



The why, what, and how, of history education in Norwegian and Swedish history curricula for upper secondary schools (approximately 1920–1960)

Anne Helene Høyland Mork

To cite this article: Anne Helene Høyland Mork (08 Oct 2023): The why, what, and how, of history education in Norwegian and Swedish history curricula for upper secondary schools (approximately 1920–1960), Scandinavian Journal of History, DOI: [10.1080/03468755.2023.2258144](https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2023.2258144)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2023.2258144>



© 2023 The Authors. Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the Historical Associations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.



Published online: 08 Oct 2023.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 371



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

The why, what, and how, of history education in Norwegian and Swedish history curricula for upper secondary schools (approximately 1920–1960)

Anne Helene Høyland Mork 

Department of Culture, Religion and Social Studies, University of South-Eastern Norway, Drammen, Norway

ABSTRACT

History curricula are shaped by factors such as historiography, pedagogical ideals, political goals, international initiatives, and broader societal conditions and processes. This article examines ideas about purposes, content, and methods, of history education, in history curricula that were used in Swedish and Norwegian theoretical upper secondary schools between 1920 and 1960. These schools aimed at preparing students for university studies and providing general education (Bildung). While having close connections to academic disciplines, these schools were also influenced by political goals of democratization and ideas of progressive pedagogy. There are tensions in the curricula between material aspects of Bildung, focusing on content, and formal aspects of Bildung, focusing on students' development. Although material aspects remain essential, formal aspects are increasingly emphasized through individual projects, student interaction, more active use of historical sources, and, in the latest Swedish documents, critical thinking. Limitations of progressive methods are also acknowledged. The Norwegian and Swedish curricula differ in attitudes to nationalism and the state. These differences can be explained by different starting points for nation-building and differences between Norwegian and Swedish historiography. There is a more dramatic shift in the Norwegian curricula, from a highly teacher/material-centred approach, to an ideal of active and independent students.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 November 2022
Revised 6 September 2023
Accepted 7 September 2023


KEYWORDS

history education; upper secondary schools; Norway and Sweden; democracy; progressive pedagogy; Bildung

Introduction

To awaken love for the fatherland, to lay the foundation for a good spirit of citizenship, as well as to imprint the importance of humanism and objectivity in perception and judgement, should be the goal of all history education.¹

This quote, from the methodical guidelines issued by the Swedish Royal Board of Education in 1935, is the concluding sentence of a long paragraph about general goals of teaching and learning history in secondary schools. It illustrates how

CONTACT Anne Helene Høyland Mork  Anne.H.Mork@usn.no

© 2023 The Authors. Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of the Historical Associations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

history education has been assigned a variety of roles. Various ideas about why one should learn history have also entailed different ideas about what kind of history should be taught and how this should be done. As pointed out by Tim Keirn, history curricula, although partly related to changes within historiography, are 'uniquely informed by political, cultural, and social agendas concretely related to specific temporal and spatial contexts'.² A wide perspective, encompassing historiographical, pedagogical, and societal factors, is therefore beneficial when studying history curricula.

This article examines ideas about purposes, content, and methods of history education, in Swedish and Norwegian history curricula that were used in theoretical upper secondary schools, gymnasia, between 1920 and 1960. In 1960, gymnasia were still considered elite schools, attended by a small minority of youth, but the number of students had increased substantially over the preceding decades. Students also came from more varied social backgrounds than earlier.³ This was especially the case in Norway, where rural gymnasia had been established. A notable difference is that while Norwegian upper secondary schools were made co-educational in 1896, girls were not given access to Swedish state-run secondary schools until 1927.

In Sweden and Norway, national curricular documents played, and still play, a decisive role in forming the content and form of education.⁴ These documents were the result of extensive political processes involving different stakeholders, and there were wide public debates about history education. By 1920, important democratic reforms had been carried out in both countries, most importantly the introduction of universal suffrage. Subsequent decades saw processes of school reform with democratization as a central goal, and ideas of progressive pedagogy, promoting student-centred methods and closer connections to society, influenced school policy. These processes involved transnational exchanges of ideas. International actors, such as the Norden Associations, the League of Nations, and UNESCO, also worked for reforms in history education.⁵

Norwegian and Swedish gymnasia shared two central aims. They were to prepare students for university studies, although far from all graduates continued to university, and they were to provide general *Bildung*/general civic *Bildung* (*almdannelse/allmän medborgerlig bildning*). The complex concept of *Bildung*, referring to aims of education, encompasses both the notion of a process and of an ideal, and has been understood in various ways.⁶ In the context of the gymnasium, the culture of antiquity and classical languages were long considered the central elements of *Bildung*. Particularly from the mid-nineteenth century, this view was increasingly challenged by groups emphasizing the importance of the sciences, modern languages, nationalism, and democratization.⁷

This article aims to answer two questions. Firstly: What characterizes conceptions of history education in history curricula that were used in Norwegian and Swedish gymnasia in the period 1920–1960? This is particularly explored in relation to historiography, pedagogical ideas, democratization, and nation-building. Secondly: What are the main differences between conceptions of history education expressed in the Norwegian and Swedish curricula, and what are possible explanations for these differences? In approaching the source material, I have followed the classical didactic categories, focusing on the questions of why students should learn history, what kind of history they should learn, and how the teaching and learning should be done.

Bildung, history education, and democracy

A useful theoretical perspective when analysing conceptions of history education in a societal perspective is Wolfgang Klafki's theories of Bildung. Drawing on several thinkers, Klafki distinguishes between material theories of Bildung, where the starting point is the content to be conveyed, and formal theories of Bildung, where the starting point is the student. In Klafki's own concept of categorical Bildung, elements from the material and formal theories are dialectically combined, and Klafki stresses that the content of Bildung should be fundamental and relate to students' reality.⁸

Klafki presents two main material theories of Bildung. The first theory is the objectivist/encyclopaedic theory, where the aim is to convey what is considered the objective content of a culture. Klafki argues that, especially in secondary schools, this has often taken the form of scientism, where scientifically based knowledge is conveyed. However, this is often done in a way that objectifies this knowledge and detaches it from its historical context and from the scientific questions asked. The second main material Bildung theory is the classical theory where one chooses material with the aim of representing certain human qualities. A problem with this theory, according to Klafki, is that regarding many contemporary problems there are no adequate historical examples.⁹

Within formal Bildung theories, Klafki distinguishes between a functional theory, emphasizing development of character and powers in the individual, and a method-based theory, emphasizing the process of learning methods. Klafki writes that the functional theory was central to the neo-humanistic ideals that deeply influenced secondary schools in the nineteenth century and to the movements of progressive pedagogy from the early twentieth century. The method-based theory focuses on process rather than powers in the individual, and Klafki uses Kerschensteiner's activity school pedagogy and John Dewey's pragmatism as examples. A main problem with formal theories, according to Klafki, is that one cannot isolate methods or 'powers' from content.¹⁰

In a detailed application of Klafki's theories to history education, Sven Sørdring Jensen elaborates on these categories. In an objectivist theory of history education, the teacher and the textbook are sole authorities and there are no didactic principles for prioritizing material. Classical history education aims at giving examples that can further certain human characteristics, for example patriotism. Jensen claims that the central element in formal conceptions of history education is source criticism. A functional theory sees source criticism as the best way of training critical thinking, and a method-based theory gives source criticism general validity when facing many (or all) phenomena.¹¹

In his study of Russian and Soviet history education, Klas-Göran Karlsson applies these theories, demonstrating a move from a classical pre-revolutionary tsarist conception, through an objectivist and a categorical conception, to a new Stalinist classical conception of history education.¹² Karlsson has also developed typologies of uses of history, distinguishing between scholarly-scientific, moral, existential, political-pedagogical, and ideological uses. These categories are also useful when exploring the wide range of objectives assigned to history education.¹³

After the Second World War, the goal of democratization was highlighted in central school policy documents in Norway and Sweden.¹⁴ However, education for democracy can take different forms. One can, for example, focus on giving students knowledge about democratic institutions to qualify them for existing society, or focus on helping students

become independent and critical citizens who can form and change society.¹⁵ While material aspects of *Bildung* are important in both cases, goals of independence and critical thinking require a stronger emphasis on formal aspects. Ronald W. Evans exemplifies the complexity of democratic education by pointing out that in educational debates about social studies in the United States, the Second World War entailed a move from a climate of questioning American political, social, and economic institutions, to one of supporting them and to an emphasis on the indoctrination of democracy.¹⁶

Norway and Sweden: society, historiography, pedagogy

A comparison involving Norway and Sweden, falls into the category Marc Bloch describes as the most promising, a 'parallel study of societies that are at once neighbouring and contemporary, exercising a constant mutual influence, exposed throughout their development to the action of the same broad causes'.¹⁷ In his book about Norway and Sweden in the twentieth century, Francis Sejersted highlights several common traits: the role of the social democratic parties, the development of the welfare state, and the implementation of comprehensive schooling.¹⁸

There were also notable differences. According to Sejersted, around 1900, Sweden had come further in industrialization, while Norway had come further in democratization. These differences can be linked to Sweden being a far more hierarchical society than Norway. The transformation of the social democratic parties from Marxist class parties to democratic reform parties happened earlier in Sweden than in Norway.¹⁹ Both countries remained neutral throughout the First World War. While Sweden retained its neutrality during the Second World War, Norway was occupied by Nazi Germany. After the war, Norway joined NATO, while Sweden did not.

The starting points for nation-building were different in the two countries. While Sweden had a long history of independence, Norway had been a junior partner in a union with Denmark until 1814. Norwegian nation-building was deeply formed by the events of 1814 with the Constitution and Parliament as main national symbols, thus connecting nationalism to liberal reforms. Unlike in many other European countries, Norwegian mainstream nationalism did not become increasingly conservative towards the end of the nineteenth century. Within the liberal *Venstre* movement, demands for democratic reforms were combined with calls for equality in the union with Sweden and eventually full independence. In contrast, in Sweden, nationalism became more closely connected to the political right.²⁰

While the dissolution of the Swedish-Norwegian union in 1905 was seen as an important link in a Norwegian national narrative about struggle for freedom and democracy, in Sweden, the dissolution first caused disappointment.²¹ Torbjörn Nilsson argues that the conservative nationalism in Sweden of the time around 1900, strengthened by the events of 1905, soon lost its strength. Ideas about Sweden would eventually be linked more to democratization and modernization. These ideas of the nation did not have the strong historical dimension that hegemonic nationalism had in Norway.²² Jarle Simensen points out that in contrast to countries where nationalism was discredited after the Second World War, Norwegian nationalism was strengthened, and the years 1940 and 1945 were inserted into the national narrative alongside 1814 and 1905.²³

Different starting points for nation-building are also relevant to understanding the development of Norwegian and Swedish historiography in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. A main difference is that while the nation was the central element in Norwegian historiography, the state played the central role in Swedish historiography.²⁴ Peter Aronsson et al. point out that leading Swedish historian Harald Hjärne's strong criticism of 'cultural history', which included society, culture, and ordinary people, essentially excluded such aspects from professional historiography for a long time. Swedish historiography had a quite conservative and exclusively academic character, which made it difficult to meet the demands of democratic society. In Norway, on the other hand, a left-wing historiography, emphasizing class, emerged in the early twentieth century.²⁵ An important development in Swedish historiography at that time was the emphasis on method and strict rules for source criticism, promoted by Lauritz and Curt Weibull.²⁶

The relationship between academic disciplines and school subjects is complex. In the period 1920–1960, ties between gymnasia and universities were close. Historians participated in school committees, curriculum work, and textbook writing. History teachers in the gymnasium had a long academic education in history, and some kept publishing within the field. Notwithstanding these ties, history education in the gymnasium was also formed by other factors, such as more general educational debates.

Ideas of progressive pedagogy influenced school debate and policy in Sweden and Norway in this period, and the term activity school (*arbeidsskole/arbetskola*) was widely used. Although more strongly felt in primary schools, these ideas also affected secondary schools.²⁷

The term progressivism is used about many movements that criticized existing teaching practices and promoted more student-centred education.²⁸ These movements were diverse and contained political and pedagogical tensions.²⁹ While some stressed individualistic child-centred ideals, other emphasized societal aspects. A central proponent of socially oriented progressivism was Dewey, and these movements gained strength in the 1930s.³⁰ In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey presents education as growth and 'continuous reconstruction of experience', and states that democracy is not just a form of government but primarily 'a mode of associated living'. As for history education, Dewey stresses knowledge of the past as key to understanding the present, and that the starting point of history is a present situation with its problems.³¹

Previous research

International research on the history of history education in the twentieth century has highlighted recurring tensions within the subject. In his study of debates over history education and curriculum in U.S. public schools, Keirn emphasizes curricular dichotomies concerning scope, learning outcomes, spatial scale, and disciplinarity.³² The paradox of teaching history to conserve the past and change the present is highlighted by Larry Cuban.³³ In their broad study of history education in England, David Cannadine et al. point out that history is simultaneously a global discipline and the avatar of distinct national identities, and that these endeavours rarely align.³⁴

There is more research on the history of history education in Sweden than in Norway. A central work, from the field of curriculum studies, is Tomas Englund's study of the political dimensions of the curriculum. Englund explores history and

citizenship education, showing how curricula are compromises formed in ideological and political struggles.³⁵ Göran Andolf's 1972 doctoral dissertation deals with the development of history education in the gymnasium, 1820–1965. Andolf discusses how the role of history education was seen both from the perspective of society's need to form citizens, and from that of the development of the individual, and illustrates how these issues were fiercely debated.³⁶ Negotiation is a central concept in Henrik Åström Elmersjö's work about the Swedish state approval scheme for textbooks. According to Åström Elmersjö, history education was renegotiated from having an aim of promoting patriotism, to one based on international understanding and democracy.³⁷

The influence of international guidelines and textbook revisions on history education is discussed in several works. Åström Elmersjö's work about the revision of history textbooks by the Norden Associations exemplifies the complex relationship between the national and transnational.³⁸ Thomas Nygren's work on international reformation of Swedish history education, examines the influence of guidelines developed by the League of Nations, UNESCO, and the Council of Europe, with the aim of making history education more international and contributing to peace. Nygren argues that one sees a turn towards a more international focus after the Second World War.³⁹

Johan Samuelsson explores the influence of ideas of progressive pedagogy on Swedish secondary schools, and especially on the teaching of history. Samuelsson criticizes the notion of secondary schools as almost exclusively traditional and conservative and argues that there were elements of progressivism in policy documents and in teaching far earlier than what has often been assumed.⁴⁰

There is little research on the history of history education in Norwegian upper secondary schools, although history education in primary and lower secondary schools has been the focus of several studies. An important starting point is Fredrik Thue's article about the place of history in Norwegian secondary schools between 1869 and 2019. Thue discusses history, both as a subject and as a wider curricular perspective. He emphasizes the close connection between secondary schools and the university that lasted from the end of the nineteenth century until well after the Second World War. History education in secondary schools and the academic discipline conveyed a liberal form of nationalism that saw the nation as a part of a European civilizational process.⁴¹

In addition to adding to the scarce amount of research on the Norwegian side, the main contribution of this article is its comparative perspective. Broad comparisons of Norwegian and Swedish history curricula for the gymnasium in this period have not been conducted before, although a study exploring nation-building in Swedish and Norwegian curricula for primary and lower secondary schools (1900–2020) was recently published.⁴² Attention is also given to the extensive transnational influences in this period. In addition to this, the study strives to illustrate the complexity of history education, by including the didactic aspects of purpose, content, and method. In that respect, it is closest to Andolf and Thue's studies, but by examining a shorter time span and comparing Norwegian and Swedish curricula, it opens for a more in-depth study and more nuances.

Swedish and Norwegian history curricula

The central source material of this study is history curricula and methodical guidelines for upper secondary schools, developed in connection with the Swedish school acts of 1928/1933 and the Norwegian school act of 1935.⁴³ In addition to this, history curricula that were in use in 1920, namely the Norwegian curriculum of 1911 and the Swedish curriculum and methodical guidelines of 1909, were analysed. This made it possible to explore aspects of change and continuity in the later documents. While the Swedish board of education issued methodical guidelines as elaborations on the curricula and guidelines for teachers, methodical elements were included in the history curricula in Norway.⁴⁴

After the First World War, school commissions and expert groups were set up to work on reforming the school systems in both countries. Politicians, historians, educationalists, and secondary school teachers were among those involved.⁴⁵ In the reports produced, comparisons with school systems in the neighbouring countries were often presented.

The subject of history was obligatory in all tracks of the gymnasium throughout the period. History was strengthened in the Norwegian school act of 1896 and the Swedish school act of 1905. Andolf points out that this was done to strengthen 'the National elements of Bildung' in Sweden.⁴⁶ Thue argues that the Norwegian school act of 1896 was marked by an ideal of 'encyclopaedic general Bildung' and that history was important in bringing together national and modern elements and including certain components earlier covered by Latin. The new historical-linguistic track was also an expression of the strengthening of historical perspectives.⁴⁷

In Sweden, reform processes leading up to the school act of 1928, showed tensions concerning the role of history education, especially outside the Latin track.⁴⁸ In the school act, the name was changed from 'history' (*historia*) to 'history with social studies' (*historia med samhällslära*), and the subject was removed from the first year of the gymnasium. A novelty was individual projects (*enskilt arbete*), inspired by progressive ideals.⁴⁹ Students would choose a topic from one of their subjects and work independently under the teacher's guidance. The school act was revised in 1933, and following strong protests, history and social studies was given an extra hour, and was again to be taught in all grades.⁵⁰

During the 1940s, school commissions worked on plans for reforming the Swedish school system. In 1954, the general track was introduced in the gymnasium, and history with social studies became the main subject in the social strand. A new curriculum was issued in 1954 and methodical guidelines in 1956. In 1960, social studies (*samhällskunskap*) became an independent subject, and new curricula followed.

The Swedish curricular documents increased in volume. While the methodical guidelines for history from 1909 comprised two and a half pages, the methodical guidelines of 1956 comprised twelve pages. The 1909 curriculum and methodical guidelines were published together without a general introduction, while the methodical guidelines of 1935 were published separately with a 27-page-long general section, discussing overarching principles.

The Norwegian curricular documents were fewer, shorter, and issued over a shorter period. The school act of 1935 presented five tracks in the gymnasium. The subject of history (*historie*) was renamed 'history and social studies' (*historie og samfundslære*). It was a main subject in the Norse track, with additional hours devoted to Norwegian history.

During the parliamentary process, the name was changed from 'history *with* social studies' to 'history *and* social studies' to emphasize the importance of social studies.⁵¹ The German occupation entailed delays in the implementation of the school act. On 1 July 1940, a temporary curriculum was issued. Two new elements had been added: individual projects (*særarbeid*), inspired by Sweden, and epoch reading, entailing in-depth studies of certain periods. Especially during the first years of occupation, attempts were made to shape schooling according to Nazi ideology. These measures met opposition and had little success.⁵² After the war, gathering input for permanent curricula began, and these were issued in 1950.

The Norwegian history curricula of 1940 and 1950 differ greatly from the curriculum they replaced. While the history curriculum of 1911 has fourteen pages of specific topics to be covered, the curriculum of 1950 devotes far more space to discussing working methods and educational resources than to specifying content.

Why history?

The curricular documents differ considerably in the space devoted to purposes and justifications for the subject. The documents issued before 1920 have short and descriptive formulations about purpose. In contrast, the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 present a wide array of purposes. While keeping in mind that these guidelines are far more extensive than the ones from 1909, this difference might also be an indication of a greater need to justify the subject. The position of history was, most likely, seen as more self-evident, both from a nation-building perspective and a classical humanistic perspective, in the first decade after 1900.

There are tensions in the curricular documents between material aspects of *Bildung*, stressing content, and formal aspects of *Bildung*, stressing students' development. The Norwegian history curriculum of 1911 prioritizes material *Bildung*, close to an objectivist conception of history education. Although material aspects remain essential and the curricula are structured chronologically throughout the studied period, material ideals are challenged by more formal ideals. There are also different ways of approaching the material. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956 are detailed concerning content, but unlike the lists of topics in the Norwegian curriculum of 1911, they include discussions about what to include, what not to include, and how this should be done.

There is, throughout the period, a growing emphasis on the importance of including formal aspects of *Bildung*. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 state that history education should develop students' 'intellectual activity, and teach them to understand, put together and examine'.⁵³ Developing students' working skills, and teaching them to work rationally are main goals in the Norwegian curriculum of 1940.⁵⁴ In the Norwegian curriculum of 1950, it is argued that the value of individual projects lies 'more in the growth that the work makes possible, than in the result itself'.⁵⁵

Critical thinking, that, according to Jensen, is at the centre of functional conceptions of history education, is introduced in later Swedish curricular documents. The methodical guidelines of 1956, explain that the teaching of history, when done correctly, gives particularly good opportunities for training students' critical sense, arms them against one-sided influence and propaganda, and helps them to understand conditions and

views that are different from their own. History education should 'create respect for facts, sense for proportions and balance in judgement'.⁵⁶

Some of the formal elements have a more emotional imprint. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 emphasize that history education should strive to give nourishment to students' imagination, awaken their interest in the people and society of the past, and bring the past to life. One should attend to the possibilities of influencing the students' development of character'.⁵⁷ The Norwegian curriculum of 1940 argues that the textbook's presentation should have the capacity of 'immediately capturing students' interest and giving them notions that can mean something for their development, for their intellectual and emotional lives'.⁵⁸

Moral use of history, in line with a classical theory of *Bildung*, is implied in the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935, where it is stated that students should get to know great personalities. A caution is included. Even though examples from the past of good human qualities should be highlighted, one should not make history into a collection of moral examples.⁵⁹

The purpose of history education that is most strongly emphasized in both countries throughout the period is that of learning about the past to understand the present. This is linked partly to an existential use of history, focusing on students finding their way in society, and partly to a political-pedagogical use of history to form citizens.⁶⁰ It includes material aspects of *Bildung*, focusing on knowledge about events that have led to the current situation, and formal aspects, aiming at forming active citizens.

The focus on the present, is strengthened by the close connection to social studies. The trajectory of the relationship between these subjects is remarkably similar in Norway and Sweden. In the curricular documents under the school acts of 1896 and 1905, learning about current political institutions, is included in the subject of history. In 1928 and 1935, the subjects were renamed 'history with social studies' in Sweden and 'history and social studies' in Norway. The part covering social studies was far more extensive than the topics of the older curricula, and it included social economy in Norway and national economy in Sweden. However, a recurring criticism was that social studies did not get the place it was supposed to.⁶¹ Social studies (*samhällskunskap/samfunnskunnskap*) became an independent subject in Sweden in 1960 and in Norway in 1964. This development can be explained both by an added emphasis on democratic education and by the strengthening of the social sciences.⁶²

This emphasis on the present is elaborated on in several of the documents. According to the Swedish curriculum of 1928 the objective of history education is

to widen and deepen the insights of the students in Swedish and general history, giving special attention to what is of greater importance for the understanding of our own time's culture and society. Meanwhile introducing them to a historical approach, as well as, based on this teaching, convey to them knowledge about the structure and activity of current society, and clarify for them the significance of our time's most important social and economic problems.⁶³

The Norwegian temporary curriculum of 1940 states that the main objective of history and social studies is to 'orient the students' in the society they are going to become members of, by showing them how contemporary conditions have come into being, and by contributing to their worldview.⁶⁴

A notion of reciprocity between past and present is articulated in the Swedish methodical guidelines. The fruitfulness of comparisons with current events is stressed in the guidelines of 1935. Through letting the present and past shed light on each other 'the teaching of history contributes to increased understanding both of past times and our own time'.⁶⁵ The guidelines of 1956 add that this reciprocity lets the student see the present as 'a link in a still ongoing historical course of events'. However, a warning against presentism is included. Teachers must, as far as possible, try to 'objectively assess historical figures and events against the background of the situation of their own time and environment, without letting the views of the present give a wrong perspective'.⁶⁶

While there is a focus on learning about societal institutions throughout the period, explicit formulations about furthering democracy appear in the curricular documents after the Second World War. The introduction to the Norwegian curricula of 1950 stresses the schools' task of raising the young 'to cooperation and social understanding in a modern democracy'.⁶⁷ Rolf Th. Tønnessen points out that the word democratic was absent in the 1938 plan committee report that laid the foundations for working methods under the school act of 1935, and he sees its appearance in the curriculum of 1950 as a trace of the Second World War.⁶⁸

The link between democratic education and formal aspects of Bildung is evident in the documents from the 1950s. In the introduction to the Norwegian 1950 curricula, it is argued that although the curricula contain requirements for conveying knowledge, it must be put into practice in accordance with the demands of modern society 'to upbringing, and to developing the students' character and will, their ability to think independently, their intellectual honesty, and their sense of right and wrong'.⁶⁹

In the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956, principles of democratic education are explicitly linked to history education, and material and formal aspects are combined. The guidelines state that orientation in modern society, especially in Sweden, is prepared through the teaching of history. The basic values of society should be presented in the social studies part of the subject. Students should see how these values develop, discuss their meaning and realization, and understand that each generation must fight for them. This is especially crucial in 'the important analysis of the terms democracy and dictatorship' because 'a vigilant criticism, with attention both to what has been gained and what is lacking, gives the best starting point for active participation in the work of society'. When working with international organizations and human rights, the historical perspective should also reach back, not only to the French and American revolutions but also to antiquity and to Christian and Nordic ideas about man and law.⁷⁰ In the history section, issues such as popular movements, liberalism, suffrage, taxes, and the military, are topics to be traced from the past to the present.⁷¹

Many studies have emphasized the role of ideological use of history to promote nationalism in history education.⁷² In the Swedish curricular documents, there is a shift in the attitude towards nationalism. The school act of 1928 states that all teaching should be conducted in a way that contributes 'to the awakening and preservation of a patriotic mindset in the student'.⁷³ The formulation is nearly identical to the one used in the school act of 1905.⁷⁴ In the revised school act of 1933, there are additions: 'All teaching should have as its goal to awaken and nourish in the students love for the truth, for freedom and for the fatherland, its nature, culture and language, as well as making the students good and able citizens'.⁷⁵ In the methodical guidelines of 1935, awakening love for one's

fatherland is presented as one of the main goals of history education. In contrast, the methodical guidelines of 1956 have no such formulations, and a mild criticism of nationalism is voiced, when saying that the common characteristics in the development of European culture should be paid attention to, so that 'the uniting element is not silenced by the description of divisive national characteristics'.⁷⁶

In the Norwegian curricula, there are no mentions of awakening love for one's country. This might be surprising considering previous research on nationalism in Norwegian history education. Thue makes a valid point, when saying that most Norwegian research on history education has focused on primary schools and textbooks in Norwegian history, which might have given a one-sided impression, not considering the strong European tradition in the gymnasium.⁷⁷ Interestingly, Kirsten Sivesind and Magnus Hultén show a similar tendency in their study of curricula for primary schools in the period 1900–1940, with a stronger emotional nationalist emphasis in the Swedish curricula.⁷⁸

Although lacking formulations about love for the fatherland, the nation is very central in the Norwegian curricula. This is especially evident in the strong emphasis on the events of 1814 and the focus on Norwegian history in the Norse track. There is no criticism of nationalism in the Norwegian curricula.

The differences in attitude to nationalism between the Norwegian and Swedish documents may be linked to changes in Swedish nationalism, as noted by Nilsson. Conservative nationalism lost strength, and a newer liberal nationalism was more associated with modernization and less with history. This was different from the situation in Norway, where, according to Thue, secondary schools and the university shared a liberal 'epistemic nationalism'.⁷⁹ The events of 1814 could easily be linked both to nationalism and democratization. After the Second World War, occupation and liberation were included in the same narrative about a struggle for democracy and national freedom.⁸⁰

Attempts to reform history education in the direction of promoting international understanding and peace, were made by several actors, especially from the inter-war years.⁸¹ 'The international peace movement' is a topic to be covered in the Norwegian 1911 curriculum, while giving students some knowledge about peace efforts and furthering their solidarity with the world, are objectives in the 1940 curriculum.⁸²

There is a shift in the ideological and political use of history, to further international understanding and peace, in the Swedish curricula. While the Swedish curriculum of 1909 makes no mention of the peace movement, the methodical guidelines of 1935 discuss the balance between necessary information about wars and the importance of peaceful development and suggest an extensive presentation of the League of Nations, its origin, work, and 'the striving for promoting the will to peace and understanding among the peoples'.⁸³ In the post-war curricula, added emphasis is put on international understanding. According to the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956, history education can make an essential contribution to raising citizens in a free society of law and contribute to international understanding.⁸⁴

What kind of history?

Attempts to deal with the problem of content overload are visible, especially in the Swedish curricular documents. Closeness to the present is a principle emphasized in the methodical guidelines of 1935.⁸⁵ This principle is discussed and modified in the guidelines

of 1956. One must focus on things that are characteristic or have had profound influence on the future, and it is natural that recent periods receive a wider coverage, without this leading to a continuous widening. Some periods are also of great general interest and require more attention.⁸⁶ Subjects such as Christianity, mother tongue, philosophy, and English, had strong historical components. The importance of cooperation, as well as clear work division, is stressed in the curricula.⁸⁷

The nation, Norden, and the Western world are the main geographical entities throughout the period. Local history is mentioned in connection with individual projects.⁸⁸ The first questioning of an all-encompassing Eurocentric approach, appears in the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956, where it is stated that one should emphasize a world perspective, 'so that the entire world history is not presented from purely European views'.⁸⁹ This is in line with UNESCO's recommendations for history education.⁹⁰ Minorities and Indigenous populations are not mentioned, except for the Swedish minority in Finland.⁹¹

In general, there is a shift from a more idealistic conception of history, with an emphasis on political history and the state, to a broader scope with added emphasis on cultural, social, and economic factors. The Norwegian encyclopaedic curriculum of 1911 includes cultural, social, and material aspects, but political history still dominates. However, it is stated that the additional lessons in the historical-linguistic track should be devoted to the cultural history of the last century, and the teacher is free to include a course in national economy.⁹² In the curriculum of 1940, it is pointed out that students should see the most important driving forces in history, and one can organize the teaching of world history after 1815 according to the topics: the national idea and the struggle for political sovereignty and freedom, technical advances and their consequences, social development, imperialism, and intellectual life.⁹³

The emphasis on political history and the state is stronger in the Swedish curricular documents that were issued before the Second World war, than in the Norwegian curricula. This aligns with observations about differences between Norwegian and Swedish historiography. The methodical guidelines of 1935, stress the importance of the state as the natural backbone of history education, 'because only that can give the genetic view, the objective understanding of the course of history'. However, the guidelines also support giving room for aspects such as inner development and the history of intellectual and material culture. Teachers with special orientation in cultural history, can give a coherent presentation of some chapter of cultural history, such as the history of fishing, agriculture, clothing, housing and transport.⁹⁴ Andolf points out that Gustaf Jacobson, a student of historian Harald Hjärne, was in the committee that drafted these guidelines, and that Hjärne's ideas about the centrality of the state are clearly present. Andolf adds that the guidelines do not display any deeper influence from the Weibull brothers' radical source criticism.⁹⁵

The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956, widen the perspective further, stating that the main line in the subject should be 'the political-social in a frame of general cultural history'. The history of political and economic ideas should also be included. When working with certain periods, works of art can be used to discuss the artist's individuality and the character of the time. It is pointed out that one must always stress that events are conditioned by interaction between different factors, for example: the effort of the

individual, organized human endeavour, ideas, cultural currents, social conditions, natural resources, and economic cycles.⁹⁶

Regarding the relationship between the school subject and the academic discipline of history, there are expressions of both material objectivist conceptions of history education and more formal conceptions of history education in the curricula. The criticism Klafki raises against scientism for objectifying the scientific material, is applicable to the Norwegian curriculum of 1911. However, many of the curricular documents display a tension between objectivism and perspectivism. Although the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 warn against 'construction' and stress objectivity, the importance of presenting different perspectives is also stressed. One can use a historical problem to give students knowledge about means and methods in historical research and show how judgements about persons or events change.⁹⁷

Including recent historical research is mentioned in some of the documents, such as in the context of teaching about 1814 in the Norwegian curriculum of 1940.⁹⁸ The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956 point out that students could, to some extent, read or listen to sections of historical literature and 'at least encounter the names of our most prominent historians'. It is recommended to give a short orientation about sources and source criticism and present one of the classical historical controversies, although one should not spend too much of the limited time discussing historical method.⁹⁹

Historical method is mainly presented as something students should have knowledge of, but there are also ambitions of more active use. This entails an added emphasis on formal aspects of *Bildung*. A gradual shift is visible in the Swedish curricula. According to the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1909, it can sometimes be appropriate to let students read shorter parts of sources for illustration. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 stress that students can get experience with historical method through the individual projects, even though they are not supposed to conduct a scientific study. In the methodical guidelines of 1956, it is stated that students should work with sources as often as possible.¹⁰⁰ This is also linked to critical thinking, which, according to Jensen, is central to a functional conception of history education. One should use sources to observe the role of propaganda in opinion formation and pay special attention to 'psychological warfare and preparedness against propaganda in war'.¹⁰¹

There is a similar, yet less far-reaching, shift in the Norwegian curricula. While working with historical sources is only mentioned in connection with the linguistic-historical track in the Norwegian curriculum of 1911, the curriculum of 1940 states that one should 'to a certain degree' let students work with sources, such as texts, pictures, buildings, or artefacts. Individual projects should give students an impression of the diversity of life behind the basic presentation they usually get, and by working with historical sources, students can train their ability to observe, compare, and draw conclusions.¹⁰²

How should history be taught?

A comparison between the curricular documents developed under the school acts of 1928/1933 and 1935, with the curricular documents they replaced, shows a move towards more student-centred formal ideals of *Bildung*, especially through the introduction of individual projects and more student interaction and participation.

A change in the view of the student's role, is especially evident in the Norwegian curricular documents. In the history curriculum of 1911, the teacher and textbook dominate, homework is given from the textbook to be examined in class, and it is stated that the student will, with reasonable work, be able to 'acquire what the textbook conveys'.¹⁰³ In contrast, the general introduction to the curricula of 1950 presents an ideal of students as active and interested co-workers.¹⁰⁴ When writing about individual projects in history, it is stressed that it is important that students have a sense of having produced something from their own initiative, and a main priority is to find tasks and methods for individual work and group work suitable for the students' ages and for the individual student.¹⁰⁵

In the Swedish curricular documents, the shift is less dramatic, mainly because the student described in the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1909, appears more active and independent than the student of the Norwegian curriculum of 1911. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1909 state that students should be taught to work independently so they are gradually prepared for freer study forms in higher education. The teacher should, where possible, lead the lessons in a more reasoning manner and make students find causes, draw conclusions, and extract the essence of a presentation. Advanced students could give short lectures.¹⁰⁶

Although this image of the more independent student is compatible with progressive ideals of education, it is important to note that the principles in the curriculum of 1909 concern student independence, and not student interaction. Principles of self-activity and independence have far older roots.¹⁰⁷ In a 1937 lecture about the state of the activity school in Scandinavian secondary schools, Herman Ruge, principal of the Norwegian pedagogical seminar, argues that although the activity school has come to secondary schools as an external requirement, the principle of independent work has long traditions. According to Ruge, independent work was central in the old secondary schools, but the current Norwegian schools, having increased both in numbers of students and subjects, threaten to drown independent work in homework reading and exams.¹⁰⁸

Principles of student interaction and participation appear in the curricular documents from the 1930s, indicating a stronger emphasis on the societal aspects of education. According to the Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935, assignments can be given to the class, groups, or individuals, and discussions are a way to engage with students' interests. The teacher can give an orientation about a contested historical issue and suggest literature, then interested students can prepare introductions from different points of view and present these before the discussion starts. One should encourage self-studies, starting from the students' interests, recommend literature, and integrate it in lessons and tests.¹⁰⁹ The Norwegian curriculum of 1950 suggests individual projects suitable for group work and emphasizes that one should choose the best working methods in consultation with the students.¹¹⁰

The textbook has a stronger position in the Norwegian curricular documents than the Swedish. Detailed specifications of the number of pages in the required textbooks is given throughout the period. However, the Norwegian curriculum of 1940 states that the extra hours of Norwegian history in the Norse track provide good opportunities for working according to activity school principles, without a textbook.¹¹¹ While textbooks also play an important role in the Swedish curricula, the methodical guidelines of 1909 state that the teacher can sometimes organize

the material in a different way than the textbook,¹¹² and in the general part of the methodical guidelines of 1935, it is pointed out that the textbook, in many cases, is more of a handbook.¹¹³

There is an increasing emphasis on the use of other learning resources than the textbook, in both countries. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1909 stress the importance of visuals, and state that the teacher should give information about popular science publications to interested students.¹¹⁴ In the Swedish curriculum of 1954, excursions are included for all grades.¹¹⁵ The Norwegian curriculum of 1950 states that there should be a reading and workroom, devoted to history and similar subjects with movable tables, a lectern to be used by teachers and students, a screen, and a projector stand. There should be handbooks, posters, books, journals, historical atlases, photographs, posters, slides, films, reference books, statistical publications, budgets, white papers, journals, publications from the UN, historical texts, and an archive devoted to local history, based on newspaper clippings.¹¹⁶

The introduction of individual projects, in Sweden in 1928 and in Norway in 1940, is a clear example of progressive influence. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1935 state that in history one should make sure tasks are limited, so one can really go in-depth. Good tasks could be a closer study of a historical problem or different opinions in historical literature about prominent people.¹¹⁷ In Norway, individual projects became an integral part of the history curriculum, and the curriculum of 1950 devotes several pages to describing them. The curriculum encourages cooperation with other teachers, libraries, museums, institutions, and interested persons. If one wants students to trust in themselves, projects should be based on historical sources and not historical literature. If historical literature is to be used, students should study different works and compare.¹¹⁸ However, it must be pointed out that the individual projects were a small part of the subject, and as one of the curriculum drafters put it, 'the little sector the exam school had opened for the reform school'.¹¹⁹

Difficulties in implementing progressive principles are acknowledged in the introduction to the Norwegian curricula of 1950, namely workload, large number of students in each class, and uneven access to libraries.¹²⁰ In the history curriculum it is pointed out that it is impossible to cover all topics following the principles of activity school, and the teacher must consider which parts are most suitable to work with in that manner. The curriculum balances material and formal aspects, stating that especially in social studies, activity, discussion, and showing relevance, should be the main methods, but one must remember that the foundation of a sober discussion is knowledge.¹²¹

Assessment and exams are mentioned as obstacles to introducing progressive methods. The Norwegian plan committee of 1938 discusses the challenges of using activity school methods when assessment is largely based on memorization.¹²² When alternative forms of assessment are introduced in the curricular documents it is as an addition rather than a replacement. The Swedish methodical guidelines of 1956 describe how one can sometimes spend up to a few weeks on a topic, using different methods, and have an assessment where students know the tasks in advance. It is stressed that this is very demanding and can usually only be done in alternation with homework reading in the traditional sense, especially out of consideration for students without 'special talent for academic studies'.¹²³

Conclusion

This article has examined ideas about purposes, content, and methods of history education in history curricula that were used in Swedish and Norwegian upper secondary schools between 1920 and 1960. The Swedish and Norwegian curricula show many similarities. Some of these are expressions of recurring tensions within the school subject of history, as shown in several international studies on the history of history education. Other similarities can be explained by mutual influence and by being affected by the same factors and developments. However, there are also notable differences that can be related to societal and historiographical dissimilarities.

Although material aspects of *Bildung* remain central in history curricula throughout the period, there is a shift towards giving more attention to formal aspects, through individual work, student interaction, varied educational resources and more active use of historical sources. This shift can be linked to the influence of progressive pedagogy and goals of forming democratic citizens. The findings support Samuelsson's claims of an earlier and more profound influence of progressive ideals in Swedish secondary schools.

Tensions between material and formal aspects of *Bildung* are visible in the curricular documents. Limitations of progressive methods are acknowledged in the later curricula, particularly when it comes to assessment. The textbook remains central, especially in the Norwegian documents.

Elements of different conceptions of history education, as described by Jensen, are found in the curricular documents. A classical conception is visible in goals about strengthening the love for the fatherland and learning from the heroes of history, in Swedish documents from before the Second World War. The clearest example of an objectivist/encyclopaedic conception is the Norwegian history curriculum of 1911. Although the scientifically based material continues to be essential in the curricula, material conceptions are modified by more formal ideals and by elements of perspectivism. As for functional and method-based conceptions, these are most clearly articulated in the latest Swedish documents, with the emphasis on critical thinking and source criticism.

A point, which has not been given enough attention in previous research, is that the main objective given for history education in both countries from the start of the twentieth century, is learning about the past to understand the present. This objective is strengthened by the connection with social studies. The goal of furthering democracy is more explicitly articulated after the Second World War. Goals of developing independence and critical thinking align with the idea of forming active, democratic citizens. In that sense the Swedish post-war curricula differ somewhat from the tendency noted by Evans about a move towards 'democratic indoctrination' rather than critical questioning in the United States.

The nation, Norden and the Western World are the main geographical entities in the curricula of both countries. National minorities and the Indigenous population are not mentioned. In the latest Swedish curricular documents, a first criticism of an all-encompassing Eurocentric approach is voiced, in line with UNESCO's recommendations.

One notable difference between the Norwegian and Swedish curricula is that while there is a shift in the attitude to nationalism in the Swedish curricula, from awakening love for the fatherland to a mild criticism of nationalism, there is no such shift in the Norwegian

curricula. This may be explained by different starting points for nation-building and a more consistent hegemonic form of nationalism in Norway that could more easily be linked to democratization.

Another difference is linked to dissimilarities between Norwegian and Swedish historiography, with the state being far more central in Swedish historiography. There is a general widening of perspectives from a more idealistic conception of history, emphasizing political history, to including social, economic, and cultural aspects, in the curricula of both countries. However, the Swedish methodical guidelines issued in the 1930s strongly emphasize the centrality of the state and political history as the backbone of the subject.

There is a clearer shift in the Norwegian curricula from a teacher/material-centred approach in the earliest curriculum, to an idea of the students as co-workers in the last curricula. In the Swedish curricula there is more continuity regarding the principle of student independence, while elements of student interaction appear in the 1930s.

Finally, on their own, curricula give a limited image of history education. Curricula are interpreted and implemented in various ways. Many factors affect history education, such as teachers' and students' understanding of the subject, educational resources, and the institutions where education happens. It is, therefore, important to broaden the study of the history of history education by examining sources that shed light on such factors.

Notes

1. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 108. All translations by the author.
2. Keirn, "History Curriculum: Transatlantic Analysis," 409.
3. Sirevåg, *Utsyn*, 228–9; Johansson, *Normalitet, kön och klass*, 39–41.
4. Karseth and Sivesind, "Læreplanstudier – perspektiver og posisjoner," 23; Lundgren, "Curriculum Theory," 5.
5. See: Nygren, "History"; Åström Elmersjö, "The Norden Associations".
6. See: Sjöström and Eilks, "The Bildung Theory," 57–8; Gustavsson, *Bildningens dynamik*.
7. Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 170–4; Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 287; Zander, *Fornstora dagar, moderna tider*, 82–3.
8. Klafki, "Kategorial dannelse," 185–95.
9. *Ibid.*, 172–8.
10. *Ibid.*, 178–85.
11. Jensen, *Historieundervisningsteori*.
12. Karlsson, *Historieundervisning i klassisk ram*.
13. Karlsson, *The Holocaust*, 38–43.
14. *Fellesprogrammet*, 30; *SOU 1948:27*, 1–17.
15. Hohr, "Kategorial danning," 169; Cuban, *Teaching History*, 2.
16. Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 74, 94–5.
17. Bloch, "Comparative History," 47–8.
18. Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder*, 19–20, 323–6.
19. *Ibid.*, 19, 26–7, 90–1, 142.
20. Stråth, "Swedish Path," 58–62; Sørensen, "Norwegian National Identity," 23–4.
21. See Nilsson, "Sverige och 1905," 223–4.
22. *Ibid.*, 224–5; Sejersted, *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder*, 204–5.
23. Simensen, "National and transnational history," 99.
24. Björk, "Hjärne-traditionen," 70–4; Meyer, "Social Structure," 34–40.
25. Aronsson et al., "Nordic National Histories," 265, 268.
26. Torstendahl and Odén, "Den weibullska riktningen," 132.

27. *Arbeidsskoletanken i Norden*; Samuelsson, *Läroverken och progressivismen*.
28. Ruge, *Skoletanker og skoleproblemer*, 65; Aagre, *Folkeopplysere*, 109–13; Samuelsson, *Läroverken och progressivismen*, 39–50.
29. Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 48–50.
30. Englund, *Läroplanens politiska dimension*, 232; Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 24.
31. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 58, 86, 93, 227.
32. Keirn, "History Curriculum, Standards," 13.
33. Cuban, *Teaching History*, 2.
34. Cannadine et al., *Right Kind of History*, 220–1.
35. Englund, *Läroplanens politiska dimension*.
36. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 318–9.
37. Åström Elmersjö, *Av staten godkänd historia*; Åström Elmersjö, "Negotiating the Nation".
38. Åström Elmersjö, "Norden, nationen och historien"; Åström Elmersjö, "The Norden Associations".
39. Nygren, "International Reformation"; Nygren, "History"; Nygren, "The Contemporary Turn".
40. Samuelsson et al., "Practice before Policy?"; Samuelsson, *Läroverken och progressivismen*.
41. Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 168.
42. Sivesind and Hultén, "Reform Histories".
43. I use the term act about the Norwegian *lov* (law) and Swedish *stadga* (royal statute/bylaw). See Westberg, "Basic Schools," 201.
44. More specialized curricula, such as those for educational experiments and economic gymnasia, were not included.
45. Examples of historians and history teachers involved: Anton Ræder, Edvard Bull, Tønnes Sirevåg (Norway), Rudolf Fåhræhus, Karl Nordlund, and Gustaf Jacobson (Sweden).
46. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 70; *SOU 1904:3*, 258.
47. Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 172–4.
48. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 77–80; *SOU 1926:5*, 242.
49. *Arbeidsskoletanken i Norden*, 35.
50. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 70.
51. KUD, *Innstilling II*, 6.
52. Karcher, "A National Socialist School," 662.
53. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 108.
54. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 18.
55. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 73.
56. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 288–9.
57. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 108.
58. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 19.
59. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 108.
60. See Karlsson and Zander, *Historien är nu*, 52–66.
61. KUD, *Innstilling II*, 326–7; *SOU 1948:27*, 324.
62. Samuelsson, "Skolan och samhällsvetenskapen," 75; Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 179–80.
63. *SFS 1928:252 (Undervisningsplaner)*, 645.
64. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 18.
65. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 111.
66. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 288.
67. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 7.
68. Tønnessen, *Læreplaner i nasjonsbyggingsperspektiv*, 26–8.
69. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 7–8.
70. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 296–8.
71. *Ibid.*, 293.
72. Englund, *Läroplanens politiska dimension*; Lorentzen, "Fra nasjonal oppdragelse"; Lorentzen, *Ja, vi elsker*; Tingsten, *Gud och fosterlandet*.
73. *SFS 1928:412 (Stadga)*, 1334.

74. Hall, *Sveriges allmänna läroverksstadgar*, 16 (paragraph 49).
75. *SFS 1933:109 (Förnyade stadga)*, 157.
76. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 108; *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 288.
77. Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 169–70.
78. Sivesind and Hultén, "Reform Histories," 232–3.
79. Thue, "Den historiske allmenndannelse," 168, 180; Nilsson, *Norden runt*, 68–71; Nilsson, "Sverige och 1905," 223–6.
80. Simensen, "National and transnational history," 99.
81. Nygren, "International Reformation".
82. *Gymnasiet 1911*, 101; *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 18.
83. *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 23; *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 110.
84. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 289.
85. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 109.
86. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 289.
87. *Ibid.*; *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 110; *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 23.
88. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 70–1; *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 115.
89. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 288.
90. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 34–5; Nygren, "International Reformation," 337.
91. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 294.
92. *Gymnasiet 1911*, 105.
93. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 18–9.
94. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 109–10, 112.
95. Andolf, "Historien på gymnasiet," 92.
96. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 288–9.
97. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 111–2.
98. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 19.
99. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 295.
100. *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 22; *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 24–5, 112, 115; *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 294.
101. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 295.
102. *Gymnasiet 1911*, 105; *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 18.
103. *Gymnasiet 1911*, 93–4.
104. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 7.
105. *Ibid.*, 73.
106. *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 22.
107. Klafki, "Kategorial dannelse," 184.
108. *Arbeidsskoletanken i Norden*, 1–3.
109. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 113.
110. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 71, 73.
111. *Ny foreløbig leseplan 1940*, 21.
112. *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 23.
113. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 10.
114. *SFS 1909:28 (Undervisningsplan)*, 22.
115. *AfS 1954:14 (Kursplaner)*.
116. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 69–70.
117. *Metodiska anvisningar 1935*, 115–6.
118. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 70–3.
119. Sirevåg, *Katedral og karusell*, 83.
120. *Undervisningsplaner 1950*, 6.
121. *Ibid.*, 74–5.
122. KUD, *Innstilling II*, 30.
123. *AfS 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*, 295–6.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Anne Helene Høyland Mork is a PhD research fellow in history at the University of South-Eastern Norway. Her research interests include the history of education, history didactics, historical comparison, and textbook analysis. In her PhD project, she explores uses of history in Norwegian and Swedish upper secondary schools between 1920 and 1960.

ORCID

Anne Helene Høyland Mork  <http://orcid.org/0009-0002-8357-5784>

References

- Aagre, Willy. *Folkeopplyseren: Anna Sethne og den norske reformpedagogikken*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2016.
- Aktuellt från Skolöverstyrelsen 1954:14 (Kursplaner för gymnasiet)*.
- Aktuellt från Skolöverstyrelsen 1956:19 (Metodiska anvisningar)*.
- Andolf, Göran. "Historien på gymnasiet: undervisning och läroböcker 1820–1965." PhD diss., Uppsala University, 1972.
- Arbeidsskoletanken i Norden innenfor den høiere skole. Tre foredrag på filologene og realistenes fagmøte på universitetet i Oslo 13.–15. august 1937*. Oslo: Den høiere Skole, 1937.
- Aronsson, Peter, Narve Fulsås, Pertti Haapala, and Bernard Eric Jensen. "Nordic National Histories." In *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, edited by Stefan Berger and Chris Lorenz, 256–282. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Åström Elmersjö, Henrik. "Norden, nationen och historien: perspektiv på föreningarna Nordens historieläroboksrevision 1919–1972." PhD diss., Umeå University, 2013.
- Åström Elmersjö, Henrik. "The Norden Associations and International Efforts to Change History Education, 1919–1970: International Organisations, Education, and Hegemonic Nationalism." *Paedagogica Historica* 51, no. 6 (2015): 727–743. doi:10.1080/00309230.2015.1013560.
- Åström Elmersjö, Henrik. "Negotiating the Nation in History: The Swedish State Approval Scheme for Textbooks and Teaching Aids from 1945 to 1983." *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, & Society* 8, no. 2 (2016): 16–35. doi:10.3167/jemms.2016.080202.
- Åström Elmersjö, Henrik. *En av staten godkänd historia: förhandsgranskning av svenska läromedel och omförhandlingen av historieämnet 1938–1991*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2017.
- Björk, Ragnar. "Hjärne-traditionen." In *Historieskrivningen i Sverige*, edited by Gunnar Artéus and Klas Åmark, 59–105. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2012.
- Bloch, Marc. "A Contribution Towards a Comparative History of European Societies." Chapter 2 in *Land and Work in Mediaeval Europe: Selected Papers*. Translated by J. E. Anderson, 44–81. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Cannadine, David, Jenny Keating, and Nicola Sheldon. *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Cuban, Larry. *Teaching History Then and Now: A Story of Stability and Change in Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2016.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education; With a Critical Introduction by Patricia H. Hinchey*. Gorham, ME: Myers Education Press, 2018.
- Englund, Tomas. *Läroplanens och skolkunskapens politiska dimension*. Göteborg: Daidalos, 2005.
- Evans, Ronald W. *The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children?*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.

- Fellesprogrammet: hvordan det ble til og hvordan det ble ført ut i livet.* Det norske Arbeiderparti, 1947.
- Gustavsson, Bernt. *Bildningens dynamik: framväxt, dimensioner, mening.* Göteborg: Bokförlaget Korpen, 2017.
- Gymnasiet. Lov om høiere almenskoler. Reglement for de høiere almenskoler. Undervisningsplan. Eksamensreglement.* Kristiania: Brøgger, 1911.
- Hall, B. Rudolf, ed. *Sveriges allmänna läroverksstadgar 1561–1905, Vol. 11: 1905 års läroverksstadgar.* Lund: Fören. för svensk undervisningshistoria, 1930.
- Hohr, Hansjörg. "Kategorial danning og kritisk-konstruktiv didaktikk. Den didaktiske tilnærmingen hos Wolfgang Klafki." In *Dannelse: Introduksjon til et ullent pedagogisk landskap*, edited by Kjetil Steinsholt and Stephen Dobson, 163–175. Trondheim: Tapir, 2011.
- Jensen, Sven Sødning. *Historieundervisningsteori.* København: Christian Ejlers' Forlag, 1978.
- Johansson, Ulla. *Normalitet, kön och klass: liv och lärande i svenska läroverk 1927–1960.* Tavelsjö: U. Johansson, 2000.
- Karcher, Nicola. "A National Socialist School for Norway: Concepts of Nazification During the German Occupation." *Paedagogica Historica* 56, no. 5 (2020): 662–679. doi:[10.1080/00309230.2019.1675728](https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2019.1675728).
- Karlsson, Klas-Göran. *Historieundervisning i klassisk ram: En didaktisk studie av historieämnets målfrågor i den ryska och sovjetiska skolan 1900–1940.* Lund: Dialogos, 1987.
- Karlsson, Klas-Göran. "The Holocaust as a Problem of Historical Culture: Theoretical and Analytical Challenges." In *Echoes of the Holocaust: Historical Cultures in Contemporary Europe*, edited by Klas-Göran Karlsson and Ulf Zander, 9–57. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2003. doi:[10.2307//jj.919484](https://doi.org/10.2307//jj.919484).
- Karlsson, Klas-Göran, and Ulf Zander, eds. *Historien är nu: en introduktion till historiedidaktiken.* Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2004.
- Karseth, Berit, and Kirsten Sivesind. "Læreplanstudier – perspektiver og posisjoner." In *Læreplan – i et forskningsperspektiv*, edited by Erling Lars Dale, 23–61. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2009.
- Keirn, Tim. "History Curriculum: A Transatlantic Analysis." In *The SAGE Handbook of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment*, edited by Dominic Wyse, Louise Hayward, and Jessica Pandya, 408–423. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2016. doi:[10.4135/9781473921405.n26](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473921405.n26).
- Keirn, Tim. "History Curriculum, Standards, and Assessment Policies and Politics: U.S. Experiences." In *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning*, edited by Scott Alan Metzger and Lauren McArthur Harris, 13–36. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2018. doi:[10.1002/9781119100812.ch1](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119100812.ch1).
- Klafki, Wolfgang. "Kategorial dannelse." In *Om utdanning. Klassiske tekster*, edited by Erling Lars Dale, 167–203. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk, 2001.
- KUD. *Innstilling II fra Plankomiteen for den nye skoleordning*, 1938.
- Lorentzen, Svein. *Ja, vi elsker - Skolebøkene som nasjonsbyggere 1814–2000.* Oslo: Abstrakt, 2005.
- Lorentzen, Svein. "Fra nasjonal oppdragelse til kildekritikk. Dannelsingsdimensjoner og arbeidsmåter i skolefaget historie." In *Fagenes begrunnelse: skolens fag og arbeidsmåter i dannelsingsperspektiv*, edited by Kjetil Børhaug, Anne-Brit Fenner, and Laila Aase, 157–170. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2005.
- Lundgren, Ulf P. "When Curriculum Theory Came to Sweden." *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy* 2015, no. 1 (2015): 5–13. doi:[10.3402/nstep.v1.27000](https://doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v1.27000).
- Metodiska anvisningar till undervisningsplanen för rikets allmänna läroverk.* Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen, 1935.
- Meyer, Frank. "Social Structure, State Building and the Fields of History in Scandinavia. A Personal and Comparative View." In *Nordic Historiography in the 20th Century*, edited by Frank Meyer and Jan Eivind Myhre, 28–49. Oslo: Department of History, University of Oslo, 2000.
- Nilsson, Torbjörn. "Sverige och 1905 - glömska eller förträngning?" *Historisk tidskrift* 84, no. 2 (2005): 217–228. doi:[10.18261/ISSN1504-2944-2005-02-05](https://doi.org/10.18261/ISSN1504-2944-2005-02-05).
- Nilsson, Torbjörn. *Norden runt i tvåhundra år: Jämförande studier om liberalism, konservatism och historiska myter.* Huddinge: Samtidshistoriska institutet, Södertörns högskola, 2010.
- Ny foreløbig leseplan og pensa i de boklige fag i den høgre skolen etter lov av 10 mai 1935.* KUD. Riksarkivet RA/S-1022/G/L0004, 1940.

- Nygren, Thomas. "History in the Service of Mankind: International Guidelines and History Education in Upper Secondary Schools in Sweden, 1927–2002." PhD diss., Umeå University, 2011.
- Nygren, Thomas. "International Reformation of Swedish History Education 1927–1961: The Complexity of Implementing International Understanding." *Journal of World History* 22, no. 2 (2011): 329–354. doi:[10.1353/jwh.2011.0041](https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2011.0041).
- Nygren, Thomas. "The Contemporary Turn: Debate, Curricula, and Swedish Students' History." *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, & Society* 4, no. 1 (2012): 40–60. doi:[10.3167/jemms.2012.040104](https://doi.org/10.3167/jemms.2012.040104).
- Ruge, Herman. *Skoletanker og skoleproblemer i det 20. århundre sett fra europeisk synspunkt*. Oslo: Cappelen, 1961.
- Samuelsson, Johan. *Läroverken och progressivismen: perspektiv på historieundervisningens praktik och policy 1920–1950*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2021.
- Samuelsson, Johan. "Skolan och samhällsvetenskapen – Framväxt och etablering av en svensk gymnasial samhällsvetarutbildning 1922–1970." *Nordidactica – Journal of Humanities and Social Science Education* 13, no. 1 (2023): 74–93.
- Samuelsson, Johan, Niklas Gericke, Christina Olin-Scheller, and Åsa Melin. "Practice Before Policy? Unpacking the Black Box of Progressive Teaching in Swedish Secondary Schools." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 53, no. 4 (2021): 482–499. doi:[10.1080/00220272.2021.1881166](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1881166).
- Sejersted, Francis. *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder: Norge og Sverige i det 20. århundre*. Oslo: Pax, 2013. SFS 1909:28. *Kungl. Maj:ts kungörelse angående undervisningsplan för gymnasiet*.
- SFS 1928:252. *Kungl. Maj:ts kungörelse angående undervisningsplaner för rikets allmänna läroverk*.
- SFS 1928:412. *Kungl. Maj:ts stadga för rikets allmänna läroverk*.
- SFS 1933:109. *Kungl. Maj:ts förnyade stadga för rikets allmänna läroverk*.
- Simensen, Jarle. "National and Transnational History. The National Determinant in Norwegian Historiography." In *Nordic Historiography in the 20th Century*, edited by Frank Meyer and Jan Eivind Myhre, 90–112. Oslo: Department of History, University of Oslo, 2000.
- Sirevåg, Tønnes. *Katedral og karusell: streiflys på skole og politikk i krig og fred*. Oslo: NKS-forlaget, 1981.
- Sirevåg, Tønnes. *Utsyn over norsk høgre skole: frå lærde skolar til lov om vidaregåande opplæring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1988.
- Sivesind, Kirsten, and Magnus Hultén. "Reform Histories and Changing Educational Conceptions of the Nation and Nationalism in Norwegian and Swedish Curricula (1900–2020)." In *Education, Curriculum and Nation-Building: Contributions of Comparative Education to the Understanding of Nations and Nationalism*, edited by Daniel Tröhler, 224–248. Milton: Taylor & Francis Group, 2023. doi:[10.4324/9781003315988-11](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003315988-11).
- Sjöström, Jesper, and Ingo Eilks. "The *Bildung* Theory—From von Humboldt to Klafki and Beyond." In *Science Education in Theory and Practice: An Intorductory Guide to Learning Theory*, edited by Ben Akpan and Teresa J. Kennedy, 55–67. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43620-9_5).
- Sørensen, Øystein. "The Development of a Norwegian National Identity During the Nineteenth Century." In *Nordic Paths to National Identity in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Øystein Sørensen, 17–35. Oslo: The Research Council of Norway, 1994.
- SOU 1904:3. *Betänkande afgifvet den 8 December 1902 af den för utredning af vissa frågor rörande de allmänna läroverken*. Stockholm: Isaac Marcus, 1902.
- SOU 1926:5 *Utredning angående det svenska skolväsendets organisation*. Stockholm: Norstedt & Söner, 1926.
- SOU 1948:27 *1946 års skolkommisjons betänkande med förslag till riktlinjer för det svenska skolväsendets utveckling*. Stockholm: Ivar Hæggströms boktryckeri, 1948.
- Stråth, Bo. "The Swedish Path to National Identity in the Nineteenth Century." In *Nordic Paths to National Identity in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Øystein Sørensen, 55–63. Oslo: The Research Council of Norway, 1994.
- Thue, Fredrik W. "Den historiske allmenndannelse: Historiefaget i høyere/videregående skole, 1869–2019." *Historisk tidsskrift* 98, no. 2 (2019): 167–190. doi:[10.18261/issn.1504-2944-2019-02-04](https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1504-2944-2019-02-04).
- Tingsten, Herbert. *Gud och fosterlandet: studier i hundra års skolpropaganda*. Stockholm: Norstedt, 1969.

- Tønnessen, Rolf Th. *Læreplaner i nasjonsbyggingsperspektiv. Ei sammenlikning mellom Norge og Tyskland*. Kristiansand: Høgskulen i Volda, 2003.
- Torstendahl, Rolf, and Birgitta, Odén. "Den weibullska riktingen." In *Historieskrivningen i Sverige*, edited by Gunnar Artéus and Klas Åmark, 107–134. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2012.
- Undervisningsplaner. Den høgre almenskolen etter lov av 10. mai 1935*. Oslo: Brøgger, 1950.
- Westberg, Johannes. "Basic Schools in Each and Every Parish: The School Act of 1842 and the Rise of Mass Schooling in Sweden." In *School Acts and the Rise of Mass Schooling: Education Policy in the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Johannes Westberg, Lukas Boser, and Ingrid Brühwiler, 195–222. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-13570-6_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13570-6_9).
- Zander, Ulf. *Fornstora dagar, moderna tider: bruk av och debatter om svensk historia från sekelskifte till sekelskifte*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2001.