "Virtue and the Virtues: A Study of Method in the Teaching of Morals," in 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911), p. 419.

[34] Sadie Bell, The Church, the State, and Education in Virginia (1930; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), p. 484, citing Acts of Assembly, n.d., 1906, 433.

[35] Bell, p. 486, citing Bruce R. Payne, Religious Education, 6 (April 1911), 99-101.

[36] Bell, p. 487.

The 1920's and 1930's

During the 1920's and 1930's character was often defined in terms of traits. Edwin C. Broome and Edwin W. Adams described a person with good character as one who possessed the traits of good citizenship.[37] Harry C. McKown defined character as the "sum total of an individual's inner traits as represented by his conduct."[38] In his book The Teaching of Ideals, W. W. Charters defined character as "the most fundamental of the traits of personality . . . integrated total of the traits of character which he actually possesses."[39]

Traits and Ideals

Charters based his character education on traits, defining a trait as a "type-reaction . . . quality" and ideals as "desired traits."[40] He believed man had discovered moral traits and ideals, devised generalizations about them, given names to the traits, and classified them as good or bad. Traits were "an extremely useful discovery. By its use we formulate ends."[41]

---

[37] Edwin C. Broome and Edwin W. Adams, Conduct and Citizenship (New York: Macmillan, 1926), preface.

[38] Harry C. McKown, Character Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935), p. 1.

[39] W. W. Charters, The Teaching of Ideals (New York: Macmillan, 1928), p. 41.

[40] Charters, pp. 23, 33.

[41] Charters, pp. 21-23.

According to Charters, constructing a character education curriculum included three steps: select the traits, provide situations in which the traits can be taught, and determine trait actions necessary to handle the situations.[42]

There were four methods of selecting traits which Charters described. The first was using individual opinion, such as Benjamin Franklin's list of virtues or Hutchin's Code; this method tended to reply more on individual needs. The second method relied in consensus of groups, such as the Oath of Hippocrates or the scouting mottoes. The Denver school system had also used this method; the teachers had chosen thirty traits in a program under L. Thomas Hopkins. Personnel analysis was the third method. In this, personnel in a specific vocation were analyzed for their traits. Closely related to this was activity analysis, a refinement of personnel analysis. Charters had used all four methods to prepare lists of traits.[43]

Charters also outlined five principles to be considered when teaching ideals. These included diagnosing the situation; creating desire; developing a plan of action; requiring practice; and integrating personality, which meant to "integrate traits, ideals, habits, and customs in such a way that the person will act in the light of principles."[44] In his book he elaborated on these principles and also described numerous plans and programs in use around the country.

---

[42] Charters, p. 48.

[43] Charters, pp. 48-63.

[44] Charters, p. 13.

National Education Association (NEA)

The NEA continued to show an interest in character education based on trait development. Much of this interest was undoubtedly due to conditions in the country at the time.

Thrift. Beginning in 1916 the NEA showed great interest in the trait of thrift. S. W. Straus quoted Abraham Lincoln as saying, "Teach economy. That is one of the first and highest virtues; it begins with saving money."[45] To Straus thrift was "the very foundation of individual efficiency, and individual efficiency is the foundation of all success."[46] Thrift was considered essential for America to continue to be great, for "by education in thrift we can not only influence the nation of today, but we can also revolutionize the nation of tomorrow."[47]

Robert H. Wilson recommended correlating the teaching of thrift with other subjects; it would not be thrifty to have it as a separate subject. He even outlined a complete course of study in thrift which included a tentative outline, list of materials for libraries, principles to drill thrift, organization of thrift and other correlated clubs, and relevant quotations on thrift.[48]

---

[45] S. W. Straus, "Thrift--an Educational Necessity," in 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916), p. 196.

[46] Straus, p. 197.

[47] Straus, p. 200.

[48] Robert H. Wilson, "Thrift in Its Relation to Country Life," in 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916), pp. 201-02.

Also in 1916 Clarence H. Dempsey stated that

> one of our most vital problems in the actual realization of such standards and practices in our character, both as individuals and as a nation, that we shall stand, not only the test of hardship, but [also] the severer trial of prosperity, and find our thrift an unalloyed blessing."[49]

He then presented his plan for training to improve thrift in industry which would "insure our permanent supremacy in the markets of the world."[50]

Straus, speaking again at the 1917 NEA meeting, stated that thrift should be in the schools "on the grounds of patriotism."[51] He was convinced that only the school could solve the national need for thrift.[52]

Thrift was again discussed in the 1920 annual meeting. Arthur H. Chamberlain, chairman of the Committee on Thrift Education, stated, "No one element makes for good citizenship more than does the proper practice of thrift."[53] In a different speech he said, "Thrift must

---

[49] Clarence H. Dempsey, "Thrift in Relation to Industries," in 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916), p. 206.

[50] Dempsey, p. 208.

[51] S. W. Straus, "Thrift, a Patriotic Necessity," in 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917), p. 148.

[52] Straus, "Thrift, a Patriotic Necessity," p. 149.

[53] Arthur H. Chamberlain, "Thrift Readjustment in Progress," in 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920), p. 120.

be understood and practiced, both as an economic measure and as a training for character."[54] Speaking as he had at every annual meeting since 1915, in 1920 Chamberlain expanded the meaning of thrift to include moral cleanliness.[55]

Florence Barnard and Ada Van Stone Harris participated in a discussion on thrift at the 1920 annual meeting. Barnard suggested using a chart for a budget, stating that "this formula suggests the development of character. A fair mind, a warm heart, and a strong will constitute the cardinal elements of character."[56] Harris recommended relating thrift to citizenship and teaching it at all grade levels. She included thrift of time, talent, energy, effort, materials, food, health, and money at each grade level.[57]

In 1926 Chamberlain gave his annual report, stating that he had thought this year would be the last. He related that a number of cities had programs in thrift education, and credited his committee for creating the emphasis on thrift that had promoted many of the programs.[58] However, after that year, thrift was no longer given a prominent plance in the NEA agenda.

---

[55] Arthur H. Chamberlain, "Report of the Committee on Thrift Education," in 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), p. 170.

[56] Florence Barnard, "The Business of Living," in 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), p. 326.

[57] Ada Van Stone Harris, "Thrift--Civics," in 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921), pp. 328-29.

[58] Arthur H. Chamberlain, "Report of the Committee on Thrift Education," in 1925 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1925), pp. 188-90.

Work. At the 1927 annual meeting, Wylie A. Parker spoke on "Character Training Through Regular Classroom Work." His main points included how traits and ideals could be incorporated into the curriculum using both direct and indirect methods, classroom procedures in relation to character education, emphasizing a good social environment; responsibilities of the teacher, particularly to be organized and punctual; and classroom organization, including class officers.[59]

Trait Study. At the 1926 annual meeting, the Committee on Objectives had been asked to study traits. In the 1930 Committee report, Carroll G. Pearse discussed the checklist survey which had been sent to all members of the National Council of Education on June 9, 1930. This survey listed traits or qualities under the four headings of physical qualities, mental knowledge and manual skills, vocational qualifications, and social qualities. When the replies were tabulated, physical qualities included those of strong vital organs, strong nervous system, and health habits; mental knowledge and manual skills included knowledge of the language of the country, knowledge of the field of literature, culture, recreation, and ability to speak effectively and correctly to others; under vocational qualifications were adequate preparation for the vocation chosen, study of personal qualities as indicative of adaptability for certain vocations,

---

[59] Wylie A. Parker, "Character Training Through Regular Classroom Work," in 1927 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1927), pp. 601-07.

information as to possible employments, vocations, or professions; under social qualities were honesty, home membership, and industry.[60]

Teacher Training. In 1930 Paul T. Rankin elaborated on the importance of teacher training for the teaching of character traits. Because of changes in the make-up of society, teachers needed to teach more traits than had been required before. Another problem was that teachers tended to consider annoying traits such as dishonesty more serious, while mental hygienists were more concerned about withdrawing behaviors. Also, an "older and more restricted notion of character," with its emphasis on conformity and a "You must" philosophy was being replaced by a "newer and broader concept" which emphasized choice and "I will."[61] Rankin reminded his audience that Hartshorne and May had shown that character education was often too specific and geared to a specific situation; students needed to be taught to generalize, with teachers realizing the importance of every pupil-teacher contact. He ended with a plea for a conscious, direct planning for the character education program.[62]

---

[60] Carroll G. Pearse, "Study of Traits Desirable in an American Citizen--Preliminary Report," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), pp. 226-29.

[61] Paul T. Rankin, "The Training of Teachers for Character Education," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), pp. 319-322.

[62] Rankin, pp. 323, 325.

1930 Superintendents Conference. Character education was the topic of the conference of the Superintendents of Schools in 1930. At that conference W. W. Charters spoke on the "Aims and Methods of Character Training in the Public School." He stated, "The one major value that character contributes to the happiness and usefulness of individuals is a battery of moral traits which have been tested by the centuries."[63] His first aim of character education was the "development of these traits which orient us in carrying through our purposes and in helping us cooperate with other people."[64] According to Charters, there were two types of traits which needed to be taught. The first, the "hard traits" such as honesty, forcefulness, courage, industry, and ambition, were needed to "control our environment and develop our own programs of living," while the "gentle traits" such as kindliness, cooperation, and tact, were required "that we may live happily in a social situation."[65] The second aim was the "ability to think one's way through moral and social situation," which Charters claimed was developed through "reason and discussion," but not example, imitation, suggestion, force or punishment.[66] The third

---

[63] W. W. Charters, "Aims and Methods of Character Training in the Public Schools," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), p. 746.

[64] Charters, p. 746.

[65] Charters, p. 746.

[66] Charters, p. 747.

aim was to "have strong emotional convictions of the worth of these qualities of character" and to "love and utilize" those qualities.[67]

Charters considered methods to be implied by the aims. First the curriculum must be established to decide which traits to teach. Then situations must be established in which children would need to show those traits. Thirdly, appropriate actions must be made for those situations. Then the proper rewards or punishment and praise or censure must be determined. Correlated extracurricular activities must be planned. Finally, measurement of achievement, one of the "most significant . . . least developed" areas, needed to be devised.[68]

Summarizing character education to include "any means which may be available to promote the development or the improvement of character," Frank N. Freeman defined character as the sum total of characteristics which described a person.[69] According the Freeman, the terms of behavior in a social setting were described as behavior and/or traits. The elements of character were intelligence or understanding, emotions, attitudes, and habits. Methods for trait measurement included intelligence tests, the Woodrow-Mathews

---

[67] Charters, p. 747.

[68] Charters, pp. 48-50.

[69] Frank N. Freeman, "The Measurement of Results in Character Education," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), p. 751.

Questionnaire, observation of attitude change, the Hartshorne and May studies of truthfulness and honesty, and the case study method.[70]

One of the concerns at the 1930 meeting was whether or not it was right to experiment with children on character traits.[71] This concern was discussed at length after a speech by A. L. Threlkeld on "Character Education in the Regular Curriculum" in which he mentioned the "discrepancies between the realities of life at large and the things we teach at school."[72]

Plans and Programs

During the 1920's and 1930's numerous character education plans were developed based on character traits. Cities and states, as well as some individual schools, attempted to devise plans which would successfully teach those traits considered necessary or desirable.

Utah Plan. Earnest A. Smith described the Utah Plan at the 1920 NEA meeting. Under this plan the state was responsible for the child's character education year round. Records concerning traits, detailed personal habits, and club activities followed the child until he was eighteen. Although the system required a large record-keeping staff, Smith felt it was profitable since traits were

---

[70] Freeman, pp. 752-58.

[71] "General Discussion" in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), pp. 766-70.

[72] A. L. Threlkeld, "Character Education in the Regular Curriculum," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), p. 766.

reinforced by practice.[73] Utah also devised what Charters considered the "most comprehensive" state course of study; it included objectives for each grade, subjects, and extracurricular activities.[74]

Boston Plan. The Boston Plan focused on citizenship as described by Hutchins' Code.[75] Charters called the plan the best "from the point of view of its detail and its suggestiveness to teachers."[76] According to Leonard M. Patton, the Boston school system had surveyed what was being done in character education and had developed their plan for their research. They published a monthly journal to keep the teachers motivated and wrote a detailed plan of study for grades one through eight. A pamphlet they produced included information on development of fundamental virtues, adjustment of life work to natural abilities, and development of capacities for the right use of leisure.[77] Referring to the Boston course of study, Jeremiah E. Burke described its use of definite daily time allotments for practice and exercise of virtues.[78]

---

[73] Earnest A. Smith, "Compulsory Character Education," in 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), pp. 473-74.

[74] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, pp. 203-04.

[75] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, p. 202.

[76] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, p. 202.

[77] Leonard M. Patton, "Training in Citizenship--A New Approach," in 1926 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1926), pp. 741-51.

[78] Jeremiah E. Burke, "Entrance Requirements for Citizenship," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), p. 687.

Elgin Plan. The Elgin, Illinois, schools used a plan under which a specific topic was assigned to each day of the week: morals on Monday, manners on Tuesday, respect for property on Wednesday, safety on Thursday, and thrift and patriotism on Friday.[79] Fifteen minutes per day were spent on the topic in grades one through eight, with an emphasis on key words and activities.[80] According to Charters, ninety-six of 101 teachers involved indicated they thought the character education plan was meeting the need.[81]

Norfolk Plan. As part of the Norfolk Plan, first the desirable traits that were to be taught had been determined. Then methods to integrate character education into the school program and how to measure character training and citizenship were devised. The methods were centered around the social studies, club activities and habit formation.[82]

Lyndale School in Minneapolis. Agnes Boysen, speaking at the 1929 NEA annual meeting, described the plan used at Lyndale School in Minneapolis, Minnesota. First local businessmen were asked what traits were lacking in their workers; they responded with traits such as

---

[79] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, p. 197, citing Annual Report of the Public Schools of Elgin, Illinois for the School Year, 1924-25 Part III, (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), n.p.

[80] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, p. 86.

[81] Charters, The Teaching of Ideals, p. 201.

[82] Edith B. Joynes, "Citizenship in the Making," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), p. 87.

responsibility, dependability and punctuality. Then parents were asked to select traits they considered needful. Using this information, some of the district schools began to include some of these traits on report cards; and in 1925 the Lyndale staff decided to use report cards with character traits only, choosing the traits of obedience, reliability, industry, self-control, social attitudes, judgment, punctuality, initiative, personal habits, and thrift. The traits were defined on mimeographed sheets and discussed with the children. The students made individual books for each trait in which they defined the trait and illustrated how they could personally show it. After a meeting with the parents, the staff proposed to try the new report cards for one semester. As an academic record, the children kept track of their subject matter progress on graphs. According to Boysen, "We started out to prove that growth in character would produce growth in scholarship and we proved it."[83]

Birmingham Plan. Involving the entire city and using the press for publicity, the teachers of Birmingham "endeavored, without appearing to do so, to develop traits of character."[84] They used a different slogan picked for each year. Examples of slogans used included "The Development of Character through Health" and "The

---

[83] Agnes Boysen, "Character Traits as a Basis for Good Scholarship," in 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928), pp. 394-401.

[84] N. H. Price, "Some Modern Tendencies in the Teaching of Character Education--Abstract," in 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929), p. 413.

Development of Character through Sportsmanship"; as new slogans were studied, old ones were reviewed.[85] High school students were able to expand on these themes. For example, the year the theme was sportsmanship, the high school developed a written code entitled "Characteristics of a Good Sportsman." The characteristics chosen included courteous, modest, generous, game, obedient, and fair.[86]

An Individual Plan. Marian Smithling described the plan based on traits that she and Helen Hay Hely used. To begin they made a list of traits, picked which ones they wanted to emphasize for one year, and read Charters' Teaching of Ideals to help orient their thinking. They then taught character education lessons as the situations arose. Methods they used included poems, stories, discussion, multiple choice tests concerning situations, clubs, a "Book of Golden Deeds," and a reminder board with children's names and the traits exhibited listed. The two women considered their plan successful in terms of character improvement noticed.[87]

Plans Based on Literature. Many individual teachers used literature to teach character traits. Stella Sufinsky described the

---

[85] Price, p. 414.

[86] Charles A. Brown, "Character Education," in 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929), p. 629.

[87] Marian Smithling, "Character Education Projects--Abstract," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), pp. 475-78.

method in which the teacher first selected the trait, either negative or positive, and then chose a story to teach it. The telling of the story was followed by discussion, questions, and enrichment activities.[88] Robert Garvey illustrated this method in an article in Grade Teacher in which he presented a story illustrating a character trait, followed by sample questions for discussion.[89]

Sadie Goldsmith also promoted the teaching of character traits through literature. For her, "Literature, intelligently interpreted by an enthusiastic teacher, is without a superior as an instrument of moral training."[90] One reason she felt the method was effective was because students "admire heroes, despise villians."[91]

Research

As additional emphasis was put on traits in character education, researchers began to study the results of character education based on traits.

Hugh Hartshorne and Mark May. Hartshorne and May began their studies in the nature of character in 1924. The first was a study of

---

[88] Stella Sufinsky, "Literature for Character Training--a Suggestive Method," Educational Methods, 10 (April 1931), 407-12.

[89] Robert C. Garvey, "Little Alice's Day: Simple Stories Involving Behavior Problems," Grade Teacher, 53 (June 1936), 20.

[90] Sadie Goldsmith, "The Place of Literature in Character Education," The Elementary English Review, 17 (1940), 178.

[91] Goldsmith, p. 177.

deception, and the second studied the use of testa of moral knowledge and attitude. After completing their research, they concluded that talking and studying about traits and practicing traits, with rewards given for good deeds, did not seem to aid honesty, nor did religious activities or Sunday School attendance.[92] By 1932 Hartshorne was expressing the opinion that the old ways of teaching character would not work, that through environment and participation would come successful moral education.[93]

Making a presentation at the 1928 Mid-West Conference on Character Development, May spoke on What Science Has to Offer Character Education." He discussed current tests to measure "dynamic factors" in character--instinct, emotions, drives, sentiments, attitudes, and interests. May foresaw being able to test for a character quotient just as an intelligence quotient.[94] Although he was unsure whether heredity or environment was responsible for a child's character, he did state that "children are unequal with respect to their chances of achieving desirable character."[95] He concluded from his experiments that behavior was more dependent on the situation than on a trait and

---

[92] Hugh Hartshorne, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth, Studies in the Organization of Character, Vol. III of Studies in the Nature of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1930), p. 340.

[93] Hugh Hartshorne, Character in Human Relations (New York: CHarles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. v.

[94] Mark A. May, "What Science Offers on Character Education," in Building Character: Proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Character Development (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 13-16.

that character could be taught, but teaching it would require changes in curriculum and school organization rather than additional courses or religious training.[96]

William F. Russell. William F. Russell reported on "Some Hints from Scientific Investigations as to Character Training" at the 1929 NEA annual meeting. He claimed character was the development within self of the ideas of right and wrong and then the ability to live by those ideas. According to Russell, research had indicated that character was made up of specific and definite elements, those elements could be trained, and more research would teach educators to become more successful at teaching character. He believed that knowledge of right and wrong was relatively simple to teach but was incomplete training. Moral conduct was also relatively easy to teach because the child learned by doing. However, what Russell called "drive" needed to be added to character education to extend behaviors to other situations which were out of the teacher's control. Russell also gave four conclusions based on his interpretation of the work of Hartshorne and May: a boarding school would be more effective than a day school because the lack of twenty-four-hour-a-day influence was a big problem; training should begin at an early age; the group should be emphasized rather than the individual; and pupils must be happy.[97]

---

[96] May, p. 44.

[97] William F. Russell, "Some Hints from Scientific Investigations as to Character Training," in 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929), p. 758.

Blanche Skinner. Blanche Skinner compared character traits given in elementary history texts with good citizenship traits. She also determined what the chief objectives of character education were based on

> moral codes, sets of reference books, studies in citizenship training, authors who are leaders in the field of character education, state courses of study, and teachers' college classes in character education.[98]

Her conclusion was that objectives were related to what was "necessary for the safety and progress of society and for the development of an altruistic type of individual," while the traits being stressed in textbooks were "those of the great soldier or statesman rather than those common to all good citizens."[99] In other words, the objectives were based more on society while the texts stressed traits common to heroes.

Books

Character traits were the topic of numerous books written during this period. Many textbooks were also written to aid in the development of character traits in students. The following are examples of these books.

Moral Education in School and Home. In his book J. O. Engleman emphasized science, habits, and psychology. He recommended teaching

---

[98] Blanche Skinner, "Comparision of the Character Traits Given in Elementary History Textbooks with the Traits of Good Citizenship," The Teachers Journal and Abstract, 5 (Dec. 1930), 574.

[99] Skinner, p. 576.

morals through school activities rather than "didactic teaching" or formal ethics courses, while promoting moral training through teacher example and personality: "Children remember teachers for what they are and not for what they teach."[100] He also highly recommended using reading and literature for moral training:

> In building his character there are few better ways than that of systematically placing before the pupil moral situations embodied in story and dealing with the virtues and vices peculiar to each period of his unfolding.[101]

Traits were considered a basis on which to classify stories.[102] His book included chapters on how to teach character through the various school subjects, emphasizing traits appropriate to each discipline.

Fifty Hints and Helps in Character Education. A teacher and principal, Edith M. King wrote her book in 1931. Defining character as "what you are,"[103] she then listed thirty-one character qualities which constituted character, such as honesty, generosity, order, and courtesy. The majority of the book was a list of fifty ways to teach character, including focusing on particular traits, writing essays, literature, contests and games, study, memorization, and drill.

---

[100] J. O. Engleman, Moral Education in School and Home (New York: Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1920), pp. 22, 37.

[101] Engleman, p. 84.

[102] Engleman, p. 85.

[103] Edith M. King, Fifty Hints and Helps in Character Education (Painesville, Ohio: The Educational Supply Co., 1931), p. 6.

Character Building in Primary Grades. Joseph B. Egan wrote a series of books to teach character building, beginning with ten books for grade three. Each book in the series covered a different trait such as cleanliness, fairness, or thankfulness. Because Egan considered stories the "most potent force to make essential situations live in the child mind,"[104] the books were basically collections of stories. For every story Egan included suggestions for development, vocabulary, and opportunities for creative activities. At the end of each book were hectograph pages with additional activities, cartoons, and a "Just for Fun" section.

1940's to Today

In a summary of character education published in 1936, Francis J. Brown identified a diminishing emphasis on character tests; however, she claimed the teaching of character traits through literature was still prevalent.[105]

Though traits are still mentioned in texts and articles today, the trait approach to teaching character has diminished in popularity. By 1952 William C. Bowers, one of the leaders of the Kentucky character education program, criticized Charters and the trait approach because it was too abstract, based on adult experience, taught by the Herbartian

---

[104] Joseph B. Egan, Character Building in Primary Grades: Grade Three, I (Wellesley Hills, Ms.: n.p., 1939), p. 3.

[105] Francis J. Brown, "Character Education--Past and Present," School and Society, 43 (1936), 588.

method, and required both learning and application.[106] Explaining his philosophy, he said that traits come from adults, but values come from school experiences.[107] The trait emphasis had given way to a search for development of moral and spiritual values.

Summary

Americans have often used character qualities or traits as a basis for character development, but often it has been, in reality, a vehicle for a Bible-based or society-based character education. The Puritans had a strong emphasis on traits which they believed were even indicative of salvation, taught by the Bible, and necessary for acceptance in Puritan society. Ben Franklin was concerned for development of traits in his personal life as was Thomas Jefferson. Textbooks such as the McGuffey readers, but including many more, included chapters to teach students to evidence particular traits in their lives. Sometimes the texts used a Bible-base, but more often they emphasized traits of a good American or a good citizen, with famous American leaders being the role models for specific traits.

The traits emphasis was especially popular during the 1920's and 1930's. During this period numerous authors and programs and research projects advanced the idea of development of traits; again, often the

---

[106] William Clayton Bower, Moral and Spiritual Values in Education (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1952), p. 62.

[107] Bower, p. 75.

approach was also based on society. W. W. Charters, Milton Bennion, Hugh Hartshorne, Mark May, Arthur H. Chamberlain were especially known for their work with character traits.

By the 1950's, however, the emphasis on traits had diminished in popularity, giving way to a search for development of moral and spiritual values.

CHAPTER 6

Independent Decision Making

Both Bible-based and society-based character education rest on an "external norm or authority."[1] However, some educators consider character education based on appeals to an authority "doomed to failure."[2] In fact, Roger Straughan claimed that "morality can never be defined in terms of mere obedience to authority."[3] Charlotte Buhler also observed,

> The value of blind obedience has become completely invalid and even the value on conformity, which up until recently was generally undisputed, is scorned by those who want to see an individual's personality maximally developed.[4]

In Principles of Character Making, Arthur Holmes contrasted various philosophies of character education when he said that punishing a boy for the habit of swearing because it was immoral was "immoral" but punishing him because it was anti-social was "sane and rational."[5]

---

[1] Alan Montefiore, "Moral Philosophy and the Teaching or Morality," Harvard Educational Review, 35 (1965), 438.

[2] Maurice P. Hunt, "Some Views on Situational Morality," Phi Delta Kappan, 59 (April 1969), 453; Roger Straughan, Can We Teach Children To Be Good? (Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1982), p. 54.

[3] Straughan, p. 59.

[4] Charlotte Buhler, "Values and Beliefs in Our Time," Educational Leadership, 21 (1964), 521.

[5] Arthur Holmes, Principles of Character Making (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1913), pp. 289-95; rpt. in Dennis Clayton Troth, ed., Selected Readings in Character Education (Boston: Beacon Press, 1930), p. 69.

He then stated he believed that to make someone do something was also immoral; actions were not as important as intentions.[6]

Methods which emphasize independent decision making are sometimes called relativistic. Maurice P. Hunt summarized the basic premises of all relativistic views: (1) moral rules are invented, (2) moral rules are not universal, (3) moral rules will change, (4) moral rules vary according to the situation, and (5) holders of the relativistic view tend to be very committed.[7] However, not all advocates of independent decision making hold this strong relativistic view.

Independent Decision Making in the Past

As Bible-based character education was often identified with early America, and society-based with the 1800's, so character education based on independent decision making is often identified with the emphasis on valuing and situation ethics found in the twentieth century. However, some early Americans also had strong feelings against religious dogma and imposed values and beliefs.

Thomas Jefferson

Thomas Jefferson advocated independent thinking. Writing to Peter Carr in 1787, he encouraged him to come to his own conclusions in regards to religion. He recommended examining the Bible, particularly any parts which appeared to go against nature and reason, and come to his own opinion, without fear of what it or the

---

[6] Holmes, pp. 68-71.

[7] Hunt, p. 453.

consequences would be: "You must lay aside all prejudice on both sides, and neither believe nor reject anything, because any other persons, or description of persons, have rejected or believed it."[8] Showing his personal practice of this philosophy, Jefferson wrote to Francis Hopkinson in 1789,

> I never submitted the whole system of my opinions to the creed of any part of men whatever, in religion, in politics, or in anything else, where I was capable of thinking for myself. Such an addiction is the last degradation of a free and moral agent.[9]

Jefferson based his own morality on an inner knowledge of what was right: "I have ever found one, and only one rule, to what is right, [italics in original] and generally we shall disentangle ourselves without almost preceiving how it happens."[10]

Horace Mann

Fifty years later Horace Mann, the father of American public education, reiterated this belief when he said,

---

[8] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Peter Carr, with enclosure, Aug. 10, 1787, in The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, VI, ed. Albert Ellery Bergh (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907), p. 257.

[9] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Francis Hopkinson, 13 March 1789, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, V, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 162.

[10] Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Wilson Cary Nicholas, 26 March 1805, in The Works of Thomas Jefferson, VIII, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York: G. G. Putnam's Sons, 1904), p. 349.

> What we learn from books, even what we think we are taught in the Bible, may be mistake or misapprehension; but the lessons we learn from our own consciousness are the very voice of the Being that created us; and about it can there be any mistake?[11]

John Dewey

John Dewey was also more concerned with the process used in moral decision making than in the decision itself. In 1893 he wrote,

> Let the teacher, at the outset, ask the pupils how they would decide, if a case of seeming misery were presented to them, whether to relieve it and, if so, how to relieve. This should be done without any preliminary dwelling upon the question as a "moral" one; rather, it should be pointed out that the question is simply a practical one, and that ready-made moral considerations are to be put to one side. Above all, however, it should be made clear that the question is not what to do, but how to decide what to do.[12]

Stating this concept in a different way, he wrote in 1920,

> This process of growth, of improvement and progress, rather than the static outcome and result, become the significant thing. . . . The end is no longer a terminus or limit to be reached. It is the active process of transforming the existent situation. Not perfection as a final goal, but the ever-enduring process of perfecting, maturing, refining is the aim in living. . . . Growth itself is the only moral "end."[13]

Free choice was also important to Dewey. In a communication presented to the French Philosophical Society he stated,

---

[11] Horace Mann, Life and Works, I, eds. Mary Peabody Mann and George Combe Mann (Boston: Lee & Shephard, 1891), p. 51, cited by Neil Gerard McCluskey, Public Schools and Moral Education (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958), p. 87.

[12] John Dewey, "Teaching Ethics in the High School," Educational Review, 8 (Nov. 1893), 315, cited by McCluskey, p. 235.

[13] John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy (New York: Holt, 1920), p. 177.

> Moral progress and the sharpening of character depend on the ability to make delicate distinctions, to perceive aspects of good and evil not previously noticed, to take into account the fact that doubt and the need for choice impinge at every turn.[14]

Independent Decision Making in Transition

Even though some educators promoted free choice and independent thinking before 1900, many twentieth century educators felt the need for a changing base of morality and encouraged rejection of morality based on authority.

Edward Sisson

According to Edward O. Sisson, character came from "original tendencies" or "power sources."[15] He believed "moral tendencies, then, must always strive to make connection with these sources of power by directing the impulses of nature into the service of human ideals."[16] In other words, the child had natural, inward qualities which needed to be developed. Sisson disagreed with forcing unnatural tendencies on children as had been done in the past.[17]

Sisson also believed children were naturally inclined to be obedient.[18] For this reason, teachers were to "encourage good . . .

---

[14] John Dewey, "Three Independent Factors in Morals," trans. JoAnn Boydston, Educational Theory, 16 (1966), 199.

[15] Edward O. Sisson, The Essentials of Character (New York: Macmillan, 1910), p. vii.

[16] Sisson, p. vii.

[17] Sisson, pp. 5-6.

[18] Sisson, p. 13.

discourage bad."[19] To do this the teacher could rely on three fundamental educative processes: "the stimulation of good acts, the weeding out of the bad, and the suggestion of new desirable forms."[20]

Edwin Starbuck

Edwin Starbuck emphasized both natural tendencies and free choice.[21] Writing in 1930 he summarized his beliefs concerning moral education:

> Moral life is a dynamic somewhat. It cannot be created; it may be elicited and stimulated. Morals cannot be taught; like diseases they are caught. . . . Commands repel; images attract. Prohibitions arouse defiance; symbols awaken the sympathies. Punishments brutalize; spontaneous choice of values brings grace and strength.[22]

Willis A. Sutton

In 1930 Willis A. Sutton proposed a changing base for character when he said, "Good character is not the same in all generations."[23] He noted that Americans tended to critize youth for traits that had made America great, such as speed and courage.[24] Disparaging the Bible, he stated, "We may believe all we please but salvation comes

---

[19] Sisson, p. 38.

[20] Sisson, p. 39.

[21] Edwin Diller Starbuck, et. al. A Guide to Books for Character, II (New York: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 15, 27.

[22] Starbuck, et. al., p. 15.

[23] Willis A. Sutton, "What the Schools Can Do in Character and Religious Education," in 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930), p. 27.

[24] Sutton, p. 25.

through a man's own initiative and thinking and adaptation of his life into the doing of the thing that he believes and thinks."[25] According to Sutton, "The greatest thing in the world in the making of character is the free play life of the child."[26]

A. L. Threlkeld

At the 1935 annual NEA meeting, A. L. Threlkeld led a panel jury discussion on character education. While Edythe Jeannette Brown wanted "codes of ethics for good behavior and similar devices . . . fundamental in a character education program,"[27] Lois Coffey Mossman disagreed, claiming that "group thinking and action should be allowed, and that children should develop codes of their own."[28] Advocating an independent base for character, Threlkeld summarized the discussion stating, "There are no absolute standards of character."[29]

NEA Committee on Academic Freedom

In 1941 the NEA published Principles of Academic Freedom. In it the committee strongly criticized any teacher who would inflence children toward a particular way of morality:

---

[25] Sutton, p. 29.

[26] Sutton, p. 30.

[27] "Education's Oldest Challenge--Character," Panel Jury Discussion Group in 1935 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1935), p. 113.

[28] Panel Jury Discussion, p. 114.

[29] Panel Jury Discussion, p. 114.

> If any teacher, by the way in which he teaches, either willfully or carelessly permits some bias or prejudice of his own, or even the inappropriate expression of his reasoned convictions, persistently to mar the process of fairminded study of the part of those studying under him, he is to that extent damaging these students and in that same degree manifesting his unfitness to teach.[30]

Committee on Religion and Education

In 1947 the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education indicated they were for religion but against indoctrination as they presented their opinion concerning the teaching of values: "To be educated does not mean to have been taught what to think, but it does mean to have learned what to think about [italics in original] and to have acquired definite convictions with respect to values."[31]

Ernest Wesley Cason

Ernest Wesley Cason was against authoritarian and autocratic practices, believing that morality "resides in the human act and not in beliefs, faiths, allegiances, and dogmatic tenents."[32] Children would develop values from their own personal experiences which had

---

[30] "Principles of Academic Freedom," in 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941), p. 913.

[31] American Council on Education, Committee on Religion and Education, The Relation of Religion to Public Education (Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1947), p. 13.

[32] Ernest Wesley Cason, "Teaching Creative Freedom As a Moral Ideal," Phi Delta Kappan, 38 (March 1957), 232.

meaning to them.[33] He challenged, "When the teacher relinquishes a faith in absolute values and substitutes a faith in mankind's ability to reconstruct values continuously for himself, the way is open for creative teaching. . . ."[34]

Stuart A. Courtis

Not only did Stuart A. Courtis speak strongly against religious sanctions for morals, but he was also against any religious teaching in public schools.[35] His goal was for the school to provide "courses that will organize and inspire the creative energies of men without enslaving them to any superstitious belief about either God, the herafter or a 'savior.'"[36] Teachers could guide students but should not impose their beliefs. Courtis claimed that character was the outcome of the right kind of schools, but he admitted that schools had not been very effective in developing character.[37]

Raymond English

Raymond English claimed that by the mid-1960's educators had accepted the fact that there was no standard consensus of values;

---

[33] Cason, p. 235.

[34] Cason, p. 235.

[35] Stuart A. Courtis, "Religion Has No Place in Public Schools," The Nation's Schools, 39 (June 1947), 22-23.

[36] Courtis, p. 23.

[37] Courtis, p. 23.

> . . . some of the most serious and even religiously devout teachers were attracted by the new systems, although in truth the new systems were designed to undermine conventional or traditional standards of judgment and behavior.[38]

He described three foundations for morality, including religion, convention, and reason, which he defined as "consensus of the wisest and best persons from diverse cultures over the course of history."[39] Though he wanted individual determination of values, he was against "ethical relativism . . . the antithesis of the philosophy of Right Reason and Natural Law."[40] He stressed that in a pluralistic society "there must [italics in original] be a considerable area of voluntary moral consensus."[41]

Bernard S. Miller

In 1965 Bernard S. Miller presented the idea that truth and values must change with each generation:

> The truth may set us free, but what is truth for one generation may be old-fashioned nonsense for another. Values to be viable can not be embalmed and set apart for reverent worship. When a new generation in a changing world is unable to have a choice in determining values, the values lose their vitality. Young people will not readily accept a life of death.[42]

---

[38] Raymond English, "The Revival of Moral Education," American Education, 18 (1982), 4.

[39] English, pp. 5-6.

[40] English, p. 6.

[41] English, p. 8.

[42] Bernard S. Miller, "The Quest for Values in a Changing World," Social Education, 29 (1965), 70.

Maurice P. Hunt

Maurice P. Hunt claimed that because man was destined for relativistic thinking, absolutism was both inappropriate and doomed.[43] He identified a moral crisis in the United States in the late 1960's but believed it to be between relativistic moralities rather than against absolutism.[44] According to Hunt, young people in 1969 favored situational morality.[45]

Barbara Biber and Patricia Minuchin

In a study comparing children from "traditional" schools where behavior was based on conformity to standards and authority to those from "modern" schools where behavior was based more on meaning, motivation and principles, Barbara Biber and Patricia Minuchin concluded that strict discipline may defeat the goal of developing "moral maturity."[46] In other words, teachers who were more flexible about right and wrong were seen to accomplish more in moral education than those who relied on authority-based standards.

Louis J. Rubin

Louis J. Rubin also believed that the need for absolute moral standards had passed. Fixed morals were applicable only when social

---

[43] Hunt, p. 453.

[44] Hunt, pp. 452-53.

[45] Hunt, p. 452.

[46] Barbara Biber and Patricia Minuchin, "The Impact of School Philosophy and Practice on Child Development," in The Unstudied Curriculum: It's Impact on Children, ed. Norman V. Overly (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1970), pp. 28-43.

change was slow; with technology came the need for a new moral system.[47] In addition, he claimed it was "only through education that people became moral."[48]

Independent Decision Making Today

The term "character education" is rarely used in public schools today. However, terms such as "moral education," "values education," and "moral reasoning" are often used to refer to similar and related curriculum content.

Alan Montefiore described two modern philosophies concerning morality. One based morality on external authority, while the other believed "true morality must in the last resort spring from the free and deliberate decisions of mature and responsible individuals. . . ."[49] Persons who followed the latter philosophy, "autonomists," were concerned with (1) getting the facts; (2) understanding the situation, circumstances and what society would say; (3) other people's opinions and advice, and (4) personal feelings. An autonomist "has to take responsibility in his own individual decision."[50]

Roger Straughan divided modern moral education content into four different "appeals." Appeal to authority was "doomed to

---

[47] Louis J. Rubin, "Introduction," in The School's Role as Moral Authority, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977), p. 2.

[48] Rubin, p. 2.

[49] Montefiore, p. 438.

[50] Montefiore, p. 440.

failure"[51] because "morality can never be defined in terms of mere obedience to authority."[52] Appeal to nature "holds that morality is to be defined in terms of some state of affairs which can be factually described [italics in original]."[53] However, according to Straughan, the fact that something is does not mean that it ought to be that way.[54] Appeal to human welfare often coincided with common sense and what the individual determined was "best."[55] The fourth appeal, appeal to reason, relied on identifying moral principles.[56] Of the four appeals, all but the first are used today relative to character education based on independent thinking.

Donald H. Peckenpaugh identified four methods used to teach morality today. He included value clarification, analysis of issues, humanistic education and positive self-concept.[57] Of these, many

---

[51] Straughan, p. 54.

[52] Straughan, p. 59.

[53] Straughan, p. 63.

[54] Straughan, p. 64.

[55] Straughan, p. 70.

[56] Straughan, p. 76.

[57] Donald H. Peckenpaugh, "Moral Education: The Role of the School," in The School's Role as Moral Authority, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977), p. 34.

authors considered values clarification and Kohlberg's moral reasoning the two most popular moral education programs in use.[58]

Positive Self-Image

E. Frank Frances summarized the attitude of persons correlating character education with a positive self-image when he wrote, "Whatever the individual can do to enhance himself without infringing on the rights of others is worthy and desirable."[59] He believed that bad character developed "as a substitute or as a compensation for failure to satisfy needs in desirable and constructive ways. In a sense, poor character is a deficiency disease."[60] Thus, to educate for good character, the teacher must help the child develop a good self-concept and meet his psychological needs.

Stating the philosophy differently, Maxine Dunfee and Claudia Crump were concerned that every child should be able to say, "I AM ME! I AM SOMEBODY! I AM LOVABLE AND CAPABLE! [capitals in original]"[61] They considered this a requirement for adequate teaching of values.

---

[58] Flake-Hobson, Bryan E. Robinson, and Patsy Skeen, Child Development and Relationships (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1983), pp. 364-65; Kathleen M. Gow, Yes Virginia, There is Right and Wrong! (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980), p. 8; James R. Rest, "The Research Base of the Cognitive Developmental Approach to Moral Education," in Values and Moral Development, ed. Thomas C. Hennessy, S. J. (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), p. 102.

[59] E. Frank Frances, "Fundamentals of Character Education," School Review, 70 (1962), 349.

[60] Frances, p. 350.

[61] Marilyn Dunfee and Claudia Crump, Teaching for Social Values in Social Studies (Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education, 1974), p. 11.

Humanistic Education

Also called natural education or appeal to nature, humanistic education is based on the premise that children are naturally good and should be allowed to be free.[62] In fact, Alexander S. Neill, headmaster of Summerhill, a school at which there was no direct moral instruction, claimed it was "moral instruction that makes the child bad."[63] Rest presented the idea that a society or education which gave "oughts" was one which ruined children, and he recommended studying men such as Neill and Carl R. Rogers as examples of humanistic educators.[64]

Carl Rogers, though primarily involved with psychotherapy, had interest in identifying the psychologically mature person. Believing that for the average adult "the majority of his values are introjected from other individuals or groups significant to him, but are regarded by him as his own,"[65] Rogers described a mature person as one for whom "values are not held rigidly but are continually changing."[66] He

---

[62] C. H. Patterson, Humanistic Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), pp. 47-48.

[63] Alexander S. Neill, Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing (New York: Hart Publishing, 1960), p. 221.

[64] Rest, p. 104.

[65] Carl R. Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969), p. 248.

[66] Carl Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68 (1964), 84.

maintained that as his clients matured they tended to "move away from 'oughts' . . . from meeting the expectations of others" to personal values.[67] He considered this situation exciting for the following reasons:

> I find it significant that when individuals are prized as persons, the values they select do not run the full gamut of possibilities. I do not find, in such a climate of freedom, that one person comes to value fraud and murder and thievery, while another values a life of self-sacrifice, and another values only money. Instead there seems to be a deep and underlying thread of commonality. I dare to believe that when the human being is inwardly free to choose whatever he deeply values, he tends to value those objects, experiences and goals which contribute to his own survival, growth, and development, and to the survival and development of others. I hypothesize that it is characteristic of the human organism to prefer such actualizing and socialized goals when he is exposed to a growth-promoting climate.[68]

Values Education

According to David E. Engel, traditional values education included inculcation in which the "learner has limited control and hence limited responsibility in the development of his own values."[69] In contrast with this approach, the moral relativism of today takes a "prescriptive view that all values, including moral values, should be

---

[67] Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values," p. 88.

[68] Rogers, Freedom to Learn, p. 254.

[69] David E. Engel, ed. "Some Issues in Teaching Values," in his Religion in Public Education (New York: Paulist Press, 1974), p. 169.

considered equally valid,"[70] as stated by Gary Wehlage and Alan L. Lockwood. Louis Raths pioneered methods in values education with his emphasis on values clarification, but other approaches have also utilized the emphasis on development of a personal set of values.

Values and the affective domain. David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia described behavior based on "valuing" as "motivated, not by the desire to comply or obey, but by the individual's commitment to the underlying value guiding the behavior."[71] In their taxonomy of objectives for the affective domain, they outlined three levels of valuing: acceptance of a value, preference for a value, and commitment. Acceptance involved belief, while commitment involved certainty and real motivation.[72]

Value-conflict strategies. Defining values as "our standards or principles of worth,"[73] James P. Shaver and A. Guy Larkins described three strategies to employ when faced with a value conflict. The first

---

[70] Gary Wehlage and Alan L. Lockwood, "Moral Relativism and Values Education," in Moral Education . . . It Comes with the Territory, eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 331.

[71] David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook II: Affective Domain (New York: David Mckay, 1964), p. 140.

[72] Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, pp. 140-150.

[73] James P. Shaver and A. Guy Larkins, Decision-Making in a Democracy (Atlanta: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), p. 399.

was to appeal to a higher value than either of the two involved. The second strategy was to compare the situation with a similar but non-conflicting situation. The third was to find a policy that would support both values.[74]

Values clarification. According to David Purpel and Kevin Ryan, values clarification was the most widely practiced moral education approach starting in 1966 when Values in Teaching was first published.[75] They credited Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon with being the "major architects" of values clarification, while Howard Karschenbaum was the "major theorist."[76] Reasons given for its popularity included that the techniques were easy to learn, it allowed teachers to deal with important issues, it was not a didactic approach, and students enjoyed it.[77]

In Values and Teaching, Raths, Harmin, and Simon were concerned with the "process of valuing" rather than if the child formed a specific value.[78] They presented seven criteria considered necessary for a value to result: choosing freely, choosing from among alternatives, choosing after thoughtful consideration of the

---

[74] Shaver and Larkins, p. 417.

[75] David Purpel and Kevin Ryan, eds., "Introduction," in Moral Education . . . It Comes With the Territory (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 73.

[76] Purpel and Ryan, p. 74.

[77] Purpel and Ryan, p. 73.

[78] Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1966), p. 78.

consequences of each alternative, prizing and cherishing, affirming, acting upon choices, and repeating the action.[79] Any result of this process was considered a value. Thus a value was defined as "those beliefs, purposes, attitudes, and so on that are chosen freely and thoughtfully, prized, and acted upon."[80] Values and Teaching included numerous examples of dialogue, methods, and correct teacher responses to use with students to allow them to "clarify" their own personal set of values. Correct verbal responses included the following: giving no moralizing, criticizing, giving of values or evaluating; putting responsibility on the child to think; allowing students the opportunity to not respond; emphasizing mood more than visible results; not using class time as an interview or extended discussion; not responding to everything; emphasizing there are no right answers; and not being mechanical but creative.[81]

Believing that "the only thing that indoctrination did for people in the past was to help them postpone the time when they began the hard process of hammering out their own set of values," Sidney Simon stated in 1971 that children must make their own values, developed from their experiences, and "the skills necessary for doing this can be learned in values clarification."[82] Then in 1972 he, Leland W.

---

[79] Raths, Harmin, and Simon, pp. 28-30.

[80] Raths, Harmin, and Simon, p. 38.

[81] Raths, Harmin, and Simon, pp. 53-54.

[82] Sidney Simon, "Values Clarification vs. Indoctrination," Social Education, 35 (1971), p. 915.

Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum published a book of seventy-nine "strategies" designed to aid teachers "help students build the seven valuing processes into their lives."[83] They wanted the teacher to

> use approaches which help students become aware of the beliefs and behaviors they prize and would be willing to stand up for in and out of the classroom. He uses materials and methods which encourage students to consider alternative modes of thinking and acting. Students learn to weigh the pros and cons and the consequences of the various alternatives. The teacher also helps the students to consider whether their actions match their stated beliefs and if not, how to bring the two into closer harmony. Finally, he tries to give students options, in and out of class; for only when students begin to make their own choices and evaluate the actual consequences, do they develop their own values.[84]

Simon re-emphasized his approval of values clarification strategies in 1975, pointing out strategies which had worked well.[85] He and Polly de Sherbinin advocated using values clarification in schools within courses, as separate courses, and as electives.[86] They listed the aims of value clarification as helping students become more purposeful, helping students become more productive, helping students

---

[83] Sidney B. Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students, rev. ed. (New York: A & W Visual Library, 1978), p. 20.

[84] Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, pp. 19-20.

[85] Sidney Simon and Polly de Sherbinin, "Values Clarification: It Can Start Gently and Grow Deep," Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (June 1975), 680.

[86] Simon and de Sherbinin, p. 681.

sharpen critical thinking, and helping students have better relations with each other.[87]

Concerned that values clarification

> may indeed be discarded in the coming decade, unless teachers and educators come to understand the approach as more than games to be used on Fridays, or as a means of enlivening the classroom when students get bored or restless,[88]

Leland Howe and Mary Martha Howe published Personalizing Education with the following aim:

> The aim of our book is to . . . make Values Clarification an integral part of every dimension of the classroom. What teachers and administrators must come to see is that valuing is not a gimmick of limited usefulness, but a way of thinking about teaching, a way of relating to students, a way of personalizing [italics in original] education so that every student can achieve his or her full potential.[89]

This book included strategies from a variety of approaches, including values clarification, which could help teachers personalize instruction.

Kirschenbaum later reported he had misgivings about using the seven processes as required criteria for a value.[90] Besides the

---

[87] Simon and de Sherbinin, pp. 680-81.

[88] Leland W. Howe and Mary Martha Howe, Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond (New York: Hart Publishing, 1975), p. 9.

[89] Howe and Howe, p. 11.

[90] Howard Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," in Readings in Values Clarification, eds. Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973), p. 93; Howard Kirschenbaum, "Clarifying Values Clarification: Some Theoretical Issues," in Moral Education . . . It Comes with the Territory, eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 119.

seven steps, communication and the ability to deal with feelings were also important.[91] He expanded the idea of seven criteria to five "dimensions" of the valuing process: thinking, feeling, choosing, communicating, and acting.[92] Thinking was to take place on all cognitive levels. Feeling dealt with strengthening self-concepts and knowing how to deal with all types of feelings. Choosing involved skills which needed to be learned. Communicating included verbal and nonverbal interaction, for values develop "through an ongoing process of social interaction."[93] A person must make his needs known to others to they can meet them; sharing helps one clarify his values. Finally, acting occurred in accordance with values.

Kirschenbaum defined values clarification as "an approach that utilizes questions and activities designed to teach the valuing process and to help people skillfully apply the valuing processes to value-rich areas in their lives."[94] He did not believe values clarification was value free. In fact, he claimed that some advocates of values clarification did believe in absolute values while others did not.[95]

---

[91] Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," p. 94.

[92] Kirschenbaum, "Beyond Values Clarification," pp. 102-06; "Clarifying Values Clarification," pp. 120-22.

[93] Kirschenbaum, "Clarifying Values Clarification," p. 121.

[94] Kirschenbaum, "Clarifying Values Clarification," p. 122.

[95] Kirschenbaum, "Clarifying Values Clarification," p. 123.

Dunfee and Crump, though emphasizing self-concept, did follow the values clarification approach: "The key is teaching children how to value, not what to value [italics in original]."[96] They suggested the following for a teacher's motto: "If I want each child to develop values that are meaningful, significant, and active for him, I cannot insist upon my values for him. My values are relevant only to me [italics in original]."[97]

Believing that a "state of psychological imbalance or dissonance" must take place before attitudes changed, Milton Rokeach used values clarification to help students realize their values were inconsistent; and, therefore, there was a need for change. He reported that long range attitude change took place using this method.[98]

Not all modern educators praised values clarification, however. Goerge J. Harrison was critical of the approach because students were not taught the difference between actions based on principles and actions based on feelings; there was a difference between "desired" and "desirable" [italics in original].[99] He charged,

---

[96] Dunfee and Crump, p. 11.

[97] Dunfee and Crump, p. 18.

[98] Milton Rokeach, "Persuasion that Persists," in Readings in Values Clarification, eds. Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973), p. 93; Kirschenbaum, "Clarifying Values Clarification," pp. 65-70.

[99] George J. Harrison, "Values Clarificaton and the Construction of Good," Educational Theory, 30 (1980), 187.

> If the distinctions between desired and desirable, valued and valuable are not clarified; if valuational propositions lack de jure quality; if the approach breeds confusion between opinions held and judgments made; then, in the deepest sense in which values clarification should be practical, namely, helping people engage in the valuing process, it is not. And this is a tragic irony, for values clarification is not a theory of meta-ethics; it is a teaching theory and by definition, has practical import.[100]

Alan L. Lockwood also criticized the approach, claiming it was merely another form of Rogers' client-centered therapy.[101] However, his major concern was that "values clarification or any program of values education can come to represent ethical relativism,"[102] which, because it could be used to justify anything, was unable to resolve "interpersonal conflicts of value."[103]

Criticizing the values clarification approach because of its use of peer pressure, John S. Stewart also charged, "The movement is rooted in a confused philosophy of absolute relativism and in an inadequate psychology of instrumental individualism."[104] However, he did give the approach some positive credit:

---

[100] Harrison, p. 189.

[101] Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teacher's College Record, 77 (Sept. 1975), 40-46.

[102] Lockwood, pp. 47-48.

[103] Lockwood, pp. 46-47.

[104] John S. Stewart, "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique," Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (June 1975), 688.

> One of the greatest contributions of values clarification to the field of values/moral education has been its direction confrontation with traditional-authoritarian education, clearly revealing the inadequacy, inhumanity, and injustice of this approach.[105]

Hugh Nevin compared values clarification with the philosophy of John Dewey and found values clarification, in his opinion, lacking:

> The Raths-Simon approach to values clarification finally slips into precisely that position which Dewey sought most consistently to avoid. Its direction of thought is ultimately backward to an antecedent, independently existent object--the "value" held--unaffected by its interaction with the knower.[106]

He claimed Dewey's system led to the formation of values, while values clarification did not.[107]

Reflective values. Clive Beck preferred the term "values" over "moral" because "moral" implied "the right approach to human conduct lies in the unreflective adherence to a set of rather specific rules . . . has absolutist and conventionalist connotations" while "values" implied that "if one weighs human conduct in terms of more fundamental life goals or life concerns one sees that all decisions

---

[105] John S. Stewart, "Problems and Contradictions of Values Clarification," in Moral Education . . . It Comes With the Territory, eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976), p. 149.

[106] Hugh Nevin, "Values Clarification: Perspectives in John Dewey with Implications for Religious Education," Religious Education, 73 (1978), 671.

[107] Nevin, p. 674.

are life decisions and there are no distinctively moral decisions."[108] He promoted the term "reflection," which he described as "the process of testing and hence at arriving at sound valuings."[109] The four steps in the process of reflecting included the following: knowing the real facts of a situation or person, determining if new values were consistent with old ones, bringing "means-values into line with end-values," and determining life goals.[110] Summarizing the importance of reflecting, he wrote,

> If, then, one is to have the degree of security that humans commonly desire, one must reflect on one's way of life in the light of one's ultimate life goals. . . . One must determine what, ultimately [italics in original], one is after in life and establish a pattern of life appropriate to these utlimate concerns. Thus, reflection on one's values in the manner I have outlined, is fundamental to a satisfactory human existence.[111]

Beck did not believe that reflection required denying religious values. Rather he stated,

> A value that has stood the test of time or that is strongly advocated by a reliable authority is for that reason to be given careful attention. . . . Traditions and authorities must be assessed in terms of the likelihood that the values they support are sound.[112]

---

[109] Beck, p. 14.

[110] Beck, pp. 14-15.

[111] Beck, p. 16.

[112] Beck, p. 17.

He did emphasize, however, that "one message comes through loud and clear from the modern movement in moral/values education: students should not have values imposed on them. . . ."[113]

Value-developing strategy. Jack R. Fraenkel considered moralistic teaching, giving examples of what was "right," and the idea of learning from the environment and other "persuasive communications" as "relatively ineffective" for moral education.[114] Claiming he was a moral relativist, he advocated what he termed "Value-Developing Strategy."[115] This involved the presentation of a story with follow-up discussion of alternative actions, possible results, and personal feelings and empathy. Fraenkel did not want right or wrong specified; he believed that how one felt was more important than what was "right."[116]

Situational values. Joseph Fletcher, considered by Arthur I. Melvin to be the major spokesman for situational ethics,[117] proclaimed that "the ROCK-BOTTOM [capitals in original] issue in all ethics is

---

[113] Beck, p. 19.

[114] Jack R. Fraenkel, "Value Education in the Social Studies," Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (April 1969), 458.

[115] Fraenkel, p. 460.

[116] Fraenkel, p. 460.

[117] Arthur I. Melvin, "Cross-Cultural Moral Values," in Morality Examined, eds. Lindley L. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977), p. 53.

'value.'"[118] Fletcher promoted a morality which "follows a moral law or violates it according to love's need."[119] Rejecting both legalism and lawlessness, he advocated an ethics in which the situationist

> is prepared in any situation to compromise them [the ethical maxims of his community and its heritage] or set them aside in the situation [italics in original] if love seems better served by doing so. . . . The situationist follows a moral law or violates it according to love's need.[120]

O. Sidney Barr presented the conflict of legalism versus the new morality as a conflict of law versus love, or the ten commandments versus the greatest commandment.[121] What he desired was "flexibility in application of laws."[122] He justified his position with the Bible, claiming it was based on Christ's teaching.[123] Scripture made the law servant to agape love; the situation had priority over all other laws.[124] However, though he believed that "love is the sole inviolable 'law'" of morality,[125] he did not equate the freedom involved with license.[126] Rather, the new morality assumed self-discipline and

---

[118] Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics: The New Morality (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1966), p. 57.

[119] Fletcher, p. 26.

[120] Fletcher, p. 26.

[121] O. Sidney Barr, The Christian New Morality (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969), p. 12.

[122] Barr, p. 12.

[123] Barr, p. 17.

[124] Barr, p. 14.

[125] Barr, p. 98.

[126] Barr, p. 20.

rejection of any activity which was harmful or did not show love.[127]

Analysis of Issues--the Cognitive Domain

Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver proposed the following bases of moral judgments: prudence, law, utility, freedom, beneficence, justice, equality, and honesty.[128] Renouncing institution, revelation, and societal introjection as incomplete, they defended moral reasoning with observation and discussion as necessary for satisfactory development of moral principles.[129] After analyzing issues underlying moral reasoning, they concluded that some values were universal, but they rejected any imposition of values on others.[130] They also perceived the need for some consistent moral principles in contrast to a relativistic view of ethics.[131]

After describing why most groups considered moral education in the United States a failure, Michael Scriven presented the cognitivist solution. "In the cognitivist view, moral education for prerational

---

[127] Barr, pp. 102-03.

[128] Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver, Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies (Boston; Little, Brown, 1970), pp. 90-99.

[129] Newmann and Oliver, p. 100.

[130] Newmann and Oliver, pp. 102-03.

[131] Newmann and Oliver, p. 104.

children must be absolutely minimal, preferably reversible, and its content must be culturally, not parentally, legitimated."[132] He believed that a cognitive curriculum, one which included knowledge and understanding of facts, moral reasoning skills, and foundations of ethics, was the best way to achieve affective change.[133]

This cognitive approach to moral education, particularly Kohlberg's moral reasoning approach, has included some of the most popular moral education approaches in recent years.

Havighurst and Peck. In 1956 Robert J. Havighurst stated that moral character was not inborn, not improved by didacticism, nor was it an accumulation of good and bad habits; it was learned.[135] He, Robert F. Peck, Ruth I. Cooper, Douglas M. Moore, and Jessee W. Lilienthal proposed a theory of moral development based on these ideas which they worked out at the University of Chicago. They theorized that character development through five stages which corresponded roughly to age.[136] An adult would use thinking at all five stages,

---

[132] Michael Scriven, "Cognitive Moral Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (June 1975), 690.

[133] Scriven, pp. 692-94.

[134] Rest, p. 102.

[135] Robert J. Havighurst, "Moral Character and Religious Education," Religious Education, 51 (1956), 163.

[136] Havighurst, pp. 165-67; Robert F. Peck, Robert J. Havighurst, et. al., The Psychology of Character Development (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960), pp. 3-8.

but the majority of his thinking would settle at one stage.[137] Stage one was "amoral," with "no internalized moral principles, no conscience or superego"; the child was self-centered with no concern for others.[138] Stage two, "expedient," was also self-centered but realized the importance of being accepted by society.[139] At stage three, "conforming," the child had one internalized principle, "conform to all the rules of his group" whether or not they were consistent.[140] A stage four person, "irrational-conscientious," "judges a given act according to his own internal standard of right and wrong."[141] The stage five person, "rational-altruistic,"

> not only has a stable set of moral principles by which he judges and directs his own action; he objectively assesses the results of an act in a given situation, and approves it on the grounds of whether or not it serves others as well as himself.[142]

Studying the families of children at various stages, they were able to correlate some family tendencies with various character types. They concluded that mature love and mature discipline were the best ways to build character.[143] Character was "largely learned by emulation of

---

[137] Havighurst, p. 165.

[138] Peck, et. al., p. 5.

[139] Peck, et. al., p. 5.

[140] Peck, et. al., p. 6.

[141] Peck, et. al., p. 7.

[142] Peck, et. al., p. 8.

[143] Peck, et. al., pp. 109-25.

the attitudes and behavior of those few people who are emotionally essential to the growing child."[144] As far as school environment was concerned, "it is fatal to the development of mature character to enjoin behavior solely on the weight of authority"; pupils should be encouraged to "think for themselves."[145]

Later, in 1976, Havighurst still supported his five levels, claiming they were compatible with Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning.[146] At the same time he described three traits of mature character types: they observe how people behave; they have insight and true understanding into the needs of and feelings of others; and they exhibit empathy.[147]

Hall and Davis. Robert Hall and John Davis wanted moral education without indoctrination, stating,

> The objective of moral education, as we see it, cannot be simply the inculcation of accepted values and standards. We must aim, rather, at developing in students the ability to think [italics in original] about their own values, to relate decisions of right and wrong to ideals of a coherent and principled lifestyle.[148]

---

[144] Peck, et. al., p. 189.

[145] Peck, et. al., p. 192.

[146] Robert Havighurst, "Reaction to Selman: Social Perspectives and the Development of Moral Judgment," in Values and Moral Development, ed. Thomas C. Hennessy, S. J. (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), p. 13.

[147] Havighurst, "Reaction to Selman," p. 168.

[148] Robert Hall and John Davis, Moral Education in Theory and Practice (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus, 1975), p. 19.

Their plan for moral education was "the creation of a classroom environment of open discussion, interaction, and experiences" based on two assumptions.[149] First the proposal assumed that "we can, through a Socratic method, induce students to consider the morally relevant consequences of their decisions and actions."[150] The second assumption was that the child would progress through a series of stages, with the teacher as a facilitator.[151]

Hall and Davis based their plan on a number of principles. They believed moral education "ought to be centered around a consideration of basic traditional values; however, each person is, in the end, his own moral agent. . . ."[152] They maintained that moral principles needed to be prioritized so that "a morally acceptable action is one which is judged on the whole, or all things considered [italics in original], the best course of action."[153] They also believed there should be a "universality of moral principles" with "no reference to particular people or objects."[154] In addition, they claimed "the various decisions and judgments a person makes need to be related

---

[149] Hall and Davis, p. 54.

[150] Hall and Davis, p. 51.

[151] Hall and Davis, p. 51.

[152] Hall and Davis, p. 62.

[153] Hall and Davis, p. 65.

[154] Hall and Davis, pp. 71-74.

to each other [italics in original] in at least a roughly coherent way to constitute what might be called a moral perspective."[155]

Hall and Davis believed the future for moral education was with the cognitive approach, partially because "people are attracted to higher-stage reasoning when it is presented to them."[156] Their recommended procedure was the case study with four steps: present the case, find alternatives, calculate the consequences, and test the alternatives.[157] Thus they would provide "experience in skills of moral thinking" and a "situation which facilitates normal moral development."[158]

Lawrence Kohlberg. In 1955 Lawrence Kohlberg began a longitudinal and cross-cultural study of the development of moral reasoning in young boys. He cited three implications of this study: (1) moral reasoning develops by stages which (2) follow in an "invariant sequence" and (3) include "hierarchal [sic] integrations" in which higher level thinking includes thinking at lower stages.[159] He found that for most children, 50 percent of their moral decisions were at one

---

[155] Hall and Davis, pp. 76-77.

[156] Hall and Davis, p. 98.

[157] Hall and Davis, pp. 132-36.

[158] Hall and Davis, pp. 130-31.

[159] Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (June 1975), 670-71.

stage. They could understand thinking at stages below that stage but never more than one stage above.[160]

The six stages were subdivisions of three levels, preconventional, conventional, and postconventional or principled, which according to Kohlberg, were comparable to Dewey's three levels.[161] At the preconventional level right and wrong were based on consequences, at the conventional level on conformity and loyalty to society, and on the third level the child exhibited.

> a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles and apart from the individual's own identification with these groups.[162]

The six stages included the following: (1) punishment and obedience orientation; (2) instrumental relativist orientation--right is what staisfied one's needs or the needs of others; (3) interpersonal concordance or "good boy--nice girl" orientation; (4) "law and order" orientation, which included maintenance of the social order; (5) social-contract, legalistic orientation, which is the "official" morality of our government; and (6) universal ethical principle orientation, based on self-chosen ethical principles.[163]

---

[160] Kohlberg, p. 671.

[161] Kohlberg, p. 670.

[162] Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Moral Atmosphere of the School," in The Unstudied Curriculum: It's Impact on Children, ed. Norman V. Overly (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1970), p. 125.

[163] Kohlberg, "The Moral Atmosphere of the School," pp. 124-25.

Kohlberg then based his methodology on the premise that "one cannot follow moral principles if one does not understand . . . moral principles."[164] The most common exercise was presentation of a moral dilemma which involved conflicts of values. Through discussion he would try to raise the child to the next level of reasoning as he talked through resolution of the conflict.

Kohlberg's aim was for the child to "make judgments in terms of universal [italics in original] principles applicable to all mankind."[165] He claimed that sometimes principles required breaking a rule which was "supported by social authority."[166] In contrast, principles were "freely chosen by the individual because of their intrinsic moral validity."[167]

Kohlberg also compared his approach with indoctrination and values clarification. Values clarification was good in that it did elicit the child's own opinion, started self-awareness, and combatted indoctrination; however, it did not go far enough because it allowed for no "correct" answers. His approach and values clarification were similar in that they encouraged open discussion and opposed indoctrination. A major difference was that his cognitive approach had an aim, to progress to the next stage. In addition, because he focused

---

[164] Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," p. 672.

[165] Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," p. 672.

[166] Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," p. 672.

[167] Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," p. 672.

on the principle of justice, it was a "moral development approach [which] restricts value education to that which is moral, or, more specifically, to justice."[168]

As early as 1967 Kohlberg had presented his six stages and advocated a moral education goal of "the stimulation of the 'natural' development of the individual child's own moral judgment and of the capacities allowing him to use his own moral judgment to control his behavior."[169] By 1971 the Encyclopedia of Education claimed that his six levels "definitely reign supreme" in the area of moral education.[170] Yet in 1980 he shared some ways he had had to adjust his approach. In 1976 he had advocated teaching social studies with the inquiry method so that students could understand Stage 5 reasoning:

> Aside from neglect of civic education, the principal alternative was the old-fashioned indoctrinative civic education for Stage 4, teaching respect for law and order, authority, nation, and the free enterprise system on the value side and straight facts on the cognitive side.[171]

Now he was aiming for "solid attainment of the fourth-stage commitment of being a good member of a community or a good citizen."[172]

---

[168] Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach," pp. 673-75.

[169] Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral and Religious Education and the Public Schools: A Developmental View," in Religion and Public Education, ed. Theodore R. Sizer (Atlanta: Houghton Mifflin, 1967), p. 169.

[170] "Moral Education," The Encyclopedia of Education, 1971 ed., p. 400.

[171] Lawrence Kohlberg, "High School Democracy and Educating for a Just Society," in Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development, ed. Ralph L. Mosher (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980), p. 28.

[172] Kohlberg, "High School Democracy," p. 28.

Kohlberg's emphasis and approach spawned a number of related projects in schools throughout the country. Some of these were described in a book edited by Ralph L. Mosher.[173] From these came the concept of schools which did not "teach about values of democratic and communal living" but were "trying to realize these values in a social world."[174] As Robert Sperber and David Miron, participants in the related Brookline project, stated, they were attemptiong a "Just Community Concept at the School-Within-A-School."[175]

Authors were not unanimous in their praise of Kohlberg, however. Craig Dykstra charged that three claims to Kohlberg's theory, the philosophical, the psychological, and the operations, were all inadequate.[176] Richard S. Peters criticized the approach for its emphasis on justice only, its undermining of reasoning at stages three and four, its weakness in the affective domain, and its neglect of the aspect of the will.[177] As an advocate of the direct teaching or moral education, Andrew Oldenquist disagreed with Kohlberg's refusal to teach

---

[173] Ralph L. Mosher, Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development.

[174] Mosher, p. 319.

[175] Robert Sperber and David Miron, "Organizing a School System for Ethics Education," in Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development, ed. Ralph L. Mosher (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980), p. 66.

[176] Craig Dykstra, "Moral Virtue or Social Reasoning," Religious Education, 75 (1980), 115-128.

[177] Richard S. Peters, "Why Doesn't Kohlberg Do His Homework?" Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (June 1975), 678.

right and wrong or give specific answers to dilemmas.[178] Jack Fraenkel questioned whether values in general were universal and, specifically, whether justice was the universal value. He also claimed Kohlberg could not prove that being at a higher stage was necessarily better."[179]

Oliver, Newmann, and Bane. Donald Oliver, Fred M. Newmann, and Mary Jo Bane attempted a social studies curriculum using moral reasoning because they believed "looking for value conflict or value tension is a more realistic approach to social controversy than searching for some overriding principle will that [sic] tell us the correct solution to any particular problem."[180] Their aim was to solve value conflicts "by reflection and conversation rather than force or coercion."[181] The resultant Harvard Social Studies Project, which they claimed was similar to Kohlberg's moral reasoning,[182] was based on the "autonomy of the individual."[183] It included the three steps of (1) identifying

---

[178] Andrew Oldenquist, "Essay Review," Harvard Educational Review, 49 (1979), pp. 240-43.

[179] Jack R. Fraenkel, "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations," Social Education, 40 (April 1976), 294-95.

[180] D. W. Oliver, and M. J. Bane, "Moral Education: Is Reasoning Enough?" in Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches, eds. C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, and E. V. Sullivan (Great Britain: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971), p. 253.

[181] Oliver and Bane, p. 253.

[182] Oliver and Bane, p. 259.

[183] Oliver and Bane, pp. 258-59.

issues, (2) developing strategies for justification and clarification, and (3) discussing.[184]

Conrad Johnson. Conrad Johnson proposed two levels of moral thinking which he claimed were comparable to Kohlberg's levels II and III.[185] Level one consisted of specific rules, while level two consisted of abstract principles and goals. He believed that "to understand what abstract goals and principles require is not enough"; some rules were necessary.[186] He believed the morally educated person needed to combine reasoning at both levels:

> The morally educated person ideally both has an intrinsic motivation to do what the specific code requires and is prepared and knows how to reason about that code using the grander, abstract principles or morality.[187]

Summary

Throughout the history of the United States, some educators have attempted to develop skills which would lead the student to independent thinking. Some have tolerated boundaries of varying latitudes, while others have rejected imposed standards or authority of any kind. Yet all have based their character education on the ability of the child to develop an appropriate value system when provided with relevant skills and an open, supportive environment.

---

[184] Oliver and Bane, pp. 254-57.

[185] Conrad Johnson, "The Morally Educated Person in a Pluralistic Society," Educational Theory, 31 (Summer/Fall 1981), 238.

[186] Johnson, pp. 241-42.

[187] Johnson, p. 247.

Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, and John Dewey were prominent educators concerned that students be allowed to make their own decisions and not be pressured in their decision making. Dewey was also concerned with the process of decision making and the concept that morality included growth in the ability to become moral. Almost without exception the educators of today claim that their approach in independent decision making is based on Dewey's philosophy, a claim that is often disputed. Mainly as a reaction to dogma and authoritarian character education, approaches that are based on independent decision making emphasize that students should be allowed to make their own decisions. Where the approaches differ is in method and content. Some teach relativisitic morals while others do allow for an authority to set standards; some teach process only while others aim for content. It is also noteworthy that many educators rely on some type of social base while claiming to strive for a totally individual morality.

CHAPTER 7

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The problem of this study was to determine some of the bases of character education in the United States from 1607 to 1983. To do this, research was conducted concerning persons, movements, organizations, and materials which were mentioned in the literature as being pertinent to character education in the United States. An attempt was made to include material representative of major educational philosophies. Research was conducted at numerous libraries, and a phone interview was conducted with Margaret Wolfe, professor in the field of history.

For the purpose of this paper, the various bases of education were grouped under four categories--religious, societal, traits, and individually determined. The bases determined by the research were assigned to these categories, and the history of each area was traced in a separate chapter.

It was evident that character education has been a major focus of public school education since colonial times. To many educators it has been the primary goal of education; no educator or movement studied considered it unimportant. However, there were major disagreements on content, methods, and bases.

Summary

Character education in colonial times came mainly from Puritan religious beliefs based on the Bible and from a belief that man was totally depraved. Man's view of himself and his God gave rise to his

traditional methods of teaching character education, some with an emphasis on the Bible, others with an emphasis on society.

Thomas Jefferson appeared to represent a pivotal philosophy affecting the character education attitudes of Americans. His idea that "moral precepts are innate in man" and thus separate from the Bible continues to be a trend of character education in America. Horace Mann later went so far as to suggest that moral lessons learned from within the individual were the very voice of the Being that created him.

The revision of the McGuffey Readers from a Bible-based, instructional method of rote learning to its latest secularized copy exemplified man's gradual acceptance of a new basis for his relationship to God and an emphasis upon man learning to think.

Character education based on living in society could be summarized by the NEA resolution in 1972 entitled "Moral and Ethical Values," which assumed that Americans have believed from the days of the Puritans to our present time that education is a right and necessity for our society.

Traits were defined by Bible principles, from individual needs, or due to prevailing social conditions in early attempts at character education. Later they were defined in a more general way because of changes in society. During the early twentieth century, expanded meanings of traits, beginning with thrift, to moral cleanliness, to citizenship appeared, with all of the above traits and more eventually included under the title, "Thrift Education."

Literature and history continued to rank high as vehicles for moral training; many educators continued to rely on traditional methods

of character education to teach the values considered important by society. There still exists a strong moral tone in today's public schools, and secular textbook writers continue to include teaching of character traits in their texts. Twentieth century educators also continue their search for methods and curriculum to teach character education even though they lack a well-defined direction or consensus of what they need to teach.

Debate has remained between Bible-based and man-centered philosophies, yet writers quoted in this paper have not reversed the processes which shaped our society's character. The question remains to be answered whether religious teaching can be excluded from our public schools without destroying a still-prevalent Puritan values system. Some writers, such as Kohlberg, believed our constitutional system allowed the individual to develop values important to ensure the continuance of our society.

In today's character education, the message is strong that students should not have values imposed upon them and that the child has some natural, inward qualities which can be developed. Today's educators have accepted that our society is not ready to define a set of values and that they do not have the freedom to influence children toward a particular way of morality.

Conclusions

The hypotheses of the study were stated in the interrogative form. 1. What have been the most prominent bases of character education in the literature? According to the literature the majority of character

education in the United States from 1706 to 1983 has been based on society. This basis has appeared strong from colonial times to the present. Bible-based character education has also been prominent, particularly in colonial times; however, as the schools became more secular, Bible-based character education was mentioned less, even though religion and "spiritual values" are still emphasized even today. Independent decision making has also been a goal since colonial times but has gained popularity since the 1960's, largely as a result of the work of Raths and Kohlberg. Yet often what was termed independent thinking was in reality based on society. The trait approach, though very popular in the early part of the century, was mainly an approach used in relation to other bases. Thus society and the Bible were the two most prominent bases and were often found in combination. Evidently most Americans tend to base their values on an external authority.

2. Has character education in the United States changed from mainly a biblical emphasis to more diversified bases? This hypothesis would be answered in the affirmative according to the literature and materials reviewed. As society has become more pluralistic, a greater diversity of philosophical bases has become more acceptable. It should be noted, also, that very few educators adhere strictly to a single base. Most seem to combine bases in varying degrees to arrive at some sort of personalized base for their own philosophy of moral education. Prominent examples of this would include Thomas Jefferson, Horace Mann, John Dewey, and Lawrence Kohlberg. Though these men were often given credit for being influential in one particular base area, an analysis of their writings indicated that they had a broad base for their philosophies.

These men, as well as others, appeared in more than one chapter of this paper for this reason.

Some additional conclusions were made.

1. The influence of indoctrination has been very strong; most educators rely on some kind of rules or absolutes, regardless of their basic philosophy. This includes some who claim to be strong advocates of independent decision making.
2. Society is the strongest base for most individuals, including many who believe in Bible absolutes. Statement of basis did not always correlate with actual writings and practice.
3. Today's educators tend to be too concerned that their ideas are based on Dewey; this reliance on one person is not necessarily good nor advantageous.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made on the basis of this study;

1. Educators should take advantage of the great wealth and wide range of thought concerning character education rather than rely only on a Dewey or Kohlberg, for example. Men such as Jefferson and Mann have much to offer the student of moral education.
2. Further research is needed in the following areas: What traits have made America great; is man unfolding, becoming more moral; is moral behavior learned; what is the consensus of the wisest and best persons from diverse cultures as far as character is concerned; is it possible to get away totally from external sanctions; can Bible-based education allow independent thinking; what is our real goal for character education?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Books

American Council on Education, Committee on Religion and Education. The Relation of Religion to Public Education. Washington, D.C.: The Council, 1947.

Archambault, Reginald, ed. John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings. New York: Random House, 1964.

Baird, Robert. Religion in the United States of America. London: Duncan & Malcolm, 1844.

Barnard, Henry. "Editorial Introduction." American Journal of Education. 1 (1855-1856), 137-40. Rpt. in Vincent P. Lannie, ed. Henry Barnard: American Educator. New York: Teachers College Press, 1947, pp. 146-51.

----------. Third Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board. Hartford: Case, Tiffany, and Burnham, 1841. Rpt. in Vincent P. Lannie, ed. Henry Barnard: American Educator. New York: Teachers College Press, 1947, pp. 103-24.

Barr, O. Sidney. The Christian New Morality. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.

Bartlett, Edward R. "The Character Education Movement in the Public Schools." In Studies in Religious Education. Ed. Philip Henry Lotz. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931.

Beck, Clive. "A Philosophical View of Values and Value Education." In Values and Moral Development. Ed. Thomas C. Hennessy, S. J. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Beckwith, George Derr. The American Home and Character Trends. Butler, Indiana: The Highley Press, 1941.

Beecher, Catharine. An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers. New York: Van Nostrand and Dwight, 1835. Rpt. in Willystine Goodsell. Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States Emma Willard, Catherine [sic] Beecher, Mary Lyon. 1931; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Beecher, Lyman. Autobiography. 2 Vols. Ed. Barbara M. Cross. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1961.

Bell, Sadie. The Church, the State, and Education in Virginia. 1930; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969.

Benson, Clarence H. History of Christian Education. Chicago: Moody Press, 1943.

Bergh, Albert Ellery, ed. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. 20 Vols. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.

Best, John Hardin, ed. Benjamin Franklin on Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1962.

Biber, Barbara, and Patricia Minuchin. "The Impact of School Philosophy and Practice on Child Development." In The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children. Ed. Norman V. Overly. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1970.

Blanshard, Paul. Religion and the Schools. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Bliss, William D. The Encyclopedia of Social Reform. 1897; rpt. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Brickman, William W., and Stanley Lehrer. John Dewey: Master Educator. 1959; rpt. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1975.

Bower, William Clayton. Moral and Spiritual Values in Education. Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1952.

Boyd, Julian Parks, ed. The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. 21 Vols. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1955.

Bradford, William. Of Plymouth Plantation 1620-1647. Ed. Samuel Eliot Morison. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

Brooks, Gladys. Three Wise Virgins. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1957.

Broome, Edwin C., and Edwin W. Adams. Conduct and Citizenship. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Brubacher, John S., ed. The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.

Burder, George, ed. Essays to Do Good. By Cotton Mather. Reproduction. Boston: Lincoln and Edmonds, 1808.

Bushnell, Horace. Christian Nurture. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

----------. "Common Schools: A Discourse on the Modifications Demanded by the Roman Catholics." Delivered in North Church, Hartford, 25 March 1853. Hartford, Ct.: n.p., 1853. Rpt. in Rush Welter, ed. American Writings on Popular Education: The Nineteenth Century. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971, pp. 174-99.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. The Meaning of Education. 1915, rpt. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971.

Campbell, Jack K. Colonel Francis W. Parker: The Children's Crusader. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Castle, E. B. Moral Education in Christian Times. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1958.

Chambers, Glen, and Gene Fisher. United States History. Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1982.

Channing, William Ellery. "Remarks on Education." Christian Examiner. 15 (Nov. 1833), 258-63, 265-68, 274-76. Rpt. in Rush Welter, ed. American Writings on Popular Education. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971, pp. 45-57.

Charters, W. W. The Teaching of Ideals. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Childs, John L. American Pragmatism and Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1956.

----------. "The Spiritual Values of the Secular Public Schools." In The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. Ed. John S. Brubacher. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.

Church, Robert. "Moral Education in the Schools." In Morality Examined. Eds. Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977.

Coe, George A. Education and Religion in Morals. New York: Revell, 1904.

Cotton, John. The Bloudy Tenant of Percecution, Washed and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe (1647). 1647; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Craven, Braxton. "Braxton Craven, Founder of Trinity College, Around which Duke University was Established, Describes Proper School Practices, 1849," in Educational Theories and Practices, Vol. V of A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860. Ed. Edgar W. Knight. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. C. Press, 1953.

Cremin, Lawrence A. American Education: The National Experience 1783-1876. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

----------. Traditions of American Education. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Culver, Raymond B. Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

De Garmo, Charles, Ethical Training. Vol. III of Principles of Secondary Education. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Department of Superintendence Tenth Yearbook: Character Education. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

----------. Experience and Nature. Republication. New York: Dover Publications, 1958.

----------. Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: Holt, 1922.

----------. Moral Principles in Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.

----------. Reconstruction in Philosophy. Enlarged ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948.

----------. The School and Society. Rev. ed. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1915.

Dewey, John, and James H. Tufts. Ethics. New York: Henry Holt, 1908.

Downs, Robert B. Famous American Books. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Dunfee, Maxine, and Claudia Crump. Teaching for Social Values in Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1974.

Dunn, William Kailer. What Happened to Religious Education? The Decline of Religious Teaching in the Public Elementary School, 1776-1861. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1958.

Educational Policies Commission. Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951.

Edwards, Jonathan. "The Nature of True Virtue." In Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections, with Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. Ed. Clarence H. Faust and Thomas H. Johnson. Atlanta: American Book, 1935.

----------. Uncited Manuscripts. In The Works of President Edwards. Eds. Edward Williams and Edward Parsons. 1817; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Egan, Joseph B. Character Building in Primary Grades: Grade Three, I. Wellesley Hills, Ms.: n.p., 1939.

Elson, Ruth Miller. Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Emerson, Everett H. John Cotton. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1965.

Engel, David E. "Some Issues in Teaching Values." In his Religion in Public Education. New York: Paulist Press, 1974.

Engleman, J. O. Moral Education in School and Home. New York: Benj. H. Sanburn & Co., 1920.

Faust, Clarence H., and Thomas H. Johnson, eds. Jonathan Edwards: Representative Selections, With Introduction, Bibliography, and Notes. Atlanta: American Book, 1935.

Flake-Hobson, Bryan E. Robinson, and Patsy Skeen. Child Development and Relationships. Reading, Ms.: Addison-Wesley, 1983.

Fleming, Sandford. Children and Puritanism: The Place of Children in the Life and Thought of the New England Churches. 1933; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969.

Fletcher, Joseph. Situation Ethics: The New Morality. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1966.

Ford, Paul, ed. New England Primer. 1897; rpt. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1962.

----------, ed. The Works of Thomas Jefferson. 12 Vols. New York: Putnam, 1904.

Fowler, Henry. "The Educational Services of Mrs. Emma Willard." American Journal of Education. (n.d.), n.p. Rpt. in Henry Barnard, ed. Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, and Promotors and Benefactors of Education, Literature and Science, I. 1861; rpt. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969, pp. 124-68.

Franklin, Benjamin. "Plan for Future Conduct." In Benjamin Franklin's Autobiographical Writings. Ed. Carl Von Doren. New York: Viking Press, 1943.

----------. "A Plan for Moral Self-Improvement." In Benjamin Franklin on Education. Ed. John Hardin Best. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia Univ., 1962.

Freeman, Ruth S. Yesterday's School Books: A Looking Glass for Teachers of Today. Watkins Glen, N.Y.: Century House, 1960.

Fremont, Walter G., and Jim R. Biddle. Teaching Bible Action Truths. Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1974.

Gaer, Joseph, and Ben Siegel. The Puritan Heritage: America's Roots in the Bible. New York: New American Library, 1964.

Goodsell, Willystine. Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States. Emma Willard, Catherine [sic] Beecher, Mary Lyon. 1931; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1970.

Gow, Alexander Murdoch. Good Morals and Gentle Manners. New York: American Book, 1873.

Gow, Kathleen M. Yes Virginia, There Is Right and Wrong! New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.

Gregg, Fred M. A Course of Study in Character Education for School and Home. Lincoln, Nebraska: Lincoln School Supply Company, 1930.

Hall, G. Stanley. Life and Confessions of a Psychologist. New York: Appleton, 1923. Rpt. in Charles E. Strickland and Charles Burgess, eds. Health, Growth, and Heredity: G. Stanley Hall on Natural Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965, pp. 29-39.

Hall, Robert, and John Davis. Moral Education in Theory and Practice. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus, 1975.

Hartford, Ellis Ford. Moral Values in Public Education: Lessons from the Kentucky Experience. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Hartshorne, Hugh. Character in Human Relations. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

----------. Childhood and Character. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1919.

----------, Mark A. May, and Frank K. Shuttleworth. Studies in the Organization of Character. Vol. III of Studies in the Nature of Character. New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Reaction to Selman: Social Perspectives and the Development of Moral Judgment." In Values and Moral Development. Ed. Thomas C. Hennessy, S.J. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Healey, Robert M. Jefferson on Religion in Public Education. 1962; rpt. of dissertation. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1962.

Hearn, D. Dwain, ed. Values, Feelings and Morals: Part I. Research and Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educations, 1974.

Hennessy, Thomas C., S. J., ed. Values and Moral Development. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Hocking, David L. "The Theological Basis for the Philosophy of Christian School Education." In The Philosophy of Christian School Education. Ed. Paul A. Kienel. Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978.

Holmes, Arthur. Principles of Character Making. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1913. Rpt. in Dennis Clayton Troth, ed. Selected Readings in Character Education. Boston: Beacon Press, 1930, pp. 67-71.

Howe, Leland W., and Mary Martha Howe. Personalizing Education: Values Clarification and Beyond. New York: Hart Publishing, 1975.

James, William. Talks to Teachers on Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939.

----------. The Works of William James: Pragmatism. Cambridge, Ms.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975.

Jefferson, Thomas. "Bill for Amending the Charter of William and Mary." In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, II. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

----------. Letter to Benjamin Rush, 23 Sept. 1800. In The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, X. Ed. Albert Ellery Bergh. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.

----------. Letter to Francis Hopkinson, 13 March 1789. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, V. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: Putnam, 1904.

----------. Letter to John Adams, 5 May 1817. In The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, XV. Ed. Albert Ellery Bergh. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.

----------. Letter to John Tyler, 19 Aug. 1785. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XI. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.

----------. Letter to Matthew Carey, 11 Nov. 1816. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XII. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: Putnam, 1904.

----------. Letter to Martha Washington, 7 April 1787. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, IV. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: Putnam, 1904.

----------. Letter to Nehemiah Dodge and Others, 1 Jan. 1802. In The Portable Thomas Jefferson. Ed. Merrill D. Peterson. New York: Viking Press, 1975.

----------. Letter to Peter Carr, 19 Aug. 1985. In The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, VIII. Ed. Julian Parks Boyd. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1955.

----------. Letter to P. S. DuPont de Nemours, 24 April 1816. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, X. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: Putnam, 1904.

----------. Letter to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, 24 Nov. 1808. In The Works of Thomas Jefferson, XI. Ed. Paul Leicester Ford. New York: Putnam, 1904.

----------. Letter to William Roscoe, 24 Dec. 1820. In The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, XV. Ed. Albert Ellery Bergh. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.

----------. Notes on Virginia. In The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, I. Ed. Albert Ellery Bergh. Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1907.

Katz, Michael B. The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1968.

----------. School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Kiefer, Monica. American Children Through Their Books 1700-1835. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

Kienel, Paul A. The Philosophy of Christian School Education. Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. Modern Education and Better Human Relations. U.S.A.: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1942.

----------. Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

----------. "Reminiscenses of Dewey and His Influence." In John Dewey: Master Educator. Eds. William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer, 1959; rpt. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Press, 1975.

King, Edith M. Fifty Hints and Helps in Character Education. Painesville, Ohio: The Educational Supply Co., 1931.

Kirschenbaum, Howard. "Beyond Values Clarification." In Readings in Values Clarification. Eds. Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

---------. "Clarifying Values Clarification: Some Theoretical Issues." In Moral Education...It Comes With the Territory. Eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976.

Kliebard, Herbert M. Religion and Education in America: A Documentary History. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook, 1969.

Knight, Edgar W. Educational Theories and Practices. Vol. 5 of A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860. Chapel Hill; Univ. of N. C. Press, 1953.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "High School Democracy and Educating for a Just Society." In Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development. Ed. Ralph L. Mosher. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

----------. "Moral and Religious Education and the Public Schools: A Developmental View." In Religion and Public Education. Ed. Theodore R. Sizer. Atlanta: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

----------. "The Moral Atmosphere of the School." In The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children. Ed. Norman V. Overly. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1970.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Masia. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay, 1964.

Lannie, Vincent P., ed. Henry Barnard: American Educator. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.

Lindberg, Stanley W. The Annotated McGuffey: Selections from the McGuffey Eclectic Readers 1836-1920. Atlanta; Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976.

Lockerbie, D. Bruce. The Way They Should Go. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.

Lotz, Philip Henry, ed. Studies in Religious Education. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1931.

MacLeod, Anne Scott. A Moral Tale: Children's Fiction and American Culture 1820-1860. Hamden, Ct.: Archon, 1975.

Mann, Horace. "Baccalaureate Address of 1857." In Horace Mann at Antioch. By Joy Elmer Morgan. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1938.

----------. Annual Report. 12 Vols. Facsimile ed. Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, 1838-1849.

----------. Go Forth and Teach: An Oration Delivered Before the Authorities of the City of Boston, July 4, 1842. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937.

----------. Letter to Frederick A. Packard, 18 March 1838. In Horace Mann and Religion in the Massachusetts Public Schools. By Raymond B. Culver. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Mann, Mary Tyler Peabody. Life of Horace Mann. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937.

Marrin, Albert. Nicholas Murray Butler. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1976.

Mather, Cotton. Essays to Do Good. Ed. George Burder. Reproduction. Boston: Lincoln and Edmonds, 1808.

----------. Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England; from its First Printing, in the Year 1620, unto the Year of our Lord 1698. 2 Vols. 1697; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1852.

May, Mark A. "What Science Offers on Character Education." In Building Character: Proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Character Development. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928.

McCluskey, Neil Gerard. Public Schools and Moral Education. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958.

McKown, Harry C. Character Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

McLester, Frances Cole. Achieving Christian Character. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1937.

Melvin, Arthur I. "Cross-Cultural Moral Values." In Morality Examined. Eds. Lindley L. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977.

Michaelsen, Robert. Piety In the Public School. New York: Macmillan, 1970.

Minor, John D., et al. The Bible in the Public Schools. 1870; rpt. New York: DeCapo Press, 1967.

Moore, Edward C. American Pragmatism: Pierce, James, and Dewey. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1961.

"Moral Education and the Mission of the Teachers, 1856." The Massachusetts Teacher. 9 (Feb. 1856), 104-07. Rpt. in Michael B. Katz. School Reform: Past and Present. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Morgan, Joy Elmer. Horace Mann at Antioch. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1938.

Morison, Samuel Eliot, ed. Of Plymouth Plantation. By William Bradford. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

Murdoch, Kenneth B., ed. The Day of Doom or a Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment. By Michael Wigglesworth. 1929; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.

Neill, Alexander S. Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart Publishing, 1960.

Newmann, Fred M., and Donald W. Oliver. Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.

Oliver, D. W., and M. J. Bane. "Moral Education: Is Reasoning Enough?" In Moral Education: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Eds. C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, and E. V. Sullivan. Great Britain: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971.

Overly, Norman V., ed. The Unstudied Curriculum: It's Impact on Children. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1970.

Park, Joe, and R. William Barron. "Can Morality Be Taught?" In Morality Examined. Eds. Lindley J. Stiles and Bruce D. Johnson. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Book, 1977.

Parker, Francis W. Notes of Talks on Teaching. Reported by Lelia E. Patridge. New York and Chicago: E. L. Kellogg, 1889.

Patterson, C. H. Humanistic Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Peck, Robert F., Robert J. Havighurst, et al. The Psychology of Character Development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

Peckenpaugh, Donald H. "Moral Education: The Role of the School." In The School's Role as Moral Authority. Ed. Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977.

Peirce, Charles S. Pragmatism and Pragmataicism. Vol. V of Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Eds. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge: Belknaps Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1965.

----------. "Pragmatism in Retrospect: A Last Formulation." In Philosophical Writings of Peirce. Ed. Justus Buchler. New York: Dover Publications, 1955.

----------. Scientific Metaphysics. Vol. VI of Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Eds. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1965.

Polishook, Irwin H. Roger Williams, John Cotton and Religious Freedom: A Controversy in New and Old England. Edgewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Purpel, David, and Kevin Ryan, eds. Moral Education...It Comes With the Territory. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976.

Raths, Louis E., Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon. Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1966.

Reimer, Joseph, and Clark Power. "Educating for Democratic Community. Some Unresolved Dilemmas." In Moral Education...It Comes With the Territory. Eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976.

Rest, James R. "The Research Base of the Cognitive Developmental Approach to Moral Education." In Values and Moral Development. Ed. Thomas C. Hennessy, S. J. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Rokeach, Milton. "Persuasion that Persists." In Readings in Values Clarification. Eds. Sidney B. Simon and Howard Kirschenbaum. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

Rubin, Louis J. "Introduction." In The School's Role as Moral Authority. Ed. Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977.

Sanders, William J. "Spiritual Values and Public and Religious Educators." In The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. Ed. John S. Brubacher. New York: Harper and Row, 1944.

Shaver, James P., and A. Guy Larkins. Decision-Making in a Democracy. Atlanta: Houghton Mefflin, 1973.

Simon, Sidney B., Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum. Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies, Rev. ed. New York: A & W Visual Library, 1978.

Simon, Sidney B., and Howard Kirschenbaum, eds. Readings in Values Clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

Simonson, Harold P., ed. Selected Writings of Jonathan Edwards. New York: Frederick Unger Publishing, 1970.

Sisson, Edward O. The Essentials of Character. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

Sizer, Theodore R., ed. Religion and Public Education. Atlanta: Houghton Mifflen, 1967.

Sklar, Kathryn Kish. Catharine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1973.

Smith, Bradford. Bradford of Plymouth. New York: Lippincott, 1951.

Smith, Matthew. Universalism not of God: An Examination of the System of Universalism; its Doctrine, Arguments, and Fruits. N.P.: American Tract Society, 1847.

Sperber, Robert and David Merion. "Organizing a School System for Ethics Education." In Moral Education: A First Generation of Research and Development. Ed. Ralph L. Mosher. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980.

Starbuck, Edwin D. "Character Education Seen in Perspective." In Building Character: Proceedings of the Mid-West Conference on Character Development. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1928.

Starbuck, Edwin Diller, et al. A Guide to Books for Character, II. New York: Macmillan, 1930.

Stewart, John S. "Problems and Contractions of Values Clarification." In Moral Education...It Comes With the Territory. Eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976.

Straughan, Roger. Can We Teach Children To Be Good? Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1982.

Taylor, Marvin J. Religious and Moral Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Thayer, H. S. "Introduction." In The Works of William James: Pragmatism. By William James. Cambridge, Ms.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975.

Thayer, V. T. The Attack Upon the American Secular School. Westport, Ct.: Glenwood Press, 1951.

Tuer, Andrew W. History of the Hornbook. n.p.: n.p., 1896.

Tyack, David B. "Onward Christian Soldiers: Religion and the American Common School." In History and Education: The Educational Uses of the Past. Ed. Paul Nash. N.Y.: Random House, 1970.

Veltcamp, James J. "A History of Philosophical Patterns of Thought." In The Philosophy of Christian School Education. Ed. Paul A. Kienel. Whittier, Ca.: ACSI, 1978.

Webster, Noah. "A Letter to the Honorable Daniel Webster." In his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects. 1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

----------. The American Spelling Book: Containing the Rudiments of the English Language for the Use of Schools in the United States. 1824; rpt. Gatlinburg: Marion R. Mangrum, J. P., 1964.

----------. The Elementary Spelling Book, being an Improvement of the American Spelling Book. New York: American Book, 1866.

----------. "Form of Association for Young Men." In his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subjects. 1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

----------. "Letter to a Young Gentleman Commencing His Education." In his A Collection of Papers on Political, Literary and Moral Subject. 1843; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Wehlage, Gary, and Alan L. Lockwood. "Moral Relativism and Values Education." In Moral Education . . . It Comes With the Territory. Eds. David Purpel and Kevin Ryan. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1976.

Welter, Rush, ed. American Writings on Popular Education: The Nineteenth Century. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.

Westerhoff, John H., III. McGuffey and His Readers. Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.

Wigglesworth, Michael. The Day of Doom or A Poetical Description of the Great and Last Judgment. Ed. Kenneth B. Murdoch. 1929; rpt. New York: Russell & Russell.

Williams, Edward, and Edward Parsons, eds. The Works of President Edwards. 8 Vols. 1817; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.

Woody, Thomas. Early Quaker Education in Pennsylvania. 1920; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

----------. Quaker Education in the Colony and State of New Jersey. 1923; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

Ziff, Larzer. The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1962.

Journals

Babcock, Lyndon R. "Direct Moral Training." Educational Method. 10 (Nov. 1930), 67-71.

Broome, Edwin C. "Let the School Do It." School and Society. 53 (1941), 617-21.

Brown, Francis J. "Character Education - Past and Present." School and Society. 43 (1936), 585-89.

Buhler, Charlotte. "Values and Beliefs in Our Time." Educational Leadership. 21 (1964), 520-22.

Carr, William G. "How Can We Teach Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools?" NEA Journal. 46 (1951), 177-78.

Cason, Ernest Wesley. "Teaching Creative Freedom As A Moral Ideal." Phi Delta Kappan. 38 (March 1957), 232-35.

Courtis, Stuart A. "Religion Has No Place in Public Schools." The Nation's Schools. 39 (June 1947), 22-23.

Dewey, John. "Three Independent Factors in Morals." Communication Presented to the French Philisophical Society. Trans. Jo Ann Boydston. Educational Theory. 16 (1966), 197-209.

Dykstra, Craig. "Moral Virtue or Social Reasoning." Religious ducation. 75 (1980), 115-28.

Ekstein, Rudolf. "Origins of Values in Children." Educational Leadership. 21 (1964), 523-26.

English, Raymond. "The Revival of Moral Education." American Education. 18 (1982), 4-12.

Fishburn, Eleanor Craven. "He Gave Us Schools." NEA Journal, 26 (Nov. 1937), 257.

Fraenkel, Jack R. "Value Education in the Social Studies." Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (April 1969), 457-61.

----------. "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations." Social Education. 40 (April 1976), 216-22.

Frances, E. Frank. "Fundamentals of Character Education." School Review. 70 (1962), 345-57.

Garvey, Robert C. "Little Alice's Day: Simple Stories Involving Behavior Problems." Grade Teacher. 53 (June 1936), 20.

Glasscock, Laird V. "The History of Character Education." Educational Method. 11 (March 1932), 351-58.

Goldsmith, Sadie. "The Place of Literature in Character Education." The Elementary English Review. 17 (1940), 176-78.

Harrison, George J. "Values Clarification and the Construction of Good." Educational Theory. 30 (1980), 185-91.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Moral Character and Religious Education." Religious Education. 51 (1956), 163-69.

Hiner, N. Ray. "Herbations, History and Moral Education." School Review. 79 (Aug. 1971), 590-601.

Hunt, Maurice P. 'Some Views on Situational Morality." Phi Delta Kappan. 50 (April 1969), 452-56.

Johnson, Conrad D. "The Morally Educated Person in a Pluralistic Society." Educational Theory. 31 (Summer/Fall 1981), 237-50.

Kilpatrick, William H. "The Future of Education." NEA Journal. 26 (Nov. 1937), 255.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Education." Phi Delta Kappan. 56 (1 June 1975), 670-75.

----------. "Moral and Religious Education and the Public Schools: A Developmental View." School Review. 74 (1966), 1-30.

Lockwood, Alan L. "A Critical View of Values Clarification." Teacher's College Record. 77 (Sept. 1975), 35-50.

Miller, Bernard S. "The Quest for Values in a Changing World." Social Education. 29 (1965), 69-73.

Montefiore, Alan. "Moral Philosophy and the Teaching of Morality." Harvard Educational Review. 35 (1965), 435-49.

Nevin, Hugh. "Values Clarification: Perspectives in John Dewey With Implications for Religious Education." Religious Education. 73 (1978), 661-77.

Oldenquist, Andrew. "Essay Review." Harvard Educational Review. 49 (1979), 240-47.

Peters, Richard S. "Why Doesn't Kohlberg Do His Homework?" Phi Delta Kappan. 56 (June 1975), 678.

Rogers, Carl P. "Toward A Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 68 (1964), 160-67.

Scriven, Michael. "Cognitive Moral Education." Phi Delta Kappan. 56 (June 1975), 689-94.

Shane, Harold G. "A Curriculum for the New Century." Phi Delta Kappan. 62 (Jan. 1981), 351-56.

Simon, Sidney. "Values Clarification vs. Indoctrination." Social Education. 35 (Dec. 1971), 902-05, 915.

----------, and Polly de Skerbinin. "Values Clarification: It Can Start Gently and Grow Deep." Phi Delta Kappan. 56 (June 1975), 679, 683.

Skinner, Blanche. "Comparison of the Character Traits Given in Elementary History Textbooks With the Traits of Good Citizenship." The Teachers Journal and Abstract. 5 (Dec. 1930), 573-76.

Stewart, John S. "Clarifying Values Clarification: A Critique." Phi Delta Kappan. 56 (June 1975), 684-94.

Sufinsky, Stella. "Literature for Christian Training - A Suggestive Method." Educational Method. 10 (April 1931), 407-12.

NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings

Abercrombie, John W. "Ethics in Civic Life." In 1909 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1909.

Allen, Robert. "The Importance of Religious Motives and Sanctions in Moral Training." In 1887 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Salem, Ms.: NEA, 1887.

Andrews, Charles M. "History as an Aid to Moral Culture." In 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894.

Baldwin, Joseph. "Practical Culture of the Moral Virtues." In 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. New York: NEA, 1893.

Barnard, Florence. "The Business of Living." In 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921.

Barnes, Clifford W. "Relation of Moral and Religious Training." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

----------. "Moral Training Thru The Agency of the Public School." In 1907 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907.

Beckness, T. W. "President's Address." In 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Boston: NEA, 1885.

Bellamy, Francis. "Discussion." In 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894.

Benezet, L. P. "How Are We Teaching Citizenship in Our School?" In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Bennion, Milton. "Preliminary Report of the Committee on Citizenship and Character Education." In 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921.

----------. "Report of Committee on Character Education." In 1923 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1923.

----------. "Report of Committee on Character Education." In 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924.

----------. "Report of Progress Committee on Character Education - The Sanctions of Morality." In 1922 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1922.

Black, William H. "Discussion." In 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911.

Boysen, Agnes. "Character Traits as a Basis for Good Citizenship." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Brown, Charles A. "Character Education." In 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929.

Brownlee, Jane. "A Plan for Moral Training." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Burke, Jeremiah E. "Entrance Requirements for Citizenship." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Butler, Nicholas Butter. "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth?" In 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. St. Paul: NEA, 1895.

Carr, J. W. "Moral Education Thru the Agency of the Public Schools." In 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911.

----------. "The Treatment of Pupils." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Carr, William G. "Educational Policies Committee Report." In 1951 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1951.

Cassidy, M. A. "Golden Deeds in Character Education." In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Chamberlain, Arthur H. "Report of the Committee on Thrift Education." In 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921.

----------. "Thrift and Conservation." In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

----------. "Thrift Readjustment in Progress." In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Charters, W. W. "Aims and Methods of Character Training in the Public Schools." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Coe, George A. "Contributions of Modern Education to Religion." In 1903 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1903.

----------. "Discussion." In 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911.

----------. "Virtue and the Virtues: A Study of Method in the Teaching of Morals." In 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911.

Committee on Academic Freedom. "Principles of Academic Freedom." In 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941.

Committee on a System of Teaching Morals in the Public Schools. "Introduction and Recommendations." In 1911 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1911.

Cook, John W. "The Schools Fail to Teach Morality or to Cultivate the Religious Sentiment." In 1888 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Topeka: NEA, 1888.

Cooper, F. B. "How Are We Training for Citizenship in Our Public Schools?" In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Crane, A. J. "Psychology of Citizenship Training." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Cummings, Horace H. "Methods of Reducing Moral Truths to Practice." In 1910 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1910.

Curry, J. L. M. "Citizenship and Education." In 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings, Part II. Boston: NEA, 1884.

De Garmo, Charles. "Concentration of Studies as a Means of Developing Character." In 1896 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1896.

----------. "Moral Training Through the Common Branches." In 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894.

----------. "The Value of Literature in Moral Training." In 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894.

Dempsey, Clarence H. "Thrift in Relation to Industries." In 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Ann Arbor: NEA, 1916.

"Discussion." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

"Education's Oldest Challenge - Character." Panel Jury Discussion Group. In 1935 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1935.

Fairchild, Milton. "Character Education." In 1926 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1926.

----------. "Character-Education-Methods Competition." In 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917.

Fahey, Sara Helena. "Moral Education - What the School Can Do." In 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916.

Fischer, H. A. "Discussion." In 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. New York: NEA, 1892.

Force, Anna Laura. "The Public School the Laboratory for Citizenship." In 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917.

Freeman, Frank N. "The Measurement of Results in Character Education." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Garrison, J. Graham. "The Role of the Public Schools in the Development of Moral and Spiritual Values." In 1948 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1948.

Gecks, Mathilde C. "Moral and Religious Education." In 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1924.

"General Discussion." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Gregg, Fred M. "Symposium of Citizenship Training-the Nebraska Plan." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Halleck, Reuben Post. "The Value of English Literature in Ethical Training." In 1900 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings Chicago: NEA, 1900.

Hammond, L. Daisy. "Character Education by Means of Patriotic Pageants." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Harris, Ada Van Stone. "Thrift-Civics." In 1921 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1921.

Harris, William T. "The Separation of the Church from the School Supported by Public Taxes." In 1903 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1903.

Hill, Henry H. "Educational Policies Commission Report." In 1952 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1952.

Hogue, Helen Gibson. "The Three C's of Education - Character, Citizenship, and Culture." In 1937 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1937.

Index of NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings 1857-1906. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907.

Indexes of NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings 1955-1963. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1955-1963.

Joynes, Edith B. "Citizenship in the Making." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Kellogg, Eva D. "Needs in American Education." In 1884 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Boston: NEA, 1885.

Knox, Margaret. "Our Children's Neglected Inheritance." In 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1924.

Lewes, Walter F. "Discipline as Affected by Differences in Moral Responsibility." In 1910 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1910.

----------. "Teaching Citizenship." In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Lower, Louis G. "Organizing Youth for Character Building." In 1931 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1931.

MacDonald, J. W. "Educating the Whole Boy." In 1888 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Topeka: NEA, 1888.

Marble, A. P. "The Ethical Element in Patriotism." In 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings.

Mayo, A. D. "Object Lessons in Moral Instruction in the Common School." In 1880 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Salem, Ohio: NEA, 1880.

McLellan, J. A. "The Ethical Element in Literature, and How to Make the Most of It in Teaching." In 1894 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Asbury Park, N.J.: NEA, 1894.

McSwain, E. T. "The Modern School - A Workshop in Democratic Citizenship." In 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941.

Montgomery, George. "The Religious Element in the Formation of Character." In 1899 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Chicago: NEA, 1899.

"Moral and Ethical Values." Resolution C-17. In 1972 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1972.

"Moral and Spiritual Values." Resolution 25. In 1964 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1964.

Mott, Thomas A. "The Means Afforded by the Public Schools for Moral and Religious Training. In NEA Fiftieth Anniversary Volume 1857-1906. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1907.

Norton, Mrs. John K. "Character Education and the Life of the School." In 1932 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932.

Parker, Francis. "The Training of Teachers." In 1895 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. St. Paul: NEA, 1895.

Parker, Wylie A. "Character Training Through Regular Classroom Work." In 1927 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1927.

Patton, Leonard M. "Training in Citizenship - A New Approach." In 1926 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1926.

Pearse, Carroll G. "Study of Traits Desirable in an American Citizen - Preliminary Report." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Pickard, J. L. "What Lessons Does the Ordinance Teach in Regard to the Future Educational Policies of Our Government." In 1888 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Topeka: NEA, 1888.

Price, N. H. "Some Modern Tendencies in the Teaching of Character Education - Abstract." In 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929.

Rankin, Paul T. "The Training of Teachers for Character Education." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Reeder, R. R. "Moral Training an Essential Factor in Elementary School Work." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Richards, Zalmon. "Discussion." In Proceedings of the International Congress of Education of the World's Columbian Exposition. New York: NEA, 1895.

----------. "Moral Training in Elementary Schools." In 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. New York: NEA, 1892.

Rogers, James E. "Citizenship and Physical Education." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Ruffner, W. H. "The Moral Element in Primary Education." In 1876 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Salem, Ohio: NEA, 1876.

Russell, William F. "Some Hints from Scientific Investigations as to Character Training." In 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929.

Schallenberger, Margaret E. "The Function of the School in Training for Right Conduct." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Sharp, Frank Chapman. "Some Experiments in Moral Education." In 1909 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1909.

Sims, John F. "Patriotism in the Schools." In 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917.

Smith, Earnest A. "Compulsory Character Education." In 1920 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1920.

Smithling, Marian. "Character Education Projects - Abstract." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Spaulding, Francis T. "What Is Right with the Secondary Schools." In 1941 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1941.

Starbuck, Edwin D. "Fundamentals of Character Training." In 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924.

----------. "Tests and Measurements of Character." In 1924 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1924.

Straus, S. W. "Thrift - an Educational Necessity." In 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Ann Arbor, Mi.: NEA, 1916.

----------. "Thrift, a Patriotic Necessity." In 1917 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917.

Sutton, Willis A. "What the Schools Can Do in Character and Religious Education." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

Teitrick, Reed B. "The School as an Instrument of Character-Building." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Thompson, W. O. "The Effect of Moral Education in the Public Schools Upon the Civic Life of the Community." In 1906 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1906.

Threlkeld, A. L. "Character Education in the Regular Curriculum." In 1930 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1930.

----------. "Introducing the Report of the Character Education Commission." In 1932 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1932.

Tigert, John J. "Character Education from the Standpoint of the Philosophy of Education." In 1929 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1929.

White, E. E. "Discussion." In 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. New York: NEA, 1892.

----------. "Religion in the School." In Proceedings of the International Congress of Education of the World's Columbian Exposition. New York: NEA, 1895.

Williams, Delia Lathrop. "Ethical Culture in Elementary and Secondary Schools." In 1892 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. New York: NEA, 1892.

Williams, Henry H. "The School as an Instrument of Character-Building." In 1908 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Winona, Mn.: NEA, 1908.

Wilson, Robert H. "Thrift in Its Relation to Country Life." In 1916 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Ann Arbor: NEA, 1916.

Wright, J. F. "Education for Citizenship - A Human Engineering Problem." In 1928 NEA Journal of Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928.

Legal Citations

Abingdon School District v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).

Donahoe v. Richards, 38 Main 279 (1854).

Weiss v. The District Board of Edgerton, 76 Wisconsin Reports 177 (1890).

People ex rel. Ring v. Board of Education, 245 Illinois 334 (1910).

Scopes v. Tennessee, 154 Tennessee 105, 248 SW 363 (1927).

Weiss v. The District Board of Edgerton, 76 Wisconsin Reports 177 (1980).

Others

Bible. Deut. vi. 7.

Butts, R. Freeman. "Character Education." World Book Encyclopedia. 1982 ed.

"Character." Christian Student Dictionary. Greenville, S.C.: BJU Press, 1982.

Fremont, Walter. Personal Interview. 15 Feb. 1983.

Miller, James. E. "American Literature." World Book Encyclopedia. 1973 ed.

"Moral Education." The Encyclopedia of Education. 1971 ed.

Salyor, Galen. "William Heard Kilpatrick." World Book Encyclopedia. 1973 ed.

Smith, John E. "Charles S. Peirce." World Book Encyclopedia. 1982 ed.

Soltis, Jonas F. "John Dewey." The Encyclopedia of Education. 1971 ed.

VITA

BEVERLY LABELLE WHITE

Personal Data:	Date of Birth:	August 20, 1947
	Place of Birth:	Waukegan, Illinois
	Marital Status:	Married
	Children:	Two Daughters

Education:

Public Schools, Zion, Illinois
Zion-Benton Township High School, Zion, Illinois
Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina; Elementary Education, B. S., 1968.
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee; Reading, M. A., 1979

Professional Experience:

Teacher, Zion City Schools; Zion, Illinois, 1968
Teacher, Greenville County Schools; Greenville, South Carolina, 1968-1969
Teacher, Decatur Public Schools; Decatur, Illinois, 1969-1971
Teacher, Decatur Christian Academy; Decatur, Illinois, 1971
Coordinator, Tri-Cities Christian Schools; . Kingsport, Tennessee, 1976-1985

Honors and Awards:

Who's Who in American Universities and Colleges
Elementary Student Teaching Award, Bob Jones University
Phi Kappa Delta