



5

Paul Hanna's Writing Career

During the course of his career, Paul Hanna wrote dozens of books and more than a hundred articles. These works include general social critiques, thoughtful pieces on the relationship between school and society and on curriculum development, calls for citizenship education through a community school model, reports of educational practices abroad, and some of the most innovative and influential social studies textbooks and curriculum materials of his day. He even wrote pieces on arithmetic instruction, the use of audiovisual curriculum aids, and—first with Jesse Newlon and later with his wife, Jean—spelling textbooks. His writing reflected the progression of his thought from social meliorism and social reconstruction to a more traditional *mandarin*-type view of social studies education, but the bulk of his work centered on the concepts of community and social change. From his earliest writing about community schools to his last publication—a reiteration of his proposal for a national commission for the development of a uniform school curriculum—Hanna insisted that the schools must provide children with a deep understanding of the social, economic, and political

institutions around them, along with opportunities to improve those institutions.

THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Hanna's understanding of the importance of community developed out of his concern for the dilemma of modern man. From his extensive study of philosophy, the influence of his social reconstructionist colleagues at Teachers College, and his firsthand experience of the Depression, Hanna came to see that the rapid rate of technological progress since the industrial revolution was mankind's biggest challenge. In his pragmatic conception of social evolution, Hanna saw that the nature of human biological needs and the limitations imposed by the physical environment combined to give rise to problem-solving tools and techniques unique to individual cultures. The nature of these tools and techniques, Hanna believed, governed the institutional arrangements that people constructed to direct their use, and those institutional arrangements led to the formalization of values and ideology. Hanna claimed that this process "results in a philosophy that supports those social habits that have stood the acid test of usefulness" (Hanna 1939a, 2). He perceived that human institutions had not evolved quickly enough to adapt to changes in ways of life spurred by the new technologies of modern industrialism. The primary challenge of modern life, in his mind, was to develop "social institutions and arrangements that are a counterpart of our present degree of scientific control" (Hanna 1935a, 321).

One of Hanna's earliest statements of this analysis appeared in a speech that he gave to the New York Home Economics Association in March of 1932. He told the assembled teachers that the Great Depression was not just a temporary emergency, but a "fundamental change in society which offers an opportunity to commence an important reconstruction of society through the home and the family" (Hanna 1933, 386). The Depression fit into Hanna's theory of

social evolution as an example of a maladaptive social and economic response to technological progress. To illustrate his point, Hanna listed several challenges confronting American civilization. He described the ravages of technological unemployment. “Our industrial civilization builds great factories and fills them with machines to do the work of many hands but offers no employment for these now idle hands” (ibid., 389). He decried the disintegration of home life and asked, “What will be the routine of the home of the future? Will the home simply be a place where relatives convene at intervals between attending school, club, business, or recreation; a place in which to change one’s clothes, eat breakfast and dinner, and snatch a few hours of sleep?” (ibid.).

His critique was one that could be heard today, but his attribution of cause recalled an idyllic past. Disintegration of the home was encouraged, he thought, by the loss of its productive function in society: “. . . *buying* a living rather than *producing* a living is the characteristic of the modern home [emphases his]” (ibid., 390). A by-product of the modern dilemma, Hanna charged, was a declining aesthetic sense: “We have proved ourselves to be almost sterile artistically, unable to create a culture, an art, a music, a literature, a domestic architecture, a beautiful environment that is worthy of our people” (ibid., 388). Certainly his conversations with Frank Lloyd Wright about the potential of architecture to elevate the spirit impacted Hanna’s critique.

One reason Hanna gave for the low state of American aesthetic culture was the American obsession with consumption and with the crass, functional art produced by advertising. He noted, for example, that for the typical consumer, “‘High-powered’ advertising plays upon his emotions—his fear, his pride, his self-esteem, his love for his family, et cetera. His ignorance frequently offers a tempting bait to the national advertiser” (Hanna 1933, 391). In a critique that might be heard on a modern talk show, he decried the increase in crime and divorce rates, the increase in nursery schools

instead of the home as the locus of early childhood experience, the increase in women working outside the home, and the increased freedom of youth. These critiques formed the philosophical basis for much of Hanna's work in curriculum development.

Although his social critique resembles that of some present-day social conservatives, Hanna's proposed solutions were not conservative. He called on the home economists he addressed to help students reevaluate the role of technology in production:

We cannot expect economic security so long as the machine is conceived as an instrument for the production of profits for private capital rather than as a tool functioning to release mankind from the drudgery of work . . . Selfish motives will undoubtedly have to be cast aside along with many outgrown social and economic theories. In their place we must substitute drives for general social welfare . . . Pupils must be indoctrinated with a determination to make the machine work for society, rather than to allow society to work for the machine (*ibid.*, 393).

He insisted that "young consumers can be taught to be wise, slow to indoctrination by the wily advertiser, and capable of making a selection after due investigation of all factors involved." Above all, Hanna called on teachers to help students develop "a truer evaluation of what really makes happiness. Americans have been engrossed in a mad orgy of accumulating wealth, material goods, and services . . . In attaining this objective we have forgotten the joys of creating and the real purposes of consuming" (*ibid.*, 395–396).

Hanna's call for the school to help children understand the impact of modern industrial economics on their lives became a recurrent theme in his work. In his view, the school was part of both the problem and the solution. As an institution in society, the school was partly responsible for failing to prepare students for the changing world. In particular, social science education in the past had been confined largely to history and to geography, subjects that Hanna saw as static, unable to offer solutions for the future by

simply looking to the past. To replace them, he proposed a system of social education. He wrote, “The task of education is the challenge of our age—the task of designing social arrangements and values systems which will facilitate the basic human satisfactions under the conditions and possibilities of our new controls over nature” (Hanna 1939a, 14). Here Hanna outlined his pragmatic philosophy of curriculum making. Education, in his conception, is “the institutionalized and purposive intelligence of our culture.” The schools serve as instruments of social critique through which democratic cultures like the United States “collectively examine our value system, our institutions, and our technics in the light of our needs and desires” (ibid.).

The second aspect of Hanna’s call to the schools insisted that they provide children opportunities to use their newfound knowledge of social, economic, and political institutions to improve society. After adequate examination of their culture, the people “consciously design a culture toward which we desire to move,” then “we construct ‘learning’ experiences for ourselves and our young which will make it possible to achieve the desired goals” (ibid.). This process is followed by more evaluation, criticism, and correction.

Obviously, Hanna was calling for a new vision of the school as an agent for social change. In this, he reflected the influence of the social meliorists and social reconstructionists at Teachers College and in the Progressive Education Association. He wrote,

According to this concept of culture and education, the institutions of education are no longer responsible solely for passing on the accumulated social habits found satisfactory in the past. Education still has this task, but in addition a task far more significant—that of serving as a laboratory of culture in which the culture is examined for ways of continuously improving it, not to ‘learn’ the culture but to work with culture to better it—a challenge large enough for anyone (Hanna 1939a, 14).

Hanna felt that curriculum specialists must “create a climate of opinion friendly to new institutional arrangements and must encourage social, economic, political, and educational inventiveness to meet the demands of each new age” (ibid., 16). To meet this lofty goal, nothing less than “cultural reconstruction,” Paul Hanna proposed a very different type of school (Hanna 1935a, 322).

THE SCHOOL IN ITS COMMUNITY

Paul Hanna’s long and prolific writing career took him in a number of directions, but he always seemed to return to the theme of the school’s role in its society. His writing on this theme reveals growth in his thought over time, but a few emphases remained constant. In a 1953 article entitled “The Community School Defined,” Hanna listed the essential characteristics of the community school:

Some kind and degree of school–community interaction is a characteristic of the programs. The role of education is seen to be more than intellectual training. The school is viewed as an agency for helping to give direction to community growth and improvement. Of necessity, the curriculum of the community school is flexible and changing in light of community demands. Education is a total community concern, enlisting the services of all citizens as they are needed and can contribute (Hanna and Naslund 1953, 51).

Hanna’s writing about community and school relationships played off these themes throughout his career.

Hanna’s structural vehicle for reaching the goal of teaching children to understand and take control of social change was the community school. This concept was not new. Robert A. Naslund, a student of Hanna’s at Stanford who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the history of the community school concept, identified the roots of the community school in Europe. In the early nineteenth century, Phillip Emanuel von Fellenberg, a Swiss nobleman, developed

schools on his estate at Hofwyl. Their purpose was the improvement of living through close association between the schools and the community. At about the same time, Denmark began to develop Folk High Schools as centers of community life and improvement.

Hanna referred to these schools in some of his own writing. Nineteenth-century American educators were aware of these developments overseas and many advocated similar experiments in the United States. Naslund particularly identified Henry Barnard, William T. Harris, and Colonel Francis W. Parker as planting the seeds of the community school in America. He wrote, "Each of these men saw education as having a vital role in social organization and development in the community and did much to change schools and their objectives in the light of these views" (Naslund 1953, 257).

Early in the century, Irving King had written that "The social nature of the modern man has not grown fast enough to keep up with his economic progress. The problem that confronts us today is that of extending and, if necessary, reconstructing the social ideas of a simpler social order, that they may dominate the modern world, with its greatly diversified activities and the hosts of problems that have grown out of these multiplied and enlarged interests" (1913, 18).

Although King and Hanna made similar diagnoses of the dilemma of modern man, their prescriptions differed drastically. King advocated a curriculum based on the "simpler social order" of the past. Hanna sometimes wrote wistfully of those past times, but he insisted that the schools must prepare children for the future. To that end, he suggested that "the content necessary to achieve this [social reconstruction] must be found largely in our contemporary world" (1935a, 322). The community school seemed to be a worthy vehicle for developing and delivering such a curriculum, and Hanna enthusiastically promoted the community school concept for decades both here and abroad.

The more immediate influences on Paul Hanna's conception of

the community school included the activity curriculum inherent in William H. Kilpatrick's Project Method and in John Dewey's concept of education as growth. Dewey especially guided Hanna on this point. In *The School and Society*, Dewey wrote, "When the school introduces and trains each child of society into membership within such a little community, saturating him with the spirit of service, and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, we shall have the deepest and best guarantee of a larger society which is worthy, lovely, and harmonious" (Dewey 1913, 44).

Integral to both Dewey's and Kilpatrick's conceptions of learning was student activity, and Hanna enthusiastically endorsed activity-based learning experiences over the older, more static instructional techniques. In a summary of ten years of curriculum experimentation at the Lincoln School, Hanna wrote, "Psychologists have given evidence that learning takes place best under conditions where the learner has active and meaningful experiences" (Hanna 1932c, 483). Not only were activity-based curricula better for the child, but Hanna thought that they were better for the teacher as well. He wrote that in the traditional curriculum, "Teaching was not a challenge for the teacher, for there was lacking the thrill of adventure with the unpredictable qualities of children and the stimulation of working with the released energy and interest of children under freedom" (Hanna 1936c, 271). In a 1939 article for *Childhood Education*, Hanna was exultant:

The educational drought seems to be broken Through rich, varied, and direct contacts with life the modern child is given opportunities for growth which most of us lacked when we went to school Books become tools for extending and enriching ideas gained through significant first-hand experiences in social, physical, and natural sciences (Hanna 1939d, 339).

Hanna's most widely read work on the subject of community schools was *Youth Serves the Community*. This often-quoted book

was a report of a survey of social service organizations and education administrative units on the local and state levels, both in the United States and abroad. The survey's purpose was to "collect descriptions of projects carried out by children and youth to improve some aspect of the community life" (Hanna 1936a, 34). Those projects that met criteria for "educational value to the individual and significant value to the community" (ibid., 35) were published in the volume. The criteria established give insight into Hanna's conception of what a worthwhile school–community endeavor is like.

In order for the individual educational criteria to be met, a project must give the youths who participate in it a sense of its social significance. Unless the project is truly helpful to the community in a way that participants can understand, it loses much of its educational value. Second, the youths must have a part in planning the project. Important democratic learnings are lost when children are deprived of the opportunity to identify and analyze a problem cooperatively, and to plan and carry out a program for alleviation of the problem. Third, the projects should be a reasonable match for the social and physical maturity of the children participating. Hanna believed that failure could be as effective a teacher as success, but only when success seemed to be a reasonably likely outcome. Fourth, the youths must accept responsibility for the success or failure of the project. A vital step in this type of learning is frank appraisal of the results of children's actions, both successes and failures. Fifth, there must be individual growth in those who participate in a project. Without growth, the project has failed in its educational mission and is simply exploitation of the youths' efforts (ibid.).

Hanna also established three criteria for the social significance of projects. First, projects must result in actual improvement of community life. Plans and proposals must be turned into action. Second, projects should concern something that is a responsibility of youth. In other words, adults should not call on youths to solve

problems that are exclusive to the adult world, but children and adults may work together to improve their common lives. Third, projects should address underlying sources of social problems insofar as possible. Hanna thought that one-time charitable acts did little to alleviate long-term suffering, and might even develop an unhealthy class consciousness in children, an *us-and-them* mentality (Hanna 1936a, xiii). Projects that passed muster on both the social and educational criteria were described in the book under categories such as “Youth contributes to public safety,” and “Youth contributes to civic beauty” (ibid.).

Youth Serves the Community expressed Hanna’s ideas on the community school concept in other ways, as well. Unlike some of his colleagues, Hanna admired the work of the National Youth Administration (NYA) and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in enlisting young Americans to serve the nation, but he decried the lack of an integrated education program employing their work experiences to teach them important subject matter and life lessons. Hanna especially regretted that neither the NYA nor the CCC employed young people in one of his pet projects—surveys of community needs (ibid., 45). He wrote, “Youth was denied the educational experience of surveying the national community to discover the most immediately necessary, as well as the most desirable long-term tasks” (ibid.).

One reason Hanna insisted on using the schools for social service was that, aside from the educational considerations,

The school is the one universal, well-equipped, and locally controlled institution in the community. The school, with its trained leadership and its physical equipment, could, with some addition to its staff and plant and with some reorganization of its program, conduct such a national project better than any existing group. Its local control makes impossible the dangers pointed out in the European [Fascist] youth movements (ibid., 46).

Primarily, though, Hanna saw the community school as a much more relevant educational vehicle than the traditional school. He

wrote, “The school program must shift its emphasis from the classical and academic approach to an emphasis on the problems facing youth here and now. The typical curriculum of the traditional school has lacked vitality and meaning for children and youth. School tasks have been almost exclusively unrelated to the life of the community” (ibid.).

In a piece written in 1938 for the Ninth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies, Hanna focused on the impetus the community school could provide to education for responsible citizenship. He began with an endorsement of activity-oriented curricula: “We know enough of the nature of learning to be able to evaluate certain teaching procedures as more productive of growth than others. We can say with confidence that we learn more adequately when we respond to the problems and demands of an actual experience than we do when we respond to the hypothetical problems of a described situation as set out in a textbook” (Hanna 1938a, 138).

In regard to citizenship education, Hanna claimed that “Probably the most significant learning in our democratic world is the consciousness of cooperative action as the process by which we continuously improve our lot” (ibid., 141). The pattern he advocated in the community school included children surveying their community’s needs, planning strategies to meet those needs, and then carrying them out. This process gave students a deep sense of their role in society, and the positive changes that their actions could achieve. Social education became the core of the curriculum. “In this newer concept, the social studies teacher accepts the challenge that our culture may be improved by the process of analyzing the culture’s shortcomings, projecting solutions, and taking the necessary action to translate plans into achievement” (ibid., 143).

Hanna applied these concepts of democratic involvement and community learning to curriculum development, as well as to instruction. In the late 1930s, he wrote several articles advocating

increased teacher involvement in curriculum development. In a story reflected in editorial cartoons of the time, he reminded readers,

You know what happened to the usual course of study, developed by the selected experts. A committee of trained specialists worked hard all summer preparing these bulletins. The proud principal stood at the opening faculty meeting with this pile of new courses of study on the corner of the desk. He praised the Central Committee for the great task of research, synthesis, and editing. And now he was ready to pass them out. The teacher, when she left that meeting, took this new bulletin under her arm to the classroom, and placed it on top of the desk (Hanna 1938b, 143).

Hanna went on to explain how, in the press of everyday classroom demands, the document winds up in the bottom of a desk drawer, where it is not rediscovered until the teacher cleans out her desk in June, “In the meantime it had not affected the classroom procedure, it had not improved the personality of the teacher who had it in her desk drawer” (ibid.).

As an alternative, Hanna advocated a program in which teacher growth was the focus of curriculum development. Drawing on his work in the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara schools as examples, he described a process in which teachers form voluntary study groups to increase their knowledge of their subjects and of society. They take field trips with experts to increase their subject knowledge through direct experience. They experiment with new instructional approaches in their classrooms, then share and refine their innovations. Hanna warned that old patterns of educational leadership were obsolete in this new model: “In this newer program the principal becomes a leader in teacher personality growth This leadership must come through recognized merit—recognized by his associates who accept his leadership because he gives them the opportunity for satisfying growth experiences” (ibid., 146).

In an article published in 1939, Hanna described a similar program instituted in the San Diego public schools. He claimed

that “The San Diego Curriculum Development Program has grown out of an increasing awareness on the part of the entire professional staff of the necessity continuously to study the child and society in an effort to provide the best possible curricular experiences in our schools” (Hanna 1939c, 104).

However nobly spontaneous his description sounds, the program must have suffocated under the maze of committees and sub-committees established for review and cross-review of the curriculum ideas produced by teachers. An additional weakness was the lack of community input in the curriculum development process. Although Hanna asserted that “Continuously, while this program of curriculum development is going forward, the *Central Curriculum Council* will keep the public informed on developments and will invite lay participation [emphasis his],” there was no formal mechanism for public information, much less input, in the byzantine diagram of committees included in the article (ibid.).

Perhaps the most imaginative vision Hanna provided of the community school is found in the widely distributed John Dewey Society yearbook, *Democracy and the Curriculum: The Life and Program of the American School*. In a three-part chapter of that publication, Hanna presented his ideal program for the community school. He even renamed the school the “Institute for Individual and Community Development” to indicate the radically expanded program that he proposed for the school (Hanna 1939b, 381).

The first section of Hanna’s chapter in the yearbook describes the total program of the institute, a cradle-to-grave system of social and educational services. The institute provides prenatal medical care and health education for expectant parents. After their child is born, they may return for consultations on child rearing: “Problems perplexing to the parents are analyzed in the School by parents and staff and suggested solutions worked out” (ibid., 384). Despite his earlier concern about the proliferation of nursery schools, Hanna’s ideal school provides one. Parents may enroll their children at

age two in order to encourage “the physical, emotional, intellectual, and social development of these early years” (ibid., 385).

Hanna envisioned a partnership between the home and the school in raising children: “Teachers and parents consult frequently and together agree upon ways of directing the growth of each child . . . Thus the School serves as a laboratory where each parent couple may take a child for clinical study and in addition the parents delegate to the School part of the actual daily care of the child in larger social groups of his own age” (ibid.).

When the child reached school age, he would enter an institution that had, besides typical school facilities, “. . . stations or branches in every enterprise in the community. Or to state it another way, every community organization and establishment has membership in the School, and they consider how the educative experience present in the organization or establishment can be made available to each child and youth in the community” (Hanna 1939b, 387–388).

This section may be Hanna’s most fanciful. He envisioned every community institution viewing child education as a primary goal, and he expected everybody in the community to value education as highly as professional educators do. He even expected these institutions to incorporate children into their everyday operations: “Not only do industry, agriculture, transportation, communication, commerce, social and governmental agencies cooperate with the School in providing opportunities to *observe* life in the making, but wherever physically safe and not economically unsound provision is also made to have pupils become active *participants* in the processes [emphases his]” (ibid., 389).

Here, Hanna’s vision reaches poetic heights:

They [children] feel the throb of power machinery; they hear the din and rhythm of the factory; they smell the sting of gases and the odor of ozone; they see the vast movement of an assembly line as it adds piece to piece to make an automobile, or a book; they experience movement in modern transportation; they taste the

sweetness of raw sugar or the oily juice from the cotton-seed press; they feel, see, hear, taste, and smell life in the making (ibid.).

Perhaps most significantly, Hanna expected parents to surrender, at least partially, the responsibility for raising their own children. At this relatively early point in his career, Hanna advocated collectivism openly and forcefully. He also exhibited fewer reservations about indoctrination than he did in later years. As he grew older and observed the terrors of Nazi and Soviet statism and suffered the right-wing attacks connected with the *Building America* controversy, he became more circumspect in his advocacy of collectivism. Nevertheless, his advocacy of community schools overseas and a national curriculum commission at home demonstrated that, even later in life, he still held collectivist sentiments.

The educational services provided by Hanna's institute did not end at the conclusion of the traditional academic program. Career education was provided for professionals and tradesmen alike through "alternation of practical and theoretical experience" (ibid., 390). Hanna drew on his earlier experience with the Lincoln School to outline his vision for adult education:

The School through its studios, laboratories, shops, libraries, and lecture halls offers the opportunity for continuous study and enrichment of personality . . . The community conceives of the School as a place where the guidance of a trained and stimulating staff is ready to assist the individual in carrying forward any personal or vocational interest or need he cares to pursue. No member of the community is too old or too young, too learned or too ignorant to use the facilities of the community School (Hanna 1939b, 391).

Parts two and three of Hanna's yearbook chapter provided examples of community-school cooperative projects and discussed curriculum issues. The examples were drawn from *Youth Serves the Community* to demonstrate how schools could conduct community surveys, develop beautification projects, construct housing, and im-

prove agricultural methods. The curriculum section promised a framework for community schools, but it delivered only vague outlines that amounted to no more than brief descriptions of the sample projects. Hanna criticized the parochialism and lack of subject integration in the traditional curriculum, and he advocated a scope and sequence broad enough to provide common understandings nationwide, as well as attend to local concerns.

The outbreak of World War II provided a wealth of new activities for community schools. Total war required substantial contributions from all members of society, even children. Hanna served on the Commission on Resources and Education in the years before the war. A joint project of the National Education Association and the Progressive Education Association, the commission shared members with the government's National Resources Planning Board. Hanna's work on these two committees allowed him to see as clearly as anyone the need for schools to mobilize their students in the war effort. In a series of articles, he called on them to do just that in a community school-like setting.

In a 1941 piece for *Childhood Education*, Hanna warned that war was likely and that it might mean nutritional and medical shortages, interruptions of family life, physical danger from attacks and sabotage, and other kinds of suffering for children. He called on schools to prepare for these potentialities and to mobilize children: "The schools can be a means through which children can make a significant contribution to the defense program as are the schools in England where the children contribute messenger service, give first aid, supply vegetables and fruits for canning, and encourage similar activities appropriate to the ages of children" (Hanna 1941a, 102).

Hanna realized that some would resist using children in the war effort. He argued that "All of us recognize that the culture that creates an institution has a right to shape the work of that institution to emergency ends" (ibid.). To mitigate the unsettling effects of the

war, Hanna called on schools to “continue to give children the basic understandings, attitudes and skills which will be essential for the rebuilding of America and the world when the crisis is over and today’s children reach adulthood” (ibid., 102–103).

Hanna assigned to teachers the responsibility of looking out for their students’ well-being during the national emergency. He called on them to toss off their traditional passivity and neutrality in the community and play the role of community activists in service to their students. “Once she [the teacher] is familiar with the community’s inadequacies, she has a responsibility as a citizen to align herself with those community agencies which are working to improve the community” (ibid., 103). Hanna also warned teachers not to ignore parents in the educative process. He pointed out that teachers “often act as if we did not believe it is the parents and not the teachers who create and support the schools for the education of their children.” He reminded teachers that their specialized knowledge of child growth and development obligated them to “inform them [parents] in much the same way that a good public health worker informs parents of the best thought and practice in health” (ibid., 104). These two points—the teacher as activist and parents as integral to the work of the school—recur frequently in Hanna’s writing.

As a member of the National Resources Planning Board, Hanna helped draft Nine Freedoms as guidelines for postwar planning. In 1942, he wrote an article for *Frontiers of Democracy* about Freedom Number Nine, “The right to rest, recreation, and adventure; the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization” (Hanna 1942a, 244). Hanna returned to several familiar social critiques in that piece. First, he decried the loss by workers of the “deep satisfaction in knowing that their labor made a difference in the lives of their neighbors” (ibid., 243). He attributed this loss to the fact that in modern industrial production, “for the worker the connection is lost between his repetitive task and the social usefulness

of the finished product” (ibid.). He also criticized the rampant materialism of Americans: “The American people typically feel that they must purchase with money their satisfaction through commercial amusements or through the owning of objects” (ibid., 244).

As an alternative to these problems, Hanna called for opportunities for adults and youth to invest their leisure time “in substantial contributions to the general welfare of the community” (ibid.). As examples of such opportunities he described, predictably, community school surveys and cultural events. Strangely, he never mentioned the school as the locus of activity. In a foreshadowing of his future concerns, Hanna advocated young adults satisfying their sense of adventure through work in economic development projects overseas.

In 1942, Paul Hanna coauthored a section in the 1942 *National Resources Development Report* that amounted to a comprehensive plan to provide educational and social services for children through the schools. In his conception, the schools would be centers of organization for providing employment training and services, health and other social services, and recreation, as well as education for youths. However, Hanna intended that “Youth should serve as well as be served” (Hanna and Reeves 1942, 128). He argued that the healthy social development of children and youth requires that they have opportunities to be of use to others. Furthermore, he asserted that the daunting tasks of wartime mobilization and postwar reconstruction would demand their help. He believed that to accomplish America’s wartime and postwar goals, “Young people should be admitted as junior partners” (ibid.).

Perhaps the most comprehensive writing Hanna did on the subject of community schools during World War II was an article that he wrote a month prior to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Hanna was convinced that war would come, and he entitled his article “The Classroom—A Defense Unit” (Hanna 1942b). It was published a few months after war was declared. In the article,

Hanna elaborated on the educational and community service possibilities to be found in the wartime curriculum. He suggested that science classes might study materials that have a strategic defense and military use, and then investigate ways to conserve, extend, and recycle them. Social studies classes might organize community discussion groups on war topics for which they could provide geographical and historical background information. Art classes might design posters and brochures to communicate information and maintain morale. His list went on, but he summarized it with the charge, “Imaginative and loyal teachers and administrators will organize their school work in such ways that America’s children and youth may channel an appropriate amount of their energies to the jobs that must be done” (ibid., 376). Such school participation not only hastened the achievement of war goals, Hanna wrote, but also, “as a concomitant our children and youth will develop morale and an appreciation of the American way of life which we are defending” (ibid.).

After the war, Hanna shifted much of his attention to international education. He continued to develop his ideas on community schools in settings overseas, but his experience abroad also informed his writing on community and school relations domestically. In 1947, he led a committee of his graduate students in writing an article for the *Nineteenth Yearbook of the California Elementary School Principals Association* that outlined ways to use community resources in the school program.

Hanna’s students advised teachers on techniques for using guest speakers in the classroom, doing service projects, leading field trips, and other activities. Hanna’s influence is seen in their dictum that, “Democratic procedures in all human relationships involved should be accepted and practiced” (Hanna 1947b, 82). His stress on the importance of an activity-based curriculum is also echoed in their insistence that, “Facts live when they have been discovered

first-hand by children themselves in answer to a real need” (ibid., 87).

Hanna’s hand also was apparent in the 1948 publication *Education for All American Children*, a policy statement issued by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association. As a member of the commission staff, Hanna contributed to the section entitled “The School and Its Community.” Communication was essential to Hanna’s conception of community, and in that chapter he emphasized the importance of communication as a component of community. Another section in the chapter, “The World in Our Time Is One Community,” reflected Hanna’s emerging internationalism.

The culmination of more than two decades of thinking and writing about community schools was Hanna’s 1953 article in the fifty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, *The Community School*. Coauthored with Robert A. Naslund, it revealed a deeper understanding of the concept of community and the school’s role in it than some of Hanna’s previous writing.

The authors began with a familiar critique of traditional classroom education.

Traditionally, schools have been given the responsibility for developing men and women with sound and liberal education under the assumption that, if this were done, desirable and necessary social changes would inevitably occur through the effort of these individuals in their adult years. With some notable exceptions, schools have existed in a sphere more or less removed from contact with the real problems of community life (Hanna and Naslund 1953, 49–50).

They then described the variety of community school approaches by categorizing schools as those having a community-centered curriculum, a vocations-centered curriculum, a community center function, or a community service program. Hanna had formulated just such a classification system in *Youth Serves the Community*. In

his definition, the surveyed schools took varied approaches, but they all shared a common vision of the importance of community–school interaction.

Many elements in the article reiterated Hanna’s description of his ideal ‘Institute for Individual and Community Development.’ However, he was far more pragmatic in this article. For example, he recognized that the schools must be concerned with national unity within a context of local control, and he tried to balance these often conflicting goals. He also incorporated his growing sense of the multiple communities to which all people belong, writing that “The curriculum of the community school is oriented to the needs and problems of the communities of which it is a part as well as to the needs of individuals in those communities. Local problems will naturally receive the greatest attention, but the curriculum incorporates the needs of all communities and directs its efforts toward contributing to their solution” (ibid., 55).

Hanna had planted the seeds of a dilemma out of which he never really found his way. It was the tension between local control of schools and national educational goals. In later years, with his proposal for a national curriculum commission, he seemed to abandon at least one important mechanism of local control in favor of a more uniform curriculum for the schools. However, Hanna was always intrigued by the promise of collective action within the national community.

Hanna and Naslund went on to list criteria for implementing community school arrangements. Many of these were familiar, but some reflected change and growth in Hanna’s thought. For instance, the criteria included, “all communities, from the local to the international, consciously use the school as an instrument to improve living,” and “the curriculum of the community school is planned to meet the needs of all communities, from local to international” (ibid., 58). They made no attempt to reconcile communities that might have conflicting needs. In some ways, Hanna’s later

conception of the community school was just as visionary as his earlier one.

Although Paul Hanna's vision of the community school changed somewhat over time, it retained three elements that he thought were essential. First, the curriculum must be oriented toward activity rather than static, passive learning. Second, children have an obligation to serve their communities. Coincidentally, they learn best as they are serving. Third, all schools must seek to incorporate democratic practices in the interactions of all participants.

Hanna had a clear vision of a well-planned, democratically implemented future, and the community school as a vehicle to get there, but he never saw his ideal of the community school realized, nor anything very closely resembling it. One reason for this was timing. The momentum built up by the community school movement in the progressive era of the 1930s came to a halt with the outbreak of World War II. Educational historian Ronald W. Evans cited both political and social causes. He asserted that the 1930s decade was the high point for educational progressivism in its many forms, claiming that "After that time, it became clear that many educational reformers had exceeded the public's zone of toleration. A common perception developed across the land that radical educators centered at Teachers College were attempting to foist socialism on the nation through its schools" (Evans 1998, 8). In addition, Evans believed that World War II repudiated the notion in the public mind, much as World War I had done, that social improvement was possible. He wrote that "World War II brought the death of the progressive impulse and concomitant belief in redemption" (*ibid.*).

Social science educator Gary R. McKenzie also claimed that progressive education was overwhelmed by changing attitudes brought on by the war. The fascist nations had employed the schools to mold children's thinking to specific ideologies. Some progressive notions of community schooling, including Hanna's, used similar

language to describe their programs, and the public would not have it. In addition, a perception grew that the increasingly technological world emerging from the war would require a more coherent, technical form of education. To many, this meant a return to traditional instructional methods. In the same vein, parents' aspirations for their children to attend college exploded in the postwar era, requiring a more strictly discipline-based curriculum than some progressives advocated. Finally, the constraints of wartime vocational training had forced many educational psychologists to reject genetic and behaviorist approaches in favor of the much more efficient, and measurable, cognitive theories of learning (McKenzie 1998).

Another culprit in the failure of Hanna's community school vision may have been the very modernization Hanna tried to counteract. One aspect of the modern world is the specialization of jobs in the community and the social fragmentation that results. The school is the institution designated to provide education. It is the specialist. Other institutions in the community are often uninterested in participating in the education of youth, or they believe that they are inadequate to do so. At best, education will be a secondary priority for them. This attitude counteracts a conception that is vital to the community school's success, namely, that education is the job of the whole community.

Paul Hanna was adept at reading trends, and the postwar trend was away from experimental, progressive approaches like the community school. Coupled with increased attention to his textbook production and international consulting, that trend induced Hanna to write less and less about community schools in the years after the war. Increasingly, he turned to new educational concerns.

ORIGINS OF HANNA'S
SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

The community school was only one of Hanna's modes for the preparation of children for responsible citizenship in a changing world. Early in his academic career, he became involved in the development and writing of textbooks for the schools. These books became a prime expression of his beliefs about citizenship development and social education. Hanna authored more than fifty social studies textbooks over a span of forty years. He also coauthored two series of spelling textbooks, first with Jesse Newlon, and then with Jean Hanna. All of the social studies books reflected Hanna's concern that children learn about the processes of social and economic evolution so that they might learn to control them, but the books can be seen in three distinct groupings. The first, and best known, were the several series of elementary social studies textbooks Hanna produced for Scott, Foresman and Company. These books came to be known as the Hanna Social Studies Series. In the process of writing them, Hanna developed his *expanding communities* curriculum design. The second group were not traditional textbooks, but monthly magazines known as the *Building America* series. The third was a series of three books written for students in the upper grades of elementary school and junior high school. These books specifically addressed the development of economic institutions.

Each of these textbooks and materials fit into Hanna's overall approach to social education. The Hanna Social Studies Series sought to inform young children about the nature and development of social, economic, and political institutions. *Building America* provided older students an opportunity to examine specific problems in American culture, in preparation for taking action to alleviate them. The three-book series on economics, released in 1943, blended information with mild critique in order to prepare students to address issues that had proved to be problematic in the decade

of the 1930s. Together, these books provided the intellectual foundation for the social action Hanna called for in promoting community schools. Through them, Hanna promoted curriculum ideas and a model that became pervasive both in the United States and abroad.

By far the best known of Hanna's textbooks are the several series published by Scott, Foresman from the 1930s through the 1960s. These came to be called, collectively, the Hanna Series. In these books, Hanna developed and refined his *expanding communities* curriculum design as he sought to teach students the nature of their social, economic, and political worlds .

Hanna's books were designed to alleviate what he referred to as *cultural lag*:

It is clear that much of this cultural frustration and confusion is the result of rapid advances in science and technology on the one hand, and on the other hand, the relatively slow adjustments in the laws and institutions and the adaptation of old values to new conditions. We speak of this imbalance as cultural lag . . . This cultural lag is now accepted by many leaders in public education as a major concern of the schools. The lessening of this lag or imbalance is listed as a major goal of education (Hanna 1946, 27).

Although Hanna clearly saw cultural lag as a problem, and looked to the schools to address it, the best curriculum design to effect a solution was not readily apparent. The approaches of the child-centered progressives, in which "the curriculum was that which the child wished to do . . . [and] could only be defined or described after the child had had the experience," were clearly insufficient (Hanna 1974). His work as a curriculum consultant in social studies for the Virginia State Education Department, begun in 1932, provided the seeds of an answer.

Hanna reported on his work with the Virginia Study in a 1934 issue of *Progressive Education*. In that article he declared two purposes for social studies in the schools: to help children in "experi-

encing a realistic understanding and appreciation of human relations,” and to allow children to “participate in improving human relations” (Hanna 1934, 129). During the Virginia Study, Hanna’s search for a pattern in children’s interests that would prove an adequate foundation on which to organize a curriculum was a failure. However, this failure forced him finally to abandon child interest and look for a more objective organizing principle.

The process led him to the central concept upon which all of his textbooks were based. He hit upon twelve major social functions as an integrating concept for social science instruction across the grade levels in Virginia. These social functions were production, distribution, consumption, conservation, transportation and communication, exploration and settlement, recreation, education, extension of freedom, esthetic expression, religious expression, and individual integration. Through refinement they became the Nine Basic Human Activities in his later works.

In order to provide a sequence for the curriculum content surrounding the basic human activities, Hanna and Hollis Caswell adapted the *expanding environments* pattern then in wide use, in which children learn concepts first in the context of familiar people, places, and events, and then move to the less familiar by stages. Leo W. LeRiche traced the origins of this pattern to curriculum concepts of the German Herbartians, whose ideas were popularized in the United States around the turn of the century primarily by Charles McMurry (LeRiche 1987, 141–142). By 1930, a significant number of school curriculum guides featured this pattern for sequencing content (ibid., 148). LeRiche wrote that the expanding environments pattern grew out of the cultural epochs theory of child growth and development, in which individual child development mimics the cultural development of mankind through the ages. However, Hanna and Caswell did not adopt the expanding environments model for that reason.

Hanna chose his centers of study based on children’s experi-

ence, not developmental stages. He saw that “Human relations range all the way from the personal relation of ‘me’ and my family, my school, my community, to the general relation of the exchange of culture between races and nations” (Hanna 1934, 129). Consequently, grades one and two investigated the expression of the twelve social functions in the home, the school, and the local community.

Thus far, the sequence is recognizable to anyone familiar with Hanna’s design, but at this point the Virginia plan diverged from what finally became the pattern for his textbooks. The next few grade levels focused on the theme of pioneering. Grades three and four dealt with geographical pioneering, grades five and six with technological pioneering, and grade seven with social pioneering. At grade eight, the focus shifted again to the social world, grade nine focused on the American scene, grade ten on the western world, and grade eleven on the world as a whole. The twelve major social functions were woven throughout these themes. Hanna claimed that his innovation was an improvement over the traditional “chronology of political events in history, the spatial–expansion sequence of geography, or the logical–structural outline of civics,” because it was more in tune with “the pupil and his interests, abilities, and needs” (ibid., 132). Hanna later developed the more elaborate expanding communities curriculum design that incorporated a complex pattern of concentric circles of community in which each child participated, but the genesis of that design was in the Virginia curriculum project.

Another theme in Hanna’s social studies curriculum for the State of Virginia, later incorporated into his textbooks, was an *integrated* approach to the subject matter. Instead of presenting information classified into the discrete content areas of the traditional social sciences, Hanna organized the subject matter into the twelve major social functions. He felt that approach was more in line with the psychology of learning, but Hanna was neither a social

scientist nor a child psychologist. His work in philosophy at Hamline University and his exposure to the work of Harold Rugg may have convinced him that integrating disparate fields of knowledge was desirable. His supreme self-confidence convinced him that he could accomplish the task. Hanna wrote, “Human relations are those unitary life experiences that the specialists have broken up and classified into such subject-matter fields as history, geography, civics, economics, sociology, political science, esthetics, ethics, anthropology, individual and social psychology” (ibid., 130). His design was structured to incorporate information from these fields in a way that would mimic questions that interest children, such as “What makes some people live so differently from us? How were our grandparents able to live without modern machinery?” (ibid.).

Of course, these were Hanna’s own versions of children’s questions. As Professor O. L. Davis has pointed out, “Curriculum does not integrate *for* individuals. Only individuals integrate; only individuals make their meanings . . . What another (e.g., the teacher) has integrated still must be *engaged* and—it is hoped—be *integrated* by pupils” (Davis 1997, 95–96). Although Hanna’s textbooks sought to provide the “intellectually rich curriculum resources and situations” that Davis asserted students require for integration to occur, he certainly framed the world for them in his curriculum design.

For a period of time in the 1930s, Hanna devoted considerable energy to statewide curriculum revisions. In the summer of 1933 he worked on curriculum revision in Arkansas. In 1935, he became chairman of the Society for Curriculum Study’s Committee on State-Wide Programs of Curriculum Revision. After moving to Stanford, he worked in a number of curriculum revision projects, including the California Committee on the Scope and Sequence of Major Learnings. From his experiences on this last committee, he wrote a series of articles for the *California Journal of Secondary Education* further refining his curriculum design.

Hanna's design for the California schools was a reiteration of his understanding of the socioeconomic evolution of man. In his conception, man's existence has been a constant struggle to satisfy material wants and needs. The struggle was relatively slow and unsuccessful until modern times, when man gave up superstition and magic in favor of science and reason. This new approach brought relative material prosperity, but the resulting technological change has outpaced the evolution of our social institutions. As a consequence, modern man is at an impasse. The improvements to life that should accompany his newfound control over nature are frustrated by outmoded social controls. The next period of human progress must come from social pioneering, which Hanna claimed "must consist of the cooperative efforts of all interdependent people to plan for the improvement of social and economic objectives deemed desirable and possible" (Hanna 1935b, 425).

Hanna's article went on to propose a curriculum for California's schools much like the one in Virginia. Other ideas familiar from the Virginia Study recurred as well. Prominent in the curriculum design were Hanna's major social functions, providing the scope of study. These had been reduced from twelve to ten, the only differences in the two lists being that production and consumption, separate items on the Virginia list, were now combined, and exploration and settlement were dropped completely. Hanna might have assumed that with physical, technological, and social pioneering as dominant themes, exploration and settlement might be redundant. Hanna again claimed that these functions "encompass all the significant problems confronted in the man-to-man relationship in all cultures existing in time and space" (ibid., 422).

Hanna also made another strong argument for subject matter integration. He claimed that his design covered the "large number of separate subjects formerly taught" (ibid., 421). He claimed that the traditional content area divisions were unnecessary, because "The studies in spiritual and aesthetic living, together with the

social studies, constitute the sum total of the curriculum” (ibid.). Consequently, Hanna proposed his design as the core curriculum with “economic geography, economics, sociology, political science, United States history, or state history” relegated to the status of electives (ibid., 426).

Hanna again stressed the necessity of activity in the learning process. In describing the function of the California Committee, he gave the objectives of social studies in the schools as, “(1) to direct pupils in such experiences as will develop a realistic *understanding* [emphasis his] and appreciation of human relations; (2) to direct pupils to participate in improving human relations” (ibid., 421). Later in the article, he reiterated the point: “But *understanding* alone is not sufficient. Teachers of the social studies have the further obligation of providing students with experiences in *improving* human relations [emphases his]” (ibid., 422). In a companion piece written the following year, Hanna again proposed that his curriculum design was the solution to the “vexing problem” of “translating into classroom practice those major educational objectives for which as yet we have no demonstrated pattern of pupil experiences” (Hanna 1936b, 375). Hanna often made audacious claims in his writing, in part as a rhetorical tool to establish a polemic position, but also in part as an expression of his tremendous self-confidence.

Perhaps Hanna’s most biting indictment of the traditional social studies curriculum came in a 1937 article published in *Childhood Education*. In it, he drew a distinction between *social studies*, “which brought to mind many weary hours of listless memorization of history dates, geographic place locations, and civic structures and virtues,” and what he preferred to label *social education*, which was intended to “develop the child’s ability actually to live more effectively and richly as a member of a social group” (Hanna 1937c, 74). Hanna’s view was that the underlying purpose of teaching the social sciences was lost in efforts to convey the factual information. As evidence, he claimed that

With all our reciting of the facts that Columbus, an Italian, discovered America in 1492 and that the Pilgrims, from England, landed at Plymouth in 1620 we go on hating foreigners as much as if we hadn't learned the historic fact that most of us are originally from foreign shores. With all of our 'book learning' of the structure of city and state government we still have corruption in high places and indifference among our citizens. With all our geographic fact teaching we face increasing national insecurity because geography has not taught us to conserve our soil, forests, and other natural resources. Nor have we much evidence that through social studies we have aided in promoting happier family relations, bettering juvenile social behavior, obtaining higher standards of living, or generally in solving the vast number of problems that plague our culture (ibid.).

Hanna's familiar solution was an activity-oriented curriculum that would provide children "more experiences in which they can contribute to socially significant projects" (ibid., 77).

By the mid-1930s, however, Hanna was doing more than proposing solutions in narrow-circulation journals. His consulting work in local and state education agencies had afforded him the opportunity to experiment with his scope and sequence ideas in actual classroom practice. In some California school districts, such as the Santa Barbara city schools, his *basic human activities* had become the scope of the districtwide curriculum (Santa Barbara City Schools 1935). At the same time, Hanna was developing textbooks with the Scott, Foresman and Company that would make his model the dominant one in schools throughout the country.

In 1935, after considering offers from other publishers, Paul Hanna entered into a contract with Scott, Foresman and Company to produce the first two textbooks that would eventually become the embodiment of his expanding communities curriculum design. Harry Johnston of Scott, Foresman and William S. Gray, a renowned reading specialist, had developed the idea of a unified set

of curriculum materials built around a core of reading texts (Hanna 1974). Vocabulary, sentence structure, paragraph structure, and the like were first introduced in the reading books, then reinforced in series publications in science, social studies, and other subject areas. The program was called the Everyday Life Stories Series, and it relied heavily on stories as a means of conveying information. Hanna developed immense respect for Gray and his ideas while working on the project, remembering him as “one of the most gentle scholars that I have ever known” (Hanna 1974).

Hanna wrote *Peter's Family* in 1935 and *David's Friends at School* in 1936, initially as part of the Everyday Life Stories Series. Their purpose was to introduce children in first grade to similarities in the ways the basic human activities were carried out in the home and in the school. The teacher's edition for each book included a cumulative vocabulary list indexed to the pages on which the words appeared in the book, suggested activities for each section, and an index of social studies concepts showing where the application of each concept could be found in the book. Such aids for the teacher were typical features of curriculum materials in the 1930s, an era in which teachers often taught “from the textbook” (Cuban 1993, 71).

More books followed in quick succession. In 1937, *Susan's Neighbors at Work* was issued to “broaden the pupil's understanding of human relationships and increase his ability to participate constructively in the life of his home, his school, and his community” (Hanna, Anderson, and Gray 1937, 232). The book reflected Hanna's design, in that students were shown how the basic human activities introduced earlier in the series were carried out by workers in the community. The teacher's edition followed the pattern of the earlier books. Teachers were expected to use activities or discussion to introduce new material, then help students read through sections in the text and devise activities to extend learning or to answer questions that arose.

The third grade book in the series, *Centerville*, described the interactions of a town and its surrounding areas in performing the basic human activities. Students in the text were portrayed as active participants in the community, visiting businesses, contributing to community events, and the like. This portrayal must have exerted subtle pressure on teachers to copy that model in providing instructional activities for their own students. If subtlety was ineffective, the Chapter for Teachers at the back of the book admonished that, “Reading Centerville straight through without discussion or the exploring of many by-paths which are opened to view is not recommended” (Hanna, Anderson, and Gray 1938, 278). For the less imaginative teacher, the authors included a section entitled Special Study, listing ideas that the book only touches on that could be elaborated, and one entitled Things for Children to Do, with suggestions for productive activities. The To Do section reminded teachers that, “Doing things is necessary in the study of social ideas” (ibid., 280). The Chapter for Teachers also suggested that two questions frame the study of each reading section: “How is Centerville different from our community?” and “How is Centerville like our community?” Through careful investigation of these questions, the authors hoped that children would “learn that all people, by living together in communities of various kinds, obtain food, clothes, homes, entertainment, and all other necessities of American Life” (ibid., 279).

The fourth and fifth grade books in the series, *Without Machinery* and *Pioneering in Ten Communities*, expressed Hanna’s grand curriculum design based on the state curriculum studies by focusing on technological, geographic, and social pioneering. The front material of *Without Machinery* acknowledged the contributions of academic specialists to the book’s presentations. Two anthropologists, one orientalist, and one Egyptologist received thanks. This was the first book in Hanna’s series to acknowledge the input of social scientists. It represented one of his contributions to the social stud-

ies—enlisting prominent social scientists in curriculum development for elementary schools. In later years, even more social scientists expressed a willingness to work in the curriculum development field when they perceived that Hanna had created a serious-minded program for instruction.

Possibly due to the influence of the social science professionals, *Without Machinery* opened with an academic discussion of the ideas and concepts explained in the book, instead of moving immediately into a story as the earlier books had. The book then developed, through stories, the overall concept that people in other parts of the world perform tasks similar to the ones Americans do, but without the help of the machinery that Americans use. It did this by profiling everyday life in villages around the world. In the Chapter for Teachers, Hanna expressed his concern that children understand the dilemma of modern man: “Reading about people who don’t build machinery, who develop ways of living to fit the circumstances in which they find themselves, helps the child to understand the changes which the machine has brought in our own lives” (Hanna 1939, 272–273).

Hanna’s books were hugely successful. Within a few years, they had sold nearly 1.5 million copies, second only to the Rugg series in social studies textbook sales (*Time* 1943, 25). Hanna benefited in several ways. First, his royalty of two percent of sales brought income when he most needed it to pay the huge expenses incurred in the construction of the Hanna-Honeycomb House. More significantly for his career, the textbooks spread his name far and wide. Textbook salesmen promoted Hanna as they sold the books. Hanna recalled that “The sales force at World Book, the sales force at Scott, Foresman, the sales force at Houghton Mifflin, the sales force at any number of agencies and professional educational organizations had gotten in the door by saying, ‘we want to bring you a message from Paul Hanna’” (Hanna 1974).

He acknowledged that these sales techniques had boosted his career:

By constantly hearing the name of Hanna people said, ‘Well, let’s take a look at him. Let’s invite him in as a consultant; let’s have him speak to our teachers, or we will invite him to write an article.’ These things have a way of reinforcing each other. I know I would not be where I am today if it hadn’t been that I had salesmen and consultants in commercial organizations who just daily rapped on doors and talked about, ‘here is a product that Hanna has conceived’ (Hanna 1974).

The textbooks were even printed overseas; a number of editions include copyrights in the Philippines. From the 1930s through the 1970s, Hanna promoted the Scott, Foresman textbooks whenever he spoke or wrote about his curriculum design, and whenever he promoted the books, he spread the influence of his design. This reflexive relationship became so important to the publisher that in 1938, Willis Scott of Scott, Foresman annotated a contract signed that year with the remark, “Dr. Hanna’s name shall appear first on each book” (Scott 1938).

TEXTBOOKS AS TOOLS FOR SOCIAL CRITIQUE

The Hanna Series established Paul Hanna’s reputation as an educational leader. It also introduced into thousands of classrooms his curriculum concept that children should investigate the basic human activities as they have been performed by people throughout human history. However, Hanna thought that social critique was just as essential to children’s citizenship development as was the development of a fundamental knowledge of their social, economic, and political environments. This critique was a necessary first step in any community service project, or in any other work toward social improvement. Hanna’s father and the currents of progressivism surrounding him in his youth and early adulthood influenced him

in this belief. For example, education historian David Warren Saxe pointed out that as early as 1916 curriculum panels such as the Social Studies Committee of the Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education called for social criticism as an integral part of the school experience. Unfortunately, curriculum materials to support these efforts were not rapidly forthcoming and the movement languished for some years (Saxe 1991, 80). Paul Hanna hoped to correct the situation by providing attractive, high-quality supplemental texts to augment classroom discussions and projects in social improvement.

Teachers, however, are not known as pioneers of social change. In fact, this charge was brought against George Counts's stirring arguments for greater social activism on the part of schools by some of those who opposed his *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (1932). Many teachers conceived their role to be maintenance of the culture, passing it on to children intact rather than promoting change. In responding to Counts, Agnes de Lima wrote that teachers were "a class long trained to social docility" (de Lima 1932, 317). Moreover, compiling information for students on social problems that faced the nation was a daunting task for teachers, and Hanna understood the need for curriculum materials to help teachers accomplish it. In 1934, he approached his colleagues in the Society for Curriculum Study to enlist their support for the production of materials that could be used to aid classroom discussion of problems facing the country. The result was the *Building America* series of monthly magazines for the classroom.

Hanna presented his concept for *Building America* at the 1934 annual meeting of the Society for Curriculum Study. He hoped that thought-provoking pictorial materials would prompt school children to investigate and work to improve social conditions in the United States. An announcement in the Society's *Curriculum Journal* claimed that

Building America tries to make American youth and adults more sensitive to the problems which must be faced if the nation is to realize its great possibilities. To promote a realistic understanding of the basic activities and problems of American life, economic, political, and social, *Building America* plans to select and present verified data; as objectively and impartially as possible; it plans to suggest the various sides of controversial issues, holding to no special solutions and leaving the reader free to formulate his own conclusions (Society for Curriculum Study 1935a, 3).

Some Society members worried that the project would be too controversial, but Hanna was not deterred. In an article written the following year for *Progressive Education*, he divided progressive educators into two groups: the romantics and the realists. Romantics, he wrote, “recognize and to some extent grant the major maladjustments in our age, but they would not deal directly with negative aspects of the environment. Children, they say, must be protected from the destructive influences of poverty, squalor, corruption, meanness, and fear (Hanna 1935a, 318).

Realists, on the other hand, “guide these children into facing this, our baffling world, and learn the techniques with which we can cross over the threshold into the promise of tomorrow” (ibid., 319). Hanna placed himself squarely in the realist camp and went on to brand the romantics as un-American. He wrote, “To ignore these tragic conditions in America is to perpetuate the charge that progressive education is essentially class education; and if class education is the dynamic of this movement, it is thoroughly un-American” (ibid., 320).

The inaugural issue of *Building America* was entitled “Housing.” It was dedicated to “the national problem of providing good homes for everybody” (Society for Curriculum Study 1935a, 2). It was distributed with a promotional brochure that stated, “We believe *Building America* represents a unique type of curriculum material which will assist in making American youth and adults con-

sciously intelligent about the problems of our time” (ibid.). The brochure claimed that the magazines would contribute to all social science courses, as well as “science, health, home economics, art, industrial arts, and other areas of the modern school curriculum” (ibid.). It explained the origin of the series as a response to the “persistent and widespread demand of educators for a new type of classroom material that will give students a working knowledge of social and economic forces and institutions” (ibid., 1). It touted the *problem method*, by which “Every issue of *Building America* is presented to the student as a problem to be solved. The facts and ideas presented in each number and the questions raised are all intended to challenge the student’s thinking and help him to enter upon some constructive line of thought toward a solution to these problems (ibid.).

High standards of scholarship were also claimed: “The facts presented in the *Building America* series are the result of painstaking research into the most reliable sources available. In addition, these materials are carefully reviewed by a representative Editorial Board and by reputable authorities on the topics treated” (ibid.). Finally, the brochure called on “all friends of education” to promote the new publication (ibid., 2).

Following the issue on housing, *Building America* issues were published at the beginning of each month, October through May, from 1935 until 1948. The 1935–1936 volume included titles such as “Food,” “Transportation,” and “Health.” Paul Hanna’s direct influence as chairman of the editorial board was seen in topics such as “Men and Machines,” “Communication,” “Power,” “Recreation,” and “Youth Faces the World.” Each issue included many photographs and enough text to inform students and stimulate discussion.

A teacher’s guide accompanied each issue, and the guide to the housing issue is typical. In its introduction, the authors offered the following statement of purpose:

The progress of our democracy and the advancement of our American standard of living have been dependent upon the education of the mass of our people with regard to the major social and economic problems which they confronted. Today even more than in the past the school as an educational institution is obligated to help young people to understand and to cope with these problems which so vitally affect their welfare no less than the welfare of adults. If correctly presented, these crucial problems of life can grip the imagination of our youth and in turn stimulate them to work for a satisfactory solution (Society for Curriculum Study 1935b, 1).

The guide suggested that the housing issue might be used in the Problems of Democracy course then popular in schools, as well as for “adult discussion groups” (ibid.). It then proceeded to give some detail as to how the issue might be used in a variety of classes across the curriculum.

The longest section of the guide offered a wealth of ideas on age- and course-appropriate activities teachers might use to extend the classroom use of the housing issue. It reflected Hanna’s concern for the importance of activities by arguing

One of the most important principles of psychology is that people *learn by doing* [emphasis theirs]. This principle applied to education means that the teacher should provide a wealth of activities in which students participate. These activities stimulate their interest in a problem, help them to acquire vital information, assist them in achieving habits of cooperative work, and finally bring them face to face with the world outside the school (ibid., 2).

Building America had wide appeal throughout the educational community. By its second year of publication, the Society for Curriculum Study was unable to accommodate the number of requests for subscriptions. The Society instructed Hanna to seek a publisher better equipped to handle the large volume of printing and distribution. In a qualitative measure of the series’ popularity, Hanna collected testimonials from teachers and administrators across the

country. A high school teacher from Philadelphia stated, "Building America seems to me decidedly teachable material . . . I hope the series goes on and on" (Hanna 1936?, 4). A junior high school teacher in Maine wrote, "I find it of great help in teaching Vocational Information." A superintendent in Minnesota commented, "This material challenges the imagination" (ibid., 6). One in Arkansas claimed, "This publication is very unique and we think it will serve to 'Build America'" (ibid.). An elementary school principal in Michigan wrote, "This looks like a real contribution to teaching. I hope to see it widely used in our system" (ibid.). One in New York City predicted, "Building America promises to be an excellent magazine for all grades from kindergarten up. Covering so many subjects it will assist in complete correlation. It solves the difficulty of securing suitable pictures and of course is highly educational as a visual aid" (ibid., 7).

A junior high school principal thought that the series was so "beautiful and suggestive" that it "ought to be on the New York City supply list for Junior High Schools." A curriculum director in Virginia wrote, "The material is a most valuable tool for teaching. It deals with vital problems in an interesting and understandable way for girls and boys. It seems to be a splendid contribution to education" (ibid.).

Unfortunately, *Building America* ran afoul of changing trends in education. The World War II and postwar eras saw a turn away from practices of educational progressivism such as social criticism and the problem method of instruction. The ultrapatriotic mood of the times caused some to look on social criticism with suspicion, and some politicians chose to further their careers by attacking such practices. This led, in 1947, to a California legislative investigation of the ideological foundations of *Building America* and its founders. The negative publicity generated by this investigation resulted in canceled subscriptions and the magazine's ultimate demise.

Although not as directly in the social critique mode of instruc-

tion as *Building America*, perhaps the clearest expression of what Paul Hanna wanted to communicate to schoolchildren about their culture was embodied in a three-volume series of textbooks published during World War II by Scott, Foresman and Company. These books, written for fifth, sixth, and seventh graders, were an extension of the Hanna Series textbooks for the lower grades. They focused particularly on economic concepts and also stressed such perennial Hanna concerns as the interdependence of all peoples.

The first book in the series, *This Useful World*, set the stage for the volumes that followed. Designed for fifth graders, it incorporated physical geography to describe the abundance of natural resources in various locations on the globe. Then, employing concepts from cultural geography, anthropology, and economics, it demonstrated how these resources are used in the production of goods.

The second book in the series, *Making the Goods We Need*, was written for sixth graders by Hanna and his Stanford colleagues I. James Quillen and Paul B. Sears. Its stated purpose was “To help the youngster of this age see how these things [modern technological advancements] have come to be, how they affect his life and that of his fellows, and how they may be used for human advancement” (Hanna, Quillen, and Sears 1943, 274). The textbook was a departure from Hanna’s earlier ones in that it did not convey information in story form. Instead, it used history as the narrative structure and stressed elements of economic theory where applicable. The conclusion included an admonition that is typical Hanna:

Man has used his hands and brain to invent machines which produce more and more goods. Now he must use his intelligence to invent ways of using the goods produced so that more and more people can get the things they need and want. Man must invent ways of helping people to live at peace with one another so that they will use modern machines, airplanes, for example, to improve life, not to destroy it. Man must invent ways of helping people use their spare time so that they can lead happy lives even though

their work may not be particularly interesting. These are some of the great tasks of the future. They are tasks that mean work for you and other young people who are now in school (ibid., 270).

The third book in the series, *Marketing the Things We Use*, targeted seventh graders. Coauthored with Edward A. Krug, it presented the many facets of distribution and promotion, and also invited students to engage in mild social critique. One of the stated goals of the book was to encourage students to “hold to and act in accordance with democratic values” (Hanna and Krug 1943, 305). Chapter Ten, entitled Rules for Playing the Game, applied those values to business. It described honest and dishonest practices in retailing, producing, transporting, and storing goods. It explained why fair play is important in maintaining a strong economy and gave children tips on how to encourage honesty in business. Of particular interest was a section on advertising practices. Hanna felt that one reason for the attacks on Harold Rugg’s textbooks was the way in which they dealt with advertising in America. According to Hanna, “Rugg wrote a chapter on advertising in which he stated that advertising contributed little or nothing to goods and services and was an unnecessary expense to the consumer” (Hanna 1973a). Hanna, by contrast, merely characterized the excesses of advertising as inconsistent with *democratic values* and *fair play*. This defused much potential criticism that might have been leveled against him.

Student chapters in the three books concluded with exercises and suggestions for extending student learning. The chapter on advertising even recommended that students organize panel discussions on such topics as “the need for more protection for the consumer,” and “how advertising increases our wants” (Hanna and Krug 1943, 294). Likewise, each book concluded with a Chapter for Teachers that described the purposes of the textbook, provided instruction in proper lesson planning, and offered suggestions for

learning activities. One section dealt with the desired behavioral outcomes of instruction. Another listed the generalizations to be found in each text chapter and explained how to make the best use of them. A final section suggested useful visual aids.

THE EXPANDING COMMUNITIES MODEL REFINED

In the years following his initial success with the Hanna Series, Paul Hanna continued to refine his curriculum model. In a 1942 address to the American Association of School Administrators, Hanna walked his audience through a fictional school employing his curriculum design. The first grade classes learned reading and number skills as they focused on the basic human activities carried out in the family, school, and neighborhood. Second grade classes investigated the local community. Hanna explained,

We observe that these second graders are eagerly studying the workers in their community who protect them, provide them with food and clothing, transport people and goods, and the workers who help the community to have a good time. These children see that community life is made possible by a division of work and that only as each worker gives his best effort to carrying out his responsibility can the total community welfare be served (Hanna 1942c, 163).

Hanna's vision of the third and fourth grade classrooms reflected the scope and sequence established in his Scott, Foresman books, but he introduced something new for the upper grades. Instead of focusing on pioneering efforts in various spheres, the fifth and sixth grade children in his fictional school embarked on studies of *larger-than-national communities*. Seventh and eighth graders would study man's creation of social, political, and economic institutions in order to "facilitate their human associations" (ibid., 165). Hanna and Quillen developed a scheme for carrying the curriculum design through high school and even into the first two years of

college. Their three-part textbook series on economic concepts, described above, was the first step in this series for older students, but administrative obstacles at Scott, Foresman kept their plan from reaching fruition (Hanna 1974).

In the 1940s, a revision of the Everyday Life Stories series reflected a refinement of Hanna's curriculum design. Hanna had come to see that technological advances create greater possibilities for communication, as well as for production. As communication increases, it enlarges communities. In a 1946 article for *Educational Leadership*, he outlined a new scope and sequence with a wider purpose. Its overall theme was "Helping children and youth develop understanding and behavior essential to survival and progress in our world community" (Hanna 1946, 30).

As reflected in the Scott, Foresman textbooks, Hanna's design became more tightly focused on the expanding communities pattern. A revised *Peter's Family* (1942) stressed how the basic human activities are played out in the home. *David's Friends at School* (1936) became *Hello, David* (1944), focusing on the school community. *Susan's Neighbors at Work* (1936) was replaced with *Someday Soon* (1948), presenting the concepts that the child's neighbors do helpful work in the community and that the child himself will do so *someday soon*. *Centerville* (1938) became *New Centerville* (1948), and *Without Machinery* (1935) was replaced by *Cross-Country* (1942).

The new books all conveyed information through stories as the earlier editions had, but *Cross-Country* was perhaps the most imaginative of the series. To present concepts of the basic human activities as practiced in a variety of communities throughout the United States, Hanna and his coauthor, geographer Clyde Kohn, followed a fictional family as they traveled by car from Los Angeles to Washington, D.C. This device allowed the introduction of sophisticated geographic information and skills. A floor map on which students could trace the family's progress accompanied the book. Hanna

hoped that this beginning geography text would “arouse the interests and initiate the skills and attitudes which will enable a child to evaluate the geographical significance of what he does, reads, hears, sees, thinks, or otherwise experiences for the rest of his life” (Hanna and Kohn 1950, 153).

The revised books reflected a growing trend toward publishers’ including *teacher aids* in textbooks. Less was left to the teacher’s discretion. Each unit featured *work pages* that included activities for modeling attitudes, concepts, and values. Instruction and ideas on lesson planning were included for teachers, as well as a bibliography: *Books for Teachers and Parents*. Teachers were encouraged to extend lessons with activities, become familiar with their students’ home lives, and incorporate parents in the learning process. Separate teacher’s editions were published to accompany many of the revised books, a feature not found in Hanna’s earlier series.

The version of Hanna’s Scott, Foresman textbooks produced in the 1950s and 1960s, known as the Basic Social Studies Series, part of the larger Curriculum Foundation Series, reflected further refinements in his model as well as new trends in educational publishing. The series clearly mirrored Hanna’s growing interest in international communities of people, with a progression of titles like *At Home* (1956); *At School* (1957); *In the Neighborhood* (1956); *In City, Town, and Country* (1959); *In All Our States* (1956); *In the Americas* (1956); and *Beyond the Americas* (1956). In a new iteration of his design, Hanna conceived of the sequence as a set of concentric circles to represent the expanding communities of people, instead of one axis on a grid. Each widening circle represented a larger community to which children belong. As children matured through the grade levels, they were exposed to these ever-widening communities. Here, at last, was the expanding communities model for which Hanna is best known. Through this model, Hanna finally achieved a design in which he combined both the historical concept

of continuity and change over time and the geographical concept of continuity and change in space with material from the other social sciences to explain to children the evolution and nature of their social world.

The basic human activities continued to define the scope of the content as children made their way through the concentric spheres, but those activities also underwent refinement. They were reduced from ten in number to nine:

1. Protecting and conserving life, health, resources, and property.
2. Producing, distributing, and consuming food, clothing, shelter, and other consumer goods and services.
3. Creating and producing tools and technics.
4. Transporting people and goods.
5. Communicating ideas and feelings.
6. Providing education.
7. Providing recreation.
8. Organizing and governing.
9. Expressing esthetic and spiritual impulses (Hanna 1956a, 36).

Hanna sponsored a series of doctoral dissertations at Stanford University in the 1950s in order to identify generalizations from the social sciences that might be incorporated into this model.

The specific communities of people and the placement of their study in the schools also was more sharply defined in the new series. In kindergarten and first grade, students focused on the home, family, and school. In second grade, they studied the neighborhood, and in third grade, attention turned to the local community. Fourth graders studied the state and regions of states. Fifth grade students studied the nation and the inter-American community. Sixth graders focused on the United States and the Atlantic community, seventh graders studied the United States and the Pacific community, and eighth graders studied United States history. Hanna organized a second phase of doctoral dissertations to determine the proper placement of social science content in each of his concentric spheres, but that research was never completed.

The format of the Scott, Foresman books also was much refined for these 1950s editions. The books reflected an increasing concern

that children be instructed in high-level academic content as opposed to simply by creative methodologies. The texts, particularly for the upper grades, eschewed the storytelling of the earlier editions, and they included more social scientists as coauthors. Hanna expressed his view on the *content versus method* debate in a 1954 issue of the *NEA Journal*. He wrote,

I cannot agree with those who say, ‘we teach children; we do not teach subject matter.’ Children learn *something* and we are definitely concerned that this something be good subject matter. I cannot agree with some who say that *any* content is of equal value with *any other*, or that content generally must be subordinate to process. Both content *and* method—both the stuff of culture and the nature of childhood—are indispensable to a balanced curriculum [emphases his] (Hanna 1954, 273).

Certainly, this attitude of Hanna’s toward content helped attract social scientists to the work of producing social studies textbooks.

The books also reflected a growing trend toward *teacher-proof* curriculum materials. Teacher aids composed two-thirds of the text in some cases. *At Home* began with an essay to teachers entitled “Between Two Worlds.” The essay concerned child development and children’s adjustments to school in the early grades. It contained suggestions for classroom management practices, establishing teacher–student interactions, evaluation, and learning activities. A teacher’s guide entitled Guidebook detailed teaching ideas compiled from teachers throughout the United States, lists of helpful books, and audiovisual materials. The familiar vocabulary lists were appended to the books, along with “thinking abilities, social understandings, behavior traits” to be developed in each section.

A major emphasis in the Basic Social Studies books was citizenship education. Hanna had always been keen on that subject as a purpose of social education, but he had not always been so blatant about it in his texts. The Second World War and postwar tensions in the world were having their effect. Hanna wrote, “We live in a

confused world arena in which poverty, disease, ignorance, fear, and greed combine to enslave peoples under the banners of communism and fascism. We cannot leave to chance the development of democratic understanding and behavior in our young” (Hanna 1954, 274).

Throughout the series, Hanna admonished teachers to make citizenship education a primary goal. For example, in *At Home* he wrote, “Children are not talked into citizenship. They learn it slowly by practicing it and by assuming its obligations and responsibilities as well as its privileges” (Hanna, Hoyt, and Gray 1956, 9). In *At School*, Hanna reminded teachers that “Learning responsible citizenship in the home and school communities is a continuing experience for children” (Hanna and Hoyt 1957, 5). The teacher’s guide in *In City, Town, and Country*, the third grade text, concludes with a section entitled, Your Goal—Responsible Citizenship.

Paul Hanna was a prolific writer, in part due to his tremendous energy. *Time* magazine called him “one of the most rapid-moving parts of the Stanford School of Education machine” (15 November, 1943). Harold Drummond, who served as Hanna’s secretary for a time in the late 1940s, described his writing routine: “During that time I typed everything he wrote (usually the first draft on a Saturday, keeping up with his handwriting a page at a time, so that he could start proofreading and revising as soon as he had finished) . . . we started again Sunday morning—and tried to get finished before we were both exhausted” (Drummond 1997).

Only working at such a rapid pace enabled Hanna to teach, write, and travel extensively. Those activities, in turn, spread his influence while enriching him and his publisher. A consolidated contract dated 1966 paid Hanna royalties for 49 different Scott, Foresman titles. This contract was a statement of both Hanna’s financial success and his great influence over educational content and practice.

Despite its popularity, Hanna’s curriculum design drew oppo-

sition. Some complained that Hanna's interdisciplinary approach to the social sciences minimized the significant contributions and perspectives of the individual social science disciplines. In their book *Teaching Social Studies Skills*, June Chapin and Richard Gross wrote, "the interdisciplinary approach refuted the usefulness of the unique, separate social science structure" (Chapin and Gross 1973, 133). Others objected to the *step-by-step* nature of Hanna's concentric circles design, asserting that it did not allow students to revisit topics. Clements, Fielder, and Tabachnick claimed that "The Expanding Communities design, for example, seems to move in a direct line from the communities composed of family and neighborhood outward to the communities composed of nations. Linear schemes characteristically do not repeat or return to particular topics" (Clements, Fielder, and Tabachnick 1966, 144). Ord added that "this particular approach is too age-grade oriented. For example, the family has value as a focus of study for more than the first years a child is in school" (Ord 1972, 41). Hollis Caswell leveled a critique against Hanna's expanding communities when he wrote that Hanna's design for the Virginia curriculum placed too much emphasis on learning the content of social life, "and too little on the individual appreciative and creative phases" (Caswell 1935, 184). Hanna responded that his design was not intended to eliminate individual interest. He wrote, "curriculum design must *not* be interpreted as an excuse for returning to a traditional curriculum . . . We must be eternally vigilant to foster the unique and creative potential of each personality, for in this diversity of human resources lies the secret power of a democratic community to keep on growing" (Hanna 1954, 274).

Others also thought Hanna's design was too restrictive. Some argued that defining scope in terms of the basic human activities discouraged the use of current issues and problems in the classroom (Ord 1972, 41). Hanna had developed *Building America* to meet this need, but it was not a part of his Scott, Foresman textbooks. Some

complained that there was too much repetition in the themes presented in the early grades (*ibid.*, 42).

Professor Malcolm Douglass, a former Hanna doctoral advisee, and the National Council for History Education criticized Hanna's integrated approach as not academically rigorous enough. Hanna responded by emphasizing that he did not advocate creating a curriculum based solely on child interest. He contended that his design was *not* based on principles that, "1. The curriculum be limited to a child's interest in his immediate community; 2. The central theme or continuing core of the curriculum be a study of the local community; 3. We debunk reading or burn our books, nor depend primarily for our instructional material on community resources; 4. The curriculum be confined to the 'here and now'" (Hanna 1942c, 163).

The impact of such a critique is seen in Hanna's broadening of the course study in the upper grades and in the pains he took to enlist social scientists to ensure that his content reflected current thought in their fields. This was especially true of the last series he worked on for Scott, Foresman—*Investigating Man's World* (1970). The story of that series is told later in this chapter.

Some have claimed that Hanna's analysis of the dilemma of modern man is so deeply philosophical, and his classroom approach to it required such a broad understanding of the social sciences, that effective application of his ideas was beyond most teachers. In his 1935 text, *Curriculum Development*, Hollis Caswell discussed the Virginia Study at length. He sharply criticized the Virginia scope and sequence for holding unrealistic expectations of teachers. "Many teachers, as now trained," he wrote, "do not have adequate background in the content subjects to deal with many aspects of centers of interest included in an outline such as the one in the Virginia course of study" (Caswell 1935, 184). Hanna was concerned about adequate teacher education as well, and that may

account for the steady growth of teacher aid materials and instructional essays included in his series.

Perhaps the most effective critiques of Hanna's work deal with the concentric circles model for curriculum design. The concerns raised by longtime social studies educator Richard Gross typified this point of view. He contended that although it seems logical to introduce information to students within a familiar context such as the home and family, when Hanna first proposed it there was no psychological support for such an approach. He added that in an age of instantaneous electronic communications, Hanna's slow progression through the communities of man was unnecessary. Through exposure to modern communications media, many children have information on foreign lands even before they enter school (Gross 1998). This critique was echoed by Rooze and Foerster, who wrote that "Such a pattern ignored the impact of mass media to which children are exposed and which vastly increased their experiential base" (Rooze and Foerster 1972, 33). Hanna never answered these concerns, but he might have insisted that however flawed the design, at the time of its development it effectively addressed the need for children to be presented with adequate information on the nature of their world so that they could participate as intelligent citizens to improve it.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

By the outbreak of World War II, Paul Hanna had begun to draw on foreign school systems, both to inform his understanding of the American school experience and to export his educational ideas. His experiences working with school systems overseas had important impacts on his curriculum thought from the postwar era until the end of his life. First, his concept of community expanded to incorporate regions of nations, hemispheres, and finally the entire globe. At the same time his concept of citizenship expanded to

include citizenship functions and styles more appropriate to developing nations without a strong democratic tradition. Oddly, as his view of citizenship became more inclusive his political ideology narrowed considerably. From his observations of fascist ideology in World War II and communism in the postwar years, Hanna affirmed his commitment to liberal democratic values. He also gained from these observations a keener understanding of the use of schools to promote social, economic, and political ideologies.

His earliest writing on the subject of education overseas resulted from his travels in Latin America at the behest of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs. In an address to the 1941 annual meeting of the National Education Association, Hanna called on the United States and its educational organizations to help nations in that region improve their educational systems. He also pointed to comparisons between the traditional education in those countries which did not seem to serve their needs for modernization, and the traditional secondary curriculum in the United States, which did not serve the “needs of community or national life” (Hanna 1941b, 125). He called for an entirely new curriculum that would be “directly related to improving the health, sanity, safety, housing, civic beauty, recreation, family relations, and economic income of every American community. Further, we must see that our economy is so organized that each young person has a chance and a challenge to engage in useful work” (ibid.).

The following year, Hanna wrote an article for *School and Society*, a journal edited by William C. Bagley, which sounded themes he repeated throughout the rest of his career. The wartime stance of the Americas helped him to see the necessity of international cooperation and the part education could play in promoting it—not just in terms of providing information, but also in modifying children’s attitudes. He called for “modification of the curriculum of schools in the United States to help our citizens understand the nature of hemispheric cooperation” (Hanna 1942d, 458). He called

attention to the connections between education and economic growth abroad, and security at home: “By assisting the common man to attain a better standard of living, and by assisting the scholars and the political leaders to prepare themselves for their life work we, in the long run, will be contributing immeasurably to our own security and welfare” (ibid., 462). Education abroad, in support of American national security, became a major focus of Hanna’s work in the postwar world.

As much as any educator at the time, Hanna foresaw that the interdependence of the postwar world would be the key to keeping the peace. He proposed new emphases in education to prepare for a new world. In a 1942 article for *Childhood Education*, he warned that achieving the goals of the Atlantic Charter would require “world-wide institutions of government, courts, economic authorities, and education.” He wrote that such world cooperation meant that “we shall never return to many of the ways of life that we have known before” (Hanna 1942e, 3). To prepare for the new world order, Hanna proposed that schools “universally teach more accurate and more inclusive concepts of the unity of our planet” in order to counteract the “anarchistic nationalism” previously taught (ibid., 4). He assigned to schools the unique responsibility of preparing students with both the knowledge and the attitudes to “take the leadership at the peace conferences throughout the century in establishing a world community organization” (ibid., 3).

At the same time, Hanna was increasingly cognizant of the reflexive relationship between schools and society. At the annual meeting of the National Education Association (NEA) in 1942, he warned his audience that

Education will inevitably be shaped by the pattern of the postwar world. If we follow the course of imperialism, we shall educate our youth to their role as citizens of a ruling nation. If an international organization is established, then education will emphasize world citizenship. If we move back to a position of isolation

and the other nations go their competing ways, we had better prepare our children to be ready for the next world war (Hanna 1942f, 77).

Although thoroughly an internationalist, Hanna was not open to education from just any ideological viewpoint. He claimed that “Education is essential for the survival and improvement of democracy—but not *any* education. *Only the education appropriate for free men* will suffice [emphasis his]” (ibid. 76).

In a visionary article written in 1950, Hanna predicted the sources and nature of change in the second half of the twentieth century. He foresaw ever-increasing interdependence among the earth’s peoples—socially, economically, and politically. To allay the fears of Americans about this development, Hanna pointed to the analogy of the historic shift in political loyalties in the United States, from state governments to the national government. This assertion likely was no comfort to some readers, particularly those in the South, where sentiments for states’ rights over federal power remained strong.

During the postwar decade, Hanna’s experiences working with school systems abroad and the attacks he had suffered in the *Building America* controversy pushed him ever further into the role of an educational cold warrior. He expected that “The clash between ideologies is likely to increase in intensity” (Hanna 1950, 11). Hanna was not a cold warrior in the mold of McCarthy and other politicians who saw anticommunism as a means of political gain. He was more in the pattern of Dean Acheson and other diplomats who saw democratic governments as guarantors of a peaceful and prosperous world. For that reason, Hanna called on democratic nations to employ educational tools for the creation of “a democratic one-world government.” He also contended that the United States must remain vigilant at home to protect against the kinds of attacks he had suffered in the *Building America* controversy. He wrote, “It makes more important than ever the necessity of keeping our dem-

ocratic values, our institutions, and our reliance on faith and reason free from totalitarian ends with their reliance on fear and dogma” (ibid.).

Hanna then repeated his familiar prescription for the kind of preparation that all children need from the schools—data and experiences appropriate for international leadership, understandings and skills necessary to mold technology to human needs, and relevant community involvement for all young people. To this formula, though, he added some new elements. He stated more forcefully than ever that “the schools must sharpen their work of developing a clear understanding of and allegiance to our democratic values.” For the first time he indicated a theme that he would revisit at the end of the decade: “Our schools must find a satisfactory solution to the problem of central versus decentralized authority and control” (ibid., 12). Hanna also insisted that education is not the exclusive domain of the professional educator. “It is unrealistic, if not arrogant, to assume that educational leaders alone, or even primarily, possess the *word* which they must give to laymen” (ibid., 13) He called on educational leaders to facilitate the participation of community resources in the schools.

Paul Hanna directed tremendous energy in the 1950s toward working through American and international aid agencies to improve education in developing countries. Early on, his most intensive work was in the Philippines, where he acted as a consultant to various projects for most of the decade. United States agencies funded some of those missions with the intent of using education to stem the tide of communism in the third world, and that thrust influenced Hanna’s writing. In a cold war paean to the efforts of leaders in the Philippines, Hanna asked, “What makes a people so clearheaded about the precious bill of rights guaranteeing personal freedom from dictators? What gives a people the courage to fight the ruthless forces of communism?” (Hanna 1956b, 601). He attributed the stand against communism in part to “President Mag-

saysay who has dramatically crushed communism in his nation with a judicious use of force and by correcting many of the economic and social shortages in which communism breeds.” Ultimately, though, he attributed the democratic spirit in the Philippines to the schools (ibid.).

In the Philippines, as nowhere else, Hanna was able to test his ideal of the community school. Although critics have attributed mixed results to Hanna’s work there, he would have none of it. He claimed that, “of all the activity on behalf of the up-grading of the human resources, none is more exciting or productive than the community-school movement in this new Republic . . . Under modern school leaders the *barrio* school in the Philippines is becoming the center, the learning force in *barrio* health, economic productivity, social organization, and democratic living [emphasis his]” (ibid., 609).

Most important, Hanna asserted, “There is a clear cause-and-effect relationship between the community school success story and the dramatic defeat of communism in the Philippines” (ibid., 610). He wrote that other nations in the region looked to those schools in the Philippines as models for their own countries. Subsequent political events throughout Southeast Asia, as well as in the Philippines itself, cast some doubt on Hanna’s claim that either the people or their leaders had internalized the concept of *democratic living*, as he understood the term.

In another 1956 article, Hanna surveyed the educational situation throughout East Asia. All over the region he observed educational systems that were insufficient to help nations become “strong, democratic states, participating as equals in the modern, fast-moving, technological world” (Hanna and High 1956, 431). In a critique of the educational vestiges of colonialism that Hanna would repeat in later surveys of school systems throughout the world, he found that “Almost invariably, the curriculum is formal, bookish, rigidly copied from foreign models of some years ago, and

unrelated to the environment of the pupils.” He complained that much of what the children learned in school was irrelevant to their lives because the elementary curriculum was usually driven by the secondary curriculum, which was determined by college entrance requirements, even though only a very few students ever went to college. The instructional emphasis was almost always “rote memorization and concert recitation” (ibid.). In one of the few bright spots he found in the region,

Elementary, secondary, and college teachers were instructed to integrate theory with practice in their teaching, to conduct field trips to farms and manufacturing establishments, to deal with actual problems of economic development in their classwork, and to have pupils undertake practical activities such as agricultural projects on the schoolgrounds and part-time work in the mines, in industrial plants, and on farms (Hanna and High 1956, 429).

Unfortunately for the educational cold warrior, these promising schools were in the People’s Republic of China!

Hanna recommended that the leaders and their people in the region “think through the things they desire from their education program, and work out a curriculum which will achieve their objectives . . . Such a curriculum should be drawn from indigenous roots, and should serve to perpetuate those aspects of the cultural heritage which the people wish to pass on to their children” (ibid., 431). Inevitably, he advocated the community school model as it was practiced in the Philippines.

In a nod to the dominance of western ways of thought and practice in the process of industrial modernization, he also suggested that the school should “introduce to the rising generation the fundamentals of science, modern practices of health, sanitation, and agriculture, an understanding of the developing economy and technology, and an ability to cope with change. It should emphasize the democratic processes, and should create an awareness of the

wider national and world communities” (Hanna and High 1956, 431).

No written work of Hanna’s illustrates more pointedly than this one the difficulty his friends and critics alike have had in categorizing his political ideology. On one hand, he developed strong anti-communist sentiments through his experiences overseas. On the other hand, he forcefully criticized western colonialism and consistently favored collectivist solutions to social and educational dilemmas. He moved in the power circles of big business, but he favored small, local community schools as the locus of economic development. Perhaps, in matters of education for economic development overseas, Hanna must be classified as a Jeffersonian democrat. He was certainly not the first Brahmin to claim populist sentiments.

In the 1950s, Hanna seemed to ignore the wrenching difficulties in developing countries when “indigenous roots” and “the cultural heritage which the people wish to pass on to their children” came into conflict with the dominant western patterns of thought and practice in technology, science, economics, and government. He did not comment on the potential for tension between modern and traditional worldviews.

Years later, Hanna seemed to recognize the dilemma that conflicting worldviews posed for the creation of the world community he so vigorously promoted. In a 1973 editorial, he pointed out that modern technology has made it possible for disputes that would have remained local or regional in the past to become international and worldwide today. He warned that “The problem of conflicting values WILL be solved eventually in one way or another [emphasis his]” (Hanna 1973b, 1). Describing several possible solutions, he suggested that global warfare could continue to decimate mankind, or that a single power could rise to impose its “particular and narrow ethnocentric value system on the entire human family” (ibid.).

Hanna dismissed both of those solutions as unacceptable. As alternatives, he proposed two “promising, although admittedly idealistic” approaches.

In his first proposal, some international group of scholars, working presumably through the United Nations, would identify “through research the core values that are found universally in all viable cultures.” Then, the nations of the world would “use every teaching and learning technique to inculcate humans with these identified universal values” (ibid.). These nations would,

having achieved a global community in which a majority understands and is committed to a set of eternal verities, give encouragement to the preservation and creation of pluralistic sub-values that make up the unique life styles of each different group. Within an essentially harmonious global community, living by the standards of commonly held first-level values, tolerance for and even an appreciation of diversity within second-level values could follow (Hanna 1973b, 1).

Implicit in Hanna’s proposal was his belief that all value systems are merely cultural tools. He naively assumed that most people on earth share this modern, western view, but even a cursory look at traditional cultures shows that few believe that “eternal verities” are arrived at by either scientific research or democratic consensus. Few take their belief systems so lightly that they would be willing to modify or reject them by majority rule.

Hanna’s second, more modest, proposal was more plausible. A panel of scholars could identify, through research, “those commonly held values that make possible in our time significant multinational communities of men.” The findings could then be used to suggest ways to encourage more multinational combinations. He concluded with a warning that “one global approach or another must be tried before history records ‘too little and too late’” (ibid.).

THE LAST SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

Hanna’s work in international education and social science education came together most forcefully in his last Scott, Foresman textbook series, known as *Investigating Man’s World*. This series

was not merely a revision of his past textbooks. It grew out of research that Hanna supervised at Stanford in the 1950s to search for social science generalizations useful in improving the social studies curriculum. Still, it incorporated some features of the earlier books.

The search for social science generalizations was not new. In the 1920s, Neil Billings—in conjunction with Harold Rugg’s social studies pamphlets—identified 888 generalizations, categorized in seventy-nine divisions, that were useful for social education (Smith, Stanley, and Shores 1957, 259–260). Billings developed his list by surveying the writings of *frontier thinkers* in the social sciences. Rugg used some of these generalizations as overarching themes in his social studies textbooks, including concepts (similar to Hanna’s) such as technological progress forcing ever-greater human interdependence.

Hanna revived Billings’ technique in 1954 when he employed Malcolm Douglass, a graduate student at Stanford, to do a similar survey for *World Book Encyclopedia*, for which Hanna served as social science editor. Douglass and his wife, Enid, surveyed the writings of leading contemporary authorities in the social sciences. They identified 550 major topics and 5500 subtopics, which they painstakingly referenced and cross-referenced on 3×5 index cards (Douglass 1998b). Hanna used their findings to survey *World Book Encyclopedia* for the currency of its articles on social science subjects (Hanna 1974).

This work led to Douglass’s dissertation, a description of generalizations from geography that could be used in social studies curriculum development. Hanna was excited by the commercial possibilities: “He sensed this was something that would be very useful to him” (Douglass 1998b). In Douglass’s opinion, his work accomplished two things for Hanna. First, it provided a means to unite the expanding communities model with the effort to define and use social science generalizations in the school curriculum.

Second, by doing so, it provided a basis in academic research for the expanding communities model Hanna had used in his textbooks for so long. In a 1957 article, Hanna cited Douglass's work on the identification and use of social science generalizations as "the most comprehensive and scholarly report based on the assumption that the educator must draw on specialists in selecting curriculum content" (Hanna 1957a, 43).

Hanna used Douglass's work as a model in other ways, as well. He pondered the value of such research in a 1952 article entitled, "Needed Research on Textbooks." In it, he cited some generalizations Douglass had identified from geography. He suggested that children be encouraged to observe those generalizations in their immediate environment and then extend that knowledge to other places and other times. He concluded by claiming that "The same research approach might be made to any subject matter" (Hanna 1952b, 299).

Hanna also planned two series of dissertations to be completed by Stanford graduate students. The first employed Douglass's research design to identify generalizations along the lines of Hanna's basic human activities in various social science fields. Hanna and Richard Gross coordinated the completion of ten dissertations in this series. Nine of them corresponded to Hanna's basic human activities, and one focused on the creation of "tools, technics, and social arrangements" (Stanford University n.d.). The second series, which was never completed, was intended to place these generalizations in the appropriate spheres of Hanna's expanding communities model. Although these dissertations did not draw directly from Douglass's dissertation, much of Douglass's work was later incorporated into a 1966 textbook for teachers (Hanna et al. 1966). His dissertation is cited no fewer than six times in that book.

Although Hanna's plans for two separate series of dissertations was never fully realized, the work in social science generalizations was incorporated into his final textbook series, *Investigating Man's*

World. Work began on the series in 1966 and it was introduced in 1970. Although it retained some of the features of Hanna's expanding communities model, it was a radical departure from his earlier Scott, Foresman textbooks.

The most significant difference between Hanna's earlier social studies textbooks and *Investigating Man's World* was that each unit in the new textbooks was keyed to the formal divisions of the social sciences. Although first graders still studied family life in units such as Earth, Wants, and Rules, a promotional brochure for *Investigating Man's World* assured textbook buyers that those titles referred to "physical geography," "economics," and "political science," respectively (Scott, Foresman 1969, 10). In editions for the upper grades, the units were named for the social science subject areas directly. Fourth graders, for example, studied the state and region through units such as Anthropology, Sociology, and History. The brochure explained that the series "departs from the traditional pattern of combining a smattering of many disciplines in one unit. Instead, each unit leads the children to investigate one discipline at a time" (ibid., 2). In less than fifty years, the curriculum innovation of integrated social science instruction, which Hanna advocated so strongly, had become the "traditional pattern" in elementary social studies curriculum.

Another difference between *Investigating Man's World* and Hanna's earlier textbooks was the degree to which Hanna's sense of internationalism suffused the new books. Examples in all the books were drawn from foreign countries. First graders studied family life in Mexico, second graders studied a local community in France, and third graders compared cities in Africa and Japan. Throughout the text, the role of national boundaries was minimized.

With *Investigating Man's World*, Hanna continued the trend of employing experts in social science fields for the production of textbooks. Each volume listed an impressive array of social scientists

as consultants. Consequently, the trend toward simple, expository prose to replace the imaginative stories of his earlier books continued as well. Each book also included a large number of in-text activities, continuing the trend of less reliance on the creativity of the classroom teacher.

The contract for these books, signed on the eve of Hanna's retirement from Stanford, reflected his declining influence, even with his primary publisher. It referred to Hanna merely as "Consultant," and assigned him no proprietary interest in the program. A note in Hanna's hand next to one such reference read, "NO!" In an agitated notation at the bottom and on the back of the page, Hanna wrote,

Not for a moment would I be legal and insist that S.F.C. [Scott, Foresman and Company] (1) live up to the 1946 contract which specifically states that this program shall be known as the HANNA SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAM, or (2) call the 1970 edition the Hanna Program. What I am asking is that any agreement I sign make absolutely clear that Hanna has a property in the design of this 1970 program which is of value and must be protected by Hanna as his property. I am *not* a consultant to be employed or dismissed at will by Publisher [emphases his] (Scott, Foresman 1966).

Instead, Hanna proposed that he be termed "Author or Chief Program Designer or some term that adequately recognizes HANNA as 'owner' of the design of the program [emphases his]." In the final version of the contract, Hanna was referred to simply as *Hanna*. He took on *supervisory duties* for a royalty of one and one-half percent of sales (*ibid.*).

A COMMON CURRICULUM TO BUILD COMMUNITY

As Hanna's textbook writing career progressed, his books included increasing amounts of instructions and aids for teachers, as well as

in-text exercises, making the classroom teacher's unique viewpoint on the subject matter increasingly irrelevant. That content reflected the rising trend toward *teacher-proof* curriculum materials, but it also reflected Hanna's own growing concern that American children should be taught a common curriculum. As early as 1946, he called for large-scale curriculum planning to provide "learning experiences adequate to develop understanding of and loyalty to the larger community" (Hanna 1946, 29). He felt that a task "of so great importance calls for an overall framework which will be the product of the combined judgment of the leaders in our culture" (ibid., 29–30). In a 1958 article published in *The Nation's Schools*, Hanna declared that "During the last 25 years we have witnessed a splintering of the curriculum in American public schools as each school district has insisted on curricular independence" (Hanna 1958a, 43). As a result, he warned, "There is no truly American curricular design of significant content and suitable learning experiences on which the nation can rely for creating the universal understanding of and loyalty to the values, laws and institutions essential to perpetuate and improve the way of life of a free society" (ibid.). A solution, Hanna claimed, would be the creation of a national curriculum center.

In his conception, the center would develop in several stages. First, a conference would be held to determine if his proposal had merit, whether a workable process could be created by which to proceed, and who would be likely candidates for participation in the second phase of the project. The second phase would see a team of thirty fellows produce a series of papers addressing various aspects of the national curriculum problem. Fifteen of these fellows would be chosen for their expertise in major subject matter fields, ten would be specialists in curriculum theory, and five would be laymen. Their papers would be published widely and would invite responses from the education community. The third step would be the appointment of a new commission of thirty, with some overlap

from the first group, to consider the education community's responses to the first set of papers and further refine the national curriculum idea. Hanna predicted that these three phases would take two years to accomplish, and he hoped that they would lay the foundation for "a permanent, nonfederal National Curriculum Center or several such Centers whose goal would be the continuous examination of the exploding frontiers of human thought and achievement and to identify generalizations that must be incorporated into the national curriculum design" (ibid., 44).

Hanna's proposal generated considerable comment. The editors of *The Nation's Schools*, for example, agreed with Hanna that such a concerted curriculum effort was needed, but raised questions as to who would select the commission fellows, the sources of funding, and the extent to which professional jealousies might hinder the work. They invited readers to comment on the proposal and published many of the comments in subsequent issues.

Many readers expressed support. Several felt that the plan was a worthy counterattack against some of the educational conservatives of the time. One supporter thought Hanna's idea was "more in harmony with our democratic tradition than any I have seen" (Ragan 1958).

Most respondents who opposed Hanna's idea expressed concern about the centralization of curriculum control. W. W. Charters questioned the appropriateness of placing power to define the purpose of public education in the hands of a few experts (Hanna 1987, 38). David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois, warned that citizenship education is a local task beyond the scope of simple subject matter content decisions. Political scientist V. O. Key Jr. feared that the Center would become a vehicle for political indoctrination. He preferred that resources be poured into improving the subject matter knowledge of teachers. C. C. Trillingham, superintendent of the Los Angeles public schools, expressed concern that teachers were not included in the planning process. He reminded

readers that regardless of what experts say or do, change in the schools does not happen without enlisting teachers in the effort (*ibid.*).

Perhaps the most stinging criticism came from Hanna's old friend and colleague, Hollis Caswell. Then president of Teachers College, Caswell made an annual report to the school's trustees. In his report for 1961, Caswell critiqued Hanna's proposal on several points. First, he claimed that the arguments that a unified curriculum was necessary because the current one was splintered, or because of the increased mobility of Americans, were not new. Harold Rugg and William C. Bagley had made similar observations in the past. Next, he pointed to the centralized control of schools as a tool of fascism: "We had seen in both of these countries [Germany and Japan] how the national governments used the schools as a direct means of serving their inhuman, tyrannous ends" (Caswell 1961). Caswell asserted that local control of the curriculum was one of the nation's "great democratic strengths" (*ibid.*). He argued that local education leaders have a better sense of what children should know to become citizens of the community. Caswell went on to warn that by consolidating curriculum decision making, a national commission would restrict innovation and experimentation; that a single national commission would be more subject to "capture" by special interest groups; and that a national commission would contribute to the general trend toward centralization and homogenization in American society. He thought that centralized curriculum planning should be opposed on principle. As an alternative, Caswell proposed the creation of a system of curriculum development laboratories at universities around the country, along with increased attention to sound curriculum development and instructional supervision in the school districts, and the establishment of national standards for teacher preparation.

Hanna's proposal surprised some who thought they knew him.

His long career had given both progressives and conservatives cause to claim him as their own. His promotion of the centralization of curriculum development was incongruous with the vision either group held of him, but attempts to fix Hanna too firmly in a doctrinaire political position have often failed.

None who had read him closely throughout his career should have been surprised at his proposal. His experiences and observations during the war years developed in him a deep distrust for centralized power, but he held an even deeper conviction that democratic control of social institutions required concerted effort based on the commonalities among people. In an echo of his analysis of the modern dilemma from early in his career, Hanna argued in a 1960 article on the national curriculum commission that

Our social, economic, and political endeavors have lagged so far behind the material and physical achievements of our society that we are in a serious state of cultural imbalance. A necessary step toward recreating a dynamic balance for our nation lies in improvement of the school curriculum. For this reason, the creation of a nongovernmental national commission for curriculum research and development is proposed for nationwide discussion (Hanna 1960, 25).

In addition, his thirty years in curriculum development had seen trends change and fads come and go. Hanna felt that decentralized curriculum planning was too random and unstable to produce a curriculum that would serve national goals in any coherent way, and he had always appreciated orderliness and sound planning.

Hanna sought to implement the first phase of his proposal by organizing a conference to discuss the idea. Held January 24–27, 1959, the Conference on Policies and Strategy for Strengthening the Curriculum of the American Public School was attended by a small, elite group of educational leaders. Hanna and Ralph Tyler

cochaired the event, and I. James Quillen, James B. Conant, and William Carr were among the participants (*Conference on Policies and Strategy for Strengthening the Curriculum of the American Public School* 1959). Although the conference did not lead to implementation of step two, the appointment of a curriculum commission, it did cause Hanna to modify his idea. In subsequent articles on the topic in the *NEA Journal* (1963), *Phi Delta Kappan* (1961a), and elsewhere, Hanna continually stressed the nongovernmental nature of his commission and the voluntary nature of schools' compliance with its findings.

In the end, Hanna's proposal went nowhere. That failure was due, in part, to his underestimation of the fierce independence of local and state school boards and of the strong allegiance Americans have to the concept of local control. Even more significantly, Hanna may have minimized the extent to which the United States already had a national curriculum. In a letter responding to Hanna's proposal, Thomas B. Livingston of Texas Technological College, now Texas Tech University, wrote, "I have a feeling that our publishing companies, through their textbooks and other media, probably contribute a great deal of commonality to the nation's school curricula" (Livingston 1958). To support his assertion, Livingston related this anecdote: "Once, while visiting a number of schools very rapidly in rather widely scattered school systems, I found certain of the primary grades doing identical things on identical dates. After some searching, I located the cause, the Scott, Foresman calendar, distributed to primary teachers, which contained little daily suggestions to the teacher!" (ibid.).

Hanna's proposal may have failed because it was redundant with what was already being accomplished through the publishers of curriculum materials. In fact, although he never articulated it, Hanna's idea may have resulted from his recognition of the dominance of textbook publishers in the curriculum-making process. He likely thought that a national curriculum from a commission staffed

by scholars, whatever its flaws, was preferable to the trend-following, market-driven curriculum that issued from the textbook publishing industry. If he thought so, Hanna was acting somewhat disingenuously. He had grown rich and influential largely because of the role he played in establishing the publisher's role in curriculum formation. Or perhaps his unique vantage point helped him to see the pitfalls of allowing commercial forces too great a hand in school curriculum. In either case, Hanna thought that of all his contributions to education, the concept of a national curriculum commission was of such importance that he recounted his arguments and those of some of his critics in the last publication of his life, a compilation entitled *Assuring Quality for the Social Studies in Our Schools* (1987).

HANNA AND MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

Long before he wrote about the national purposes of education or published his analyses of the role schools could play in the social, economic, and political development of nations, Hanna wrote about mathematics education. His 1929 doctoral dissertation was a study of students' arithmetic problem-solving processes. As any enterprising graduate student might, he turned his findings into two solid articles, published in 1930 and 1931. More significantly, his findings reflected his educational thought even at the earliest stages of his career. Hanna found that students gained the most on post tests when they were allowed the freedom to choose their own strategies and when they were taught the underlying patterns of interrelationships—or generalizations—among numbers, rather than when they were simply asked to memorize formulas and taught to use them in narrow applications. Those findings were consonant with Hanna's belief that the newer, more progressive methods of education were superior to the traditional approaches then employed in the schools.

In later years, he used his dissertation research as a basis for advocating one of his more familiar themes. In an article written in 1935 and reprinted in 1958, Hanna showed how mathematics can be taught within the context of an activities program. He argued that learning difficulties arise in mathematics because skills are taught in isolation from real world applications. Hanna asserted that “Normal children find no particular *learning difficulty* in improving their roller-skating, or in mastering the rules and plays of a game of checkers, or in reading and following directions for assembling the parts of a model airplane” (Hanna and others 1935, 86). Likewise, mathematics should be taught in the context of activities and curriculum elements in which it is used. The authors went on to list a number of possibilities for such integration in the third and sixth grade curricula.

SPELLING INSTRUCTION

Another curriculum interest of Hanna’s was spelling instruction. In a series of Houghton Mifflin textbooks cowritten with his wife, Jean, in the 1950s and 1960s, Hanna adapted his conception of generalizations as teaching tools from the social studies to language arts. He had first established himself as a textbook author in 1932, when he and Jesse Newlon, his mentor from the Lincoln School and Teachers College, collaborated on a spelling book for Houghton Mifflin (Newlon and Hanna 1933). The two authors split a five percent royalty on all sales at wholesale prices. According to one of Hanna’s Stanford students, the later spellers were Jean’s brainchild (Douglass 1998b).

The Hannas’ Houghton Mifflin spellers were intended to span grades one through eight. The first, *Building Spelling Power*, was contracted in 1955. It was followed by *First Steps, A Speller for Beginners* (1963), *Power to Spell* (1966), and *Words in Your Language* (1967). Accompanying these were many practice books, and

an instructor's text entitled *The Foundations of Spelling and Its Teaching* (1967). The basis for the Hannas' instructional approach was a study that identified the 3000 words most commonly used by young children and determined that, for the most part, these words followed predictable spelling rules, or generalizations.

Hanna claimed that he led the study, although it was first described in a doctoral dissertation by James T. Moore Jr. (Moore 1951). Hanna and Moore coauthored an article in which they advocated a commonsense instructional approach that emphasized the generalizations and only slowly introduced exceptions (Hanna and Moore 1953). Why Moore did not work on the spelling textbooks along with the Hannas is unclear, but the incident may have fueled the rumors among some of Hanna's students that he profited personally from their work.

Predictably, Hanna drew a contrast between his approach and the traditional methods of teaching spelling, which were based on memorization and repetition of more or less arbitrary lists of words. He asserted that "The only reason for learning to spell is the necessity for correctly transmitting our ideas on paper," so spelling rules and words should be taught as the children need them in their writing (ibid., 18) Hanna and Moore also suggested that spelling be taught across the curriculum, not solely in conjunction with reading, as was often done, because the process of symbolic decoding used in reading was the reverse of that used in writing. In reading, children move from symbol recognition, through the medium of speech, to meaning. In spelling, the sequence moves in the opposite direction—from meaning to speech to symbols.

Paul and Jean Hanna coauthored a series of articles that blended description of their spelling program with promotion of their books. In one, the Hannas decried the lack of application of neurology, endocrinology, physiology, cybernetics, and computer science to the pedagogy of spelling. They pointed out that "The complex neurological behavior of the spelling act is not understood

at the moment,” but described it as “essentially a matter of neurological *input, imagery, and output* [emphases theirs]” (Hanna and Hanna 1959, 50). They proposed a “systematic program of developing oral-aural, visual, and haptical imagery . . . the one new, powerful spelling tool of *phonemic* analysis . . . [and] the current theories and practices of forming and using generalizations about the structure of the spelling of our language [emphasis theirs]” (ibid., 51).

In practice, their program would have teachers begin the school week with a presentation of new spelling words in context, along with a generalizable spelling rule, the “major phonemic principle illustrated by the word list” (ibid., 52). Any exceptions to the rule were pointed out and the students were given practice writing the words. On day two, students were quizzed over the words. Day three was dedicated to further study of the words missed on the previous day’s quiz, more practice on the phonemic principle, and a review of words from past lists. On day four, students were led in an oral-aural analysis of the word list and application of the spelling rule using new words not on the list. They formed derivatives of words on the list and created an individualized vocabulary list from their reading and writing. The last day of the school week culminated in a spelling test using words from the current list, past lists, and the students’ individual lists. Teachers still use many of these suggested practices in the classroom today.

THE WORLD BOOK ENCYCLOPEDIA

Throughout most of his career, Paul Hanna served as an editor for *World Book Encyclopedia*. On the heels of their collaboration in the Virginia Curriculum Study, Hollis Caswell brought his friends and colleagues Hanna and J. Paul Leonard onto a board of consultants he had organized to advise *World Book*. In Hanna’s recollection, “I was his first appointment and chief buddy” (Hanna 1974). During

their tenure, the encyclopedia grew from seven volumes to twenty-two. Hanna's contributions included encouraging a truly international view of the topics covered. In a 1961 letter to Bailey K. Howard, president of *World Book's* parent company, Hanna suggested, "The emerging world community needs a totally new world encyclopedia which is written not from a nationalistic point of view . . . but treats all cultures and civilizations with equal space, simpatico, etc." (Hanna 1961b). Hanna also used his international travels to gain information of use to *World Book*. In 1962, he apparently gathered information during a conference in Italy, and Bailey K. Howard wrote to thank him in advance for "finding out as much as you possibly can from the gentlemen assembled about the need in their educational systems for an internationalized version of *World Book*" (Howard 1962). Hanna replied, "I will certainly keep my ears and eyes open to glean whatever information and advice I can" (Hanna 1962b).

Hanna also published his definitive concept of community in *World Book*. His article on the subject "has been referred to over and over by scholars as a framework for organizing one's observations or one's thoughts about the world" (Hanna 1974).

A *World Book* editorial board meeting was the site of a tragic rift in one of Hanna's oldest and dearest friendships. The seeds of the rift were sown when Hanna's consulting contract with *World Book* was renewed for a period that ran beyond Caswell's retirement from the board. Caswell responded by arranging for *World Book* to dismiss Hanna at the same time Caswell retired. Hanna later claimed that "Caswell became jealous of the amount of attention which *World Book* was giving me" (Hanna 1974).

The final conflict arose over an invitation to a meeting. Certain officials in the Field Enterprises Corporation, which published *World Book*, planned to supplement the work of their board of consultants with a board of international consultants. Donald McKellar, a Field Enterprises executive, wanted members of the

domestic board to meet with their international counterparts to explain how the board worked. To that end, while the consultants were meeting in Chicago in June of 1964, Caswell invited the domestic board members to attend a meeting of the international board—excluding Hanna. As a result of missing this meeting Hanna missed an opportunity to serve on the international board as the American representative. Caswell later told Hanna that McKellar had rescinded the invitation. Hanna relayed this to Donald Ludgin, the editorial coordinator for *World Book*, and Ludgin told McKellar. McKellar was incensed, and he confronted Caswell in what Hanna termed “as tense and unpleasantly dramatic [a situation] as any I can recall, ever” (Hanna 1964b).

In a letter to McKellar, Caswell attributed the entire situation to a misunderstanding on either Hanna’s or Ludgin’s part. He repeated the theme in a conciliatory letter to Hanna, in which he wrote, “In so far as I am concerned I am not going to let the unfortunate incidents in Chicago this week affect our long friendship. I hope you feel the same way . . . It is just one of those unfortunate and unhappy incidents in life which comes along from time to time, either by accident as in this case, or upon occasion by design” (Caswell 1964).

However, the damage was done. Hanna was convinced that Caswell had lied to the advisory board. Ludgin concurred in Hanna’s interpretation, writing that “As time goes on, I become more and more convinced that the problem arose with Cas . . . I feel certain that he decided for some reason not to have Americans present [at the meeting of the international consultants] on Wednesday” (Ludgin 1964).

The preceding account is admittedly only one side of the story. Hanna reluctantly told this story to Martin Gill in 1974, while the hard feelings were still fresh. He regretted that the two friends were estranged, lamenting that “Caswells and Hannas now exchange

Christmas cards only” (Hanna 1974). In later years, the two men were reconciled (A. Hanna 1999).

CONCLUSION

In Hanna’s long writing career he reflected the views of at least three distinct lines of thought in the development of social studies education: social meliorism, social reconstruction, and mandarinism. His upbringing, suffused with the best impulses of the Social Gospel movement, along with his training in philosophy, determined that his earliest writing would be social critique along the lines of the social meliorists. In the Depression years, under the influence of mentors such as Harold Rugg, Jesse Newlon, and William Heard Kilpatrick at Teachers College, Hanna’s social critique focused on economic dislocation and its remedies. This placed him in the camp of the social reconstructionists. He continued to write in that vein, often critical of traditional educational methodologies, for many years. World War II marked a change in Hanna’s thought. The devastation that fascism had wrought on the world caused Hanna to be more circumspect in his discussions of education as a tool for social change. He continued to advocate employing the schools in efforts to improve society, but he was much more insistent that change must come about only within the context of liberal democratic values. In the last phase of his writing career, he seemed more at home among the mandarins—those scholars in the subject areas who advocated substantive instruction in the discrete disciplines to form a knowledge base for democratic action.

Throughout these permutations, however, he consistently advocated a social education for children adequate to their roles as citizens. Early in his career, he was more insistent that the schools be vehicles of social change than he was later. In fact, his national curriculum commission would have removed a great deal of flexi-

bility in curriculum making from classroom teachers and placed it in the hands of *experts*, arguably an undemocratic process.

Hanna's grand plan for social education was embodied in his Scott, Foresman social studies textbooks. His *expanding communities* design articulated through these books became the "major organizing idea for the elementary social studies curriculum" in the United States and abroad (LeRiche 1987, 139). The recognition he gained from his textbook production provided him opportunities to promote other ideas, such as his national curriculum commission and his views on education for international development. Hanna preferred to write about the large ideas rather than the more technical aspects of curriculum. For instance, rather than discuss research on how children learn values, Hanna proposed a means to determine what values are universal across cultural lines. His focus was usually on social studies education's role in shaping society.

The wealth that accompanied Hanna's textbook production allowed him to continue to add to the Hanna-Honeycomb House and contribute to causes he deemed worthy. It also alerted him to the financial possibilities in textbook writing. When an opportunity to expand from social studies textbooks to spellers presented itself in the 1950s, he did not hesitate. Despite the fact that his only work in spelling instruction had been twenty years before, and that his expertise lay in other fields, Hanna saw a potentially profitable approach and exploited it. Throughout his career, that type of entrepreneurship raised questions among his colleagues and students (Douglass 1998b), but writing was not the only way in which Hanna indulged his entrepreneurial side. He was instrumental in the formation of several professional organizations in education, and he was influential in many others. Networking with colleagues around the world allowed Hanna to spread his ideas even further.