

TIME

The Split in How Americans Think About Our Collective Past Is Real—But There’s a Way Out of the ‘History Wars’



A girl in class with her social studies book. Southington, Conn., May 1942. Fenno Jacobs for Office of War Information—Universal Images Group / Getty

BY **DANA SCHAFFER** AND **PETE BURKHOLDER**

APRIL 29, 2021 10:28 AM EDT

What are Americans supposed to know about the history of their country? Whose stories should be taught in classrooms, whose should be omitted and who decides? Such questions inform recent education bills like Louisiana’s HB564 and Iowa’s HF802, which prohibit the teaching of “divisive concepts” and are just two of the latest entrants in an often-contentious

dialogue reaching back to the founding of the Republic itself. But while there's been a steady stream of opinions from politicians, pundits and professors about where to find "Historical Truth," it's always been hard to know how exactly the American public would answer these questions.

Our recent national survey of people's understandings and uses of the past, the full results of which will be published this summer, gives voice to the unheard masses. A collaboration between the American Historical Association and Fairleigh Dickinson University, and funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the poll of 1,816 Americans reveals the tensions of a nation riven by racist violence and political anxieties. Yet, those same results are reason for optimism, revealing commonality and paths forward for a divided nation.

The survey data suggest the divisions are real when it comes to how we think about our collective past. For example, 69% of respondents self-identifying as Democrats believe that women generally receive too little historical attention, while fewer than half that number (34%) of Republicans agree. That trend continues for other groups: racial and ethnic minorities, as well as the LGBTQ community, are seen by Democrats as shortchanged by historians, by a two- or even three-to-one margin, relative to their Republican counterparts' views. Meanwhile, Republicans are up to twice as likely as Democrats to say that religious groups, the Founding Fathers and the military get inadequate historical consideration. Most strikingly, 84% of Republicans believe that history should celebrate our nation's past, while 70% of Democrats think history should question it.

Read more: *The Long History of Politicizing American History Class*



PAID PARTNER CONTENT

This is What Real Change in Health Care Looks Like

[Watch] [↗](#)

BY PIEDMONT HEALTHCARE

Nor are divisions simply a matter of political affiliation. White respondents are more than twice as likely as people of color to feel that the histories of racial and ethnic minorities garner too much attention. Those with a college degree see men dominating the thoughts of historians at nearly twice the rate that non-degreed respondents do. Age is likewise a factor, with people in the 18-29 bracket calling for more attention to LGBTQ history by a 19-point margin, relative to those in the 50-64 age range. The “history wars” are thus polarizing beyond the party affiliations within which they are typically framed.

Yet, if the survey results’ divisions are evident, so are the points of commonality. Asked whether it was acceptable to make learners uncomfortable by teaching the harm some people have done to others, over three-fourths of respondents said it was. That breakdown largely remained, across age groups, college education, gender or geographic location. Even by political affiliation the similarities held steady, with 78% of Democrats and 74% of Republicans supporting the appropriateness of confronting painful history. (The only outlier here was among Hispanic respondents, where just 58%—though still a clear majority—defended making history learners uncomfortable.)

Get your history fix in one place: sign up for the weekly TIME History newsletter

Perhaps most importantly, our findings offer a possible path out of the history wars by changing the focus from *what* sets of facts are taught to *how* they are taught. To be clear: we firmly support teaching the histories of peoples and events that have been omitted from traditional narratives. But we also recognize the impossibility of covering everyone and everything in the past, especially given the conflicting viewpoints expressed above.

As it stands, two-thirds of our survey respondents felt that “history” is primarily just an assemblage of facts. Moreover, our respondents voiced disdain for the facts-centric approach most of them encountered in high school, and which continued, though to a lesser extent, in college. But, although facts do form the basis of historical inquiry, they are only that—a means to various ends, as opposed to ends unto themselves. Unsurprisingly, by an eye-popping ratio of greater than seven-to-one, respondents reported more interest in

learning history as a form of inquiry as opposed to mastery of factual content.

Such inquiry-based pedagogies have been advocated (though unevenly adopted) for years, with the American Historical Association, selected school programs and individual teaching mavericks taking leading roles in curricular change. But our survey indicates that the predominant modes of instruction, to say nothing of content, remain out-of-step with methods that make students want to learn more about the past.

History education, like politics, shouldn't run on the basis of polls. Yet it's worthwhile to consider the extent to which Americans are asking for evidence-based techniques that embrace the ambiguities of the past, and that challenge their understandings of history itself. More so than any education policy based on favoring a particular narrative or viewpoint, such a realignment holds the potential for making the past more accessible and applicable—and more unifying for the American public.

Historians' perspectives on how the past informs the present

Pete Burkholder is professor of history at Fairleigh Dickinson University in Madison, NJ. He serves on the national advisory board of the Society for History Education, and the editorial board of The Teaching Professor.

Dana Schaffer is deputy director at the American Historical Association. She has overseen numerous public history projects and conferences, and she also serves on the board and is chair of the advisory committee of National History Day.

MORE MUST-READ STORIES FROM TIME

- **Shonda Rhimes Already Knows** What You're Going to Watch Next
- How **Donald Trump Turned Jan. 6** into a Windfall
- Why 2022 Is the Year **We Learn to Live With COVID-19**
- Public Schools Are **Struggling to Retain Black Teachers**. These Ex-Teachers Explain Why
- CDC Director **Rochelle Walensky Faces a Surging Virus**—And a Crisis of Trust
- How **Addictive Social Media Algorithms** Could Finally Face a Reckoning in 2022
- The Supreme Court Could Let **Religious Schools Take Taxpayer Money**. Former Students Say That's a Mistake

CONTACT US AT LETTERS@TIME.COM.

SHARE THIS STORY



[View on NGE](#)

Tomochichi

CA. 1644-1739

Tomochichi, chief of the **Yamacraw Indians**, remains a prominent character of early Georgia history. As the principal mediator between the native population and the new English settlers during the first years of settlement, he contributed much to the establishment of peaceful relations between the two groups and to the ultimate success of Georgia.

Early Life

Little is known about the youth of this warrior and chieftain because of the absence of accurate documentation. Presumably, he was **Creek** and participated in their early activities with Englishmen in South Carolina, both peaceful and hostile. About 1728 Tomochichi created his own tribe of the Yamacraws from an assortment of Creek and Yamasee Indians after the two nations disagreed over future relations with the English and the Spanish. His group, approximately two hundred people, settled on the bluffs of the **Savannah River** because the location was the resting place of his ancestors and had close proximity to English traders. When **General James Oglethorpe** and his fellow settlers reached the region in February 1733, they realized the need to negotiate fairly with the neighboring Indian tribes or risk the success of their enterprise. Among Oglethorpe's entourage was **Mary Musgrove**, daughter of a Creek mother and an English father, who served as interpreter between the general and the chief. Tomochichi had had previous contact with English colonists, making him unafraid yet cautious. The aging warrior had several different options available, but he decided to receive the new arrivals and to give them permission to establish **Savannah** in order to take advantage of trading and diplomatic connections.

Accomplishments in Georgia

During the first five years of English settlement, Tomochichi provided invaluable assistance to the new colony. One year after Oglethorpe's arrival, the Indian chief accompanied him back to England along with a small delegation of family and Lower Creek tribesmen. There, Tomochichi expertly fulfilled the position as mediator for his people during numerous meetings with important English dignitaries. He politely followed English mannerisms in his public appearances while pushing for recognition and realization of the demands of his people for education and fair trade. Upon his return to Georgia, Tomochichi met with other Lower Creek chieftains to reassure them of the honest intentions of these new Englishmen and convinced them to ally with the English despite previous deceitful encounters with their northern neighbors in South Carolina.

After Oglethorpe returned to Georgia in February 1736, the chief received **John Wesley**, minister of Savannah, his brother **Charles**, and their friend Benjamin Ingham. Tomochichi reiterated his requests for Christian education for his tribe, but John Wesley rebuffed him with complex replies. Ingham, on the other hand, assisted in creating an Indian school at Irene, which opened in September 1736 much to the delight of the elderly chieftain. The same year, Tomochichi and Oglethorpe participated in an expedition to determine the southern **boundaries** of Georgia and helped mediate interactions with the Spanish. Tomochichi exerted his best efforts to maintain peace, and Oglethorpe regularly asked his friend for advice and assistance in achieving this goal. During the summer of 1739 Oglethorpe made an unprecedented journey to Coweta, deep in Indian Territory, to bolster his connections to the Lower Creeks, which resulted in a mutually favorable treaty. Tomochichi was unable to partake directly in Oglethorpe's negotiations; instead, he lay at home in his village fighting a serious illness.

Tomochichi died on October 5, 1739, and while sources differ over his exact age, historians and contemporary observers generally agree that he was in his late nineties. His contributions to the colony of Georgia were celebrated with an English military funeral, and the grave site was commemorated with a marker of "a Pyramid of Stone" collected from the vicinity. He left his wife Senauki and his nephew Toonahowi in charge of his small tribe, but he appointed no one to take his place as the impartial mediator between the Indians and the English. It was in this role that he provided his most lasting contributions, a role that both cultures accepted and applauded. The mound of stones honoring his final resting place in Savannah was removed in the early 1880s, and as a replacement, a large **granite** boulder with a decorative copper plate was installed southeast of the original structure with a dedication ceremony on April 21, 1899. The **Georgia Historical Commission** later placed a large marker in Savannah's Wright Square, which details the achievements of the Yamacraw chieftain.

Author

Julie Anne Sweet, Baylor University, Waco, Texas

Originally published Sep 20, 2002

Last edited Feb 21, 2018

Further Reading

- Charles C. Jones Jr., *Historical Sketch of Tomo-Chi-Chi, Mico of the Yamacraws* (Albany, N.Y.: J. Munsell, 1868).
- Helen Todd, *Tomochichi: Indian Friend of the Georgia Colony* (Atlanta: Cherokee, 1977).

INSIGHTS

The Atlanta Journal-Constitution

"Ask yourself one question. 'Is it right?' Then do what you believe is best for your town, your state and your country." — James M. Cox, founder, Cox Enterprises

EDITORIAL BOARD

Donna B. Hall, Publisher

Kevin Riley, Editor

Mark A. Waligore,
Managing Editor

Andre Jackson,
Opinion Page Editor

Tomochichi's full history is worth knowing

How we honor an unheard history is as important as who we honor.

By Malinda Maynor Lowery and Beth Michel

Recently, Atlantans have made the city's historical landscape more inclusive by temporarily installing a statue of Tomochichi at Atlantic Station. Standard histories of Georgia place Tomochichi at the founding of the colony, alongside James Oglethorpe. The statue gestures with an open hand to the Millennium Park gates, as if to welcome newcomers to his home.



Malinda Maynor Lowery

As Native people who live in Atlanta but whose tribal homelands are elsewhere, Tomochichi's welcome has a special meaning to us. We want to make sure our neighbors have the right context. Georgia's history is becoming our history too.



Beth Michel

This statue brings a welcomed opportunity to offer more nuance to the story people know, to educate the public about the past. Georgia schoolchildren only learn a few sentences about Tomochichi in their classes. Tomochichi is remembered as leading a village of Yamacraw Indians, promoting friendly relations with the English, and allowing Georgia founder James Oglethorpe to establish the city of Savannah.

Told this way, Tomochichi's story sounds like the Southern version of the first Thanksgiving — an overly romanticized tale of the Yamacraw chief as Squanto to the Pilgrims. Today's Tomochichi statue contains remarkable echoes of earlier sculptures of Massasoit now in Massachusetts, Utah, and elsewhere, the Pokanoket chief who, legend has it, sat down with those Englishmen for that first Thanksgiving.

We know that not all is as it seems with Thanksgiving, and Tomochichi's history with James Oglethorpe is no different. Tomochichi was, in fact, an outcast from his home town, the Muscogee (Creek) village of Apalachicola. He established the village of Yamacraw



Workers prepare to install a statue of Tomochichi, chief of the Yamacraw, at the Millennium Gate Museum on 17th Street on Sept. 20. The statue brings an opportunity to offer more nuance to the story of Native people in Georgia. STEVE SCHAEFFER FOR THE AJC

with mostly Creek family members.

At the time of Tomochichi's leadership, the Creek were recovering from a costly war with South Carolina fought over Carolina settlers' perpetual kidnapping and enslavement of Native people. The English were in seemingly endless conflict with the Spanish, who still occupied Florida. Oglethorpe banned enslavement of Africans because he did not want to import them only to have them run to Florida and the Spanish, who promised to free anyone who would help them defeat the English. Oglethorpe, like his Carolina cousins, did not object to enslaving Native people. The Creeks and their allies had waged war on Carolina to stop this practice.

Tomochichi's role in these conflicts isn't clear, but Oglethorpe entered a war zone, not a wilderness. His reputation was already tainted by his English brethren. He did not have the upper hand and did not want his efforts to go the way of South Carolina's, nor did he want to inadvertently help the Spanish.

Tomochichi, too, was probably a poor negotiator — at first, he threatened Oglethorpe and his men with violence. For their safety, both men needed the

protection of a Creek woman, Mary Musgrove, who was the niece of a key Creek leader. In fact, Mary Musgrove negotiated that first treaty between Tomochichi and Oglethorpe from her home on Yamacraw Bluff. A skilled translator and trader, she put both men in their places, and is personally responsible for many of the harmonious relationships that the early settlers managed. In Creek society, women held a great deal of influence over politics. But we don't have a statue of Mary Musgrove, we have one of Tomochichi.

In light of the facts, we can appreciate how the standard version of Tomochichi and James Oglethorpe might obscure rather than reveal. After all, as one of my students pointed out, despite Oglethorpe's dependence on the Yamacraw chief's generosity, "there's no university in Georgia named after Tomochichi." Historically, Georgia's subsequent settlers have not been anxious to return his kindness.

To be sure, the installation of Tomochichi in Atlanta this week begins to right that wrong, it is a sign of a new era. We can educate the public about the past without exploiting their history or elevating avowed racists. Monuments

such as these can offer visitors and residents the chance to reflect on what the past means to us, to understand that we are part of a bigger picture and to see evidence that our actions have consequences far into the future.

But given the widespread dispossession of Native people that brought Georgia — and the city of Atlanta — about, we propose that how we honor an unheard history is as important as who we honor. Commemorative efforts should also meaningfully reflect the communities they are intended to honor.

Indigenous nations in the United States face two related obstacles that converge in this moment of the unveiling of the statue of Tomochichi. First is a widespread belief that we are no longer here, that we died out long ago, or that we have been replaced. The standard narrative of Tomochichi's gift to James Oglethorpe reinforces this erroneous belief. It paves over the longer, more difficult and tragic events that unfolded later, and erases the crucial, complex role of a Native woman.

But even those events didn't lead to our disappearance from this land. These events did, however, make possible a related belief: that Native people have lost everything, even the power or authority to decide who among us is Native, who belongs to our communities. A DNA test that demonstrates Native ancestry does not make someone a member of a tribe who can stand in for this history. As with the controversy over U.S. Sen. Elizabeth Warren's Native ancestry, DNA does not equate to belonging. And because of the tragedies our nations have endured, we must continually assert our own definitions of who should speak for us.

Muscogee (Creek) people have continued to call Georgia home despite these tragedies. In 2014, at the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, one of the events that launched the final period of Muscogee dispossession in Georgia, Muscogee Nation Principal Chief George Tiger spoke eloquently of this longer history. He said, "through adversity, we gain strength." That is the message we hope visitors gain from Tomochichi in Atlanta.

Malinda Maynor Lowery is a citizen of the Lumbee Nation and Cahoon Family Professor of American History at Emory University. Beth Michel is a citizen of the Tohono O'odham Nation and associate dean of admissions at Emory University.

ON THE SCENE ATLANTA



In a steady rain Monday, workers temporarily install the statue of Chief Tomochichi of the Yamacraw at the Millennium Gate Museum on 17th Street. PHOTOS BY STEVE SCHAEFER FOR THE ATLANTA JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION

Chief Tomochichi statue arrives at temporary home

Tribute to Native American 'co-founder of Georgia' will soon stand in new park.

By Ernie Suggs

ernie.suggs@ajc.com

Matt Thomas looks like he was chiseled in bronze.

That is why it was a no-brainer for Rodney Cook Jr. to commission renowned sculptor Stan Mullins to render the 31-year-old sometimes model and corporate wellness adviser to be the face and body of Atlanta's latest statue: Chief Tomochichi.

Standing 20 feet tall, the statue was unveiled Monday and installed at the Millennium Gate Museum near Atlantic Station, its temporary home.

By at least 2022, Cook hopes to move it to Rodney Cook Sr. Park in Vine City, where it will rest atop a 15-story peace column that will anchor the recently opened park. In

Tomochichi continued on **B7**



Matt Thomas, who modeled for the Chief Tomochichi statue because of his resemblance to a descendant and after a DNA test confirmed his Native American heritage, attended Monday's temporary installation.

Tomochichi

continued from B1

July, the first statue, of Congressman John Lewis, was unveiled at the new park.

Cook plans to ring the Vine City park with 18 bronze statues, plaques and monuments dedicated to peacemakers with ties to Georgia, including Andrew Young, C.T. Vivian, Julian Bond and Martin Luther King Jr.

Tomochichi, a Native American born close to 400 years ago, seems like an outlier, but Cook said he is the perfect foundation for the park.

According to the Georgia Encyclopedia, in 1733, when General James Oglethorpe settled in Georgia, Tomochichi, the chief of the Yamacraw Indians, received him and granted permission to establish Savannah to take advantage of trading and diplomatic connections. In 1736, Tomochichi and England's Oglethorpe participated in an expedition to determine the southern boundaries of Georgia and helped mediate interactions with the Spanish.

"We got a very beautiful, monumental statue of the co-founder of Georgia," Cook said of the chief, who lived from roughly 1644 to 1739. "He was one of the first peacekeepers in Georgia, and we are proud to tell his story."

Most Native Americans eventually were pushed off



The Chief Tomochichi monument will eventually be moved to its permanent home, among the peacemakers rising up from peace columns at Rodney Cook Sr. Park in Vine City. STEVE SCHAEFER FOR THE ATLANTA JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION

their lands by European settlers, including in the 19th century, when thousands of Cherokee Indians in Georgia and neighboring states were forced to resettle in Oklahoma, in what is known as the Trail of Tears.

Monday morning, while Cook and his guests watched from the top of the Millennium Gate, Mullins directed his team in erecting the statue. Against torrential rain, a crane carefully hoisted the statue as workers carefully guided it to the pedestal.

"Point him right at me," Mullins barked, standing about 20 feet away on a median to make sure the statue faced the city.

Atlanta City Councilman Michael Julian Bond stood in the rain all morning, waiting

for the statue to be placed. With his suit soaked, he narrated the process on Facebook Live.

"It is beautiful," Bond said. "People are taking down Confederate statues, as they should. This is a statue we should be uplifting. We have been wise enough to want to make it right."

Cook and Mullins were looking for a likeness of Tomochichi and stumbled upon Thomas, whom they both knew. Going through old paintings of Tomochichi, Cook noted that Thomas bore a resemblance to one of the chief's heirs, Toonahowie, "and he looked like the great chief probably would have looked in his prime."

Thomas, who grew up in Cobb County, took a DNA

test to determine whether he had Native American blood, and passed.

"Then it progressed to me modeling in a loincloth," Thomas said. "Seeing the statue now is surreal. I still haven't wrapped my head around it. I can't wait to show my grandkids one day."

Dressed in shorts and a T-shirt, Thomas, with his girlfriend Cassie Cope, walked over to the statue as the workers screwed it to the pedestal. He folded his arms and posed for pictures in front of his likeness.

"It is pretty cool to see a giant, 20-foot statue of my boyfriend out here," Cope said. "I can brag to my friends about it. But I told him if we ever broke up, I would never drive by here again."

[Home](#) > [Publications & Directories](#) > [Perspectives on History](#) > [Issues](#) > [March 2021](#) > From the Executive Director > A Paradox

AHA ACTIVITIES , FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

A PARADOX

History without Historians

James Grossman | Feb 9, 2021

I'm wrestling with a dilemma, a paradox. Media, social and otherwise, want to know why history has seemingly lost status in higher education. Majors are declining; enrollments have stabilized unevenly across institutions. Departments are being consolidated and losing positions as chairs are told to tighten their belts.

At the same time, history itself—along with history education and the public commemoration of historical events—pervades these same media, the focus of battles over the very essence and future of the United States. The already iconic photographs from the January 6 insurrection at the US Capitol reek of history: medieval imagery, the 1775 Gadsden flag, abundant Confederate emblems. Reporters ask historians whether 1619 or 1776 holds the key to our national identity, or why state legislators have disparaged a particular set of curricula and introduced bills that list forbidden concepts, topics, and perspectives.



The controversy generating the most attention of late is the already infamous “Report from the President’s Advisory 1776 Commission,” issued on the penultimate full day of the Trump administration. After President Biden quickly withdrew the report and disbanded the commission, many journalists and historians breathed sighs of relief; surely this was the end of the matter. But the report lives on, not only in the National Archives as an official document, but also on the Heritage Foundation website as part of an attack on academic historians and the *New York Times* and Pulitzer Center’s 1619 Project Curriculum. As one journalist told me, one commission member has made it clear that she “wants school boards and students to read the report,” and that “the deactivated commission still plans to meet and rework the report.”

The 1776 Commission is not yet dead. I fear seeing the report put to use, zombie-like, to delegitimize the work of professional historians, while activists and legislators work—as boosters or propagandists, *not* as historians—to influence local history education. This is already brewing in at least three state legislatures (Arkansas, Iowa, and Oklahoma), with bills in the hopper that aim to purge teaching materials of “divisive concepts.” Consider proposed legislation in Arkansas:

A public school shall not allow a course, class, event, or activity within its program of instruction that: Promotes the overthrow of the United States Government; Promotes division between, resentment of, or social justice for a: (A) Race; (B) Gender; (C) Political affiliation; (D) Social class; or (E) Particular class of people.

The AHA’s statement on the 1776 Commission report, printed below, articulates what is at stake. Although the immediate target of the commission, the president who appointed it, and its allies in state legislatures is the 1619 Project, the broader and more enduring goal is to perpetuate celebratory myths of a nation whose essence lies in extremely limited government and cultural homogeneity. They want neither to confront our past nor learn from it.

In the context of the current fixation on the 1619 Project, it is not merely the question of whether 1619 or 1776 represents the nation’s “founding.” It is a matter of whether one can understand documents written by slaveholders in the late 18th century without understanding their world—one in which humans had owned, bought, and sold other humans for nearly two centuries.

I fear seeing the commission report put to use to delegitimize the work of professional historians, while activists and legislators work to influence local history education.

Historians know this, including those who have identified flaws in the 1619 Project. But the proponents of a history that marginalizes slavery and its aftermath while denying the deep and continuing impact of racism on nearly all aspects of American life would rather not have historians at the table. There were no professional historians of the United States on the 1776 Commission. Nor were any historians consulted by the San Francisco Board of Education in advance of its recent decision to rename 44 public schools. The chair of the school “renaming committee” believes historians themselves to be both troublesome (here’s that paradox again) and irrelevant. “What would be the point?” in consulting a historian, he asked. “History is written and documented pretty well across the board. And so, we don’t need to belabor history in that regard. . . . Based on our criteria, it’s a very straightforward conversation. And so, no need to bring historians forward to say—they either pontificate and list a bunch of reasons why, or [say] they had great qualities. Neither are necessary in this discussion.”

These controversies are by no means equivalent. What happened in San Francisco is unusual, an extreme case, in the battles over naming. But in its details can be found a call to action for historians, to be aware of what is happening not only in our state legislatures, but in our communities and school boards—indeed all those civic associations that Alexis de Tocqueville so admired—and to show up, perhaps even to join the table without a special invitation. We cannot heal this nation without accurately understanding its pathologies, which are by their very nature historical.

AHA CONDEMNS REPORT OF THE ADVISORY 1776 COMMISSION

The just-released “1776 Report” claims that common understanding of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution can unify all Americans in the love of country. The product of “The President’s Advisory 1776 Commission,” the report focuses on these founding documents in an apparent attempt to reject recent efforts to understand the multiple ways the institution of slavery shaped our nation’s history. The authors call for a form of government indoctrination of American students, and in the process elevate ignorance about the past to a civic virtue.

The report actually consists of two main themes. One is an homage to the Founding Fathers, a simplistic interpretation that relies on falsehoods, inaccuracies, omissions, and misleading statements. The other is a screed against a half-century of historical scholarship, presented largely as a series of caricatures, using single examples (most notably the “1619 Project”) to represent broader historiographical trends.

The sections on the founders envision godlike men who crafted documents that asserted “universal and eternal principles of justice and political legitimacy.” Ironically, the report erases whole swaths of the American population—enslaved people, Indigenous communities, and women—the way the founders excluded those groups from the body politic in a wide variety of founding documents as well as actual public practice. In listing threats to the ideals of the nation, the report ignores the Confederate States of America, whose leaders, many clearly guilty of treason, initiated a civil war that claimed more than 700,000 lives—more American lives than all other conflicts in the history of the country combined. Instead, the authors focus on early 20th-century Progressive reformers and bizarrely suggest they were similar to Mussolini and other World War II European fascists. Of particular note is the implied condemnation of Progressive Era legislation—workplace health and safety legislation, regulation of the production of food and drugs, the elimination of child labor, and other social goods we take for granted today.

The report concludes with a full-throated assault on American universities, which, the authors claim, have produced what they call “deliberately destructive scholarship.” This scholarship is described as the “intellectual force behind so much of the violence in our cities,” including the

“defamation of our treasured national statues.” The vast majority of targeted statues, as the AHA has noted before, honor either men who committed treason by violating oaths of office and taking up arms against the United States government, or whose main historical significance lay in their defense of slavery or other forms of white supremacy.

Written hastily in one month after two desultory and tendentious “hearings,” without any consultation with professional historians of the United States, the report fails to engage a rich and vibrant body of scholarship that has evolved over the last seven decades. Americans across the nation, perhaps including some of the commissioners, have encountered this history not only in books and classrooms, but also at museums, in national parks, and even in their homes as they watch documentaries.

Though it extols (narrowly defined) family and faith as the ultimate forces for good, the “1776 Report” also observes that the “bedrock upon which the American political system is built is the rule of law.” Yet its condemnation of contemporary social movements ignores recent efforts to undermine the legitimacy of the very institutions enshrined in the Constitution itself.

The AHA Council approved this statement on January 20, 2021.

James Grossman is executive director of the AHA. He tweets @JimGrossmanAHA.

Tags:

[AHA Activities](#)

[From the Executive Director](#)

[Advocacy](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). Attribution must provide author name, article title, *Perspectives on History*, date of publication, and a link to this page. This license applies only to the article, not to text or images used here by permission.

The American Historical Association welcomes comments in the discussion area below, at [AHA Communities](#), and in [letters to the editor](#). Please read our [commenting and letters policy](#) before submitting.

COMMENT

Please read our [commenting and letters policy](#) before submitting.

The final reading will be up to you!

Please bring in an article about history that is local to you and told in multiple ways. Be prepared to discuss how these perspectives differ and the potential reasoning behind these differences.

If you have you any questions, please email Eli (earnold@oglethorpe.edu) or Sarah (srodgers@oglethorpe.edu).