

UC Berkeley

Charlene Conrad Liebaw Library Prize for Undergraduate Research

Title

Politics, America, and Sex: What Could Go Wrong? The Orange County Right Wing and the Battle over Progressive Education

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/44061544>

Author

Bianco, Emma

Publication Date

2019-04-01

Undergraduate

Politics, America, and Sex: What Could Go Wrong?
The Orange County Right Wing and the Battle over Progressive Education

Emma Bianco
History 101 Thesis
Professor M. Brilliant
Fall 2018

I. Introduction

On November 9th, 2016, while the national press focused on a quite tumultuous presidential election, a subtler revolution took place. For the first time in eighty years, my home county of Orange County, California voted for a democratic presidential candidate (by 39,000 votes).¹ A similar process repeated itself in the 2018 midterms: the Democrats gained control all four House seats in Orange County and flipped all seven Republican held seats.² This dent in the Right's political monopoly over Orange County suggests a reversal of its staunch conservative nature. During such a tumultuous period in one of the most infamous political regions, I sought to fathom the development of my county's Republican disposition. However, when conducting preliminary research, I became aware of a fascinating ideological battle within Orange County during the 1960s, centered around a contentious debate of "progressive education." Amongst a population of 1.4 million in twenty-two cities, with 361,890 children enrolled in public K-12 districts by 1970, this curriculum battle revealed the depth of political influence upon educational policies.³ This all but forgotten incident in Orange County's history presents an intriguing case study in the development of this

¹ Seema Mehta, "Orange County Voted for a Democrat for President for the First Time since the Great Depression," *Los Angeles Times*, November 9, 2016, <http://www.latimes.com/nation/politics/trailguide/la-na-election-aftermath-updates-trail-orange-county-turns-1478716018-htmllstory.html>.

² Adam Nagourney, "A Democratic Rout in Orange County: Cisneros's Win Makes It Four," *The New York Times*, November 18, 2018, sec. U.S., <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/17/us/politics/cisneros-orange-county-democrats.html>.

³ U.S. Census Bureau, *Census of Population and Housing 1970: Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, California* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau, 1972), 12.

notoriously Republican zone, before Nixon's Silent and Reagan's Moral Majority took the national stage.

Understanding this niched political battle—one of the first waged by the nascent right wing—requires a deeper appreciation for the area of Orange County itself, and its conservative reputation. The editors of *Post-Suburban California: The Transformation of Orange County Since World War II* describe Orange County in terms of a “suburbia city.”⁴ Not merely a haven for white flight and suburban safety from urban decay, this region intentionally interweaves industrial and residential housing over a large expanse of space, linked by the private automobile.⁵ Orange County's commitment to private industry and its religious, middle class white population created the perfect recipe for a more reactionary environment in the 1950s and 1960s.⁶ By 1960, 40% of the California's Republicans lived in Orange County; in every presidential election from 1948 to 1968, 63% of the population voted republican.⁷ Yet Carey McWilliam's germane assessment still rang true: “Southern California [was] politically insane.”⁸ Up until Ronald Reagan's gubernatorial race in 1966, *half* of Orange County's voters still

⁴ Adam Nagourney, “A Democratic Rout in Orange County: Cisneros's Win Makes It Four,” *The New York Times*, November 18, 2018, sec. U.S., <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/17/us/politics/cisneros-orange-county-democrats.html>.

⁵ Eric Avila, *Popular Culture in The Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2004), 46-47.; Kling, Olin, and Poster, *Post-Suburban California*, 18.

⁶ Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001), 158.

⁷ McGirr, 112.; CQ Press, “CQ Voting and Elections Collection,” accessed October 30, 2018, <http://library.cqpress.com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/elections/document.php?id=avg1948-1CA2&type=hitlist&num=0>.

⁸ Carey McWilliams, *Southern California: An Island on the Land* (Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith Publisher, 1973), 274.

registered with the Democratic party.⁹ Democrats that voted for Reagan earned the name “ticket splitters,” as party polarization did not exist in such an extreme manner.¹⁰ Despite Goldwater’s 1964 Republican nomination, which demonstrated the depth of Orange County republicans’ grassroots mobility, this region did not fully support the Radical right at the onset of their emergence.¹¹ But by the late 1960s, right wingers (both Radical and ultraconservative) fortified their presence in Orange County.¹² These societies mostly clung to the label of “anti-communist,” which refers to opposition to internationalist movements and state control.¹³ Two major bastions of their ideology delineate how these groups would later attack progressive education: their commitment to limited government interference, and a dedication to preserving private “morality.”

⁹ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 205.

¹⁰ Gladwin Hill, *Dancing Bear: An Inside Look at California Politics* (Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1968), 219.

¹¹ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 12.; Ira Shor, *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 25.; In *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration*, historian Ira Short addresses the common misconception that only the Radical right and conservative factions opposed communism. However, he deduces that the “New Left” did not support the communist revolution around the world, although they still retained populist ideas. By the 1960s, there was no single “red menace,” but conservative forces were more aggressive in labeling the communist enemy (25). Nevertheless, anti-communist sentiments existed on both sides of the aisle.

¹² As defined in an “Inquiry into the Effect of the Radical right and Ultra-Conservatives on Public Education,” George H. Crosson Jr. delineates a subtle difference between Radical rightists and ultra-conservatives. The former in the 1950s-1960s believed that a grand communist plot had already taken root amongst the government, and it was their duty to expose it. The latter did not believe a communist plot was afoot, but that inept politicians were easy target, and “too soft” on communism; this would make it easier for communism to take root in all levels in government (5-6). In this paper, due to the great plethora of Right groups in Orange County, the terms “right wing,” “Radical right,” and “the Right” will be used interchangeably.

¹³ The term “state control” is a reference to any form of government control, whether by the United States government, California State government, or local government.; McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 43.

Before launching into the woes of Orange County’s curriculum wars, one must familiarize themselves with the “enemy:” progressive education. Herbert Kliebard’s *The Struggle for American Curriculum: 1893-1958* remains the authority on this subject, and chronicles progressive education’s various implementations from the early 20th century to the 1960s. One of the most cataclysmic events to ever hit the United States, the Great Depression subsequently weakened American faith in capitalism and engendered progressive educators to sedulously advocate their educational goals.¹⁴ This new form of education upended more traditionalist forms of schooling, particularly the emphasis on drills: the memorization of various historical and classic literary facts, and the “3 R’s” (“reading, riting [sic], and [sic] rithmetic [sic]”).¹⁵ The overarching ambitions of progressive education originated from its “founding father” John Dewey.¹⁶ In *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (1916), Dewey recapitulates his argument that education serves “as a shaping, forming modeling activity—that is, a shaping into the standard form of social activity.”¹⁷ This pithy synthesizes progressive education’s conviction that education and the “real world” don’t remain mutually exclusive; education becomes a mechanism by which to cultivate social change.¹⁸

¹⁴ Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 71.

¹⁵ Max Rafferty, *Suffer Little Children* (New York, New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1963), 136.; Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, 71.

¹⁶ Kliebard, 54.

¹⁷ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: MacMillan, 1916), 28.

¹⁸ Peter F. Carbone Jr., *The Social and Educational Thought of Harlold Rugg* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1922), 23.

Great waves of anti-progressive education sentiment swept through the Cold War period, crashing onto the national and Californian stage. These attacks predicated themselves around a few crucial deductions from these Radical right groups: that progressive education sponsored notions of socialism, and promoted wayward morals unsuited to the American lifestyle. The contentious debate over progressive education during the time of the Red Scare seeped into the local level, including Orange County. Some Orange County parents already critiqued the new “experimental” nature of progressive education in the primary and secondary schools.¹⁹ Complaints addressed progressive education’s commitment to conformity (or “adjustment”) which supposedly degraded the intelligence of the child, essentially reducing them to obedient “serfs.”²⁰ In the national setting, other forms of progressive education generally withstood the more radical factions of society; yet in Orange County, their tenacity in reiterating progressive education’s commitment to communism and its threat to the individual demolished a fundamental cog of this pedagogical structure.²¹ Vociferous right wingers swarmed public speaking areas, successfully campaigned to elect anti-progressive school board members, and greatly diminished progressive education programs in their districts. Through the analysis of news coverage provided by the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Orange County*

¹⁹ “To Max Rafferty from Mrs. J. M. Dieter,” August 14, 1970, Department of Education, Max Rafferty F3752: 773, Box 30 Folder D, California State Archive.

²⁰ Zora V. Smoyer, “Our Modern Education: To the Post-Intelligence,” *Orange County Register*, 1952 Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.

²¹ Stuart J. Foster, *Red Alert! Educators Confront the Red Scare in American Public Schools, 1947-1954* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 2000), 181.

Register, along with first person accounts through letters and journalists' work, it comes to light that progressive education in Orange eventually succumbed to the Right's criticism.

But how did these Orange County right wingers succeed when others in the country failed?²² What about *their* rhetoric led to their fruitful reward? To produce a careful study of this particular historical moment, we will concentrate on two major "battlegrounds" over which these right-wing associations contested over progressive education: social studies curriculum and sex education in the 1960s. Right-wing clusters protested social studies curriculum that supposedly promoted an anti-American attitude and emphasized a one world government, which eventually led them to reject an 1965 eighth grade history textbook, *Land of the Free: A History of the United States*. However, the Right's campaign against *Land of the Free* ultimately failed, with city leaders and educators finding their anti-socialist views paranoid and pandering.²³ However, their luck shifted with sex education. The Radical right capitalized on the private nature of Orange County citizens by gearing their argument to increasingly personal issues. By delineating the inherent threat sex education posed to the individual—and their moral principles— they eventually gathered enough backing to effectively eradicate most forms of sex education in the county by 1969. While the Right did not immediately succeed with regards to removing progressive

²² Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 103.

²³ Archie Shamblin, "CTA Pattern Repeated In Conservative Probes," *The Register*, May 26, 1965, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-may-26-1965-p-36/>.

education, their claims of progressive education's threat to personal morality and family life (not solely their anti-socialist rhetoric) crucially appealed to this County which prided itself on privatization and religious ethics.

I do not aim to narrate the rise of the Right in Orange County but to uncover the rhetoric they employed to eventually remove progressive education. In interpreting Orange County's exceptional curriculum battle within the larger national context, I rely on Jonathan Zimmerman's *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools* and Andrew Hartman's *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School*, which examine the consequences of right-wing populism on progressive education from the 1940s to the 1970s.²⁴ Although some remnants of progressive education still exist in private and charter schools, this type of "revolution" ended.²⁵ *Whose America?* references conservatives' stake in the "culture wars" from the 1950s to the 1980s, which took issue with education promoting more multiculturalism and "inclusion," specifically in textbooks.²⁶ Progressive education held an important role in these wars, especially amongst topics of religious and social studies instruction which attempted to "demythologize" American history.²⁷ Using an epistemological and theoretical lens, Hartman argues that 1950s and 1960s schooling became a battleground of the Cold War, where in the face of communist threat,

²⁴ Andrew Hartman, *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 6.; Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 6.

²⁵ Tom Little and Katherine Ellison, *Loving Learning: How Progressive Education Can Save America's Schools* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2015), 27.

²⁶ Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 2.

²⁷ Zimmerman, 10.

education became more conservative and anti-left.²⁸ Yet Zimmerman and Hartman maintain that progressive education's demise truly arose from matters of necessity. Critics (e.g., conservative intellectual Arthur Bestor) found progressive education lacking: it could not adequately prepare children for instruction in science or math.²⁹ During a period when American supremacy relied on their domination over the USSR in the arms and space race, training the next generation for a technological and scientific world became of the utmost importance.³⁰ These sentiments reified in the 1958 National Education and Defense Act, which endorsed academic funding to enhance math and science courses in the public schools, and simultaneously defunded programs progressive education lauded (e.g., vocational education).³¹ Addressed in Zimmerman's and Hartman's work, whilst the extreme right wing attacked progressive education, they did not solely cause its downfall. I intend to add to their discourse around rhetorical strategies utilized by conservative groups and the subject of "culture wars" with regards to social studies and sex education. However, I wish to supply a much more localized lens in analyzing Orange County's encounter with progressive education. I also disagree with Zimmerman's and Hartman's assertion that extreme Right views-which fixated on threats of internal

²⁸ Hartman, *Education and the Cold War*, 6.

²⁹ Arthur E. Bestor, "'Life-Adjustment' Education: A Critique," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955)* 38, no. 3 (1952): 414, <https://doi.org/10.2307/40220906>.

³⁰ Ronald Lora, "Education: Schools as Crucible in Cold War America," in *Reshaping American Society and Institutions: 1945-1960* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1982), 246.

³¹ Hartman, *Education and the Cold War*, 176.

communist subversion-did not gain much traction.³² These right-wing sentiments *did* find an audience in Orange County, due in part to the area's commitment to privatization and Judeo-Christian tenets. I intend to analyze these features with aid from Lisa McGirr's *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. In offering a comprehensive examination into the rise of the Right in Orange County, McGirr contributes the Right's rise to intense grassroots mobilization in the 1960s and their proclivity for privatization (specifically around Goldwater's 1964 republican nomination).³³ Her analysis of Orange County's populist movements certainly informs my argument, but I do not plan to add to her analysis of how Orange County reinvented the nature of Republicanism for the rest of the nation. Elaine Lewinnek's article "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles" supplicates McGirr's enquiry into grassroots mobilization-particularly among white conservative women during the Cold War era, specifically with regards to progressive educational policies.³⁴ Although Orange County does receive mention, most of her argument confines itself to the theory of "historical fundamentalism" and women's role in this educational strife.³⁵ Lastly, Natalia Petrzela's *Classroom Wars: Language, Sex, and the Making of Modern Political Culture* specifically addresses Orange County's handling of sex education in the 1960s-1970s, and the region's unique commitment to

³² Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 132.

³³ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 43,12.

³⁴ Elaine Lewinnek, "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles: *Land of the Free* , Public Memory, and the Rise of the New Right," *Pacific Historical Review* 84, no. 1 (February 2015): 48, <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2015.84.1.48>.

³⁵ Lewinnek, 50.

morality and religious fundamentalism.³⁶ However, this only encompasses a portion of her analysis, for she places these events within the context of national trends. In determining how the right wing dissolved progressive education in Orange County, I aim to merge *Suburban Warriors's* political study on Orange County's unique conservative situation, combined with Petrzela's, Zimmerman's, and Hartman's evaluation of progressive education's evolution during the Cold War.

II. Social Studies and *Land of the Free*

"A subversive monstrosity:"³⁷ *Land of the Free's* Introduction

"[America] offers the broadest educational opportunity, thus enabling every person to make the most of this ability. Along with this movement, past generations of Americans have handed on a set of institutions and ideals, inspiring and fortifying."³⁸ This statement from *Land of the Free: A History of the United States* (1965) reifies progressive social studies' aim to inspire students to further social advancement. History classes sought to inform students of their civic duty to better their environment through critically analyzing their country and its historical atrocities, injustices in federal and foreign policy, and economic discrepancies.³⁹ The 1939 California Teachers' Association manual outlines how to aid students to "[have] skill in

³⁶ Natalia Mehlman Petrzela, *Classroom Wars: Language, Sex, and the Making of Modern Political Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 7.

³⁷ Elaine Lewinnek, "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles: *Land of the Free*, Public Memory, and the Rise of the New Right," *Pacific Historical Review* 84, no. 1 (February 2015): 55, <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2015.84.1.48>.

³⁸ John W. Caughey, John Hope Franklin, and Ernest R. May, *Land of the Free: A History of the United States*, vol. 1 (Pasadena: Franklin Publications Inc., 1967), 618,619.

³⁹ Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, 170.

finding...materials in the solution of social, civic, economic, and ethical problems faced in a democracy,” all in an effort to promote good citizenship and civic responsibility.⁴⁰ Since the 1940s, social studies textbooks encountered assaillment, with state and national organizations (usually Right-leaning) citing their alleged espousal of communist causes.⁴¹ These views emerged in Orange County, propagated by the Radical right over the American history textbook, *Land of the Free*. These groups amassed support by stoking fears that this version of progressive education fostered socialist tendencies.

Social studies reformation and history textbook alteration encompassed an important facet of Zimmerman’s “culture wars” of the 1960s and 1970s, when progressive educators sought to encourage a more “realistic” (and subsequently more unfavorable) depiction of the United States.⁴² In the 1960s, progressive educators responded to civil rights activism and a new interest in intersectional histories by rewriting American history textbooks in an increasingly multilateral way.⁴³ This effort to create a more inclusive, multicultural social studies pedagogy intensified when the California State Curriculum commission adopted new guidelines in 1964 to

⁴⁰ California Teachers’ Association, “Appreciating Democracy: A Unit of Work for Junior and Senior High Schools” (California Teachers’ Association Southern Section, 1939), Pamphlet box of materials on the California Teachers Association: Box 1, Folder 27, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.; California Teachers’ Association, “California Educational Policies and Plans Committee Consulting Groups: Discussion Outline ‘Education and the Economic Success of the Individual,’” 1941, Pamphlet box of materials on the California Teachers Association: Box 2, Folder 5, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.

⁴¹ Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 100.

⁴² Zimmerman, 58.

⁴³ Zimmerman, 114.

fashion a more accurate representation of minorities in textbooks.⁴⁴ These guidelines prompted UCLA Professor John Caughey, John Hope Franklin and Ernest May to author *Land of the Free* for eighth grade history classes.⁴⁵ Symptomatic of progressive education ideologies, the textbook endeavored to incite critical thinking amongst its readers, specifically by delineating America's blunders and economic discrepancies:

A fifth of American families earn too little decent food, clothing and housing. In a nation so rich, such a condition should not exist. Nor should the cities where most Americans live be slum ridden and inadequate in transportation, schools and public service. And the countryside...is being stripped of its resources and beauty at a prodigal rate.⁴⁶

In addition to identifying America's "errors," *Land of the Free* also challenged students to undertake these "great responsibilities," naming the "unfinished business" of making "our cities better places in which to live, to make equal rights a reality, to bring the United States closer to...the Land of the Free."⁴⁷ However, progressive educators' bid to create awareness around America's societal ills sparked outrage amongst right-wing groups.

Radical right assault on social studies curriculum existed for many years; typically, the criticism revolved around history texts' leftist leanings.⁴⁸ In the 1930s, Harold Rugg (a prominent progressive educator) faced the wrath of organizations including the Sons of the American Revolution, who

⁴⁴ Lewinnek, "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles," 57.

⁴⁵ Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*.

⁴⁶ Caughey, Franklin, and May, 1:619.

⁴⁷ Caughey, Franklin, and May, 1:619.

⁴⁸ O.K. Armstrong, "Treason in the Textbooks," *The American Legion Magazine*, September 1940, 71, The American Legion Digital Archive.

accused his textbooks of communist teachings.⁴⁹ In late 1940s California, the book *Building America* launched an avalanche of Radical right attacks. Anti-communist organizations, particularly the House of Un-American Activities (HUAC) and the 1941 Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in California, launched investigations into textbook subversion and communist messages.⁵⁰ *Land of the Free* joined the long list of textbooks suspected of socialist leanings; in her extensive research, Lewinnek documents the demonstrative response *Land of the Free* generated in the suburban areas of southern California, directed by white-conservative women.⁵¹ Various Right ensembles (both in Orange County and statewide) attempted to halt this book's adoption, referencing its unfavorable-and thereby socialist-stance.⁵²

Despite the intense animosity, the vociferous right-wing opposition did not succeed in removing the text. Orange County citizens and educators observed the Right conducting “false charges of progressive education,” and making outlandish accusations.⁵³ Anti-socialist sentiment did endure in this conservative Cold War area, but failed to eradicate *Land of the Free*.

⁴⁹ Armstrong, “Treason in the Textbooks.”

⁵⁰ Goodwin J Knight, Harold J Powers, and Joseph A Beek, “Third Report Senate Investigation Committee on Education: Textbooks,” *Senate of the State of California*, 1948, 115.

⁵¹ Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 52.

⁵² Helen Johnson, “County Board to Study Controversial Textbook: Petitions Call ‘Land of Free’ Unpatriotic, Request Its Removal,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 23, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156041996/93FAB43011324714PQ/1?accountid=14496>.

⁵³ Archie Shamblin, “CTA Pattern Repeated in Conservative Probes,” *The Register*, May 26, 1965, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-may-26-1965-p-36/>.; Jack Boettner, “Grand Jury Criticizes County School Board: Report Says Undue Times Spent on Local District Problems Such as Sex Education,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 30, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper.

From the book's publication in 1965 to its revision in the last months of 1966, Radical right wing followers in Orange County utilized an anti-socialist rhetoric to criticize the text, specifically referencing the un-patriotic attitude towards important American heroes and events, in addition to its internationalist views by its endorsement of the ACLU, UN, and UNESCO.⁵⁴ In 1967, after an investigation into the complaints by the California Curriculum Commission, protestors resumed lambasting the text, despite its reinstatement.⁵⁵ But even after the book's stay of execution, right-wing assemblies in Orange County continued to demand its removal until 1969, naming its socialist propaganda, despite evoking criticism from other citizens and the California Teachers' Association, whom assailed the Right's presence in public education.⁵⁶ The story of *Land of the Free* from 1965 to 1966, its revision, and its debasing until 1969, exposes the Right's failure to destroy this form of progressive education. Fear of socialist subversion predominantly featured in Orange County, but the Right's allegations failed to convince the county of *Land of the Free's* innate threat. While progressive social studies lived on, quite a different result would emerge with progressive sex education.

⁵⁴ Lewinnek, "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles," 52.; Dick Turpin, "New History Textbook Gets Severe Criticism," *Los Angeles Times*, May 11, 1966, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155442761/3BCC0EE6B20B4928P/48?accountid=14496>.

⁵⁵ "Foes May Take 'Land of the Free' Ruling to Court," *Los Angeles Times*, March 23, 1967, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155692264/833B36DC7C6F498DPQ/54?accountid=14496>.

⁵⁶ Jack McCurdy, "CTA Defends Textbook: Teachers Issue Rebuttal to 'Land of Free' Critics," *Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155785705/C3D4333F5CE647B9PQ/52?accountid=14496>.

1965-1966: The Right's Rhetorical Offense to *Land of the Free*

Condemnation of progressive education textbooks existed for many years; however, the American Legion defended the notion that *Land of the Free* “evoked more adverse criticism than almost any other text ever adopted for commissary use in the public schools.”⁵⁷ Echoing other right-wing complaints of that time, their “resolution” to remove *Land of the Free* documented the inherent “socialist” approach to American history.⁵⁸ These right-wing fears suited post-war Orange County, which intrinsically opposed left leaning politics that supported socialism or government interference. Spouting the necessity of a limited government, anti-communist organizations including the John Birch Society oversaw an increase in membership, along with a host of other groups: the Americanism Education League, the Freedom Club, or the American Birthright Committee.⁵⁹ Fred Schwarz’s 1961 School of Anti-communism in Anaheim attracted thousands, which hosted talks on “Communism and Youth” and the “Communist Program for World Conquest.”⁶⁰ One may elucidate the methods by which

⁵⁷ American Legion, “From Edward Sharkey to Mr. Max Rafferty,” September 18, 1968, Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:812, Box 31, Folder G, California State Archive.

⁵⁸ American Legion.

⁵⁹ Bill Becker, “Right-Wing Groups Multiplying Appeals in Southern California,” *New York Times*, October 29, 1961, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/115274281/D365178ECEA94A0BPQ/37?accountid=14496>.

⁶⁰ “Anti-Red Meets Drawing Big County Crowds,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 9, 1961, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/167833549/82A80A3329B04563PQ/36?accountid=14496>.; “Freedom of Information Act Documents: CACC-Fred Schwarz-HQ-2,” sec. Program for Orange County School of Anti-Communism, Online Archive, accessed September 18, 2018, https://archive.org/details/foia_CACC-Fred_Schwarz-HQ-2?q=Orange+County+School+for+Anti-Communists.

the Right attempted to dismantle progressive social studies curriculum through their attack on *Land of the Free* from 1965 to 1966. Specifically, they referred to *Land of the Free's* apparent socialist intention through its anti-American attitude and lauding of international super governments; these subjects proved sensitive for the already conservative Orange County.

Land of the Free faced the firing squad in the late 1960s, accused of “anti-American” and communist principles; a common tactic utilized by right-wing groups with previous social studies textbooks. In 1949, HUAC’s “100 Things You Should Know about Communism: Communism in Education” proclaimed that any form of education that did not portray America as “the light and hope of the world” contained communist propaganda.⁶¹ Victim to a Catch 22, how could progressive educators instruct students on America’s faults—topics of slavery or lynching— in a positive portrayal? Lewinnek defines this rhetoric as “historic fundamentalism:” a theory, endorsed by many suburbanites, that history contains “sacred” texts, and that alternative historical interpretations are “blasphemous.”⁶² Acting within the theory of historic fundamentalism, some Orange County parents utilized the National Anti-Communist League of America’s 1961 Elementary Textbook Evaluation Guide: mirroring HUAC, it presented parents with a list of negative words and phrases, which if written in the text, revealed the textbook’s communist

⁶¹ United States. Congress. House. Committee on Un-American Activities, *100 Things You Should Know about Communism Series* (Washington, 1949), 62, <http://archive.org/details/100thingsyoushou1949unit>.

⁶² Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 50.

intentions (“slavery,” “racial minority,” “upper class,” and “welfare”).⁶³ Following HUAC’s reasoning, other extreme organizations linked the connection with anti-American attitudes to communist beliefs; “slanting” the textbooks to produce a “false history” supposedly revealed a Marxist substructure.⁶⁴ Such sentiment surfaced in the Orange County *Land of the Free* debate, with parents declaring the text “lacked historical fact” and “[denies] our great American heritage.”⁶⁵ At school board meetings, right-wing crowds explained how the book essentially debased American heritage by criticizing past historical events.⁶⁶ In 1966, the Pro American Group led by Mildred Hyatt asserted that the text demeaned the significance of the Declaration of Independence (referencing how the text remarks that “the next twenty-seven paragraphs [of the Declaration]...were specific complaints against the tyranny of George III. Some were exaggerations; some are not quite fair...”).⁶⁷ The group also professed that the text “belittled” various American heroes (referencing how the text reminds readers that Paul Revere rode the shortest route and other riders also informed of British invasion).⁶⁸

⁶³ National Anti-Communist League of America, “Elementary Textbook Evaluation Guide” (National Anti-Communist League of America, 1961), 2–15, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.

⁶⁴ “A Scheme for Brainwashing,” *Fullerton News Tribune*, October 18, 1965, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 5, Orange County Archives.

⁶⁵ “Court Dismisses Downey Suit on Controversial History Book,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 9, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155994523/A640989D0C124B51PQ/49?accountid=14496>.

⁶⁶ “Text Trouble Cited by History Author,” *Orange County Register*, October 11, 1962, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.

⁶⁷ Maury Beam, “‘Land of Free’ Textbook Blasted by Pro America Group,” *The Register*, June 14, 1966, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-jun-14-1966-p-3/>; Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*, 1:130.

⁶⁸ Beam, “‘Land of Free’ Textbook Blasted by Pro America Group.”; Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*, 1:134.

In 1966 the Orange County Land of the Free Protestors, led by Rose Martin, stormed board meetings with a petition of 3,000 signatures, alleging that the book “project[ed] negative thought models and promot[ed] propaganda alien to the American ideal.”⁶⁹ Numerous right-wing groups professed that *Land of the Free* established a socialist viewpoint due to its excess of historical distortions and its failure to foster patriotism.⁷⁰

According to the Orange County Right, *Land of the Free's* socialist background evidently derived from its anti-American prose in addition to its more blatant endorsement of big government and internationalism. Anti-internationalist views became a major point of contention amongst right wingers since the 1950s, particularly when pitted against progressive education's commitment to group cooperation.⁷¹ Dewey proposed that progressive education should harmonize the individual with the “real-world” to stimulate cooperation amongst fellow men.⁷² Practically, this translated into classroom settings which stressed effective means of class discussion and an internationalist mindset, alluded to in *Land of the Free*.⁷³ For example, the text resolved that “UNESCO [United Nations Educational,

Scientific and Cultural Organization] has helped define the standards of

⁶⁹ Helen Johnson, “Round 4 Coming Up for ‘Land of the Free’: Board Agrees to Hear Further Discussion in Textbook Dispute at Oct. 10 Meeting,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 27, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155928980/F50BFB6B012848E7PQ/59?accountid=14496>.

⁷⁰ Alice Pilson, 1965, Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:842, Box 4, Folder H California State Archive.

⁷¹ Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 87.

⁷² Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, 54.

⁷³ California Teachers' Association, “Suggestions for Associates of the California Educational Policies and Plans Committee,” October 1940, Pamphlet box of materials on the California Teachers Association: Box 2, Folder 7, Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley.

freedom and fairness toward which all nation ought to strive. Many other UN agencies have done important work.”⁷⁴ In 1965 and 1966, some of the aforementioned groups referenced *Land of the Free’s* celebration of the UN and the post-WWII commitment to a more interconnected world, even when the text noted the UN’s goal to fight the common enemy of communism.⁷⁵ The United States National Commission for UNESCO dismissed John Birch Society allegations that California textbooks supported a one world mindset, but right-wing bands continued to unravel *Land of the Free’s* celebration of an internationalist socialist movement.⁷⁶ America’s Future Textbook Evaluation Committee in Orange County proclaimed that the book praised the UN, “[going] so far as to say that eventually the U.N. will lead to a World State.”⁷⁷ Orange County parents Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Engle expressed their concern over the “socialist” slant of the textbook, in addition to citizen Alice Pilson’s belief that the textbook praised “socialistic projects” and “The People’s World.”⁷⁸ This fear of a socialist “international government” catered to Orange County’s well established fear of federal control. A dedication to privatization remained a mainstay of Orange County, with the establishment of organizations such as California Free Enterprise Association, founded by conservative businessman Walter Knott, who championed private enterprise

⁷⁴ Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*, 1:592.

⁷⁵ Caughey, Franklin, and May, 1:619, 595.

⁷⁶ Allan Nelson, “The United States National Commission for UNESCO to Dr. Rafferty,” October 26, 1964, Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:841, Box 33, Folder G, California State Archive.

⁷⁷ “Evaluation Panel Rejects Fourth of School Textbooks,” *Orange County Register*, June 22, 1964, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 5, Orange County Archives.

⁷⁸ Mr. and Mrs. Bruce D. Engle, 1966, Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:842, Box 33, Folder H, California State Archive.

and less government regulation in the economy. In Orange County, Anaheim and Newport Beach school districts publicized their refusal to adopt UNESCO educational guidelines, believing this demonstrated allegiance to a great socialist government evidently swearing “loyalty to a “godless” world government would result in national suicide.”⁷⁹ Radical rightists specifically indicated *Land of the Free’s* appraisal of world governments, thereby highlighting social studies’ commitment to a “socialist, one-world viewpoint.”⁸⁰

In 1965 and 1966, right-wing organizations weaponized an anti-socialist position to allege that *Land of the Free* contained anti-Americanism and a dedication to a “ one-world government.”⁸¹ Both of these arguments verified *Land of the Free’s* and progressive education’s socialist undertones which could “‘brainwash’” children.⁸² Yet the arguments did receive acknowledgement and encouraged the State Curriculum Commission to revise the text.

A Massive Overhaul: The Revision of *Land of the Free*, January 1967

From 1965 to 1966, the Orange County right wing attempted to expose *Land of the Free’s* socialist intentions to justify its removal. But not the only

⁷⁹ Anaheim City School District Board of Education, “Resolution of the Board of Education: Anaheim City Elementary School District,” June 12, 1962, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.; Dr. Terrell L. Root, “Comments on the UNESCO Convention and Recommendation on Discrimination Against Education Before Newport Harbor Elementary School Board,” n.d., Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.

⁸⁰ “An Apathetic Approach,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 26, 1970, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156379392/F15FA7FEB5EE4BFEPQ/40?accountid=14496>.

⁸¹ McCurdy, “CTA Defends Textbook: Teachers Issue Rebuttal to ‘Land of Free’ Critics.”

⁸² “A Scheme for Brainwashing.”

objectors, a state “Land-of-the-Free Committee” gathered various complaints from Californians to produce “Critical Appraisal of *Land of the Free*,” which accused the book of “destroy[ing] pride in America’s past” and “indoctrinat[ing] toward communism.”⁸³ This encouraged the State Curriculum Commission to launch a panel of historians (led by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Max Rafferty) to evaluate possible changes and corrections to the text.⁸⁴ Collecting letters and protests from individuals, they produced “Criticisms of the *Land of the Free*,” where they noted citizens’ concerns over a lack of patriotism and leftist leaning language.⁸⁵ Almost 10,000 people, including teachers and historians, assessed *Land of the Free* and sent their revisions to Dr. Russel Parks of the State Curriculum Commission (also the Superintendent of the Fullerton Elementary School District in Orange County). In January of 1967, the State Curriculum commission adopted the text, decreeing its accuracy.⁸⁶ The second edition of *Land of the Free* came into use, distributed by the California Curriculum Commission, to all of California’s eighth graders.⁸⁷ Now a supplementary text, school districts could decide whether to employ the

⁸³ Anaheim City School District Board of Education, “Resolution of the Board of Education: Anaheim City Elementary School District,” June 12, 1962, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.; Land-of-the-free Committee, 8.

⁸⁴ Max Rafferty, “To Dr. Dumke from Max Rafferty,” August 1, 1966, Department of Education, Max Rafferty, F3752:842, Box 33, Folder H, California State Archive.

⁸⁵ John W. Caughey, John Hope Franklin, and Ernest R. May, “Criticisms of Land of the Free” (Bureau of Textbooks and Publications Distribution California State Department of Education, July 25, 1966), Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:842, Box 32, Folder B, California State Archive.

⁸⁶ Mrs. Thompson Rolland, “Readers’ Forum,” *Pasadena Star News*, January 18, 1967, Newspaper Archive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/star-news-jan-18-1967-p-12/>.

⁸⁷ Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 59.

book or not; according to Raffety “the book now contain[ed] some of the most scathing denunciations of communism [he] had ever seen.”⁸⁸

But despite the state’s approval of the text, the Radical Right continued to demand the book’s removal. Lewinnek almost applauds these right-wing organizations’ ability to keep “fighting.”⁸⁹ Even with the book’s adoption, from 1967 to 1969, they continued to protest against this socialist text, threatening legal action and demanding answers from the various school boards. However, others doubted the veracity of their contentions. Unlike the issue of sex education, these arguments failed to gain enough validation, almost becoming laughable in the eyes of other Orange Countians.

1967-1969: “No Amount of Minor Revisions Could Alter Its Basically Subversive Trend.”⁹⁰

In the post-revision years, *Land of the Free* still faced intense accusations from the Right end of the political spectrum. In 1968, the Orange County Board of Education decided to launch a study about the impact of the *Land of the Free* on the population, at the behest of the rancorous Land of the Free Protestors who packed the local school board meetings.⁹¹ The

⁸⁸ Helen Johnson, “Disputed Text in, but Use Up to School Districts,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 23, 1967, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155661279/B78F143BE6274D99PQ/50?accountid=14496>; “Controversial 8th Grade Text Gets Final Ok,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 21, 1967, ProQuest Historical Newspaper.

⁸⁹ Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 77.

⁹⁰ “Board to Seek Study on ‘Land of Free,’” *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156106518/5C0E60C7727E4A85PQ/1?accountid=14496>.

⁹¹ “Board to Seek Study on ‘Land of Free.’”

Downey School District protested the fact that the state forced schools to adopt a “politically slanted” textbook, and threatened a lawsuit.⁹² Publius & Associates of Pasadena distributed the film “Education or Indoctrination” to school districts and parents, which erroneously reported that the *Land of the Free* sought to put the “[communist] party line in textbooks” in a “diabolic campaign to capture the minds of the American youth.”⁹³ School boards and parents did listen to the Right’s claims, but many rejected their anti-socialist paranoia, declaring that “most of the critics showed a willingness to use obvious forms of propaganda.”⁹⁴

The fear of subversion did not convince the entire county of *Land of the Free’s* socialist objectives.⁹⁵ The Radical right and ultra-conservatives of Orange County encountered a losing battle with social studies curriculum. A July 1969 grand jury found the Orange County Board of Education erroneously conducted a “barbershop poll” on *Land of the Free*, only acting in the interests of a few right-wing board members.⁹⁶ In 1968, the superior court dismissed the Downey Board of Education’s argument that they could

⁹² “Foes May Take ‘Land of the Free’ Ruling to Court.”

⁹³ Elaine Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles: *Land of the Free*, Public Memory, and the Rise of the New Right,” *Pacific Historical Review* 84, no. 1 (February 2015): 75, <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2015.84.1.48>.

⁹⁴ Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 75.; David Shaw, “County School Friction Laid to Political Stress,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 16, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156097604/CAE2BFF183AB4BE6PQ/3?accountid=14496>.; McCurdy, “CTA Defends Textbook: Teachers Issue Rebuttal to ‘Land of Free’ Critics.”

⁹⁵ Shaw, “County School Friction Laid to Political Stress.”

⁹⁶ Jack Buettner, “Grand Jury Criticizes County School Board,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 20, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156291314/EE3E3FCC49C64ABDPQ/9?accountid=14496>.

ban *Land of the Free* from classrooms due to its anti-American and communist nature.⁹⁷ Some citizens criticized the Right opposition, and the Orange County Board of Education's duplicity in providing the Right a platform to spout their ideas.⁹⁸ Furthermore, in 1968, the California Teachers' Association actually distributed a pamphlet to teachers ("*Land of the Free* and its Critics") so they could properly rebuke right winger's allegations. It professed that Right complaints bore racist ideologies, and that most who criticized the book failed to actually "'read the text itself.'"⁹⁹ The extreme Right undoubtedly caused a stir, but their effort to stamp out progressive education faced hardships and opposition.¹⁰⁰

Lost the Battle, But Win the War

The Right's attempt to eradicate the progressive *Land of the Free*—stretching from 1965 to 1967—ultimately failed. *Land of the Free* reinforced progressive education's aim of asking children to critically assess the faults of their society, (*i.e.*, the poor treatment of immigrants in the 1920s, or Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb.¹⁰¹ This led right wingers to believe that this new form of historical teaching damaged American patriotism and encouraged socialist attitudes.¹⁰² From its publication in 1965 to 1966, right wingers employed well known rhetoric to expose its socialist conspiracy, referencing its anti-American expressionism and its idolization of

⁹⁷ "Court Dismisses Downey Suit on Controversial History Book."

⁹⁸ Shaw, "County School Friction Laid to Political Stress."

⁹⁹ McCurdy, "CTA Defends Textbook: Teachers Issue Rebuttal to 'Land of Free' Critics."

¹⁰⁰ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 12.

¹⁰¹ Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*, 1:419, 591.

¹⁰² Caughey, Franklin, and May, *Land of the Free*, 1:419.

an internationalist world view. After state revisions in 1967, various organizations resumed protesting the book's adoption, which came to no avail, for the book remained in usage. Whilst this anti-socialist diatribe faced criticism and failed to rid of this specific feature of progressive education, a new challenger emerged. In the late 1960s the Orange County Right now attacked progressive sex education, which proved a much more private—and therefore more sensitive—topic amongst the population. Sex education struck a deeper cord in Orange County, and its commitment to family values and Christian ethics; a definite advantage for the right wing's assault against progressive education.

III. Sex Education

Sex Education: Orange County and Anaheim FLSE Program

In 1968, Superintendent of the Anaheim School District Paul Cook received a clandestine phone message from a concerned citizen:

The persons responsible for introducing this sex program into the schools are sadists and sex perverts and should be lined up against a stone wall and shot.¹⁰³

This radical viewpoint exemplifies Orange County's right-wing populism which predicated itself on defending the notions of family, nation, and God.¹⁰⁴ In the late 1960s, the battle of sex education in Orange County—specifically in Anaheim—demonstrated a Radical right victory over progressive education programs. By arguing that this form of progressive education posed a direct threat to the personal life of the individual (and

¹⁰³ Natalia Mehlman, "Sex Ed... and the Reds? Reconsidering the Anaheim Battle over Sex Education, 1962-1969," *History of Education Quarterly* 47, no. 2 (2007): 203.

¹⁰⁴ Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 187.

children), the right wing gained much more reception in this matter than with *Land of the Free*.

Beginning in the 1940s, progressive sex education sought to foster social improvement by promoting independent thinking, economic efficiency, and personal development.¹⁰⁵ Namely, through a 1950s educational method called “Life-Adjustment.” The Federal Security Agency Office of Education outlined Life Adjustment’s purpose to “equip all America youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as home members, workers, and citizens.”¹⁰⁶ The “Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth” 1951 instructor materials outlined various programs to aid with the ethical, moral, and mental health of the child; specifically, with a stress on home and family life, which encompassed sex education.¹⁰⁷ Sex education constituted a significant proportion of Life Adjustment.¹⁰⁸ This pedagogy also described sex education in terms of promoting a strong family structure, asking students to “appreciate family life and make it successful” by understanding the duties of a husband and wife through home-economic and biology classes.¹⁰⁹ In 1964, the more professional Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) advocated for sex education

¹⁰⁵ Little and Ellison, *Loving Learning: How Progressive Education Can Save America’s Schools*, 157.; Carbone, *The Social and Educational Thought of Harold Rugg*, 134.

¹⁰⁶ Federal Security Agency: Office of Education, “Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Bulletin 1951, No.2.” (United States Government Printing Office, 1951), 9, ED543614, ERIC, http://archive.org/details/ERIC_ED543614.

¹⁰⁷ Federal Security Agency: Office of Education, 10.

¹⁰⁸ Little and Ellison, *Loving Learning: How Progressive Education Can Save America’s Schools*, 157.; Federal Security Agency: Office of Education, “Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Bulletin 1951, No.2.,” 61.

¹⁰⁹ Federal Security Agency: Office of Education, 61.

for all children.¹¹⁰ Their teacher study guides fixated upon helping children understand the moral gravity of sex education, but extolled Life Adjustment's dedication to the role of the family and society.¹¹¹

Historian Natalia Petrzela in *Classroom Wars* defines California's important role in setting the standards of sex education through the country.¹¹² In Anaheim, progressive curriculum leaders Paul Cook, and nurse Sally Williams took it upon themselves to introduce the trend setting Family Life Sex Education courses (FLSE) into the K-12 schools. Inaugurated in 1965, this program consisted of a four-and-a-half-week-long course (at alternating grade levels), set up in a Socratic style structure, where students could ask almost any question of the teacher; subjects included reproduction, pregnancy, social adjustment and family structure.¹¹³ A *Los Angeles Times* student questionnaire revealed that most participants appreciated the program and found it beneficial, since the Anaheim course covered everything from "'social and cultural problems of adolescence... [to] family structure, dating, moral conduct, and problem solving.'"¹¹⁴ At the start of the program, almost 92% of Anaheim parents approved of it, with less than 1%

¹¹⁰ Harold I. Lief M.D., *Letter to New Members*, 1970, http://archive.org/details/TNM_SIECUS_sex_information_and_education_council__20180308_0243.

¹¹¹ Lester Allen Kirkendall, "SIECUS Study Guide No. 1: Sex Education" (New York, Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S., 1970), 11, http://archive.org/details/SexEducation_667.

¹¹² Petrzela, *Classroom Wars*, 129.

¹¹³ Mehlman, "Sex Ed... and the Reds?," 213.; Mary Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), 24-25.; Herman Wong, "Source of Controversy: Sex Education in Anaheim: View From the Classroom," *Los Angeles Times*, June 8, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156201402/48C215A70DB541F6PQ/46?accountid=14496>.

¹¹⁴ Wong.

opting to remove their children from the program.¹¹⁵ The enrolled students proclaimed their appreciation of the teacher's candor, attempting to dispel the myth that they talked about "'dirty'" subjects.¹¹⁶ A few years after the introduction of Anaheim's FLSE classes, other Orange County school districts began to enact similar curricula, from Fullerton, to Huntington Beach, to Placentia.¹¹⁷

Similar to social studies curriculum, this version of progressive education came under heavy fire. Reeling from Barry Goldwater's defeat in 1964, Petrzela argues that Orange County Rightist set their sights on a new target: that of sex education.¹¹⁸ McGirr supports this conclusion, determining that schools now became the place of political contests, attacked by the Right due to their evident socialist background and debauchery. Zimmerman and Petrzela chronicle the various communist accusations hurled against national sex education programs but fail to realize why Orange County sex education faltered, despite sex education's survival in the rest of the nation. With an urge to re-examine morality, Orange County right wingers did act within the context of anti-communist rhetoric, but now pursued a very personal affair: that of religion and family.¹¹⁹ This proved effective in Orange

¹¹⁵ Steve Emmons, "Issue of Sex Education Stalks School Elections: Controversy Prompts Power Struggle in Orange and Tustin: Top Issue in Anaheim," *Los Angeles Times*, April 13, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper.

¹¹⁶ Vi Smith, "Sex Education Gains Acceptance in County," *Los Angeles Times*, June 23, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/155961182/1D152F6C9FF4375PQ/44?accountid=14496>.; Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 70.

¹¹⁷ Smith, "Sex Education Gains Acceptance in County."

¹¹⁸ Petrzela, *Classroom Wars*, 145.

¹¹⁹ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 95.

County. The Post-war period saw an influx of white individuals (typically from the Midwest) lured by promises of jobs and housing. These individuals also brought their religion to Orange County, creating a landscape dotted with Protestant and Catholic churches (a combined 53.4% of the whole population).¹²⁰ In a district where the primary newspaper (the *Santa Ana/Orange County Register*) extolled the importance of God and the ten commandments in daily life, the Radical right could realistically appeal to an already Judeo-Christian population.¹²¹ McGirr argues that the particular religious character would later contribute to Orange County's important role in the Silent and Moral Majority in the 1970s and 1980s. The Christian Anti-Communist Crusade and the Mothers Organized for Moral Stability enticed the religious factions of the county, decreeing that communism proved antithetical to Christianity and God.¹²² Even though a 1969 poll found that 71% of all Americans permitted this form of education, particular right-wing actors—among them the John Birch Society and the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade—advocated the view that sex education gave rise to an “immoral state.”¹²³ With the lethal combination of God, family, and country, radical opponents of sex education specifically appealed to Orange County

¹²⁰ McGirr, 34.; Kling, Olin, and Poster, *Post-Suburban California*, fig. 7.2.

¹²¹ “Editorial Page,” *The Register*, January 18, 1966, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-jan-18-1966-p-16/>.

¹²² “Freedom of Information Act Documents: CACC-Fred Schwarz-HQ-2,” pt. Dr. Fred Schwarz Testimony to the United State House Committee on Un-American Activities, May 29, 1957, Online Archive, accessed September 18, 2018, https://archive.org/details/foia_CACC-Fred_Schwarz-HQ-2?q=Orange+County+School+for+Anti-Communists.

¹²³ Mrs. Charles Howe, “Mrs. Charles Howe to Governor Ronald Reagan,” April 30, 1969, Department of Education, Max Raffety F3752: 773, Box 30, Folder H, California State Archive.

citizens' personal matters which encouraged the dismantling of progressive sex education by 1970.¹²⁴

Through stitching together Petrzela's studies on Orange County's sex education, a plethora of newspaper reports, and journalist Mary Breasted's on the ground reporting on the fall of sex education in 1960s Anaheim (*Oh! Sex Education*) presents a clear narrative of this second battle over progressive education curriculum. Akin to the social studies controversy with *Land of the Free*, Orange County right-wing groups cited sex education's promotion of federal control and socialist leanings. Yet the fight against sex education succeeded where the one against *Land of the Free* faltered. Taking a much more personal approach, the Orange County Right also utilized Orange County's commitment to Christian morality by charging that sex education violated the privacy of family affairs and religious virtue. From 1965 to 1968, right wingers condemned this form of education in both school board meetings and public settings, referencing both socialist subversion and immoral teaching.¹²⁵ In 1969, these extreme views culminated in the Spring school board elections, where these organizations successfully placed candidates on the school boards, campaigning on the promise to preserve children's morality.¹²⁶ From 1969 to 1970, sex education programs were

¹²⁴ Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 79.

¹²⁵ Helen Johnson, "School Official Split on 2 Issues in Sex Hearings," *Los Angeles Times*, February 28, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156086511/EE3E3FCC49C64ABDPQ/21?accountid=14496>.

¹²⁶ Herman Wong, "Sex Education Fight Comes to a Boil Again in Anaheim," *Los Angeles Times*, April 20, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156173752/C44EF060863F447FPQ/19?accountid=14496>.

either outright removed or rendered weak and ineffective at the behest of the newly elected school board.¹²⁷ In the latter half of 1960s, the Radical right efficaciously removed an important part of progressive education curriculum. The extremists actually won the day, due in part to their claims of socialist control and their reiteration that sex education posed a threat to citizens' private lives and morality.

1965-1968: The Threat of Federal Control with a Virtuous Twist

With *Land of the Free* dissolving into the background, the contentious battle of sex education took its place. Orange County hosted a unique series of events in which these radical criticisms of progressive education attracted a sizable audience and shattered a prominent aspect of this pedagogy; a feat not necessarily accomplished in the rest of the county. But unlike the social studies debacle, the right wing successfully dealt a crippling blow to this version of progressive education by indicating how it personally violates the student and the family.¹²⁸ Critics of the right wing perceived the much more personalized nature of this attack, noting that when the John Birch society or other groups when a groups "'seize [on] the emotional sex issue, they automatically get a larger audience for their views.'"¹²⁹ With fears of communist subversion dwindling, citizens saw that the Right "'needed a new

¹²⁷ Mehlman, "Sex Ed... and the Reds?," 227.

¹²⁸ Wong, "Source of Controversy: Sex Education in Anaheim: View From the Classroom."

¹²⁹ Douglas Robinson, "Sex Education Battles Splitting Many Communities Across U.S.," *New York Times*, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, accessed June 24, 2018, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156431542/79EC230ECB88491APQ/31?accountid=14496>.

target:” sex education.¹³⁰ From the mid 1960s (when Anaheim started its FLSE program in 1965) until the school board elections of 1969, the Radical right maintained that akin to *Land of the Free*, Life Adjustment’s sex education promoted socialist tendencies through federal interference. However, their victory emerged from their assertion that sex education successfully violated the private sphere of the home by “pitt[ing] students against parents” and sponsored notions of immorality.¹³¹ Facing opposition, these organizations evoked interests amongst the Orange County population, intimidating progressive education proponents.

Similar to their indictments against *Land of the Free*, Radical right groups strove to expose a socialist underbelly to the sex education programs, mainly by highlighting SIECUS’s “communistic” intentions and abuse of federal power. This mission came under the purview of a belligerent organization called the California Citizen’s Committee (CCC), led by Jim Townsend. A vitriolic individual, Townsend argued that SIECUS deliberately wanted to “communize” students, and to “make the children ‘loyal to the world, not to the United States.’” Journalist Mary Breasted recorded various 1960s Anaheim School Board meetings in which the CCC stormed in, accusing educators of employing SIECUS materials that promoted a socialist outlook.¹³² Ironically, board member Royal Marten pointed out that Anaheim didn’t exclusively utilize the SIECUS materials, but referred to them for

¹³⁰ Sharon E. Fay, “Immaturity in Sex Education Scored,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 8, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper.

¹³¹ Kenneth Lamott, “Max Rafferty Is Not a Mad Messiah of the Right-He Is More Disturbing Than That,” *New York Times*, September 1, 1968, ProQuest Historical Newspaper.

¹³² Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 32.

supplementary purposes.¹³³ With the CCC, other organizations concluded that SIECUS violated the parents' right of telling their children about sex. Therefore, it signified both a federal institution overstepping its boundaries while simultaneously promoting their own forms of ideology.¹³⁴ Undoubtedly, a sign of a socialist government. In the words of Huntington Beach school trustee Matthew Weyuker, "sex education belongs in the home and church, where a family's own morals can be taught...how do we know whose morals are being taught in the classroom?"¹³⁵ Pro-Birch, right-wing journalists Sam Campbell and John Steinbacher of the *Anaheim Bulletin* published scathing attacks on sex education that mirrored this sentiment:

My conviction is that when you talk about sex instruction, you are talking about the family. When you are talking about the family, you are talking about the home. When you are talking about the home, you are talking about the country.¹³⁶

Campbell's delineation of these particular spheres speaks to his conviction that the most private sector—the family—anchors the entire fate of the nation. But with the introduction of SIECUS materials, other parents of the late 1960s believed that this federal organization now put the power of teaching sex (a previously private and family affair) into the hands of the state funded public-school teachers, thereby usurping the role of the private

¹³³ Breasted, 39.

¹³⁴ McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*, 230.

¹³⁵ Herman Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat," *Los Angeles Times*, March 29, 1970, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156434613/EE3E3FCC49C64ABDPQ/23?accountid=14496>.

¹³⁶ Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 137.

household.¹³⁷ This action represented a socialist government's invasion of the American people's most protected domain.

Hartman concluded that in the anxious Cold War America, issues of morality became a common topic in education reformation, with intellectuals stating that "'American education can contribute to a moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution.'"¹³⁸ In addition to anti-socialist rhetoric, the key to this anti-progressive education argument lied in its targeting of a very personal and private matter; specifically the topic of Christian virtue and student morality.¹³⁹ Radical right groups cited sex education's failure to properly instruct students on true morality and Christian matters.¹⁴⁰ With citizens Bob Bennet and Elinor Elder of Orange County writing to the California Superintendent of Public Instruction in the late 1960s, continuously referencing their "Christian consciousness" and the cruciality of the church in the educational process, the threat to Christian virtue clearly resonated in the very Protestant and Catholic Orange County.¹⁴¹ From her reporting at Anaheim Board meetings, Breasted observed how the CCC and Anaheim Antis (another Radical right groups) based many of their pro-religion

¹³⁷ Linda Mathews, "Battle Lines Being Drawn Over Sex Education," *Los Angeles Times*, December 23, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156062403/78917C7BB8F24608PQ/28?accountid=14496>.

¹³⁸ Hartman, *Education and the Cold War*, 120.

¹³⁹ Petrzela, *Classroom Wars*, 145-46.

¹⁴⁰ Gordon V. Drake, *Is the Schoolhouse the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex?* (Tulsa, Oklahoma : Christian Crusade Publications, 1968), 6-20, <http://archive.org/details/isschoolhousepro00drak>.

¹⁴¹ Elinor Elder, "From Miss Elinor L. Elder to Max Rafferty," October 16, 1970, Department of Education, Max Rafferty F3752: 773, Box 30, Folder E, California State Archive.; Bob Bennet, "To Dr. Max Rafferty from Bob Bennet," October 4, 1970, Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, F3752:746, Box 35, Folder B, California State Archive.

arguments on the pamphlet “Is the Schoolhouse the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex?” written by Gordon Drake of the Christian Crusade.¹⁴² Distributed to citizens through door to door campaigns and at board meetings, this pamphlet banked on citizen’s religious commitment, by alleging that sex education proved antithetical to any religious teachings, and drove a wedge between the family, school, and church.¹⁴³ Paradoxically, 1964 SIECUS president Mary Calderone noted that the public school and church should work together to properly instruct sex education, not against one another.¹⁴⁴ Regardless, right-wing tactics proved effective, convincing citizens that these programs “[were] Godless.”¹⁴⁵ In addition to the religious affront, the Antis followed the pamphlet’s affirmation that SIECUS material disseminated pornography and smut, which would spoil the virtuous nature of the student.¹⁴⁶ Besides voicing their concerns at board meetings, Mrs. Pipping, Ms. Howe, and Mrs. Burns of the Antis hosted workshops in 1968 on the depraved nature of sex education, with the permission of the Orange County Board of Education.¹⁴⁷ They advocated Drake’s conviction that sex education taught students corrupt lessons, with their graphic and explicit language replacing the respectable information about sex children would receive from

¹⁴² Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 72.

¹⁴³ Mathews, “Battle Lines Being Drawn Over Sex Education.”

¹⁴⁴ Mary S. Calderone, “Sex Education and the Roles of School and Church,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 376, no. 1 (March 1968): 53–60, <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271626837600106>.

¹⁴⁵ Wong, “Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat.”

¹⁴⁶ Drake, *Is the Schoolhouse the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex?*, 26.

¹⁴⁷ Petrzela, *Classroom Wars*, 141.; Johnson, “School Officials Split on 2 Issues in Sex Hearings.”

their parents.¹⁴⁸ The program apparently “encouraged children to go out and experience sex [and] stimulat[ed] them erotically” (referencing FLSE’s instruction in basic sexual biological functions of the human body).¹⁴⁹ Even with the open discussion structure of the FLSE course, many students ironically noted that the classes proved “boring, ” since the “dirty talk” lost its taboo identity.¹⁵⁰ Far from promoting immorality, FLSE and SIECUS teaching materials spend an inordinate amount of time discussing how to improve family life and social morality, instructing students that sex education should “provide an appreciation of the positive satisfaction that wholesome human relations can bring in both individual and family living.”¹⁵¹ But the right-wing rhetoric from the CCC and Antis resonated among Orange County in the late 1960; the Anti’s workshops in 1968 drew in curious participants, and parents turned out in droves to hear them and the CCC speak at board meetings.¹⁵²

However, these right-wing views did not immediately convince the entire county of Life Adjustment’s inherent danger. Similar to the social studies arguments, sex education critics also encountered opposition from 1965 to 1969. At board meetings, parents and students spoke up to affirm that the classes did not violate any immoral acts and did not contain

¹⁴⁸ Wong, “Source of Controversy: Sex Education in Anaheim: View from the Classroom.”

¹⁴⁹ Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 100.

¹⁵⁰ Breasted, 70.; Wong, “Source of Controversy: Sex Education in Anaheim: View From the Classroom.”

¹⁵¹ Kirkendall, “SIECUS Study Guide No. 1: Sex Education.”; Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 111.

¹⁵² “An Apathetic Approach.”; Mehlman, “Sex Ed... and the Reds?,” 226.; Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 170.

inappropriate material.¹⁵³ Teenagers enrolled in the courses refuted the Antis and Townsend, willing to offer their support of this progressive policy and to dispel harmful rumors.¹⁵⁴ *The Los Angeles Times* followed other's outrage at the Orange County Board of Education's permission to give these "extremists" a voice in their board meetings.¹⁵⁵ The same 1969 jury that found the Orange County Board of Education paid too much credence to the *Land of the Free* uprising also found that the sex education hearings "'got out of hand'" at the bequest of pro-Bircher school board trustee Dale Rallison.¹⁵⁶ However, Petrzela argues the Radical right's persistence, organization, and their commitment to "personal issues" led to a breakdown in unity amongst the more liberal factions in society.¹⁵⁷ Despite this "vocal, organized minority [that] got in the way, " the *LA Times* conducted a survey of 30 districts, where anonymous proponents of sex education came to the same conclusion: resistance proved futile.¹⁵⁸ In an interview with Breasted, Anaheim FLSE founder Paul Cook explained that the Radical right groups would downgrade parents who defended sex-education, making them "'wild with fear, shame, embarrassment, and hostility.'"¹⁵⁹ Proponents found it more productive to tread lightly around the subject of sex education, fearful the topic could ignite right-wing fury.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵³ Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

¹⁵⁴ Mehlman, "Sex Ed... and the Reds?," 230.

¹⁵⁵ Shaw, "County School Friction Laid to Political Stress."

¹⁵⁶ Boettner, "Grand Jury Criticizes County School Board: Report Says Undue Times Spent on Local District Problems Such as Sex Education."

¹⁵⁷ Mehlman, "Sex Ed... and the Reds?," 214.

¹⁵⁸ "An Apathetic Approach. "; Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

¹⁵⁹ Breasted, *Oh! Sex Education!*, 124.

¹⁶⁰ Breasted, 124.

While advocates of *Land of the Free* found the Right's arguments ridiculous and ineffective, the rhetoric that addressed anti-socialism and the confidential matter of family structure and morality led to "an organized protest by a minority of parents [that was] spectacularly successful in reversing sex education expansion."¹⁶¹ This would prompt the destruction of this mode of Life Adjustment, signaling the eventual downfall of progressive education in Orange County.

The Pivotal Elections: Spring and Summer 1969

School board elections-designed to remain bipartisan-became a hotspot for right-wing dispute over progressive sex education.¹⁶² Even though the conservative *Orange County Register* still reported on the necessity of teaching sex education, Radical right groups became "unusually vocal" in the school board elections of 1969.¹⁶³ Yet, did their techniques prove effective? Contrary to the national battles over progressive education waged by the right wing, in Orange County, these radicals succeeded in dismantling this form of Life Adjustment. This feat arose from the Radical right's victory in the Anaheim School Board and Orange County School Board elections in 1969, where a pro-moral rhetoric dominated the discourse.

¹⁶¹ Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

¹⁶² Donald S. Jordan, "Party Politics Decried," *Los Angeles Times*, August 16, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156148749/EE3E3FCC49C64ABDPQ/5?accountid=14496>.

¹⁶³ Associated Press, "Politics, Like Sex, 'Optional' At School," *The Register*, April 23, 1966, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-apr-23-1966-p-6/>;; Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

In 1969, 33 school districts hosted elections for school boards. Despite calls from citizens and school board members who pleaded to retain a non-partisan election, the school setting hosted a deeply divided Right vs. Left battle.¹⁶⁴ Many Radical right organizations—including the John Birch Society, the CCC, and the Antis—supported candidates who wished to remove FLSE programs.¹⁶⁵ Anaheim became a key race, already imbued with a history of politically contentious school elections. Before the issue of sex education in April of 1964, the Magnolia Parents Committee and Save our Schools Committee lambasted Magnolia School Board Members (a subsection of Anaheim) who accepted the resignation of school principals that wished to retain the progressive “phonics” form of education.¹⁶⁶ Alleging this style of first grade education (which asked the children to sound out words) did not prove to be academically rigorous, these committees gathered 2,500 signature to recall school board members.¹⁶⁷ In the third recall election in four years, the parents emerged victorious by 646 votes. This trivial skirmish foreshadowed the eventual pitting of “neighbor against neighbor over ‘right wing’ and ‘left wing’ issues.”¹⁶⁸ Sex education encompassed a majority of the

¹⁶⁴ Orange County Parents for Local Control, “Orange County Parents for Local Control Mission Statement,” 1963, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 1, Orange County Archives.; Mehlman, “Sex Ed... and the Reds?,” 208.

¹⁶⁵ Wong, “Sex Education Fight Comes to a Boil Again in Anaheim.”

¹⁶⁶ Dick Turpin, “Seven School Principals Quit Over Reading Issue,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 21, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/168495459/A01C488D78F34B45PQ/3?accountid=14496>.; Kathleen Weiler, *Democracy and Schooling in California: The Legacy of Helen Heffernan And Corinne Seeds* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 173.

¹⁶⁷ Turpin, “Seven School Principals Quit Over Reading Issue.”

¹⁶⁸ “Magnolia School Recall Wins by Slim Margin: Unofficial Returns Show 3,504 Votes for and 2,858 Against Ousting Three Trustees SCHOOL,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 29, 1964, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/168550099/326870AFD8744E35PQ/10?>

dialogue surrounding the April 16th, 1969 Anaheim School District Board of Education election, which opened up two spots on the five-person board. The conservative frontrunners Robert Bark and James Barnell did address the seemingly socialist leaning of sex education, but vitally evoked the pathos of promising to preserve the innocent morality of the child. The aforementioned right-wing groups backed these candidates, “claiming documentation of classroom ‘immorality,’” and the candidates’ promises to remove the immoral SIECUS materials.¹⁶⁹ This rhetoric worked. Bark and Barnell barley achieved victory on April 16th.¹⁷⁰ They now joined incumbents Edward Hartnell, Royal Marten, and John Barton; in a few short months they would drastically change the nature of Anaheim’s FLSE program.¹⁷¹

The Radical right also achieved victory in the Orange County special school board elections of August 26th, 1969. Winning with only 2,055 votes over the moderate Richard Acton, Dr. Doris Araujo took the fifth seat in the Orange County Board of Education.¹⁷² She now tipped the scales to a more conservative board, along with John Birch member Dr. Dale Rallison and Clay Mitchell, along with extremely reactionary Superintendent Robert

Peterson.¹⁷³ Her victory came with endorsement from the California

accountid=14496.

¹⁶⁹ Wong, “Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat.”

¹⁷⁰ Steve Emmons, “Challenges to Sex Education Fall Short in School Elections,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 16, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156157751/C44EF060863F447FPQ/3?accountid=14496>.

¹⁷¹ Wong, “Sex Education Fight Comes to a Boil Again in Anaheim.”

¹⁷² Helen Johnson, “Conservative Winner in School Board Race,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 27, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156151563/A268B94172749EBPQ/5?accountid=14496>.

¹⁷³ Helen Johnson, “Conservative, Moderate Seek Fifth Seat: Vote Will End County School Board Split,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 17, 1969, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest->

Republican Assembly and the John Birch Society, whom anonymously leafleted on her behalf. Vivally, Araujo appealed to the very personal aspect of educational policies, campaigning on a promise to listen to the complaints of other citizens, and criticized the previous board for not taking the hearings on textbook censorship and sex education seriously.¹⁷⁴ She further canvassed on her ability to enact a “woman’s viewpoint with concern for children and education;” in this manner, she directly appealed to the new class of white, republican, female activists that Lewinnek argues developed during the mid 1960s.¹⁷⁵ Related to the election results in Anaheim, the Orange County Board now began to reevaluate sex education programs, even though they had no legal authority to mandate curriculum in specific districts.¹⁷⁶

The seemingly insignificant political victories of republicans in the Anaheim and Orange County School Boards wrought considerable upheavals to progressive education in Orange County. Now with a more conservative majority, the Radical right owned various mouthpieces on the boards.¹⁷⁷ Where they failed in reforming social studies education with *Land of the Free*, they would succeed with sex education.

“Practically Worthless:”¹⁷⁸ A Casualty of Progressive Education 1969-1970

com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156240554/A0EADF1D432D4912PQ/1?accountid=14496.

¹⁷⁴ Johnson.

¹⁷⁵ Johnson.; Lewinnek, “Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles,” 52.

¹⁷⁶ “Senator Seeks Local Control of Textbooks,” *The Register*, April 6, 1965, NewspaperArchive®, <https://newspaperarchive.com/santa-ana-register-apr-06-1965-p-24/>.

¹⁷⁷ Shaw, “County School Friction Laid to Political Stress.”

¹⁷⁸ Mehlman, “Sex Ed... and the Reds?,” 227.

In only a few short years, sex education programs, which once proliferated across the county with high approval ratings, became products of the past. In Orange County, this important pillar of Life Adjustment collapsed under the weight of Radical right curriculum changes, now made possible by the right-wing's victory in 1969 school board elections. In Anaheim, the board removed all SIECUS materials from classrooms (despite their lack of use) and rendered it almost impossible to schedule FLSE programs. With almost 33,000 children enrolled before 1969, now only 9,000 children enrolled in the program. Scared of parents' wrath, fewer teachers volunteered to instruct the courses.¹⁷⁹ In the fall semester of 1969, the FLSE program in the Anaheim School District was outright dissolved; the same pattern occurred in the Huntington Beach and Tustin School Districts.¹⁸⁰ FLSE program founder and Anaheim Superintendent Paul Cook resigned following the election.¹⁸¹ Only four of the 33 districts still attempted to initiate new courses, but committee studies found that these programs "'never got off the ground;'" the right wings' attack "'restric[ted] the study of sexual growth.'"¹⁸² Even until the 1970s, the CCC sought to eradicate any remnants of this program, issuing pamphlets and speaking at board meetings. The CCC and Telephone Taxpayers Committee urged voters to reject a 1970 bond measure that supposedly funded sex education programs, although no

¹⁷⁹ Emmons, "Sex Education---New Direction Emerging."; Jack Boettner, "Anaheim Board Limits Sex Education Classes," *Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1970, ProQuest Historical Newspaper, <https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/docview/156302111/C30C4919CD9447EEPQ/1?accountid=14496>.

¹⁸⁰ Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

¹⁸¹ Emmons, "Sex Education---New Direction Emerging."

¹⁸² Wong, "Sex Education in County Schools Is in Retreat."

evidence linked the bond funds to those programs.¹⁸³ Petrzela infers that the Antis “watered down” the post 1969 sex education courses so much that they proved “worthless” in actually educating students about safe sex or Life Adjustment strategies.¹⁸⁴ Issues of health did not come to light, and most of the courses (if they still existed) presented a sheltered view that adolescent sexuality “was a bump on the road toward the nuclear family.”¹⁸⁵ Themes of abstinence became predominant in the classroom by the early 1970s. This practice of progressive education could no longer accomplish the goals of Life Adjustment in helping students master their physical and mental health.¹⁸⁶

Zimmerman concluded that since the 1940s, the extreme Right believed that sex education “was an attempt by the communists to destroy American morality.”¹⁸⁷ However, he contends that even with local protests throughout the country, their complaints mostly fell upon deaf ears.¹⁸⁸ But in Orange County, a quite extraordinary transformation took place. From about 1965 to 1970, suffering the backlash from their failed reform of social studies curriculum, right wingers successfully campaigned and lobbied to remove sex education: a crucial structure of the progressive Life Adjustment education. The CCC stated that these courses promoted a socialist ideology, due to SIECUS usurping the role of the parents in this private matter, and the

¹⁸³ Boettner, “Sex Education Held Key to Approval of Issues on Financing.”

¹⁸⁴ Mehlman, “Sex Ed... and the Reds?,” 227.

¹⁸⁵ Mehlman, 229.

¹⁸⁶ Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, 210.

¹⁸⁷ Zimmerman, *Whose America?*, 194.

¹⁸⁸ Zimmerman, 195.

promotion of a one world child. However, the most valuable asset for these Radical right groups came from reiterating that sex education threatened the individual, their family and personal morality. Campaigning on behalf of persevering children's morality by removing sex education, conservatives gained seats on the Anaheim and Orange County Boards in 1969, despite opposition. Board members then voted to remove or severely hinder many of these FLSE programs, leaving them feeble and vain. Contrary to national trends, the Radical right of Orange County actually succeeded in destroying a vital facet of progressive education; accomplished by their campaign on anti-socialism, but more crucially, their evocation of personal matters of religion and morality.

IV. Conclusion: "Where no one has gone before."

Since their proliferation in the 1950s and 1960s, anti-communist organizations situated themselves in Orange County and came to dominate the political climate.¹⁸⁹ During the era of Soviet arms buildup, the space race, and an ideological war, "schools served as an instrument of national security."¹⁹⁰ The Orange County Radical right burdened themselves with removing any leftist threat to their country. Therefore, they aimed to severely weaken the "leftist" progressive education, particularly by evoking their commitment to individual matters of family and morality.

Proposed in the early 20th century, progressive education encouraged children to develop judicious opinions of their country and to improve their

¹⁸⁹ Lucia Moust, "How Extremists Attack the School," *The Christian Science Monitor*, 1969, Alfred Schoepe Papers (1963), Box 8, Folder 4, Orange County Archives.

¹⁹⁰ Hartman, *Education and the Cold War*, 56.

personal well-being. Similar to their national counterparts, the Radical right in 1960s Orange County seized upon the opportunity to condemn features of progressive education: particularly social studies curriculum (via the censorship over the *Land of the Free* textbook) and the recently commissioned sex education program. With *Land of Free*, they contended that it promoted anti-American notions and a socialist, internationalist viewpoint. Despite their squabbling, the Land of the Free Protestors did not successfully ban the book. Yet with the battle over sex education, organizations like the California Citizens Committee and the Antis objected to these programs' immoral teachings in addition to its pro-government stance. They did secure victory with these concepts, by successfully electing anti-progressive education members to various school boards in 1969, which subsequently diminished sex education programs in districts.

Progressive education endured until the 1970s, when a majority of the proponents faded away; Hartman determined that eventually progressive education "failed" with the rise of the "Cold Warriors" and more conservative educational policies.¹⁹¹ But he and Zimmerman resolved that the extreme right-wing opposition did not produce immediate educational amendments. By scrutinizing the story of *Land of the Free* and sex education from newspaper reports and eye-witness accounts, one recognizes how the Radical right successfully dismantled large portions of progressive education (specifically that of Life Adjustment sex education). Their victory did face

¹⁹¹ Little and Ellison, *Loving Learning: How Progressive Education Can Save America's Schools*, 50.; Hartman, *Education and the Cold War*, 201.

setbacks, for they proved unable to remove *Land of the Free* from the schools. Nevertheless, by perfecting the methods of reaffirming their commitment to anti-socialism and virtue, they essentially eliminated sex education in Orange County—an exploit not necessarily seen in the rest of the country.

The remnants of Radical right Republicanism still endure in Orange County, but now face internal opposition. Victim to the “blue flu,” this region’s political future still remains in question.¹⁹² National and state elections certainly remain indicative of greater political changes, but local issues—i.e. education—divulge the understated intellectual shifts among a population. In an endeavor to examine a nationally renowned conservative area and its evolution to that state, I realized that studying a specific, narrow issue illuminated the grander political changes of the country. Orange County in the coming years will remain a closely watched district; perhaps we may understand its new transformation the same way we could fathom its past political shifts in the 1960s.

¹⁹² Gustavo Arellano, “An Obituary for Old Orange County, Dead at Age 129.,” *Los Angeles Times*, November 7, 2018, <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-arellano-orange-county-obit-20181107-story.html>.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives

Alfred Schoepe Papers, Orange County Archives, Santa Ana, California.

Department of Education, Max Rafferty Files, California State Archive, Sacramento, California.

Pamphlet Box of Materials on the California Teachers Association, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.

Periodicals

The Los Angeles Times
Fullerton News Tribune
The New York Times
The Orange County Register/ Santa Ana Register
The Pasadena Star News
Redlands Daily Facts
United Press International
Christian Science Monitor

Armstrong, O.K. "Treason in the Textbooks." *The American Legion Magazine*, September 1940. The American Legion Digital Archive.

Bestor, Arthur E. "'Life-Adjustment' Education: A Critique." *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955)* 38, no. 3 (1952): 413-41. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40220906>.

Breasted, Mary. *Oh! Sex Education!* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Calderone, Mary S. "Sex Education and the Roles of School and Church." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 376, no. 1 (March 1968): 53-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271626837600106>.

Carbone, Peter F., Jr. *The Social and Educational Thought of Harold Rugg*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1922.

Caughey, John W., John Hope Franklin, and Ernest R. May. *Land of the Free: A History of the United States*. Vol. 1. Pasadena: Franklin Publications Inc., 1967.

CQ Press. "CQ Voting and Elections Collection." Accessed October 30, 2018. <http://library.cqpress.com.libproxy.berkeley.edu/elections/document.php?id=avg1948-1CA2&type=hitlist&num=0>.

Crosson Jr., George H. "An Inquiry Into the Effect of the Radical right and Ultra-Conservatives On Public Education." Southern Connecticut State College, 1967.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: MacMillan, 1916.

Drake, Gordon V. *Is the Schoolhouse the Proper Place to Teach Raw Sex?* Tulsa, Oklahoma : Christian Crusade Publications, 1968. <http://archive.org/details/isschoolhousepro00drak>.

Federal Security Agency: Office of Education. "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth. Bulletin 1951, No.2." United States Government Printing Office, 1951. ED543614. ERIC.
http://archive.org/details/ERIC_ED543614.

"Freedom of Information Act Documents: CACC-Fred Schwarz-HQ-2." Online Archive. Accessed September 18, 2018.
https://archive.org/details/foia_CACC-Fred_Schwarz-HQ-2?q=Orange+County+School+for+Anti-Communists.

Harold I. Lief M.D. *Letter to New Members*, 1970.
http://archive.org/details/TNM_SIECUS_sex_information_and_education_council__20180308_0243.

Kirkendall, Lester Allen. "SIECUS Study Guide No. 1: Sex Education." New York, Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S., 1970.
http://archive.org/details/SexEducation_667.

Knight, Goodwin J, Harold J Powers, and Joseph A Beek. "Third Report Senate Investigation Committee on Education: Textbooks." *Senate of the State of California*, 1948, 115.

Rafferty, Max. *Suffer Little Children*. New York, New York: Devin-Adair Co., 1963.

United States. Congress. House. Committee on Un-American Activities. *100 Things You Should Know about Communism Series*. Washington, 1949.
<http://archive.org/details/100thingsyoushou1949unit>.

U.S. Census Bureau. *Census of Population and Housing 1970: Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove, California*. Washington D.C.? U.S. Census Bureau, 1972.

Secondary Sources

Avila, Eric. *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2004.

Foster, Stuart J. *Red Alert! Educators Confront the Red Scare in American Public Schools, 1947-1954*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 2000.

Hartman, Andrew. *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

- Hill, Gladwin. *Dancing Bear: An Inside Look at California Politics*. Cleveland, Ohio: The World Publishing Company, 1968.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Kling, Rob, Spencer Olin, and Mark Poster, eds. *Post-Suburban California: The Transformation of Orange County Since World War II*. University of California Press, 1991.
- Lewinnek, Elaine. "Social Studies Controversies in 1960s Los Angeles: *Land of the Free*, Public Memory, and the Rise of the New Right." *Pacific Historical Review* 84, no. 1 (February 2015): 48-84.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2015.84.1.48>.
- Little, Tom, and Katherine Ellison. *Loving Learning: How Progressive Education Can Save America's Schools*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2015.
- McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- McWilliams, Carey. *Southern California: An Island on the Land*. Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith Publisher, 1973.
- Mehlman, Natalia. "Sex Ed... and the Reds? Reconsidering the Anaheim Battle over Sex Education, 1962-1969." *History of Education Quarterly* 47, no. 2 (2007): 203-32.
- Petrzela, Natalia Mehlman. *Classroom Wars: Language, Sex, and the Making of Modern Political Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Shor, Ira. *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Weiler, Kathleen. *Democracy and Schooling in California: The Legacy of Helen Heffernan And Corinne Seeds*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Zimmerman, Jonathan. *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.