

Their World Cracked Open: Theorizing Shelter in 9/11 Curricula

Jennifer Grace Job

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in
the School of Education (Culture, Curriculum, and Change).

Chapel Hill
2013

Approved By:

Lynda Stone

Madeleine Grumet

Julie Justice

Rebecca New

Jocelyn Glazier

©2013
Jennifer Grace Job
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

JENNIFER JOB: “Their World Cracked Open”: Theorizing Shelter in 9/11 Curricula
(Under the direction of Lynda Stone)

Following the tragic events of September 11, schools had to work with students on “first draft history”—teaching students about a political trauma as the details and repercussions of the event were still unfolding. Materials for teaching such a trauma have to grapple with the concept of shelter; that is, what students should be exposed to or shielded from that may be intellectually, morally, or emotionally upsetting to them.

This dissertation is a curriculum study theorizing the mechanism of shelter in national programs used to teach students about September 11. Document analysis is used to interpret the curricula, and the secondary analysis is grounded in curriculum studies, exploring the mechanism of shelter across critical thinking, political value systems, and emotional responsibilities operationalized across the curricula. The study ends with a use of the theory of Julia Kristeva to interrogate the possibilities for using uncertainty for a different type of sheltered curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This has been a tumultuous process, and I know I have not been an easy student. This dissertation would not exist if it were not for Lynda Stone's guidance, support, and constant faith that I had something of worth to find in my project. Dr. Stone provided me both a metaphorical and literal home at UNC, and I will be forever grateful. Thank you also to my committee, who pushed me to make this dissertation the best it can be.

Thank you to my mentors, Mary Ruth Coleman and James Gallagher, who believed in my capabilities and gave me the knowledge and space to strengthen them when I would have rather given up. I am leaving UNC with an incredible group of friends, especially Brandon Sams and Amanda Bock, who I will treasure for the rest of my life and who always were somehow able to make me write more when they were typing across the table from me. And thank you to my lifelong friend JP Pagan, who listened to me vent, never let me get down on myself, and acted as my own personal graphic designer.

I am so grateful to my sister, Lauren, for going through this process before me and supporting me on my own journey. I finally want to thank Bob and Rhonda Job, who have fulfilled the cliché of being the best parents in the world. It did not matter what I needed—dry my tears when I was frustrated, babysit my pups when I was buried in writing, do my laundry when I was too tired to move—they did it all and made me feel brilliant and capable at the same time.

I love you all and hope I do you proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Avoidance of Politically Controversial Topics in the Classroom.....	1
The Operation of Shelter in September 11 Curricula.....	4
Identifying Shelter in Curriculum.....	4
Shelter as a Mechanism in Curriculum.....	6
The Need for a September 11 Curriculum.....	7
The Risks of Teaching a September 11 Curriculum.....	10
The Difficulty of Controversial Topics in the Classroom.....	12
Varying Modes of Teaching Controversial Issues.....	15
The Difficulty with Neutrality.....	16
Overgeneralization in an Attempt to Protect.....	19
The Consequences of Shelter in Curriculum	19
Shelter in Action.....	20
The Complications of Shelter.....	21
Reconsidering Shelter as a New Device.....	23
The Organization of This Study.....	24
II IDENTIFYING SHELTER IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULUM.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Sheltering as Seen Through Curriculum as a Concept	26
Choosing the Data Set.....	27
Adolescent Curricula.....	27
National Curricula.....	28
Influence and Pervasion.....	29
The Data Set.....	32

Intake and Analysis Methodology.....	45
The Affective Tension of Document Analysis.....	47
Method of Content Analysis.....	48
Initial Analysis for Shelter.....	49
Secondary Analysis.....	50
III SHELTER AS A MECHANISM IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULUM.....	52
Introduction.....	52
Exposure in September 11 Curricula.....	53
Terrorism in Historical Context.....	53
Terrorism in Context of the Sufferers.....	54
Terrorism in Context of Global Events.....	55
Distance as a Shelter Device.....	56
Student Activities and Shelter.....	57
Definitions and Defining.....	58
The Use of Narrative as Shelter.....	64
Narratives of September 11 Curricula.....	64
The Role of the Framework in Removing Shelter.....	73
Student Responsibility in Political Trauma as Exposure.....	79
Shelter in the Mission Statements.....	82
Democratic Education and Shelter in September 11 Curricula.....	89
The Passivity of Patriotism.....	90
Teacher Support as Shelter in September 11 Curricula.....	91
Normalizing as Shelter.....	92
Shelter Devices in Class Discussion.....	95
Shelter in Teacher Choices.....	96
Conclusion.....	97
IV CONSEQUENCES OF SHELTER IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULA.....	99
Introduction.....	99
Sheltering the Emotional Affect of September 11.....	100
The Emotional Risks of Working with Sep. 11 as a Controversial Topic...	101

The Turn to Care in September 11 Curricula.....	102
Care and Exposure.....	105
Caring for Students Through Exposure.....	106
Distance Through Writing as Well in Addition to Subject Matter	107
The Shelter of Narrative.....	108
Normalizing as Shelter from Emotion.....	109
The Consequences of Shelter on Critical Thinking.....	111
The Essentialness of Critical Thinking.....	112
Critical Thinking as Aim of September 11 Curricula.....	114
Shelter Devices and Impact on Critical Thinking.....	117
Defining and Definitions in Critical Thinking.....	117
Narrative and Critical Thinking.....	118
Frameworks and Shelter.....	119
The Device of Class Discussion.....	120
Sheltering for Nondemocratic Education in September 11 Curricula.....	126
Unsheltered Democratic Education.....	128
Nondemocratic Education of September 11.....	129
Shelter and Rigidity of Nondemocratic Curricula.....	131
Conclusion.....	134
V RETHINKING SHELTER AS A NEW DEVICE.....	136
Introduction.....	136
The Certainty Problem.....	139
The Need for Uncertainty in a First Draft.....	140
Julia Kristeva and Work-In-Process.....	143
Reaching for the Unanswerable.....	146
Moralism and the Recognition of the Foreign.....	148
Ingesting Violence...and Undoing the Normalizing Order.....	152
The Shelter of Uncertainty and a New Curriculum.....	156
REFERENCES.....	163

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table

1. Curriculum Data.....	31
2. Comparison of Two Discussion Activities.....	77
3. Questions of Responsibility.....	79
4. Mission Statements.....	83
5. Examples from 4Action Guidelines.....	92

Appendix

A.....	161
--------	-----

What a wonderful world
this would be when the only place where
you could find a terrorist
would be in the pages
of a history book.



<http://www.englishblog.com/2012/09/cartoons-remembering-911.html#.UTVRLHyY5o8>

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

What can a democracy do to protect itself?~Constitutional Rights Foundation's
Terrorism in America curriculum

Avoidance of Politically Controversial Topics in the Classroom

I should have been teaching on 9/11. I had gone to New York City for a weekend break, already exhausted by my experience as a young preservice teacher in a program that had begun the previous June. My flight home was scheduled for the evening of the 10th, but it rained hard in North Carolina and my flight was canceled. I was rescheduled for a 7:30 flight the next morning, a flight that left exactly on time. Toward the end of the flight, the attendants gathered in the front of the plane, whispering nervously and glancing at their watches, disappearing and reappearing from the cockpit, but at the time I did not think of it. We landed in Raleigh a little after 9:00, and I grabbed my carry-on. People rushed all around me in the airport, and flight cancellations were announced over and over. I ignored it, tired from my trip and wanting to go home to rest before trying to meet my afternoon classes at the school where I was a student teacher.

When I walked through the door of my apartment, my roommate was waiting for me. "Thank God you're all right!" He hugged me, which he had never done in all of our time living together. I stood in confusion; I had called him the night before to let him know

about the flight change. “You have to call your parents,” he said. “They are freaking out. We didn’t know if it was your flight.”

The television was on in the living room, and what had happened finally struck me. I saw a video of a plane crashing into the World Trade Center, over and over as the tape restarted again and again. The phone rang; it was the friend I had stayed with in New York City, calling to find out if my flight had made it to North Carolina. Call waiting beeped; it was another New York friend calling to find out if I was home. It had been like that all morning, my roommate told me. All that was known for most of the morning was that American Airlines flights had crashed; my flight was on American. I called a friend who worked in the North Tower. He had stayed home that morning, oversleeping. I called my parents. My mother picked up the phone and immediately began to cry. She handed the phone to my father, who was also crying. He had been in a hardware store when he saw that an American Airlines flight had crashed in New York. (His father had also been flying American in New York when he died in a crash forty years earlier). Our roots in New York were deep—there were cousins, uncles, and friends who worked in the Towers that they had not heard from.

The day slipped away from me, with my classes covered by my assigned mentor, the English department chair. When I arrived at school the next day, the teachers lounge was awash in tearful stories of relatives caught in the Twin Towers and husbands and daughters in the military already readying for deploy. I heard that one of my students, a strong senior who had been working the subject of his enlistment in the Marines into every essay he had written all year, had collapsed to the floor when he heard the news, crying and shaking with anger. *Who would dare attack the United States like this?* I heard

some people murmur. As soon as I entered my class, my students began asking me questions that I could not answer. They wanted to turn on the TV. They wanted to know all they could find out.

Yet on my desk was a note from the department chair, letting me know that she had stuck to the lesson as planned yesterday, and that I should do the same. When I spoke to her later, she told me that we were English teachers and that it was not our place to expose our students to the disaster that was taking place but instead protect them from it. Our principal concurred. I was a preservice teacher—while this class was mine for the year, I did not feel I had any authority whatsoever to challenge either my mentor or my principal. I did not know what the right course of action was; at the time, I hoped those in charge knew what was best. Yet, as I opened the textbook to the next section of *The Canterbury Tales*, I could not ignore a nagging discomfort. I did not become a teacher to assist my students in ignoring the world around them.

Four years later, I found myself teaching in an American School in Israel when it went to war with Hezbollah in Lebanon. The experience in that school, driven by Israeli personnel, was altogether different than mine during the days following 9/11. We began each morning with a discussion session about the events of the Hezbollah War, allowing students to express their feelings and anxieties while attempting to answer questions they might have had. I was awed by how natural this process was, likely stemming from living in a country often the center of violence, but also having a different world view and philosophy of instruction. I began to question how we could face our own traumas differently. I wondered how we would begin to work through September 11th in the classroom when we did teach it, and how this work would help or

hinder students' negotiation of such an important, divisive, and traumatic event in the American narrative.

The Operation of Shelter in 9/11 Curricula

While what I have begun is a discussion of my own pedagogy, in thinking through my experience, I realize that what I am concerned with is a question of curriculum. I was directed in what I was allowed to teach during September 11 itself, and after watching the curriculum work through the war in Israel, I was curious as to what teachers were allowed to discuss and not discuss about September 11, which is a question of curriculum.

The question of this dissertation is, "How does shelter operate in September 11 curricula?" In studying this question, I wished to interrogate specific curricula of September 11 in terms of what students were exposed to and sheltered from, and what impact those choices made on what students were expected to take away from the programs. I also wanted to try to come to an understanding of how these factors could be used in building political trauma curriculum in the future. This study uses a qualitative analysis of specific September 11 curricula to theorize the concept of shelter and what the consequences of using shelter may be.

Identifying Shelter in Curriculum

"Shelter" is a metaphor I have chosen to describe the act of making curricular decisions of what not to teach due to the controversial or upsetting nature of the subject; others may describe what is being done to the curriculum as "protection," or

the pervasive “developmentally appropriate practice.” According to the Oxford English Dictionary, shelter is more than protection—it is the act of *screening something out* in order to protect. Schools do not merely aim to protect students from the harm of information they deem to be controversial or taboo; they want to shelter the students from the information altogether by removing it rather than mitigating it (e.g., Glazier and Seo, 2005; Fine & Weis, 1993; Landsman, 2001; McIntyre, 1997). Part of what I wished to address in this study is the question of whether shelter is positive or negative in its implementation.

At its core, shelter is the act of screening out material, information, opportunities for discussion, and avenues of investigation that might expose the student to information that has been deemed inappropriate.

Several criteria may be considered for inappropriateness. The student may be considered emotionally or intellectually unprepared for this information or investigation, as determined by his teacher, a child development expert, a parent, an administrator, or the student himself. The emotional upset caused by the information may be considered to outweigh any benefits of opening the information to the student. Similarly, one of these groups may consider the student unprepared, given his current knowledge base, to handle the complexities of the information under considerations.

Another criterion for shelter decided by the community writ large—including teachers, administrators, and the surrounding district population—that the information or avenue of investigation may be inappropriate to the values of the community. A community that is based in strong Christian values, for example, may wish for students to learn creationism in biology class and excise evolution from the curriculum;

similarly, a community that feels it is struggling with immigration may want an anglo-centered history curriculum rather than one that highlights multiculturalism in an effort to acculturate the incoming populations.

Shelter as a Mechanism in Curriculum

When considering the case of adolescents' experience of political trauma, these criteria become more specific. Political trauma occurs when a human perpetrates violence against a large group of people. If an identified enemy exists at the root of the violence, such as Al-Qaeda with a terrorist attack, the decision-makers in an educational setting may decide that it is of utmost importance to shield students from horrific information, images, or discussions in order to make school a safe space when the children are surrounded by the event in their everyday life.

Additionally, if a government has decided to respond to the trauma against who it sees as the cause—Osama bin Laden after 9/11, the Israeli Defense Force after a suicide bombing—educational decision makers and community members may want students to support the government response and thus shelter them from information or inquiry that would lead them in an opposite direction.

Shelter is a mechanism that can be found in both pedagogy and curriculum, and one is typically inseparable from the other. In a pedagogical sense, teachers are in control of what is taught or investigated in the classroom, to a point. They may use specific discussion techniques to lead students in a particular direction on a subject and shelter them from others, or they may choose the sources students read so others are avoided. Curriculum designed for political trauma uses a number of methods to shelter students,

including limiting the narrative of the event, providing students with specific primary sources relating to the trauma and leaving others out, and creating activities intended for a specific learning outcome so the direction of student thinking is controlled.

While Hess and Stoddard (2007) call September 11th the ultimate “teachable moment,” the attacks of that day also presented a teaching conundrum of balancing the desire to protect students emotionally while provoking them intellectually, which is explored below as an introduction to theorizing shelter.

The Need for a September 11 Curriculum

There seems to be an obviousness to teaching about September 11. America has not had an event like it in recent history on her shores. Articles addressing the topic of September 11 tend to begin in hyperbole—it is difficult to find one that does not begin by claiming that it was the day that “changed everything.” Media coverage of September 11 was certainly ubiquitous, and the images of firemen hoisting an American flag and citizens of every background covered in gray ash became iconic (Goldberger, 2011). President George W. Bush declared September 11th “Patriot Day” in 2001, and it seemed to be the ultimate “teachable moment”—a chance to heal rifts in a multicultural landscape and make a movement toward peace (Slattery & Rapp, 2002; Packer, 2011). Of course teachers would find such an occasion rife with pedagogical opportunity; teachers felt that students were looking for answers during this traumatic time, and as the adults in the room, they felt a responsibility to provide one (Helfenbein, 2009; Mehlinger, 2002).

Educational scholars recognized the importance of teaching aspects of September 11

after it happened in order to fulfill several purposes of education writ large: democracy, multiculturalism, and patriotism, among others. Apple (2002) broached September 11 in his classrooms because he considered it an important lesson in how America is viewed by the rest of the world; Ravitch (2002) named seven lessons that must be taught in the classroom after September 11, including “not all cultures share our regard for equality and human rights” (p. 7) and “we must teach students to appreciate and defend our democratic institutions” (p. 9).

Judith Pace (2002) interviewed education scholars Maxine Greene, Nel Noddings, Jesse Goodman, Michael Apple, and Gloria Ladson-Billings, asking their thoughts on the impact of September 11 on curriculum. Each scholar agreed on the importance of incorporating the tragedy of September 11 into the classroom curriculum, albeit for different reasons. Maxine Greene and Jesse Goodman expressed the necessity of keeping the community feelings and respect for one another that they saw occurring after September 11 alive through instruction, while Nel Noddings and Gloria Ladson-Billings saw September 11 as a marker for examining the relation of seeing oneself as American to working with those Americans see as outsiders.

Apple (2002) claims that the decisions that were made during and after September 11 in the classroom have had reverberating repercussions throughout education. September 11 provided educators with an opportunity to create what Hess, Stoddard, and Hammer (2011) term a “first-draft history,” that is, history that is being taught as it is being written. They argue that how teachers present this history has political and social ramifications. America’s particular response to the event, the resulting wars and invasions, the cultural narratives Americans built around the sites of September 11 and

the people involved—all are interpreted through curricula, absorbed and reinterpreted by students, and (re)produced through their future actions and awareness.

Initial studies of how education has been affected by September 11 have also been done on textbooks used in history classrooms, and the results have shown just how important curricular input is in discussing September 11. In studies of textbooks, Hess and Stoddard (2007) analyzed the use of September 11 and found several interesting inconsistencies among them. World and American high school history textbooks trend towards many mentions of September 11, dozens in each; yet the researchers found that few of the textbooks mentioned any specifics of the attacks, including how many people were killed, who the perpetrators were, or how America reacted militarily. The conclusion that Hess and Stoddard draw from this analysis is that textbook publishers believe that readers already know the details of September 11, not taking into consideration that the typical high school junior in 2012 was only four years old when the attacks took place. Even adults are often unaware; Hess and Stoddard (2007) note that in 2005, nearly half of all American adults believed Saddam Hussein was involved in the events of September 11. The September 11 Education Trust, which published a curriculum exclusively devoted to the study of the attacks (2009), follows suit: the curriculum's stated purpose is to "inspire" students rather than inform as to the specificities of the attacks. U.S. history textbooks do offer more information about the War on Terror (Hess, Stoddard, and Murto, 2008), while world history textbooks use September 11 in particular as a marker against which to compare events such as Pearl Harbor. Trading on this lack of depth and detail, in combination with students' lack of awareness about September 11, allows textbooks to use vague assumptions and

hyperbolic statements instead of specific detail for students to learn. Thus, teachers must look for materials that go beyond the textbook in order to deeply investigate the attacks with their students.

Intellectual provocation is not the only benefit teachers may find in teaching more specifically about September 11. The emotional benefits of working with political trauma are also identified in the literature. Zembylas (2008) echoes virtues such as learned resilience and empathy in his exploration of curricular responses to political trauma; he especially emphasizes the necessity for curricula to support students in fostering empathy (not to be confused with sympathy) with those who suffered. Zembylas (2005) recognized a movement in curriculum as a whole towards the recognition of the emotional lives of student and teacher. A study by Noppe, Noppe, and Bartell (2005) showed that directly addressing September 11 in the high school classroom helped students address their feelings of vulnerability and raised students' confidence in their own safety and understandings of the events. Deborah Golden (2005) also found positive results in creating what she termed a "discourse of vulnerability" in directly addressing the topic of political trauma in the classroom. Thus, there are both intellectual and emotional benefits to addressing political trauma in the classroom—the question is how best to go about doing so.

The Risks of Teaching a September 11 Curriculum

While the case can thus be made for the significance of in-depth study of September 11 in the classroom, the event itself is traumatic in such a way that teachers find themselves grappling with how they will present the material without causing

emotional trauma in their students, as schools make a concerted effort to shelter students from such trauma. Before September 11, trauma intervention was in its “infancy” (Brock, 2003, p. 5), as schools were comparatively safe places to be. America was not a common target of attack, therefore the need for an educational response to political trauma was not deemed particularly warranted. The events of September 11, termed a political trauma as it involved violence perpetrated by humans on a large scale, gave such curricula momentum.

Rosenfeld et al. (2005) differentiate political traumas as requiring a unique response in that they are not an “act of God” or an accident; they do not bring people together in solidarity as a hurricane or a plane crash might. While many Americans were seen putting flags on their cars and donating to the Red Cross after September 11, there was also dissension about how best to react to the tragedy and whether or not criticism is policy. Television show hosts were fired for considering the terrorists’ motives, and Muslims suffered discrimination in the days following the attacks; despite an outward appearance of solidarity in the American community, there were sharp disagreements taking place. The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, as well as the crash of Flight 93, brought the trauma into every classroom in America; the trauma was felt as an attack on the entire country, unlike previous (and isolated) disasters that had occurred (e.g., the Oklahoma City bombing or Columbine) (Brock, 2003). September 11 was unique in its images of suffering, in that the majority of Americans who experienced the attacks did so through observing on the Internet, television, and newspapers—all repeated over and over again until the images became sensationalized.

Despite its ubiquity, Hess (2011) maintains that September 11 was and still is covered very rarely in the secondary-school classroom. Among the reasons discerned in her research, aside from too little time in a too-packed curriculum, she names the desire of schools to avoid such a controversial topic. Discussion of September 11 opens up the classroom to discussion of the politics of the Middle East, Muslim cultures and religion, and acts of war and acts of terror. Efforts to address the controversy of September 11, or contextualize it, were met with backlash in the public arena (Giroux, 2002). As mentioned, textbooks sublimated the controversy by simplifying the narrative of the events and portraying America as the victim in an apolitical, unprovoked attack (Hess, Stoddard, & Murto, 2008). Schools cited the desire to “protect” their students by keeping discussion of September 11 largely out of the classroom (Hess, 2011). When it comes to discussing those topics, there is a pervasive culture of avoidance (Sillin, 1995), a pervasive desire to shelter.

The Difficulty of Controversial Topics in the Classroom

Levinson (2006) developed a definition of controversial topics derived from the literature:

1. When people start from different premises and hold different key beliefs, understandings, values, or offer conflicting explanations or solutions that are rationally derived from these premises;
2. When it involves a substantial number of people or different groups; and
3. When the issue is not capable of being settled by appeal to evidence. (p. 1204)

These controversial topics are considered taboo in schools. Evans, Avery, and Pederson (2000), as does Sillin (1995), note the strength that the concept of *taboo* has in our society. Taboo, a topic that is absolutely not to be broached in conversation or public

forum, is a prevailing constraint on culture in America—a common saying is, “It is impolite to discuss politics or religion in mixed company.” The word “taboo” comes from the Polynesian word *tabu*, meaning “an object not to be touched” (Evans, Avery & Pederson, p. 295). The strength of the taboo, they surmise, is in its ability to multiply and proliferate in society endlessly, until society almost forgets why such a topic was taboo to begin with. In other words, topics in the classroom may remain taboo long after the cultural context in which the taboo was created has dissipated. Sillin (1995) names the continued use of the nuclear family as one such topic; curriculum generally sticks to a generic example of one father, one mother, and one or two children when speaking of the family, despite the fact that single-parent households are quite common—in fact, surveys found that more children were born to single mothers under thirty than married mothers last year (CDC, 2012).

A typical teacher response to this avoidance identified by Levin (2008) is trying to assert apoliticism in the classroom. Thampi (1975) argues that higher educational institutions have trained teachers to believe that academic integrity is incompatible with involvement in the political real world, and thus they should remain “neutral” by keeping political topics out of the classroom. This perspective gives teachers a significant corner from which to avoid addressing these topics, and for good reason. Zeigler’s (1967) seminal research on the political lives of teachers highlighted the extent to which teachers feared sanction for discussing controversial subjects in the classroom. They cited administration, parents, and local groups as likely to inflict repercussions if teachers broke the status quo in this manner, and Levin (2008) confirms how powerful such groups are in deciding what is appropriate to discuss in

the classroom. Teachers also cite the unwillingness to offend their students (partly due to their perceived nurturing roles and partly, again, for fear of sanction) as reason to not raise controversial topics in the classroom (Evans, Avery, and Pederson, 2000). Stradling (2006) identifies several additional teacher constraints, including lack of knowledge about particular issues, desire to stick to traditional content, and fear of losing control of open-ended discussions. The community also imposes its own constraints that Stradling (2006) further identifies as the hidden curriculum, the prevailing climate of the school, the value system of the community and the students, possibility of disapproval from parents, and the demographic makeup of the school.

The risks of discussing controversial subjects in the classroom are not just significant in the realm of the community; there are risks on the level of the individual student as well. Initially, students may be unfamiliar with instruction about controversial issues and may be unwilling to participate. Additionally, students come to class with firm prejudices and ways of thinking which may not be conducive to discussing the topics (Stradling, 2006). Furthermore, there may be personal risks for students when broaching these topics. Sillin (1995) addresses the emotional needs of students who might be experiencing the very controversial topics being discussed: a child whose parent has AIDS, for example, or one who has a cousin at war in Iraq, both topics often perceived to be taboo in schools. Teachers may not be aware of these individual situations when they broach a discussion of the AIDS epidemic or the search for the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Returning to the example of September 11: I personally had a student who had already enlisted in the Marines when America first deployed soldiers to Afghanistan following the attacks, a fact I was unaware of when I

started a discussion of the benefits and detriments of such a military response. Looking back, I can only imagine the array of emotions he felt—anger, uncertainty, indignation—as his fellow students described a mission he was about to embark on as “useless” and “war against innocents” and “a waste of time.” I wonder now if I would have framed the discussion differently on had I known the personal risks to him.

Varying Modes of Teaching Controversial Issues

Even if teachers venture into these topics with their students, they do so in ways that are varied. Hess (2004) identifies four approaches to controversial topics she has found in her research on teachers: denial (e.g., “Some people may say it is controversial, but there is really a right answer to this question. I will teach it to ensure that students develop that answer”); privilege (e.g., “It is controversial, but I think there is clearly a right answer and I will try to get my students to adopt that position”); avoidance (e.g., “The issue is controversial, and my personal views are so strong that I do not think I can teach it fairly”); and balance (e.g., “The issue is controversial and I will aim toward balance and try to ensure that various positions get a best case, fair hearing”) (p. 259).

These approaches are similar to the findings of Neighbour (1996), who built a model of teaching controversial issues that categorizes the approaches as exclusive neutrality, exclusive partiality, neutral impartiality, and committed impartiality. *Exclusive neutrality* indicates the complete omission of a controversial topic from the curriculum (analogous to Hess’s “avoidance”), *exclusive partiality* indicates that the instructor gives one side of the topic (similar to Hess’s “denial”), *neutral impartiality* is the attempt to present all sides of a topic without indicating a preference for one (akin to Hess’s

“balance”), and *committed impartiality* occurs when all sides are presented but the instructor indicates a preference for one (similar to, but not the same as, Hess’s “privilege”).

In both of these models, the actual controversy of the controversial issue is broached in instruction in only one instance (balance and neutral impartiality).. The very nature of controversial issues (according to Levinson’s definition) requires a recognition of the idea that 1) there is more than one (likely valid) viewpoint on the issue, and 3) the issue is not likely to be resolved through an appeal to evidence. In three of four approaches in both Hess’s and Neighbour’s models, the instructor implies that either the issue is not a topic of discussion in the classroom or that the issue has a clear, resolvable answer that he or she is going to instruct the class to understand. This is an inherent risk, therefore, of teaching controversial issues in the classroom—the controversy itself may be directed towards the teacher’s position.

The Difficulty With Neutrality

The emphasis in the discussion of controversial issues is on the knowledge students may gain in education about them. There is recognition of varying forms of intellectual ability but no recognition of differences in emotional ability. This is a common dichotomy in curriculum; it has become accepted practice to understand that students will learn material at different rates, and that some students will completely misunderstand what is taught, while others will skim the surface, and still others will dive deeply into the material (Gardner, 1985). Paradoxically, when working with material that might be considered traumatic in its subject matter or material presented

(e.g., the Holocaust or AIDS epidemic), very little is taken into consideration as to how students will absorb and react to the material emotionally (Sillin, 1995).

The most overt and widespread difficulty is the assumption that there are a set of “facts” for each controversial issue, or hard truths that are simply muddled by bias and extenuating cultural circumstances. As Levinson (2006) explains in his categories of controversial issues, there are those that do have facts, but the majority have either 1) facts that are not yet or cannot be entirely known or 2) basis entirely in emotional, moral, or cultural beliefs. However, as shown in Clarke’s (2005) “Demystification Strategy,” for example, the model is based on the idea that there are facts to be uncovered rather than ideas that may differ *among* the discussants.

In a similar vein, the majority of the models of discussing controversial issues rely on some position of neutrality from the teacher. However, in contrast, the theoretical grounding for teaching controversial issues emphasizes not only that teachers are not neutral in these discussions, but that it is considerably difficult, if not impossible, to be so. Hess’s (2004) model of the four approaches to controversial issues highlights the inability for teachers to be neutral in discussing politically charged topics, as does Neighbour’s (1996) model, in which even the choice to not discuss an issue class is a political decision with bias attached. However, Hess’s earlier (2002) discussion of best practices in teaching controversial issues relies on some attempt at neutrality by the instructor. Teachers are expected to be moderators that allow for both “sides” of each issue to be discussed and refrain from influencing the discussion to every extent possible. Levinson’s (2006) “Epistemological Model of Controversy” requires scientific (e.g., non-biased) approaches to topics, regardless of Levinson’s own admission of the

impossibility of such neutrality in some cases. The remainder of the models also call for neutrality with the exception of MacIntyre's (1988) "Acts of Empathetic Conceptual Imagination" that operates on the assumption that all participants, including the instructor, will be partial in some way and that notion must be at the forefront of every discussion.

The other difficulty with neutrality is that it negates the biases and values with which students come to the discussion. While the assumption made by all of the models is that all controversial issues should have space for discussion in the classroom and that all viewpoints should be given a voice, the idea of instituting neutrality suggests that all viewpoints are valid (Fleming, 1987). In many cases, an instructor may want a viewpoint to be voiced specifically for the purpose of debunking it through compassionate discussion (as in Levinson's conversational virtues). If a teacher claims to be neutral in a discussion of a controversial topic that is morally charged (e.g., honor killings in Muslim populations), the message she may be inadvertently sending to her class is that the belief that honor killings are harmful to society is just as valid as the belief that honor killings are an excellent means of upholding moral standards. Imagine if that teacher had a student in her class whose relative was a victim of an honor killing! However, showing partiality in a topical discussion does not imply partiality towards the students who hold the same opinion. A tension exists between those two concepts that should be explored.

Overgeneralization in an Attempt to Protect

On a smaller scale, instructors using these models would likely face the impetus to

overgeneralize the arguments concerning the controversial topics and relegate the topics to discussing “outsider” events, or events that take place outside of students’ cultural standpoints. In trying to create models that can be broken down into steps or assignments (e.g., Hedley and Markowitz), there is little room for the messiness that digging deeply into controversial topics often brings about. Additionally, the models tend to assume that there will be an “outcome” to these discussions, that students will come to a final decision or be able to produce a specific answer. This assumption is troubling on several levels. As Stradling (2006) notes, in the model’s requirements, there is an implied belief that humans have the ability to rationalize their moral and emotional reactions. Teachers will ask students, especially in the models designed to increase self-understanding, to articulate and reason their reactions, but much of the reaction may be feelings that cannot be rationalized with evidence or the “facts” the models believe exist. “Solving” these issues that are increasingly shown as unsolved in society may strike students as artificial at best. The overgeneralization of issues can lead to oversimplification and seemingly easy answers to issues that the best minds in the world grapple with. Students can pick up on that hypocrisy.

The Consequences of Shelter in Curriculum

Considering the dichotomy of the desire and justification of teaching September 11 in the classroom versus the difficulties and barriers of broaching such a controversial and potentially upsetting topic, there must be a mediating mechanism that allows teachers to hold the tension of both in their decisions. Shelter, the concept I introduced briefly at the beginning of this chapter, is that mediating mechanism, and the one that centers this

study. Sheltering as operationalized in working with political trauma can be seen in working with many politically loaded issues in the classroom including September 11. Several topics are consistently avoided in the classroom in the name of sheltering students, including the global threat of AIDS, sexuality, and recreational drug use (Sillin, 1995; Fleming, 1987). Evans, Avery, and Pederson (2000) add to the list abortion, pornography, open discussion of personal/family problems, obscene language, religious beliefs, and criticism of administration.

Shelter in Action

I was in college before I learned that America had lost the Vietnam War. A professor mentioned the loss in passing in a lecture on the NATO bombings on Sarajevo. I do not remember the point of the lecture, but I remember that moment as a jolt to my sensibilities. America had lost a war? How could I not know this? In my mind, as a still uninformed seventeen-year-old from suburbia, America was undefeated in wars.

This assumption carried with it implications much further reaching than just not knowing how the Vietnam War ended. This knowledge (or, more accurately, lack thereof) had formed my cultural identity and framed my historical perspective—a perspective that saw history as a dichotomy rather than a continuum. Until then, the “right” side won wars, the “wrong” side lost them. Weren’t we always right when we went to war? Even my “side” of the Civil War, as I was from the North, was the “right” side—the anti-slavery, pro-Union states that defeated the evils of human bondage. If our actions in Vietnam did not produce a victory, then perhaps they were unwarranted. Most importantly, if our actions were unwarranted, than perhaps the NATO actions we

were discussing were as well.

I do not have a specific memory of anyone telling me that America had won the Vietnam War, but rather, I believe the topic was avoided altogether. A review of my AP U.S. history notes shows that the class skipped from the end of the Korean War to the election of Reagan. None of my other history classes in elementary or secondary school had addressed anything later than World War II. My father had joined the Peace Corps rather than the draft, and thus Vietnam was never a topic of conversation at the dinner table. As that high school U.S. history class had covered the '80s and even part of the '90s, I could not reconcile not covering Vietnam with running out of time at the end of the school year. Instead, it seemed the Vietnam War conflicted with the American narrative I had been taught until then—covering the American loss in Vietnam would constitute critique of that narrative.¹ I was sheltered from questioning or critiquing the cultural narrative that the curriculum had laid out before us: that the U.S. had won the Vietnam War.

The Complications of Shelter

Shelter, as seen in this study, allows teachers to broach controversial subjects while simultaneously protecting students from that which they—or the administration, standard curriculum, or policy mandate—deem to be emotionally or intellectually inappropriate. The material could be inappropriate due to its upsetting nature, its break from a cultural narrative desired by the curriculum, or the intellectual challenge it provides.

¹ This “narrative” also completely excised any wars-by-proxy in which the U.S. was involved, including our activities in Central America and South America at the time.

For example, shelter may protect students from confrontations for which they are not ready. In classes that have not created a safe space for the students to talk, or have not established rules of trust and respect for one another, broaching controversial topics can inadvertently cause traumatic occurrences in the classroom. Students may repeat racist or prejudiced language they have heard elsewhere without understanding the repercussions. Shelter may also protect a teacher from topics that he is not prepared to address or balance in the classroom. Apple (2002) and Giroux (2002) describe instances of teachers who were reprimanded or suspended for how they discussed September 11 in the classroom. Teachers who broached the subject of the terrorists and why they may have wanted to attack the United States were particularly targeted—in a time of American solidarity shown by yellow ribbons and flags on cars, the idea of laying any of the blame on America for causing the attacks was considered offensive and anti-patriotic, and teachers across the country were subject to punitive action for raising such a topic in the classroom.

However, in contrast, by sheltering students from such subjects, schools prevent not only the potentially harmful aspects of such discussions (e.g., stereotyping, racist speech), but the beneficial aspects as well, including offering students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking. Scriven and Paul (1987) describe critical thinking as the:

intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action. In its exemplary form, it is based on universal intellectual values that transcend subject matter divisions: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, sound evidence, good reasons, depth, breadth, and fairness. (para. 1)

Critical thinking requires exposure to information. Employing sheltering in high

schools may imply an assumption that students are incapable of processing information that may challenge their understandings of the world. It makes the assumption of a low level of moral and cognitive development and may have the capacity of stunting growth into the next levels of thinking and emotional abilities.

Additionally, while shelter may protect students from material they are not prepared to process, in operationalizing shelter teachers can be making assumptions about students' emotional or cognitive abilities that may not bear out. Can students' boundaries be truly understood without pushing against them? What if by sheltering students from particular information, teachers in the end oversimplify a student's understanding of the issue at hand, an oversimplification that proves difficult to work past in future studies? Does the risk of sheltering outweigh the benefit?

Reconsidering Shelter as a New Device

Shelter as a mechanism in curriculum is neither good nor bad, educative or restrictive, in its own right. Rather, the use of shelter can be restrictive to a student's ability to think critically and examine subjects through an inquiry-based process if the mechanism is implemented as a way to withhold certain information or force a student's direction of thinking to a predetermined end. Shelter may actually encourage critical thinking or greater depth of inquiry if it is used to provide a framework for students to think about a subject but does not limit the information they may use. Shelter may also protect and support a student emotionally while he is grappling with a difficult topic. Thus, what is important about the nature of shelter is ultimately the pedagogical motivation behind the curriculum that practices it.

The Organization of This Dissertation

This study theorizes the concept of shelter through the examination of curricula written about and after September 11.

Chapter 2 discusses the data set of this study. In this chapter, the methods of data collection and a summary description of the different curricula used are given. The methodology of the analysis of the curricula is discussed, giving a complete description of both the initial analysis for the devices of shelter and the secondary analysis of how the shelter works through three themes.

Chapter 3 describes the devices of shelter as analyzed in the curricula, i.e., how shelter operates across the curricula and the different tactics the curricula take to shelter students.

Chapter 4 discusses the consequences of the devices discussed in Chapter 3, across the themes discussed earlier about the paradox of teaching controversial issues: emotional needs, critical thinking, and political ideology.

Chapter 5 interrogates a possibility of a different type of curriculum for investigating political trauma. In this chapter, I show how shelter can be used to protect a curriculum that privileges uncertainty over coming to specific answers, drawing from the philosophy of Julia Kristeva.

CHAPTER II

IDENTIFYING SHELTER IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULUM

I am still the same me I was on September 10th, with just an added experience to my life. Honestly, I think more than anything the whole event has confused me. I don't understand so much. I don't understand how people could feel whatever they felt and do something so terrible. I don't understand all these feelings I'm 'supposed' to feel that are being shoved down my throat. I don't understand the feelings I actually do have about the events of September 11 because everyone else's feelings influenced me so much. ~11 grader quoted by Work and Families Institute.

Introduction

To theorize how the concept of shelter operates across curriculum relating to September 11, I looked at fifteen different curricula through a multi-level rhetorical analysis. Grumet (2008, with Osmond and Anderson) identify research in curriculum theory as having at least three strands:

First, the study of the curriculum phenomenon as a cultural object.

Second, the study of the curriculum object as an event.

Third, the study of curriculum in the perspective of the researcher. (p. 137-138)

In attempting to begin the understanding the curricula of this study as a cultural object and event, I begin this chapter with a description of the context of the data set and the curricula themselves. The chapter ends with a description of the methodology, addressing the third strand of my perspective as researcher.

Sheltering as Seen Through Curriculum as a Concept

An essential understanding of this study is that sheltering cannot be theorized as *good or bad*, conducive to learning or inimical. Sheltering operates through different devices and on different levels for different purposes, which is the point of this study. As a lens for the dissertation, I look to theorize shelter as a concept in a curriculum critique.

This dissertation relies on the idea of curriculum conception beyond the idea of what is systematically taught in the classroom. As Egan (1978) notes, the word curriculum comes from the Latin for “course,” and Cicero included all of life’s experience as making up one’s life-course, or curriculum. Curriculum is more than a series of lesson plans taught in the classroom; how the student interacts with those lessons, and how the lessons interact with society, make up a complicated conversation of learning that is much more indicative of what I intend by the use of the word “curriculum” than merely a packet of lessons teachers deliver in the classroom.

Jackson (1992, as quoted by Pinar et al., 2008) lists how the definition of curriculum has changed over most of the last century:

1. a course, a regular course of study or training, as at a school or university
2. a course, especially a specified fixed course of study, as in a school or college, as one leading to a degree, or the whole body of courses offered in an educational institution, or by a department
3. curriculum is all of the experiences children have under the guidelines of teachers
4. curriculum encompasses all learning opportunities provided by a school
5. curriculum [is] a plan or program for all experiences which the learner encounters under the direction of school. (p. 26)

This dissertation considers the last definition for its use; while this study is an analysis of curricula designed for schools, it is conducted through the lens of the

emotional and intellectual impacts on the student, rather than evaluation against standards or classroom objectives reminiscent of the standardized field before the 1970s. The definition of curriculum used here is reminiscent of the work of Bobbit (as described by Pinar, et al.), encompassing not only the work of the planned lessons but also what is deliberately not taught, as well as what is implied (called the *hidden curriculum*). In terms of the work of the analysis of curricula, this study relies heavily on my own experience with teaching through September 11 and political trauma afterwards, while interpreting current September 11 curricula through several different literatures to theorize the concept of shelter. At the end of the study, I imagine a future of a different type of working with political trauma in curriculum, influenced by the synthesis of the study.

Choosing the Data Set

Although only twenty states require September 11 as a topic in their curriculum (Robelan, 2011), dozens of textbooks and hundreds of lesson plans exist on the subject, not counting materials teachers create for individual classrooms. I narrowed the data set according to three specific criteria.

Adolescent Curricula

Significant differences exist, as they should, between political-trauma curricula for adolescents and that for students in primary grades. Adolescence provides a particular inroad into the study of educational response to education due to its unique developmental aspects. Adolescents are more likely to have come to terms with the

permanence of death and also engage in abstract and hypothetical thinking that allows for deeper political investigation than younger children (Lerner, Volpe, & Lindell, 2003). Adolescents are also likely to have a more sophisticated understanding of loss than younger children and may experience phases of grief (e.g., survivor guilt, disorganization) that younger children do not. Rosenfeld et al. (2005) describe adolescence as a period of questioning rules and beliefs that may cause greater confusion during times of trauma than for younger children. They are seen as searching for identity and are particularly attuned to hypocrisy or being lied to, but also place a premium on belonging to a group. These reactions are often accompanied by a sense of guilt or the feeling that one could have done more to help those who experienced the trauma (Pfohl, Jimerson & Lazarus, 2003).

Using this lens of adolescence provides certain expectations and values to which curricula can be held in terms of looking at shelter. Violent images, for example, may cause less concern for the creators of curriculum for adolescents than for younger children; similarly, the complexities of government policy are more likely to be addressed with adolescents who are able to parse through gray areas in ways that younger children would not be expected to do. Additionally, my own experience with teaching has primarily been with adolescents, so the basic curricular expectations are ones that I am accustomed to. The curricula chosen for this study are all written for grades 9-12, which encompass ages 14-18.

National Curricula

Children in California were not awake when children from New York City were

evacuated from their schools on September 11. How a teacher from one coast might introduce September 11 would likely be very different than how a teacher from another would approach the topic. To avoid geo-cultural issues (e.g., is political trauma perceived differently in Texas than in Michigan?), which would be beyond the purview of this study, the data only included curricula both aimed at national audiences and made available to them. This limits not only the scope of the study, but also makes assumptions about teachers and writers of curriculum—that similarities in terms of desire to shelter exist among all educators, regardless of geographical location. This may be considered a limitation of this study.

Some of the curricula are available free of charge while others cost money, but they are all accessible no matter where in the United States one may be, and each contains core materials that may be downloaded from the Internet.

Influence and Pervasion

My criteria for choosing these particular curricula, aside from adolescent comprehension and national focus, were to verify that the curricula studied had a significant likelihood of being used. Aside from wanting to study curricula that had an effect on students, I had a secondary reason: The authors of pervasive curricula for September 11 typically have created other widely used curricula, so by studying their work, I would have some sense of their larger influence in the field.

To find such curricula, I first compiled a list stemming from a large body of research I did on education after September 11. This body included articles from academic journals, mainstream publications (e.g., *Education Week*), and Google searches. I found

over 100 different curricula (defined here as written lesson plans in a unit intended to teach the topic of September 11). I removed all data for which an author or source of production could not be found, in consideration of the importance of the source to the implications of the curricula. I then did a recursive search, removing any curricula for which I could not find at least three recommendations from high-use curriculum sites, including the U.S. Department of Education, Scholastic, and the What Works Clearinghouse. What remained were the fifteen curricula identified in Table 1, making up a collection of nearly 2,000 pages. While this method may have led to a normative set of curricula, the purpose of this study was to find what was most likely used, rather than the largest spectrum of the type of curriculum available.

Table 1. Curriculum Data

Curriculum Title	Publisher/ Author	Date of Pub.	Standards/ Objectives
Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy	CHOICES for the 21 st Century	2011	Custom
Voices for Peace	Civic Voices	nd	Custom
Teaching 9-11 Lesson Plan Winner	Clarke Forum	2003	National US History Standards
Terrorism in America	Constitutional Rights Foundation	2002, 2004	National US History Standards, National Civics Standards, California Content Standards
Modules for Democracy/ Civic Mission Classrooms	Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago	2006	Custom
9/11: Looking Back, Moving Forward	Families and Work Institute	2003	Custom
Global Security, Terrorism, and 9/11 in the Classroom	4Action Initiative	2011	“Align with school goals and curricula”
9/11 and War on Terror	Learn Our History	2011	Custom
The Learning Network 9/11 Lessons	New York Times	2001	CTSS Standards/World History Standards
9/11 Memorial	9/11 National Memorial and Museum	2012	Common Core Standards
America Responds	PBS	2001	McREL Standards
September 11 th Education Program	September 11 th Education Trust/Taft Institute for Government	2009	National Social Studies Standards
September 11 th and the Aftermath	Smithsonian Institute	2011	National History Standards
September 11 th	Tribute WTC	2012	Common Core Standards
We the People: 9/11 & the Constitution	US DOE Center for Civic Education	2011	Not stated

The Data Set

The section below gives an overview of the fifteen curricula used in this dissertation. These curricula are either a unit, a set of units, or a group of lesson plans related to September 11. Each curriculum is summarized, and then the objective and an exemplar lesson plan are given. The purpose of providing this overview is to give an overall idea of the curricula and their motivations before delving into the content specifically.

“Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy” (2011)

The CHOICES for the 21st Century Program has been “committed to providing rigorous and scholarly educational materials to teachers and classrooms” (p. i) since 1989. The curriculum was written by the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University. The organization of the curriculum begins with a 32-page reading on terrorism, using the framework of September 11, and a several-day group project asking students to investigate four choices of policy response to terrorism. The second part of the program includes three day-long lesson plans: Oral History, Defining Terrorism, and Political Cartoons in the Press. The program completes with a two-day long group project in which students role-play policymakers to debate U.S. policy.

Objective.² The program addresses the issues arising from the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Students are drawn into consideration of the changing nature of terrorism, motivations of terrorists, and the implications for U.S. domestic and international policy.

Exemplar Lesson. In “Oral History and September 11,” students interview a person they know who has a connection to September 11. In Part 1, they discuss the

² Each of the objectives to follow are quoted directly from the programs.

importance of oral history and review what they have learned about the attacks. They brainstorm a list of questions based on handout with predecided questions to conduct their interview. They conduct the interview for homework. In Part 2, they work in small groups to debrief about their interviews and share their conclusions they have drawn from the answers they were given. They also use a handout to reassess their own views with which they started the unit.

“Should the Government Go Beyond the Normal Limits of Its Authority During Wartime?”
(2003)

The Clarke Forum for Contemporary Issues is an interdisciplinary project of Dickinson College. The Forum held a contest in which teachers submitted original lesson plans about September 11, and this lesson, written by Masato Ogawa of Ontario High School, was the winner. The Clarke Forum published the lesson plan and promoted it. The plan asks students to compare two uses of authority during wartime: the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II and the detention of non-citizens under the Patriot Act after September 11. Students use a copy of the Bill of Rights and executive orders to define their positions on how civil liberties are interpreted through the Constitution and government actions.

Objectives. Students will be encouraged to participate in a debate on the issues of what the limits of authority should be during wartime. They will be able to explain and define the positions they have taken on the use of authority during wartime. Students, using various primary and secondary sources, will be able to build their own perspectives on civil liberties and issues of national security.

Exemplar Lesson. Students read the Bill of Rights and Bill of Rights hypothetical situations. They discuss in groups whether the hypothetical situations contain violations of the Bill of Rights. Students then read background information on the Japanese-American Internment during World War II and the detainment of enemy combatants after September 11. Students read the Fifth Amendment, Civilian Exclusion Order 108, and Executive Order No. 9066 (Patriot Act). The class debates the merits of both orders and then completes individual writings on their own thoughts about civil liberties.

“Terrorism in America” (2002, updated 2004)

The Constitutional Rights Foundation commissioned Marshall Croddy, Carlton Martz, Bill Hayes, and Charles Degelman to write a unit on terrorism after September 11. The unit includes teacher preparation materials on handling controversy in the classroom, directing discussion of controversial topics, encouraging brainstorming, and using role-playing in the classroom. The unit comprises 15 lesson plans all using the same format. Each lesson includes a reading about the topic (e.g., “What is terrorism?”), discussion questions, and activity, and a debriefing of the activity. Each lesson also comes with the suggestion of a possible outside resource person (ORP) who may assist in the lesson. OSRs include elected officials, first responders, and historians.

Objectives. The threat of terrorism and the current war on terrorism raise innumerable questions that can be dealt with in the classroom. The 15 lessons are grouped into five categories: background, issues related to international terrorists, issues related to domestic terrorists, civil liberties issues, and civic participation. The

final lesson sequence can be used by teachers in all curriculum areas. It models a civic participation process that encourages students to take a hands-on approach to addressing community problems. The activities are designed to engage students in the material and to foster critical thinking skills.

Exemplar Lesson. In “What is Terrorism?,” students read a one-page summary of the history of terrorist acts America has dealt with since 1950. The teacher asks students to discuss the meaning of the sentence, “One person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter.” The culminating activity is a review of several case studies; students must decide whether each case is an example of terrorism.

“Modules for Democracy/Civic Mission Classrooms” (2006)

The Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago designed a unit after September 11 that contains eight interrelated modules: 1) “Detaining U.S. Citizens as Enemy Combatants,” 2) “Federal Surveillance of U.S. Persons Under the USA Patriot Act,” 3) “Expanding Search and Seizure Powers of the Federal Government,” 4) “Creating a Federal Database: The Total Information Awareness Project,” 5) “Using Torture on Suspected Terrorists,” 6) “Defining Terrorism,” 7) “Press Freedom and Military Censorship,” and 8) “Racial and Ethnic Profiling Before and After September 11.” Each of the modules uses the Constitution as a framework for interrogating the topic. The modules all contain overviews written by the program’s authors, readings from outside sources such as journals and newspapers, and writing activities for the students to complete in which they take a stand on the particular topic at hand.

Objectives. This unit gives an overview of some of the issues relating to America’s

response to September 11. It reviews some of the powers of presidents during wartime, the rights of citizens in the United States, and the ways in which the U.S. Supreme Court has tried to balance individual freedoms with national defense. It also presents a discussion model called “structured academic controversy” for exploring the facts, arguments, and options surrounding these issues.

Exemplar Lesson. “Detaining U.S. Citizens as Enemy Combatants” takes students through several steps in investigating the detention of enemy combatants after September 11. First, they read “Enemy Combatants,” a single-author overview. Part B is a glossary of necessary terms (e.g., *habeas corpus*, material witness), Part C is a primary source document from the White House declaring Jose Padilla an enemy combatant. Part D is an activity giving background activity on Jose Padilla, asking students to decide whether President Bush made the correct decision. Part E contains six short case studies for students to read and decide whether the person described is an enemy combatant. Students are given a graphic organizer and criteria for their determinations (Part F and G).

“September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward” (2003)

The Families and Work Institute devised a committee to write 16 lesson plans after asking students “Has September 11 changed you?” The unit contains art and quotes from students drawn from that question, and the lesson plans focus on both understanding September 11 as history and the goals of: 1) helping children feel safe, 2) helping children understand heroism within themselves and others, 3) helping children find and give support within their communities, 4) helping children learn perspective

taking, 5) helping children become critical thinkers, 6) helping children understand the historical antecedents of terrorism, and 7) helping children identify and respect American values. Of the 16 plans, four are devoted to 9th-12th graders. Lessons rely on class discussion and arts-based methods.

Objectives. See numbers 1-7 above.

Exemplar Lesson. In a lesson entitled, “Diversity: Our Strength—Our Challenge,” students complete a three-part lesson examining the effects of being a target of hatred. First, they draw symbols that personally characterize their own lives, such as gender, ethnicity, or religion, and discuss the connotations of those symbols. Next, they write journal entries about times when they have felt like part of minority or part of the majority. Finally, students role-play times they have seen bias occur and discuss what they have seen.

“Global Security, Terrorism, and September 11 in the Classroom” (2011)

The 4Action Initiative, supported by several foundations, provides extensive teacher preparation materials instructing how to work with September 11 as a sensitive issue in the classroom. The program also provides seven pages of additional resources, including museums, organizations, and service projects. The high school lesson plans are divided into seven units of between two and four lessons each: I) Human Behavior; II) From Playground to World Stage—Violence, Aggression and Terrorism; III) Historical Context of Terrorism; IV) A Contemporary Case Study in Terrorism; V) Post September 11: Consequences and Challenges; VI) Remembrance and the Creation of Memory;, and VII) Building Better Futures: Narrative, Recovery and Responsibility. The

lessons plans do not follow a common format, but rather incorporate outside research, DVDs and web materials, discussion questions, and graphic organizers.

Objectives. Education is a must to eliminate these tragedies in the future and to educate all as to what happened on September 11. We believe that students who engage in meaningful projects or give service enhance their own resilience and understand the value of being global citizens.

Exemplar Lesson. In “The Individual: Identifying with Groups,” students work with identity charts to discern how they see themselves. They participate in an “Us vs. Them” activity, using the charts to divide themselves into groups to which they see themselves belonging, and discuss the concept of group identity. Finally, they work in pairs to write about who in the world they see themselves as having obligations to love and protect.

“TimeCycle Academy: September 11 and the War on Terror” (2011)

The *Learn Our History* program, cofounded by Mike Huckabee, created half-hour-long videos covering topics of history. This particular video, a cartoon, follows children as they learn about September 11 through traveling back in time to visit three periods in history: the attack on the World Trade Center, their hometown immediately following the attacks, and an Afghan terrorist training camp immediately prior to the attack. The website for the video provides games and study guides for the videos.

Objective. In this important film, the time-traveling teenagers learn about America’s heroic response to the tragic events of September 11. They strive to understand why Al-Qaeda attacked us and how the ongoing War on Terror protects Americans at home and American ideals abroad.

Exemplar Lesson. Video

“September 11 Memorial Lesson Plans” (2012)

The September 11 National Memorial and Museum created a unit of lesson plans centering on the events of September 11 and the building of the memorial that followed the attacks. The September 11 Memorial has 29 different lesson plans. As the plans are connected to different areas of the memorial website, it does not appear that teachers are expected to cover all of them, but rather choose based on the needs of their particular classroom. The plans give a multisensory and multi-aspect picture of the effects of September 11 on both New York and America as a whole, providing links to oral histories of survivors, photographs of acts of patriotism following the attacks, and written accounts of New Yorkers’ responses, among other artifacts. The final lesson asks students to choose what they think they would add to a memorial to September 11 to encompass what they believe is most important.

Objective. The lessons are aligned with the Common Core State Standards.

Exemplar Lesson. “Exploring Afghani Culture Through Literature” asks students to learn about Afghani culture through reading *The Kite Runner* and *A Thousand Splendid Suns*. Students are given three papers to write on the books. The first answers the question “What are the fundamental similarities and differences highlighted in the book?” The second and third ask students to agree or disagree with the following statements: “moral choices are essentially choices between two sets of values: one belonging to one culture or era, one to another” and “personal trauma coincides with cultural change” using textual evidence.

“The September 11 Education Program” (2009)

The *September 11 Education Trust*, supported by the Social Studies School Service and the Taft Institute for government, produced this program, which is both the most expensive (\$128) and the most publicized. Former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani personally promoted this program to schools across the country, and articles touting the program appeared in both education publications (e.g., *EdWeek*) and general-interest publications (e.g., *The New York Times*). The program comprises seven lessons: 1) Visualizing September 11: Photographs and Words, 2) The Historian’s Craft: Creating Timelines and Using Personal Narratives, 3) The Post-September 11 Recovery Process, 4) Designing a September 11 Memorial, 5) Honoring Heroes, 6) Advocacy: Civic Action and the Role of the Government, and 7) U.S. National Security and September 11. The program culminates with a group remembrance presentation. Accompanying the program is a DVD with numerous images from September 11 and oral history interviews, and the focus is on students understanding the impact of that day as it is framed by the curriculum.

Objectives. We believe that building on the story of September 11—the courage, compassion, and unprecedented civic responses—will translate well beyond the classroom and will be lessons that our nation’s youth can apply to lead more meaningful, productive lives. It is our hope that this comprehensive program, which incorporates written lessons, an interactive DVD, and web-based resources, will enable you to impart the vital lessons of this tragic yet inspiring time in American history.

Exemplar Lesson. “Visualizing September 11: Photographs and Words” provides photos and video clips of September 11. Students break into groups of four and use

graphic organizers to analyze what is happening in the visuals.

“The Learning Network” (2001)

The New York Times published a lesson entitled “Another Day That Will Live in Infamy” to “encourage students to share, through discussion and writing, their feelings about these and other acts of terrorism, as well as related issues, such as national security and media coverage of the attacks” (p. 1). The lesson asks students to complete a free-writing exercise, examine the *New York Times* report on September 11, hold a discussion about their feelings about the attack, and write a reflective journal entry. The plan links to numerous outside sources that investigate the attacks in comparison with other acts of terrorism.

Objectives. In the wake of the September 11, 2001 acts of terrorism in the United States, students are encouraged to share, through discussion and writing, their feelings about these and other acts of terrorism, as well as related issues, such as national security and media coverage of the attacks.

Exemplar Lesson. Students begin by free-writing about their impressions of September 11. They read *New York Times* articles about the attacks and work in a roundtable discussion format to talk through how the articles align with or challenge their perceptions.

“America Responds” (2001)

The Public Broadcasting Service produced a video following the attacks of September 11 called *America Responds*; the lesson plans of this unit are based on students’

watching that video. The emphasis of the lesson plans is on understanding Afghanistan and the Taliban and their place *among* Middle Eastern countries. Students are asked to investigate American treatment of Muslim cultures and the difficulties of exhibiting tolerance in times of trial, comparing this decade with the times of Japanese internment camps. The lesson plans lead students to external Internet resources to extensively research the global context of September 11.

Objectives. The lessons align with the McREL standards of teaching world history.

Exemplar Lesson. “Afghanistan Today: The Civil War and Human Rights” asks students to discuss what they know about the Taliban. They then use Internet resources to research the following questions: 1) How did the Taliban come to power? 2) Why are human rights organizations worried about the Taliban? and 3) How do the Taliban’s religious views compare to those of other Muslims around the world? Students then write about contemporary life in Afghanistan from the point of view of either a military leader, a teacher, a soldier, or a citizen in neighboring Uzbekistan.

“September 11 and the Aftermath” (2011)

Similar to the September 11 Memorial program, the Smithsonian’s program uses the framework of creating memory to teach students about September 11. The program puts the student in the role of museum curator, asking him to collect artifacts for a Smithsonian exhibit on September 11, including oral histories, student reactions, images, and products he would include. The students are expected to be able to explain why their finished exhibits would look as they do, and thus explore the importance of creating remembrance projects in understanding historical events.

Objectives. The Smithsonian lessons align with the National History Standards to investigate memories of important events.

Exemplar Lesson. In “The Curator’s Challenge: Life in a Post–September 11 World,” students read background information about September 11 and then decide what artifacts they would include in a September 11 exhibit.

“September 11” (2012)

The Tribute WTC program developed a unit based on videos of descriptions of oral histories. Each of the eight units follows the same format, beginning with a video relating to the topic, then providing students with a list of facts relating to the video and pertinent materials (e.g., a timeline or backstory) and finishing with “personal experience questions” that students are to answer either in class discussion or in journals. The eight topics covered by the program are: 1) Rebuilding a School Community, 2) A Survivor Helps Others Heal, 3) Creating a September 11 Learning Center, 4) Uniformed Services: Loss and Recovery, 5) Empowering Women Globally, 6) Being Muslim in New York after September 11, 7) Globalizing Peace, and 8) Building National Memorials.

Objectives. Tribute WTC aims to provide high school teachers with primary-resource classroom materials that introduce the personal impact of September 11.

Exemplar Lesson. In “Rebuilding a School Community,” students watch an oral history interview of Ada Dolch, the principal of a high school facing the World Trade Center. Students then complete a “Connect and Reflect” activity in which they read a fact and then answer questions from information they learned from the video.

“We the People: September 11 and the Constitution” (2011)

The Center for Civic Education was funded by the No Child Left Behind Act to create a unit emphasizing American values in terms of the Constitution and principles of the founders of the United States. The introduction to the unit is an overview of the attacks of September 11 and America’s response to the attacks. Students then complete four lessons, each answering a question: 1) What is an American? 2) What fundamental ideas about government do Americans share? 3) How well is the American government serving its purpose? 4) How can the American government better fulfill its purposes? Students participate in classroom discussions based on activities to provide answers to the guiding questions.

Objectives. The anniversaries of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, provide us an opportunity to reflect upon who we are as Americans, examine our most fundamental values and principles and affirm our commitment to them, and evaluate progress toward the realization of American ideals and propose actions that might narrow the gap between these ideas and reality.

Exemplar Lesson. In the lesson “What is an American?” students read quotes from historical figures in America. Students then work in groups to identify the main idea from each quote and state whether they agree or disagree with the idea. The concluding activity has the teacher write the ideas on the board and helps students come to a consensus of what ideas make up fundamental American values.

“Voices for Peace: Nonviolent Strategies for Change” (nd)

The Civic Voices project, which focuses on providing a “memory bank” of struggles for democracy around the world, addressed September 11 by creating a project to teach students methods for promoting peace as a way to fight terrorism. Students learn about 11 different methods of peaceful protest (e.g., boycotts, elections, and strikes); for each method, they are introduced to a leader from a different culture who used it. Students are asked to compare the different methods and, as a group, come up with a comprehensive strategy for change to combat injustices they see in America after September 11.

Objectives. *Voices for Peace* works to help students 1) identify various nonviolent strategies for effecting political change, 2) assess the benefits and limitations of these strategies, 3) recognize contemporary examples of those strategies in action, 4) reflect on the legitimacy and effectiveness of various strategies, and 5) consider which strategies they are most likely to employ as citizens.

Exemplar Lesson. “Change through Arts” has students read quotes from Michael Longley, Antonio Garcia, Salman Ahmad, Adam Kalita, and Law Eh Soe. Each quote describes how the speaker used art to protest civil injustice in society. Students use a graphic organizer to compare the artistic forms and intended messages of the art, as well as the impact on the community. They then search for uses of artistic expression as protest in their own communities.

Intake and Analysis Methodology

As noted earlier in this chapter, I approached this study with the idea of three particular strands of understanding of curriculum research. My concept of shelter was initially developed through my own experience of being both student and teacher in situations where I believed information was sheltered from me or where I felt the need to shelter my own students. I did not approach the curricula as a blank slate to see what themes emerged; rather, I approached it as a cultural artifact looking for whether my mechanism of shelter would bear out or not. What really interested me was how the story of September 11 was culturally situated in curriculum; in other words, by teaching about September 11, teachers lead their students into the narrative of the attacks that is dependent on the time and place of where they are when they broach the topic—e.g., in 2003, a teacher may have framed a story of September 11 that included Saddam Hussein and weapons of mass destruction, while in 2011, the story would debunk those assumptions but may include the assassination of Osama bin Laden. The curriculum the teachers choose to use mitigates that story, and in this study, I am attempting to approach the phenomenon of why certain aspects of the story are told and some are left out. The beginning of that understanding is this theorizing of shelter.

In order to identify devices of shelter in the curricula of this study, I completed a content analysis of the documents based initially on Purdue University's methods of analyzing visual documents (Pepper, et al., 2010). Content analysis is somewhat different than discourse analysis, in that rhetorical analysis recognizes the interaction of images and text in the documents and emphasizes both word choice and image choice in determining the purpose and indications of the documents at hand. Selzer (2008) emphasizes the need of the analytical screen of the documents to look to the

purpose—in this case, shelter. To do so, he suggests identifying key questions to ask oneself while analyzing the documents both visually and for language. As Johnstone (2002) asks in defining the purpose of analysis of documents, “Why is the text the way it is? Why is it no other way?” (p. 8).

For the first level of analysis, I asked myself these questions while examining the documents: What patterns of language exist? What are the significances and connotations of this language in terms of how I have theorized shelter? Does it seem to fit within the shelter metaphor or reject it? In this analysis, I hoped to discern the choices of the curricula and gain a deeper understanding of the implications of shelter that existed within them.

The Affective Tension of Document Analysis

Before moving on to my process, it is important to make one more note of methodology. Much is written about the necessity of honoring the affect of human subjects in research, especially with the intensity required of ethnography (e.g., Clifford & Marcus, 1996, Willis & Trondman, 2000). Gershon and Wozolek (2012) explore what they call “affective tension” in subject analysis; they identify a push-pull between the desire to interpret the actions of the people they observe and the desire to let them speak for themselves through their research. A struggle exists between trying to push the subject to express what he or she is working out internally and not wanting to identify what may not be there through overanalysis.

The risk of such is likely less with document analysis—or perhaps it is actually greater. While reading documents, there is no inflection or body language for the

researcher to interpret; the words are all there is. The researcher can make the mistake of emphasizing that which the author wrote carelessly or of glossing over what the author perceived to be essential. In curriculum analysis, this disconnect between author and reader has a different type of impact: What the teacher of the curriculum may choose to spend the most time on or highlight for her students may be completely opposite from what the author intended.

Intentionality is key in this curriculum study. Part of the analysis involved significant research into the background of each unit, identifying the author and publisher and the context of each. It was important to this work to understand the voice behind the curriculum, as well as the purpose and objectives of production. Being able to make claims about the discourse used in the units—words, images, activities chosen, sources and derivations made—relies on understanding where the curriculum came from and what the larger sociopolitical contextualities may be. However, analysis of sources came after the initial reading analysis, because I did not want to cloud what I was seeing; just as with human subjects, I wanted to let the curriculum speak as it would before interpreting it.

Method of Content Analysis

To align analysis of the documents while I read, I “interviewed” each document with an intake form (Appendix A). For each curriculum, I noted the name, publisher/author, date of publication, and standards or objectives stated. The more I investigated, the more important those details became. Only a few of the curricula are based on the Common Core Standards now adopted by 46 states, but most are driven by other

national standards, indicating an alignment across geographical areas and supporting my choice of national curricula. I then noted any given definitions (e.g., definitions for words that are disputable, such as “terrorism”), because I found in the controversial issues literature discussed in Chapter 1 that a recurring theme among the topics that teachers found taboo was words that they either tried to avoid or those that they tried to define in ways that would neutralize them for the student.

I then looked for stated and implied purposes of the unit (e.g., “Students will reflect on nonviolent strategies for change”) and stated and implied teacher actions (e.g., a teacher being expected to facilitate a discussion or teach a historical lecture) to gain an initial picture of what would be expected of students and what role shelter might play in those expectations.

Initial Analysis for Shelter

On the back of the intake form (Appendix A), I analyzed for aspects of the curricula that seemed to imply sheltering of the students based on the impressions described in Chapter 1, such as straightforward narratives from one source, or the glossing over of incongruent details. I also noted evidence of provocation, such as open discussions and self-guided research, or graphic images and video. As I completed this analysis, I noted methods of the curricula that began to recur across each program. An investigation of these notes highlighted various devices that I found to either provoke students or shelter them, and the analysis of those devices is discussed in Chapter 3. In the first level of analysis, I began by looking for exposure to potentially upsetting material in order to find the ways that sheltered students from it. Through that analysis, I found

that September 11 was described through three different lenses: historical context, context of the sufferers, and context of global events. Those lenses highlighted the devices that showed themselves: distance, defining, and narrative.

Secondly, I looked to the content of the mission statements and used a rhetorical analysis on the statements themselves to identify both the responsibilities placed on the students and the purposes of the curricula. I found that the mission statements emphasized essential questions that placed considerable responsibility on students with little support as shelter. Additionally, I found that the rhetoric of the mission statements created a spectrum of language from directive learning to democratic learning.

Finally, I looked to the content for what pedagogical actions were required of the teacher. On the intake sheet, I noted direct instruction to teachers as well as implied instructions to the teachers that the curricula depended on for completion by the students. These directions highlighted a significant level of normalizing as a device expected to be used by teachers, as well as a narrow definition of classroom discussion in order to prevent students from broaching topics or ideas outside the planned questions and answers.

Secondary Analysis

As I coded for these devices, an opportunity of a secondary analysis presented itself of three themes that emerged—critical dialogue, political influence, and personal emotional context. I found these themes to be consequences of the devices, and thus performed secondary analyses of specific parts of the curricula to investigate these

themes more deeply. The first analysis was a comparison of the use of definitions in the curricula; the second, a comparison of specific lesson plans in terms of language of framework; the third, an analysis of political language of mission statements of the curricula; the fourth, an analysis of image and hyperbolic language choice; and the fifth, a comparison of responsibility questions in each of the curricula. Each of these analyses are discussed more in depth in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER III

SHELTER AS A MECHANISM IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULUM

Students hear references to September 11 every day. They are deeply curious about this event that took place during their lifetimes, in their living rooms and neighborhoods through the power of instant media. While students want to know more, many teachers and parents may be frightened about confronting this somber history without appropriate material to provide their students.
~Tribute WTC Curriculum

Introduction

In order to theorize shelter through the curricula of this study, I analyzed the study for instances of provocation in terms of material that may be disruptive or upsetting, and then the shelter that is used to mitigate that provocation. Each of the curricula exposes students to material that may be considered traumatic—visuals, stories of violence, or accounts of people who have died. What makes this material different from reading about, for example, the Civil War, is the immediacy of the issue. As the Tribute WTC curriculum notes in the quote above, not only did September 11 happen within students' lifetimes, but the event intruded—and continues to intrude—into their living rooms through repetition of footage of the event and coverage of the resulting wars. What changes among the different curricula is the type of exposure that occurs, and whether it is meant to provoke students to greater understandings in balance to the potential emotional and intellectual upset that they can cause. As I analyzed for shelter that mitigates exposure, I found devices of shelter that recurred through the curricula despite the differences in approach. Those devices are described in this chapter across

three aspects: student activities, curricular objectives, and prescribed teacher actions.

Exposure in September 11 Curricula

To begin this part of the study, I analyzed how the events of September 11 are introduced to students as part of their lesson plans. I looked for descriptions of the events, level of specific detail, and imagery of the events. While each curriculum in this study covers the events of September 11, they differ in the choices they make in how to introduce students to the events, as well as in which other events they choose to frame September 11. This exposure falls across three different categories: terrorism in historical context, terrorism in context of the sufferers, and terrorism in context of global events.

Terrorism in Historical Context

I found that rather than spending significant time on the actual events of September 11, several of the curricula focus more on historical events that relate to September 11 across varied themes, relegating coverage of September 11 to a small percentage of the unit. The CHOICES program has students read a thorough history of terrorist activity beginning in the 1700s, describing various forms of terrorism that happened in different countries. The Clarke Forum, Constitutional Rights Foundation, PBS, and We the People look at constitutional rights and how a variety of events in American history, especially Japanese internment during World War II and the suspension of *habeas corpus* during the Civil War, relate to American policy in the aftermath of September 11. For instance, the Clarke Forum has students read the executive orders for internment of

Japanese-American citizens during World War II and compare it to what is promised in the Bill of Rights. The We the People program draws a parallel between September 11 and the signing of the Constitution in 1787 as major events in American History that caused America's citizens to reevaluate their fundamental values. In Lesson 2, students read an excerpt from the Declaration of Independence and reflect on the phrases "these Truths to be self-evident," "all Men are created equal," and "unalienable rights" in terms of what they mean when the country experiences a trauma such as September 11. In this way, students examine the policy effects of September 11 without actually delving into the event itself.

Terrorism in Context of the Sufferers

These curricula seek to provide a personal connection to September 11 for students through oral histories, videos of the attacks and aftermath, and other artifacts from the event. The Tribute WTC curricula are mostly discussion-based, asking students to listen to oral histories. In Unit 6, students watch a video narrated by Mohammad Razvi, a Muslim resident of New York City, as he describes what it is like being Muslim in New York after September 11. The Smithsonian and the September 11 Memorial have similar activities: Students are asked to view videos (e.g., *Objects from September 11, 2001*, Smithsonian) and artifacts from the World Trade Center (September 11 Memorial), and then create obituaries and museum exhibits using the artifacts they've examined.

The 4Action program and *Learn Our History* program also center on videos about September 11; however, the 4Action videos are documentaries and the *Learn Our*

History video is a cartoon narrative of the events. The September 11 Education Trust has students examine September 11 from many different angles, including a ten-minute introductory video, oral histories of survivors and first responders, images of the aftermath of the terrorist attacks, and an examination of the process of recovering remains.

Finally, the September 11 Memorial program presents the events of September 11 through first responders and victims. One lesson has students read an article entitled, “The Survivor Staircase Vesey Street.” The article puts students in the place of survivors who used a 68-story staircase to descend the World Trade Center North Tower building and escape to safety.

Terrorism in Context of Global Events

These programs cover the events of September 11 in detail and then connect them to political trauma taking place in other parts of the world. The *Voices for Peace* curriculum operates on the idea that there is an overabundance of violence in the world that is linked to injustices taking place within it, and that through nonviolent activism, both the violence and injustices can be counteracted. September 11 is covered in the curriculum, but the entire unit is divided equally across the study *among* those who have used processes of nonviolent activism (e.g., boycott, strikes, judicial recourses) in reaction to atrocities. These atrocities include apartheid in South Africa, intraracial violence in Ireland, and subjugation of women in Pakistan. Thus, while students are researching September 11, they are also researching similar political traumas across the globe, creating the idea that political trauma is a global struggle as opposed to just

an American one. Several other curricula employ the same method. The CHOICES program includes lessons on world crises such as smallpox outbreaks and bioterrorism; the Constitutional Rights Foundation-Chicago investigates international complications in the use of torture and the effects of racial and ethnic profiling; and PBS uses the frame of September 11 to have students research Afghan culture and the human-rights violations that occurred under the Taliban.

Distance as a Shelter Device

Each of the categories above creates a space between the student and the events of September 11; it can be theorized that the greater the space, the greater the shelter. The first category could be seen to have the least amount of exposure and, in contrast, the greatest amount of shelter. In this context, shelter is considered the screening out of the horrific details and images of the events of September 11—the space described is the distance given by using historical events. At this particular level, the students are given a historical connection between September 11 and an event that did not happen within their lifetimes (or, for that matter, their parents' or grandparents' lifetimes), and thus they can examine the event while given a certain chronological distance that buffers their experience. This distance can act as a type of shelter, as I discuss in this study; students are kept at an emotional distance from what they are studying.

The second level of exposure eviscerates this shelter; students are exposed to personal, immediate materials that highlight the horror of September 11. They hear personally from survivors in videotaped oral histories (Smithsonian), see pictures of rubble (September 11 Memorial), and read stories of parents fighting to keep the

grounds open so they may keep searching for remains of their children (September 11 Education Trust).

The only buffering of this material comes in two different forms. The first is in the *Learn Our History* video, which uses a cartoon for its story rather than live-action footage. Whether the use of a cartoon acts as shelter is supposition on my part. The scenes and the art are not realistic and thus may shelter students' senses; however, recent research into video games that use cartoon-like graphics may prove students' susceptibility to the realism of the games.

Secondly, the September 11 Memorial curriculum includes several lessons that could be seen as "kid-friendly." One lesson focuses on the work of K-9 units at the World Trade Center, while another covers flag usage and etiquette students can practice in their classrooms. Dogs and flags take the human element out of the exploration, mitigating the exposure.

Finally, the third category incorporates the exposure of the second and adds a global context; students research atrocities occurring across the world that could be compared with September 11, opening them to the idea of violence as not just an isolated incidence on American soil but rather a widespread problem the entire world is suffering. Thus, this category contains the least amount of shelter using space as a device.

Student Activities and Shelter

The next aspect of the curricula I examined was the required activities of each of the programs, looking for shelter in what students were asked to do and in their objectives.

Definitions and Defining

To define: to determine the boundary or spatial extent of; to settle the limits of; to determine, lay down definitely; to specify; to set forth or explain what (a word) means; to declare the significance of; to give character to, characterize

A definition: bounds or limits; limitation, restriction; determination, decision; a precise statement of the essential nature of a thing; a declaration or a formal explanation of the signification of a word or phrase (OED)

A distinct difference *among* the curricula in this study highlights the disparity in the meanings of the words “define” and “definition.” Agreement exists *among* all but two of the curricula that there are certain words that need a definition for students to work from. The words that recur most frequently throughout the different units are “terrorism,” “prejudice,” “jihad,” and “hero”; “terrorism” and its definition take up the most space in each of the units in which it is discussed.

Providing a definition serves as a device which shelters. According to the OED, a definition creates boundaries, limits, a decision already made, a given instruction on the essence of the thing. Moreover, it delineates the significance (or lack thereof) of the thing itself. The September 11 Memorial curriculum defines terrorism (borrowing from the National Counterterrorism Center) as “violent acts aimed at civilians intended to create and spread fear to further religious, political, or ideological goals” (sec. historical impact) and, in doing so, provides for students’ rejection of an entire series of violent threats to their well-being. As the perpetrators of terrorism can only commit violent acts aimed at civilians, the enemy is only one that commits violence towards civilians, as opposed to military units who enact violence towards other units that may be considered by some to be civilian and by others to be military—e.g., violence of the Israeli Defense Force toward Hamas targets. The enemy is given, as is the lens through

which the enemy is viewed. Tribute WTC has a similar definition: “Terrorism is the use of violence against civilians with the intent to cause fear or panic.” Similarly, this is a limiting definition of terrorism.

Eleven of the curricula note that the definition of the word “terrorism” is controversial; as the CHOICES program explains, the definition of “terrorism” can be different depending on the beliefs and values of the creator of the definition. According to CHOICES, some consider terrorism to occur only if perpetrated by a foreign person but not a domestic entity; some feel that acts of terror are conducted only by individuals or unsanctioned groups but not a recognized military; others find terrorism is dependent on the damage done or lives lost. There is disagreement as to whether terrorism needs to have political aims or religious ones, threats or actual acts of violence, civilian victims or not.

Amongst the September 11 curricula, three do not give a definition of terrorism, although they use the word and thus make the assumption that students know what the definition is. Of the remaining, one third provide a given definition, the second third give a source to find a specific definition, and the last group asks students to read various sources and develop their own definition of terrorism.

The Constitutional Rights Foundation’s *Terrorism in America* program takes an opposing method in definition, putting the power in the hands of the students to define it rather than sheltering them with the Foundation’s own definition. The focus question of the activity (“Lesson #1: What is Terrorism?”) given to the students asks them to deconstruct the statement “One person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter” (p. 9). The two-page reading given to the students states directly, “Today, there is no

universally accepted definition of terrorism. Countries define the term according to their own beliefs and to support their own national interests” (p. 10). The reading compares the narrow definitions espoused by European countries and the United States with the more liberal definition of Middle Eastern states [e.g., the 1987 Organization of the Islamic Conference: “Terrorism is an act carried out to achieve an inhuman and corrupt objective and involving threat to security of any kind, and in violation of the rights acknowledged by religion and mankind” (p. 10)]. The reading also gives students additional definitions of terrorism from the League of Nations, the United Nations Office for the Prevention of International Terrorism, and a professor of criminal justice at California State University, Sacramento (p. 11). The assignment students complete after this reading is to write an essay answering four questions:

1. Why is it difficult to agree upon a universally accepted definition of terrorism?
2. What are the different definitions of terrorism contained in this reading? Which do you favor and why?
3. Why does Alex Schmid call a terrorist act the equivalent of a peacetime war crime? Do you agree? Why or why not?
4. Is it important to arrive at a universal definition of terrorism? Why or why not? (p. 11-12)

Unlike the September 11 Memorial curriculum (or the others that offer definitions with no other source aside from their own expertise, like the PBS curriculum or *Global Security, Terrorism, and September 11 in the Classroom*), the *Terrorism in America* curriculum gives students definitions from primary sources and asks students to examine their own values and beliefs (again, the difference between critical and analytical thinking) in identifying which one they “favor.” Students working through this program examine a variety of possible parameters, boundaries, criteria, and perspectives before settling on their own—the epitome of “defining.” Thus, the shelter

of definition is removed, as students are not directed to a specific way of knowing, but are instead allowed to investigate on their own.

The limitation of this activity, which is similar to activities in curricula such as the Families and Work Institute's *September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward* program, is that students are asked to choose their preference *among* several given, rather than coming up with their own definition. The implication is that there are only four (or two or six) definitions of terrorism and that the "right" one is *among* them, rather than asking students to first examine their own value systems to devise their own definitions. Additionally, students are asked to choose a definition without any discussion or research beforehand as to any other element of terrorism aside from the act itself, such as the various purposes of terrorism or the historical development of the term, which may affect their decisions and shelter them from thinking outside these definitions.

A middle ground in this definition conundrum is shown by curricula such as the CHOICES program, in which students are given an entire reading on the varying definitions of terrorism from varying perspectives. The reading notes, "Experts have struggled to agree on a definition of 'terrorism'" (p. 2). It provides the U.S. State Department's definition of terrorism as "politically-motivated violence directed at civilians and perpetrated by nonstate groups" (p. 2) but then immediately presents arguments others have with this definition, such as it being too narrow in limiting itself to "nonstate groups" or "civilian targets," and provides myriad examples, beginning with the French Revolution and continuing through Stalinist Russia, World War I, through Middle Eastern acts of terror through the 1970s and 1980s. CHOICES also

answers hypothetical student questions in the reading:

1. Why did state-sponsored terrorism increase during the 1980s?
2. What are some of the ways the United States responded to state-sponsored terrorism?
3. Why is there concern about a rise of religiously motivated terrorism?
4. What common factors help explain the motivations and methods of religious terrorists?
5. What are examples of religiously motivated terrorism?
6. Why did U.S. officials grow increasingly concerned about terrorism? (p. 3-8)

Several sections of the reading follow up with discussions of various types of terrorism and make the connection between the U.S. State Department's official definition of terrorism and America's activities following the events of September 11. The culminating activity asks students to decide *among* four policy recommendations for the U.S. to deal with terrorism:

- Option 1: Lead an assault on terrorism (military option)
- Option 2: Collaborate to fight terrorism (coalition with other countries option)
- Option 3: Defend the homeland (increase security option)
- Option 4: Address the root causes of terrorism (diplomacy option) (p. 33)

The assignment asks the students to decide on one of the options and then create a presentation supporting that option. However, as part of the decision process, students must write their own definition of terrorism based on their reading that then informs their policy decisions. Building this definition removes the shelter of being provided the definition, as students are required to define values and beliefs of what the term "victim" encompasses, how acts of terror as they define them affect the population at large, and various other points before deciding how they believe the United States should act.

While I have focused on the definition of "terrorism" in this section, other similar activities are included in the curricula. The September 11 Education Trust curriculum,

September 11 Education Program, for example, asks students to define the word “hero” after reading several oral histories of the day of September 11, 2001. However, I focus on the definition of “terrorism” here not only because it is in itself a measure of the shelter device of definition of the curricula, but also because the framing of the definition (or the requirement to define) generally both gives insight into and impacts the rest of the curriculum. “Terrorism” is a patina in which all of the curricula is awash; how students view terrorism—including how they envision a terrorist, a terrorist act, a terrorist cause, and a terrorist retribution—is a viewpoint that carries them through the rest of the curriculum, sheltering them from thinking through other possibilities.

For example, the September 11 Education Trust curriculum (the most popular and most used of all of the curricula of the study) is one of the three curricula that do not define terrorism at all. The only terrorist act focused on in the curriculum is September 11, and in the timeline given of the event, the word “terrorist” is used interchangeably with “hijackers” and, at one point, “Osama bin Laden” (p. 29-30). Thus, there is a specific image associated with the word “terrorist” in this program—that of Osama bin Laden, with a turban, long beard, sandals, machine gun. The hijackers themselves, and thus terrorists, become faceless, nameless versions of bin Laden. This unquestioned form is then associated with the words “tragedy” and “horror” and “evil” throughout the description of September 11, and with no other frame of definition to work from, this is how students are left to process the event—completely through the eyes of America, through the eyes of victims, and through the eyes of a culture with a nearly caricaturized enemy, rather than a complex notion built through the curricula that addresses the definition of terrorism. Again, the power lies within the authorship of the

curricula rather than with the students working with it, sheltering students from other ways of knowing.

The Use of Narrative as Shelter

Each of the curricula examined in this study presents some form of narrative, including that of what happened during September 11 as well as those of other terrorist attacks or historical events that led up to or proceeded from such attacks. How the students are expected to navigate the narrative and how the narrative is presented determine what level of shelter exists in the work.

Narratives of September 11 Curricula

My initial readings of the September 11 curricula, driven by the readings that led to the summary above, caused me to jump to two conclusions. First, I believed that the curricula that challenged policies of the government (for example, CHOICES's challenging of the detention of enemy combatants indefinitely or 4Action's challenging of the privacy violations in the Patriot Act) would provide narratives that did not shelter, but instead would provoke students into upsetting or disruptive thinking. Second, I believed that the curricula that provided a strong narrative would have more evidence of shelter. Deeper analysis proved neither to be the case.

Learn Our History appears to be the outlier. Not only is there only one narrative to September 11 provided in the video, but the children in the video are sent on their journey specifically because their teacher felt they needed to learn that one specific narrative. Again, the purpose is clear—students are to learn “why the radical Islamic

terrorists attacked us, and how America pulled together to unleash the War on Terror” (back cover). The jacket for the DVD gives the following summary:

For every American who lived through the pain of September 11, 2001, the memory evokes strong emotions. When the first plane hit, we didn't know what happened. But as the events of that day unfolded, it was clear that America had been attacked, and that for the first time since World War II, the attack was within our own borders.

We quickly realized that we were attacked by a group of Islamic terrorists known as Al-Qaeda. Led by Osama bin Laden, Al-Qaeda operated a network of terror that was supported by many fundamentalists around the world, most notably in Afghanistan, where the ruling Taliban provided safety and resources that enabled Al-Qaeda to carry out its massive attack.

In contrast to the horrific acts of violence, thousands of great Americans made heroic sacrifices. Many policemen and firefighters in New York gave their lives attempting to rescue victims in the World Trade Center. And on Flight 93, brave passengers took control of the hijacked plane to prevent it from reaching its intended target.

In the days that followed, we joined together to support each other in this time of sadness. All the while, we began preparing to bring the terrorists to justice.

In this important film, the time-traveling teenagers learn about America's heroic response to the tragic events of September 11. They strive to understand why Al-Qaeda attacked us and how the ongoing War on Terror protects Americans at home and American ideals abroad.

Of all of the curricula in the study, *Learn our History* is the only one that is explicit in its purpose of cultural narrative. As for shelter, this is the first obvious connection between shelter and narrative. Students are sheltered from a wide variety of upsetting elements, from the images of September 11 (the video is a cartoon, and the actual plane strikes are not shown) to any discussion of what might have caused the hijackers to attack (aside from “evil”) to any emotional uncertainty for the American response, as it is explicitly stated that the War on Terror is necessary to protect Americans both at home and abroad.

Controlling the narrative. However, while the intentions of the video are clearly supportive of the Bush administration’s policy, they are not what constitutes its shelter. Rather, the pedagogical choices concerning the narrative do, and they occur in curricula in this study that would clearly be considered critical by the authors (who will be discussed in the next chapter).

As mentioned in the earlier section on definitions, the CHOICES curriculum provides extensive readings on terrorism and terrorist attacks. It also includes readings on security, civil rights, and the War on Terror. However, with the exception of a lesson on freedom of speech that has students look at political cartoons pulled from various outside sources (p. 22-29), all of the readings are written under single authorship with no cited sources and no access or invitation to primary sources. The curriculum presents itself as an authority on the topic, and the contradictions in its narrative are ones that it provides—there is one interpretation of the “story” of September 11 and the pertinent details, and the CHOICES authors have control over that interpretation. The same is true of the September 11 Education Trust program. While many of the activities revolve around oral histories presented on an accompanying DVD, the story of what happened on September 11 and the timelines of events leading up to it are told from one perspective with no citation of sources or multiple authorships. More significant is that the oral histories are introduced by telling students *what they should look for in the video* (e.g., what the speaker is feeling, what important details the viewer should take note of, what makes the speaker a “hero”). Students are handed the analysis and the value system that goes along with it, sheltered from the need to discover either on their own.

The *Voices for Peace* curriculum approaches narrative in a different way, but with a similar result. The stated purpose of the *Voices for Peace* curriculum is to “study and reflect on how nonviolent strategies for change work” (p. 1) as a way of responding to political trauma (the emphasis is on September 11, thus why it is in this study, but the program could be applicable in other times of trauma as well). According to the *Voices for Peace* introduction, the students who learn this curriculum will be able to:

- Identify various nonviolent strategies for effecting political change
- Assess the benefits and limitations of these strategies
- Recognize contemporary examples of those strategies in action
- Reflect on the legitimacy and effectiveness of various strategies
- Consider which strategies they are most likely to employ as citizens (p. 2)

Voices for Peace predefines methods of nonviolent strategies as: arts, boycotts, civil disobedience, cross-community work, courts, education, elections, information campaigns, legislation, street demonstrations, and strikes. Students are to sort these strategies into the categories of a) change through formal systems, b) change through direct action, and c) change through community dialogue (p. 3). The narrative of September 11 is given as a single-source story in the beginning of the *Voices for Peace* curriculum, and the connection between September 11 and other world trauma (e.g., genocide in Rwanda, apartheid in South Africa, violence in Ireland) is presented as a given, with no information provided on each of the events except just to say that they were times of violence (p. 3). The curriculum instructs on each strategy for change solely by providing short (one paragraph or less) writings from three or four people who have practiced that strategy. For example, under the strategy of Change through Civil Disobedience, this quotation is provided:

Aung Din, Burma: Then we made a one week[sic]—we called for civil disobedience. Civil disobedience we mean, at the time the [Burmese military]

regime made the announcement—put the martial law in the country. Then more than five person[sic] are not allowed to gather. And there is a lot of “no marching,” “no gathering,” so many restrictions. So, our civil disobedience campaign is that we would challenge these affairs, rules, and laws—that we will gather more than five person[sic]. We will talk about politics and we will talk about the national reconciliation. We’ll talk about democracy and human right[sic]. We will march anywhere as long as we can. So, this is our campaign. We try to bring back the courage of the people by using this one week of civil disobedience. (p. 10)

Under the same category of Civil Disobedience, quotes from Swaminathan Gounden, Gwen Saunders Gamble, and Chimedtseren Byambajar are also included. While this introduces more voices into the narrative and therefore more opportunity for students to examine authority of the topics themselves, they also do not present nearly the detail required to “assess the benefits and limitations of these strategies” or “reflect on the legitimacy and effectiveness of various strategies” as the curriculum expects students to do in the activity accompanying the narratives.³ In this particular activity, students are asked to explain whether they think “refusing to obey an unjust law is a responsible strategy for promoting change” (p. 9). Considering solely the information provided to them (the question is included in a worksheet to be completed after reading the quotations), there is little room to interrogate the process of civil disobedience critically—students are instead driven towards one understanding, and thus sheltered from others. The Constitutional Rights Foundation curriculum provides much of the same scenario—while students are asked to develop critical awarenesses in assignments, the readings, while referencing primary documents, are all of single authorship. The CHOICES program provides an extensive background reading, but one

³ Obviously, teachers may ask students to research outside sources in this curriculum, as with the others. However, for the purposes of this analysis, I am not considering that possibility unless the curriculum explicitly asks for it.

written by a single author, with no primary or conflicting source documents, thus sheltering just as much as the more conservative curricula discussed earlier.

The *We the People* curriculum provides the narrative on its website of what happened on September 11 and takes it one step further. The narrative is written in first-person plural (“We look back to July 4...” p. 7), further reinforcing that not only is there one single narrative, it is *our* (i.e., the only one belonging to us, Americans) narrative. This particular aspect of the *We the People* curriculum is especially significant in consideration of the tasks that it asks students to complete. The four guiding questions of the curriculum are:

1. What is an American?
2. What fundamental ideas about government do Americans share?
3. How well is the American government serving its purpose?
4. How can the American government better fulfill its purpose?

Taken on their own, these can be read as provocative questions that invite critical thinking. Deciding what makes an American relies on investigating one’s beliefs on immigration, American values, heritage, and various other abstract concepts. How well the government is serving its purpose, again, calls for deciding what that purpose may be. But in the context of this curriculum, the narrative given shelters students from addressing these beliefs and values. The implicit idea of the narrative as given is, as previously stated, that such a thing as *our* (American) narrative exists as one entity.

The curriculum is presented as part of the narrative following each guiding question, and then students complete an activity, which at first glance, seem to provoke thinking across many areas. However, the *our* narrative permeates the activities as well as the narrative. Returning to that first example, students are given quotes from six well-known figures in American history, including Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Ellison, and

Franklin D. Roosevelt. The quotes are straightforward values statements (e.g., the King quote is “I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character” p. 9), and students are required to identify the value statement of the quote—in the example, the value statement would be “People should be judged by the content of their character, not by the color of their skin”—and then mark whether they agree or disagree with the value statement. Finally, they are expected to share their decision with the class so the teacher may tally the results and, through the tally, conclude what values all American share. All of the quotes are from respected leaders in American history; all of the value statements are clear. If a student were to disagree with any of them, he would be required to announce to the class that, for example, he disagrees with John Marshall Harlan’s assertion that the all citizens are equal before the law (p. 9)—quite a feat of emotional strength for an adolescent. The other activities are similar: even for question number four, the class as a whole is given a narrative of the preamble to the Constitution and a set of problems to choose from that the government may improve upon. Not only is the narrative presented in this curriculum not open to critique, the activities force students to be complicit in developing a further, preplanned narrative defining values and beliefs. This narrative type seems to shelter students from truly interrogating their own values.

Opening the narrative. Designing the cultural narrative is but one theory of the use of narrative in curriculum. As Macdonald (1964) notes:

School does not exist primarily to inculcate our cultural heritage, not principally to develop role players for society nor primarily to meet the needs and interests of the learners. The school exists to bring learners in contact with reality, of which our society, ourselves, and our cultural heritage are parts. (p.

47).

In this theory of curriculum, students are free to develop their own thinking and values. In that vein are the curricula that expect students to research narratives (most often that of September 11, but also other related topics, such as the rise of the Taliban) outside of what is given in the curricula themselves. Some of the curricula still control the narrative to the extent that they provide the sources for outside research. The Tribute WTC curriculum, for example, structures each lesson around a September 11-related topic (e.g., survivors helping others heal) and gives students a set of “facts” and then personal-experience questions, followed by an online biography of a person that exemplifies the topic. The Smithsonian curriculum sends students to various websites to build a narrative of September 11 from a variety of sources, as does the September 11 Memorial curriculum. The PBS curriculum requires students to watch the PBS documentary *America Responds*, but then asks students to research what they’ve seen on the Internet. All of these curricula send students to websites outside of their own and ask students to further their research using search engines.⁴

Students researching sources that have not been preapproved must rely on their own analysis of the sources’ biases, reliabilities, foundations, and intentions (Steinberg, 2009). Furthermore, there is a possibility of disrupting, and then rebuilding, curriculum integration (Jardine, LaGrange, & Everest, 2004) into counternarratives. Curriculum integration is the result of threading the ecology of what is to be learned together to give it place and structure, designing what the authors call “narrative integration.”

⁴ Of the programs that do not give assignments for students to research outside of the curricula, four of them offer activities that do ask for outside research as “extensions” or “advanced student work”, showing a different level of expectation connected to student ability.

Jardine et al.'s metaphor, through which they describe narrative integration, is an extension of a Heidegger reflection on a Van Gogh painting of a pair of shoes. As Heidegger notes, in just looking at the shoes as shoes, there is no way to understand this painting's shoes; instead we must look at the shoes from the earth, or from the woman who wore them, or the work that was done in them. Jardine et al. extends this observation through an examination of the significance of an even greater particular, providing specific context of the person, the place, the idea, all as one. The shoes can only be understood as "my neighbor Harry's boots...in our trudging work of installing furnaces in people's basements...along with his thermos and lunchpail worn thin from use..." (p. 327). In other words, the depth of understanding of the boots is only achieved through relevant integration—comparing the boots' size or shape to other types of boots or giving a history of boots would offer nothing. The narrative of September 11 in this study's curricula achieve curriculum integration at varying levels (through methods I will discuss in more depth later in this chapter). The integrative narrative might be anything from the role of dogs in rescue efforts, such as in the September 11 Memorial curriculum, to the nature of art as recovery, as covered in the *September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward* curriculum. September 11 can never be itself the curriculum or point of study—it is so large as to be meaningless.

Inviting students to work with resources outside the curriculum, however, removes the shelter of the curriculum itself—the control of the narrative—and asks students to not only find more information, but also to rethink the narrative integration they are researching, perhaps reworking it into a counternarrative. These programs (*September 11 Memorial; September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward; The New York Times*

Learning Network; PBS: America Responds; and the Clarke Forum) that ask students to research the narrative outside of included resources risk students' returning with a narrative different than planned. Hypothetically, a student could be researching the Taliban for *PBS: America Responds*, which intends for students to understand the Taliban as a Nazi-like organization (the comparison is made literally) that commits numerous human rights violations. That same student may hypothetically find a new narrative integration that, from his own unsheltered investigation, prioritizes another value system by instead reporting on research he has found on the Talib view of religious piety and strict code of behavior as a positive aspect.

Two of the programs other than *PBS: America Responds* attempt to provide, if not a counternarrative, a companion narrative by presenting information to students about the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq from the perspective of the Afghan and Iraqi people. The CHOICES program presents an overview of America's relationship with the Middle East beginning with the 1970s and some of the grievances against America these populations are seen to have. The program *Global Security, Terrorism, and September 11 in the Classroom* specifically states a purpose of understanding a complex world, with lessons on human behavior intending to provide awarenesses of Middle Eastern populations. Again, however, the narrative is tightly managed through single sources and a lack of outside research requirement, still sheltering students.

The Role of the Framework in Removing Shelter

While single narratives may prove to increase shelter, frameworks can actually be found to remove shelter and invite provocative work. To begin, there are curricula with

expressed frameworks of understanding. The Constitutional Rights Foundation's *Terrorism in America* course of study uses historical challenges to the Constitution to examine America's response to terrorism today. A similar framework is implemented by the Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago's *Modules for Democracy*, which uses the Constitution to examine controversial actions by America in the War on Terror, such as detaining non-citizens without a warrant. The CHOICES program looks at the event of September 11 as a challenge to America's democracy, with each lesson relating to how our individual rights and freedoms are affected by both September 11 and our response to it, as does *We the People: September 11 and the Constitution*. The Clarke Forum Winner is a lesson that uses a similar framework, asking whether the Government should go beyond the normal limits of its authority during wartime, and *PBS: America Responds* does much the same.

September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward (from the Families and Work Institute) has a framework focusing on the emotional impact of this particular political trauma on children, with each lesson addressing emotional responses and interpersonal connections. *Global Security, Terrorism, and September 11 in the Classroom* (from the 4Active Initiative), combines a framework of interpersonal understanding with that of geopolitics in viewing September 11. The *September 11 Memorial* curriculum views September 11 through a framework of memorializing and understanding for posterity. The *Tribute World Trade Center* curriculum utilizes the importance of memorializing as well, but expands further to looking at September 11 to instruct on how students may act in the future. *Voices for Peace* examines political trauma through a framework of

possibility of nonviolent action for change.⁵

Perhaps ironically, the most expensive, popular, and promoted curriculum of the study, the September 11 Education Trust program, does not have a stated framework of understanding that ties the units together. The program claims an “interdisciplinary approach, with lessons that draw upon questions of history, government and citizenship, economics, and artistic interpretation” (p. vii). However, the lessons seem disconnected from one another. Students may spend one lesson hearing oral histories of September 11 and then the next writing an op-ed about the role of government in civic action. In the curriculum as a whole, the following topics are covered:

- Photography of September 11
- Oral histories of survivors
- Timelines of the day of September 11 and the events leading up to it
- Recovery of remains of victims
- The September 11 Commission Report on preparedness
- The court case attempting to stop the building of the memorial
- Choosing a memorial design
- Heroes of September 11
- Civic action following September 11
- National security following September 11
- Civil rights issues
- Terrorist activity across the globe

Activities students are asked to do in this program range widely as well, from the aforementioned op-ed piece, to photography analysis, to debate, to designing a memorial. This seems to be exactly what Jardine et al. (2004) describe as lack of curriculum integration—what possible meaning can be made from these pieces with none of Doll’s relations to tie them together? September 11 is just not enough of a lens to be a “framework”—as Heidegger would say, the students of this curriculum are just

⁵ Again, the Learn Our History video is an outlier. As there is so little discovery asked for in the curriculum—simply watch the video and answer questions about the video—it is difficult to identify what ties that together as a “framework.”

looking at shoes.

While a framework provides what is, in all practicality, an inroad into thinking about a topic in a certain way—i.e., shelter—the frameworks of many of these programs seem, as Doll (1993) expresses in his categorization of relations, to provoke richness and deeper thinking. The Constitutional Rights Foundation program, for example, gives students a reference to frame an issue against (e.g., the case of Abraham Lincoln’s suspending *habeas corpus* during the Civil War) and asks them to compare that circumstance to the holding of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay in this era. The question posed for students to interrogate begins with analysis—are these the same situations?—but moves into provocative thinking—is our government breaking Constitutional law with its actions, and is that something that I (the student) value? Other frameworks of other programs ask similarly value-laden questions, including: What are our responsibilities to our fellow man (*September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward*)? What lengths should Americans go to protect ourselves (CHOICES)? What freedoms are they willing to give up (*Modules for Democracy*)?

What is essential to remember is that while frameworks do not constrict critical thinking, the possibilities of fostering critical thinking can be negated by their narrative formations, as noted in the previous section.

Using frameworks. Contrasting the Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago’s program (with a strong framework of American actions in terms of Constitutional law) with the September 11 Educational Trust (which has no express framework), a difference in the level of critical thinking required in classroom discussion exercises becomes apparent. To illustrate this point, consider two specific exercises, one from

each program (Table 2).

Table 2. Comparison of Two Discussion Activities

	Constitutional Rights Foundation of Chicago	September 11 Education Trust
Lesson Title	Detaining U.S. Citizens as Enemy Combatants (p. 1-20)	U.S. National Security and September 11 (p. 146-159)
Background /Reading	History/construction of the idea of enemy combatants; war powers of the government; use of <i>habeas corpus</i> ; cases of detention of enemy combatants after September 11	Definitions of four policy positions (unilateralism, multilateralism, isolationism, hard/soft power); four excerpts from various sources to illustrate each position (a book excerpt, a letter from a victim's parent, a policy statement, and a newspaper op-ed)
Activity	Reading of lists of compelling arguments for and against detaining enemy combatants; reading four case studies of enemy combatants	Students are divided into four groups and given one of the four positions and accompanying excerpt; each group fills out a graphic organizer about the excerpt identifying the author's main points, policy position, criticism of other positions, and students' policy recommendation, which they then present to the class
Classroom Discussion Questions	For each of the four case studies, should the person described be designated as an enemy combatant? Should the U.S. be allowed to detain those designated indefinitely without a lawyer or trial?	Which of the four authors' positions makes the most sense to you and why? What is your sense of each author's view of human nature? How might these views affect foreign policy? Which author's suggestion do you feel is a realistic foreign policy for the U.S., and why? What seems less realistic about other policies?

In the two examples, both open with class discussion about U.S. national policy. However, the Constitutional Rights Foundation works from a framework of the Constitution, and thus has a narrative integration for students to approach the discussion. Again, they must first, as Hemming (2000) requires, apply the use of logic, dialogical reasoning, assessment of criteria, and relationship of content before moving into critical spirit of thought. In this specific lesson, these elements are all possible because the framework is provided—the Constitutionality of *habeas corpus* along with U.S. historical precedent are given as criteria for comparative analysis; thus, making informed decisions about each case study is possible before moving the discussion into the forum of what priority the Constitution should be given in times of trauma—a provocative discussion that asks for deep analysis on the part of the student.

The September 11 Educational Trust program, in contrast, has no such framework to work from in the lesson. The readings used to evaluate the four policy choices are not only from different sources, but are different genres with different purposes, as well as different interests. Students are given no criteria with which to assess the policy choices, nor are they actually asked to compare the readings themselves, and each group only takes one reading. Thus, students are only privy to their own group's reading and the other groups' interpretation of the other three policy choices. It is quite possible that an open class discussion of the four policies might produce critical thinking, but not likely, due to the design of the lesson itself. Thus, the lesson that is more sheltered—the Constitutional Rights Foundation—through a directed framework also provides a richer experience for students.

Student Responsibility in Political Trauma as Exposure

Beyond the effect of individual activities, I looked at the overall objectives of the programs. To see whether the objective of the lessons provided shelter or not, I examined each for an essential question named in their unit and then derived either the explicit or implicit question that emerged. Each of the curricula presents a current problem in American society and asks students to develop a solution to that problem (or more than one, in many cases). The table below shows the question of the problem and the question of the solution for each, with the driving activity in parentheses.

Table 3. Questions of Responsibility

CHOICES: How can terrorism be considered a repercussion of America's global actions? What responsibilities do Americans have to prevent such terrorism in the future? (Students are asked to debate the best foreign policy for the U.S.)

Clarke Forum: What is the constitutionality of detaining enemy combatants without trial? What responsibility do Americans have to protect the constitutional rights of our fellow citizens? (Students are asked to examine a case study of an enemy combatant and write about his rights as a human being as well as what citizens should do to protect him.)

Constitutional Rights Foundation: How can America's response to terrorism be interpreted in terms of constitutionality? What responsibility do Americans have to protect innocent civilians in times of war? (Students are asked to evaluate various U.S. actions in terms of constitutionality and then write an analysis of our effectiveness at protecting constitutional rights.)

Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago: What are the constitutional issues in holding enemy combatants without trial? At what point should Americans care about personal freedoms more than our own safety? (Students are asked to debate the use of the PATRIOT Act and whether it should be overturned or not.)

Families and Work Institute: How did September 11 divide America as a society? What responsibility does it have for taking care of one another? (Students are asked to develop connections with students they typically do not associate with in school.)

4Action: How do Americans differentiate between Muslims and Taliban? What responsibility do they have for reaching out to Muslim peoples to connect our two societies? (Students research Afghan culture and are asked to write essays analyzing their findings.)

Learn Our History: How has the government kept America safe since September 11? What responsibility do Americans have to support government policies? (Students watch a video directing them to support government policies while keeping an open mind about Afghan people.)

September 11 National Memorial and Museum: Why do Muslim terrorists commit the act that they do? What responsibility do Americans have to Muslims as a culture of the same world they inhabit? (Students research September 11 and Muslim cultures simultaneously and complete activities analyzing both.)

September 11 Educational Trust: How do security measures protect Americans while maintaining their freedoms? What foreign policy should they espouse in fighting terrorism? (Students write an op-ed supporting one foreign policy.)

New York Times Learning Network: What national security measures are in place after

September 11? Which of these measures should Americans uphold and which should they remove? (Students research security measures and analyze them in terms of the Bill of Rights.)

PBS: How do Afghans suffer under Taliban rule? What are Americans responsible for doing in order to prevent further terrorist attacks from Muslim extremists? (Students research the Taliban and write editorials about human-rights violations.)

Smithsonian: What artifacts are most important in creating a memorial to September 11? What responsibility do Americans have to remember September 11 in order to prevent such tragedy in the future? (Students choose which artifacts should be placed in a memorial for September 11.)

We the People: What fundamental ideas and values do all Americans share? How can they better direct our government to fulfill those ideas and values? (Students examine the values in quotes from famous Americans and then discuss whether America still espouses those values. They then write suggestions for improving the government.)

Voices for Peace: Why is nonviolent activism preferable to violent activism? When are Americans responsible for acting to prevent trauma in society? (Students analyze nonviolent activism strategies and then choose one to apply to a current societal problem.)

All of the second questions, those of the solution, can be termed in some sort of responsibility for the student. These are all controversial issues and problems that arguably have not been solved sufficiently in today's society; the implication is that the students are responsible for solving them in the future when they are adults. The

emotional weight of these responsibilities are intense—if the adults in these students’ lives have not been successful in balancing security and freedom, creating working relationships with Muslim countries, or guaranteeing an end to terrorism, imagine the pressure students must feel in trying to work these issues out themselves. It is this issue that perhaps could be addressed with some measure of shelter, but none exists.

Shelter in the Mission Statements

While the expectations of the students in the curricula are provoking in terms of student responsibility, the actual mission statements of the program cloud the purposes of the programs and thus provide a muddled landscape of what the programs want students to understand and do in the future. As a framework for comparison, I analyzed the mission statements against the ideals of democratic education (Pinar, 2010; discussed further in Chapter 4). The chart below gives the mission statements of each of the programs that produced the curricula used in this study. A rhetorical analysis of the words in the statements highlighted phrasing along the lines of democratic education; phrasing that goes against the ideals of democratic education is italicized, and phrasing that is particularly aligned with democratic education is bolded. The chart is arranged beginning with the most anti-democratic and continues through the most heavily democratic, and the shading gets darker according to the weight.⁶

⁶ The last two curricula in the chart have no shading because the mission statements contained none of the phrasing I was looking for.

Table 4. Mission Statements

<p>TimeCycle Academy: September 11 and the War on Terror Series: <i>Learn Our History: Take Pride in America’s Past</i> Source: Brad Saft and Governor Mike Huckabee, a noted Republican pundit and Fox News commentator Mission: The <i>Learn Our History</i> series uses the incredible lessons of history to present important themes to your child, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need to <i>stand up</i> to bullies• The importance of <i>self-respect</i> and respect for others, including their elders• Belief in <i>democratic</i> values such as <i>freedom</i> and equality• <i>Faith in God as a key principle in America’s development and greatness</i> <p>Our dedicated team of historians and writers has designed the series to help young viewers connect the stories of the past to the world we live in today. You can make sure your child gets the most out of <i>Learn Our History</i> DVDs by engaging in discussions with them about the lessons they’ve learned in our history videos.</p>
<p>September 11 and the Constitution Series: We the People Source: Center for Civic Education, funded by No Child Left Behind legislation Mission: The program, subtitled “<i>On American Identity, Diversity, and Common Ground,</i>” commemorates the anniversaries of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, and the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, providing us an opportunity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ reflect upon <i>who we are as Americans,</i>▪ examine our most <i>fundamental values and principles and affirm our commitment to them,</i> and▪ evaluate progress toward <i>the realization of American ideals and propose actions that might narrow the gap between these ideals and reality</i>
<p>September 11 Memorial Curriculum Series: National September 11 Memorial and Museum Source: Collaboration with September 11 Education Trust and Social Studies School Service Mission(s): The mission of the Memorial Museum, located at the World Trade Center site, is to <i>bear solemn witness</i> to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993. The Museum honors the nearly 3,000 victims of these attacks and <i>all those who risked their lives</i> to save others. It further recognizes the thousands who survived and all who demonstrated extraordinary compassion in the aftermath. Demonstrating the consequences of terrorism on individual lives and its impact on communities at the local, national, and international levels, the Museum attests to <i>the triumph of human dignity over human depravity</i> and affirms an unwavering commitment to the <i>fundamental value of human life.</i></p>
<p>The September 11 Education Program: A National Interdisciplinary</p>

Curriculum

Series: Social Studies School Service

Sources: September 11 Educational Trust, Anthony Gardner, Taft Institute for Government, Professors Jack Zevin and Michael Krasner

Mission: Evolving from its genesis as the *WTC United Family Group*—one of the original and largest of the **September 11 community organizations**—the *September 11 Education Trust* produces comprehensive, flexible, and engaging September 11 and civic literacy education programs that *protect the legacy and memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks, preserve and harness the lessons of September 11 and its aftermath, unify and direct our nation's youth toward informed and effective civic participation*. Our lesson plans are personalized and enriched through first-hand accounts, filmed oral histories, and *authentic, primary archival materials to permanently record this shared historic event* in a way that is not stagnant, but inspiring and relevant to the nation's youth.

September 11

Series: None

Source: Tribute WTC

September 11 Tribute Center offers visitors to the World Trade Center site a place where they can **connect with people from the September 11 community**.

Through walking tours, exhibits and programs, the September 11 Tribute Center offers "Person to Person History," linking visitors who want to understand and appreciate these historic events with those who experienced them.

The Tribute Center embodies the need to gather at the World Trade Center site, connect with the people, places and events of February 26, 1993 and September 11, 2001, and reflect. September 11 Tribute Center is a project of the September 11 Families' Association, a 501(C)3 non-profit corporation. The September 11 Tribute Center expands upon the September 11 Families' Association mission to **unite and support victims of terrorism by incorporating the entire September 11 community** - families, survivors, residents, rescue workers and volunteers affected by September 11/01. The Center creates a central place for information about September 11 at the WTC site. Visitors learn factual information about the events on September 11, the identity of 2,973 people killed in the attacks, the *unprecedented rescue and recovery operations* and the **tremendous spirit of support and generosity that arose after the attacks**. Personal gallery and walking tour experiences are available to student groups and family audiences. The Tribute Center welcomes over 500,000 visitors to Lower Manhattan annually. The September 11 Tribute Center is located next to FDNY firehouse 10/10 and across from the World Trade Center site, at one of downtown's historic buildings at 120 Liberty Street.

September 11: Looking Back, Moving Forward

Series: None

Source: Families and Work Institute (Authors: Lois Backon, Ellen Galinsky, Erin Brownfield, Kelly Sakai)

Mission:

Families and work Institute (FWI) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization

that studies **the changing workforce, family, and community**. As a preeminent think-tank, FWI is known for being ahead of the curve, **identifying emerging issues**, and then conducting rigorous research that **often challenges common wisdom**, provides insight and knowledge[sic]. As an action-tank, we conduct numerous studies that put our research into action and then evaluate the results. Our purpose is to create research to live by.

Terrorism in America

Series: None

Source: Constitutional Rights Foundation (Authors: Marshall Croddy, Bill Hayes, Carlton Martz, Charles Degelman)

Mission:

Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF) seeks to instill in our nation's youth a deeper understanding of citizenship through values expressed in *our Constitution and its Bill of Rights* and to educate young people to become **active and responsible participants** in our society...CRF is a non-profit, non partisan, **community-based organization** dedicated to educating America's young people about the importance of **civic participation in a democratic society**...Board members are chosen from the worlds of law, business, government, education, the media, and the community.

Detaining Enemy Combatants

Series: Modules for Democracy/Civic Mission Classrooms

Source: Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago

Mission:

Strengthening Democracy One Classroom at a Time

The Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago (CRFC) strengthens American democracy by providing elementary and secondary students with hands-on *learning about the Constitution* to prepare them for informed civic engagement. Nonprofit and nonpartisan, CRFC designs and conducts local, national, and international programs that emphasize current and historical controversies involving rights, law, and policy.

CRFC reaches the nation's youngest citizens through:

Student Programs

CRFC's [student programs](#) promote the nonpartisan discussion of controversial public issues to help students understand multiple perspectives and promote greater civility in American democracy. CRFC uses real-life constitutional questions so students can determine their own answers and find their own voices on civic issues.

Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy

Series: None

Source: Choices for the 21st Century Education Program; Watson Institute for International Studies; Brown University; Susan Bechtel; Andy Blackadar

Mission:

The Choices program is a national education initiative developed at Brown University's Watson Institute for Educational Studies. The Choices program develops curricula on current and historical international issues...materials place special **emphasis on the importance of educating students in their**

participatory roles as citizens. The program seeks to **empower young people** with the skills, knowledge, and participatory habits to be **engaged citizens** who are capable of addressing international issues through thoughtful **public discourse and informed decision-making.**

Learning from the Challenges of our Times: Global Security, Terrorism, and September 11 in the Classroom

Series: 4Action Initiative

Source: Variety of high school teachers; support through FOS11 and NJ Commission on Holocaust Education

Mission:

Families of September 11, Inc. (FOS11) is a nonprofit organization founded in October 2001 by families of those who died in the September 11 terrorist attacks. Membership is open to anyone affected by the events of September 11, be they family members, survivors, responders, or others as well as those who support our mission. The group has two goals:

- **To support families and children by offering updated information on issues of interest, access to resources, relevant articles, and advocacy to raise awareness about the effects of terrorism and public trauma.**
- *To champion domestic and international policies that respond to the threat of terrorism including support for the September 11 Commission Recommendations, and to reach out to victims of terror worldwide.*

Remember: **Remembrance is Continuing the Resistance:** NJ Commission on Holocaust Education; The core mission of the New Jersey Commission on Holocaust Education is to promote Holocaust education in the State of New Jersey. On a continual basis, the Commission shall survey the status of Holocaust/Genocide Education; design, encourage and promote the implementation of Holocaust and genocide education and awareness; provide programs in New Jersey; and coordinate designated events that will provide appropriate memorialization of the Holocaust on a regular basis throughout the state. The Commission will provide assistance and advice to the public and private schools and will meet with county and local school officials, and other interested public and private organizations, to assist with the study of the Holocaust and genocide.

Should the Government Go Beyond the Normal Limits of Authority During Wartime?

Series: Clarke Forum Winners

Source: Masato Ogawa, Ontario High School

Mission:

The Clarke Forum for Contemporary Issues, founded...from Trustee Henry Clarke, brings the unique strengths of **an interdisciplinary progressive arts perspective** to the **critical examination** of pressing contemporary issues. The Clarke Forum believes that knowledge and understanding are gained through **critical reflection and the informed exchange of divergent ideas** across academic disciplines.

America Responds

Series: Classroom resources

Source: PBS

Mission:

PBS is America's largest classroom, the nation's largest stage for the arts and a trusted window to the world. As America's largest classroom, **PBS is available to all of America's children** – including those who can't attend preschool – and offers educational media that help prepare *children for success in school*. PBS is the No. 1 source of media content for preschool teachers and a leading place parents turn to for preschool video online, with **content proven to improve critical literacy skills in young children**. At a time when funding for music and arts within our schools is being cut, PBS is helping to keep the arts alive today and for generations to come by **ensuring the worlds of music, theater, dance and art remain available to all Americans, many of whom might never have had the opportunity to experience them otherwise**. In 2011, PBS offered 500 hours of arts and cultural programming, which was watched by 121 million people.

PBS offers programming for a **wide range of ages, interests and genres**. Each month, 120 million people through television and nearly 28 million people online explore the worlds of science, history, culture, great literature and public affairs through PBS' trusted content.

Voices for Peace

Series: Civic Voices

Source: US Dept of Ed funding under Education for Democracy Act

Mission:

Civics Mosaic is dedicated to the principle of **comparative civics—that the politics and government of one country can be learned most effectively by comparing them with those of other countries**. The first phase of Mosaic explored political ideas like democracy by **comparing their historical development and current application in political systems around the world**. The primary product of that phase is a high school reference book, titled *Exploring Political Ideas*, published by CQ Press (January 2010). The second phase enabled teachers and students to **apply political ideas to current civic issues**. The learning resources for this phase are housed at the Student Survey section of this website. The **International Democracy Memory Bank** engages teachers and students from around the world in developing a rich bank of oral histories from **democratic activists**. Students learn how to conduct oral histories and **preserve the legacy of their country's democratic struggles**, harnessing the stories of the past to inspire the citizens of the future.

September 11 Lessons

Series: *The Learning Network*

Source: *The New York Times*

Mission:

Our mission is to offer rich and imaginative materials for teaching and learning using *New York Times* content.

Every weekday we offer new educational resources based on the articles, photographs, videos, illustrations, podcasts and graphics published in *The New York Times*—all for free.

We invite parents, teachers and students who are 13 and older to use our ideas and tools. We hope that through posting your comments you'll become part of an

ongoing conversation about teaching and learning.

September 11 and the Aftermath

Series: Smithsonian lesson plans

Source: Smithsonian Museum of American History

The Smithsonian's National Museum of American History dedicates its collections and scholarship to inspiring a broader understanding of our nation and its many peoples. We create opportunities for learning, stimulate imaginations, and present challenging ideas about our country's past. The Museum hosts a full roster of public programs, from demonstrations, lectures and tours to storytelling and festivals. Our website offers online exhibitions, behind-the-scenes glimpses into our collections and an overview of Museum programs and activities. Using the website, you can plan your visit to the Museum or go on a tour from your home. The Smithsonian's History Explorer, the Museum's new education Web site, offers free, standards-based, innovative resources for teaching and learning American history. We even have our own blog, "Oh Say Can You See," where you can stay updated on what's happening at the Museum.

An examination of this chart in terms of what is valued and what is expected of students shows just how difficult it is to define the values in September 11 curricula as democratic or not. Many of the programs have elements of both democratic and antidemocratic education; the September 11 Education Trust mission, for example, asks for students to engage in civic participation while also unifying in one narrative of the event—similar to the normalizing effects discussed below—while the We the People program emphasizes both diversity and a commitment to a singular set of values. Even the 4Action program, which falls on the more progressive end of the spectrum, states a desire to support government policy against terrorism, indicating unilateralism rather than challenge. These mission statements are illustrative of how murky our own political aims are in society when it comes to students' education.

Democratic Education and Shelter in September 11 Curricula

The connection between the curricula's political value system to shelter lies in what is expected from each system. Shelter, as I have defined it, requires a measure of passivity from the student who is experiencing it. The metaphor requires that if the shelter is an action on the part of the curriculum or the instructor, the person being sheltered must stand still to some extent. The farther the student is allowed to roam, the harder it is to keep her sheltered, whether from information or challenges to specific beliefs and values.

The analysis of democratic education through the curricula fit with this idea of passivity in shelter in that the maintenance of the status quo is by definition a type of standing still, while working to effect change in society requires action. The phrasing in the mission statements seems to prove that hypothesis, in that the antidemocratic elements reflect the "banking model" of education—depositing information into students—while the progressive elements call for a more active learning on the students' parts. The September 11 Memorial mission, for example, identifies the core ideologies that it feels its purpose is to uphold. On the other hand, the Working Families Institute mission is more active, seeking to identify trends in a constantly changing society and study the needs of varying populations in America. Democratic elements of the mission statements include words such as *prepare*, *struggle*, *resist*, and *empower*, while nondemocratic elements include words such as *commit*, *respect*, *affirm*, and *record*. There is a fundamental difference in the two groups in that the nondemocratic elements assume there is an agreed-upon knowledge to which the programs are

providing access, while the democratic elements identify that there are unknowns that the programs feel responsible for promoting the discovery of.

The Passivity of Patriotism

To narrow the scope of the question of democratic education as sheltering or not, I focused on the idea of patriotism in the programs. Joel Westheimer (2011) describes two types of patriotism: authoritarian patriotism and democratic patriotism.

Authoritarian patriotism is:

- the belief that one's country is inherently superior to others,
- primary allegiance to land, birthright, legal citizenship, and government's cause,
- unquestioning loyalty
- following leaders reflexively, supporting them unconditionally,
- blind to shortcomings and social discord within nation, and
- conformist, with dissent seen as dangerous and destabilizing.

Democratic patriotism is:

- the belief that a nation's ideals are worthy of admiration and respect,
- primary allegiance to set of principles that underlie democracy,
- questioning, critical, deliberative,
- caring for the people of society based on particular principles (e.g., liberty, justice),
- outspoken in condemnation of shortcomings, especially within nation, and
- respectful, even encouraging of dissent. (p. 85)

The common thread in these definitions is that, in terms of America, one who is patriotic is loyal to the ideals of the democracy our country is based upon, and that America is a society worth protecting. But while authoritarian patriotism requires unquestioning loyalty as a prerogative, democratic patriotism sees dissent as a patriotic principle. This is quite aligned with Pinar's (2010) idea of democratic education.

Nondemocratic values, those that oppose the democratic definition, certainly align with authoritarian patriotism, while the democratic values align with democratic

patriotism. There is, again, a passive quality to nondemocratic patriotism; Kahne & Middaugh (2011) found a connection of students who identified patriotism as loving one's country with ideas that they did not have a responsibility to engage politically. They also note that education policies that specifically focus on teaching students patriotism have defined it as encouraging allegiance with noncritical activities. For example, there have been a marked increase in state laws requiring the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in all classrooms—17 states wrote laws after September 11 (p. 99).

Teacher Support as Shelter in September 11 Curricula

While the missions of the curricula may be very different, it is necessary to look at shelter in terms of how teachers support students through the different programs. Several of the curricula in this study take up the same question of teacher responsibility for supporting students' emotional needs in studying September 11 as a political trauma by explaining how teachers can do so. The Families and Work Institute program, in fact, was created for the express purpose of helping students cope with the emotional trauma of September 11. The lessons of the unit use arts integration, sensitive question techniques, and the assignment of building a time capsule of their own lives to help students come to terms emotionally with what they feel about the topic. This purpose actually supersedes academic missions, although connections to national history standards are made. The 4Action program instructs teachers that these are sensitive topics they will be raising in class, and teachers are provided with "Guidelines for Teaching the Lessons in the Classroom" and "Guidelines for Creating a Safe Space in the Classroom."

Table 5. Examples from 4Action Guidelines

Examples of the “Guidelines for Teaching the Lessons in the Classroom”:

- Identify the background information needed by the students and/or teachers to accomplish the goals of the lesson.
- Be sensitive to the visual materials—photos, videos, audio—and their emotional nature and potential impact upon students.
- Be sensitive to the vulnerability of students who have a history of trauma in their own lives and how they may connect this event to their personal experiences.

Examples of the “Guidelines for Creating a Safe Space in the Classroom”

- Be aware of how your experiences, reactions, and thoughts may influence how you present and react to the material in the classroom.
- Before a lesson, ask if any students or their family members know people who were directly or indirectly affected by the terrorist attacks on September 11.
- Be aware of how your students react and cope with potentially difficult subjects. (P. I-5-6)

Other curricula, such as the Smithsonian program, ask students to take on roles outside of themselves, such as museum curator, to discuss the events without relating to them personally.

Normalizing as Shelter

Nonetheless, many examples of normalizing work present themselves in the September 11 curricula. The We the People curriculum instructs students how they are supposed to think about the events of September 11 before sharing a narrative of America that students are directed to parrot. The instructions for the activities are written in first person plural, implying that there is one narrative that all Americans share:

We look back to July 4, 1776, when a group of leading American colonists gathered in Philadelphia.... Although the application of these values and

principles has often been controversial, the principles themselves have been cherished by Americans since first presented to the world so long ago. How successful has our nation been in realizing these values and principles? Do we still believe in all of them? (p. 7)

The September 11 Education Trust gives examples of people reacting with sadness at the events but pride in America's actions, and holds those people in high esteem, implying that students should have the same reactions. In this way, students may feel sheltered but supported—direction in how to feel in a confusing and complex situation. However, this normalizing can present the difficulty of suppressing feelings that students may instead need to work through.

As for support of students through the actual discussion of the controversial aspects of September 11, the Constitutional Rights Foundation program gives significant instruction to the teacher on how to prepare students for discussions that do not turn into debate or bullying. The program uses conversational roles and strong rules of civil discussion to stop students from mocking each other or making a conversation a personal attack.

Despite the work that these three curricula do to support students in navigating September 11 as a subject, they are the only three of the study that attempt to do so. The September 11 Education Trust program most notably exposes students to the most stories of death, the most images, and the most oral histories—the curricula is over 100 pages long—yet devotes no space to assisting teachers in supporting students through the emotional effects of those materials.

Normalizing through manipulation of the text. The *September 11 Memorial* program instructs students to watch a seven-minute long video about the recovery efforts at Ground Zero. Following the video, the teacher is instructed to lead a class

discussion of what the curriculum terms “critical thinking discussion questions” (“Make History Site”). The culminating question of this set is, “How did America and Americans change after September 11, 2001?” This question certainly has the possibility to provoke critical discussion; envision a class of students talking about personal freedoms, collective action, trust in government, or fears of flying. The leading questions before that final one change the dynamic of the discussion from one of openness to one of a desired end envisioned by the author of the text. The first four questions before that final one include, for example, “How does [the filmmaker] use music to set or influence the mood projected by the film? How would you describe the overall mood of the film?” Questions such as these alert students to the idea that there is a way they are *supposed* to feel about the film and the events they depict, which would affect their later answers.

Other curricula in this study manipulate what is supposed to be critical class discussion in a variety of ways, to the same end. Recall the example of the *We the People* curriculum, driving students to a specific collective narrative. The September 11 Education Trust program pulls quotes from readings and shades them in boxes or makes their text twice as large, emphasizing their importance, before asking students to critically examine the reading. *Global Security, September 11 & Terrorism*, which has a stated purpose of helping students to develop a sense of individual identity (and how could that be done without critical thinking?), asks a set of “Critical Thinking Questions” in a lesson about group mentality with loaded language, which directs students towards a certain belief system, including:

- What facts about these people’s [fundamentalist Muslims] lives are worst?
- What two stages of psychosocial development is a person experiencing during

- the teens and early 20s?
- How can the U.S. help change the results of these factors?
 - Based on the theories discussed [group mentality], can the “War on Terror” as a physical altercation on such a large scale possibly stop the growth of terrorist organizations?

The implied understandings of these questions (fundamentalist Muslims are living terrible lives, the stages of psychosocial development of one’s teens and 20s have negative results, the growth of terrorist organizations cannot “possibly” be stopped by a war) lead students to the answers the curriculum desires, not to open-ended dialogue.

Shelter Devices in Class Discussion

Classroom discussion, as described in Chapter 1, poses risks of broaching taboo subjects and devolving into emotional arguments rather than epistemological production. This is explicitly noted in the 4Action curriculum, which is why it provides such extensive teacher instruction for the use of the program. However, other programs attempt to shelter students’ experiences in class discussion through ground rules of discussion.

Terrorism in America assumes that the discussion of September 11 will cause controversy in the classroom and thus provides teachers with a model that is a hybrid of the two described in the literature: removing the controversy from the controversy while also exploring oneself in the discussion. Akin to Clarke’s (2005) “demystification strategy,” the teacher is instructed to a) identify the issue under dispute, b) identify areas of agreement and disagreement, c) indentify underlying assumptions, and d) make sure students concretely define terms (p. 1). The “ground rules” teachers are to share with students are as follows:

- They must argue ideas, not personalities.
- They must represent the opposing positions.
- They should admit doubts and weaknesses in their own position.
- The argument should concentrate on evidence. (p. 1)

The program emphasizes discussions that ask students to “infer, compare, analyze, synthesize, hypothesize, or evaluate information” (p. 1), key aspects of critical thinking. An exemplar of such a discussion to be led is in the lesson on *habeas corpus*, with the leading question being, “Did Lincoln have the right to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in his proclamation of 1862?” (p. 57). The teacher is then instructed to ask follow up questions to have students examine their beliefs and values about the topic.

The CHOICES program uses a different model of removing controversy from the controversial while still having students think at a critical level. Students are expected to discuss the U.S.’s best options for addressing terrorism in America, but rather than having an open discussion, each student is given a specific role (legal advisor, foreign policy advisor, domestic policy advisor, or historian) from which to make their case (p. 36). While students are still expected to analyze their own values against the facts and options at hand, they must also reconcile their positions with the values and purposes of the roles they are given. This is, in a way, a form of shelter, as they are not connecting their personality to their assertions.

Shelter in Teacher Choices

While the curricula in this study has, in some cases, specific direction on how to use the curriculum and how to guide students through it, the length of many of the curricula can also be seen as a type of shelter. The CHOICES, 4Action, September 11 Memorial, and September 11 Education Trust programs are all units containing more than 10 day-

long lesson plans. The entire 4Action program would take over a month to complete, as would the September 11 Memorial curriculum. In the September 11 Memorial curriculum, several of the lesson plans repeat the same subject material from different angles.

Considering the strict pacing guides of today's classroom, it is unlikely that any teacher would be able to complete the entirety of those four programs. 4Action and September 11 Memorial are explicit in this understanding; both state that they want teachers to choose the lesson plans that fit best with the teachers' programs. Thus, there is a type of shelter in the teacher's choice in that teachers may pick which lessons not only fit best with their own standards and objectives for their classes, but also which fit best with their students' readiness to adjust and absorb to such material. Teachers may choose to avoid the most provoking or upsetting of the material and opt instead to use the more moderate lessons.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have identified devices of shelter through student activities, curriculum objectives, and teacher actions. What is interesting about the devices is how divergent their purposes are; the same curriculum may use shelter to direct students to one particular narrative but expose students to upsetting images, thus showing concern for what students learn but not what they feel. In terms of the definition of curriculum discussed in Chapter 2, shelter acts to mitigate the experience that the student has with the curricula. Curricula in this case is the course of study the students use to learn about

the word, and there is a pedagogical space for the curricula to control how the students converse about September 11.

These purposes are what led to the secondary analysis of this study, an analysis completed in an attempt to understand these purposes better. The initial analysis that provided these devices opened an inroad to secondary analysis that showed the consequences of the devices across three themes: emotional affect, critical thinking, and political value systems. These consequences and themes will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4

CONSEQUENCES OF SHELTER IN SEPTEMBER 11 CURRICULA

Lived experience is not preconceptual but always already linked to our representations of it. While none of these (lived experiences, representations, and their reciprocal relations) are necessarily simultaneous or transparent—in trauma, representation is belated because our experience of an event cannot coincide with it—it is “I” (in whatever reconstructed form) who must communicate the character and meaning of experience, including to myself.
~William Pinar

Introduction

In the previous chapter, devices of shelter were identified in student activities, curricular objectives, and prescribed teacher actions. However, the immediate consequences of shelter—that is, the removal of information from the student’s educational transversal through the curriculum—carry with them consequences that are further reaching than simply not knowing. A secondary analysis of the devices of shelter produced consequences along three themes: emotional affect, critical thinking, and political value systems.

Curriculum is not a set of objectives written on a piece of paper or a textbook with accompanying activities. Curriculum is, as Pinar (2010) describes:

[The analogy of] sociality and subjectivity. As teachers, individuation denotes the developmental—and intellectual—specification of our individuality, informed as individuality inevitably is by society, history, culture. It is specifically formed through

academic study and participation in the complicated conversation that is curriculum. (loc.⁷ 1609-1610)

This complicated conversation is a social and psychological process that cannot be relegated to simple knowledge acquisition, but rather encompasses emotional, intellectual, and interpersonal development. Thus, what is sheltered or not through curriculum has effects in all three realms.

Sheltering the Emotional Affect of September 11

The device of providing distance—through focusing on historical context or objects instead of victims—shelters students’ emotional lives from the impact of the violence that signifies September 11. This sheltering makes the assumption that there are certain emotional subjects that students should not be exposed to, which is interesting considering the current educational paradigm. Much of the current policy about education stops with knowledge or skills acquisition; the focus is on knowledge for, as the Common Core State Standards would say, “career and college readiness” (CCSI, 2012). However, in trying to understand the purposes behind teaching September 11 and the purposes of the curricula of this study, it is impossible to ignore the emotional aspects or to just concentrate on the intellectual, which is why this shelter is present. If the creators of September 11 curricula did not consider emotions of their audiences, they would not take care to shield students from images of the carnage that ran frequently in journalistic sources after the attacks.

The emphasis of current educational policy on skills acquisition (Pinar, 2010) is ironic in its recognition of varying forms of intellectual ability, yet lack of recognition of

⁷ Kindle edition location.

variation in emotional ability. This is a common dichotomy in curriculum; it has become accepted practice to understand that students will learn material at different rates, and that some students will completely misunderstand what is taught, while others will skim the surface, and still others will dive deeply into the material (Gardner, 1985).

The Emotional Risks of Working with September 11 as a Controversial Topic

Students of political trauma come to class with firm prejudices and ways of thinking which may not be conducive to such instruction (Stradling, 2006). As noted in Chapter 1, Sillin (1995) addresses the emotional needs of students who may be experiencing the very topics being discussed: a child whose parent has AIDS, for example, or who has a cousin fighting in the war in Iraq. Teachers may not be aware of these individual situations when they broach a discussion of the AIDS epidemic or the search for the weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Returning to the example of September 11: I had a student who had already enlisted in the Marines when we first deployed soldiers to Afghanistan following the attacks. I was not aware of this fact when I started a discussion of the benefits and detriments of such a military response. Looking back, I can only imagine the array of emotions he felt—anger, uncertainty, and indignation—as his fellow students described a mission he was about to embark on as “useless” and “war against innocents” and “a waste of time.” This risk is evident in the device of directed discussion questions, as the questions are meant to drive students towards a pre-identified conclusion rather than leaving controversial issues open to what may become hurtful conversations.

Aligned with this device is the care ethic teachers have identified as their perceived responsibilities (Vogt, 2002; Zembylas, 2005), as well as the idea that recognition of the emotional lives of students and support in integrating them in the classroom is a desirable practice. This is seen almost immediately in the September 11 curricula of this study. For example, Derrida speaks to the impossibility of mourning (Zembylas, 2008), in that it has no end—mourning does not develop into healing, but rather it must be put to an end by the mourner. Mourning is a complex emotional undertaking that requires catharsis and outlets for internal struggles. However, much of the curricula in this study engages students in the writing process by having them write obituaries and creating memorials, brief activities that are often superficial and do not allow for the complexity mourning requires.

The Turn to Care in September 11 Curricula

The theorizing of the discussion of controversial topics in the classroom brings to the forefront the question of schooling's responsibilities for the emotional lives of its students. As early as the 1920s, but especially in the 1940s, the Supreme Court addressed the topic of "appropriateness" of various classroom materials—that is, what might be too much for students to grapple with at various stages of their emotional development (Salomone, 2000). On one side of the argument, educators felt that avoidance of emotional issues could suppress freedom of thinking and lead to indoctrination; on the other, educators argued that there were certain topics that students just could not process without it being detrimental to their own psyche (e.g., Jim Crow laws in the 1940s). Both of these assumptions, however, rely on the early- to

mid-20th century assumptions of education as a structured academic exercise addressing the intellectual and moral being rather than the emotional.

One of the notable advancements in the reconceptualization of the field of curriculum studies is the rethinking of curriculum as a social text that addresses the personal as well as the collective academic (Schubert, 1986). Pinar rooted curriculum studies in an analysis of educational experience, opening the doors to the use of psychoanalytical theory, using theorists such as Freud, Kristeva, and Lacan to come to social understandings, as opposed to relying solely on the intellectual, or the intellectual and character, as previous curriculum studies had done.

A part of the growth of the reconceptualization of curriculum studies was the beginning of an understanding of curriculum as a test of “intellectual and psychological labor” (Pinar, 2010, loc. 1579). Scholars such as Janet Miller (1992) argue that the emotional needed to be integrated with the intellectual in order to realize the curriculum’s full potential, rather than relying on a patriarchal model of character education that women teachers were expected to teach. In *Bitter Milk*, Madeleine Grumet argues for the occupation of a unique space identified as living between the public and the domestic. Her work argues for an owning of that relationship to reform the idea of curriculum out from under the patriarchy’s organization.

This reimagining of the space of teaching also opened the door for the idea of emotional responsibility for our students, using “the individual teacher’s judgment [as] necessary to rebalance and restructure these various elements each day” (loc. 1579). The new concept of curriculum described a deep involvement in human relationships for education—as Grumet (1988) notes, “Knowledge evolves in human relationships”

(p. xix). It is in this framework that scholars began to claim “safe spaces” for learning (Grumet, 1988; Miller, 1990; Rom, 1998; Fried, 1993) where students and teachers could explore experiences together, and the experience of being with each other, without feeling the vulnerability of connecting emotion with intellect. This reimagining also opened a place in curriculum studies for the direct work of supporting students’ emotional beings.

Perhaps best known in this arena is Nel Noddings’s (1984, 2002) care theory. Noddings sees care ethics as a relational imperative of the teacher-student connection that is an ongoing learning process. In other words, one is not a “caring” person; one practices care and is continually learning to adapt this practice to the person with which she is interacting. Engster (2005) defines caring in terms of reproductive work, that which is necessary for society to keep functioning at ever increasing levels. He also draws on Noddings and Finnis to identify caring as essential for “helping others to develop or sustain their basic capabilities for sensation, emotion, movement, speech, reason, imagination, affiliation” (p. 52) as well as “avoid or relieve suffering and pain so they can carry on with their lives as well as possible” (p. 53). Thus, caring is an integral part of well-being, which is of high consequence in discussing traumatic events such as September 11.

Engster further draws on Noddings and Blum to identify three virtues of caring. The first is attentiveness, the noticing of when others are in need and possession of empathy for that person. The second is responsiveness, engaging the person in need and fulfilling those needs. The third is respect, the understanding that others are worthy of attention and care. Zembylas (2008) echoes these virtues in his exploration of curricular

responses to political trauma; he especially emphasizes the necessity for curricula to support students in fostering empathy (not to be confused with sympathy) with those who suffered. Zembylas (2005) recognized a movement in curriculum as a whole towards the recognition of student and teacher emotional lives.

However, this responsibility seems to be shifted to the students in examining the essential questions discussed in Chapter 3 (e.g., What can you do to prevent terrorism in the future?). Is it worth sheltering students from troubling images or histories if they are then exposed to deep questions of responsibility for the well-being of America and global relations without support?

Care and Exposure

Each of the curricula exposes students to material that might be considered traumatic—visuals, stories of violence, or accounts of people who have died. What makes this material different than reading about the Civil War, for example, is the immediacy of the issue. As the Tribute WTC curriculum notes in the quote above, not only did September 11 happen during students' lifetimes, but the event intruded—and continues to intrude—into their living rooms through repetition of footage of the event and coverage of the resulting wars. What changes *among* the different curricula is the type of exposure that occurs, and whether it is meant to provoke students to greater understanding in balance to the potential emotional upset that they can cause.

The immediacy of September 11 also appears through analogous situations that invoke similar emotional reactions from students, which opens the complicated conversation through analogous investigation (Pinar, 2010). On April 15, 2013, two

brothers born in Chechnya set off two explosive devices at the finish line of the Boston Marathon, killing three people and wounding hundreds. A massive manhunt for the perpetrators shut down the city of Boston for two days, and the entire nation watched twenty-four-hour news coverage of the carnage and the ensuing capture of the suspects. The Boston bombing naturally connects allegorically to the events of September 11 (especially as it became known that the perpetrators were Muslim), and the work that teachers can do to process the situation through emotional processing in September 11 can “forefront both history and questions of its representation as central to understanding self and society through study” (Pinar, 2010, loc. 1526).

Caring for Students Through Exposure

Emotional trauma can be defined as both “outside the range of typical human experience” and as something that “would evoke significant symptoms of distress in almost everyone” (Weathers & Keane, 2007). In this study, it is the event of September 11 that has been identified as the trauma, and with few exceptions, the event would be considered to have had traumatic effects on its sufferers. However, it is quite possible that the study of a traumatic event could be traumatic in itself. Suleiman (2007) identifies the dangers of secondhand trauma from studying traumatic events such as the Holocaust: Students can be so taken in by the images and oral histories that they move past empathy for the sufferer and begin to imagine themselves as one of the victims. In her example, students who read extended narratives such as *Night* were open to possibly identifying with those who were in concentration camps. It could be argued that this type of transference may strengthen students’ understanding of the

events that they are studying. In referring to the missions that were outlined in the last chapter, would suffering that kind of trauma increase resiliency or deeper critical understandings? Does it increase the ability to be an active member of democracy?

Distance through Writing in Addition to the Subject Matter

Perhaps the biggest difficulty in exposing students to emotionally traumatic material is that while teachers often have a strong sense of their students' academic abilities—through test scores, work in class, and years' worth of files they can access—they often have little idea of our students' emotional abilities. Mental illnesses and upsetting pasts are required by federal law to be kept private unless it affects a students' learning (IDEA, 2004), and it is often considered inappropriate for a teacher to interrogate a students' emotional state. As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, students can approach material emotionally in just as diverse manners as they do intellectually.

There is research to support this method; Klingman (2003), among many researchers, highlights the powers of both creative writing and bibliotherapy for coping with the mourning process, whether it be for a specific person or for large-scale trauma. Creative writing, a highly individual activity, provides students with an outlet for their concerns and anxieties, as well as the possibility of recreating their world so that it seems more upbeat or livable. Klingman (2003) recommends having students share their writing with one another so they may realize they are not alone in their affective responses. Del Valle (2003) suggests that using expressive writing works especially well if directed to some purpose, such as letters to soldiers or to children who attend school near Ground Zero. His research found that creative writing helped promote personal growth after a

trauma. Creative writing also allows students to determine their own distance (as discussed in the previous chapter) to the events, in that they can decide how they would like to approach the events in question.

The Shelter of Narrative

Adolescents can also use narrative to conceive of themselves as subjective persons and understand how their stories are their own, rather than representations of truth, by using such narrative to bear witness. Oliver (2001) describes the difficulty and importance of bearing witness in working through and beyond the violence of trauma. Being a witness must be understood as different from being a spectator; witnesses are working towards carrying their understanding with them and sharing their experience with others, as opposed to the spectator who may watch and take nothing away psychologically or emotionally (Zembylas, 2008). It is essential that one “learns to hear the other’s pain and respond to this pain as witnesses and not as spectators” (p. 31). Witnessing takes those who learn from the witnesses beyond the facts. Oliver (2001) claims that even the most shocking statistics lose the truth of trauma; statistics cannot show how people are Othered, how they are objectified or commodified during and after a disaster. Testimony is the only key to the psyche of the victims, and the act of witnessing also helps the witness himself to understand.

In public spheres of reaction to trauma, especially in a secondhand witnessing, the danger exists of falling into a sense of sentimentality rather than true empathy (Zembylas, 2008). Sentimentality develops out of several factors, including overexposure to information with no context and commodification of trauma,

contributing to a blasé attitude developed out of a sense of self-protection. Zembylas argues there is violence in such sentimentality; people who experience sentimentality tend to prioritize certain traumas over others in their desire to resolve the tension between universality of a trauma and its particularity (a tension that Zembylas believes needs to stay in progress in order to develop understanding). A tension also exists between those who are witnessing and what is witnessed (Oliver, 2001). Adolescents who practice witnessing are able to maintain the experience and their work in understanding without relegating it to another sensationalized event. Thus, narratives as witnessing can also be highly effective in the stage of recovery and healing that Rosenfeld, et al. (2005) term the creation of a “postdisaster future” (p. 311).

Normalizing as Shelter from Emotion

The last chapter discussed the device of normalizing—that is, aligning students to one mode of thought. To understand the motivation for normalizing, it is necessary to understand that exposure to the images and oral histories of September 11 is not the only possible source of secondhand trauma. By nature, discussion of September 11 broaches topics of sensitivity (Hess, 2002) such as religion, political beliefs, and culture. Students may feel put in the position of defending their own beliefs, which may be especially traumatic, particularly if their beliefs are outside the classroom norm. A strong theme in post-response curricula is that of “normalizing thinking,” which connects closely to the “status quo” values reviewed in the last chapter. NOVA (Young, 2003), for example, focuses on controlling information and directing emotions. In general, there is an emphasis on explaining to students not only what they should think

about a political trauma, but what they should feel as well. This “normalizing” factor of government plans raises several troubling questions. The insinuation that there are such things as “faulty thinking” and “normal thinking” counteracts social justice ideals in education. Who is to say which student is having a “correct” reaction to a trauma and which is not? Privileging one mode of thinking over another is disconcerting at best.

What is the purpose of September 11 curricula, aside from academic knowledge and building individual characteristics? What do these curricula want these students to do after they experience these programs—five, ten, or twenty years from now? A significant emotional weight exists to these units, as well as the study of political trauma as a whole, and it is possible that it will not be known what is learned for years after the complicated conversation takes place (Pinar, 2010).

The device of pity. The research emphasizing the building of resiliency shares a desire to foster empathy, that is, a feeling of understanding others. By taking the focus off oneself and placing it on another, adolescents have been shown to more effectively handle traumatic situations. However, building empathy in students can be quite difficult and requires sensitivity from both the teacher and her pupils. As Zembylas (2008) explains, *sympathy* is a relatively easy emotion to exhibit, yet can produce undesirable results. Feeling sorry for another person can lead to feelings of superiority, and finally to a lack of caring once it is no longer convenient to sympathize. Empathy, on the other hand, requires students to step outside themselves and try to position themselves in the space of another, a quite difficult move to accomplish. Nonetheless, when it is accomplished, empathy results in students who are more understanding, tolerant, and socially giving. In fostering empathy in our students, the theory extends,

teachers prepare them not only for resiliency, but also for good citizenship.

This risk of sympathy is highlighted in the devices that encouraged students to research Afghanistan discussed in the last chapter; the encouraged study led students to look at the hardships of the Afghan people and the suppressive nature of the Taliban rather than a well-rounded view of the country. In doing such study, students are encouraged to feel pity for the Afghans, placing themselves on a level above those people and falling into the trap discussed by Zembylas.

The Consequences of Shelter on Critical Thinking

In *What Is Curriculum Theory?* (2010), William Pinar argues:

The central curriculum question—what knowledge is of most worth?—is no instrumental calculation of what skills students need to succeed in some imaginary workplace. Nor is it identification of the next step to take, as when so-called skills are to be mastered for the sake of learning more advanced “skills” later, as if the curriculum were a prolonged Ponzi scheme, later payouts dependent upon ever-increasing investments. Instrumental rationality itself has long been decried in curriculum studies as foreclosing educational experience, which is less a means to an end than an unforeseen and infinitely variegated consequence of study. Like art objects, outcomes of study cannot be known in advance, unless, of course, one’s intention is to copy. (loc. 1624)

Several of the devices outlined in the previous chapter have an impact on students’ critical thinking, as an integral part of the work that Pinar describes above rather than a “skill” students are to acquire and apply at will for testing situations. Since Dewey’s *Work in democratic education* (1938), critical thinking has been considered to be a common aim of a well-developed curriculum. A working definition of critical thinking that is oft-quoted in curriculum studies states is that of Scriven and Paul (1987), who state that critical thinking is the:

intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action. In its exemplary form, it is based on universal intellectual values that transcend subject matter divisions: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, sound evidence, good reasons, depth, breadth, and fairness. (para. 1)

The Essentialness of Critical Thinking

Are the benefits of critical thinking self-evident? Educational situations exist where critical thinking is not desirable. An example might be basic training in the Army, where new recruits learn the methods and systems of survival and cannot question what they are learning if they are to succeed—following orders is imperative. Another example is teaching kindergarten students to “stop, drop, and roll” in the case of fire. This behavior must become instinctual and there is no room for critique. There are various other models of education that do not invite critical thinking, especially in the form discussed here; there are test answers to be learned and behaviors to inculcate, and critical thinking is not welcome.

This study operates through a lens of belief that more is lost by sheltering topics from critical thinking than by raising them. What would have been lost by not discussing the mission to Afghanistan in my class? Whether students were enlisting or not, their country was about to embark on a war, a war that was to last over ten years. This one event encompassed many of Hunt and Metcalf’s (1955) “problematic areas of culture”: power and the law, economics, nationalism, patriotism and foreign affairs, religion, and morals—areas where core beliefs could be examined in the classroom to create deeper critical understandings. As iterated above through Scriven and Paul’s (1987) definition of critical thinking, it is nearly impossible to achieve deeper critical understandings

without broaching controversial issues, as there must be something “at stake”: a belief that is challenged, a way of life that may be changed, or a course of action that may be altered by truly examining an issue at hand. If the issue is not controversial, that is, if it is on its face “true” or not to be challenged, none of these actions will take place.

An almost century-long literature theme in the social studies has argued for the presence of controversial topics in the curriculum to expand critical thinking skills (Evans & Saxe, 1996; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Hunt & Metcalf, 1955; Rugg, 1921). A focus of this literature has always been on the need for the discussion of such topics to improve citizenship skills in preparing students for adulthood, but recently, that focus has become even more emphasized (Levinson, 2006). Students in a democratic society will eventually be called on to make decisions in an ever-increasing polarized political schema; if they are not able to work through controversial issues and challenge held beliefs, these new curricula theorize (ibid.), they will not be able to participate in their own democracies. Additionally, Stradling (2006) provides the following three discrete reasons for teaching these sorts of topics:

1. They offer a useful focus for helping students to develop academic and study skills (e.g., constructing hypotheses, collecting and evaluating evidence, analyzing statistics, presenting findings).
2. They offer a useful content for practicing social and life skills (e.g., skills in communicating with others, exercising empathy and understanding, influencing others, cooperating together in projects).
3. Specific issues may prove to be useful case studies for comprehending theories, concepts, and generalizations. (p. 123)

Another purpose of privileging critical thinking in the classroom is that the institution of schooling may be one of the last places where students are exposed to diversity (both socioeconomic and of opinion) in their lives. Adolescents often attend schools that are of mixed demographics when their neighborhoods are not; after finishing schooling, it

is likely that students will end up in work environments, living situations, and social activities with people who are demonstratively like themselves (Rainie & Smith, 2012). Even social media outlets and internet activity are geared toward bolstering and confirming one's point of view and ways of thinking (Parser, 2011), directing users towards sites and commentary that align with one's established political activity. If students do not learn to not only accept, but think through opposing viewpoints in school, they may not have the opportunity to do so later in life.

Critical Thinking as Aim of September 11 Curricula

Fourteen out of fifteen of the study's curricula claim to evoke critical thinking from the students who are studying them.

Learn Our History, however, gives only the objectives that students will "take pride in America's past" and "learn the truth about America's past" (cover). *Learn Our History* is a video cartoon featuring four students in the same class who are required to write a report on why September 11 is important. To complete the assignment, they use a time machine that one of them built to travel back to three different periods. First they visit the World Trade Center just as the planes hit the twin towers. They then visit the town where they live (a generic Midwestern-type town) to see the reactions of the townspeople, and find that all of the townspeople are seen joining together in relief efforts for the victims of September 11. Finally, the students travel to Afghanistan where they witness members of the Taliban planning "destruction of America" but also meet a little Afghan girl dressed up as a boy. The students speak with the girl, and she realizes that Afghan people have a completely wrong view of America. The American

children, for their part, come to see that Afghans live a life of hardship and oppression, and thus should be pitied instead of hated.

The video is accompanied by questions for students to answer, but they are knowledge-based questions to assure that students watched the film. There is nothing in the video or the accompanying questions that indicates the desire for critical thinking as an objective of the curricula. But as for the rest of the curricula, critical thinking is at least to be an assumed objective.

The examination of critical thinking in particular relation to September 11 curricula, rather than reserving such a space as this for other pedagogical concerns, relies on a theory of curriculum as an activation of culture. The reasons stated until this point for encouraging critical thinking in the classroom involve what is done *to* the student as one of many; but the central subject at hand here is one of theory of curriculum as shaping individual identity (Pinar et al., 2008). Operating on the assumption that the events of September 11 are both disruptive and formative in American culture (Slattery & Rapp, 2002), and that culture is not something that is fixed, one dimensional, or assimilating for all (McLaren, 1991), curricula on September 11 have enormous power to form a student's personal identity. The extent to which the curricula allow for critical thinking, for the student to place what he learns within his own personal narrative, is essential. If curriculum is looked at in the tradition of Atkins (1988), a "coping-with, rather than as a mirroring-of, reality" (p. 437), then there is an implied transaction between students and the curriculum of September 11, developing a way of negotiating the trauma of the event instead of passively learning about it. Critical thinking implies not only "the capacity to seek reasons, truth, and evidence, but also the drive to seek

them” (Burbules & Berk, 1999, p. 48).

In terms of this shaping of identity, it would be assumed that this does not involve sheltering the student in the way I have defined. Identity is intensely personal by definition, and for curriculum to interact with the student’s particular identification of him/herself, barriers must be breeched. Emphasizing critical-thinking skills in curriculum encourages students to examine their own held beliefs while simultaneously building higher-level awarenesses of what is happening in their classrooms and the power structures that work in them. In their text, Pinar et al. (2008) describe the political natures of all curricula, not just those which address political topics or explicitly state the wish for students to conduct critical thinking. Most noteworthy for this particular context is the idea of the reproductive qualities of curriculum as a political text. The claim of reproduction theorizes that curriculum has the purpose of reproduction, whether it be reproducing social stratifications, cultural norms, or political ideology. In this theory, Pinar et al. recall Gramsci’s idea of hegemony, which they adapt to define as the dominance of a cultural superstructure insofar as those within the structure are prevented from developing class consciousness (p. 250). Curriculum is often designed then, whether consciously or unconsciously, to reproduce this cultural structure within the students it is instructing.

However, Pinar et al. (ibid.) also note efforts to understand such political aspects of curriculum and undermine it through new praxis. They mark the work of Giroux, Apple, and Weis (various pub., 1983) as efforts to identify and resist the ideological methods of curriculum. By inviting students to improve their critical-thinking skills, teachers can then ask them to turn that critical eye on the very curriculum to which they are exposed

and resist reproduction of institutionalized systems, including racism, xenophobia, and sexism. The very act of discerning whether the request for critical thinking is genuine or not gives students power over their own learning and a deeper understanding of the hidden curriculum behind their lessons—what the ultimate purpose of the curriculum may be, aside from the standards listed. In the next section, I analyze the devices of shelter in terms of critical thinking.

Shelter Devices and Impact on Critical Thinking

Defining and Definitions in Critical Thinking

In the previous chapter, I discussed the shelter that occurs in providing definitions for students rather than allowing them to discern the definitions as their own work. The providing of a definition also works to remove the opportunity for critical thinking.

Limiting the critical thinking inherent in these acts, however, is the material students read from the program. Each chapter is written by one author with no cited sources (aside from the U.S. State Department definition of terrorism)—the reading is made to be taken as authority (as truth), and students are not invited to reach outside of this narrative to frame their decisions. A significant aspect of critical thinking as defined earlier is the development and implementation of one's evaluative means. In providing students with a definition, especially those noting, for example, not just what terrorism is but who can be defined as a terrorist, evaluation is not invited. Similarly, the limiting of the definitions to a number of choices limits the implementation of critical thinking. Critical thinking is desired, but in a particular box; freedom of developing definitions does not exist in any of the programs that provide choices to decide upon.

Narrative and Critical Thinking

Narrative use is briefly covered in the emotional affect section of this chapter; I go into more depth here. Before further addressing the narratives in the particular curricula of this study, an educational purpose of narrative must be described. Educational historians (e.g., Jeynes, 2007; Carter, 1992; Angus & Mirel, 1999, among a long list of others) have identified two strands of curricular purpose in American schools: that of creating a common culture of which new citizens could be a part (i.e. a cultural narrative), and that of creating citizens ready to participate in the democratic nation. Both of these tasks were considered especially necessary in the fledgling democracy that was America in the nineteenth century—not only did students need to be prepared to take part in their government through voting and civic duty, but many were newly immigrated, and it was in the government’s best interest to provide students with a cultural paradigm to inculcate them with the narrative it preferred (Jeynes, 2007).

While both of these goals have the possibility of working in concert, there is a specific contradiction that can be seen in how they have been manifested in the American curriculum over time. Teaching students to be democratic citizens has the possibility of the aforementioned *provocation*—asking adolescents to not only learn the processes of democracy, but how to critically examine the democracy in which they live in order to make the best choices in leadership and challenge the status quo, leaning heavily towards the purpose of pedagogy discussed by Giroux (2002) and McLaren (2005), for example—that of challenging the status quo and oppressive practices. However, the

process of teaching a cultural narrative can be a process of *shelter* in that it generally offers students a story with which they can reconcile their place in society, at least for those in the majority—the trouble with the cultural narrative is that it often misplaces or leaves out altogether those in the minority (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Asking students to “buy into” the cultural narrative simultaneously asks them to not critically question the status quo. Williams (1961) named this narrative “selective tradition” for its ability to choose what teachers tell students about history in order to create the narrative.

The purpose of the narrative in discussing political trauma is much more than to learn *what happened*, but *what it means to us that it happened*. The use of emotion-laden words such as “terror,” “horrific,” “heroic,” and “justice” combined with calling the film “important” and explaining that the War on Terror protects “Americans at home and American ideals abroad” gives more than a descriptive narrative; it is one that intends to direct students’ thinking about the topic. There is no room for discussion of the events of the video in the curriculum, and certainly not for critical thinking. But then, critical thinking is not a purpose—providing a cultural narrative is.

Frameworks and Shelter

As noted in the second chapter, each program in this study has standards and objectives—some developed on their own, some taken from national programs like the Common Core or the National History Standards. However, the framework of curricula is different than objectives; it is the “lens” that the narrative is seen through, the pulling thread, the structure that supports the work towards, as Greene (1971) calls for, “occasions for ordering the materials of the world, for imposing configurations by

means of experiences and perspectives made available for personally conducted cognitive action” (p. 253). The framework also provides what Doll (1993) identifies as “relations,” both pedagogical and cultural—the connections teachers make under a common idea that give richness to the curriculum. In the end, the framework attempts to prohibit the meaninglessness of curriculum from a lack of integration, prevent it from being/becoming a list of facts or knowledge to be gained for no other purpose except itself (Greene, 1971).

In this curriculum integration, drawn from Jardine et al. (2004), the framework also provides a translational analogy for critical thinking. As described in the previous chapter, the Constitutional Rights Foundation provides the Constitution as a framework for discussing events of September 11, and the discussion of these events involves the application of concepts that span history. The week of the Boston Marathon bombing, Senator Lindsay Graham called for the designation of one of the bombers as an “enemy combatant”—the concept of which is covered in lessons described in Table 2. Students who have delved into the curricular narrative of the Constitutional Rights Foundation program are engaging in critical work that is not present in the September 11 Educational Trust program, which lacks a consistent framework.

The Device of Class Discussion

I return now to the first question of this chapter: If critical thinking is an objective, is open dialogue encouraged, or are questions still leading towards a desired way of thinking? How does open dialogue affect shelter? With only two exceptions, each of the curricula of this study call for classroom discussion. Inviting such discussion raises a

number of issues of comfort, knowledge construction, and value derivation.

Discussing controversy without causing controversy. Of the methods noted in controversial discussion literature [those that are a) from within the last twenty years and thus still likely to be used in the classroom and b) noted in other literatures as evidence of “best” practice], approximately half of them have in common the desire to avoid the difficulties noted earlier of teaching controversial issues in the classroom (e.g., arguments rather than discussion, emotional distress, and community backlash, among others) (Levison, 2006). In avoiding these issues, the strategies attempt to remove the controversy from controversial issues—that is, control the discussion to such an extent that such problems do not arise.

Clarke’s “Demystification Strategy” (2005) is very similar to that described in the September 11 Education Trust program and the WTC Tribute program. The strategy operates on the assumption that by relegating the discussion to just the facts and stripping away any ideology or bias, students can discuss a highly controversial topic without introducing any controversy into the discussion itself. The strategy operates on a four-question model:

1. What is the issue about?
2. What are the arguments?
3. What is assumed?
4. How are the arguments manipulated?

In discussing her model, she uses the example of Middle Eastern honor killings, showing how by sticking to the four questions, the students discuss the problem itself rather than their feelings about the problem. She argues that her model answers a need for:

an approach to teaching issues that overcomes the obstacles—specifically, a concern for the influence of a teacher’s own biases, a fear of becoming a

lightening rod for controversy oneself simply because a controversial issue is discussed in class, and a lack of confidence because of unfamiliarity with an issue (p.1-2).

In discussing “What is the issue about?” (question 1), Clarke posits that every controversial issue relates to three types of questions: values (What is best? What should be?), information (What is the truth?), and concepts (What does this mean? How should it be defined?). In question 2, students are asked to determine what the various arguments around a topic may be. In question 3, students define assumptions and prejudices that may be present within the topic, and in question 4, students determine the manipulations used by the sources of information about the topic.

Other models of discussing controversial topics also attempt to define a framework of inquiry that will work across any issue (e.g., Hendricks, Burkstrand-Reid, & Carbone, 2011; Levinson, 2006; Ravitch, 2002). For example, Levinson (2006) proposes to divide controversial questions into nine categories, ranging from those that are “answerable” to those that cannot ever be answered (due to lack of concrete evidence, or complete reliance on moral or religious conviction). His model attempts to approach each question depending on what category it falls into. Ravitch, on the other hand, recommended (in 2002) a model emphasizing patriotism in directing the discussion of controversial issues, no matter what the discussion pertains to. This model relates to the device of teacher choices as well; teachers try to neutralize the topics through these methods and thus take away the controversy while removing the purpose for critical thinking.

A third type of model of inquiry, synthesized from various pedagogical methodology by Hess (2002) in what she calls CPI (discussion of Controversial Public Issues),

emphasizes the teacher as questioner rather than font of knowledge, and thus places the instructor in the appearance of a neutral position. In her model, teachers use paedeia, public-issues discussions, and town hall meetings in order to organize their students to integrate CPI while the teacher only asks discussion-driving questions. In each method, the teacher finds him/herself more successful the fewer questions he/she asks, thus leaving most of the space for the students to talk to each other. Oulton et al. (2002) advocates for a similar model, incorporating role playing, student-led discussion, and resource-based learning into their models of discussing controversial issues in order to take on a neutral role.

What ties these models together is a desire to draw the discussion of the controversial topic away from the students' personal lives and towards an outside case that they can discuss with some neutrality. Clarke (2005) and Lusk and Weinberg (1994) both clearly point to using outside cases as a necessity in discussing controversial issues—assuming that if students are speaking of a case that is removed from their lives, the discussion will not become heated or uncomfortable, which is echoed in the teacher objectives described in the curricula that emphasize classroom discussion.

Discussing controversy while discussing oneself. An option for classroom discussion without sheltering critical thinking exists in models for teaching controversial issues by focusing directly on the beliefs and values of students themselves. Hedley and Markowitz (2001) attribute much of the difficulty of teaching controversial issues, especially in the case of those students who are resistant to the discussion, to the “norm/other” dichotomy they see in students. In their conception,

students come to their class with the idea that their ways of being and believing are the “norm,” while the beliefs and beings of those different from them are the “other,” and it is impossible to directly address controversial issues without overcoming that belief system. Thus, they begin their model by directly attacking that way of thinking by locating all problems within sociological discourse. In other words, they work with students to help them identify and understand their own moralities, then bringing them to the conclusion that their moralities are drawn from sociocultural norms they have been exposed to since birth rather than some ultimate truth of right and wrong. As a homework assignment, students are asked to write a “biography of belief,” tracing the reasons behind why they believe what they do.

When broaching controversial topics directly, especially those of a political nature, Hedley and Markowitz (2001) use the topic as the center of five different activities to help students approach the topic without falling into the norm/other trap:

- *Taking the other*—in this case, students are given a situation, asked to choose which actor in the situation they most identify with, and then told to take the role of another actor in order to try to identify feelings and actions that person may take.
- *Teacher as devil’s advocate*—in this activity, if the class seems to have come to a consensus on a certain action or position that should be taken with a particular controversial issue, the teacher presents the opposite position.
- *Mitigating circumstances*—in this exercise, the students are divided into small groups and asked to take a moral position on an activity (e.g., that not voting in an election is morally wrong because it fails the democracy as a whole). The group presents the position to another group, who then is charged with coming up with a justification for the action that has been labeled as wrong.
- *Gender atypical behavior*—for this assignment, students explore typical gender expectations and the role those expectations play in what they believe the outcomes of controversial issues should be.
- *Inequality as social policy*—this final activity directs the students away from moral analysis towards causal analysis, asking students to investigate particular social policies that relate to the controversial issue and how the policy may be causing social inequalities in the in the situation.

Hedley and Markowitz clearly state a social justice motivation behind their model, and their main purpose for discussing controversial issues in the classroom is to draw social justice beliefs from their students, rather than a primary purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the issue itself. MacIntyre's model of acts of empathetic conceptual imagination (as cited by Levinson, 2006) has a similar drive, asking students to place themselves imaginatively in opposing arguments and in cross-cultural dialogue in order to gain deeper understanding of social justice issues. Students are not sheltered in these models—their systems of values and beliefs are exposed for examination and reevaluation.

Other models emphasize the need to discuss controversial issues in order to learn skills to better oneself in a social justice vein. Bridges' communication across differences model (as cited by Levinson, 2006) lists six "communicative dispositions" that he believed were essential for having cross-cultural and global conversations: 1) procedural action, 2) moral obligations, 3) freedom, 4) equality, 5) respect, and 6) openness. Bridges believed that all of these dispositions applied in tandem could foster conversation with productive outcomes.

Levinson (2006) emphasized the process of examining the overlapping of narratives in finding common ground to discuss controversial issues. Rather than drawing students' attentions to an outside case to which they had no relation, Levinson believes the most productive conversations came from students creating their own narratives and then examining how they overlapped with one another to find common discussion points.

Sheltering for Nondemocratic Education in September 11 Curricula

Returning to Hess, Stoddard, and Hammer's (2011) idea of the act of teaching September 11's acting as "first-draft history" opens up a new area of investigation into how the individual student forms history while learning history, especially so close to the event. Assuming that this current generation of students (those who experienced high school history/humanities courses between 2002 and the present day) will very shortly be the policymakers, educators, and defenders of a not-too-distant American future, what Hess, Stoddard, and Hammer consider to be malleable will soon be solidified into a narrative that those students will use to inform America's foreign policy, homeland defense, and domestic multicultural relations, among other public policies. Several of the devices described in Chapter 3 are intended to affect this ethical subject.

It is likely that the cultural narrative of September 11 will change, especially as new information comes to light and new political lenses gain strength through new elections and shifts in power. Consider, for example, the effect of learning that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq had on the public perception of our war with that country—twice as many people called Iraq a war of choice rather than necessity after that revelation (Kull et al., 2006). A comparable example is that of teaching the Holocaust in American schools. The focus and political bias of the curriculum cycled repeatedly, from pro-German to anti-German, from a military perspective to humanistic, from no place in the curriculum to a prominent one (Beidler, 2010; Novick, 1999). Myriad factors determined these swings, including political influence and opening of records that brought new information to light.

However, several factors differentiate curriculum interpretation of the Holocaust from September 11, aside from the obvious differences in locality and time frame. A significant factor is dissemination of information—the difference in a society that received information over the course of days, weeks, and years versus one that received information instantaneously from a multitude of sources. This inundation of information that was often analyzed without careful consideration in a rush to be published emphasized a need for conviction. This conviction is later hard to relinquish when new information comes to light; Hess and Stoddard (2007) found that in 2005, four years after September 11, nearly half of all American adults believed that Saddam Hussein was involved in the attacks of September 11 despite all evidence to the contrary at that time. Thus, what teachers teach about September 11 now, while students are still forming opinions and the narrative is still malleable, creates a number of possibilities for what the body politic will shape itself to be (Slattery & Rapp, 2002).

Several problems present themselves in reading September 11 curriculum for political weight and ethic. There is the question of students' possession of or lack of civic literacy, the understanding of not only the history and facts of September 11 (if such things can be known), but also the power structures that worked within America's responses (Giroux, 2002). What understandings are students expected to have of the American political system when they address this curricula? Additionally, what political understandings do the curricula direct the students toward as they work with these curricula? Additionally, the decisions of what is done through the curricula must be interpreted through a historical recollection of schooling, which may highlight a disconnect from the curricula's stated purposes.

Unsheltered Democratic Education

Just as this study relies on the assumption that provoking critical thinking is preferable to suppressing it, it also relies on the value of democratic education, one that privileges education as a process of self-revelation, investigation, and engagement with one's peers and instructors (Pinar, 2010).

The definition of "democratic values" is difficult to delineate beyond Pinar's definition. As Price (2011) notes, echoing critical examinations such as Jaramillo (2010) and McNeill (2004), democracy can carry different implications and meanings, from the process of governing rooted in majority-ruled voting to the state of being discussed by Dewey. It can be a simple act at a ballot box or a belief system connected to social justice and progressive ideas of freedom (Macedo, 2003). It may be simplest to refer to Dewey's claim that "a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (1944, p. 87). Leahey (2011a) uses Dewey's principle to identify four tenets of democratic values in education:

1. Democratic education recognizes teachers and students as rational people who possess the capacity to make decisions, reflect on their experiences, think critically, and act.
2. Democratic education supports young people in developing value systems and drawing on those systems in creating knowledge and presenting arguments.
3. Democratic pedagogy charges students with the responsibility to participate in our nation's political system in meaningful ways.
4. Democratic education posits that (quoted from Schor, 1992 in Wood, 1998, p. 187), "alternative social arrangements to the status quo exist and are worthwhile." (p. 305-306)

Thus, "democratic" emphasizes specific values that were uncovered in the analysis of

the mission statements in Chapter 3. Readers see an emphasis on collectivism, tolerance, participation in a whole, and critique, opposing an emphasis on maintaining the status quo and competition to the top of a hierarchy.

Nondemocratic Education of September 11

The Fordham Institute is a conservative nonprofit institute in Washington D.C. that identifies education as suffering from a “dumbed-down curricula and weak instruction, and whose school systems are too often held hostage by adult interest groups, including but not limited to teacher unions” (Fordham, n.d., para. 1). In 2003 the Fordham Institute released a publication called *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy: What Our Children Need to Know*, a collection of essays that was intended to respond to curricula that it perceived as progressive in its coverage of the War on Terror. The Institute specifically called these curricula “relativistic, nonjudgmental (except about the United States), pacifist, and anything but patriotic” (Finn, 2003, p. 9, as quoted in Leahey, 2011b, p. 306). Several essays were written by high-profile conservative education reform advocates such as William Bennett, Lynne Cheney, and Sheldon Stern. The Fordham Institute (2003) describes the collection:

This new report from the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation includes the voices of 29 political leaders, education practitioners, and cultural analysts who discuss what schools should teach about U.S. History, American ideals, and American civic life in the wake of September 11, the war on terror, and the liberation of Iraq. (Fordham, Para. 1)

Christopher Leahey (2011b) evaluated *Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy* through a lens of democratic values, and found four themes that qualified its nondemocratic nature:

1. American exceptionalism is an appropriate framework from which to study international conflict;
2. The September 11 terrorist attacks were an attack on American democratic ideals;
3. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are supported by just war theory; and
4. The doctrine of preemption is the only viable solution to international terrorism. (p. 306)

Terrorists, Despots, and Democracy (TDD) is a well-known and influential policy document on teaching September 11, and a useful frame for identifying characteristics of nondemocratic September 11 curriculum that appeared in the mission statement.

Referring back to the nondemocratic values listed earlier (status quo, hard work, obedience, stability, sexual restraint, and individualism), several of them are apparent in the recommendations of *TDD*. The theory of American exceptionalism is a dramatic example of maintaining the status quo and erasing any question of whether America's actions are in the right because by definition America is inherently right. Status quo is also maintained through unquestioned acceptance of not only government policy, but the flaws in our policy that are dismissed as the acceptable collateral damage of our desirable system. Stability and individualism are two values implicit in the idea of needing to protect our values of individual liberty, prosperity through capitalism, and freedom of expression, and this is presented as the work of all Americans. Individualism and hard work are also intentional components of the competition required of capitalism practices that also go unchallenged in such conservative curricula.

Shelter and Rigidity of Nondemocratic Curricula

In theorizing the operation of shelter through democratic and nondemocratic value systems in curriculum, it is important to begin to recognize the variances in rigidity apparent between the two. If the concept of shelter includes the screening of ideas that may be disruptive or upsetting, then nondemocratic value systems may move into a more sheltering position than provocative ones. Eventually, the systems can act as sheltering because they can be construed as constant. However, democratic value systems are changing by nature, requiring democratic participation to define the morality that society will live by. This is an internal process rather than an external one. Thus, democratic value systems are less sheltering.

Regardless, an examination of the mission chart in Chapter 3 in terms of what is valued and what is expected of students shows just how difficult it is to define the values in September 11 curricula as democratic or nondemocratic. Many of the programs have elements of both; the September 11 Education Trust mission, for example, asks for students to engage in civic participation while also unifying in one narrative of the event, while the We the People program emphasizes both diversity and a commitment to a singular set of values. Even the 4Action program, which falls on the more progressive end of the spectrum, states a desire to support government policy against terrorism, indicating unilateralism rather than challenge. These mission statements are illustrative of how murky our own political aims are in society when it comes to students' education.

A rhetorical analysis of the curricula for this study revealed not only shelter in the passivity of the patriotism devices identified, but that there is a connection between the language used in describing America and activities of Americans—as well as in

describing the terrorist attacks—and the political value system connected with the curricula’s program missions.

In a reading provided by the September 11 Education Trust program, there is a judge quoted as describing the efforts of those people repairing New York as “herculean” (p. 68). This type of hyperbolic language is strongest in those curricula that have the most nondemocratic mission statements. The *Learn Our History* video portrays a teacher describing September 11 as the “one time” Americans have “all pulled together” in the face of adversity. *We the People* describes the first responders as “incredibly brave” and “heroic.” However, the more democratic curricula, even while describing the same events, is more likely to describe the actions of Americans in detail without using such language. The same is true for description of terrorist actions—the more nondemocratic the curriculum, the more likely it is to use words such as “monstrous,” “horrific,” and “devastating.”

A similar connection can be made between the images and descriptions of September 11 used in the curricula and the curricula’s value systems. The most democratic of the curricula, *Voices for Peace*, does not describe the terrorist attacks on September 11 at all, choosing instead to move on to how the aftermath was dealt with. Additionally, there are no images in the curricula. *America Responds* (PBS) does include images of the attacks in its video, but the lesson plans do not, and the students are asked to research the events on their own rather than read descriptions provided directly in the lesson plans. The 4Action and Choices curricula are similar in choosing not to describe the attack, but rather the aftermath from it. The Constitutional Rights Foundation takes a

different path, bringing up constitutional issues that relate to America's response to September 11, but using case studies from earlier in history.

However, the nondemocratic curricula rely heavily on images and description in their lesson plans. The September 11 Memorial, WTC Fund, September 11 Education Trust, and *We the People* units all use similar pictures of the towers after the planes hit and first responders at the scene in activities for students to examine. The first three all include the same image, one that has become iconic in September 11 imagery, that of firemen raising the American flag in the rubble of the World Trade Center. The *Learn Our History* video includes a scene of the students watching the planes hit the towers during their time-travel visit. Both the September 11 Memorial and September 11 Curricula use the same detailed timeline for students to read, depicting a moment-by-moment account of the events of September 11, from the first plane that hit the tower until Flight 93 crashed in Pennsylvania, and the September 11 Education Trust program comes with a DVD with oral history videos and news footage from the scene of each plane crash. Thus, patriotic, nondemocratic curriculum programs shelter students by not only directing students' knowledge of the events but also their emotions about the events, exposing them to specific images and languages to affect their own cultural narratives about what happened on September 11.

The irony of teaching American exceptionalism as part of September 11 curricula is that, considering the core belief of the theory, one would think that it would be a concept that would not need to be taught at all. If America is truly exceptional as the most nondemocratic of the curricula asserts—"America's greatness"—then that exceptionalism would likely be self-evident. Consequentially, the more nondemocratic

the value system of the curriculum, the less trust the program places in the student to come to that conclusion on her own. Instead of presenting a framework of investigating September 11 through a historical or cultural context, these curricula use heavy-handed language and shocking images to steer students toward believing in America's greatness and singularity in how it handled the attacks, and by extension, its ongoing military response.

However, perhaps the ethic of the curricula is most difficult to unravel in those that are on the middle of the spectrum, those that have missions with elements of critical civic literacy and strong conservative value systems: the programs from the September 11 Education Trust, September 11 Memorial, and Tribute WTC. These are the curricula that simultaneously ask students to both become active participants in their democracy while honoring America's efforts without questioning them, to balance believing in America's superiority while still showing cultural sensitivity to Muslim countries, to spend time evaluating their own beliefs and values while still expecting them to arrive at America's so-called fundamental values in the end.

Conclusion

The devices of shelter in the September 11 curricula of my study have consequences beyond that of knowledge not learned—students who are sheltered may also forgo opportunities for emotional and intellectual growth, as well as the benefits of a democratic education. However, risks of not sheltering are also attendant across the three themes discussed above: Students may be exposed to concepts and images that are more troubling than enlightening; classroom discussion that is open without being

supported can invite discourse that devolves into arguments based on prejudice and misunderstanding, becoming more hurtful than expansive.

At the end of this analysis, I return to my Chapter 1 assertion that shelter cannot be identified on its own as *good* or *bad*, *educative* or *indoctrinating*. Shelter that works through frameworks may actually encourage critical thinking through screening out extraneous information and giving students the time and inroads to think deeply about one aspect of September 11 rather than the overwhelming task of trying to tackle the enormity of terrorism against America as a whole. Moreover, using the device of hyperbolic language or that of focusing on patriotism can discourage democratic discourse and critical thinking.

Considering the effects of shelter, all the more importance is placed on teacher choice as a device. As the teacher is the mediator of the curriculum and is the one person with specific knowledge of his students' emotional maturity and preparedness for critical discourse, as well as the safe space of his classroom, and he has the most effect by his own choices—not only which curriculum to use to teach September 11, but whether to shelter his students from or expose students to aspects of each of the curricula.

CHAPTER 5

RETHINKING SHELTER AS A NEW DEVICE

We are already confronted, notably in advanced democracies, with prepolitical and transpolitical experiences that render obsolete any appeal for a normative conscience or for a return to the reason/revelation duo. ~Julia Kristeva, 2007

Introduction

In the last three chapters, I have identified eight devices of shelter and analyzed them in terms of the pathways of the intellectual (through critical thinking), the moral (through democratic and nondemocratic education), and the emotional (through care ethic and the weight of responsibility). In analyzing shelter as potentially good or bad, I have found the concept of “shelter” throughout these chapters has shown itself to be sometimes fluid, and sometimes even elusive, in terms of identifying how it operates and affects the transmission of the curricula. Actual critical thinking could be proven to be provocative, but various strong frameworks within the curricula provided a shelter that may be actually positive in that it stops the epistemological overflow that students encounter from curricula with weak or no frameworks and gives them a clear space from which to work through their own ideas. A passivity was identified through curricula with nondemocratic ethics, sheltering students from decision-making and the need to examine their own value systems. However, the information that students were

exposed to throughout those curricula could prove to break through the very shelter that the ethics systems were trying to provide, thus rendering the shelter ineffective. Finally, little attention is given to students' emotional well-being in terms of exploring a political trauma such as September 11. Through this lens, the shelter perhaps could have been most apparent in providing teachers with specific methods of protecting students from emotionally traumatic images and information, yet that shelter was largely absent. Additionally, in the choices the programs made in privileging certain types of questions over others, students can be even further exposed. They face an immediacy of threat to their security, simultaneously discovering the inadequacies of the government that runs their lives while expected to do better for their society in the future. This analysis highlighted a shift in ideas from the focus on the student as an individual to the focus on the student as a subject moving through constantly changing ways of thinking and modes of acting through various ethical and emotional realms.

Shelter as a mechanism in curriculum is particularly neither good nor bad, educative or restrictive, in its own right. Rather, the use of shelter can be restrictive to a student's ability to think critically and examine subjects through an inquiry-based process if the mechanism is implemented as a way to withhold certain information or force a student's direction of thinking to a predetermined end. Shelter may actually encourage critical thinking or greater depth of inquiry if it is used to provide a framework for students to think about a subject but does not limit the information they may use. Shelter may also protect and support a student emotionally while he is grappling with a difficult topic. Thus, what is important about the nature of shelter is ultimately the pedagogical motivation behind the curriculum that practices it.

What I have attempted to do in identifying mechanisms of shelter in these chapters through analysis of larger themes is shy away from endorsing or discouraging shelter in itself, considering how fluid the concept turned out to be throughout the work. As explained in each chapter, I found shelter to be positive in areas and negative in others. This leaves me with a final question of what the fluidity of shelter as a concept *means* in future work. I have spent the last three chapters identifying varying discourses in September 11 curricula and what those curricula accomplish in relation to the student. The last chapter of the dissertation should, typically (according to, e.g., Cresswell, 2002; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012), synthesize the analysis and make recommendations for future work in the writer's area, whether it be likely future research directions or new work in the same type of curriculum study.

However, the possibilities that I would like to discuss in this chapter do not fit into that typical box of "future recommendations." I find my analysis to be problematic in various areas, with multiple holes in what I have found. Primarily, my original concept of shelter has metamorphosed throughout the chapters. I began with a negative interpretation of shelter, only to find that there are positive aspects to it that may outweigh the negative. In the same vein, the concept of "first-draft history" (Hess, Stoddard, & Hammer, 2011) that I broached as part of the background to my central question has proven to be much more significant throughout the work than I originally saw it to be. This concept of "first-draft history," which by definition should be revisable and malleable, has been shown in the curricula to bounce back and forth between a certainty of fact and an uncertainty of purpose. What I will do in this conclusion, then, is use a Kristevan theoretical grounding to explore the possibilities of the fluidity of the

concepts I have analyzed. I use Kristeva's theories to undo three "certainties" I found in my analysis, raising not only questions, but the possibility of retaining them as questions in the action of shelter.

The Certainty Problem

The current paradigm of American education is one of certainty; standardized testing programs are at the center of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which authorizes funding for public schools, and those schools have to meet certain score levels in order to get this funding (ESEA, 2002). The majority of the standardized tests are written by one company—Pearson—and the tests are either multiple choice or essay response that are graded on a standardized rubric (Singer, 2012). This testing focus has contributed to what Taubman (2009) has termed an "audit culture"—students only matter in terms of what score they obtain, and teachers are judged on how their students do on tests they did not prepare. This audit culture has emphasized certainty in education; there are right answers students must learn for the test, so teachers must know those right answers and teach to them, rather than encouraging a democratic inquiry in the classroom.

The audit culture is exemplified in the Common Core State Standards, a national set of standards for k-12 language arts and math (with science and social studies to follow in 2014) that have been adopted by 46 states. President Obama's Race to the Top initiative requires adoption and implementation of the Common Core standards, and Pearson was instrumental in the development of the standards and the first standardized tests

that have been designed to align with them (Singer, 2012). The curricula of this study that were written after 2010 are aligned with the Common Core standards.

The alignment with these standards is antithetical to the use of democratic discourse in the classroom, and the audit culture is instrumental in impeding what Grumet (2010) describes as the “citizen teacher,” one who is involved in developing the practices of his or her school and thoughtfully encourages inquiry-based learning. Much of the shelter that takes place in the curricula removes autonomy from the teacher: definition and closed narratives determine the direction of the story of September 11, while discussion questions with predetermined answers remove the teacher from the inquiry altogether. In these cases, students are subjected to the banking model of education, in which information is deposited rather than acquired.

The Need for Uncertainty in a First Draft

I explained that the teaching of political trauma has shown change over time. Using the example of the Holocaust and Holocaust education, methods, content, and thematics have shifted over the decades it has been a topic in the classroom (e.g. Juzwick, 2009). However, a shift in education policy and the changes brought about in society as a whole after September 11 have coincided in a change in how trauma is handled in the classroom over the past thirteen years. The No Child Left Behind Act (PL 107-110 of 2001) changed the focus of schooling in several ways key to this study: 1) knowledge and skills that could be tested through standardized assessments were made mandatory over more esoteric goals of teaching, 2) character education became a mandated part of state curriculum, and 3) nationalized “citizenship” education through

We the People was made available to all schools. The Common Core Standards (CCSI, 2012) added further layers of standardization and a focus on “college and career readiness” rather than democratic citizenship and the emotional being of the child. It has become more difficult to work with material that is not explicitly called for in mandated curricula, and as pointed out in Chapter 1, only 22 states mandate study of September 11 at this time. In other traumatic situations that have happened since, including Hurricane Katrina and the shootings in Newtown, teachers have found it increasingly difficult to find the space to address their students’ needs, whether emotional, intellectual, or moral (Weems et al., 2009).

As students grapple with a curriculum that is becoming more standardized and, by proxy, requiring more certainty in their responses, they are meeting a society today in 2013 that has been feeling uncertainty since the events of September 11. America has been at war in Afghanistan for nearly twelve years, with no consistent progress or improvement of the situation there and no identifiable security improvements at home. Our political leaders have become dysfunctional; America is now experiencing a “sequester”—severe budget cuts, including cuts to social programs that provide safety to millions of children, brought about by Congress’s inability to come to terms on something as basic as a budget (Yellin & Cohen, 2013). In the past four years, 530 youth under the age of 21 have died from gunshot wounds in Chicago alone, yet policymakers are stymied over the issue of gun control (Lydersen & Ortiz, 2012).

What is perhaps most problematic in the use of standardized curricula that emphasizes a binary—an answer is either right or wrong—is in the certainty of the answers that are required, disregarding how those answers may have changed over

time. This same binary is reflected in education reform literature—in other words, what teachers are doing in the classroom now, whether politically or pedagogically, is wrong, but there is a definitive answer of what would be *right*. This can be equally true of a democratically and social-justice oriented method of education that is described in detail in many of the literatures of political pedagogy (e.g. Westheimer, 2011; Roberts & Steiner, 2010). This certainty seems to contradict the idea of “first-draft history.” As noted in Chapters 1, one of the negative aspects of teaching “first-draft history” is that what Americans know about the event, as well as the meaning of what they know, is changing on a constant basis, thus certainty can lead to misunderstandings in the future. It also rings false against the very uncertainty students face every day in their society.

The problem runs deeper than just coming to understandings that may be based on information or facts that prove to be false in the future. To explain the difficulty I am trying to approach, I offer this illustration.

In my first semester of graduate school (2008), I co-wrote a paper with a fellow student on the value systems of globalization of higher education. We worked diligently on the paper for a year, but then our lives and research agendas took separate directions, and we left the paper behind. Four years later, I picked the paper back up again because a publication was looking for one on the same topic. I spoke with my coauthor about it, and we both read the paper again to see if we would want to submit it. Aside from a few references that would need to be updated through future research, the paper was still factually correct, to the best of our knowledge. However, my coauthor’s views of higher education had evolved in a different direction over the last

several years, and he decided he no longer wanted to pursue the paper.

This evolution of thought brings me back to the original meaning of “first draft,” that which is to be revised not only for grammar or facts, but also for new ways of thinking and new understandings that the author has reached. Our view of the purpose in teaching of the Holocaust has changed over the course of decades, from a military intervention to a social ill to a human-rights issue. However, the Holocaust was not taught immediately after it happened, but rather began to be taught two decades later. September 11, in contrast, entered the classroom immediately after it occurred. What I was looking for as a possibility, then, was a theory that would retain a sense of uncertainty rather than certainty, one that would privilege a student’s questioning of aspects of the event over his coming to answers for it. I also wanted to explore the possibility of studying a subject while keeping one’s interpretations and applications of values in flux, a thought process that might support a student’s journey through the hypocrisies and insecurities of today’s political reality better than one of certain answers.

Julia Kristeva and Work-in-Process

Julia Kristeva is perhaps most well known for her work with language in *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984). She identifies language and the human psyche as composed of the semiotic and the symbolic. Her work can be described (Wang, 2010) as bringing the body back into the symbolic:

The semiotic refers to tones, rhythms, and traces of language which are characterized by mobility, polyvalence and instability; in the human psyche, the semiotic is the repressed, unconscious other, which is oriented to the maternal body. The archaic memory is closely associated with the semiotic flow. The

symbolic refers to the structure, grammar, or syntax of language, conscious judgment, which is linked to the paternal law. The semiotic has the potential to challenge the symbolic order, but the symbolic regulates the semiotic fluidity. *These two aspects are always combined and cannot exist without the other.* (emphasis mine) (2010, p. 376).

Thus, the essence of Kristeva is bringing the body back into the language and the human psyche, and she privileges the maternal body as the site for creativity but the paternal for separation and independence. This is significant in the connection of the psyche to the interaction through language, and one's need to retain the idea of the body in discourse.

In the essay "Word, Dialogue, and Novel" (1966), Kristeva deconstructs the discourse theory of Bakhtin, identifying words not as concrete symbols with fixed meanings but rather an "intersection of textual surfaces" (p. 36) constantly subject to reinterpretation. Kristeva identifies the space among the subject speaking, the person addressed, and the object of discussion as a space of cultural and historical context. Thus, Kristeva sees a sense of intertextuality working in language that I found useful in examining the texts for this study. Her (1966) notion of "ambivalence," drawn from Bakhtin, when discussing language in historical context, seems applicable to the discussion of multiple interpretations of texts regarding the subject of discourses of September 11:

Any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double....The term "ambivalence" implies the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history. (p. 37-39)

In the case of ambivalence, it is impossible to remove the text from its historical or social context, and in the case of September 11, the mission and dates of the curricula

are crucially important in how students come to read them. Students who are learning from a curriculum written in 2003 will not be able to have the same interaction with the text as they would had it been written in 2011.

However, it is Kristeva's notion of subject-in-process that is most relevant to this study. Kristeva's "subject" in language and thought is continually "in-process"—no subject (the person inscribed through body and linguistics) can be refined to a singular thesis that is static (Lechte & Margaroni, 2004). This determination of the subject highlights its extreme subjectivity and constant movement, incorporating cultural and historical contexts as well as psyche.

This philosophy of subject-in-process has particular possibilities in how scholars view the educated subject (Stone, 2004). The significance of the subject-in-process in movement to the political is essential to this study is described in *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984). Kristeva highlights the essentialness of the speaking subject that participates in discourse with the object and the other of dialogue in forming an ever-changing gestation of being, rather than a soul that operates on stagnant theses constantly reinterpreted by the one who is dialoguing with her.

The larger notion Kristeva (2002) derives that leads her to a political turn is the idea that the intimate revolt of internal process brings us to a universal sense. Each subject struggles with the same type of internal questioning of the conclusions one draws from the dialogue with another, and that questioning develops who one is as subject as a dynamic definition. While the questions one poses may be different, the process is the same in each subject. Thus, the intimate and the universal are one and the same, as the questioning connects subjects to one another on a human level. As Winfield (2010)

notes, subjects may presume to be immune to historical consciousness, but they are not. Scholars need to include the cultural contexts present and examine the way they work through time. What subjects experience on an intimate level is tantamount to a universal occurrence, and can be deployed globally.

In the following sections, I use several of Kristeva's ideas to unravel some of the certainties I found in the curricula of the study, and show how the uncertainties can be seen as shelter that is beneficial. I purposely end each section with a question, my own uncertainty, which I find I need to let stand in order to honor the subject.

Reaching for the Unanswerable

As shown in Chapter 3, regardless of the presence or absence of critical thinking in the objectives of the curricula, students are expected to come to a conclusion depending on the topic of study, whether it be the constitutionality of the Patriot Act or the justness of the U.S. foreign-policy response to the attacks of September 11. The search for these meanings is very much aligned with Kristeva's view of our purpose as human as in process of internal revolt (2007, p. 220), she argues for the need to question above all the processes being imposed on the subject, and the political implications of the aforementioned policy on one's personal freedoms is central to such questioning. The difficulty emerges in the lack of time given to students to interrogate these questions as quests for meaning as opposed to gathering information to fulfill an assignment. As Kristeva (2007) notes, "What matters is that from the outset the thinking subject should connect his thought to his being in the world through an affective 'transference' that is also political and ethical" (p. 220). This is a process that requires time and individuality

of action, neither of which are allowed by the curricula.

In Kristeva's book *Intimate Revolt* (2002), she describes her idea of revolt as one very different from the vernacular (e.g., the overthrowing of a government in favor of another). Kristeva rejects the idea of throwing out current systems in favor of new ones as revolt (p. 6); she argues that as the new system is already in mind at the time of revolution, it is not a true questioning and rejection but rather a change in status from one thing to another. Rather, she points to the original roots of revolt and how they are shared with a return, in the sense that revolting is an individual, internal process of reviewing what one has done before and continually questioning one's values and beliefs. She looks to Sartre for a full freedom in questioning (p. 153) without outside constraints or societal pressures of "propriety." Kristeva's notion of revolt emphasizes the intimacy of the process and thus the need for an investigation of one's inner self. These revolts, or questionings of oneself, bring about greater self-awareness along with deeper understandings and, if done over a wide scale, can be a universal political movement. Kristeva (2003) claims that the current age demands "a politics based upon therapeutic patience" (p. 25)— a post-group revolution into one of intimate revolt.

What education contributes to this intimate revolt is an extended dialogue beyond that of the student's peers. Essential to the revolt is the dialogue that adds new perspective to fold into the questioning, and education can exist to provide those perspectives, assuming they are not presented as certainties.

Integral to this idea of intimate revolt is Kristeva's assertion that negation is necessary to the subject-in-process. Smith (1996) interprets Kristeva's work in this area as grounded in negativity; i.e., there is no possibility of revolt within the subject that is

non-antagonistic and there is no positive way to bring about revolution. Kristeva discusses the idea of a “death drive” in *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984) that the subject struggles against—this tension causes a reactivism, a greater life. This struggle is considered political (Lechte & Margaroni, 2004); there is a violence in this tension that causes political shift and, if the intimate is the universal, the possibility for widespread reimaginings of the societal landscape.

However, returning to the lesson I highlighted in Chapter 3, in those curricula that ask students to decide *among* several policy choices for that most beneficial to America, the brevity of the lessons (90 minutes from the beginning of the reading time, through discussion, to the presentation of the policy choice) highlights just how little space students are provided to work through their own intimate revolts in terms of their belief systems for America’s relationship with the global community. In practice, there is no space for questioning whatsoever—students are given a problem and directed to find a solution, rather than allowed an investigation of the problem itself for its roots and context. Kristeva (2002) directs us in this way: “Today, psychical life knows that it will only be saved if it gives itself the time and space of revolt: to break off, remember, refashion” (p. 223). Today’s classroom of scripted curricula, segmented days, and predetermined answers cannot provide such a space. In what way can teachers provide students that kind of psychical space?

Moralism and the Recognition of the Foreign

The moralism of the intimate revolt transitions well into the idea of the recognition of the foreign. Kristeva (2002) notes the moralism she finds inherent in the

psychoanalysis described in *Intimate Revolt* and its connection to political life. Rather than moralism being imposed by the state, it is come to by the individual through her own internal struggle, one that never ends (p. 234). This investigation into oneself unearths the unknown/stranger, which in turn brings about the recognition of the foreign. The work I discuss here is drawn from Kristeva's *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991). Kristeva discusses the idea of the foreign as a concept that grows from the unknown within ourselves:

A foreigner seldom arouses the terrifying anguish provoked by death, the female sex, or the "baleful" unbridled drive. Are we nevertheless so sure that the "political" feelings of xenophobia do not include, often unconsciously, that agony of frightened joyfulness that has been called *unheimlich*, that in English is *uncanny*, and the Greeks quite simply call *xenos*, "foreign"? In the fascinated rejection that the foreigner arouses in us, there is a share of uncanny strangeness in the sense of the depersonalization that Freud discovered in it, and which takes up again our infantile desires and fears of the other—the other of death, the other of woman, the other of uncontrollable drive. **The foreigner is within us.** And when we flee from or struggle against the foreigner, we are fighting our own unconscious. (emphasis hers, bolding mine) (p. 191).

Kristeva uses this theory to interpret a several-thousand-year-long history of both xenophobia and xenophilia in society, from the Greeks and the barbarians to the persecution of the Jews as the "chosen people." Recognition of the concept allows for a fuller acceptance of those foreign to us and opens up the space for cosmopolitan frames of reference.

This concept is exceptionally important in the curricula of September 11, but I found it to be absent. As shown in Chapters 3 and 4, the Muslim, Afghan, and Taliban populations are regularly conflated into one. In the more democratic curricula that ask students to research the Afghan peoples (the *NYT Learning Network*, 4Action, and *Voices for Peace*, for example), the study is focused on the hardships that Afghanistan

suffered during the early part of the decade and the suffering they continue through today. Students working with these lesson plans are put in a place of power over the Afghans, placed in the position of those who pity the foreigners in the Middle East. There is no interrogation of our relation to those people or from where students' ideas of "foreign" originate. In fact, in some ways we celebrate our own foreignness similarly to the way that Kristeva describes, in the context of the Jews in Egypt. Part of the American narrative, as described in Chapter 3, is our escape from the tyranny of England and our striking out on our own, tied only by our American exceptionalism, which is viewed very similarly to the Jews' covenant with G-d. However, it is that exceptionalism and not our differences that we celebrate.

Kristeva's emphasis in *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991)—drawn from Freud's notions of our own disintegration that causes us to reject those who seek to become part of us, as well as the Oedipal complex as noted above—is that we identify the foreign because we are not entirely comfortable with the unknown we see in ourselves. Thus, by identifying what we are not, we can comfort ourselves with what we are. Varsamopoulou (2009) identifies four principles of what she terms Kristeva's cosmopolitanism, which show a very different mode of being:

1. Primacy of the individual
2. Reciprocal recognition of another's equal worth
3. Noncoercive political practice
4. A say in the practice for all who are affected by it (p. 29)

Cosmopolitanism can be defined as "the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this

community should be cultivated (Stanford, 2006). Kristeva's cosmopolitanism derives from a human history of not only identifying the foreign, but also subjugating those we make foreign, as she illustrates by describing the relationships with the Greeks and barbarians (p. 54). In the chapter of *Strangers to Ourselves* entitled "By What Right Are You a Foreigner?," Kristeva recounts the history of the identification of the foreign in European culture and implicates this identification in a separation of rights of people—the rights of the *man* and the rights of the *citizen*. The rights of man—the right to life, to pursue a means to wealth, to move unmolested through the city whether foreign or not—were subsumed by the rights of the *citizen*—the right to vote, to inherit property, and in some cases, to marry freely. The development of Kristeva's ideas of cosmopolitanism were founded on the question of the right to vote. The binary argument she identifies is this: A man cannot ensure his rights as man without the right to participate in his political system, but the political system cannot guarantee the sanctity of that system if foreigners (noncitizens) are given the vote. However, this question is what brings about cosmopolitanism as a solution—if the question is faced and parsed with the understanding of our own embedded foreignness, we will come to agree on cosmopolitanism. What Kristeva provides is the concept of one's agency in deciding what is foreign, and what inside of us connects with the foreign we identify.

These ideas are not the basis of the discussion of foreign peoples that I describe above. If students are asked to research the populations that contained the terrorists involved in September 11, they are directed toward the place of pitying rather than the empathy suggested by Zembylas (2008a) or equality called for by Kristeva in these ideas of cosmopolitanism. Kristeva suggests that until we understand our own

foreignness, and the artificiality of the barriers that we have identified *among* us and other people, we will not progress to a more universal concept of society.

A recurring theme in my analysis of shelter in Chapters 3 and 4 is the direction of how students are to view the events of September 11 and the strong narratives that appear in many of the curricula. What is interesting in considering Kristeva's theory is that there is a possibility for the idea of the foreign to be redirected. As the foreign is something that actually comes from strangeness within, then the idea of what is strange can be theoretically disrupted. I return to the *We the People* curriculum for this concept; the narrative is written in first person plural, as highlighted in Chapter 1, and the emphasis is on having the student understand the common fundamental values that Americans hold. However, students could approach the narrative from a standpoint of comparing themselves to those who wrote it, or those who are quoted in it (e.g., Jefferson, Washington, Franklin, and others) and identify the foreignness of those to themselves.

Similarly, students could interrogate the authors of the curriculum and how they find themselves to perhaps be different in their value systems and ways of thinking, thus separating themselves from the curriculum altogether as part of themselves. In what way can we provide a space for students to challenge those they believe to be the same as themselves, and to find the foreign instead?

Ingesting Violence... and Undoing the Normalizing Order

In a movement toward the unknown, Kristeva's work on the subject has interesting implications in terms of the study of the tragedy of September 11. *Revolutions in Poetic*

Language (1984), in foregrounding the negativity of the subject-in-process, shows that a violence takes place in the process of semiotic and symbolic, a violence that is to be taken in rather than directed outward. Violence is an unavoidable aspect of life, as Lechte and Margaroni (2004) suggest:

The invitation to incorporate/ingest a form of violence that is traditionally directed “outside” is also important, however, for any attempt to reconceptualize postmodern politics. Not only because, as we have come to realize [through Kristeva], the formation of new, empowering allegiances cannot ignore the challenge of our responsibility towards the other, but also because we cannot continue to regard violence as an “aberraton”(sic) that a renewed modernity or a dialogic postmodernity can hope to control or leave behind. (p. 28)

Kristeva’s *Powers of Horror* (1982) investigates our interaction with the abjection in society, and the effects of trauma are threaded throughout various aspects of her other works (e.g., *Strangers to Ourselves*, *Intimate Revolt*). *Powers of Horror* connects to an earlier notion of the embodiment of the subject; the emotional, moral, and intellectual are all symbolized through language and are inextricable from one other. Kristeva recognizes the draw we have to what she terms the “abject”—“that of being opposed to I” (emphasis hers) (p. 1). In *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva broaches subjects that are repulsive: feces, corpses, incest, and Auschwitz. Terrorism would almost assuredly be seen as an abjection, or the commission of violence against the innocent, acting for the most impact through bloodshed and carnage. Yet Kristeva inextricably links us with the abject, defining it as “something rejected from which one does not part, from which one does not protect oneself as from an object. Imaginary uncanniness and real threat, it beckons to us and ends up engulfing us” (p. 4). While we run the risk of being destroyed by the abject, we are drawn to it as a means to define ourselves by when we turn from it.

In Chapter 3 of this study, I reviewed the mission statements of the September 11 curricula. However, in using the lens of Kristeva's work, the possibility must be broached that we bring September 11 into the classroom in part because of this draw to the abject. Kristeva speaks to the sacredness of the taboo: the need to discuss the unbroachable to better understand our own humanity. In doing so, Kristeva recognizes the fear of approaching the abject, the fear of loss of control, of trying to name the unnamable, of recognizing our own capacity to do harm in trying to understand the harm others have caused (p. 36-38). But these fears strengthen the argument for dialogue of the abject rather than the argument for sheltering against it. Kristeva emphasizes the self-protection that comes from applying language to the abject, creating a metaphor for that which horrifies us that allows us to process it within ourselves.

The understanding of the abject, in Kristeva's view in *Powers of Horror*, illuminates the idea that "suffering is the place of the subject" (p. 141). Suffering is part of the universal of the subject-in-process, and connecting that suffering calls for a use of language so strongly that she terms it a "crying-out theme" (p. 142). At this point, Kristeva emphasizes the need for those exposed to the abject to create a narrative for themselves. This is different from the acceptance of the narrative provided as described in Chapter 2; rather, the actual act of recounting one's own experience gives the distance and the language one needs to quiet the horror of the abject. This is reminiscent of Kelly Oliver's (1991) concept of bearing witness and the necessity thereof, and has interesting implications for what we ask our students to do with the material they witness.

What happens when the narratives diverge? Part of the idea of the democracy of the multiples that Kristeva (2007) emphasizes means allowing for multiculturalism and multiplicity of ideas. She says, "It is to this space that the parent, teacher, and intellectual are being called. While insisting on pragmatism and generosity from the political spheres, we ourselves must come up with ideals adapted to modern times and the multiculturalism of souls" (p. 225). The difficulty in this paradigm brings us back to *Powers of Horror*. If we are drawn to the abject, we need a way to process that in the classroom.

The possibilities of teaching September 11 can run to the gruesome. Considering how open the sources are for many of the curricula, and asking students to research a variety of topics on the web, it is not inconceivable that a student may take a particular interest in the macabre aspects of the tragedy. One of the lessons in the September 11 Education Trust curriculum asks students to read about the process of recovering remains of bodies in excavations following the original rescue attempts at Ground Zero. A student may decide to do a project exploring that topic further, finding pictures of body parts, researching how long a person can breathe in a collapsed building, or collecting film clips of people dying as they fell from the buildings during September 11.

Another consideration is the constantly-changing curriculum agendas pushed through various state and district entities. In the month of February, 2013, alone, three states have adopted measures allowing for the teaching of creationism alongside evolution, and Texas history books have excised various revolutionary leaders that did not fit within a white cultural narrative. To some, these developments may evoke the same feelings of abjection as the ones named by Kristeva.

Kristeva, in the recognition of the foreign, finds that we need new ideals adapted to the multiculturalism of modern times (2007). She sees both a dynamic tension between the individual and the community (Varsamopoulou, 2009) as well as a lack of higher authority in the traditional deity sense (Kristeva, 2006) that did not occur in previous histories. Because the individual is a subject-in-process, and is given primacy in Kristevan theory, normalizing practices are counterproductive and repressive. We must find a place for the abject, whether emotionally or morally repulsive, in the uncertainty of education, without sheltering by imposing our own value systems. Is it possible to find a space to recognize the validity of work teachers may find repulsive while not endorsing it or risking the sensibilities of another student?

The Shelter of Uncertainty and a New Curriculum

In an interview entitled, "Why the United States?" (orig. 1977; rep. 1986), Kristeva said that she thought that the United States is in a constant state of what we would call trauma management:

I feel that American capitalism...is a system of permanent recuperation, of patching up of crisis. Here I don't mean to be pejorative, but rather want to convey a sense of the most livable possibility of survival. I seemed to perceive in the economic and political logic of America a new way of dealing with the law, with the increasingly brutal economic and political constraints which are inevitable in any society, and all the more so in a technocratic system.... In America, though, it seems to me that opposition to constraint is not unique, isolated, and centralized, but is polyvalent in a way that undermines the law without attacking it head-on...it avoids developing into paranoia and the confrontation of two laws, equally sure of itself but fascinated by and internalizing the other. (p. 274)

While Kristeva makes many other observations of America in this interview that have withstood the test of time—our reliance on images and gestures rather than language,

the decline of the admiring of the intellect, and the persistence of a historical vision that begins with the formation of the country—this particular observation is interesting in that it would seem our “permanent recuperation” has led us to exactly what Kristeva said we were avoiding at the time, “a paranoia and the confrontation of two laws, equally sure of itself but fascinated by and internalizing the other.”

The term “permanent recuperation” brings to mind our state of consciousness since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Curricula for September 11 began appearing as soon as two months after the attacks, and nearly immediately there began an argument between conservative and progressive educators as to what the “law” of this type of education would be. The political system we encounter now is very similar: red states and blue states, Republicans and Democrats, “equally sure of” themselves but each unable to convince the other, to the point that the feeling of attack has shifted from outside to within. There seems to be a belief that comfort can be found in certainty. What I have tried to show here is the opposite.

The previous three sections are purposely ended with questions. In the analysis of the middle three chapters of this study, the idea of shelter transformed from something that prohibited students from interrogating the subject of September 11 to a mechanism for supporting such interrogation through strong frameworks and support for emotional space. What Kristeva’s subject-in-process idea of the individual as universal provides is a different type of shelter, but one that is no less valuable. This is the shelter of the “first” of the “first draft history,” a protection of a space for freedom of discovery and a continual investigation of morality, protected from certainty and protected from the pressure on curriculum to box students into a single answer. If we ignore the value of

such uncertainty, and leave it open to destruction, we risk fulfilling the prophecy

Kristeva gives in the end of *Intimate Revolt* (2002):

America, this America that I love, that no longer has adversaries and that tends to silence its opponents, is in the midst of becoming the Fourth Rome: after Byzantium and Moscow. In the new world order, America imposes an oligarchy that is at once monetary, economic, and cultural, whose label is liberalism but whose risk is the exclusion of a certain human freedom. (p. 268)

What I am arguing for, then, in the end of this study, is a deliberate shelter from certainty. The central question of this study—that of the nature of shelter in September 11 curricula—is largely a question of what America decides is available to the teacher and what is not in working with her students. In the current paradigm of September 11 education, information, including counternarratives, images, and discussion from students, is screened out through devices. The decision of what students are sheltered from is made by the authors of the curricula, with the exception of modifications teachers might make to them.

If curricula is meant to improve the conversation students have with the world, if it is a course of life study rather than just lesson plans for the classroom, shelter could be used instead to screen out elements of certainty from being imposed on the classroom. I am asking for a curriculum that provides the space to investigate the questions posed in this chapter. I am not suggesting a curriculum dependent solely on essential questions, but rather one that provides information and support for students to develop their own questions based on their own in-process natures. A Kristevan curriculum for September 11 would implement shelter in the following areas:

Time. Jardine's curricular integration requires an inroad to the curriculum students can grasp, and an inquiry is an individual process that needs time to worth through. An

entire class can be taught on September 11; it is unreasonable to expect teachers to navigate a several-hundred page long curriculum (such as the 4Action program) in two or three weeks. Rather, students need to be given such time to interrogate one aspect of September 11 that they determine to be significant.

An emphasis on questions, not answers. If understandings are constantly changing, then the question is more important than the answer. The product of this type of inquiry into September 11 would begin with questions and show a progression into the more complex questions that develop from understandings gained from investigation into the original queries. This questioning would be sheltered from the certainty required from standardized tests and prescribed curricula.

A freedom for the multiples. A curriculum of this type is as much self-discovery as it is discovery of September 11 in that students engaging in this program would need to gain understanding of their own interests, prejudices, and beliefs that they are to challenge. I asked earlier in this chapter if there is space to recognize the validity of work teachers may find repulsive while not endorsing it or risking the sensibilities of another student. That space requires a shelter of a different sort, shelter from judgment and normalizing practices from both top-down curriculum and people within the classroom. Such a space recognizes the value of diversity of thought without necessitating the valuing of the actual thoughts themselves.

A September 11 curriculum as I describe is not standardless or objectiveless, regardless of the fact that it does not fit within the current audit culture paradigm of education. Current September 11 curricula attempt to direct students' thinking; Such a

curriculum as I describe here instead taps what I believe is an unrealized capacity to openly engage in students' thoughts.

The curriculum as I describe shelters teachers as it does students, by placing the teacher in the role of facilitator rather than authority and removing the emotional responsibility named in the beginning of this study: having the answers during the uncertainty of a political trauma.

APPENDIX A

9/11 Curriculum Interview Form

Name of Curriculum	CHOICES Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for
Publisher/Author	Choices for the 21 st c. Den
Date of Publication	2011

Objectives/Standards of the Curriculum

Address the issues arising from 9/11 Attacks and consider changing nature of terrorism, motivations of terrorists, and implications for US domestic + international policy.

Given Definitions (e.g. terrorism):

A definition of terrorism from US State Department is given, but students are asked to come up with their own

Vocabulary lists for each reading worksheet, but definitions not supplied

Stated and Implied Purposes:

Develop critical thinking and an understanding of the significance of history in our lives today - essential ingredients of responsible citizenship (ii)
Implied critical view of United States actions + policies

Stated and Implied Teacher Actions:

Most of the instruction is through activities and worksheets

Very little support for discussing tough issues

lots left up to interpretations as to alternative activities

Elements of Shelter from Controversy

(elimination of upsetting images/topics/ideas; concrete definitions; defined narratives; etc.)

- Very liberal perspectives
- Detailed history, background, and context given
- Emphasis on the policy choice
- "Alternate" asks to think deeply, Standard does not
- No images of terror directly
- Lack of discussion of victims
- Few primary sources

Elements of Provocation to Critical Understandings

(critical thinking questions; exposure to difficult topics/images/ideas; debatable topics, narratives; etc.)

- Higher order thinking skills questions, especially in "alternate" lessons
- UN/Congress exercise focus on deliberation
- Activity on deciding whether act is terrorism or not
- Examples given to allow drawing of conclusions on own
- Open to the idea of trauma
- Little support for student discussion of these ideas
- Challenge government policy
- Political cartoons
- Use of directive "exploration"
- Threat of terrorism
- Open discussion + use of graphic organizers

REFERENCES

- Apple, M.W. (1990). The politics of official knowledge in the United States. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(4), 377-400.
- Apple, M. (2002). Patriotism, pedagogy, and freedom: On the educational meanings of September 11. *Teachers College Record*, 104(8), 1760-1772.
- Angus, D.L., & Mirel, J.E. (1999). *The failed promise of the American high school: 1890-1995*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beidler, P. D. (2010). *The victory album: Reflections on the good life after the good war*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Berlant, L. (2004). *Compassion: The culture and politics of an emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Bloomberg, L.D. & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. London: Sage.
- Brock, S. (2003). Crisis theory: A foundation for the comprehensive crisis prevention and intervention team. in S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (eds.). *Best practices in school crisis prevention and intervention* (5-18). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Burbules, N.C., & Berk, R. (1999). Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, difference, and limits. In T. Popkewitz & L. Fendler (eds.) *Theories in education: Changing terrains of knowledge and politics*. (pp. 45-66). New York: Routledge.
- Carter, P. (1992). The social status of women teachers in the early twentieth century. in R. J. Altenbaugh (ed.). *The teacher's voice: A social history of teaching in twentieth-century America* (127-138). London: The Falmer Press.
- Center for Civic Education (2012). About us. Retrieved from <http://new.civiced.org/about>.
- Centers for Disease Control. (2012). Births: preliminary data for 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr61/nvsr61_05.pdf.
- Clarke, P. (2005). Teaching controversial issues: A four-step classroom strategy on controversial issues. *BCTF/CIDA EnglGlobal Classroom Initiative*, 1-5.

- Clifford, J. & Marcus, G.E. (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Common Core Standards Initiative. (2012). About the Standards. Retrieved from www.corestandards.org.
- Cosmopolitanism. (2006). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>.
- del Valle, P. (2003). Traumatized refugee children. in S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (eds.). *Best practices in school crisis prevention and intervention* (599-614). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1944). Antinaturalism in extremis. *Naturalism and the Human Spirit, New York*, 1-16.
- Doll, W. (1993). Curriculum possibilities in a "post-future." *Journal of Curriculum Supervision*, 8(4), 277-292.
- Egan, K. (1978). What is curriculum? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 8(1), 65-72.
- Engle, S., & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision-making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Engster, D. (2005). Rethinking care theory: The practice of caring and the obligation to care. *Hypatia*, 20(3), 50-74.
- Evans, R.W., Avery, P.G., & Pederson, P.V. (2000). Cultural restraint on teaching social issues. *The Clearing House*, 73(5), 295-302.
- Evans, R.W., & Saxe, D. (1996). Handbook on teaching social issues. Washington, D.C.: *National Council for Social Studies*, Bulletin #93.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2011). *Hate crimes statistics, 2011*. A Uniform Crime Reporting Program Publication. Ret. from: <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr>
- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1993). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in U.S. Schools*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- Fleming, D. (1987). Ethical issues in the classroom: Realism or happy talk? *The Clearing House*, 61(2), 85-87.

- Fordham Institute. (n.d.) Our mission. Retrieved from:
<http://www.edexcellence.net/about-us/fordham-mission.html>
- Fried, J. (1993). Bridging emotion and intellect: Classroom diversity in process. *College Teaching*, 41(4), 123-128.
- Gardner, H.E. (1985). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Perseus.
- Gershon, W. & Wozolek, B. (2012). Researching with others: Affective tensions between ethics and method in interpretive studies of education. Presentation at the 13th annual Curriculum & Pedagogy conference.
- Giroux, H. (2002). Democracy, freedom, and justice after September 11: Rethinking the role of educators and the politics of schooling. *Teachers College Record*, 104(6), 1138-1162.
- Glazier, J. & Seo, J. (2005). Multicultural literature and discussion as mirror and window? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(8), 686-700.
- Goldberger, P. (2011). The buildings at Ground Zero. *The New Yorker*, 9/12/11, 78-80.
- Greene, M. (1971). Curriculum and consciousness. *Teachers College Record*, 73(2), 253-269.
- Grumet, M. (1992). Existential and phenomenological foundations of autobiographical methods. In W.F. Pinar & W.M. Reynolds (eds.), *Understanding the curriculum and phenomenological and deconstructed text* (pp. 28-43). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grumet, M., Anderson, A., & Osmond, C. (2008). Finding form for curriculum research. In K. Gallagher (ed.) *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 136-156). New York: Routledge.
- Hedley, M., & Markowitz, L. (2001). Avoiding moral dichotomies: Teaching controversial topics to resistant students. *Teaching Sociology*, 29(2), 195-208.
- Helfenbein, R.J. (2009). Looking through the lenses: Culture in classrooms, curriculum, and the crisis of September 11. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 6(1), 100-117.
- Hemming, H.E. (2000). Encouraging critical thinking: "But...what does that mean?" *McGill Journal of Education*, 35(2), 173-186.
- Hendricks, J.S., Burkstrand-Reid, B., & Carbone, J. (2011). Teaching controversial topics. College of Law Research Paper Series, 145.

- Hess, D. (2001). Teaching students to discuss controversial public issues. Retrieved from:
<http://cssie.indiana.edu/Portals/456/CSSIE%20Archives/2001/Teaching%20Students%20to%20Discuss%20Controversial%20Public%20Issues.pdf>
- Hess, D. (2002). Teaching controversial public issues discussions: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 30*(1), 10-41.
- Hess, D. (2004). Controversies about controversial issues in democratic education. *Political Science and Politics, 37*(2), 257-261.
- Hess, D., & Stoddard, J. (2007). September 11 and terrorism: The ultimate teachable moment in textbooks and supplemental curricula. *Social Education, 71*(5), 231-236.
- Hess, D., Stoddard, J. & Murto, S. (2008). Examining the treatment of September 11 and terrorism in high school textbooks. In Bixby, J. S., & Pace, J. L. *Educating democratic citizens in troubled times : Qualitative studies of current efforts* (193-226). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Hess, D., Stoddard, J., & Hammer, M. (2011). The challenge of writing 'first draft history': The evolution of the September 11 attacks and their aftermath in school textbooks in the United States. In L. Yates & M. Grumet (eds), *Curriculum in today's world: Configuring knowledge, identities, work, and politics* (pp. 223-236). New York: Routledge.
- Hunt, M.P. & Metcalf, L.E. (1955). *Teaching high school social studies: Problems in reflective thinking and social understanding*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Jardine, D., LaGrange, A., & Everest, B. (2004). "In these shoes is the silent call of the Earth": Meditations on curriculum integration, conceptual violence, and the ecologies of community and place. In D. Flinders & S. Thornton (eds). *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (2nd ed.). pp. 329-329. New York: Routledge.
- Jeynes, W. (2007). *American educational history: School, society, and the common good*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Kahne, J. & Middaugh, E. (2011). Is patriotism good for democracy? A study of high school seniors' patriotic comments. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (p. 93-102). New York: Peter Lang.
- Klein, M.F. (1992). A perspective on the gap between curriculum theory and practice. *Theory into Practice, 31*(3), 191-197.

- Klingman, A. (2003). School and war. in S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (eds.). *Best practices in school crisis prevention and intervention* (pp. 577-598). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). Psychoanalysis and the polis. *Critical Inquiry*, 9, 77-92.
- Kristeva, J. (1984). *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). Why the United States? An interview with Marcelin Pleynet and Philippe Sollers. In. T. Moi (ed.). *The Kristeva Reader* (pp. 272-291). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1993). *Nations without Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (2002). *Intimate revolt: The powers and limits of psychoanalysis, Vol. 2*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kristeva, J. (2003). The future of a defeat: Julia Kristeva interviewed by Arnaud Sprire. *Parallax*, 9(2), 21-26.
- Kristeva, J. (2006). Thinking in dark times. *Profession*, 13-21.
- Kristeva, J. (2007). Rethinking “normative conscience”: The task of the intellectual today. *Common Knowledge*, 13(2/3), 219-226.
- Kruse, J. & Presseisen, B.Z. (1987). *A catalog of programs for teaching thinking*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.
- Kull, S., Ramsay, C., Stephens, A., Weber, S., Lewis, E., & Hadfield, J. (2006). *Americans in Iraq: Three years on*. Program on International Policy Attitudes. Retrieved from: http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/pdf/mar06/USIraq_Mar06_rpt.pdf.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that’s just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Landsman, J. (2001). *A white teacher talks about race*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Lazare, D. (2011). A core curriculum for civic literacy? In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (p. 207-216). New York: Peter Lang.
- Leahey, C. (2011a). Negotiating a parallel curriculum: Making space for critical civic literacy in the social studies classroom. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A*

- reader*. (p. 191-206). New York: Peter Lang.
- Leahey, C. (2011b). Delimiting the debate: The Fordham's attack on democratic values. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (p. 305-318). New York: Peter Lang.
- Leahey, C.R. (2010). *Whitewashing war: Historical myth, corporate textbooks, and possibilities for democratic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lechte, J. & Margaroni, M. (2004). *Julia Kristeva: Live theory*. London: Continuum.
- Lerner, M.D., Volpe, J.S., & Lindell, B. (2003). *A practical guide for crisis response in our schools* (5th ed.). New York: American Academy of Experts in Traumatic Stress.
- Levin, B. (2008). Curriculum policy and the politics of what should be learned in school. In F.M. Connely, M.F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds), *The SAGE handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 7-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publisher.
- Levinson, R. (2006). Towards a theoretical framework for teaching controversial socio-scientific issues. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(10), 1201-1224.
- Lusk, A.B., & Weinberg, A.S. (1994). Discussing controversial topics in the classroom: Creating a context for learning. *Teaching Sociology*, 22(4), 301-308.
- Lyderson, K. & Ortiz, C.J. (January 25, 2012). More people are killed in Chicago than in any other American city. *The Chicago Reporter*. Retrieved from: <http://www.chicagoreporter.com/news/2012/01/more-young-people-are-killed-chicago-any-other-american-city>
- Macedo, S. (2003). *Diversity and distrust: Civic education in a multicultural democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose justice? Which rationality?* London, UK: Duckworth.
- Markham, T. (2012). Project-based learning and Common Core Standards. *The Whole Child Blog*. Retrieved from: <http://www.wholechildeducation.org/blog/project-based-learning-and-common-core-standards/>.
- Mayer, R., & Goodchild, F. (1990). *The critical thinker*. New York: Wm. C. Brown.
- McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- McLaren, P. (1991). Decentering culture: Postmodernism, resistance, and critical pedagogy. In N. Whyner (ed.), *Current perspectives on the culture of schools* (pp. 231-257). Boston: Brookline Books.

- McLaren, P. (2005). Critical pedagogy in the age of neoliberal globalization. In P. McLaren (ed.) *Capitalists and conquerors: a critical pedagogy against empire* (pp. 19-74). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mehlinger, H.D. (2002). Teaching about September 11 and its aftermath. *Social Education*, 66(5), 303-307.
- Mertes, L. (1991). Thinking and writing. *Middle School Journal*, 22, 24-25.
- Miller, J. (1990). *Creating spaces and finding voices: Teachers collaborating for empowerment*. Albany, NY: Statue University of New York Press.
- Miller, J. (1992). Women and education: In what ways does gender affect the education process? In J. Kincheloe & S. Steinberg (Eds.,) *Thirteen questions* (pp. 151-158). New York: Peter Lang.
- Miller, J. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women, autobiography, curriculum*. New York: Lang.
- Mulcahy, C.M. (2011). The tangled web we weave: Critical literacy and critical thinking. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (pp. 1-10). New York: Peter Lang.
- Neighbour, B. (1996). Geography teachers and the treatment of controversies. In R. Gerber & J. Lidstone (eds). *Developments and Directions in Geographic Education* (p. 175-184). Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Nelson, J.L., Carlson, K., & Polonsky, S.B. (1996). *Critical issues in education: A dialectic approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nickerson, R.S., Perkins, D.N., & Smith, E. (1985). *The teaching of thinking*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust in American life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Old Dominion University. (nd). Bloom's Taxonomy. Retrieved from: http://ww2.odu.edu/educ/roverbau/Bloom/blooms_taxonomy.htm
- Oliver, D. & Shaver, J.P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

- Oliver, K. (2001). *Witnessing: Beyond recognition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Oulton, C., Dillon, J., & Grace, M. (2004). Reconceptualizing the teaching of controversial issues. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26(4), 411-423.
- Packer, G. (2011). A decade of missed opportunities. *The New Yorker*, 9/12/11, 62-71.
- Parker, W.C., Ninomiya, A., & Cogan, J. (1999). Educating world citizens: Toward multinational curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 117-145.
- Parsier, E. (2011). *The filter bubble*. Ret. from: <http://www.thefilterbubble.com/ted-talk>
- Pfohl, W., Jimerson, S. & Lazarus, P. (2003). Developmental aspects of psychological trauma and grief. in S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (eds.). *Best practices in school crisis prevention and intervention* (309-331). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Pierce, B.L. (1930). *Public opinion and the teaching of history in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pinar, W.F. (2010). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd edition, Kindle). New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W.M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P.M. (2008). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Price, J.M.C. (2011). Democracy: A critical red ideal. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (p. 291-304). New York: Peter Lang.
- Purpel, D.E. (2011). The politics of character education. in J.L. DeVitis & T. Yu (ed) *Character and moral education: A reader*. (p. 43-42). New York: Peter Lang.
- Rainie, L. & Smith, A. (2012). Social networking sites and politics. *Pew Internet*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Social-networking-and-politics/Main-findings/Social-networking-sites-and-politics.aspx>
- Ravitch, D. (2002). September 11: Seven lessons for the schools. *Educational Leadership*, 60(2), 6-9.
- Riley-Taylor, E. (2010). Reconceiving ecology: Diversity, language, and horizons of the possible. In E. Malewski (ed.) *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 286-298). New York: Taylor and Francis.

- Robelen, E.W. (2011). Majority of states' standards don't mention September 11. *Education Week*, 31(2), 14-16.
- Roberts, P.A. & Steiner, D.J. (2010). Critical public pedagogy and the Paidagogos: Exploring the normative and political challenges of radical democracy. in J.A. Sandlin, B.D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (eds.). *Handbook of public pedagogy* (20-27). New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Rodriguez, R., Weinstein, K., Hanson, V., & Mead, W. (2003). *Terrorists, despots, and democracy: What our children need to know*. Retrieved from: <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/terrorists.html>.
- Rom, R.B. (1998). 'Safe spaces': Reflections on an educational metaphor. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 30(4), 397-408.
- Rosenfeld, L., Caye, J., Ayalon, O. & Lahad, M. (2005). *When their world falls apart: Helping families and children manage the effects of disasters*. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers Press.
- Rugg, H. (1921). On reconstructing the social studies. *Historical Outlook*, 12, 253-260.
- Salomone, R.C. (2000). *Visions of schooling: Conscience, community, and common education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sams, L. (2003). How to teach grammar, analytical thinking, and writing: A method that works. *English Journal*, January, 57-65.
- Schubert, W. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: MacMillan.
- Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (1987). Critical thinking as defined by the National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking. *The Critical Thinking Community*.
- September 11 Education Trust. (2009). *The September 11 education program*. Retrieved from <http://www.learnabout9-11.org/>
- Short, G. & Reed, C. A. (2004). *Issues in Holocaust education*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co.
- Sillin, J. (1995). *Sex, death, and the education of children: Our passion for ignorance in the age of AIDS*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Singer, A. (2012). Pearson 'education'—Who are these people? *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-singer/pearson-education-new-york-testing- b 1850169.html>.

- Slattery, P. & Rapp, D. (2002). *Ethics and the foundations of education: Teaching convictions in a postmodern world*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Smith, A. (1996). *Julia Kristeva: Readings of exile and estrangement*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- SO 020-343: Department of Education's refusal to fund Holocaust curriculum, 100th Congress, 2nd Session. (1988).
- Steinberg, S.R. (2009). Preface: Reading media critically. In D. Macedo & S.R. Steinberg (eds.) *Media literacy: A reader*. pp.xii-xv. New York: Peter Lang.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1984). How can we teach intelligence? *Educational Leadership*, 42(1), 38-48.
- Stone, L. (2004). Crisis of the educated subject: Insight from Kristeva for American education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 23, 103-116.
- Stradling, R. (2006). The teaching of controversial issues: An evaluation. *Educational Review*, 36(2), 121-129.
- Suleiman, S.R. (2007). *Oneself as another: Identification and journaling in writing about victims of the Holocaust*. 15th annual David and Sarah Rabin Holocaust Memorial Lecture, East Lansing, MI.
- T.F.D. (2012). Analytical thinking. Ret. from: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/analytic+thinking>.
- Tama, C. (1989). Critical thinking has a place in every classroom. *Journal of Reading*, 33, 64-65.
- Taubman, P. (2009). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse standards and accountability in education*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- Thampi, M. (1975). Politics in the English classroom. *Social Scientist*, 4(3), 76-81.
- Thomas, T.P. & Schubert, W.H. (1997). Recent curriculum theory: Proposals for understanding, critical praxis, inquiry, and expansion of conversation. *Educational Theory*, 47(2), 261-285.
- Vogt, F. (2002). A caring teacher: Explorations into primary school teachers' professional identity and ethic of care. *Gender and Education*, 14(3), 251-264.

- Wang, H. (2010). Intimate revolt and third possibilities: Cocreating a creative curriculum. In E. Malewski (ed.) *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 374-386). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Weathers, F.W. & Keane, T.M. (2007) The criterion, a problem revisited: Controversies and challenges in defining and measuring psychological trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20*(2), 107-121.
- Weems, C.F., Taylor, L.K., et al. (2009). Post traumatic stress, context, and the lingering effects of the Hurricane Katrina disaster among ethnic minority youth. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 38*, 49-56.
- Westheimer, J. (2011). Politics and patriotism in education. In J. L. DeVitis (ed.) *Critical civic literacy: A reader*. (pp. 81-92). New York: Peter Lang.
- Williams, R. (1961). *The long revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Willingham, D.T. (2011). The cognitive science of skills and learning. Retrieved from: <http://commoncore.org/pressrelease-03.php>
- Willis, P. & Trondman, M. (2000). Manifesto for ethnography. *Ethnography, 1*(5), 5-16.
- Winfield, A. G. (2010). Eugenic ideology and historical osmosis. In E. Malewski (ed.) *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 142-157). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Winton, S. (2011). Does character education really support citizenship education?: Examining the claims of an Ontario policy. in J.L. DeVitis & T. Yu (ed) *Character and moral education: A reader*. (pp. 102-117). New York: Peter Lang.
- Wraga, W.G. (1999). "Extracting sun-beams out of cucumbers": The retreat from practice in reconceptualized curriculum studies. *Educational Researcher, 28*(1), 4-13.
- Wraga, W.G. & Hlebowitsh P.S. (2003). Toward a renaissance in curriculum theory and development in the USA. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(4), 425-437.
- Wright, H.K. (2000). Nailing Jello-O to the wall: Pinpointing aspects of state-of-the-art curriculum theorizing. *Educational Researcher, 29*(5), 4-13.
- Yellin, J. & Cohen, T. (March 1, 2013). Obama signs order activating deep spending cuts. CNN Politics. Retrieved from: http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/01/politics/forced-spending-cuts/index.html?hpt=hp_t2
- Young, M. (2003). The community crisis response team: The National Organization for Victim Assistance protocol. in S. Brock, P. Lazarus, & S. Jimerson (eds.). *Best practices*

in school crisis prevention and intervention (pp. 333-354). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Zembylas, M. (2005). "Structures of feeling" in curriculum and teaching: Theorizing the emotional rules. *Educational Theory*, 52(2), 187-208.

Zembylas, M. (2008a). *The politics of trauma in education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan Press.

Zembylas, M. (2008b). Trauma, justice and the politics of emotion: The violence of sentimentality in education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(1), 1-17.

Ziegler, H. (1967). *The political life of American teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.