

---

## EDITORIAL REVIEW

# ADDRESSING SENSITIVE, CONTENTIOUS AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES: PAST AND PRESENT

---

International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research [IJHLTR],  
Volume 14, Number 2 – Spring/Summer 2017

Historical Association of Great Britain  
[www.history.org.uk](http://www.history.org.uk)

ISSN: 14472-9474

*Page numbers in the text refer to IJHTR volume 14.2*

## EDITORIAL REVIEW

### ADDRESSING SENSITIVE, CONTENTIOUS AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES: PAST AND PRESENT

---

#### IJHLTR 14.2

##### Introduction: Thinking historically – syntactic ‘know how’ and substantive ‘know that’ knowledge

As an academic discipline History has two dimensions: the ‘know how’ syntactic or procedural knowledge of the skills and processes of ‘Doing History’ and the ‘know that’ substantive or propositional knowledge of History as a body of factual information (Rogers, 1979, IJHLTR 9.1). History Education empowers children through its procedural, syntactic ‘know-how’ knowledge to ask historical questions; to interact with sources that they interrogate, evaluate and extract evidence from; to test the validity of historical ‘facts’, arguments, narratives and claims in their sources; to organise, collate and colligate their evidential data to find answers to their questions; to use their findings to create and test hypotheses and finally to construct and report their own interpretations – histories. All of course under the guidance and with the support of their history teachers.

The opening paper of IJHLTR 14.2, Roland Bernhard’s *Are Historical Thinking Skills Important To History Teachers? Some Findings From A Qualitative Interview Study In Austria*, pp. 29-39, focuses upon the **syntactic** element of History Education and sets the scene for the other papers in this edition of IJHLTR 14.2. Bernhard raises the crucial importance of the historical education of History Educators. Indeed, a question that permeates the papers of IJHLTR 14.2 is History Education as much about the history education of teachers of history as the history education of their pupils and students: *quis custodiet ipsos custodet?*

The **syntactic ‘know how’** dimension of historical thinking is a central factor in three of this edition’s six papers: Heather Sharp’s and Niklas Ammert’s *Primary Sources In Swedish And Australian History Textbooks: A Comparative Analysis Of Representations Of Vietnam’s Kim Phuc*, pp. 57-70, Jeff Byford’s and Sean Lennon’s *American [USA], The Dilemma Of Senator Williams: A Case Study Of Student Decision-Making, Controversy, And Ethical Dilemmas*, pp. 71-92, and Mihiri Warnasuriya’s *Examining The Value Of Teaching Sensitive Matters In History: The Case Of Post-War Sri Lanka*, pp. 93-107. Their papers raise the crucial importance of the ability to understand the viewpoints of ‘the other’ in developing understanding of historical topics and situations. This enables pupils to discuss, debate, argue and evaluate different arguments, opinions, perspectives and sensitivity to a range of opinions, attitudes, beliefs and values.

Here syntactic historical knowledge also draws upon the affective, imaginative, creative faculties: pupils can use their informed imaginations to develop insight into and understand the thoughts, motivation, hopes, aspirations and behaviour of the agents, actors involved in sensitive, contentious and controversial topics. Without the syntactic ‘Doing History’ dimension, pupils are open to the closed-mind unquestioning acceptance of the often bigoted, distorted, xenophobic, sectarian, intolerant, simplistic irrationality of positivistic history’s uncontested historical accounts, narratives and interpretations, i.e usually a version of a single explanatory national master narrative.

The three papers also extensively involve **syntactic affective, imaginative, empathetic thinking**. Empathy, is central to Everardo Perez-Manjarrez’s *‘History On Trial’ The Role Of Moral*

*Judgment In The Explanation Of Controversial History*, pp. 40-56. Here we see the empathetic dimension at its starkest: it seems that the pupils' whose thinking Everardo analyses with clarity have not developed the ability to think historically. Everardo's research suggests that they see the past, including sensitive, contentious and controversial issues through contemporary, two-dimensional stereotypical eyes. Such a-historical reasoning is a barrier to the resolution of civil conflict, war and discord typical of many controversial, contentious and sensitive issues.

History Education also provides the **substantive or propositional temporal dimension** of History without which it is impossible to learn about the sensitive, contentious and controversial Issues that affect and even shape pupils' and students' lives. Substantive historical knowledge provides the essential network of linked factual 'know that' information about topics – the historical skeleton that structure all accounts, narratives and interpretations. 'Know that' knowledge includes information about dates, events, geographical data and the culture, thoughts, aspirations, motivations, values, faith and beliefs of the agents, the people involved – a contextual framework. For example, Geoffrey Short's paper *Learning From The Aftermath Of The Holocaust*, pp. 108-118 highlights the importance of such substantive knowledge about the Holocaust, arguing that in current teaching the contextual framework used is seriously deficient because it fails to include what happened after 1945 to the Holocaust's perpetrators and also the continuation of often endemic, murderous anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe with reference to post 1945 Poland.

The final paper in this edition of IJHLTR, Anastasia Vakaloudi's *From The Holocaust To Recent Mass Murders And Refugees. What Does History Teach Us?*, pp. 119-149, mirrors the both the syntactic and substantive perspective draws together many of the strands of the five predominantly syntactically oriented papers and the seventh, Geoffrey Short's *Learning From The Aftermath Of The Holocaust*, pp. 108-118.

### **Perspectives upon Sensitive, Contentious and Controversial Issues and History Education: IJHLTR's seven papers**

Roland Bernhard's *Are Historical Thinking Skills Important To History Teachers? Some Findings From A Qualitative Interview Study In Austria*, pp. 29-39, sets the scene for the following six papers that address a range of issues in the teaching of sensitive, contentious and controversial issues linked to the historical dimension of citizenship education. Roland 'presents some findings of a qualitative interview study with 42 Austrian history teachers, conducted in the framework of an on-going three-year research project (2015–2018) ... "Competence and Academic Orientation in History Textbooks (CAOHT)".'

Underpinning 'Competence and Academic Orientation' of both teachers and textbooks are four key questions.

1. What is their understanding of the nature of History as an academic discipline in terms of its procedural, syntactic structures: the skills, processes, procedures, protocols and disciplinary concepts?
2. What aspects of History's holistic, disciplinary nature endows it with a singular, even unique role that should axiomatically makes it an essential element in the school curriculum and the wider education of children and students as proto-citizens?
3. How can History's disciplinary framework that teachers assimilate through secondary and tertiary education be translated into both *pedagogic subject knowledge* and *applied, professional knowledge*? their professional development as teachers of history [education and training] to ensure that thinking historically underpins, informs and shapes their teaching of history?

4. What are the factors that prevent this and how can they be overcome? Barriers such as:
  - the nature of their professional development; t
  - their school's, departmental and overall classroom cultures;
  - statutory educational constraints such as national curricula, demands of testing and assessment, government inspection
  - their own values, beliefs and attitude – their professional orientation? (Harland & Kinder, 1997)

The final element, orientation, is pivotal to Roland's Austrian study with its focus upon school history's role in citizenship education.

One central element is the connection of the past with the present and future, namely the critical reflection about the fact that history always means personal orientation in the present and enables future actions.

The four key questions above relate to one of the two central elements of History Education that tends to be overlooked: that the historical education of the teachers is as important as the historical education of their pupils. While Roland places his study in a wider historical context, the whole issue of teachers' ability to think historically has been a central element in British History Education since John Fines and Jeanette Coltham's (1971) epochal *Educational Objectives for the Study of History*, and David Sylvester's *Schools Council History Project* (1972), aka the Schools History Project, and Peter Rogers (1979) *The New History Theory into Practice* (1979). Coltham & Fines analysed the nature of history and historical thinking in relation to the apparent threat to school history from social studies/sociology grounded in Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956). IJHLTR 9.1 reviews the impact of Fines' & Rogers' pamphlets – as well as making them available on line. (IJHLTR 9.1 2010)

The largely unacknowledged David Sylvester, mastermind, creator and director of the British Schools Council History Project based his project four square upon the eminent Oxford philosopher and historian, R.G. Collingwood's explanation of the nature of history in both his *Autobiography* (1939) and *The Idea of History* (1946). In other words, the goal of the Schools Council History project was pupils thinking historically (SCHP, 1976 – 1; SCHP, 1976 – 2; Sylvester, 2009; Sheldon, 2011). The focus of Peter Roger's 1979 pamphlet was the philosophical distinction between propositional [substantive] and procedural [syntactic knowledge] with the argument that crucial was procedural, 'know how' knowledge upon which was based 'know that' propositional knowledge, i.e. the 'factual' network of historical narratives, analyses and interpretations. Peter analysed what such procedural knowledge meant for teachers : its skills, processes, procedures, protocols and concepts, some 15 years before it became the Shulman inspired (1986)(1987) general zeitgeist of the educational community in the mid 1980s.

Coltham and Fines, Sylvester and Rogers identified and analysed the elements that thinking historically involves. So influential were they and the related discourse that they triggered that their ideas permeated and influenced a range of British examination syllabi and related developments in history teaching pedagogy and the training and professional development of history teachers. Recognition of the importance of thinking historically was its incorporation as one of the two structural elements of the English National Curriculum for History implemented in 1992. Ever since it has been a central feature of English school history curricula for 5-14 year olds and national history examination syllabi for 14-19 year olds. A similar concern with teaching pupils to think historically underpins Roland's paper:

The first dimension 'competence in questioning' reflects the ability to devise historical questions as well as detecting and assessing the questions that lie behind historical narratives with which one is dealing.

The second dimension is called 'methodological competence', which comprises being able to synthetically construct historical narratives or historical statements from given information such as historical sources or historical representations ('re-construction-competence'). Moreover, it is also about the skill to analytically reflect and assess given historical statements and work out what 'lies behind them', or how, why and with what intention they were constructed ('de-construction-competence').

The third dimension is called 'orientation competence' and is connected to the present and future in the above-mentioned sense, reflecting the ability to relate history, insights and judgements about the past to one's own life in the present (see Körber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015, p. 93). Peter Seixas labels this focus on uses of the past for orientation in the present as the 'strength' of the Austrian-German model (Seixas 2015, p. 4).

The fourth dimension of historical competence is called 'Sachkompetenz' and is difficult to translate into English. One could say that it is – among other things – the "competence of notions and structures" insofar that it contains all concepts and categories that are used to structure the historical universe (knowledge about patterns of periodisation or epochs, of sectors – political, economic, cultural, micro-and macro history, etc.). However, this dimension contains much more than that; rather, it encompasses all of what is called 'second-order concepts' in the English-speaking discourse, e.g. the 'six big historical thinking concepts' of Seixas and Morton (2013) belong to this area (see Körber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015, pp. 93-94). Moreover, skills of gaining access to achieve, the analysis and interpretation of documents and ordering information chronologically belong to the dimension of 'Sachkompetenz' (Körber & Meyer-Hamme, 2015, p. 94). In this context, Austrian contributions about historical knowledge and concepts include Kühberger (2012) and Kühberger (2016).

The fundamental issue of teacher understanding of historical thinking is central to Roland's argument:

For the further development of the discipline of history education research, it is important to truly understand the practice and know what teachers think about history education and historical thinking. Based on this knowledge, it will be possible to think about what needs to be done to greater inspire school practice and how to inform Initial Teacher Education and Education policies.

Here Roland hits the nail on its head with a hefty thud – echoing the fascinating and invaluable work of Chris Husbands, Alison Kitson and Anna Pendry in Britain (2003). Roland's paper raises the fundamental issue of education theory, policy and practice having an empirical, evidential, research basis without which it has little or no validity.

Reassuringly, his paper has such secure quantitative and qualitative research foundations. The findings mirror concern that there is a gulf between educational theorists and even policy makers and classroom teachers. While Austrian teachers reject the 'traditional' view of history education as inculcating in pupils a given, unquestioned positivistic body of knowledge there is little evidence that they have assimilated the concept that central to History Education's structure should be pupil learning of historical thinking. Instead teachers' pedagogy was based on a more general, universal phenomenon in reaction to adverse PISA findings about Austrian and German pupils

so as 'to focus not so much on content compared with **domain-specific competencies**, and **competence models** for different subjects – including for history' [editorial bold]. Interestingly, this mirrors the 1960s and 1970s Educational Objectives movement in the USA and then in Britain that looked outside the subject disciplines for the radical, reforming catalyst that would transform national education in the light of an external challenge: the Russian humiliation of America in the space race highlighted through the launching of Sputnik, the world's first satellite.

Roland's *Are Historical Thinking Skills Important To History Teachers?* paper reports Austrian teachers rejection of competences education because of it being an alien, top-down, nationally imposed model grounded in criticism of them and their teaching. Despite this, there are elements of competences education that reflect teachers underlying values and beliefs about teaching history. As such, they are teaching thinking historically almost accidentally, even incidentally – a factor highlighted in what they consider vital, important and valuable in teaching history: '... many teachers saw three elements that belong to historical thinking as important aspects of history education, namely fostering critical thinking, understanding the present by dealing with the past and participation in political discourse and historical culture.'

The second paper in this volume, Everardo Perez-Manjarrez's '*History On Trial*' *The Role Of Moral Judgment In The Explanation Of Controversial History*, pp. 40-56, illuminates this perception. Everardo's research is on pupils' interpretation of the Spanish conquest of Mexico in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century. Everardo's research hypothesis is that moral values both influence and shape pupils sense-making of history through the construction of narratives, narratives that depend largely upon the cultural context of their learning history in schools. Here we should bear in mind that internationally narrative is the dominant factor in pupil's History Education mediated through teacher controlled and dominated classroom discourse and the ubiquitous textbook. And, indirectly, the moral values of teachers that transcend their own historical knowledge are crucial, i.e. they strongly influence the history that is taught.

From the earliest educational phase a body of narratives, stories, with a range of common themes; the warp and weft of the tales that pupils weave into their own versions of the national story: 'validated interpretations of the past, socially contextualized and situated within a particular moral system.' Everardo comments on the wider context of the role of narrative and its moral values that are the focus of his research:

The framework of narrative patterns enables insight into how meaning is structured. These patterns are schematic templates that mediate both the representation of historical events and their social significance (Wertsch, 2008); they also structure cultural accounts conveying common historical motifs and values. For instance, studies conducted in different countries show that in students' national historical narratives, there are common narrative patterns such as anti-colonial struggle; the birth of the nation is depicted through the historical motif of the pursuit of freedom, which is guided by values such as bravery, courage, and loyalty (Carretero, 2011; Wertsch & Karumidze, 2009). Likewise, patterns of values are attributed to particular historical characters, and their actions are morally judged (Carretero, Lopez-Manjon & Jacott, 1997).

The second salient characteristic is the discursive articulation of the narrative. Several studies illustrate the array of discourses involved in the explanation of a historical event, and suggest the moral values inherent to each discourse. For instance, the explanation of the nation's origins invokes multiple discourses: firstly, there is a patriotic discourse explaining the significance of battles that were fought for national liberation (Carretero, 2011); and secondly, a threat discourse that creates the figure of a foreign enemy who endangers the

country (Wertsch & Karumidze, 2009). Both discourses are often accompanied by a gender discourse that portrays the nation as a caring mother, nurturing her children and expecting the same nurturance in return (Mayer, 2000; Yuval-Davis, 1997). Hence, while people may not be historically accurate, these interconnected discourses provide them with compelling explanations.

The foregoing also shows that there are different moral values associated with historical narratives, such as heroism, respect, defence, and care. Although not all are explicit, every narrative has an implicit moral subtext. Studies have shown that any historical narrative is rooted in the context and worldview of its construction (Koselleck, 1985/2003; White, 2009).'

Intriguingly, Everardo's paper then reports case-study research into two sixteen year old Spanish and Mexican pupils, Alex' and Michelle's interpretations of the Spanish conquest of Mexico. Alex lives in Madrid, Michelle in Mexico City. Both have similar middle class backgrounds: education in public schools and outstanding educational achievement. Alex and Michelle are two of a cohort of c. 40 such case studies. Their case studies are typical and as such illuminate the nature and role of what underpins the 40 students' historical explanations and related historical thinking.

Everardo reports that Alex and Michelle, in common with other pupils, often use moral judgments 'to explain history through common discourses that convey the main circumstances of the Conquest' drawing on three main common discourses that in turn draw upon a range of different discursive tools that centre on moral values.

The first common discourse centres on racial stereotypes that represent the superiority and technological development of the Spaniards in comparison with the indigenous inhabitants of Mexico.

The second discourse is based upon the superiority of the Spanish language – the indigenous population was incapable of effective communication.

The third discourse is cultural – reflecting Alex and Michelle's views about the racial superiority of the Spanish and their culture.

These three common discourses permeate Alex and Michelle's moral views about the indigenous population and the impact that the Spanish had upon it. Michelle's perspective 'allows her to morally excuse Spaniards' actions, ascribing to them the agency of a superior civilisation.' Everardo's paper then teases out in detail different aspects of the moral values that permeate Alex and Michelle's interpretation.

A fascinating, compelling aspect of Everardo's article is how it relates to the wider picture of children's historical thinking. The pioneering research work of Peter Lee and Ros Ashby in the mid 1990s established a benchmark for such research that has focused upon the development of pupil's historical understanding. Here both Alex and Michelle are operating in a framework in which history is a body of positivistic, uncontested, substantive knowledge that they assimilate. The related pedagogy is one of transmission with the teacher and textbook as the agents through which knowledge is assimilated. There seems no evidence from the analysis of Alex and Michelle's discourse that they have been taught to think historically so as to develop **any understanding** of the mentalities of the historical agents involved in the Spanish conquest of Mexico (Lee et al, 1996, Van Boxtel & Van Drie, 2008; Van Boxtel and Van Drie, 2013). And, in relation to this, they used a set of mental tools about contemporary moral values to shape their interpretations of the Conquest, i.e. they were thinking in a profoundly a-historical way.

The conclusion of Edverardo's paper is sobering: it perhaps helps explain the major problems facing schools in dealing with controversial and sensitive issues where the pupils' orientation has not involved them in historical thinking that involves an empathetic and cognitive understanding of the thinking and behaviour of 'the other', i.e. the agents who are the actors in both past and the present situations that the pupils study:

The analysis shows that the students' sense-making of history intertwines historical and moral concerns, personal values, and socially significant motifs such as peace and progress. In this process morality plays a significant role, especially moral judgment functioning as a discursive linkage between personal moral stances and historical understanding.

Michelle and Alex explain the Conquest as a civilizing process legitimized in the language of material, cultural, and intellectual progress, while the violent nature of colonialism is overlooked. They achieve this by using an array of moral judgments, within three discourses that pertain to the historical characters' personal traits, reasoning abilities, and beliefs. Moral judgments tend to relate to misconceptions of the past and present-day prejudices, as demonstrated in other studies (Lee & Ashby, 2001; Von Borries, 1994). In general, the participants appraise the Conquest through their own moral values, which are rooted in personal historical beliefs of cultural development and civilization.

Everardo's paper perfectly complements Heather Sharp and Niklas Ammert's Primary **Sources In Swedish And Australian History Textbooks: A Comparative Analysis Of Representations Of Vietnam's Kim Phuc**, pp. 57-70. Heather and Niklas's research relates closely to the *Editorial Review's* third key question:

How can History's disciplinary framework that teachers assimilate through secondary and tertiary education be translated into both *pedagogic subject knowledge* and *applied, professional knowledge*? Their professional development as teachers of history [education and training] to ensure that thinking historically underpins, informs and shapes their teaching of history?

The focal point of Heather's and Niklas's paper is an iconic photograph, Figure 1, taken during the Vietnam War. The photograph has become a symbolic representation of the Vietnam War's impact upon Vietnam's civilian population. The Vietnam War lasted from the early 1960s until the fall of Saigon, South Vietnam's capital, in 1975 when the North Vietnamese armed forces, the Viet Cong defeated the South Vietnamese and their ally, the United States of America.



Nick Ut's famous photograph in *Levande historia* (p. 387)

Heather and Niklas explain the focus of their article:

This article [pp. 57-70] compares primary sources used in Swedish and Australian school History textbooks on the topic of the Vietnam War. The focus is on analysing representations of Kim Phuc, the young girl who was infamously chemically burnt with napalm. Applying an approach that incorporates Habermas's three knowledge types, this article focuses on student questions and activities in relation to how sources are treated in textbooks.

The article uses a case study approach to conduct a comparison between how, and if, Swedish and Australian textbooks engage students through questions and activities directly connected with the use of primary sources.

Findings suggest that current textbook approaches could incorporate a greater variety of questions with differing knowledge types, to use images more consistently beyond illustrative purposes, and to structure activities that require students to compare and contrast two or more primary sources.

The paper's Australia and Swedish locus provides an insight into the teaching of universal, global issues that directly affect all countries and their pupils and students. The article's rationale places History Education at the forefront of the education of pupils for active citizenship [as opposed to passive citizenship] in a world that depends upon them being critical, informed sceptical (not cynical) thinkers:

The discipline of history, with its traditional focus on using primary source documents to navigate through various perspectives can provide students with at least some of the tools in which to engage with the political discussions going on around them. The History curriculum broadly, and also source activities included as part of History teaching in school classrooms, play a significant role in educating students and providing them with the skills to be critical, active citizens (Sharp, 2015). p. 57.

Heather and Niklas draw upon Habermas's three types/domains of knowledge to categorise the role and nature of sources in textbooks. An introductory analysis of textbooks sources categorises them as being predominantly Illustrative – related to but not an integral element of either text or activities or as an element in deepening 'factual' knowledge, i.e. comprehension and finally as supporting explanation or interpretation through providing an investigative perspective. These three elements relate to Habermas's domains:

*technical knowledge, practical knowledge, and emancipatory knowledge.* Each different type of knowledge contains a higher level of thinking. The technical knowledge draws on content that accounts for, describes, is factual, and/or is easily verifiable. It can be seen as highlighting comprehension. The practical knowledge develops on from the statement knowledge type, and includes explanation, interpretation, judgement, and dialogical communication with others. The third type, emancipatory, recognises and encourages knowledge that is subjective, encourages students to be self-reflective, and is concerned with how students (when applied to an educational context) position themselves and others, see Table 1 that relates source analysis to a variation of Habermas's knowledge. (p. 59).

The authors also address the relationship between visual sources in textbooks and their role as historical evidence – a central aspect of teaching about the Vietnam War drawing upon the Kim Phuc photo [or rather series of photographs, there are more than one].

TABLE 1. Knowledge types applied to sources in textbooks

Knowledge Type	Attributes of the Knowledge Type	Habermas Definition	In textbook activities, types of questions asked include:
Illustration only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source included to fill the page, perhaps as a filler and perhaps as an aesthetic</li> </ul>	Not applicable.	No questions or activities associated with this type of source. Not included in the main text of the textbook.
Statement (draws on Habermas' technical knowledge)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Factual</li> <li>Accounting for</li> <li>Confirmation</li> <li>Brief description</li> <li>Statement</li> <li>Highlights comprehension</li> </ul>	Emerges from the questions "what" and "how"; largely descriptive knowledge, often based on observation; helps people regulate, predict and control their daily lives.	What is? Who is? What happened? When? How much? How often?
Explanation/ Interpretive Description (draws on Habermas' practical knowledge)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation</li> <li>Interpretive</li> <li>description</li> <li>background</li> </ul>	Emerges from the question "why" and is interpretive rather than descriptive. Concerned with motives and causes, and helps us understand people's actions and attitudes, and thus helps us in our dealings with these people.	How was that possible? What does it mean? Why? What happened afterwards?
Critical Reflection/ Analysis	Connecting to the student, students' experiences and previous knowledge. References to parallel contexts, theoretical concepts or models	Emerges from the questions "in whose interests" or "who benefits and who loses".	How can I understand this? What can I compare with? Why did people act/ react in that way? What could have happened?
Emancipatory, transformative knowledge (draws on Habermas' emancipatory knowledge)	Students are required to consider how to take a theoretical understanding of a history topic or concept and to 'activate' it in an authentic, active citizenship context that critiques commonly held assumptions	Concerned with the effect of power, privilege and advantage in situations, and thus help people emancipate themselves from various forms of disadvantage and oppression, and to seek justice for themselves and others.	What action could be taken?

The paper is directly relevant to all countries and jurisdictions in which history is taught. Not because of the substantive, propositional 'factual' information about the Vietnam War it presents but because it draws upon the universal medium for the teaching of history – *the textbook*. Concerning textbooks, the authors focus upon the embedding of 'sources' in them with an associated contextual penumbra and commentary. And, perhaps, crucially, the activities framework that provides the support for the students to develop their ability to understand, analyse, reflect upon, discuss and evaluate the sources including their provenance, reliability and the value of the

information that they contain in developing a deepening understanding of the historical situation being studied.

The embedding of sources in textbooks is a universal, common feature: as such, the article's is of value to all History Educators who believe that historical thinking should be a crucial element in the DNA of history teaching. Historical thinking is central to the activities that accompany the text: a text whose content government's universally prescribe through their national curricula and related regulations.

... the importance that textbook activities have in providing a thorough reflection of the types of knowledge and skills that the textbook authors, and teachers too, want students to learn become obviously important. It is of central interest to many governments, education researchers, and other key stakeholders to study what students are required to learn and to achieve at school... While the content of the curriculum and accompanying syllabus documents can be clearly known, the same cannot be said for what students are instructed to achieve. Analysing textbook activities is one way to partially uncover this current deficit of knowledge in this area of research. (pp. 58-50).

Heather's and Niklas's detailed analysis of the Kim Phuc photograph in four textbooks is sobering. Instead of the photograph being used to develop incrementally pupil thinking, knowledge and understanding in all three Habermas domains its use is predominantly illustrative.

On the whole, the activities surrounding this photo engage students in only lower order thinking activities, if any at all. Two textbooks include only a photograph of the young Kim Phuc with no mediating activity and can be categorised as being for illustrative purposes only. In these textbooks it is included more as a violent aesthetic, perhaps to shock students or be a site of visual interest, but not to be used as part of an explicit, official student activity. One textbook includes a student activity that could be regarded as statement, requiring students to produce factual or comprehension-style responses. Only one textbook, *Retroactive*, moves into the category of explanation/interpretive description, mainly because of it acting as a pedagogical device for teachers on how to analyse sources, and also because students are required to complete activities on an accompanying online sites, where they connect new information learnt to the broader context of the Vietnam War. Kim Phuc's experience, constructed as a case study in History textbooks, is a valuable inclusion as it is of historical importance, having significantly contributed to bringing about a change in public attitudes, and also for her continued presence as an example of the human impact of war on civilians.

Indeed, the photograph, figure 2, used in the only textbook that uses activities to develop pupil insight and understanding, conveys different messages from the iconic photograph, the universally famous image, see figure 1, (p. 67).

It is a different photograph that mutes [sanitises] the horror, terror that the body language of Kim Phuc conveys in the first photograph, figure 1. The authors conclude that the low level illustrative and not illuminative use of images is because of ingrained Australian and Swedish pedagogic cultures. 'It became obvious in the analysis of the textbook activities that the history teaching traditions of the respective countries are different, and that these teaching traditions become apparent through the types of questions/exercises included in textbooks. The textbook activities can be seen as a reflection of the favoured pedagogical practices of both nations.'

Here we return to the fundamental issue of what the political nation – the social and political network that control educational policy and practice views as the role of History in the education of



Source 1.38 Children fleeing a village bombed with Napalm

Source 1.37

*We sure are pleased with those backroom boys at Dow [Chemicals]. The original product wasn't so hot—if the gooks were quick they could scrape it off. So the boys started adding polystyrene—now it sticks like shit to a blanket. But if the gooks jumped under water it stopped burning, so they started adding Willie Peter (white phosphorus) so's to make it burn better. And just one drop is enough, it'll keep on burning right down to the bone so they die anyway from phosphorus poisoning.*

A US army source talks about Napalm.  
Quoted in *Vietnam Inc.* by Philip Jones Griffiths (1971)

Source 1.38

*We of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations who participated in the decisions on Vietnam acted according to what we thought were the principles and traditions of this nation. We made our decisions in light of those values. We were wrong, terribly wrong. We owe it to future generation explain why.*

Extract from *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vie*  
by Robert McNamara, 1995. Robert McNamara was  
US Secretary of Defence from 1961 to

Primary sources and questions on the Vietnam War?" (Carrodus, Delany, McArthur, Smith, Taylor & Young, 2012, p. 29)

its pupils. In Sweden it is a 'reflection of Sweden's approach to teaching History in schools, which uses History as a way to acculturate students to Swedish culture, traditions, political systems and history as a reference for understanding and interpreting the present.' Heather and Niklas argue that in both Sweden and Australia such this is no longer fit-for-purpose:

With so many primary sources—being visual across both modern and ancient histories, it is vital students develop the skills to analyse them in meaningful ways, and for this to be modelled to students by not including images for illustrative purposes only: to entertain or to fill up space, without being used as a pedagogical experience. In order for students to be acculturated into not just a disciplinary way of thinking and knowing the field of history, but also to be able to use sources to critically analyse the world around them; a particularly crucial point in the visually saturated media context of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, then it is vital that students have those initial learning experience in the classroom under the pedagogical guidance of a teacher. (p. 68).

Which raises perhaps a radical hypothesis: that History Education should be more to do with the History Education of teachers of history than with that of pupils. Nowhere is this more crystal clear than in the thought provoking fourth paper in IJHLTR 14.2, paper of Jeff Byford's and Sean Lennon's, ***The Dilemma Of Senator Williams: A Case Study Of Student Decision-Making, Controversy, And Ethical Dilemmas***, pp. 71-92. The abstract outlines the challenge that both teachers and their students face in the teaching of this topic:

The title "*Senator Williams, Do You Vote For or Against on the Diego Resolution before Senate*" encourages students to engage in historical empathy and critical inquiry in considering the possible military intervention in the small hypothetical country of Ersatz. The Diego Resolution asks the Senate to endorse the President's plan to move a navy task force to a position ten miles off the shore of Ersatz so that to be available quickly if needed. The resolution does not say explicitly what the Navy will do after it is there, only that it would be "ready to take whatever actions are necessary to protect American lives."

With each document, students receive more pertinent information that presents controversy and ethical dilemmas. Such an investigation encouraged students to confront three fundamental questions:

- 1) When does the United States have the authority or obligation to intervene in another country's affairs,
- 2) When, if ever, should the President have the power to use military force without Congressional approval, and
- 3) When, if ever, does the value of American lives outweigh the risk and reward of foreign policy or diplomacy?

The research involved four questionnaires on the Case Study's four scenarios in evaluating the effectiveness of its development of the students' knowledge and understanding of the Diego resolution and the related historical empathy and skills of historical enquiry. (p. 71).

Central to the *Senator Williams* paper is the ability of the students to be empathetic through building up understanding of historical context, scenarios and agents involved in unfolding situations: Case Studies. Jeff and Sean provide a clear and comprehensive explanation of the thinking behind their use of Case Study involving role-play and simulation in contrast to a conventional pedagogy that involves direct instruction and rote memorisation. A major problem of conventional pedagogy is its failure to enable students to develop both accurate knowledge of and understanding of complex events and movements such as American involvement in Vietnam and currently Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan and ISIS, jihadism and resurgent, often xenophobic, nationalism.

In contrast Case Studies involve extensive, continuous and intensive student interaction with them being forced to discuss, analyse, develop, clarify, declaim, justify and defend their opinions about historically related events. The historical value of their learning depends upon how accurately the Case Study can realistically and accurately 'model' the historical circumstances upon which it is based. Through empathetic involvement in considering, discussing, arguing and choosing from the range of possible decisions and outcomes facing figures in the past, the students are empowered to:

- 1) better understand complicated issues, historical events, and content material;
- 2) discuss issues with their peers;
- 3) engage in informative discussion and debate related information presented;
- 4) become active agents in the learning process;
- 5) develop solutions to historical problems;

6) decipher causes of events (Kunselman & Johnson, 2004; Byford, 2013).

The authors report both British and American analysis of the educational value of teaching pupils to be empathetic, noting that empathy requires students to be both affective and cognitive. They have to be able to:

- 1) project their thoughts and feelings into a historical situation;
- 2) distinguish the historical period from their own;
- 3) utilize reference materials or sources;
- 4) present the person or situation to illustrate the circumstances of the case or dilemmas; and
- 5) can be cognitive of the misunderstanding, conflict or tragedy (Portal, 1987 & Yilmaz, 2007).

And, this can only be achieved through the teachers grounding their teaching in their understanding of historical thinking and using it as the basis for a continuous, progressive educational process that enables their pupils in turn to think historically. The authors conclude:

Teacher-led, student dialogues are powerful tools for engaging students in a broad and varied range of conceptual thinking exercises, and this activity is no exception. As the instructor moves the students from one scenario to the next, each with the overlapping degrees of new information, the teacher can refrain or engage the students during each segment, to elicit discussions or dialogues pertinent to their concerns or views. Using student differences in answering, without identifying the student, but by showing the class the numbers or percentages, can be an easy prompt for those willing to talk about their decision-making processes. This activity style has been utilized effectively in other scenario types, especially with ethics such as the trolley dilemma, allowing for complex thinking while avoiding controversial issues as the scenarios are abstract and not grounded in real world subjects or issues (Lennon, Byford & Cox, 2015).

With proper prompting as well as functioning as an 'outlet' to prevent hostility or frustration, the instructor can use the scenario to help guide students through levels of thinking beyond mere rote memorization while avoiding common pitfalls of controversial issues or other discussions that generate hostility. By doing this, the teacher develops a twofold objective; promoting dialogic discourse invaluable for students in hearing contrarian views and understanding that their peers may be different but that is okay, and to allow these same students to critically rationalize what is not an easy, or possibly even a solvable problem (Lennon, 2017). If anything, an issue of complexity is where there are no simple fixes or easy answers. Both of these activities allow for students to learn from each other, peer influences as well as the teacher in developing higher functioning skills so necessary for a functioning democracy.

... To expose students to the perceived realities of statesmanship and foreign diplomacy, students were exposed to a simulated case study involving, foreign governments, American lives, and global and domestic economic interests. This time-tested moral dilemma allows students to analyze, evaluate and decide the final vote on the fictional Diego Resolution. This lesson provides students with creative insight into the functions of government, political party alignment, and American domestic and geopolitical interests not commonly found in today's social studies curriculum. (pp. 81-82).

Nowhere in the world is the imperative of thinking historically that Geoff and Sean highlight more crucial than in the educational challenges facing Sri Lanka after an extended period of Civil War ended in 2009. Mihiri Warnasuriya's fifth article in IJHLTR 14.2, ***Examining The Value Of Teaching Sensitive Matters In History: The Case Of Post-War Sri Lanka***,

pp. 93-107, focuses on these; reconciliation through education as it affects mind-sets, values and beliefs. Her paper's abstract raises the fundamental issues involved in creating an educational programme, grounding her conclusions in her research findings:

Driven by the overarching objective of promoting reconciliation through education, this paper explores the impact of history teaching on youth identity and ethnic relations in Sri Lanka.

Building on the arguments of scholars the likes of Cole and Barsalou (2006) who hold that the failure to deal with the causes of conflict could have adverse future consequences, the study attempts to answer the following question: Should the controversial issues that are believed to have led to the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict be discussed in the secondary school history curriculum?

The investigation is largely based on the findings of 71 semi-structured interviews with youth and history teachers in Sri Lanka, and supplemented by an analysis of history textbooks and existing literature. The analysis of textbooks reveals that thus far such issues are either glossed over or completely ignored in the history lesson. The primary data generally supports the inclusion of contentious matters by uncovering the glaring lack of knowledge among Sri Lankan youth regarding the origins of the conflict, highlighting the need to curtail the spread of misinformation, and indicating how the avoidance of controversy goes against the goals of the discipline.

However, problems related to the willingness and capacity of teachers in dealing with sensitive subject matter and the prevalence of pedagogies that suppress critical thinking, present a compelling counter argument. This points towards the conclusion that controversial issues should be discussed in the history curriculum, provided that certain conditions which would support teachers and students in dealing with them are fulfilled. (p. 93).

What are the problems that these 'certain conditions' would need to address for reconciliation to be effective? Crucial is an understanding of the historical roots of the Civil War and the traumatic events of the Sri Lankan Civil War (1986-2009), memories of which deeply affect the consciousness, sense of identity, attitudes and behaviours of contemporary Tamil and Sinhalese societies. Extensive research and scholarship has illuminated the nature of 20<sup>th</sup> century Sri Lankan society and related ethnically sensitive issues and controversial, 'flashpoint' events. This essentially historical knowledge underpins evidentially based understanding of the outbreak of civil unrest and rioting of the 1980s and the ensuing Civil War between the Tamil separatist group, the Tamil Tigers, and the Sinhalese community. Teaching pupils about the origins and causes of the Civil War from the perspectives of both Sinhalese and Tamils raises controversial issues – an understanding of which should enable reconciliation through understanding the position, perspectives, orientation and behaviour of 'the other' community. Teaching about the Civil War per se is too sensitive, difficult and traumatic as memories of it are still fresh and alive in the families and communities of pupils.

Mihiri presents an analysis of nine major different factors in the 1980s that fuelled tension and civil discord between the Tamil and Sinhalese communities to breaking point. Her analysis draws upon the body of academic literature which recognises that the conflict was based upon the 20<sup>th</sup> century divisiveness that British rule over the island caused. For each of nine controversial areas Mihiri details the issues and problems involved, ending each account with an analysis of current textbooks that are grounded in a single, official Sinhalese interpretation that ignores the multi-faceted arguments and issues that each area involves. Crucially, a single, official 'master narrative' transmitted through the teacher mediated textbook makes no provision for the critical thinking,

reflection, discussion and debate, thinking historically, that would enable pupils to understand the roots of the Civil War from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century through their comprehension of the perspectives of both the Tamil and Sinhalese communities. Textbook analysis starkly reveals that such 'sensitive and contentious subject matter' is avoided within the Sri Lankan history curriculum'.

Mihiri analyses the value of teaching sensitive and controversial issues through a pedagogy based upon developing and refining the critical thinking skills of civic minded citizens. Central is questioning, an understanding of the evidence that underpins arguments, discussion, interpretation and reaching conclusions that are conscious of a range of views and related values. Personal, communal and national identity affects what what Sri Lankan pupils learn from teaching about sensitive and controversial topics and issues that led to Civil War. Central is pupils' ability to understand, value and defend 'others' ethnic, cultural, religious and social beliefs. This understanding is at the heart of reconciliation upon which Sri Lankan peace, social cohesion and progress will depend.

A rider to the argument for teaching sensitive and controversial history through examination of the historical roots of the Sri Lankan Civil War was the pupils' extraordinary ignorance 'the glaring lack of knowledge that exists among Sri Lankan youth regarding the breakdown of relationships between Sinhalese and Tamils.' An aspect of what little historical knowledge pupils had was its folk history nature: stories, myths, anecdotes and incidental details – misinformation that permeates the understanding across all communities. As with studies of pupils' historical understanding in other communities, Mihiri's research showed that the major influence on pupils' historical insights and perspectives was what they had learned in school.

This, allied to teacher acceptance of the value of teaching about a controversial past for reconciliation led Mihiri to conclude that a key element is the education and training of teachers:

While it is both necessary and important to discuss the controversial issues that are believed to have led to the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict in the secondary school history curriculum, inclusion of such sensitive subject matter needs to be preceded by teacher training and pedagogical reforms. Taking steps to address the broader issues related to history education that were exposed through this study, is also of vital importance. In the absence of these measures, efforts to educate the seemingly ill-informed Sri Lankan youth regarding the country's difficult past, could prove to be more harmful than helpful. (p. 104).

Geoffrey Short's and Anastasia Vakaloudi's final two papers in IJHLTR 14.2 Holocaust education encompass many of the issues of teaching sensitive, contentious and controversial issues that previous papers raise and illuminate. Geoffrey in **Learning From The Aftermath Of The Holocaust**, pp. 108-118, raises fundamental issues about teaching a topic where the teachers do not have a comprehensive knowledge or understanding of the topic, i.e. the substantive knowledge involved, that results in teaching and learning that is partial, inadequate and misleading. In his paper Geoffrey argues that the history of the Holocaust as represented in textbooks is seriously deficient. They fail to place anti-semitism of the holocaust in its wider European context in which persecution of the Jews is endemic and much worse than in Germany. In dealing with anti-semitism textbooks omit major factors: the self-interest of those involved through their stealing of Jewish property / possessions / asserts: larceny on the grandest of scales, the role of the Catholic church both during and after the Holocaust and an implicit, even explicit perception, that the Jews failed actively to resist their oppression that 'also risks students construing passivity in the face of the oppressor as a trait more deserving of contempt than compassion, an outcome patently at odds with any notion of responsible citizenship.'

While these omissions means major distortion in the teaching of the holocaust Geoffrey argues that there is a much more serious problem: an almost universal failure to deal with both the post 1945 treatment of those responsible for the holocaust, the perpetrators, and the treatment of Jews who continued to live in countries who Jewish populations suffered most from the Holocaust. Here Geoffrey reports the research evidence from a major survey at the UCL IoE that indicates that less than 50% dealt with the experience of Holocaust survivors since 1945 and the Nuremberg trials. From an editorial perspective we suspect that the Nuremberg trials and not the post war experience was the topic that the majority of teachers covered here. Succinctly and with force Geoffrey argues strongly for extending the teaching about the Holocaust to include major omissions:

Specifically, an awareness of what happened to those Jews who returned home following their forced exile or incarceration and learning also about the fate of the perpetrators can lead to a more sophisticated understanding of the Holocaust. In other words, certain post-war events illuminate the Jewish experience between 1933 and 1945 and may well influence the way we think about that experience. Studying these events may also help to promote responsible citizenship. (p. 109)

Pupils learning about the Holocaust touch upon the rawest, most sensitive and controversial aspects of any history curriculum: man's inhumanity to man. The Holocaust becomes directly relevant to most pupils with both the widening of its study to *geographically* include their home countries, i.e. across Nazi Europe and further afield and *chronologically* to include the post war period and later.

Having outlined the arguments about extending Holocaust education to the period after 1945, Geoffrey then examines in often harrowing detail two cases: 'The Jewish Experience in Poland 1945-46' and 'The fate of the perpetrators.' A focus of the Polish account is a continuation of anti-Jewish violence including widespread anti-semitism that at its extreme included large-scale murder. Ethnic Poles killed some 1500 Polish Jews in the fifteen months after the end of World War II in Europe. In the south-eastern town of Kielce in July 1946 Poles slaughtered 42 Jews in a pogrom. A related issue was the role of the Catholic church during this period: with minor exceptions its members continued to be hostile and anti-Semitic and failed totally to respond pastorally to the continued often deadly persecution of Poland's Jewish population.

Learning about the origins of this pogrom [Kielce] can help students deepen their understanding of stereotypes. They are certainly able to recognise the potential longevity and devastating consequences of a hostile ethnic stereotype ... Most importantly, students should learn from this pogrom that venomous stereotypes can lead to carnage despite their being wholly without foundation...

In so far as responsible citizenship involves reflecting critically on the society in which one lives, knowledge of the Kielce pogrom might have the added benefit of prompting students to think about why it is that some people are willing to believe completely unfounded rumours. It might further prompt them to ask how society can help such people become less gullible. The stereotype linking Jews to Communism was rather different in that it did contain a kernel of truth; a number of assimilated Jews being prominent members of the Ministry of Public Security. That said, the danger inherent in any ethnic stereotype is that those exposed to it will assume that what is true of some members of the targeted group is true of all of them and consequently, any action based on the stereotype will likely punish the innocent along with the guilty. Students should be made aware of this danger. The Kielce pogrom highlights it graphically as there were a number of children among the dead. (pp. 112-13).

The paper's section on 'The fate of the perpetrators' highlights the massive extent to which those responsible for the Holocaust escaped trial. The reasons were multiple: it was in the national interest of the western allied countries, mainly Britain and the United States, to turn a blind eye:

The prosecution of leading war criminals by the Allies began in Nuremberg in November 1945 and continued either at Nuremberg or elsewhere in Germany until around 1948, by which time the Cold War, having eclipsed all other political concerns, was dictating a change in priorities. The Allies needed to strengthen West Germany economically, militarily and in other ways and this required a substantial reduction in the number of prosecutions. By the early 1950s they had effectively stopped.<sup>3</sup> For the Allies, perceived national interest took precedence over the quest for justice and this meant that many former Nazis were allowed to return to their previous jobs in the armed forces, in the judiciary, in industry and in other areas of the economy. The Allies actually went further and not only abandoned the search for justice but began actively to recruit those they knew or suspected of having committed war crimes (Cesarani, 2001). In particular, the United States sought scientists, such as Wernher von Braun, to work on the country's space programme and to develop its nuclear weapons capacity. Braun had not only joined the Nazi party but had been a member of the SS and had employed slave labour to produce V2 rockets. Such hypocritical behaviour on the part of the United States, prosecuting some Nazi war criminals at the same time as granting American citizenship to those they considered useful, should make students question just how seriously the Allies took the search for justice after the war and how much they ever really cared about the suffering of Jews and other victim groups under the Nazis. (p. 114)

Geoffrey's paper is a sobering illustration of how the teaching of a sensitive, contentious and controversial issue can play a key part in pupils' political literacy and citizenship education. The final section of his paper illustrates this through two major examples: the Kielce pogrom and the role of the Catholic Church:

The background to the Kielce pogrom enables them to deepen their understanding of racism by familiarising themselves with one of its key components, namely ethnic stereotyping. They are able to learn about both the durability and extensive influence of such stereotypes and also about their destructive potential even when lacking a grain of truth. Moreover, the pogrom serves to remind students of how social institutions can foster and perpetuate ethnic stereotypes and the danger of them doing so. I refer specifically to the role of the Catholic Church in associating Jews with communism and the consequences of this association in terms of the suffering caused to innocent and guilty alike. (p. 116).

An intriguing aspect of **Learning From The Aftermath Of The Holocaust** is that it highlights the importance of content, i.e. substantive, historical knowledge, in the historical dimension of Citizenship Education. However, while content is vital, it needs to be handled in the context of developing pupils ability to think historically so as to engage critically with sensitive, contentious and controversial issues reaching their own judgment grounded with evidential justification. Without this, History Education is merely propaganda – brain washing, a contentious and controversial statement.

The final paper in this edition, Anastasia Vakaloudi's **From The Holocaust To Recent Mass Murders And Refugees. What Does History Teach Us?**, pp. 119-149, mirrors the perspective Geoffrey Short's paper 'Learning From The Aftermath Of The Holocaust' as well as drawing together many of the strands that the other five papers address. Anastasia reports on the rationale and initial planning phase of a four-month project on the Holocaust with twelve three-hour sessions. The pedagogy involves pupils in four workshops that actively develops their historical thinking

through role play, discussion, debate and the critical investigation and evaluation of sources and using the evidence to inform their own interpretation, conclusions and the narratives they create to understand topics. The four workshops are:

Workshop 1: Introduction To The Holocaust, Analyzing Propaganda

Workshop 2: Resistance To The Nazism

Workshop 3: Testimony Of The Living

Workshop 4: Cases Of Recent Mass Atrocities – The Refugees

The paper's appendix contains full details of each of the workshops with resources, activities and all ancillary information.

Anastasia's paper's abstract succinctly summarises the Holocaust project's main features:

Through studying cases of genocide and mass atrocities, students can come to realize that: democratic institutions and values are not automatically sustained but need to be appreciated, nurtured, and protected; silence and indifference to the suffering of others, or to the infringement of civil rights in any society, can – however unintentionally – perpetuate the problems. Because the objective of teaching any subject is to engage the intellectual curiosity of students in order to inspire critical thought and personal growth, when we teach History, it is helpful to structure lesson plans aiming not only to educate students about particular topics such as the Holocaust and global mass atrocities but to help them prevent possible future atrocities.

Through the historical analysis we should be engaged to the moral and anti-racist education. Thus the principal aim of the educational project that we propose is to explore secondary school students' knowledge / understanding of the Holocaust and recent mass atrocities. However, we are also interested in examining how knowledge / understanding is related to other issues, such as students' attitudes towards out-groups or their beliefs in a "just world".

Students attend various workshops, see Appendix, Workshops 1-4, pages 126-49, plotting refugee journeys, investigating why refugees are migrating, analyzing stories written by survivors, studying Nazi propaganda means aiming to fuel bigotry and hatred, watching photos and film scripts on topics of Holocaust and recent mass atrocities, and looking at the legacy of the Holocaust. The aim is to help students draw links between historical events and the world today. Thus the Holocaust is linked with the recent mass atrocities, the refugees in Greece, the victims and survivors of different genocides from the past to the present day.

Anastasia frames her paper according to three questions for teachers to address:

1. Why should students learn the history of Holocaust, about various genocides and refugees?
2. What are the most significant lessons students should learn from studying the Holocaust?
3. Why is a particular reading, image, document, or film an appropriate medium for conveying the topics that someone wishes to teach?

Central to teaching the Holocaust, echoing the themes that Geoffrey Short illuminates are seven key points: that students should consider, appreciate and understand:

- I *democratic institutions and values* are not automatically sustained, but need to be appreciated, nurtured, and protected;
- II *silence and indifference to the suffering of others*, or to the infringement of civil rights in any society, can – however unintentionally – perpetuate these problems;

- III *it is vital to know that the roots and ramifications of prejudice, racism, and stereotyping can be present in any society;*
- IV *development of an awareness of the value of pluralism and an acceptance of diversity.*
- V *the dangers of remaining silent, apathetic, and indifferent to the oppression of others;*
- VI *thinking about the use and abuse of power as well as the roles and responsibilities of individuals, organizations, and nations when confronted with civil rights violations and/or policies of genocide.*
- VII *how a modern nation can utilize its technological expertise and bureaucratic infrastructure to implement destructive policies ranging from social engineering to genocide;*
- VIII *knowledge and understanding of topics such as the Holocaust and similar global mass atrocities both help in dealing with current such atrocities and the prevention of future ones.*

The *Editorial Review* opened with a trope that History Education should perhaps focus **as much upon the education of teachers as of their pupils**. Anastasia places at the heart of her project teacher orientation – the beliefs, values, attitudes and conceptual understanding that informs and shapes pedagogy. Central is an awareness of what empathy is and the role it can play in developing understanding – something the *Review Article* raised when discussing Everardo Perez-Manjarrez’s ‘History On Trial’ The Role Of Moral Judgment In The Explanation Of Controversial History’. The ability to understand events from the perspectives of the agents involved – the historical actors – is crucial. This engagement with their mind-sets requires the affective, emotional understanding of things through their eyes, their perspectives as well as the cognitive ability to analyse the issues, events, causes and consequences that affected their values, beliefs and behaviours. This is what pupils trained to think historically should be able to do – a way of thinking that Anastasia relates to the current problems and difficulties facing Greece on the periphery of the Middle East witches’ cauldron of civil, ethnic, tribal, communal, sectarian and religious warfare and mass migration. While the project’s substantive dimension is the Holocaust and recent mass atrocities:

... we are also interested in examining how knowledge / understanding is related to other issues, such as students’ attitudes towards out-groups or their beliefs in a “just world”. Students attend various workshops plotting refugee journeys, investigating why refugees are migrating, analyzing stories written by survivors, studying Nazi propaganda posters aiming to fuel bigotry and hatred, watching photos and film scripts on topics of Holocaust and recent mass atrocities, and looking at the legacy of the Holocaust. The aim is to help students draw links between historical events and the world today. Thus the Holocaust is linked with the mass atrocities in Middle East, Asia and Africa, the various refugees in Greece, the victims and survivors of different genocides from the past to the present day.

## Conclusion

Editing IJHLTR 14.2 has been a fascinating experience. The overall themes and trends that the seven paper suggest provide a major justification for History Education – the temporal dimension of both formal and informal curricula that aim to prepare pupils for an active, positive citizenship role. Standing back from IJHLTR 14.2’s seven papers from a geographically diverse range of countries and societies one message screams out: crucially important is the overall **academic historical education as well as the professional development** of teaches of history. Without teachers understanding what historical thinking is and entails they will be locked in a pedagogy of the past that supports xenophobic nationalism that produces closed minds that easily lead to civil conflict, oppression, atrocity, war and even genocide.

**Correspondence:** Jon Nichol, [Heirnet@gmail.com](mailto:Heirnet@gmail.com)

## References

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) (1956). Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H. & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc.

Collingwood, R.G. (1939). *An Autobiography*, kindle edition.

Collingwood, R.G. (1949). *The Idea of History*, Oxford.

Coltham, J. & Fines, J. (1971). *Educational Objectives for the Study of History*, The Historical Association.

Harland, J. & Kay Kinder, K. (1997). *Teachers' continuing professional development: framing a model of outcomes*, *Journal of In-Service Education*, 23:1, pp. 71-84.

Husband, C., Kitson, A. & Pendry, A. (2003) *Understanding History Teaching*, Open University Press.

**IJHLTR: *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research***

Volume 9, Number 1 – July 2010 The Historical Association ISSN 1472-9466

See below\* for the contents of this edition, which focuses on the *Educational Objectives* and *New History* pamphlets impact and also includes the two pamphlets as ancillary resources.

Lee, P., Ashby, R. & Dickinson, A. (1996). 'Progression in children's ideas about History' in M. Hughes (ed), *Progression in Learning*, Multilingual Matters [Bera Dialogues].

Rogers, P. J. (1979). *The New History: Theory into Practice*, The Historical Association.

SCHP, Schools Council History 13-16 Project (1976). *A New Look at History*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall.

SCHP, (1976) *What Is History?* Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). 'Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching' *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4- 31.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). 'Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform' *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.

Sylvester, D. (2009) Interview with David Sylvester, 7 July 2009, [www.history.ac.uk](http://www.history.ac.uk)

David Sylvester was the originator of the *Schools Council History Project*. He was invited by HMI Roy Wake to head the pilot project in 1972 and formed the team himself.

Van Boxtel, C. & Van Drie, J. (2008) 'Enhancing Historical Reasoning: A Key Topic In Dutch History Education' *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, Volume 8.2. The Historical Association.

Van Boxtel, C. & Van Drie, J. (2013). 'Historical reasoning in the classroom: what does it look like and how can we enhance it?', *Teaching History*, 150, The Historical Association.

**\* IJHLTR International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research**

Volume 9, Number 1 – July 2010

ISSN 1472-9466

This edition reviews both John Fines & Jeanette Coltham's *Educational Objective* and Peter Rogers *New History* pamphlets and their significance for History Education

**1. Editorial – Hilary Cooper and Jon Nichol**

**2. Articles**

Current reflections – 2010, on John Fines' *Educational Objectives for the Study of History: A Suggested Framework* and Peter Rogers' *The New History, theory into practice*.

**Nicola Sheldon**

Jeannette Coltham's, John Fines' and Peter Rogers' Historical Association pamphlets: their relevance to the development of ideas about History teaching today

**Peter Lee**

Reflections on Coltham's & Fines': Educational objectives for the study of History – a suggested framework and Peter Rogers': *The New History, theory into practice*

**Hilary Cooper**

'History is like a coral reef': A personal reflection

**Kate Hawkey**

Response to Coltham & Fines' (1971) *Educational Objectives for the Study of History: a suggested framework; and Rogers' (1979) The New History: theory into practice*

**Erturul Oral ve Kibar Aktan**

Coltham, Fines & P. J. Rogers: their contributions to History Education – a Turkish perspective

**Grant Bage**

Rogers and Fines revisited

**Terry Haydn**

Coltham & Fines – '*Educational Objectives for the Study of History*': what use or relevance does this paper have for history education in the 21st Century?

**Jon Nichol**

John Fines' *Educational Objectives for the Study of History* (Educational Objectives), Peter Rogers' *New History: Theory into Practice* (New History): Their contribution to curriculum development and research, 1973–2010: a personal view

**Arthur Chapman**

Reading P. J. Rogers' *The New History 30 Years on*

**3. Debate & Commentary of the 1970s & 1980s**

Coltham, J. (1972). *Educational Objectives And The Teaching of History* TH II, 7, pp. 278-79.

Gard, A. & Lee, P. J. (1978). Paper in - *History Teaching And Historical Understanding*.

Fines, J. (1981). *Educational Objectives For History – Ten Years On*, TH 30, pp. 8-9.

Fines, J. (1981). *Towards Some Criteria For Establishing The History Curriculum* TH 31, pp. 21-22.

Rogers, P. J. & Aston, F. (1977) *Play, Enactive Representation and Learning* TH, 19, pp. 18-21.

**4. Theory and Practice: Applied Ideas**

Roberts, M. (1972). *Educational Objectives for the Study of History* TH, II, 8, pp. 347-50.

- Alexander, G. et al. (1977). *Kidbrooke History: A Preliminary Report* TH, 19 pp. 23-25.  
Associated Examining Board (1976). *A Pilot Scheme in 'A' Level History* TH IV: 15, pp. 202-09.  
Jones, B. (1979) *Roman Lead Pigs* TH, 25 pp. 19-20.  
Hodgkinson, K. & Long, M. (1981). The Assassination of John F. Kennedy, TH 29, pp. 3-7  
Palmer, M. *Educational Objectives and Sources Materials: Some Practical Suggestions* TH IV-16, pp. 326-330.  
Brown, R. & Daniels, C. *Sixth Form History – An Assessment* TH IV, pp. 210-22.  
Culpin, C. B. (1984). *Language, Learning and Thinking Skills in History* TH 39, pp 24-28.

**5. The Pamphlets: Educational Objectives and The New History**

- Coltham, J. B. & Fines, J. (1971). *Educational Objectives for the Study of History: A suggested framework* The Historical Association.  
Rogers, P. J. (1979 ). *The New History, theory into practice* The Historical Association