



2021 SPECIAL ISSUE: DISRUPTING CURRICULUM HEGEMONY THROUGH COUNTERSTORIES

Guest Edited by: Lakia M. Scott, Sarah Straub, & Gwendolyn Webb

Recommended Citation: Norton, G. (August, 2021). Verbing history: Disrupting curriculum hegemony. *Journal for Social Studies & History Education*, 5 (1), 1-25.

Verbing History: Disrupting Curriculum Hegemony

Ginney Norton

Abstract: As a category of historical analysis, gender is used in this paper to analyze curricular motifs that operationalize in decisions surrounding social studies standards and curriculum. In the political milieu of World War II (1939-1945), disruptions are modeled in traditional tropes to understand how the social studies curriculum has become a space for the simultaneous deliberation of both national identity and gender politics. This paper suggests that the social studies curriculum normalizes and reifies gendered, racial, and queer citizenship in relationship to white, masculine, and heteronormative citizenship. Analyzing specific World War II vernacular such as nationalism, American exceptionalism, and citizenship via domestic containment, this paper offers suggestions and implications for history education and policy reform.

Well known for her stunt flying and landmark aviation from New York to Los Angeles in 1930, Laura Ingalls was arrested in September 1939 for dropping anti-war leaflets over the Capitol from her plane. A

member of the Mother's Movement, she did so to pressure Congress to block President Roosevelt's proposal selling arms to support the Allied Powers in their efforts against Hitler. While Ingalls joined Charles Lindbergh as a proponent for the America First Committee, an isolationist group in the U.S. Before World War II, she went so far as to partner with Germany's fascist government to spread pro-Nazi messages throughout the United States. Ingalls was just one member of many from the Mothers' Movement, named after its companion groups: the National Legion of Mothers of America, the Mothers of Sons Forum, and the National Blue Star Mothers. The themes of the movement were hatred of Jews, Communists, the British, Black folks, and the Roosevelts (Yellin, 2004).

The contributions of the Mother's Movement helped to give rise to women's political activism through citizenship. Motherhood has historically been a feature of female citizenship because it was considered the mother's duty to instill patriotism in her children. The Mother's Movement was significant not only

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

because of the volume of women involved but because of the ability of these white women to assemble publicly and mobilize other women (Jeansonne, 1999). The Mother's Movement also acts as a contradiction to destabilize normalized representations because it was a women's movement without feminism and an anti-war movement that was not peaceful (Jeansonne, 1999).

The Mother's Movement helps illustrate the rhetorical and historical use of curriculum to influence the displacement of women and gay men as agents in history and history education, particularly as the standardization movement has become the predominant marker of what constitutes knowledge in public schooling experiences. As Pinar (2012) contends, "it is the symbolic character of curriculum that renders debates over the canon struggles over the American identity itself" (p. 188). Gender is used as a theoretical construct in this paper to examine the structural and ideological elements within narratives representing women and gay men – the arguments, figures, and tropes – that infused and pervaded the political milieu of the 1940s.

Therefore, this paper becomes a praxis from the theory of gender to the practice of using gender as an intervention to disrupt curricular patterns of master narratives. The purpose is to understand how constitutive rhetoric creates narratives that expose American identity as unique. The author also makes recommendations for operationalizing such narratives in history education (Charland, 1987). Curriculum itself is a form of power because the historically limited access to schooling for many Americans has produced intellectual and social inequality. Simultaneously, the production of formalized curriculum

circulates hidden assumptions about gender, race, and class entrenched in institutional inequality. In order to trace the influence of gender on historical agents, specifically women and gay men, this paper explore the following questions: *What are the rhetorical and historical exigencies that displace women and gay men as agents in history? What has to happen for critical conversations to take place surrounding hegemonic reproduction?*

HEGEMONIC REPRODUCTION IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Hegemonic reproduction relies on inaction in order to perpetuate power relations (Lemert, 2004). Conservative agendas and particular education policies limit diverse curricular engagement, evidenced by the Texas State Board of Education's standards and textbook debates (Isensee, 2014), Oklahoma's decision regarding A.P. courses (Macneal, 2015), and Arizona's abstinence stickers for education (Shraber 2015). North Carolina's assertion of what ought to be taught in social studies in 2019 (Schwartz, 2020), West Virginia's controversial social studies curricular changes (Gallahan, 2020), and Missouri's debates surrounding race and privilege in history curriculum (2021) also marked a milieu where conservative activists have been able to reframe the movement for traditional social studies in the face of the opportunity to reconsider the role of citizenship and gender in social studies education.

State legislators, school officials, and conservative political interest groups have turned to rhetorical and political strategies to articulate how a lack of American Biblicalism and exceptionalism are ruining citizenship and patriotism (Kock & Villadson, 2012; Smith, 2006). These officials have made a case for expanding state and federal control

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

in dictating what is taught in the U.S. history classrooms. Education has been shifted from No Child Left Behind (2004) to race to the Top (2009) at the federal level and then again since Trump's election in 2016 (Anderson, 2007; Schwartz, 2020). This also can be seen with the various template legislation battles at the state level regarding history curriculum and public school funding (Messenger, 2021). As a result, history curriculum and history textbooks are being regenerated to reflect a nostalgic representation of a romanticized past. Textbooks act as a fundamental resource for teaching American history so much so that the textbook often shifts from being a material resource to becoming a curriculum for many teachers. One major drawback to national history textbooks is that it is known for its insular approach to history (Lindaman & Ward, 2004). This insular approach mirrors curricular revisions instigated by state legislatures that conflate identities and experiences across space and time. Trenchant debates since 2012 on social media and in academic journals take to task the curricular changes made by conservative Republicans that "help to reproduce raced, classed, and gendered realities, which in turn are shaped within a confluence of spaces, including schools, homes, community centers, and popular media" (Brown & Au, 2014, p. 377). These revisions communicate a lack of value for difference and demonstrate the permeation of hegemonic representations.

DISRUPTIVE PEDAGOGY: CURRICULAR INTERVENTIONS

Disruptive pedagogy is about making strategic decisions to poke holes or reframe dominant and hegemonic narratives. Such decisions serve to make visible the socializing of gender to disrupt hegemonic cultural norms (Ladson-Billings, 1995; San Pedro, 2018). These

decisions can be related to access to power or resources, containment, rhetorical silencing, or narrative gaslighting. Thoughtful decisions bring awareness so that attention can shift to `l i s t e n i n g a n d a g e n c y .`

One purpose of disruptive pedagogy is to provide a practice-readiness approach for experiences in the real world. It operationalizes gender, in this instance, as a pedagogical practice to disrupt normalizing discourse to provide the space for "a language of possibility" (Giroux, 1992, p. 204). The disruption of normalizing discourses questions the legitimacy of school processes that produce and reproduce oppressive power relations. Mills (1994) claims that counter-narratives delegitimize curriculum hegemony by illustrating how containment surrounding categories of difference can shift over time to evolve historical understanding instead of set in stone instead as something in an iterative `p r o c e s s o f b e c o m i n g .`

Popular histories act as an intervention to disrupt such normalizing discourses. While historians and history educators focus on academic scholarship, the general public largely relies on obtaining historical knowledge outside academia. Popular history is one avenue to construct historical knowledge where compelling narrative combines with a historical scholarship to fill in gaps where formal history has glossed over important or interesting figures or moments (Beck, 2015). In searching for means to contextualize the fragmented master narratives in history education, well-crafted popular histories can serve as an intervention to enrich and infuse a polysemic approach that places gender at the center of the history curriculum.

Curricular interventions offer an opportunity to challenge and regenerate

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

conceptions of historical significance within the U.S. history curriculum. These interventions serve to enact a Deweyan notion of curriculum as experience that regenerates conceptions of gender, citizenship, and curriculum in the social studies discipline. For this paper, gender is conceived as multiple, intersectional, and performative. It is a constitutive element used to imply social relations among the sexes and a signifier of power. Echoing Butler's (2004) articulation that gender is something we do, not something we are, I articulate gender as relational and signifying the importance of subjectivities to a gendered identity. Gender emerges at the intersection of race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, and other identifying features. Gender is also multiple because women can only constitute a group within a political context of feminist struggle. Because *a woman* is "not the naming of an essence," we must consider the specific "attributes of women's experiences" (Young, 1997, p. 18). Therefore, this paper will attempt to correctly identify the women throughout this paper by signifying the experiences of white women, Black women, and working-class women.

WHY GENDER?

Gender occupies an especially critical space to question and disentangle how knowledge is constructed since it calls into question the mode by which the U.S. history curriculum normalizes and socially reproduces gendered roles and gendered citizenship. Citizenship can be defined as "participation in civic life;" however, it also enacts an identity (Roy, 2005, p. 6; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). This paper builds on the work of Scott (1986), who defines gender as "perceived differences between the sexes" and "a primary way of

signifying power" (p. 1067). The "perceived differences" to which Scott refers are more than just "differences between the sexes," but, instead, how perceived gender differences can help establish social, political, rhetorical, and economic dominance of men in curriculum through the exclusion of women. Gender history is also different than women's history. Gender history rejects studying men as "neuter beings," which assumes that gender attributes, such as masculinity and sexuality, have no meaning (Cott, 2015, p. 2). Cott (2015) contends that "understanding of the past cannot be gained without paying attention to women and men as such, to systematic differentiation of womanhood and manhood, masculinity and femininity" (p. 1). Investigating gender attributes in history traces the changes of womanhood and manhood that reveal the constitutive elements of gender.

Consequently, gender often takes on meanings that Scott did not intend (Weed & Butler, 2011). It has been most commonly and incorrectly used in two ways: synonymous with sex and interchangeable with women. When gender is used synonymously with sex, it suggests that gendered differences are biologically determined rather than culturally and socially constructed. Put simply, "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (de Beauvoir, 1973, p. 283), echoing what Butler (1986) has articulated as " 'being' female and 'being a woman' are two different sorts of being" (p. 35). As Butler (2004) famously intoned: gender is something we do, not something we are.

Similarly, gender often refers to women, which, according to Scott (1986), "suggests that information about women is necessary information about men" (p. 1056). Like Scott (1986), I understand

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

gender as a "social category imposed on a sexed body" (p. 1056). As such, the term gender becomes a series of representational symbols that project normative or ideal expectations, creating hierarchies to signify power (Scott, 1986). Until recently, even compelling feminist scholarship in history education failed to consider the complexity of women's lives at the level of social temporality. Studies like those by Bair, William, and Fralinger (2008) focus on integrating women's history into U.S. history merely suggests including women into the traditional male-dominated curriculum. This "add women and stir" model serves to be problematic because it does not resolve the Otherness of women or consider the relationship between the experience of men and women (Harding, 1991). gender is a proper method because it brings hegemonic representations to the surface more clearly.

EXPRESSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship is a particularly unique space to question the articulation of gendered discourses since it calls into question the modes that fashioned discourses of power. While some citizenship is directed towards building community, much of the impetus for active citizenship is directed towards creating rhetorical identification through exclusion (Glenn, 2004). "The 'citizen' was defined historically and rhetorically (Glenn, 2004, p. 20). It also gained meaning through the contrast with the oppositional concept of the 'non-citizen' (the alien, the slave, the woman), who lacked standing because she or he did not have the qualities needed to exercise citizenship" (Glenn, 2004, p. 20). Language of citizenship helped build the ethos of women's participation in the war effort, while women's actions as a category of people were traditionally

politically obscured.

Citizenship, like gender, has been bifurcated in its social construction to create an Othered. As women are defined concerning men, the non-citizen is defined concerning the citizen. The definition of citizenship is often how an individual interacts with the state in a legal, civic, political, and social way (Newmann et al., 1996; Heilman, 2010). However, citizenship is a "slippery term" because it draws boundaries of membership to determine who is "entitled to respect, protection and rights" among community members and "those who are excluded and thus not entitled to recognition and rights" (Riley, 1992, p. 182; Glenn, 2004 p. 1). The non-citizens have been relegated to the private sphere, focusing on domestic life and outside of historical exploration. In contrast, the ideal, masculinized citizens have been privileged as part of both spheres, with the historical record focusing on life in the public sector.

American citizenship has been constructed and organized based on gender, race, and sexuality, which have excluded different groups. It is essential to problematize whiteness as a feature of citizenship in American culture, as well. Historically, marginalized groups such as the Irish, Jews, and Italians have assimilated into a culture of whiteness to receive membership and privileges because whiteness has been the normative citizen for obtaining legal rights. Because of the cultural assimilation of certain groups, policies have constructed a bifurcation of race into black and white. Women of color, in particular, have been doubly excluded as gendered and racial subjects (Glenn, 2004). Therefore, masculinity and whiteness have been normative features of citizenship discourse and nationalism in the United States.

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

Gendered citizenship influenced male citizenship by asserting normative views linked to military service (Steward-Winter, 2007). Men were universally expected to be willing to enlist and fight for their country during World War II. This complex negotiation creates tension for gendered citizenship, which is appealing to the public with a mast of civic equality while at the same time reinforcing material inequalities. Thus, Glenn (2004) explains that citizenship is "essentially defined in opposition to womanhood...thus, the notion of natural hierarchy was inherently locked into liberal notions of citizenship (p. 21). In doing so, citizenship devices are defined through public standing and marked through the republic notion of citizenship that relies on a polity of public deliberation. Citizenship becomes rhetorical through this contemplative practice. Conflicts arise, however, when certain groups are not granted membership to participate in reflective practices during times such as Jim Crow for minorities and s u f f r a g e f o r w o m e n .

VERBING HISTORY

Social studies and its aims have been contested over time (Evans, 2004). In 1916, the *Report on Social Studies* released a definition of social studies articulating the importance of citizenship education (Jorgensen, 2014). Deweyan conceptions of citizenship education focus on curriculum as the vehicle for which "intellectual advancement, as well as social change, was to occur" (Jorgensen, 2014, p. 5). For example, populists in the last nineteenth century argued over what a "good citizen" looked like. The populists argued that good citizens exhibited agency in mass movements that challenged positions of power while corporate leaders wanted to promote good citizenship as

"loyalty to the status quo" (Kinchloe, 2001, p. 27). This latter version of citizenship has come to be the normalized perspective in the history curriculum.

In the crosshairs of intellectual engagement and daily experience, this study positions itself in a quest to cultivate what John Dewey (1916) calls "enduring substance" (p. 208). He pushed for the importance of community-building and agency as an aesthetic of "the space in which we are denizens," recognizing that "our ordinary daily experiences cease to be things of the moment and gain enduring substance" (Dewey, 1916, p. 208). As a result, learning needs to be meaningful in the lives of all students.

A Note on Method

Historical significance is intricately tied to historical understanding, marking the rhetorical space where feminist and historian scholars and state policymakers conflict over the purpose and perspectives illustrated in curricular representations. A rhetorical perspective in history offers a unique standpoint to represent significant aspects of history that may not be filtered through alternative perspectives according to evidence and accuracy (Turner, 1998). Seixas (1997) points out that historical significance has traditionally and "implicitly" privileged "powerful white men and their decisions and activities" (p. 22). However, historians have begun to redefine notions of historical significance by including "activities of women, workers, the poor, and ethnic minorities" that have been historically obscured and excluded (Seixas, 1997, p. 22). The purpose of considering significance is to be able to "connect particular events and trends to others in a variety of ways" (Seixas, 2006, p. 2). Therefore, the

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

significance lies in the "interpretative frames and values of those who study it—ourselves" (Seixas, 1997, p. 22).

Social studies are considered to be the most severely divided when it comes to defining discipline aims for education. Linda Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2007) acknowledge that "there are many competing definitions of social studies" and "these competing definitions of the subject matter have made it difficult for the field to develop a commonly embraced set of standards" (p. 209). Tony Blankley (2009) contends that patriotism and exceptionalism have been replaced by multicultural approaches that seek to include everyone at the expense of teaching our students to "grow into good citizens capable of sacrifice, when necessary, for the good of their country" (p. 169). He expresses concern that a history curriculum that emphasizes multiculturalism or social justice is "largely unrecognizable to a patriot or an honest historian" (p. 162). This argument for patriotism and "good citizens" is problematic because it underscores the dichotomous and "common sense" framing that to include women, men of color, or gay men and women is the opposite of "true" history.

In melding together the histories of multiple representations of women and gay men within the U.S. history curriculum as each navigates the simultaneous "common sense" and complicated tropes of an "angry feminist" culture, this paper highlights the importance of feminist historians and feminist scholars of history education in creating and circulating the rhetorical resources necessary to build and sustain gender as a category of historical analysis. As such, this disruptive pedagogy draws heavily on curricular representations, popular histories, and cultural artifacts. It

places the representation of women and gay men in the context in which they occurred to assess their contributions to the larger ideological structures of the times. In doing so, the rhetorical and historical elements are examined within the American history curriculum—the standards, vocabulary, and resources—used to frame historical events in American history classrooms. Thus, this paper seeks to understand and operationalize a constitutive framework that James Jasinski (1998) articulates as focusing "attention on a relatively narrow sense of historical context, usually encourages critics to assess textual influence on the immediate audience, and attempts to assess the advocate's attempt at solving a particular problem or exigence" (p. 73).

To understand how policymakers' responses to revisions that would embrace gender as a category of historical analysis influence the "common sense" rhetoric of curriculum, we must understand the historiography that dictates the interpretation of history. This paper enacts a rhetorical-historical approach blending rhetorical criticism with rhetorical history in understanding the complicated nature of the use of gender as a category to reframe curriculum. Accordingly, Culpepper Clark and Raymie McKerrow (1998) emphasize rhetorical history as a body of rhetorical elements that rely on the interaction of "argument and narrative in the construction of history" (p. 44). Such relationships become rhetorical history "in a sense that recognizes the role of language in the construction of history, as well as in the sense that positions one to use history as an impetus to social change" (p. 44).

An alternative rhetorical history is used to expose gender as sound historiography.

Because of the author's

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

commitment to the critical work that charts the history of ideas, this paper uses a textualist approach to tell the story of ideas surrounding representations of women and gay men, World War II, citizenship, and patriotism. The author agrees with Gronbeck (1998), who explains that "a particular context is both a way of looking and a mechanism for coherence" (p. 52) and suggests that the ideas and arguments articulated in representing women as political actors can only be understood within the complicated history from within which they emerged. Context is important because it organizes a series of past events that can be "narrativized" into a previously fragmented story. Thus, the relationship between text and context form the make-up of this paper to help understand how and to what degree the role of women's citizenship shifted and changed during and after World War II.

What Ought to Be Taught?

Tracing historical evidence is vital to interpreting the past in ways that contextualize the socially constructed notions of gender and citizenship. Curricular materials, such as textbooks, pinpoint who is ultimately responsible for what gets taught in the classroom.

Conservative influence typically favors a traditional approach that values both patriotism and American exceptionalism. Patriotism is often perceived as a "political virtue" that demonstrates a "love of one's country;" however, patriotism is "shallow" in that it only exists "at the level of mobilization" and is enacted "through crude manipulation" (Mare, 2007, p. 115). American exceptionalism supports the United States as more than a unique country, but as "superior compared to other nations" (Edwards, 2011, p. 1). Conservative arguments for American

exceptionalism distort views of the past that romanticize America because "the state of fantasy of exceptionalism justified Jim Crow, the Indian Removal Act, Operation Wetback, and Japanese internment camps" (Pease, 2009, p. 6-7). Perspectives that privilege patriotism and exceptionalism avoid conversations and allow the United States to act in a manner that genuinely seeks to solve global issues and instead skirt or stall issues without preventing or solving them in the long run (Edwards - Weiss, 2011).

History is a creation of the historian, and the construction of spheres in the stories of history presupposes that men and women live in different spheres. Michelle Zimbalist Resaldo (1980) insists upon a shift away from a private/public sphere focus in history because "the dichotomies... teach that women must be understood not in terms of relationships with other women and with men- but of difference and apartness" (p. 409). In other words, history positions women in history in terms of their relationship to men or the sphere they are associate with.

Kerber (1988) warns that the continued "language of separate spheres" creates coverture for the "reciprocity between gender and society" as well as "impose a static model on dynamic relationships (p. 35). To position women in the private sphere is to ignore her as a force in history.

Ignoring women and gay men falsifies our understanding of the past. To question a term like history is to ask how it plays, what investments it bears, what goals it achieves, what alterations it undergoes. Beard's popular book *Woman as a Force in History* (1946) is perhaps most remembered for its fierce assertion that "all women made an active contribution in history" (Alberti, 2014, p. 7). Gerda Lerner (1979) pinpoints Beard's

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

thesis that “focusing on the concept of women as victim obscures the true history of women” (p. xxiii). Essentially, women occupy dual positions in society as “subordinate, yet central, victimized, yet active” (Lerner, 1979, p. xxiii.). In order to recognize these difficult positions, history must shift from facts to interpretation through the inquiry of multiple points of view.

Moreover, while history education is revitalizing scholarship regarding representations of women, more inquiry is needed because research has yet to deal with the relationship between U.S. history and the rhetorical history of women's multiple identities from the curriculum. In order to engage with counter-narratives to disrupt hegemonic narratives, one must take on the task of situating women and gay men as political actors within their contexts aware of the rhetorical and political constraints that result from the language of citizenship and strategies of war rhetoric. Schmeichel (2014) and Schmidt (2012) have outlined a central focus of this kind of textual work, including attention to the intersecting relationship between gender, race, and ethnicity; status and its relationship to a class position; geographical sites of rhetorical production; rhetorical domains, genres, and modes of expression. At the same time, this approach must balance multiple interpretations, be reflective and reflexive towards the historical actors and the rhetorical and political constraints they were operating. Additionally, adding gay men and women as a focus creates a particularly salient space to explore the construction of history, gender, citizenship, and nationalism.

Fortunately, new scholarship regarding the representation of women in history education has emerged, highlighting the renewed public and

political interest in the U.S. history curriculum's purpose and perspectives. Margaret Crocco (2001, 2003) has been a pioneer in history education. She acknowledged a lack of "feminist consciousness" in social studies; thus laid a foundation for embracing scholarship that considers gender as a social construction in history education. She has provided many theoretical perspectives and on-the-ground interventions for teachers in such books as *Clio in the Classroom* with Carol Berkin and Barbara Winslow.

Crocco (2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2004, 2017) and Woysner (2002, 2003, 2004, 2020) have investigated women's social studies well as the influence of women's organizations in education. They argue that women should be represented as political actors in ways that move beyond contributory history and towards infusing women in complex ways to demonstrate their political contributions. Shocker and Woysner's "*Cultural Parallax and Content Analysis: Images of Black Women in High School History Textbooks*" (2015) provides a much-needed interpretation of the representation of African American women in textbooks, which creates a need for research exploring interventions to challenge master narratives. Schmeichel (2015), Engebretson (2019, 2020), and Schmidt (2012) have provided interventions to normalized narratives, particularly with the representations of women and amplification of marginalized narratives in social studies. These interventions disrupt and contextualize the portrayal of women in U.S. history standards. They go beyond the "add women and stir" approach that traditional history education curriculum still clings to (Harding, 1991)—pointing out the normalizing features of curriculum that portray women in ways to construct an

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

identity for her through her sexuality, role as a mother, or through gendered labor. Positioning women and gay men in the U.S. history curriculum in this way lacquers conceptions that these identity markers are essential and not socially constructed and reproduced. Engebretson's (2014) analysis of gender in the National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies standards provides insight into how the 2010 revision of the National Council of Social Studies standards are indicative of Tetreault's (1986) first phase of Feminist Phase Theory: male-dominated curriculum. Unfortunately, little attention is still paid to ameliorating these gender inequalities in scholarship and practice, despite the heightened attention to women and gender from the women's rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

Gender in History

History is essential because it introduces the context for which sex has historically been used as symbolism in different societies and eras to question the permanence of identity markers over space and time. Scott (2011) argues that sex has been historicized as a foundation for social and cultural discourse. However, it has been the rejection of biological determinism that has led to queer theory. As Scott (2011) puts it, "gender was no longer seen as a commentary on sex; instead, sex was understood as an effect of gender. Alternatively, to put in other terms, gender and sex were both cultural constructions, creating rather than reflecting a prior reality" (p. 8). By recognizing gender as a cultural construction, perspectives shifted in terms of recognizing norms of culture and society by shifting away from these legislative matters as natural and recognizing it as a producer of regulation.

Still, many feminist historians failed to look at categories of "men" and "women." That implies that these roles were still viewed as fixed. Scott (2011) recognizes that women had a history, but it was "'women' outside history" (p. 1424). The implications of looking at history this way are that it reifies the biological assertion that feminist historians were trying to deconstruct.

Looking at the limits of cultural construction through causality parses the complexity of the cultural construction of gender. Scott (2011) articulates the elusiveness of gender and, even more so, the indeterminate meaning of cultural construction to explain such things as gender. The premise is to point out that meaning is fluid and to try to attribute meaning to gender, even as culturally constructed, is futile because it "cannot be reduced simply to exposures to the implicit meaning or interpretations of resistance or defense" (p.15). Scott uses questions as sexed identities as applicable. Where do I come from? What do these bodies mean? How are the differences between them to be explained?

Women are interpreted by what they are lacking, and men are interpreted as a universal identity. Charland (1987) argues that constitutive narratives rely on "totalizing interpretations" to contain and control individuals' actions to be consistent with the narrative being purported (p. 141). This constraint is essential because subjects believe they can act freely while the constitutive narrative bars their actions. The situation in World War II was particularly successful in utilizing constitutive rhetoric that has been mimicked in The War on Terror. In both situations, women were contained in the service of masculinity, obscuring and subordinating

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

experiences outside the service of masculinity and heteronormativity.

At the level of argument, rhetors, such as Kock and Villadsen (2012) embraced a new approach that highlights the subordination of women, men of color, and gay men through rhetorical citizenship, which illustrates the relationship between citizenship and social capital in the United States. With notions of the militant citizen clearly in place, defining "citizenship" became the rhetorical mechanism to discipline and harness labor on the home front and military participation on the front lines. This system of exploitation was intrinsically linked to the development of the economy during World War II. However, it was also driven by the patriarchal features of capitalism where interest convergence extended a hand to women and gay men, compressing power stratification while at war. For example, Koch and Villadsen (2012) argue that "focusing on how citizens deliberate allows us to consider both macro and micro-practices, but always with an eye to the significance for the individuals involved (p. 6). They discuss deliberation in both the public and private spheres as sites for constructing reasoning strategically. They outline the usefulness of using one's rhetorical agency to destabilize mechanisms of "power and influence" while simultaneously acknowledging that disentangling such norms cannot be tackled so easily (p. 63). Unraveling the tendrils of multiple citizenships has helped feminist scholars reframe the ideologies of gender to emphasize political contexts that commonly situate women's "contributions to the 'public' and 'national' good" as problematic and fragmented (Grayzel, 1999, p. 206).

Domestic containment was

certainly a rhetorical feature, particularly from the Great Depression through the Cold War, to provide security and a sense of safety against the perceived danger of national security (May, 1988). Domestic containment idealizes motherhood. However, this focus on feminine domesticity "ultimately fostered the very tendencies it wanted to diffuse: materialism, consumerism, and bureaucratic conformity" (p. 10-11). For example, women planted Victory Gardens, rationed food, and purchased war bonds to support the war effort. Despite the attention and promise of empowerment Rosie the Riveter carries, few women transitioned into jobs previously held just for men (May, 1988). Media messages sternly pushed the "ultimate fulfillment of female sexuality" (p. 133) of motherhood at the beginning of World War II.

Gender Before, During and After World War II

Within the United States, entering World War II is portrayed as inevitable from the perspective of President Franklin D. Roosevelt even before the bombing of Pearl Harbor. After the fall of France in June 1940, Britain was operating alone against the Axis Powers in the Eastern hemisphere, rallying Americans to become "the great arsenal of democracy" (Goodwin, 1994, p. 195). As FDR's fireside chats permeated the consciousness of the country, the rhetoric of evil provided a compelling strategy for unifying the nation and reframing the collective memory of World War I in preparation for war abroad. In hindsight, the strategies used to meld the collective consciousness had implications that lasted far beyond the war.

From the early days of The Great Depression, President Franklin Roosevelt used rhetorical strategies to unify the

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

country through epideictic discourse. Epidexis acts as a salient rhetorical strategy because “it persuades on deliberate questions but without seeming to do so” (Bostdorff, 2011, p. 2). Epideictic discourse can establish unity through constitutive rhetoric by enacting collective values to explain and understand the meaning of events through praise and blame (Condit, 1985). The public developed “radio consciousness” through FDR’s fireside chats and the overall attentiveness radio broadcasters paid to the war. Orson Wells also tapped into this radio consciousness with his fictional and famous *War of the Worlds* broadcast (Carsaregola, 2009). “As war began for real, many Americans at home could experience it most intimately through the magically disembodied voice of the radio” (Carsagola, 2009, p. 18). Never before had Americans felt so immediately connected to the war.

However, before America entered into the war, the 1930s and 1940s served as a time of great uncertainty for the American family. During the Great Depression, security came in the form of opening up the home to distinctly shift the roles of the family in two ways: “one with two breadwinners who shared tasks” and another “with spouses whose roles were sharply differentiated” (May, 1988, p. 38). Popular culture encouraged women to enter the workforce during the economic crisis, especially targeting single women as strong and independent, leading many women to forego marriage as they could lead self-sustaining lives. However, the “tough and rugged career woman” was glamourized in a way that was a separate archetype from that of a wife (May, 1998, p. 42). As the familiar ideology continued to shift with the United States’ entry into World War II, so did the spaces that women could occupy. At the beginning of the war, women flooded the workforce “as

a result of combined incentives of patriotism and good wages” (May, 1998, p. 59). However, despite the expanded roles for citizenship during World War II, the residual tropes of Rosie the Riveter did not revolutionize gender roles for women in t h e l o n g t e r m .

During World War II, women’s civic membership expanded, more so for white women than women of color, while still being subjugated within the spaces of the mythical norm. Honey (1984) argues that women acted as a symbol to articulate masculinity by being “the woman making it in a man’s world” (p. 215). As a result, the stigma of subjugation would act as a dominant discourse to reinforce rhetorical silence for women and their contributions in post-war America. Additionally, the inclusion of gay men and women as acceptable Other was central to America’s mobilization in World War II. During this time, policies were constructed to enlist more than sixteen million men in the war, while at the same time evolving policies restricting sexuality that would evolve from America’s entry into the war to the war’s end (D’Emilio, 1998). In other words, women and gay men became an acceptable Other in opposition of an enemy (i.e., the Nazis and the Axis Powers), but only in the service of A m e r i c a n m a s c u l i n i t y .

America’s entry into the war seemed to “speed up the process” for young Americans to establish families, reversing the decline in marriage and reproduction of the 1930s. Second, the categorization of women increased divisiveness between “independent” women and “domestic” women. Women that chose marriage over a career during this period were characterized as heroic, while women that juggled both a career and domesticity were demonized. Third, popular conceptions of gender roles during World War II

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

portrayed expanding roles for women in society. However, while women's capabilities were represented through iconic cultural representations such as Rosie the Riveter and Wonder Woman, these expanded views of women did not extend to most characters in popular culture at the time. "One study found that although female characters were more likely to hold jobs in the 1940s than in the 1930s or 1950s, the stories of the war decade represented 'the strongest assault on feminine careerism'" (p. 62).

As gender and familial ideology transformed active citizenship into sites for patriotism, equality, and freedom, several moments defined the solidification of domestic containment and gendered citizenship in collective memory: The Great Depression (1929-1939), Pearl Harbor (1941), Japanese Internment in America (1942-1945), and the Dropping of the Atomic Bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki (1945). While historians have done these moments justice in recounting the events that transpired, these accounts highlight the role of domestic containment as well as the rhetorical strategies emerging from each moment to understand how American women and gay men's participation in being a "good" citizen transformed America's participation in World War II.

The adult, white, heteronormative, and male-dominated space of the public sphere was transformed into a feminine and shared breadwinning space. Rosie the Riveter certainly provided a model for women to embody feminized labor as a gateway into the previously male-dominated workforce during the war. However, it would not be a permanent fixture for most women in a postwar society even though she also became the figure most associated with feminine masculinity as a permanent condition of

gender universalized as the everywoman.

But even as conservative curricular revisionists use citizenship to connect with historical significance and symbolism in U.S. history, the particularity of women and gay men representation has been contextually central in the analysis of oppression emerging from feminist scholars. By the end of the war, domestic containment urged women back into the hearth and home by giving domestic tasks patriotic purpose and focusing on the needs of returning veterans to re-enter the work force.

Gender in History Education

The traditional curriculum still focuses on political and military history (Woyshner, 2012). Social education as an approach is meant to parse out traditional social studies to include social dimensions in history that women have historically filled. Woyshner (2012) notes that this approach targeted the inclusion of women specifically, and she would like to broaden it to women, girls, and gender. The findings from recent research indicate a need for attention to gender in social studies, both in terms of structural problems and curricular issues. Few empirical studies demonstrate a benefit of gender inclusion (see, e.g., Woyshner, 2012). No Child Left Behind is mentioned as a reason why a shift away from gender in social studies education has occurred. Examples of curricular efforts are given, such as the Zinn Educational Project and Women in World History Project, but both deal primarily with integrating women into the history that already exists (Woyshner, 2012). In terms of future directions, it is suggested that changes still need to be made in social studies textbooks and curricular materials, other social studies content areas (e.g., geography, economics, civics, etc.) need a

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

more inclusive curriculum, as well as history, and professional organizations need to be adding gender issues in their a c t i v i t i e s .

The social sciences and humanities have seen tremendous changes in the academic discourse of gender and sexuality since the 1970s (Crocco, 2008). Despite these transformations, social studies have felt almost no impact from these disciplines. Crocco (2008) characterizes social studies in the 1970s and 1980s to explore why such transformations did not make it to social studies. One reason is women already working in social studies before the women's movement in the 1970s and 1980s. While more men were in the classroom, women were gaining ground in leadership positions as president of the National Council of Social Studies, chairs of the College and Faculty Assembly, as well as working as editors of premier academic journals, such as *Theory and Research in Social Education* (Crocco, 2008). During this time, textbooks saw the most significant change. Educators were concerned about the gender-balancing school curriculum, and this resulted in more women being included. However, there was still little research being done on gender (Crocco, 2008). Perhaps the most significant gap between social studies and other disciplines was the transition towards a new linguistic discourse used to discuss gender and sexuality. Social studies did not transition from sex to gender the way other disciplines have. Changing language from sex to gender has illustrated a paradigm shift that social studies have missed. Crocco posits several questions to get at the implications of social studies education's failure to transition. "Does the change in nomenclature from sex to gender represent a reorientation with significance to the

social studies mandate of citizenship education? If so, what has this shift meant for research regarding gender and sexuality in social studies" (Crocco, 2008, p.173)? These gaps contributed to the fragmented foundations with which to build a curriculum from.

U.S. History Curriculum Maps

Curriculum itself is a form of persuasion influenced by the standardization movement, which has hinged upon whether conservatives or liberals have controlled the frame and how closely it became associated with American exceptionalism. Generally, a curriculum follows a political perspective, explaining events chronologically based on political eras or presidential terms. Many view this approach as essential without considering other organizational options or without interrogating the curriculum politics inherent in such a schema. For example, "the French, *au contraire*, avoid this political history in favor of a more social or economic history, one in which the history of ideas figures more prominently" (Lindaman & Ward, 2004, p. xix). Additionally, Anglophone countries are more likely to inculcate a way of seeing the world (and history) through a single story (Lindaman & Ward, 2004). It becomes essential, then, to consider the cultural and political elements that underlie any text, including curriculum.

One way curriculum follows a political perspective is through insulating the U.S. as a superpower that is distinctly different and/or isolated from the rest of the world. Lindaman and Ward (2004) argue that Americans need to "examine the way our national texts approach the study of other nations" (p. xviii). Interestingly, when the American history curriculum mentions other nations, it is only in the context of the U.S. foreign policy of U.S.

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

interests. By positioning other nations and cultures in relation to the U.S. is to sorely misinterpret cultural contexts as the U.S. developed within a global context. Why not consider these intersecting roles in history content?

Consequently, curriculum is plagued with cultural misunderstandings. U.S. history curriculum eschews an inability to read cultural context and cues. Lindaman and Ward (2004) argue that to move beyond such biases and judgments and into understanding, "we must honestly consider other perspectives" (p. xx). This understanding comes from learning to ask questions that move beyond a singular story. Some other ways that curriculum interprets history is through using the extremist view that privileges certain groups while oppressing others (Dancer, 2014). In this way, curriculum becomes bloated because it focuses mainly on content knowledge, yet students do not know history. Oftentimes, what students do know is skewed. Yet, teachers do not know history either. However, what is taught is a matter of competing opinions. What if there were more options than just Howard Zinn or Lynne Cheney?

Nationalism

Nationalism is conceived of in terms of its political purpose and can re-shape within the context of time and place. In U.S. history and the way it is taught, American exceptionalism (and patriotism and citizenship) serve as markers for nationness (Anderson, 2006). Calhoun (2012) notes that this American exceptionalism paradox "stems from America's celebration of its unique degree of diversity and its simultaneous tendency to (strive to) unite all Americans under one identity banner" (p. 7). Madson (1998) has suggested that American exceptionalism offers Americans a "mythological refuge

from the chaos of history and the uncertainty of life" in favor of romantic nostalgia for a mythical norm contrived by historical amnesia (p. 166). Edwards (2011) extends Madson's critique of American exceptionalism by terming its rhetorical voice in history an "ideological straightjacket" that deems America's founding documents as "sacrosanct" and therefore unquestionable (p. 52). The projection of American exceptionalism as a telos for American history curriculum has been felt chiefly among students with subjective identities that have been constitutively Othered by those in positions of power that are able to determine historical significance in curriculum.

World War II is crucial to current conceptions of nationalism because all revolutions since the war's end have defined themselves in terms of the imagined community of nationalism. In this way, nationalism is not a political ideology but instead acts to mobilize ideological attachments. While Anderson (2006) contends that nationalism functions as an imagined community enacted to manifest fraternal bonds among strangers (i.e., soldiers that are willing to die for citizens they have never met), some historians contend nationalism enacts a more complex dynamic. For example, Lomnitz (2000) argues that the imagined communities of nationalism "systematically distinguishes full citizens from part citizens or strong citizens from weak ones in what he calls 'bonds of dependence'" (p. 337). Therefore, nationalism cultivates fraternity while simultaneously calling for separateness through sacrifice, domestic containment, and private/public spheres.

Nationalism still foregrounds the American history curriculum today. An enduring understanding of one

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

curriculum map regarding World War II states, “the international community’s failure to respond to acts of aggression led to World War II” (Northwest Arkansas Education Service Cooperative, 2006). This attempt at an enduring understanding fails to mention in it, or in any subsequent standards, that the international community, including the United States, actively participated in the build-up to World War II through a series of neutrality acts that facilitated Hitler's occupation of surrounding European countries and allowed for the Axis Powers to gain momentum leading to World War II. It also ignores the privilege of the United States' geography that allowed for isolationism for much of the war. Using the language of "failure" implies an absence of action that does not serve America and the larger global community's complicit behavior to facilitate the aggressiveness leading to W o r l d W a r I I .

It makes sense then that the posture of these nationalistic terms (and those wielding it) alienate many students in public schools and normalize the rhetorical features that the curriculum embeds in the collective conscious by mythologizing a fragmented historical memory. Through the use of the jeremiad as a paradigmatic structure of American exceptionalism, the curriculum is able to frame history by employing strategies to instill fear and agency in nationalistic terms. Hodgkin and Radstone (2006) demonstrate how the use of the jeremiad as a feature of collective memory gives the illusion of cohesion through history because “[n]ationalist memory describes a geography of belonging, and identity forged into a specified landscape, inseparable from it” (p. 269). These features point to the legacies of citizenship in modern America,

highlighting the stratification of power and inequality by white agents of the state and protesting the exclusion of women, gay men, and men of color in the U.S. history curriculum (Ross, 2014).

American Exceptionalism

The ideological influence of American exceptionalism messaging has been drawn from its explanatory power in tracing the origins and development of citizenship and patriotism in America. This is particularly true as feminist historians have used citizenship as a vehicle for tracing the history of oppression for marginalized groups in the U.S. to help build a coherent collective memory in an effort to raise the historical consciousness about gender and citizenship (Scott, 1999).

Within this context, the rhetorical posture of American exceptionalism is more comprehensible since it is a logical extension of earlier iterations of patriotism, privilege, and power. And, as historians have used the U.S. history curriculum to craft their messages about collective identity and memory in the United States, they have also pointed to the features of patriotism that stem from ideas about the value of citizenship and exceptionalism. Gender scholars have looked to the entire history of the United States as a rhetorical resource for investigating the power of citizenship and found continuity in the oppression and containment of women and gay men throughout the nation's history.

Citizenship and Citizenship Education

Fundamentally, citizenship expands and contracts in ways that the history curriculum does not recognize. The writing of the social studies curriculum since the 1980s has highlighted American exceptionalism, patriotism, and the public

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

sphere as features of citizenship in America and created new rhetorical modes that express and prioritize progress, achievement, freedom, and equality in important and contradictory ways. In this way, citizenship is constitutive rhetoric.

Representations of citizenship in curriculum demonstrate contradictions of national unity (conservative republican ideology) and cultural pluralism (political liberalism ideology) through an elusive expansion of roles for citizenship (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006). Adrien Oldfield (1998) describes this tension as "exclusive membership" within the civic republican ideology and emphasizes the use of "expressions of political membership," particularly during times of crisis or war (p. 81). It is vital for a curriculum and the educators enacting it to recognize and communicate the contortions of civic participation across space, time, and identity. While formal curriculum articulates citizenship in universalistic and even vague ways, the enacted curriculum follows a different path.

How citizenship education is enacted in classrooms are often very confining. Abowitz and Harnish (2006) explain that "texts in this discourse, stressing the importance of conserving and maintaining U.S. democratic ideals and traditions, emphasize the importance of learning facts and information about democracy's history and institutions" (p.659). They go on to say, "such civic knowledge, in civic republican discourse, focuses on American history, institutions, and pivotal texts (the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, etc.), reserving a far smaller place for more humanistic, international, and critical content and pedagogy" (p. 659). Thus, nationalistic rhetorical strategies in curriculum writing have been tied intrinsically to issues of citizenship and group identity as American women,

gay men, and men of color, marginalized by public culture and denied access to the political sphere, looked for spaces from which to forge individual and group identities.

Within the political milieu, the language of citizenship surrounding World War II crystallized the participation of women, gay men, and men of color as political actors to create salient rhetorical resources for foreign relations highlighting systems of inequality, ostracism, and sacrifice. This globalized the audience of America's power structures after World War II, which anchored the United States as a global hegemon (Everett & Charlton, 2014). As a result, nationalism became a large part of the conversation in the second half of the twentieth century as postwar conservatives pushed back against the progressive education agenda. Conservative revisionists often took the most aggressive nationalistic stance in the rhetorical posturing of social studies curriculum, especially in the portrayal of World War II, as a means to "represent their educational program as a critical security measure" (Giordano, 2004, p. 242). This would become a permanent fixture in social studies curriculum and history classrooms.

As national security became the dominant political rationale of the social studies curriculum, several educational changes were set forth to mold dutiful citizens and distinguish the United States as exceptional. Giordano (2004) adds that conservative educators encouraged scholastic nationalism that emphasized teachers as "preparers of patriotism" to help students become "loyal soldiers" (p. 173). Because nationalism is at the center of what it means to be an active or "good" citizen, history curriculum representing World War II centers on American exceptionalism, patriotism, and gendered

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

citizenship to demonstrate how citizenship and nationalism functioned together to unify the United States, both through armed and domestic service, to "win" World War II. Conversely, many liberals found "displeasure at the rapid growth of scholastic nationalism" (Giordano, 2004, p. 202). Some consequences of this political discourse were "curricular bans against the languages of the foreign countries with which America was at war" (p. 239). These patterns set a precedent of exceptionalism for decades to come.

Framing citizenship around *sameness* casts a shadow of the dominant group to encompass citizenship that does not take into account the systematic differences between groups. The rhetorical and legal platform stemming from institutional inequality had drastic repercussions for women, gay men, and men of color throughout the United States, particularly during World War II. Glenn (2004) explains that citizenship was defined through the opposition of a "non-citizen" (p. 20). She writes that "the autonomy and freedom of the citizens were made possible by labor (often involuntary) of non-autonomous wives...children, servants, and employees" (p. 20). To plant and perpetuate the canonical collective memory, tropes of the "good" citizen constrained the voices of women, men of color, and gay men as political actors. Glenn explains this dichotomy is created through the division and opposition of the private and public sphere, whereas "the public is the realm of citizenship, rights, and generality, while sexuality, feeling, and specificity—and women—are relegated to the private," p. 21) She continues, "After World War II, liberal politics emphasized equality under the law and an assumption of sameness in daily encounters." However, this rhetoric cannot

counter the normalized and embedded features of American life actually entrenched in inequality.

It is possible to see how conservative republican activists saw an opportunity for avant-garde citizenship education, given its historical position within the American patriotism myth that "enshrine" individual liberty and collective unity simultaneously (Smith, 2006, p. 125). Sonya Rose (2003) cogently describes the shift in the masculine citizenry and the way in which it circumscribed women and gay men. She writes that:

very early in World War II, the virtues of a domestic, conservative, and middle-class nation were those that came to define manhood and 'good citizenship' as well. In World War II, the virility of the 'good citizen', and masculinity itself, were tempered...If both national identity and masculinity are constructed in opposition to an 'other', there was no more 'hyper-masculine' than the Nazis against whom to fashion nationhood and masculinity. (p. 153)

In other words, women and gay men became an acceptable Other in opposition of an enemy (i.e., the Nazis and the Axis Powers), but only in the service of American masculinity. The aesthetics of feminine masculinity within citizenship catapulted women and gay men into popular culture and media attention through representations predominately influenced and created by propaganda used to mold the new shape of membership for the previously precluded groups in the American identity.

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

Domestic Containment. In charting the complicated and shifting relationship between passive and dominant citizenship, it is clear that masculine proclamations about feminine deviance have had the effect of forcing women and gay men to draw on gendered and queer experiences through strategies that necessarily reference the “secondary and separate status” that gender containment confined them to (Zieger, 1999, p. 142). But these civic actors also used political critique, historical evidence, anecdote, personalization, mimesis, and invective (among other strategies) to problematize the minimal commitment of state and federal officials to civic participation for all members of society as soldiers returned home after World War II. Indeed, the era of Cold War magnified domesticity as a citizenship frame, so that the lenses that characterized women and gay men's role were still relatively stable and exclusionary by the time Reagan was inaugurated, using the demonization of the teachers and public education in *A Nation at Risk* to ignite the standardization movement that became part of his legacy. Still, the accounts of these non-normative citizens showcase the new conversations about repression and liberation that emerged in the domestic containment of World War II as well as the strategies that authors of artifacts that the masses can access (i.e., visual artifacts and popular histories) utilized to bridge new audiences and activists even now.

IMPLICATIONS

It makes sense then that the posture of these nationalistic terms (and those wielding it) not only alienate many students in public schools but normalize the rhetorical features that the curriculum embeds in the collective conscious

through mythologizing a fragmented historical memory. Because women and gay men's slogans and ideology were articulated by mothers and formerly occluded actors, particularly as the military and business industry targeted their civic and domestic participation, gender containment took up the relationship between identity construction and citizenship as a place to excavate new arenas for the struggle for active citizenship participation, particularly in the accounts of women and gay men. The following suggestions can be used for multiple purposes: informing classroom practice, informing social studies education policy, and guiding future research into gender as a category of analysis in the U.S. history curriculum. Before suggesting any implications that this research may propose, the authors would note that this approach to rhetorical history is only illustrative of how gender may be used in the U.S. history curriculum. Any claims or generalizations are only immediately applicable to the specific example and not intended to represent all contexts nor intended as a formulaic approach. Despite the limitation of generalizability, insights may be drawn from the work in this paper. Using gender as a category of historical analysis provides strategies that demonstrate opportunities to explore contexts using different historiography than traditionally used by academic historians and traditional history classrooms. By demonstrating these strategies for exploring gender through history, students are given a more comprehensive set of reading strategies that can be transitioned from ELA to content area classrooms and are also valuable resources for media literacy in a cultural time of deep tension between competing ideological forces.

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

Outside of the instructional practices of social studies teachers in their own classrooms, social studies education policy stands in the area between where historical construction and identity politics are most engaged through teachers, school administrators, district officials, and state, national, or private social studies organizations interested in social studies education policy. Social studies education and gender are never far from the national forefront of attention due to the myth of conflict being continually perpetuated through framework debates. Throughout state legislatures across the nation, U.S. history education is constantly challenged for not allowing the instruction of fringe histories. Proponents on both sides, those that want to teach exceptionalism in isolation and those that wish to integrate alternative histories and dissenting narratives, square off as if they are the only two sides in the debate on policy-making involving social studies education standards. These two contingents are not the only choices, yet they dominate the discussions due to a myth of conflict.

Many other stakeholders are not represented in most of these debates, such as teachers, parents, students, and feminist historians. They are proponents of an informed social studies education policy that no longer disregards the views and values of cultural differences based on gender, race, class, age, ethnicity, or religion. In no other content area are students expected to abandon their identity or their experiences for the sake of learning a mythical norm or to simply avoid the discussion of identity markers as is exhibited when learning history, particularly U . S . h i s t o r y .

Future research with students using gender as a category of historical analysis could further trace the development of students' interpretation and accessing of historical content and context. Currently, there is not very much work that expands

beyond looking at women and categorizing their involvement as historical actors in history. Furthering research on gender, specifically, would expand and deepen opportunities to provide textures to texts used in the social studies classroom.

REFERENCES

- Abowitz, K. K., & Harnish, J. (2006). Contemporary Discourses of Citizenship. Review of *Educational Research*, 76(4), 653-690. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076004653>
- Alberti, J. (2014). *Gender and the historian*. Longman.
- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
- Anderson, L. W. (2007). *Congress and the classroom: From the Cold War to "No Child Left Behind."* The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Bair, S., William, L. & Fralinger, M. (2008). Integrating women's history into an early American history course: Three lesson ideas. *The Social Studies*, 99(4), 174-180.
- Beard, M. (1946). *Woman as a force in history*. The MacMillan Company.
- Beauvoir, S. D. (1953). *The second sex*. Knopf.
- Beck, P. (2015). *Presenting history: Past and present*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Berkin, C., Crocco, M., & Winslow, B. (2009). *Clio in the classroom: A guide for teaching U.S. women's history*. Oxford

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

- University Press.
- Blankley, T. (2009). *American grit: What it will take to survive and win in the 21st century*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bostdorff, D. M. (2011). Epideictic rhetoric in the service of war: George W. Bush on Iraq and the 60th anniversary of the victory over Japan. *Communication Monographs*, 78(3), 296-323.
- Brown, A. L., & Au, W. (2014). Race, memory, and master narratives: A critical essay on U.S. curriculum history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 358-389.
- Butensky, E. and Williams-Brown, K. (2021). Queering elementary education: A queer curriculum for 4th grade *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies at Swarthmore College*: 3(1), 47-63. <https://doi.org/10.24968/2473-912X.3.1.4>
- Butler, J. (1986). Sex and gender in Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex*. *Yale French Studies*, (72), 35-49.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. Routledge.
- Butler, J., & Weed, E. (2011). *The question of gender: Joan W. Scott's critical feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- Calhoun, L. R. (2012). *Public memory of the Sand Creek massacre*. Cambria Press.
- Chandler, P. (2015). *Doing race in social studies: Critical perspectives*. Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the Peuple Québécois. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73(2), 139-140.
- Clark, E. C. & McKerrow, R. E. (1998). The rhetorical construction of history. In K. Turner (Eds.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 33-46). University of Alabama Press.
- Condit, C. M. (1985). The functions of epideictic: The Boston massacre orations as exemplar. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(4), 284-298.
- Cott, N. (2015). *What is gender history?*. College Board: A.P. Central. College Board. com Inc. <https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-united-states-history/classroom-resources/what-is-gender-history>
- Crocco, M. S. (2000a). Women, citizenship, and the social studies. *Educational Forum*, 65(1), 52-59.
- Crocco, M. S. (2000b). Teacher education and the study of women from a global perspective. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 28(3), 347-350.
- Crocco, M. S. (2001). The missing discourse on gender and sexuality in the social studies. *Theory into Practice*, 40, 65-71.
- Crocco, M. S. (2002). Homophobic hallways: Is anyone listening? *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 217-233.
- Crocco, M. S. (2003). Dealing with difference in the social studies. *International Journal of Social Education*, 106-126.
- Crocco, M. S. (2004). Women and the social studies. The long rise and rapid fall of feminist activity in the National Council for the Social Studies. In C. Woyshner, J. Watras, & M.S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenship* (pp.

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

- 142-160). Peter Lang.
- Crocco, M. S. (2008). Gender and sexuality in the social studies. In L. A. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds). *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 172-196). Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.
- D'Emilio, J. (1998). *Sexual politics, sexual communities: The making of a homosexual minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Macmillan.
- Edwards, J. A., & Weiss, D. (2011). *The rhetoric of American exceptionalism: Critical essays*. McFarland &.
- Edwards, Jason (2011). Contemporary conservative constructions of American exceptionalism. In *Communication Studies Faculty Publications*. Paper 18.
- Engebretson, K. E. (2020). What does it look like? Telling the story of global women's political participation through photographs. *Social Education*, 84(4), 224-228.
- Engebretson, K. E. (2014). Another missed opportunity: Gender in the National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 9, 21-34.
- Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?*. Teachers College Press.
- Everett, J., & Charlton, S. E. M. (2013). *Women navigating globalization: Feminist approaches to development*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gallahan, K. E. (2020, January 27). *For now, W.VA. Board of Education won't enact social studies curriculum changes*. West Virginia News. https://www.wvnews.com/news/wvnews/for-now-w-va-board-of-education-wont-enact-social-studies-curriculum-changes/article_666b0696-541a-5be2-bf8c-21d6eebc2446.html
- Giordano, G. (2004). *Wartime schools: How World War II changed American education*. Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. (1992). Resisting difference: cultural studies and the discourse of critical pedagogy, in L. Grossberg, G. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds) *Cultural Studies*. Routledge.
- Glenn, E. N. (2004). *Unequal freedom: How race and gender shaped American citizenship and labor*. Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, D. K. (1994). *No ordinary time: Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt: The home front in World War II*. Simon & Schuster.
- Grayzel, S. R. (1999). *Women's identities at war: Gender, motherhood, and politics in Britain and France during the First World War*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Gronbeck, B. E. (1998). The rhetorics of the past: History, argument, and collective memory. In K. Turner (Eds.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 47-60). University of Alabama Press.
- Harding, S. G. (1991). *Feminism and*

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

- methodology: Social science issues.* Indiana University Press.
- Heilman, E. E. (2010). Critical, liberal, and poststructural challenges for global education. In A. Segall, E. Heilman, & C. Cherryholmes (Eds.) *Social Studies: The Next Generation*, (pp.189-208). Peter Lang
- Hodgkin, K., & Radstone, S. (2006). *Memory, history, nation: Contested pasts.* Transaction.
- Honey, M. (1984). *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, gender, and propaganda during World War II.* University of Massachusetts Press.
- Isensee, L. (2014, November 21). *Texas hits the books.* NPR. <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/11/21/365686593/texas-hits-the-books>
- Jeansonne, G. (1999). *Women of the far right: The mothers' movement and World War II.* University of Chicago Press.
- Jorgenson, C. G. (2014). Social studies curriculum migration: Confronting challenges in the 21st century. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities* (pp. 3-24). State University of New York Press.
- Juzwik, M. (2014). American evangelical Biblicism as literate practice: A critical review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 1-15.
- Kerber, L. K. (1988). Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History. *The Journal of American History*, 75(1), 9.
- Kock, C & Willardsen, L. S. (2012). *Rhetorical citizenship and public deliberation.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. & Norman, W. (1994): Return of the citizen: A survey of the recent work on citizenship theory, *Ethics*, 194(2), 353-82.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Leahey, C. (2014). Creating authentic spaces for democratic social studies education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities* (pp. 51-70). State University of New York Press.
- Lemert, C. (2004). *Social theory: The multicultural and classic readings* (4th ed.) Westview Press.
- Lerner, G. (1979). *The majority finds its past: Placing women in history.* Oxford University Press.
- Lindaman, D., & Ward, K. R. (2004). *History lessons: How textbooks from around the world portray U.S. history.* New Press.
- Lomnitz, C. (2000). Nationalism as a practical system: Benedict Anderson's theory of nationalism from the vantage point of Spanish America. In M. A. Centeno and F. López- Alves (Eds.). *The other mirror: Grand theory through the lens of Latin America* (pp. 329-360). Princeton University Press.
- Lorde, A. (1980, April). Age, race, class, and sex: Women redefining

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

- difference. Paper presented at The Copeland Colloquium, Amherst College.
- Macneal, C. (2015, February 17). *Oklahoma house panel votes to eliminate AP US History course*. Talking Points Memo.
<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/livewire/oklahoma-ban-ap-us-history>
- May, E. T. (1988). *Homeward bound: American families in the Cold War era*. Basic Books.
- Messenger, T. (2021, April 29). *Missouri Republicans embrace racism and censorship in trying to ban the 1619 Project*. St. Louis Post-Dispatch.
- Mills, M. (1997). Towards a disruptive pedagogy: Creating spaces for student and teacher resistance to social injustice, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 7(1), 35-55.
- Newmann, F. M., Bertocci, T. A., & Landsness, R. M. (1996). Skills in citizenship action. In W. Parker (ed.) *Educating the Democratic Mind*. State University of New York Press.
- Pease, D. E. (2009). *The new American exceptionalism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Pinar, W. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- San Pedro, T. (2018). Abby as ally: An argument for culturally disruptive pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(6), 1193-1232.
- Riley, D. (1992). Citizenship and the welfare state. In J. Allen, P. Braham & P. Lewis (Eds.). *Political and Economic Forms of Modernity* (pp.179-227). Polity Press
- Ross, E. W. (1997). The struggle for the social studies curriculum. In E. W. Ross (Ed.) *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities*. (pp. 3-20). State University of New York Press.
- Roy, A. (2005). *Gendered citizenship: Historical and conceptual explorations*. Orient Longman.
- Schmeichel, M. (2014). "Women made it a home": Representations of women in social studies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 9(3), 233-249.
- Schmeichel, M. (2015). Skirting around critical feminist rationales for teaching women in social studies. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43(1), 1-27.
- Schmidt, S. (2012). Am I a woman? The normalisation of woman in U.S. History. *Gender and Education*, 24(7), 707-724.
- Schwartz, S. (2020, September 18). *History educators respond to Trump: It matters how we tell the national story*. Education Week.
<https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/history-educators-respond-to-trump-it-matters-how-we-tell-the-national-story/2020/09>
- Scott, J. W. (1986). Gender: A useful category for historical analysis. *American Historical Review*, 91, 1053-1075.
- Scott, J. W. (1999). *Gender and the politics of history*. Columbia University Press.
- Scott, J. W. (2011). *The fantasy of feminist history*. Duke University Press.
- Seixas, P. (1997). Mapping the terrain of historical significance. *Social*

Verbing History (Norton, G, 2021)

- Education*, 61(1), 22-27.
- Shrayber, M. (2015, August 20). *AZ School district slaps anti-choice, pro-abstinence sticker on science books*. Jezebel. <http://jezebel.com/az-school-district-slaps-anti-choice-pro-abstinence-st-1725366328>
- Smith, D. G. (2006). Troubles with the sacred canopy: Global citizenship in a season of great untruth. In G. H. Richardson and D. W. Blades (Eds.) *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 124-136). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Tetreault, M. K. T. (1986). The journey from male-defined to gender-balanced education. *Theory into Practice*, 25(4), 227-234.
- Turner, K. J. (1998). *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases*. The University of Alabama Press.
- United States. (2009). *Race to the top executive summary*. U.S. Dept. of Education.
- United States. (2004). *No Child Left Behind: A toolkit for teachers*. U.S. Dept. of Education.
- Woysner, C. & Schocker, J. B. (2015). Cultural parallax and content analysis: Images of Black women in high school history textbooks. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 43(4), 441-468.
- Woysner, C. (2002). Political history as women's history: Towards a more inclusive curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 354-380.
- Woysner, C. (2003). Race, gender, and the early PTA: Civic engagement and public education, 1897-1924. *Teachers College Record*, 105(3), 520-544.
- Woysner, C. (2004). From assimilation to cultural pluralism: The PTA and civic education, 1900-1950. In C. Woysner, J. Watras, & M. S. Crocco (Eds.), *Social Education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenship* (pp. 93-109). Peter Lang.
- Woysner, C. (2005). Notes toward a historiography of the social studies: Recent scholarship and future directions. In Barton, K. (Ed.), *Research methods in social studies education* (pp. 11-39). Information Age Publishing.
- Woysner, C. (2012). Gender and social studies: Are we there yet?. In W. B. Russell III (Ed.) *Contemporary social studies: An essential reader* (pp. 261-276). Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Yellin, E. (2004). *Our mother's war: American women at home and at the front during World War II*. Free Press.
- Young, I. M. (1997). *Intersecting voices: Dilemmas of gender, political philosophy, and policy*. Princeton University Press.