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1. Introduction

In this article, I try to identify the basic logic of composing content of historical events for political counter-socialization through teaching history. I'll compare with two unique theories of value education when teaching history, especially focused on issues-centered education, in order to examine better ways of how history education contributes to enhance student's enlightened attitude in a constitutional democracy.

As is known, School History has been used as a central subject for political socialization in many countries in modern times. In concrete, it's been used for promoting assimilation into a social group or country by which the story of the society was told as a story of freedom and liberation or a story of progress and development, making students believe that rules and institutions of their society have become what they ought to be and that there is no correct alternative. Basically, that could be realized by controlling facts and the linkage of those facts as a content which are dealt in history class. Of course, those story not only results in a one-sided, superficial understanding but it also takes away opportunities for reflection on society and prevents students from cultivating rational and critical viewpoints.

Even though history course only covers too many dates and facts as a whole, it could cause students to think that history had happen just the way it did and also it was the only way of events have unfolded. In result of that, it's obvious students viewed history was a chunk of isolated information far from their living society and confirm the status quo.

Moreover, on teaching history, as stated by Moriwake (1986), or Kodama (2005), teachers need to be careful of content selection when they teach
history because they inevitably have to choose some facts and interpretations of historical events to be connected and understood by students. If teachers didn’t show different interpretations or viewpoint of historical events, and presented their own interpretations as facts, that is, as if those facts happened spontaneously, teachers unintentionally could transmit their viewpoint of historical events or meaning without any critical thinking process (Moriwake, 1986, 80-81).

In a constitutional democracy, which favors diversity of individual thoughts and quests for ways to live, we must not indoctrinate students about how society should be or which ideas about society students should hold. As well as teaching history, we should give students opportunities of considering about validity or justifiability of exiting social institutions rather than advocating a certain doctrine or ideology on them, nor just following sequential facts of past deterministically. But, on the other hand, as I mentioned above, we inevitably have to face the matter of composing subject matters through selecting historical events and facts to be studied in teaching history. What and how should we teach history to prevent students from taking history as it comes or indoctrinating certain ideology?

Some have advocated that we could teach history as a strong tool for citizenship education, and stressed that we polished the way. I address to two influential and leading theories of history education which promote issues-centered education in teaching history in order to develop student’s decision-making ability or good sense of critical thinking. One of them is a theory of learning decision-making on controversial issues in history which is introduced and proposed by Japanese researchers. There are two subordinate types of the theory suggested by Tomoyuki Kobra, and Yasuhiro Kodama. The other is a theory of learning “Public Issues” throughout history proposed by Donald W. Oliver, James P. Shaver, and Fred M. Newmann in the United States. These theories seem to have common base, in a sense, of mainly dealing with controversial issues in history education. However, they have truly different premises on values as subject-matters. So, those differences have substantial influence over the way of content selection and organization of questions to be examined. In those that follow, I compare with two theories of history education focusing on the logic of composing values as subject matters.

2. Logic of composing values in learning of decision-making through teaching history
2-1. Decision-Making on Political Issues in History

In Japan, “Decision making” on controversial issues through teaching
history as a way of citizenship education is well known through some articles on citizenship education, especially through written by Kobara (1988). He introduced a word of “decision-making” as a central concept of citizenship education and tried to make it strong drive for change how to teach history in secondary history class. He mentioned that teachers could develop student’s sense and ability as citizens, not only based on scientific inquiry approach, but also on to teach how to reach decision-making on controversial issues through reflective thinking on values on their own. So when teaching history, teacher should take up a wide variety of political issues in regimes of each era, and, in the process of learning, have students consider the positions of historical figures or authorities who had power of making a decision under the situation, compare with alternatives which they might have been able to realize, and choose the one which could bring most favorable outcomes.

On the other hand, Kodama (2005), proposed a different approach for learning of historical decision-making\(^3\). In his theory, teachers should have student treat not only with people who had the power to decide on issues, but also with people who could have strong effect on policy selection, and who had different opinion against authorities. Actually, the instructional materials and strategies he developed, that focused on topics of national security, environmental protection, and establishment of source of revenue for social security, that dealt with issues on those topics happened in a certain place and time in detail, and that had student compare with alternatives or judgment from various positions and class of society in those days, examine the results of decision be chosen from those. The aim of dealing with different type of people’s thought for decision is to make students open-minded to understanding on possibilities of policy selection.

I indicate that theories mentioned ahead could be based on the model of historical linkage of political decisions showed in figure 1 of next page\(^5\). According to Shinohara (1987), a political scientist, we could equate history with family tree. At the point of time, people might have a situation calls for decision-making and some alternatives which they could choose and be realized, but in reality, because of all sorts of relative power and pressure of situation, chose the alternative C. Once C was chosen, possibilities of selection were opened to alternatives from Ca to Cd, then people chose Cd among them, and then Cd opened alternatives from Cda to Cdd. History could be composed as such linkage of sequential selections. Although it seemed inevitable process from the viewpoint of linkage of C-Cd-Cdd, there was still possibilities to be opened for choosing another alternatives (Shinohara, 1987, 5-6.).

Understanding such possibilities and concrete options to choose,
makes students recognize the plasticity of our society, namely, recognize the meaning of independent action of each generations to tackle problems of their own. And also, understanding real linkage of selection and historical tendency of those decision-making has student be aware of result and effect of political decisions, and of our responsibilities for those decisions.

2-2. Alternatives as a value-laden

There’s an assumption on values in these theories that students could hold and grasp values to be studied because they are included in alternatives they examine. Namely, values are laden on each policy as alternatives and that we could grasp those values through analysis or understanding of alternatives. However, even if students deal with controversial issues, what kind of value they could learn or analyze depends on cases or qualities of alternatives teachers take up. And also, it is unclear and difficult for students to grasp systematically what extents to the possibilities of policy selection were opened and will be because issues to be dealt on the topics are concentrated on only which became acute in those days. Therefore, it is possible to develop understanding of relationship between historical situation and people’s choice under the circumstance, on the other hand, to be an ad hock examination on value and difficult to find the way of reflecting decisions critically because they only know the existence of other options in each point at the time.
3. Logic of composing values in learning of “Public Issues” through teaching history

3-1. “Public Issues” and significance of teaching history

There’s another thought-provoking approach to value education through teaching history which has been advocated by Donald W. Oliver, James P. Shaver, and Fred M. Newmann. In Japan, Kodama (1976), Mizoguchi (1994), Obara (1995), Watanabe (2003), and so on, many researchers have had strong attention to their work. And mainly from teaching and learning of controversial issues, many of them analyzed the rationales of their theory, and examined the possibilities and ways of how to apply those materials into history/social studies course in Japan. So herein, I focus on the logic of composing values in teaching history in order to differentiate with the decision-making theory, and then identify a significance of their theory in the context of history education.

In contrast with decision-making theory, they emphasized the word of “Public Issues”, instead of using the word of social issues or current issues, which means persisting dilemmas between values throughout history. They mentioned that most of the important current events of modern America can be clarified by reference to public issues in other places and other times (Oliver & Newmann, 1970, 3.). So they use the word of “Public Issues” as a framework for grasping values behind of controversial issues in modern society. Fortunately, we could find plentiful stimulating cases from the past for solving our own problems, even though they are considered as failures. Furthermore, people in democratic society need to reach a rational consent between opposite positions on issues without relying on violent means as possible as they can. Democratic society shaped by the constitution, especially The United States, has built the way of analyzing and dealing controversial issues working well in which people’s opinions clashed fiercely.

We could teach various cases of persisting value dilemmas and attempts of solving such problems those which have any results, and the way of understanding those issues and leading to rational consent which created earnestly throughout history. Therefore, in those two meanings, there’s significance and meaning of teaching history in democratic society.

3-2 Logic of content selection of “Public Issues Series”

Oliver & Newmann proposed to construct the content of history from the viewpoints of persisting value conflict and embodied their theory into instructional materials and teaching strategies in units called “The Public Issues Series”. Units of teaching materials are divided into two conceptual categories of approach to history called “The Problem-Topic Approach” and “The Historical Crisis Approach”. Each unit which is categorized in both
approaches commonly has subtitles expressed conflicting values and the content of unit are composed from the viewpoint of subtitle.


In units of “The Historical Crisis Approach”, there’re units titled “Nazi Germany: Social Forces and Personal Responsibility”, “20th Century Russia: Agents of the Revolution”, “The American Revolution: Crisis of law and change” in which deal with situations people faced that endangered or corrupted democratic society in American history and also in World history.

Table 1 in next page shows main contents and persisting Questions in each part of the unit of “The Rise of Organized Labor” and “Nazi Germany”. In the Unit of “The Rise of Organized Labor”, it deals with situations that workers had struggle against with employers in order to demand and ensure of security in their daily life and various working conditions in United States history as it follows subtitles. In “Nazi Germany”, deals with situations that people in Germany suffered strong social forces urging them to go to the war, to support with Nazi which took a racist slant, and to discriminate against other races.

Also, in each part of units, there are many questions to be asked in “Persisting Questions of History” section which constituted in accordance with subtitles. Those questions are intended to locate historical situations in the unit into a general context of value conflict throughout history and to compare human behaviors in the situation with various analogies which people in our society could face. So that, it can be realized to have students examine conflict on the policy selection or human behavior in the past based on general value conflict, and use the decision-making of people in the past as a tool for shaping their own standard of judgment.

3-3 Values as Dimensional Construct and as a Regulatory Standard

This unique approach to history education mentioned above based on an assumptions on social values. According to Oliver & Shaver (1966), values operate at different levels of generality, in other words, values are on two moral planes. On higher moral plane, the more general “ultimate” human dignity posits, and on the other plane below, values such as consent or representation, due process, freedom of speech and conscience, and equal protection under
Table 1 Contents and Questions in units of "The Public Issues Series"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Leading Content</th>
<th>Examples of Persisting Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Origin of labor-management dispute in U.S. retrospect to industrialization in 19th century.</td>
<td>In what way should laws restrict the power of employers and workers? What are the effective ways resolving disputes of them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employers offered beneficial conditions for workers who were forced to work and discontented.</td>
<td>Would it be possible for employers may establish whatever working conditions he wishes or should it be restricted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Government legitimated unions of workers after workers had been fired</td>
<td>What policy and tactics mutually used by employers and workers were effective or fair or &quot;right&quot;?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Government had ways out to the situations in two harsh cases of labor-management dispute.</td>
<td>Was it right for the Government or the Court to intervene in two cases? What extent to should it be guaranteed workers right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government had actively entered in Airline labor-management dispute</td>
<td>Should all groups of workers have an equal and unlimited right to strike or be limited?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Current issue of approval on rights of collective actions in various cases</td>
<td>What method should be used or was the most effective in airline strike?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Nazi Germany: Social Forces and Personal Responsibility"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Leading Content</th>
<th>Examples of Persisting Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social forces on individuals gradually had intensified from the Weimar to the Nazi regime</td>
<td>When should an individual be expected to sacrifice his self-interest or personal safety to prevent social injustice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Imperial regime corrupted in W.W.I and the Weimar Republic founded.</td>
<td>Should soldiers and common people be able to refuse serve in a war or pay taxes for war?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nazi criticized policies of the Weimar regime and rose with absorbing dissatisfaction of people.</td>
<td>Was it right for Nazi (a political party) to accept members who were not even aware of the party’s platform? What’s his responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nazi urged people to support them and discriminate the Jews through propaganda and subversive actions.</td>
<td>How clear is the moral distinction between the use of force and the exchange of favors to gain political support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Enabling Act was legitimated and The holocaust happened in the concentration camps of the Jews.</td>
<td>Is it legal and democratic for a democracy to vote to end democracy? What circumstances does a person become an enemy of state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>News company and people in Rowell had conflict on annulment of racial discrimination.</td>
<td>When, if ever, should loyalty to one’s nation take precedence over all other values?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the law, which they call "The American Creed" can be conceived defining characteristics of and instrumental to the human dignity. So, these social values can be thought of both as the general values which help define an ultimate ideal concerning how men should treat one another and as instrumental values supporting practical public institutions which may enhance or promote the ideal of human dignity (Oliver & Shaver, 1966, 24-25).

However, in real life, people advocate the specific value which they believe to realize the human dignity as which they believe and frequently those specific values have inconsistency to general values. Moreover the most fundamental and enduring values to conflict with one another when they applied to practical political situations. So, Oliver & Shaver think values not only as "ethical ideas", but as "dimensional constructs" showed in Figure 2.

![Security of the speaker and crowd](image)

Figure 2 Dimensional Construct of Value Dilemma

Suppose a speechmaker on the street inciting a noisy large crowd, which threatens the safety of the speaker, innocent bystanders, and the crowd itself. A policeman faces a problem to determine if he/she stop the speaker abridging free speech and protecting people at there or call for reinforcements who could arrive too late to prevent violence. In the "perfect" society, people easily find actions to be rejected which fall in the lower left-hand quadrant and ones to be accepted which fall in the upper right quadrant. The most difficult decisions are required when fall in either the lower right-hand and the upper left-hand quadrant because the support of one value is to the detriment of another in those quadrant as showed in Figure 2.

When we consider social values on a dimensional constructs, the problem to be examined is to determine at what point on a value dimension an
action should be categorized as intolerable or bad or at what point it should be given priority over another competing value. Also, there should be consistency of judgment correspond to different situations. Therefore, in developed materials by Oliver & Newmann, readers asked sequential questions called “Persisting Questions in History” such as what extent to prioritize certain value to another competing value in situation X or in situation Y, why or why not change judgments in two cases, using analogical cases in the past.

Oliver & Shaver mentioned every teacher of social studies curricula had a frame of reference that, consciously or unconsciously, shaped the way he/she (originally, he) dealt with ethical and political conflict, excerpting Charles A. Beard’s words said every human being brought up in society inevitably had in mind a frame of social knowledge, ideas, and ideals, and to this frame or pattern, his thought and action would be more or less consciously referred. So, it is crucial to serve adequately as a basis for curricular decisions in the social studies.

Finally, I mentioned some possible critique to their approach to history. One of them might be about the goal of history education brought from which advocate authentic history. Certainly, their approach might be far from “genuine” historical study like what historians do. However, it can be sure that it enlivens history as a source of questions that we inevitably need to ask in democratic societies. The other might be more critical and productive one from those who support teaching history as social studies or social science education. Oliver & Shaver’s approach to history is surely based on a framework of social values which opposing values are located at poles of vertical and horizontal axis. So any historical decisions, institutions and policies to be examined apply to axis of value conflict. But it is unclear what kind of axis we should use as a framework in real controversial situation. And also, it is ambiguous what possible alternatives could be able to take up by teachers when fall in either the lower right-hand and the upper left-hand quadrant where the support of one value is to the detriment of another in those quadrant as showed in Figure 2. Is it the only way to compare with “analogy” in history in order for us to get better judgment on policies, behavior, and institutions?

4. Suggestions

On the learning of decision-making through teaching history, we could see a logic which composes values as substantive things to be included into alternatives of various policies on controversial issues. Whereas, on the learning of “Public Issues”, we could see a logic which composes values in order to grasp and evaluate controversial issues in society. In other words,
values are believed not as multilayered conceptual framework for understanding persisting dilemma of human behavior in controversial situation, but as regulative ideas for judging those people’s decision-making from the viewpoint of human dignity. Although there’re some inexplicit parts on their theory, it’s still a very stimulating model of history education even in the 21st century today from which we could excerpt interesting ideas for teaching history in a constitutional democracy.

Teaching history could be more effective for citizenship education to form student’s enlightened attitudes living in constitutional democracy if we try to be in practice based on those logics of composing values.

Notes
1) Kodama proposed two different types of theories on history education being highly rated among Japanese researchers of history/social studies education. One of them is introduced here. The other is called “learning of critical interpretations of history” in which students compares with two opposed viewpoints or interpretations of history and examine the validity of them on primary or secondary sources of the past.
2) Author arranged original figure by adding an arrow of historical tendency, (Shinohara, 1987, p.5.)
3) Author made this table with summarizing the content of each part of units and with picking up or abstracting the most typical questions included in the part of “Persisting Questions of History” in accordance with subtitles and the content of units.
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