

Public Employee Unionism: A Neglected Social Movement of the 1960s

Robert Shaffer
Shippensburg University

THE CHAPTERS on the 1960s and early 1970s in recent editions of secondary-level United States history textbooks have done an impressive job in getting beyond the traditional political narratives of presidential administrations to include the movements of protest and reform based on citizen activism. Most textbooks still have—and, of course, still need—chapters or sections on John F. Kennedy’s New Frontier, Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society, and Richard Nixon’s election, re-election, and resignation in disgrace, along with the controversial Vietnam War that marked all three administrations. But these are now accompanied not just by chapters on the movement of African Americans for civil rights, but also by chapters or sections with headings such as “Voices of Protest,” “An Era of Activism,” “Other Groups Seek Rights,” “In Pursuit of Civil Rights for All,” and “Struggles for Change,” in which textbook authors recount how Latinos, American Indians, women, and, in some cases, Asian Americans, students, persons with disabilities, gays and lesbians, and the elderly also sought to overcome prejudice and discrimination.¹ Sometimes in these sections, and sometimes in the “political” sections, many textbooks cover as well the rise of the consumer and environmental movements in the 1960s, usually highlighting the roles of Ralph Nader and Rachel Carson. Certainly, these books published over the past decade and a half have addressed one of the charges leveled against their predecessors by James

Loewen, who in his widely read 1995 indictment of U.S. history textbooks, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, charged that they presented a “Disney World history” of the 1960s and subsequent decades, downplaying “anything troubling about the recent past.”²

But despite their laudable efforts to broaden coverage to include issues of race, ethnicity, and gender, and to show how the efforts of such ordinary Americans have changed our society, textbook authors continue to neglect entirely an important social movement of the 1960s and 1970s: the rise of labor unions among public sector employees. Unionization among public sector employees—teachers, sanitation workers, postal employees, police, clerical workers, and others—gave rise to some very bitter conflicts of those decades, and ever since, it has had an important impact on debates over the role of government, on the social mobility of certain demographic groups, and on the base and power of the labor movement as a whole. Indeed, one of the most dramatic and polarizing issues of 2011 in the U.S. has been the effort by newly elected Wisconsin governor Scott Walker to eviscerate bargaining rights for state and local government employees in that state. Protests against the new legislation led to teacher strikes and closed schools, round-the-clock sit-ins in the capitol building in Madison, the largest demonstrations in the state since the Vietnam War, public criticism of the governor by Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, and a weeks-long boycott by Democratic legislators in an ultimately unsuccessful quest to prevent a vote due to lack of a quorum. Republicans in other states, such as Indiana and Ohio, emboldened by their victories in the 2010 elections, introduced copy-cat legislation, and the power and benefits of public sector unions and their members will surely remain a hot-button issue in coming years.³

But not a single one of the textbooks surveyed for this study include any mention of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the National Education Association (NEA), the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), or the American Postal Workers Union (APWU), either in their chapters on the 1960s and 1970s when they were so often in the public eye, or in any other chapters, despite their important role in local communities and national politics today. These omissions are also characteristic of college-level U.S. history survey textbooks, as I have argued elsewhere.⁴ In this regard, recent textbooks still display the problem that Loewen identified in his critique, that consideration of the labor movement largely ended with the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, and that “unions appear anachronistic.”⁵ Indeed, another textbook critic, Frances FitzGerald, had earlier observed that these books refused to allow “class conflict” to appear in their pages because it was somehow “un-American,” and the present state of the textbooks sustains her analysis.⁶

Given that some of the first union members that most students today encounter are their classroom teachers, and that the rise of public sector unionism corroborates the main lines of analysis of today's textbooks about the 1960s—that protests and activism among some groups spurred activism among others, and that seemingly disparate movements often were linked—it is incumbent upon textbooks, and U.S. history teachers, to discuss this movement with students. Moreover, coverage of public sector unionism would encourage textbooks, and teachers, to write and teach with greater clarity and depth on union issues more generally, as one cannot explain the rise of public employee unions in the 1960s without reconsidering, for example, the exclusion of public sector workers from New Deal-era labor legislation. Some textbook authors may feel that they do devote adequate attention to unions in the 1960s through their extensive coverage of César Chávez and the United Farm Workers Union in their sections on Mexican Americans or Hispanic Americans, coverage which is worthwhile for many reasons. But without detracting in any way from the courage and dedication of UFW organizers, members, and supporters in the grape and lettuce boycotts, it should be clear that the hundreds of thousands of public employees who went on strike—often in defiance of the law—and the millions of public employees who were and are members of unions deserve to have their stories told, too.

Numbers alone can make the case for the significance of the rise of public employee unions. In 1955, public employee unions had about 400,000 members in total; that figure rose ten-fold, to over 4,000,000, in the 1970s. Of course, this was during a period when public employment itself was growing quickly, but even so, the percentage of unionized government workers rose from 13% in 1960 to 39% in 1976. AFSCME grew from being the nineteenth largest AFL-CIO union in 1960 to being the sixth largest only a decade later.⁷ The AFT tripled its membership to over 200,000 during the 1960s, and reached 550,000 members in 1980. The NEA, which transformed itself during the 1960s from a professional organization to a union engaged in collective bargaining (although it remained outside the main union federation, the AFL-CIO), already had 700,000 members in 1960, but still grew 50% by the end of the decade.⁸ Today, the AFT claims 1.4 million members, AFSCME 1.6 million, and the NEA an astounding 3.2 million teachers, aides, support personnel, and retirees.⁹

Moreover, public employee unions maintained increased membership even as rates in private sector unions declined sharply after 1976. Union membership in manufacturing jobs declined from 27% in 1983 to 18% a decade later, and in the private sector, employment as a whole fell to about 10% in these years. But unionization rates in government remained at about 38% during this difficult decade for the U.S. labor movement. By the

1990s, those in public employee unions comprised over 20% of AFL-CIO membership, and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics announced in January 2010 that “[f]or the first time in American history, a majority of union members are government workers rather than private-sector employees,” as the *New York Times* summarized the story. The most recent report on the issue by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in January 2011, found that after a brief uptick in union membership from 2006 to 2008, with almost two-thirds of this growth coming among public sector workers, union membership again declined in the course of the Great Recession, especially in the private sector. According to the report, government workers were more than five times more likely to belong to a union than were private sector employees, with a “union density” rate of 36.2% in the public sector and only 6.9% in the private sector. Local government employees were more likely to be unionized than state or federal employees, and the fields of education, training, and libraries were the most heavily unionized occupations in the nation.¹⁰ Surely, the origins, in the 1960s, of such a dramatic change in the composition of the American trade union movement should be explained in our textbooks.

But numbers aside, the rise of public employee unionism is a dramatic story, recognized as such at the time, especially in the case of teachers. Early strikes, such as those in New York City, gave way to what *U.S. News & World Report* in September 1967 called a “rash” of teachers strikes across the nation. In the first three months of 1968, there were strikes which closed schools in Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., Albuquerque, and Montgomery County, Maryland. A statewide strike by almost half of Florida’s 60,000 teachers lasted over three weeks and affected half a million students. The NEA, along with the American Nurses Association, several postal unions, and the International Association of Fire Fighters, eliminated strike prohibition clauses from their constitutions in 1968. Most strikes remained illegal, nevertheless, and union leaders often went to jail. (See Figure 1)

Thus, teachers—like their counterparts in the civil rights, student, antiwar, and American Indian movements—engaged in a form of civil disobedience to win their demands for union recognition, higher pay, lower class sizes, and more conducive conditions for student learning. Mass rallies were not uncommon: 20,000 teachers gathered in the capital of Pennsylvania on March 4, 1968 to call for higher teacher salaries, and when the governor addressed the crowd, the booed him for not releasing state money quickly enough to meet their demands. The president of Pennsylvania’s NEA affiliate promised at the demonstration that teachers would become a “mobilized army of political activists.”¹¹

These teacher strikes, rallies, and confrontations garnered enormous

Figure 1: Primary Source Excerpt

“Pittsburgh Jails Teacher Pickets—Oklahoma Governor Seeks to Avert State Walkout,” *New York Times* (7 March 1968): 49. See www.nytimes.com to obtain the full article.

Reports on striking teachers poured in from many states yesterday.

More than 40 striking Pittsburgh teachers were rounded up and fined yesterday for violating an anti-picketing injunction. In Oklahoma, Gov. Dewey Bartlett urged the state’s teachers to accept a \$37 million education program and call off strike threats. Florida teachers were reported drifting back to work amid indications that Gov. Claude R. Kirk, Jr., planned to allow a \$254 million education school spending package to become law at midnight today. Teachers in Manchester, N.H., voted yesterday to return to their posts today after a one-day walkout forced all but two of the city’s 27 schools to close. Teachers at Wellston, MO, returned to classrooms after winning a school board promise to take a tax levy proposal to voters for a third time despite two defeats.

Pittsburgh teachers played a hide-and-seek game with Sheriff’s deputies, leaving a school when the deputies arrived and rushing to picket at another school. At least 42 were arrested, taken before a judge and fined \$25 each on charges of violating an injunction against picketing the schools in their strike to force the Board of Education to schedule a collective bargaining election ...

Washington Walkout Set—Public schools in the nation’s capital will be closed tomorrow because of a walkout by teachers in support of pay legislation pending in Congress. Schools Superintendent William R. Manning said he was closing Washington’s schools because nearly half the system’s 7,000 teachers had requested leave for the day.

public attention at the time, in part because they were so unprecedented, and in part because they involved parents, who would have to find other arrangements for their children during a strike. *Life* magazine in 1967 ran a photo essay under the headline, “The Shock of Public Strikes: Ford was expected, but teachers, firemen, cops!” Similar articles pervaded the national press that year and the next: “Our angry teachers” (*Look*), “Teacher power” (*Newsweek*), “Teachers’ revolt” (*The Nation*), “Teachers get militant” (*Business Week*), “Fighting mood” (*Time*), “Those newly militant government workers” (*Fortune*), and “Why teachers strike: Too little pay, too much work” (*U.S. News & World Report*). Even usually non-political women’s magazines weighed in, as *Redbook* explained “Why teachers are striking,” and *Good Housekeeping* polled its readers on whether teachers should have the right to strike.

The militancy of public workers at times united strikers and communities—AFT picket signs often bore the slogan, “Teachers Want What Children Need”—but could also lead to conflicts among erstwhile allies. The national PTA went on record in 1968 opposing teacher strikes, as mothers in union-dominated Detroit spoke out against just such a strike in September of that year.¹² Even more dramatically, although the AFT, along with many other unions, had been a major backer of Martin Luther King and other civil rights groups, the bitter 1968 strike by the AFT’s New York City affiliate against demands for “community control” of schools by local African-American-led school boards began the splintering of the labor-civil rights alliance. More violent strikes in Newark, New Jersey in 1970 and 1971 furthered the split.¹³ Just a few years later, the first generation of big-city African American mayors, facing conflicts between the need for fiscal austerity on the one hand, and union activity among public employees, including many African-American employees, on the other, often made their mark by breaking strikes of historically low-paid sanitation workers.¹⁴

While none of the textbooks surveyed here name the public employee unions involved in this upsurge, there is one instance in which several come close, and which can serve as the point of entry for such a discussion: the circumstances of the assassination of Martin Luther King in Memphis in April 1968. Unfortunately, some textbooks—including *The American Journey*, which includes among its authors prominent historians Joyce Appleby, Alan Brinkley, and James McPherson, and which refers on four separate pages to this tragic assassination—provide no information about why King was in Memphis.¹⁵ But other textbooks note that King had traveled to Memphis “to show his support for the city’s striking garbage workers,” as Gerald Danzer and his co-authors put it somewhat vaguely, or that he went “to rally support for the mostly African American garbage collectors who were attempting to unionize,” as Gary Nash says more fully.¹⁶ Joy Hakim, in her unconventional *A History of US*, includes, in addition to this explanation, a reproduction of a famous photograph from this strike, showing African-American men on the picket line, with signs reading, “I AM a Man,” and a caption briefly explaining the background of the strike. But even Hakim does not see fit to mention that the strikers belonged to a local of AFSCME, which, against great odds, poured enormous resources into this organizing campaign, and which eventually resulted in a contract, a month after King’s death, which mitigated to some extent the truly horrendous conditions under which these men worked.¹⁷

Several textbooks quote the moving passage from King’s speech in Memphis the night before his assassination that he was prepared for death because he has “been to the mountaintop” and could see beyond

the present tumult to the coming era of justice. However, none quote the specific sections of King's speech that highlight the workers' cause: "The issue is injustice. The issue is the refusal of Memphis to be fair and honest in its dealings with its public servants, who happen to be sanitation workers. Now, we've got to keep attention on that."¹⁸ King's presence at the sanitation workers' strike in Memphis—he had also endorsed the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers unionization effort in 1965, and was a strong supporter of the labor movement more generally—provides an excellent example of the influence that the civil rights movement exerted over other movements of the 1960s. Indeed, as historian Joshua Freeman has written, AFSCME's 1965 campaign to organize the predominantly African American municipal hospital workers in New York City "meld[ed] the languages of civil rights and unionism."¹⁹ The militancy of young, northern African Americans in several cities also undergirded the disruptive, and again illegal, wildcat strike of postal workers in 1970.²⁰ Teachers union and social service union activists in many cases were veterans of the student, antiwar, and feminist movements, as well as the civil rights movement.²¹ These interconnections would fit perfectly the "main idea" of Chapter 29 of Davidson and Stoff's *The American Nation* about how the civil rights movement "paved the way for other groups to work for equal rights."²² The same can be said for *America's Past and Promise*, by Lorna Mason et al., which labels the relevant section, "Widening the Equal Rights Struggle."²³ In the wake of the attacks on public unions in Wisconsin and elsewhere, unions and their supporters—including Martin Luther King III, and University of Wisconsin historian Will Jones—made the anniversary of King's death in 2011 a day of rallies and speeches tying past to present, and some of these resources would be useful to classroom teachers and students in making similar connections.²⁴

To demonstrate that the campaigns for public sector unionism represent an "equal rights struggle" also requires attention to legal issues, not just social movements, and would require adjustments in textbook coverage of New Deal labor laws as well as subsequent actions. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935, often referred to by the name of its lead sponsor, Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York, guaranteed collective bargaining rights to most (not all) employees in the private sector, but it did not cover any public employees. Thus, when John Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 in 1962 to establish a procedure for union recognition in the federal sector, he was beginning to provide equal rights for different groups of workers, and, as historian Irving Bernstein has put it, he was "updating the New Deal."²⁵ Employees of states, cities, and local governments relied on new legislation in these jurisdictions to allow unionization, but also forced the enactment of such new legislation through their strikes

and protests, much as the civil rights movement itself both relied on new laws and court rulings as well as helped to pass new laws. New York City did not even wait for a state law to establish collective bargaining procedures for its employees in 1958. It was more than coincidence—and would make for a wonderful side note in textbooks or lectures—that the mayor of New York City at the time, Robert F. Wagner, Jr., was the son of the author of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Wisconsin in 1959 passed the first state law to facilitate collective bargaining for local government employees—a fact which lends extra poignancy to its status as Ground Zero in 2011's battles over the repeal of such protections, and which teachers and textbooks could use as a different kind of historical counterpoint. In the two decades after 1959, twenty-nine states would pass similar legislation, with half of these laws enacted precisely during the strike-prone years of 1969 to 1971.²⁶

Our textbooks generally fail to note the gaps in the NLRA, which excluded from coverage farm laborers, domestic workers, and some others, along with public employees. The authors of *The American Journey*, for example, state categorically that the Act “guaranteed workers the right to form unions to bargain collectively with employers.”²⁷ Similarly, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1937 (also called the Wages and Hours Law), which established a national minimum wage, overtime pay provisions, and regulation of child labor for most jobs, did not apply to most government workers or farmworkers until the 1960s. Nevertheless, *The Americans*, by Danzer et al., is typical among textbooks in strongly implying that all workers were covered by its provisions.²⁸ One of the few textbooks that makes any effort to confront gaps in New Deal labor legislation in the chapter on the 1930s is *America: Pathways to the Present*, but the results are still a bit murky. Cayton et al. note that the FLSA “established a minimum wage for all workers covered under the act,” which leaves unexplained who was left out, and only elsewhere do they state that farmworkers and some other groups of workers had been left out of the social security program in the 1930s. In a previous edition of their textbook, these authors stated, “No New Deal provision protected domestic service, the largest female occupation.”²⁹ Given the increased focus of most textbooks on race and gender, it is imperative that they be more explicit about the limitations of New Deal legislation, and reconsideration of this topic should be extended to public employees as well.³⁰

Moving forward in time, the textbooks by Cayton et al. and by Boorstin and Kelley cover in greatest detail Kennedy's domestic legislation and achievements; these textbooks could easily add a sentence or two on Executive Order 10988. These textbooks are also the only two surveyed which describe Ronald Reagan's firing in 1981 of the striking air traffic

controllers, federal employees organized as the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO), which had first won bargaining rights after a “sickout” in 1969. It is to their credit that these textbooks mention the mass firing at all, an event which is rightly seen as one contributing factor to the more general decline in unions’ fortunes over the past thirty years. However, in order for students to understand its significance, they really must be informed about the earlier surge in public employee organizing, and about both the successes of earlier strikes as well as the backlash these strikes engendered among some Americans.³¹

Recognition of the rise of public employee unionism would also enhance the discussion of several other issues that are already in some textbooks. Davidson and Stoff mention the baby boom in their treatment of post-World War II American society, and so, at a time when the first baby boomers were entering the workplace, a comment in *U.S. News & World Report* in 1968—that “teachers are more militant, too, because the average age of teachers is declining—is very apt. Todd and Curti, meanwhile, especially in the 1977 edition of their textbook, describe at length the increase in the numbers of students and teachers after World War II, the growth of public sector employment more generally, its attendant increased costs, and the growth of the service sector relative to manufacturing in these years. While the text of their 1986 edition downplays some of these issues, several appendices in that edition show in graphic form the growth in government employment from 1950 to 1990, and related statistics on “federal outlays” and high school and college enrollment. *National Standards for United States History* also points out the rise of the service sector, of white-collar jobs, and of government jobs. With another sentence, these texts and guidelines could help students see how growth in such jobs helped facilitate the rise of public sector unions and their importance. Cayton et al., meanwhile, include a photograph of a teacher in the Head Start program in their coverage of Johnson’s Great Society programs. Many such teachers, of course, became union members.³² Danzer et al., in *The Americans*, devote six pages to the turbulent year 1968, and even brief consideration of the controversial teacher strikes and other public employee strikes would add to the authors’ discussion of the Tet offensive, assassinations, the violence at the Chicago Democratic convention, and other events which so polarized the nation that year.³³ In short, all of these topics help explain why public employee unions began to grow, especially in the 1960s, and the growth of these unions, in turn, helps to explain why some of these programs, expenditures, and events have been controversial.

Most textbooks, in their coverage of the revived feminist movement of the 1960s, devote some attention to the struggle for pay equity, but surprisingly few say anything about women joining labor unions as a means

to achieve such progress. Of course, women are more fully represented in most public employee unions than in older industrial and building trades unions. The difference in unionization rates between men and women, which stood at ten percentage points in 1983, had narrowed to one-and-a-half points in 2010.³⁴ Moreover, women are more likely to be leaders of public employee unions: both the NEA and AFT have had women national presidents, unlike most unions. In perhaps the most explicit reference in these textbooks to women and unions in this period, which illustrates really how far textbooks still have to go to get it right, Nash puzzlingly lumps “clerical, teaching, and factory jobs” together as “low-paying categories of so-called women’s work.”³⁵

Textbook coverage of more recent events concerning the labor movement would also need to be revised if the implications of public sector organizing were included. Garraty’s *The American Nation* includes an impressive survey of social and economic trends of the 1980s, including immigration, corporate mergers, and the shift to a service economy. He explains here that union membership in this period declined “in large part because white-collar workers were difficult to organize.”³⁶ While this statement contains some truth, a more specific characterization of *private-sector* white-collar workers as difficult to organize would be more accurate. Boyer and Stuckey assert that after reaching its peak at 18.5 million in 1956, union membership “declined steadily,” a statement which obscures changes within that membership by pointing only to an overall figure.³⁷ Appleby et al. observe correctly in *The American Journey* that some labor leaders were not enthusiastic about George McGovern’s campaign as the Democratic candidate for President in 1972,³⁸ but they might also note that subsequently, the teachers’ unions became enthusiastic backers of Democrats Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale. Indeed, Republican presidential candidates since 1976 have routinely referred disparagingly to Democrats as captive to the teachers’ lobby.

On a point also related to problems and tensions within unions in the 1960s and 1970s, Todd and Curti assert that by the mid-1960s, the civil rights movement emphasized economic issues, including a focus on “discrimination by businesses and by organized labor in hiring practices.”³⁹ Again, the assertion is accurate, as far as it goes, as many building trades unions, in particular, did discriminate based on race. However, many public employee unions, as well as other unions, welcomed African-American members in these years. Indeed, labor historian Will Jones has written recently that “organized labor has incorporated the lessons of the civil rights movement perhaps more consciously than any other institution,” and that many African Americans “have risen to positions of power in the nation’s largest and fastest-growing unions,” many of which, of course,

are public employee unions. Meanwhile, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that African American workers are more likely to belong to unions than members of any other racial group.⁴⁰

One function of history textbooks is to provide a long-term perspective on a time period, and in this sense they should point out the roots of today's labor statistics in organizing trends that began in earnest in the 1960s. In the end, as coverage of public sector unions improves in textbooks, their overall attention to the labor movement should also increase—also a good thing for the cause of historical accuracy.

The one labor union after the 1940s that receives consistent coverage in textbooks is the United Farm Workers Union, led by César Chávez, which garners anywhere from a paragraph of text and a photograph (in Bernstein's *America's History*) to eight pages of text, photos, and other graphics (in Nash's *American Odyssey*).⁴¹ Moreover, publishers have provided ancillary materials on the UFW to accompany what appears in the textbook, and they emphasize identification and critical thinking questions about that union in their section or chapter reviews.⁴² The rise of the UFW is covered in the section on Mexican Americans in the 1960s, but most textbook authors correctly attribute broader significance to its struggles because of the compelling personal narrative of its main leader and his commitment to nonviolence—often with comparisons to Martin Luther King and Mohandas Gandhi—and because the consumer boycotts of grapes and lettuce which helped lead to union contracts for farmworkers and real improvements in their conditions made “La Causa” a truly national issue. It does not hurt, to be sure, that two of the biggest prizes for publishers are the “textbook adoption states” of California and Texas, which also happen to have large Mexican-American populations; moreover, most UFW workplace organizing occurred in California.⁴³

While discussion of the UFW in recent textbooks is both voluminous and merited, there are three problems with how most textbooks present this material, each of which may also help explain why textbooks ignore the contemporaneous organizing drives of public employees. First, only two of the textbooks surveyed—those by Nash and by Cayton et al.—state explicitly that winning a union for migrant farmworkers was hampered because they had been excluded from coverage by the NLRA, and of these, only Cayton et al. note that a major victory for the UFW came with the adoption of the first collective bargaining law in agriculture in California in 1975, several years after the grape strike ended.⁴⁴ Davidson and Stoff ask their readers to explain why it was “difficult to organize migrant farmworkers,” but, by ignoring the legal context, do not give students enough information to fully answer the question.⁴⁵ While some white-collar, and even professional, public employees would appear to be from

a different world than the downtrodden migrant laborers, both groups had an interest in making U.S. labor law more inclusive.

Second, only two textbooks—Boorstin and Kelley's, and Hakim's—even mention the UFW's affiliation with the AFL-CIO and the broader union movement.⁴⁶ Most textbooks note that the boycott could not have succeeded without public support—from “sympathetic priests, civic groups and idealistic students,” as Todd and Curti put it, and from Robert Kennedy and other Democratic political figures, as others note—but the labor movement, too, provided significant financial and logistical support. Interestingly, a photograph of unionized hotel workers from New York City supporting the boycott demonstrates this point in Appleby et al.'s *The American Journey*, but the authors in their text completely ignore their own photograph's implications.⁴⁷ This failure to acknowledge the role of the broader union movement in the UFW's success represents the same marginalization of labor from recent U.S. history as the neglect of public employee unionism.

Finally, most textbook accounts note the hardships that the UFW faced in its efforts to win better conditions for farmworkers, and Nash, to his credit, goes furthest in naming prominent conservatives, such as Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan, as opponents of the union.⁴⁸ But overall, there is a triumphal narrative to these accounts: a problem is identified, a courageous and hard-working group acts to address the problem, and after a struggle the problem is solved, so that Americans need hardly worry about it again. Thus, in the victory of the grape strike and boycott in 1970, “Chávez had done what seemed impossible,”⁴⁹ and “in the end, the owners recognized the union, and workers won higher wages.”⁵⁰ Todd and Curti make a more modest claim for the strike's victory in 1970, but the wording is garbled to the point of meaninglessness: “Although the gulf between Mexican Americans and other farm workers was still wide, it had begun to narrow.”⁵¹ Boyer and Stuckey are virtually alone in stating that the UFW would face continuing challenges by growers and government, noting that even after 1970, “Chávez led many similar strikes before his death in 1993.”⁵² Loewen and FitzGerald have both criticized this tendency of textbooks to provide a neat and tidy approach to U.S. history, which is often inaccurate but allows for the reinforcement of national pride. Farmworkers, of course, even in California and also in other parts of the nation, have continued to face poor wages and unsafe working conditions, and unions persevere with varying degrees of success, but with less national attention than the UFW received in its heyday.⁵³ And once again, this legacy has parallels with public employee unionism, as it would be difficult to present their strikes and unionization efforts of the 1960s and 1970s as a clearly demarcated historical episode, with a clear resolution of the problem. This

Figure 2: Primary Source Excerpt

“One Letter Carrier’s Life,” *Time* (30 March 1970): 12-13. See [www.time.com](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,942203,00.html), specifically at <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,942203,00.html> for the full article.

Peter Stafford is distinctly out of character as a striker in violation of federal law, a court injunction, and union orders. A New York letter carrier for 23 years, he is an Army veteran who is active in church affairs and the Boy Scouts. He is ordinarily a law-abiding, responsible citizen; in his life there have been no riots or violent demonstrations. Yet last week Stafford was willingly risking his job and pension rights—and flirting with a jail sentence and fine. In a mood as angry as the angriest militant’s, he declared: “Our Government shows that the only way to get any action is to go on strike. The only way they appreciate people is when they give a little action. Look at the riots in the colleges.”

Stafford makes only \$8,030 a year, well below the \$11,236 that the Federal Government says a family of four needs to maintain a “moderate” living standard in New York. Stafford’s is a family of six. Like many other Post Office men, he moonlights. Sometimes he is a bartender, sometimes a chauffeur. “I can’t afford not to strike,” the husky Stafford says. “I owe it to my family to provide them with a decent living.” ...

Stafford’s day begins at 5 a.m. He must be at the Washington Bridge post office, twelve minutes away by subway, at 6. First he sorts, or “boxes up,” the mail for his route. Regulations say that the bag he carries can weigh a maximum of 35 lbs.; usually it is a little lighter. His 18-block trek takes him to 1100 mailboxes. He enjoys the job and knows many of the residents he serves ...

When buying food and clothing, the Staffords hunt for bargains Their children go to a Roman Catholic school where tuition is still free. Social life is simple, revolving mostly around the Church of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Dinner out is rare. “I have a dream for my family,” Mrs. Stafford says, “for all of us to go away somewhere to the beach or the country for a week’s vacation together.” In their 13 years of marriage, the Staffords have never had a family holiday.

very ambiguity, perhaps, accounts for some of the reluctance of textbook authors to include the story of public employee unionization.

For teachers, however, one of the benefits of teaching about public employee unionism, even before waiting for the textbooks to catch up on the issue, is precisely because it shows history in all its complexity. To develop critical thinking and an appreciation of multiple perspectives, or for historical role-playing exercises, having students debate, or act out, whether public employees—teachers, sanitation workers, motor vehicle department employees, or others—should have the right to strike, and, if so, under what circumstances, would be ideal. (See Figure 2) To have students recognize the changes that can come with unionization, comparing the salaries in the 1960s of government employees, including teachers,

with those in other professions and in more blue-collar occupations, would be of great value.⁵⁴ To show how the turbulence of the 1960s affected all aspects of American society, not just “minorities and women,” teachers can assign students to do research projects on teacher strikes in the late 1960s: the *Readers’ Guide to Periodical Literature* for 1967-1968 and for 1968-1969 (or the on-line “Readers’ Guide Retrospective” database, where available) and the *New York Times Index* are filled with references to relevant articles. Such projects might also consider changes in historical context, such as why there have been relatively few teacher strikes and other public employee strikes in more recent years. To show how ordinary people became involved in historical events, teachers in many areas can invite retired colleagues, who were the pioneers of union organization in local districts, to speak to their classes, or to sit for “oral history interviews” with selected students. To show the connections and tensions between social movements, devoting more attention to the Memphis sanitation workers strike on the one hand, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville strike on the other, would be worthwhile. To utilize Internet resources, students can search a growing number of histories of public employee unions on the web, although the objectivity and accuracy of these in-house sources should also be interrogated.⁵⁵

Individual teachers who are union members and activists will have to decide whether they are comfortable talking with their students about what is, in essence, part of their own history; if not, there are plenty of other examples of public sector unionization and strikes that are appropriate. Of course, the problem of adding yet another topic to an already packed curriculum is real. However, in the past decade, many states have moved pre-Civil War U.S. history entirely to the middle schools, and high school social studies classes often have a full semester to devote to American history from 1945 to the present. Of course, public employee unionism can be a valid topic of study in government or economics classes, as well as in history classes. With Wisconsin-style laws increasingly under consideration, it will also be a current events topic, and the history can be presented as a backdrop to current debates.

As the 1960s recedes further into the past, we can gain greater perspective about long-term patterns which emerged from events in that decade. The best revisions in textbooks highlight new issues that earlier editions overlooked. To give one more example, Todd and Curti’s 1986 *Triumph of the American Nation* explains clearly how the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, passed as part of Johnson’s Great Society, eliminated the old quota system for immigrants based on national origins, and thus helped facilitate the great increase in immigrants from Asia, in the 1970s and since. The 1977 edition of Todd and Curti’s *Rise of the*

American Nation had included no such mention of this law or of the change in immigrant origins then just beginning to be underway.⁵⁶

In this same way, textbook authors and teachers should recognize that public employee unions, alongside the other social, political, and legal movements and changes of the 1960s and early 1970s, marked a major change in the lives of many American workers and in the way governments operate, and that the effects of these unions continue to be felt long after their founding. Moreover, the connections between public employee unions and the other social movements of the 1960s remind us that these movements were often intertwined, especially around class, race, and gender, and that the arbitrary compartmentalization of movements and events actually detracts from historical understanding. For all of these reasons, the large-scale rise of public employee unions beginning in the 1960s—which led in turn to one of the most explosive public policy issues in recent years—should take its rightful place as part of the secondary-level U.S. history curriculum.

Notes

1. See, respectively: Gary Nash, *American Odyssey* (New York: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2004), 722; Andrew Cayton, Elisabeth Israels Perry, Linda Reed, and Allan Winkler, *America: Pathways to the Present* (Needham, MA: Prentice Hall, 2003), 762; Joyce Appleby, Alan Brinkley, Albert Broussard, James McPherson, and Donald Ritchie, *The American Journey* (Columbus, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2009), 894; Daniel Boorstin and Brooks Mather Kelley, *A History of the United States* (Needham, MA: Prentice Hall, 1999), 844; Paul Boyer and Sterling Stuckey, *American Nation in the Modern Era* (Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 2005), 674. The gay and lesbian movement is mentioned in: Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, 870; Gerald Danzer, J. Jorge Klor de Alva, Larry Krieger, Louis Wilson, and Nancy Woloch, *The Americans* (Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell, 2000), 993; and John Garraty, *The American Nation* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 855. Cayton et al.—or their publisher, Prentice Hall—must have lost their nerve on this issue, because the gay and lesbian movement, which is discussed in the 1995 edition of *America: Pathways to the Present*, at 823-824, all but disappears from the 2000 and 2003 editions of that textbook.

2. James Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York: New Press, 1995), 247. Loewen's charge may be exaggerated, as his investigation of coverage of the recent past focused mainly on the Vietnam War and foreign policy, not domestic movements for change. One could also make the case, by the way, that these textbooks should devote greater attention to conservatism and right-wing populism in the 1960s, and their long-term impact; see, e.g., Dan Carter, *The Politics of Rage: George Wallace, the Origins of the New Conservatism, and the Transformation of American Politics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995) and Rick Perlstein,

Before the Storm: Barry Goldwater and the Unmaking of the American Consensus (New York: Hill & Wang, 2001).

3. Of the voluminous journalistic accounts of the Wisconsin events, see, e.g., “Wisconsin Protests Continue Against ‘Union Bashing’” (18 February 2011), <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/feb/18/wisconsin-union-protests>>, “Largest Crowds since Vietnam War march in Wisconsin” (26 February 2011), <<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/02/27/us-wisconsin-protests-idUSTRE71O4F420110227>>, and “Education Secretary Criticizes Walker’s Attack on Teachers Unions” (8 April 2011), <<http://www.jsonline.com/news/education/119517804.html>> (*Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel*).

4. Robert Shaffer, “Where Are the Organized Public Employees? The Absence of Public Employee Unionism from U.S. History Textbooks, and Why It Matters,” *Labor History* 43 (August 2002): 315-334. The present essay incorporates some material from this earlier essay. These specific unions, and the issue of public sector unionism, are also ignored in the *National Standards for United States History*, coordinated by Gary Nash and the UCLA-based National Center for History in the Schools, which despite the bitter controversy over its adoption has influenced textbook-writing and curriculum standards in some states. Nash also authored one of the textbooks surveyed here.

5. Loewen, 195. Aside from coverage of the United Farmworkers Union, discussed below, this generalization holds for texts by Appleby et al. as well as James Banks, Barry Beyer, Gloria Contreras et al., *United States: Adventures in Time and Place* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001); Vivian Bernstein, *America’s History* (Austin, TX: Steck-Vaughn Co., 1997); James West Davidson and Michael Stoff, *The American Nation* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2003); Lorna Mason, Jesus Garcia, Frances Powell, and C. Frederick Risinger, *America’s Past and Promise* (Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, 1995); and the *National Standards for United States History* (Los Angeles, CA: UCLA National Center for History in the Schools, 1994). Several others end such coverage with the AFL-CIO merger in 1955. The textbooks by Banks et al., Bernstein, and Mason et al. are geared for middle school students rather than high school students.

6. Frances FitzGerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston, MA: Atlantic/Little, Brown, 1979), 155.

7. AFSCME is now the largest AFL-CIO union, with the continued decline of some industrial unions and the breakaway in 2005 of the “Change to Win” faction from the labor federation.

8. These statistics, and statistics and references in the following paragraphs, unless otherwise noted, are from Shaffer, “Where Are the Organized Public Employees?”

9. See their respective websites: American Federation of Teachers, <www.aft.org/about>; American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, <www.afscme.org/union/about>; National Education Association, <www.nea.org>.

10. Steven Greenhouse, “Most U.S. Union Members Are Working for the Government, New Data Shows,” *New York Times* (23 January 2010), and Bureau of Labor Statistics, “Economic News Release: Union Members Summary,” 21 January 2011, available at <<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm>>. See also <<http://data.bls.gov/pdq/SurveyOutputServlet>> for trends in union membership statistics, 2000-2010, and, for a qualitative overview based on a study from the Center for Economic Policy Research, see Steven Greenhouse, “Survey Finds Deep Shift in the Makeup of Unions,” *New York Times* (11 November 2009).

11. “20,000 Teachers Boo Wage Pledge by Gov. Shafer,” *New York Times* (5 March 1968): 25.

12. “School Days Are Here Again—Almost,” *Life* (20 September 1968): 56C.

13. Joshua Freeman, *Working-Class New York: Life and Labor since World War II*

(New York: New Press, 2000), 217-227; Jerald Podair, *The Strike that Changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002); Steve Golin, *The Newark Teacher Strikes: Hopes on the Line* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

14. Joseph McCartin, "'Fire the Hell Out of Them': Sanitation Workers' Struggles and the Normalization of the Striker Replacement Strategy in the 1970s," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 2 (Fall 2005): 67-92.

15. Appleby et al., *The American Journey*, 873, 891, 903, 922. Appleby and McPherson are both former presidents of the American Historical Association. For examples of textbooks that note King's death but do not explain why he was in Memphis, see also: Bernstein, *America's History*, 385; Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, 814; Garraty, *The American Nation*, 862; and Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986), 950.

16. Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 875; Nash, *American Odyssey*, 694-695. For roughly similar statements, see also: Boyer and Stuckey, *American Nation in the Modern Era*, 666; Cayton et al., *America*, 726; Davidson et al., *The American Nation*, 864; and Carol Berkin, Alan Brinkley, Claybourne Carson, et al., *American Voices* (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1995), 679-680.

17. Joy Hakim, *A History of US, Book 10: All the People* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 155.

18. King, as quoted in Michael Honey, *Going Down Jericho Road: The Memphis Strike, Martin Luther King's Last Campaign* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007), 417. For an excellent film on this strike, suitable for classroom use, see *At the River I Stand*, dir. David Appleby, Allison Graham, and Steven Ross (Memphis State University, 1993).

19. Freeman, 208.

20. Stanley Aronowitz and Jeremy Brecher, "The Postal Strike," in *Root & Branch: The Rise of the Workers' Movements*, ed. Jeremy Brecher et al. (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1975), 28-39.

21. See, e.g., Golin, *The Newark Teacher Strikes* and Paul Johnston, *Success While Others Fail: Social Movement Unionism and the Public Workplace* (Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1994).

22. Davidson and Stoff, *The American Nation*, 867.

23. Mason et al., *America's Past and Promise*, 772.

24. Martin Luther King III, "Why Martin Luther King, Jr. Would Support the Public Worker Protests," <<http://blog.afcio.org/2011/04/04/why-martin-luther-king-jr-would-support-the-public-worker-protests/>>; Will Jones, "This is Bigger than Public Employee Unions," <http://www.afcio.org/mediacenter/speakout/will_jones.cfm>; "Standing Up for Public Service" (AFSCME), at <<http://www.standforpublicservice.org/resources/solidarity-rallies>>.

25. Irving Bernstein, *Promises Kept: John F. Kennedy's New Frontier* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 204-217.

26. For accounts of the Wisconsin and New York City legislation and union efforts, see, for example, Joseph Slater, *Public Workers: Government Employee Unions, the Law, and the State, 1900-1962* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), chap. 6, and Jewel Bellush and Bernard Bellush, *Union Power and New York: Victor Gotbaum and District Council 37* (New York: Praeger, 1984), esp. 47-80, respectively. Of course, with just a few exceptions, the new public employee bargaining legislation did not confer the right to strike. On the almost-successful effort of public employee unions in the 1970s to win NLRRA protections at all levels of government, see Joseph McCartin, "'A Wagner Act for Public Employees': Labor's Deferred Dream and the Rise of Conservatism, 1970-1976,"

Journal of American History 95 (June 2008): 123-148.

27. Appleby et al., *The American Journey*, 797. See also, e.g., Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, 634, and Nash, *American Odyssey*, 470.

28. Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 674-675.

29. Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present*, 543-545, 559; Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present* (2000), 666-667. Todd and Curti, in *Triumph of the American Nation*, 731, observe that the FLSA applied only to workers in "interstate commerce," but fail to explain for students what that means. Berkin et al., *American Voices*, 480, states that the NLRA excluded farmworkers from coverage. Nash, *American Odyssey*, 470, also notes that the Social Security Act did not apply to many workers, especially members of minority groups, when it was adopted. Nash also states retrospectively in his section on the United Farm Workers Union, in the 1960s, at 739, that the NLRA had not included farmworkers.

30. Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 674-682, goes furthest in this direction for the New Deal era, devoting more attention to the New Deal's impact on women and racial minorities than on the labor movement, but they do not analyze labor legislation to demonstrate such impact.

31. Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present*, 739, 872; Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, chap. 31, 903. Cayton et al., in the 1995 edition of their textbook, at 810, had not referred to PATCO specifically, but had said, without mentioning unions, that the Reagan-led "conservative revolution" targeted the public sector for its "inefficiency and waste." Loewen had complained, in *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, 195, that none of the textbooks he surveyed covered the breaking of the PATCO strike, which perhaps spurred Cayton et al. to be more specific here.

32. Davidson and Stoff, *The American Nation*, 844; "Why Teachers Strike," *U.S. News & World Report* (19 February 1968): 85; Todd and Curti, *Rise of the American Nation*, Vol. 2, 410, 413-414; Todd and Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation*, 1003, 1006; *National Standards in United States History*, 206-207; Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present*, 750.

33. Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 901-906.

34. BLS, "Economic News Release: Union Members Summary," <<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2/nr0.htm>>; Greenhouse, "Survey Finds Deep Shift in the Makeup of Unions."

35. Nash, *American Odyssey*, 725.

36. Garraty, *The American Nation*, 898-899.

37. Boyer and Stuckey, *American Nation in the Modern Era*, 599-600.

38. Appleby et al., *The American Journey*, 952.

39. Todd and Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation*, 948.

40. William Jones, "Obama's New Deal," *The Nation* (1 December 2008): 6; BLS, "Economic News Release: Union Members Summary," esp. Table I, at <<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2/nr0.htm>>. On the contributions of one important industrial union to the civil rights movement, which are generally ignored by our high school history textbooks, see Nelson Lichtenstein, *The Most Dangerous Man in Detroit: Walter Reuther and the Fate of American Labor* (New York: Basic, 1995), and Kevin Boyle, *The UAW and the Heyday of American Liberalism, 1945-1968* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

41. Bernstein, *America's History*, 405; Nash, *American Odyssey*, 722-723, 733, 736-741.

42. See, e.g.: Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present*, 772-773; Boyer and Stuckey, *American Nation in the Modern Era*, 682-683, 700; Danzer et al., *The Americans*,

920-921.

43. On the politics of textbook adoption, see, e.g.: Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, esp. 271-274; Diane Ravitch, *The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003), esp. chap. 7; *The Mad, Mad World of Textbook Adoption* (Washington, D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2004), at <http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2004/200409_madworldoftextbookadoption/Mad%20World_Test2.pdf>; “Left and Right Agree: State textbook adoption must go!” *NEA Today* (November-December 2008): 27-29.

44. Nash, *American Odyssey*, 739; Cayton et al., *America: Pathways to the Present*, 772-773. Todd and Curti, in *Triumph of the American Nation*, 952-953, state more vaguely that farmworkers had “received little benefit from the social legislation that was intended to protect workers.”

45. Davidson and Stoff, *The American Nation*, 867.

46. Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, 865-866; Hakim, *A History of US*, 150. Nash, in *American Odyssey*, 736, notes appropriately the opposition the UFW faced from the Teamsters Union, which at the time was not part of the AFL-CIO. Boyer and Stuckey, in *American Nation in the Modern Era*, 483, note that the AFL had sponsored an agricultural union in the 1930s, but do not connect the AFL-CIO to the UFW.

47. Todd and Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation*, 953; Danzer et al., *The Americans*, 922; Nash, *American Odyssey*, 740-741; Appleby et al., *The American Journey*, 873.

48. Nash, *American Odyssey*, 740.

49. Boorstin and Kelley, *A History of the United States*, 865.

50. Davidson and Stoff, *The American Nation*, 866.

51. Todd and Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation*, 953.

52. Boyer and Stuckey, *American Nation in the Modern Era*, 684. Boorstin and Kelley, in *A History of the United States*, chap. 34, do present the social movements of the 1960s as a series of controversies over the meaning of American ideals, with the implication that these can never be fully resolved.

53. Unlike most textbooks, which limit their treatment of farmworkers and the UFW to California, Danzer et al., in *The Americans*, esp. at 926-927, describe migrant farm labor as a national phenomenon, but even they do not discuss farmworker unionization efforts outside of California. For a journalistic expose of farmworker conditions today, especially in Florida, see John Bowe, *Nobodies: Modern American Slave Labor and the Dark Side of the New Global Economy* (New York: Random House, 2007). For innovative strategies today on behalf of Florida tomato pickers, which have won agreements from fast-food chains such as McDonald’s and Taco Bell, and which therefore might be of particular interest to young people, see the website of Coalition of Immokalee Workers, at <<http://www.ciw-online.org/>>.

54. See the charts in “Why Teachers Strike,” *U.S. News & World Report* (19 February 1968): 84-85.

55. For example: on the Memphis strike, see <<http://www.afscme.org/union/history/mlk>>; on AFSCME more generally, see <<http://www.afscme.org/union/history/afscme-75-years-of-history>>; on the 1970 postal strike, see <<http://www.ny1cbr36.org/history.htm>>; on the UFT (New York City teachers), see <<http://www.uft.org/who-we-are/history/>>; on the AFT, see <<http://www.aft.org/about/history/>>; on public employees in Wisconsin, see <<http://www.civilservicecentennial.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=3747&locid=54>>.

56. Todd and Curti, *Triumph of the American Nation*, 945; cf. Todd and Curti, *Rise of the American Nation*, vol. 2 (1977).

Appendix

The following textbooks were consulted for this study, along with earlier editions of some of them:

- Appleby, Joyce, Alan Brinkley, Albert Broussard, James McPherson, and Donald Ritchie. *The American Journey, Teacher's Wraparound Edition*. Columbus, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2009.
- Banks, James, Barry Beyer, Gloria Contreras et al. *United States: Adventures in Time and Place*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001.
- Berkin, Carol, Alan Brinkley, Clayborne Carson et al. *American Voices: A History of the United States, Teacher's Edition*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1995.
- Bernstein, Vivian. *America's History: Land of Liberty*. Austin, TX: Steck-Vaughn Co., 1997.
- Boorstin, Daniel, and Brooks Mather Kelley. *A History of the United States, sixth edition, Annotated Teacher's Edition*. Needham, MA: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- Boyer, Paul, and Sterling Stuckey. *American Nation in the Modern Era, annotated Teacher's Edition*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 2005.
- Cayton, Andrew, Elisabeth Israels Perry, Linda Reed, and Allan Winkler. *America: Pathways to the Present, Modern American History, Teacher's Edition*. Needham, MA: Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Danzer, Gerald, J. Jorge Klor de Alva, Larry Krieger, Louis Wilson, and Nancy Woloch. *The Americans, Annotated Teacher's Edition*. Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell, 2000.
- Davidson, James West, and Michael Stoff. *The American Nation, Teacher's Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Garraty, John. *The American Nation: A History of the United States, eighth edition*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.
- Hakim, Joy. *A History of US, Book 10: All the People*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Mason, Lorna, Jesus Garcia, Frances Powell, and C. Frederick Risinger. *America's Past and Promise*. Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell/Houghton Mifflin, 1995.
- Nash, Gary. *American Odyssey: The Twentieth Century and Beyond*. New York: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2004.
- National Standards for United States History: Exploring the American Experience, *Grades 5-12 Expanded Edition*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA National Center for History in the Schools, 1994.
- Ritchie, Donald. *American History: The Modern Era Since 1865, Teacher's Wraparound Edition*. New York: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, 2001.
- Todd, Lewis Paul, and Merle Curti. *Rise of the American Nation, Heritage Edition, Vol. 2, With Readings*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Todd, Lewis Paul, and Merle Curti. *Triumph of the American Nation*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986.