

Ruben Cortez, Jr.
State Board of Education Representative, District 2
Ad Hoc Committee Report on
Proposed Social Studies Special Topic Textbook:
Mexican American Heritage

September 6, 2016

Ruben Cortez

Ruben.cortez@tea.texas.gov

Rubencortezfortexas@gmail.com

956-639-9171

Ad Hoc Committee

Christopher Carmona
Assistant Professor Creative Writing
University of Texas at the Rio Grande Valley

Juan Carmona
Social Studies Instructor
Donna High School

Trinidad Gonzales
History Instructor
South Texas College

Rogelio Sáenz
Dean of College of Public Policy
University of Texas at San Antonio

Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr.
Professor of History
University of Houston

Angela Valenzuela
Director of UT Center for Education Policy
University of Texas at Austin

Aimee Villarreal
Mexican American Studies Program Head
Our Lady of the Lake University

Emilio Zamora
Professor of History
University of Texas at Austin

Media Contacts: Trinidad Gonzales, trinidadgonzales99@gmail.com;

956-207-0828

Christopher Carmona, ccarmonawriter@gmail.com

956-854-1717

Emilio Zamora, e.zamora@austin.utexas.edu

512-739-0168

Introduction and Rational for Evaluation

The Ad Hoc Committee advising Mr. Ruben Cortez concludes that the proposed textbook does not meet basic standards and guiding principles in the history profession as outlined by the American Historical Association's [Guidelines for the Preparation, Evaluation, and Selection of History Textbooks](#) (1997), and [Statement on Standards of Professional Conduct](#) (updated 2011). The Guidelines provides a guiding principle in the preparation of history textbooks, "As in other fields, good textbooks offer a distillation of available knowledge on major subjects in the discipline, with arrangements specifically designed for student use and with writing and exercises geared to the appropriate student level." The Values section in the Statement on Standards adds an important note of responsibility, "Historians strive constantly to improve our collective understanding of the past through a complex process of **critical dialogue**—with each other, with the wider public, and with the historical record—in which we explore former lives and worlds in search of answers to the most compelling questions of our own time and place."¹ The "Teaching" section follows with a key word of caution, "The **political, social, and religious beliefs** of history teachers necessarily inform their work, but the right of the teacher to hold and express such convictions can never justify falsification, misrepresentation, or concealment, or the persistent intrusion of material unrelated to the subject of the course."

The professional standards and guiding principles offered by the American Historical Association are demanding yet vital and necessary to guarantee that textbooks meet the grade as sound and well-prepared guides to classroom instruction. Thus, textbooks should minimally provide a synthesis of the base professional scholarship (historiography and facts), and presentation of new ideas that adhere to the value of "critical dialogue." Indeed, critical dialogue so permeates the field that a failure to incorporate scholarship that does not align with one's perspective or to provide for a comparative treatment of differing views in the interpretation of history is an unethical avoidance of critical dialogue and generative learning.

Jamie Riddle and Valarie Angle failed to meet the professional standards and guiding principles for the preparation of a textbook worthy of our teachers and youth in Texas classrooms. They failed to engage in critical dialogue with current scholarship and, as a consequence, presented a prolific misrepresentation of facts. This means that the proposed textbook is really a polemic attempting to masquerade as a textbook. Its primary thesis, that Mexican American history reveals major menacing or un-American trends in American history, society and culture, is an unsubstantiated and highly misleading claim. It conforms with the discredited book by Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (2004) in which he raises the specter of Mexican immigration and culture (particular Catholicism) as existential threats to the United States.² In addition, the text excludes the voices and perspectives of women and other groups.

¹Bold text is from the original documents.

²For a brief overview of his thesis see, Samuel P. Huntington, "The Hispanic Challenge" *Foreign Policy*, Oct. 28, 2009. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/28/the-hispanic-challenge/>

The Ad Hoc Committee assessed the proposed textbook on the basis of factual errors, interpretative errors, and omission errors. The numerous factual errors that we identified in the textbook included incorrect facts, and assertions of opinion as facts. Equally numerous interpretative errors represent both the misuse of primary evidence to achieve a partial assertion of fact that misrepresents the whole of a phenomenon, and/or a misrepresentation of historical context and complexity.³ Interpretative errors are factual errors, but of a distinct class because of their authorial construction. Frequent omission errors included the failure to include scholarship relevant to the topic being discussed, and/or the inclusion of material either not relevant to the topic and/or a failure of the authors to link such material for understanding the topic under consideration.

We also conclude that the proposed textbook does not observe the instructional expectations and requirements of the State of Texas. The authors failed to meet the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for the Special Topic in Social Studies mostly because of its polemical tone, factual errors, and superficial coverage⁴. We are especially concerned that the proposed textbook does not engage important expectations in the TEKS standards. First, it fails to make use of relevant scholarship that would give teacher and students opportunities to connect the immediate worlds of the students with larger socio-economic trends in U.S. history. Second, its superficial treatment of Mexican American history undermines efforts to prepare students for later life, including college and university studies. The authors' insistence on misrepresenting Mexicans (e.g., as cultural and political threats to society) works against the use of empathy to encourage understanding of complex social settings that are a part of historical and contemporary life. This was especially evident when the authors presented one side of numerous issues and denied teachers and students the opportunity to compare and contrast complex experiences and ideas for a deeper understanding of history and contemporary society (e.g., differing Mexican and U.S. views on the war of 1846-48, and differences of opinion among Mexican American leaders). To conclude, we observed instances when the authors tried to meet the TEKS standards, but also noticed that they often failed. For instance, they tried to demonstrate that historical trends shape current social patterns, but they typically confined the use of this framework to associate radical causes in the distant past with current political practices (including the work of moderate groups like the League of United Latin American Citizens and the American G. I. Forum). The blatant disregard for the TEKS expectations and requirements is

³ The Five Cs of historical thinking that should be a part of the creation of a textbook or any historical analysis include; change over time, context, causality, contingency, and complexity. For an overview of these concepts see, Thomas Andres, and Flannery Burke, "What Does It Mean to Think Historically?" *Perspectives on History*, January 2007. <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/january-2007/what-does-it-mean-to-think-historically>

⁴(1) In Special Topics in Social Studies, an elective course, students are provided the opportunity to develop a greater understanding of the historic, political, economic, geographic, multicultural, and social forces that have shaped their lives and the world in which they live. **Students will use social science knowledge and skills to engage in rational and logical analysis of complex problems using a variety of approaches, while recognizing and appreciating diverse human perspectives.**

obvious, and we were fair in applying the TEKS expectations and requirements in our assessment.

The total instances of errors were:

Factual Errors	68
Interpretative Errors	42
Omission Errors	31

It should be noted that the above calculation of errors is based on passages that include multiple errors. So the number of factual errors is actually larger, but because passages compose a central idea or assertion that the authors attempt to prove through the use of factual, interpretative, and omission errors the study only enumerates passages. By highlighting passages, it becomes clear the extent of the polemical nature of the work.

The authors of the proposed textbook also committed serious errors in their discussion questions, side bars, and images. Although discussion questions do not seem, on the surface, to be biased, but more often than not, questions can lead someone toward a conclusion that the questioner desires. This is often seen in political hearings and trials, so an analysis of the questions is extremely important, as well as an analysis of the images used and the side bars. This supplemental material helps define the agenda of the narrative by defining and presenting terms and images that support the narrative the authors are putting forth and in the case of this textbook, it certainly implements several rhetorical fallacies and devices that circumvents critical thinking skills. This supplemental material narrowly focuses a specific agenda that is anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish, anti-Mexican, anti-Mexican American, and anti-immigrant.

Appendix of Errors

Abbreviations

- FE** Factual errors both represent incorrect facts, and/or assertions of opinion as facts.
- IE** Interpretative errors represent both the misuse of primary evidence to achieve a partial assertion of fact that misrepresents the whole of a phenomenon, and/or a misrepresentation of historical context and complexity.⁵ Interpretative errors are factual errors, but of a distinct class because of their authorial construction.
- OE** Omission errors represent both sections of the textbook that failed to include scholarship relevant to the topic being discussed, and/or the inclusion of material either not relevant to the topic and/or a failure of the authors to link such material for understanding the topic under consideration.

List of Errors

- P. 2-3 Title of the chapter is “The Indigenous Era.” **IE** Denotes indigenous people as extinct like the dinosaurs (i.e. the Jurassic Era).
- P. 4 “For several thousand years, major Indian empires flourished in the region between Mexico and Peru, while nomadic tribes filled the expanse of the North and South American continents by hunting, gathering, mixing, and migrating.” **FE** Extensive Native American settled communities occupied various parts of North and South America.
- P. 5 “Only a few **civilized** tribes in Mexico and Peru wrote their history down on scrolls called **codices**, but not many of these scrolls remain.” **FE** A codices is not a scroll, but a book. **FE/IE** Concerning the use of “few **civilized** tribes,”—depicts smaller sociopolitical units as the norm, but larger empires existed at various times and locations throughout the Americas.
- P. 5 The use of the terms “nomadic” and “civilized” in this section is highly problematic. **IE** The authors define civilized in terms of being like Europeans defined exclusively in terms of having writing. Indigenous cultures and modes of subsistence were very diverse, but none were living in caves or other modified

⁵ The Five Cs of historical thinking that should be a part of the creation of a textbook or any historical analysis include; change over time, context, causality, contingency, and complexity. For an overview of these concepts see, Thomas Andres, and Flannery Burke, “What Does It Mean to Think Historically?” *Perspectives on History*, January 2007. <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/january-2007/what-does-it-mean-to-think-historically>

natural structures like our early modern human ancestors. Whether indigenous communities were hunter-gatherers, semi-nomadic or settled in more permanent villages, is a matter of cultural adaptation to local resources. Life ways are not a measure by which people are deemed "civilized" or "primitive." Just because a tribe is semi-nomadic does not mean they did not have a complex culture with social structure (rules, laws, codes of behavior and ethics). Moreover, just because a society did not develop writing does not mean they did not have culture. The authors have reproduced the primitive/civilized dichotomy. This idea is rooted in racist assumptions about indigenous peoples being savage, uncivilized, and backward or behind Europeans. These ideas were also used as justifications for genocide and ethnocide against the indigenous peoples of the Americas.

P. 7 "In Latin America, Indian culture is still alive and well. While only 1.7% of North Americans currently claim Indian ancestry, roughly 75% of Latin Americans claim this heritage. Almost half of Guatemalans and Peruvians identify as pure Indian today, and most other Latin American countries have a **mestizo** majority of mixed European-Indian ancestry. Some native villages remain completely undisturbed, while mestizo communities may practice traditional ways of living, speak their native languages, and honor indigenous religious festivals." **OE** Besides the lack of source information concerning the assertion of "Indian ancestry" and "villages remain completely undisturbed" there is no connection between this information and the communities located within what became Spanish North America.

P. 8 "Just like Europeans or Asians, there were racial similarities between Indians, but there were also countless differences. Some Indians from tribes like the Waorani in Ecuador or the Yuki in California were typically very short, while the Arapaho and Iroquois Indians were known to be tall. The Inuit and Cheyenne had lighter skin, and many Amazon Indians had black skin. The Caddo pierced their noses, while the Tlingit inserted earplugs that stretched their earlobes over time. Body markings were common across Indian society to mark coming of age, victory in battle, marital status, or social rank, but there was a wide range of expression through body painting, piercings, scars, and tattoos of various forms." **FE/IE** Again, the authors set up this racist paragraph with the suggestion that they are making a cultural comparison with European and Asian societies. No meaningful comparison is being made. More importantly, what follows is an antiquated and essentialist concept of race as the division of human species based on differences in physical features defined by heredity. This view stems from 19th century ideas we now know as scientific racism, which has been disproven and discredited in anthropology and biology. There is only one human race and diversity in physical features is a product of adaptation to different environments over time. The second part of the sentence focuses on cultural differences and conflates them

with race. In sum, the paragraph is promoting racism – the idea that human cultural differences are biological and physical characteristics can be grouped as indicators of discrete racial groups. And of course, using Amerindian tribes as examples.

- P. 10 Pantheistic definition: “A belief that plants, animals, and objects in nature have spirits that should be honored and sometimes feared.” **FE** Pantheism is a European philosophical belief that God exists throughout the universe. This definition more closely represents the anthropological definition of "animism" not polytheism.
- P. 10 “Massacre was an effective strategy because the victor gained complete possession of the vanquished tribe’s land. Sometimes there was ceremonial beheading, scalping, or partial cannibalism. A common North American Indian practice was beating the dead, with the highest honor given to the warrior who struck the first blow. If massacre was not the objective, captives might be taken to be ransomed if the tribe had economic needs or taken as prisoners of war if the tribe was depopulated. It was common for wives to be kept as concubines and children to be kept as slaves and adoptees of the victorious tribe. Some tribes in the Pacific Northwest such as the Haida were even feared as habitual slave-raiders.” **FE/IE** This passage is extremely inflammatory and lacking in historical and archeological evidence. No, Native American peoples did not use massacre, war, slavery and genocide as a way to gain private land. They did have conflicts, but cooperation and building alliances was much more common as peaceful relations were essential to their survival. Large city-states did engage in ritualized forms of battle and demanded tribute from surrounding communities under their submission. All highly complex societies throughout the history of the world are both brutal and refined. The way the authors describe Native American warfare in this section is a projection of European forms of conquest and domination. In this way, they are attempting to justify their own actions by defining Native peoples as savage, warlike, and greedy. This does not match up with the evidence. In addition, Native American practices of unfreedom are not to be equated with the capitalism-driven chattel slavery of Africans that Europeans practiced. The slave trade or captivity as it is known in New Mexico among the Apache and Comanche began in the 1700s as a direct response to, and often in retaliation for Spanish colonialism. Slavery as an American institution developed as a result of European colonialism and imperialism.
- P. 11 “In recent years, historians such as Jared Diamond have emphasized the disadvantage Indians had compared to the Europeans who conquered them, due to their lack of guns, steel, and immunity to diseases like smallpox.” **FE/IE/OE** This is a gross oversimplification of Jared Diamond’s argument. Diamond’s book outlines environmental factors, or what he terms, “ultimate causes,” beginning during the Pliocene that led to Europeans having guns, germs and steel. His

argument is NOT that indigenous people of the Americas were lacking in innovation or intelligence. They had different natural resources at hand and developed different kinds of civilizations and technologies because of the resources they had. In this passage, the authors use Diamond to support their argument that Europeans were superior and that indigenous people were lacking in technology because they lagged behind Europeans in their evolutionary development. In addition, they use Diamond to support the discredited claim that diseases killed indigenous peoples, not wars with Europeans. Of course indigenous people were susceptible to European diseases and many did fall to these plagues, but it was also because the invaders disrupted their trade routes and ability to subsist that they succumbed to disease in such large numbers. People fall victim to diseases in mass when they are already weakened by starvation and war. Archeologist, Linda Cordell has calculated population statistics in New Mexico before and after Spanish colonialism. She concludes that diseases reduced the indigenous population upon first contact, but they did gain immunity within a generation and the population recovered, but they were reduced way below the numbers killed by diseases in the years leading up to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 because of the encomienda system. Spanish colonialism decimated indigenous populations. Plus, we cannot ignore the fact that diseases came with Europeans who came to conquer and displace indigenous people. Europeans were not benevolent explorers, this fact is indisputable.

- P. 10-12 The subsection: “Religion and Social Customs” **OE** There is scholarly literature related to Native American examines a variety and complexity of their religious and social view.
- P. 12 “Indians in North and South America also lacked the technological advancements of the wheel and domesticated animals, which had wide-ranging implications. In most areas, nomadic Indians had to live on what they could hunt or gather instead of being able to herd, ranch, or raise food sustainably on farms. In settled civilizations where Indians did farm, agriculture was difficult without animals to pull loads or provide manure for fertilizer. The lack of horses, oxen, and carts meant that Indians could not carry heavy loads of goods or people. This limited their ability to trade and migrate. Some Indians in South America had llamas to help transport goods, but llamas could only carry small loads, and slowly. In addition, without being able to travel long distances by horse or wagon, communication was limited to scouts or foot-runners. It was difficult to know what was going on in distant locations.” **FE** Native American agricultural systems ranged from complex systems that helped sustain communities in Mesoamerica in the millions to smaller urban communities in North America. Native American trade networks extended from Mesoamerica to the Southwest, and within North America.
- P. 14 “While the majority of Indians throughout North and South America migrated continuously, some tribes chose to settle in Peru or an area in Mexico and Central

America called **Mesoamerica**.” **FE** A majority of Native American societies were not nomadic.

- P. 14 “While the early Latin American civilizations differed from one another, they also had significant similarities. Each had urban cores with distinctive monuments and outlying farm areas.” **FE** The use of “Latin American civilizations” for pre-European contact is an error in usage. Latin America is a term utilized to categories nations that were once former Spanish colonies.
- P. 26 “The prophecy of Quetzalcoatl as ancient and trusted legend was one important reason why the Spanish were not immediately driven off by an Indian population that far outnumbered them.” **IE/OE** The issue of Moctezuma II or other Aztec believing Hernan Cortes was Quetzalcoatl is a historiographical debate that is being asserted as fact.
- P. 32 “No other civilization created, singlehandedly, such a reign of terror.” **IE** This is an assertion of fact that is not based on any scholarship. For a comparison, see the Germany Nazi Holocaust that resulted in the deaths of over 6 million Jews.
- P. 39 “In mit’a, there was no private economy, trade, or occupation to produce goods that could be paid as taxes. There was instead a centralized economy where Indians paid their taxes through labor, or working for the collective. It mirrored, most closely, European **socialism**. Instead of paying tribute with currency, harvest, or goods, natives rotated their wage-less labor in the army, mines, and publicly owned fields. Any textiles, utensils, roads, or buildings the empire needed, the mit’a laborers worked to produce.” **FE/IE** No, the Peruvian mit’a system is nothing like European socialism. First, European socialism did not exist until the 20th century. How can the authors possibly compare the Peruvian city-state with European socialism? The reason this comparison is being made is purely ideological. Again, casting socialism as a backward and cruel system like the one the Peruvians are claimed to have established.
- P. 64 “In 1598, Juan de Oñate established peaceful relations with the Pueblo Indians and successfully colonized the Santa Fe area, incorporating that area into Spanish Mexico.” **FE/IE** No, this was done through wars of conquest in which many Pueblo people were killed. In addition there was the massacre at Acoma in which Oñate killed 400 people and enslaved the rest, cutting one foot off of every young man. This is remembered in the Pueblos today. Oñate was tried and convicted of crimes against the Native people of the New Mexico and was banned from returning. He was stripped of his post and sent back to Spain where he became a lowly clerk. Relations between the Spanish and Pueblos were tense and tenuous. The Pueblos revolted against the Spanish in 1680 and cast them out for 12 years. There is no mention of this event in this textbook.
- P. 66 “The **Protestant Reformation** significantly changed Europe so that, newly freed from Popes and **absolutist** kings, settlers were looking for religious freedom and

business ventures.” **FE** Prior to the Protestant Reformation the concept of limited monarchy existed in England and Spain, particular over issues of taxes. **IF** While the Protestant Reformation representative a significant event that lead to a series of religious wars it was not the causally factor for the decline in absolutists monarchs. A more complex process occurred related to notions of human rights, and philosophical understandings of society and rule that was expressed by both Protestants and Catholics.

P. 67 “The Protestant Reformation decentralized politics, economics, and religion, which encouraged a new kind of colonialism in the New World. The goal was to settle, trade, and produce goods for sale, not to find gold and silver nor to turn the natives into loyal subjects of the king.” **FE** The Protestant Reformation was not the causal factor for “decentralized politics, economics, and religion, which encouraged a new kind of colonialism in the New World.” Nor did it produce the emergence of merchant capitalism other factors did.

P. 67 “Protestant belief in separating church and state authority meant that there was no Crusade to be fought and no political and religious kingdom to bring Indians into.” **FE** The notion of separation of church state was not part of Protestantism, indeed, the rise for the emergence of Puritanism was in response to the Church of England, the state church, which they wished to alter to align with their beliefs.

P.71 Mestizos “A person of mixed ancestry.” **FE** A mestizos is the offspring of a Spaniard and Native American.

P. 71 “In reality, however, the Audiencia mostly policed the Viceroy and the kings’ appointed leaders to make sure they were not getting too popular or ignoring royal orders. The Spanish monarchy wanted to be in control of its colonies at all times, and would not hesitate to remove someone who was threatening their authority.” **IE** The audiencia function within the Americas was to oversee political, economic, and judicial issues is correct, but the assertion “mostly policed the Viceroy and the kings’ appointed leaders to make sure they were not getting too popular” as a fact is an error.

P. 45-94 Chapter 2 Spanish Colonialism

Section 1: Exploration and Conquest

Section 2: The Spanish Colonial System

OE Only from six pages, 87-92, was devoted to any coverage of Spanish Borderlands from 49 pages of text. The omission of the Spanish Borderland scholarship (a hundred years old with thousands of books, chapters and articles) represents one of the gravest errors within this textbook. The only coverage for the Spanish Borderlands was the California mission system. Indeed, a proposed Mexican American history textbook for Texas schools that excludes Tejano history is shocking.

The equivalent of omitting Spanish Borderland scholarship would be a physics or astronomy textbook omitting Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity, and ignoring all the advances through the twentieth century that resulted from his theory. Such a textbook would end by only utilizing information about scientific advances that stopped by 1906. Would any reasonable person accept such a textbook for 2016?

- P. 94 "The large bulk of the population needed more rights and privileges such as the ability to own land, trade freely, and better themselves." **FE** Individuals within the Spanish colonial system owned private property, including land.
- P. 106-112 Mexican War of Independence, 1810-1820
OE No inclusion of the Spanish Borderlands for the examination of the Mexican War of Independence. Particularly disturbing is the exclusion of José Bernardo Maximiliano Gutiérrez de Lara from Revilla, Nuevo Santander, who went to Washington, D.C. seeking United States aid for Mexico's independence. While the U.S. refused aid, he was able to recruit men for an invading force into Tejas. The Gutiérrez-Magee expedition liberated Tejas from royalists control during 1813.
- P. 116 Federalism is "a form of governing in which a national overarching government oversees smaller localized government systems." **FE** Incorrect definition for the understanding of federalism within Mexican history. Federalism is a political system with a weak central government, and strong state governments. This is similar to the form of government organized under the Articles of Confederation.
- P. 106-125 Mexican War of Independence, 1810-1820
OE Only five pages from 19 pages were devoted to Mexican War of Independence, and its first governments. As noted before no Spanish Borderland coverage was included, particularly no Tejas history. To put the disparity of coverage in context, more content was devoted to Central America, South American, including Brazil and Haiti, then Mexican history with a difference of 14 versus 5 pages. With no coverage of the Spanish Borderlands.
- P. 126 "Americans, after all, had had over 150 years of self-rule prior to the American Revolution, from the Mayflower to the Declaration of Independence. The Spanish colonies had had none." **FE** The Pilgrim self-rule was short lived. Colonies were part of the English, and later Great Britain colonial system. If by self-rule, the authors mean that colonists resisted, rejected and contested imperial regulations, then that was a common feature of most colonial systems, including the Spanish.
- P. 129-130 "When American aristocrats and militia locked arms to rebel against King George III of England, and stated that there be "no taxation without representation," they had an entire tradition of Parliamentary government and freedoms to which they

could appeal. They were holding the King of England to a standard that the British already believed in, at least idealistically.

This line of argumentation would not have made any sense if the U.S. colonial parent had been Spain. Within the Papal system of monarchs and popes, there was no parliamentary government where commoners had any say in the legislative process. There was no discussion or debate at all. The Founding Fathers were very concerned about how Mexico and other Latin American nations would self-govern with no tradition of freedom or debate. Most Mexicans weren't literate, they could not own land, and had been given the message that they should be subdued rather than lifted up. How would they invent a system from nothing that depended on participating in political and economic life?" **FE/IE** The simplistic political representation of Spanish and Catholic views stems from the authors need to create a strawman for the notion of English-Protestant superiority. This is an interpretative error that stems from the factual error—the Spanish had local representative government within its colonial system.

- P. 134 “The signing of the Declaration of Independence was the same story of Englishmen holding the English king accountable for the rights they believed they were due. Except this time, the story went an extra step further. Americans practiced self-government for so long, and they wanted to try and govern themselves without a king at all.” **FE** The issue of imperial control of the colonies is a complicated issue, but both England, and later the United Kingdom maintained political control over the colonies to various degrees with colonist supporting, ignoring or rejecting various measures from the central government.
- P. 136 “It (U.S. Constitution) also anchored the moral philosophy of the nation in “**the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God**,” and the equality of man, acknowledging the Judeo-Christian principles espoused within British common law—the legal philosophy underlying much of the political framework of American government.” **FE** The U.S. Constitution is not based on “Judeo-Christian principles” as noted by multiple constitutional scholars. Here the authors falsely link together Lord Bolingbroke’s anti-religious reference to a late 1930s reference, “Judeo-Christian.”
- P. 137 “The long process of debate and ratification that occurred between the U.S. Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the final signing of the Constitution in 1789 ensured that a majority of the populace was on board with exactly how the principles in the founding documents would govern.” **IE** The issue of contingency and time are important components of historical analysis. To collapse the events from 1776 to 1789 as a time of a deliberation erases the complex sociopolitical, foreign affairs, and economic history of the time period.
- P. 137 “Mexico did not go through the same process. They tabled the discussion of empire or republic in order to win their war against Spain. Mexico declared

independence after their revolution was won, and allowed the monarchical faction of winners to make its founding document one of an empire. When Mexican delegates were suddenly sent to create a federalist system in 1823, not only did they have to use force to topple their existing government—setting a dangerous precedent—they did not exactly specify the limits of state and national powers. Their states were widely divided on the issue and lived in **détente** with their national government rather than trusting and participating in it.” **FE/IE/OE** This passage is troubling because of the large body of scholarship related to the processes of the Mexican War of Independence, and the intellectual debates that individuals engaged in concerning the nature of the formation of a liberal democratic-republic.

- P. 138 “Moreover, common Americans expressed themselves in avenues outside government—businesses, churches, and voluntary associations. Americans voted with their feet and their money, going to new places or creating new options if they did not like the ones they had; they did not raise an army. Mexicans, in contrast, did not have any of these options, so revolutionary action became the standard way to voice an opinion. The average Mexican had no freedom of religion, no right to own land, no education, and very little industry or free market to give them opportunity. These were some of the major obstacles the young Mexican republic had to conquer if they were going to break free from the colonial shackles they inherited.” **FE/IE/OE** This passage follows the above noted passage, and engages in linking two facts, instability of national government rule (it should be noted that the textbook does not reference the political divisions between liberals, conservatives, federalists, and centralists), and “no freedom of religion” to “no right to own land, no education, and very little industry or free market to give them opportunity...” Private property, public education (usually locally funded), and entrepreneurship did exist, but not at the scale or industrial sophistication of England or the emerging factories of the United States.
- P. 140 “During 1826–1829, the Mexican navy was even led by U.S. Commodore David Porter.” **FE** David Porter was not a member of the U.S. Navy at the time he was in service for Mexico. The sentence makes it seem that he was engaged in detached service from the U.S. Navy to the Mexican Navy.
- P. 151 “...so by the time of the Mexican independence in 1821, there were only about 2500 Tejano citizens. Most of them lived close to the **Rio Grande** border, and most of them had been sent involuntarily by the government.” **FE** Two errors are presented in this passage. First, if the statement means by the Rio Grande, the settlements of Nuevo Santander between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande, then that area was not a part of Tejas. Second, the population of the Villas del Norte of Nuevo Santander were larger than 2,500 people.

- P. 151 ““The North”; a term used to refer to the United States, illustrating the hope for a promised land and a new life there.” **FE** This is a common term for the twentieth century in relation to United States/Mexico boundaries post 1848. Its use for this time period is factually incorrect.
- P. 151 “In 1822, Moses Austin obtained the first charter to start an American colony in Texas.” **FE** Moses Austin received the charter during 1821.
- P. 151-152 “Soon, 900 more families joined them, lured by low taxes and the Mexican government’s offer of cheap land at \$1.25 an acre and up to 4,438 acres per family. Even though Tejanos were allowed up to eleven times this amount of land, only one new colonist came from Mexico at this time.” **FE** The only exception made to Mexican citizens concerning colonization was that they were given first choice.
- P. 154 In the 1830s, “the national government of Mexico began to get cold feet and consolidate power.” **FE** The Colonization Laws of 1823 were supposed to end in 1830. In other words, understood statutory limits and not “cold feet” announced the end of the Colonization Laws.
- P. 155 “As Americans began to pour in, Tejanos accepted American settlers because they were the gateway to selling their products and supporting themselves—there was no market for their goods in Mexico.” **FE** Markets existed for Texas goods in Mexico.
- P. 156-158 **OE** Authors commit a serious error by omission when they fail to note that Santa Anna was a military figure who assumed power when civil government was unable to contain violence associated with regional caciques and revolts like the attempt by East Texas secessionists to separate themselves from Mexican authority. The authors also fail to note that Santa Anna ordered the arrest of Austin when one of his intercepted letters revealed his support for armed rebellion among the East Texas farmers.
- P. 158 From a sidebar, Santa Anna, A quote from him: “It is very true that I threw up my cap for liberty with great ardor, and perfect sincerity, but very soon found the folly of it. A hundred years to come my people will not be fit for liberty. They do not know what it is, unenlightened as they are, and under the influence of a Catholic clergy, a despotism is the proper government for them, but there is no reason why it should not be a wise and virtuous one.” **IE** The authors use a quote he made without providing any sense of context for the quote, and utilize it to support their anti-Mexican culture thesis. Indeed, the selectivity of evidence throughout the textbook of quote selection, and lack of contextualization is pervasive.
- P. 158 “Meanwhile, in November 1845, special agent John Slidell was sent to Mexico City to offer \$25 million⁹ for Texas, California, and New Mexico. The U.S.

government was also willing to forgive the \$3 million in debt that Mexico owed. The Mexican President, José Herrera, initiated the negotiation, asking the United States to send an ambassador “to settle the current dispute in a peaceful, reasonable and respectable way.”¹⁰ Herrera did not want to lose Texas to the United States, but neither did he want to fight or fund a war against them. Mexico needed money and the government did not seem stable enough to administrate a war.”

IE/OE The authors cite a PBS source,

http://www.pbs.org/kerawar/ushistory/prelude/md_a_mexican_viewpoint.html,

but purposely misrepresents the effort to settle the dispute in question, which was Texas alone, and did not include in any way the rest of Mexico’s territory.

However, the authors misrepresent this fact.

- P. 160 **FE** The attempt to secede from the Mexican union was not a general “Texan” initiative since numerous Texans of Mexican-origin, or Tejanos, were opposed to it. It would be more accurate to say Anglo Texans, with the collaboration of mostly Tejano elites, supported secession.⁶
- P. 163 **FE** Document authored by José Juan Sánchez Navarro noted as “Original Source,” notes an incorrect source.
- P. 166 “The failure of the Mexican government to recognize Texan independence in 1836 directly led to the Mexican American War.” **FE/IE** Mexico’s refusal to recognize the independence of Texas was not the direct and major cause of the war between Mexico and the United States. This is as untenable as saying that the U.S. government was directly and mostly responsible for the Civil War because its leadership opposed the right of southern states to secede from the union.
- P. 182 **FE** Citation error for footnote 8. Correct citation: Jesús Velasco-Márquez, “A Mexican Viewpoint on the War With the United States,” [English translation, original in *El Siglo XIX*, 20 July 1845, p. 4]
10http://www.pbs.org/kerawar/ushistory/prelude/md_a_mexican_viewpoint.html
- P. 182 **IE** Even when the authors cite the above Mexican source, they do not incorporate the numerous arguments that Mexican authors make against the U.S. interpretation of the war as an expression of manifest destiny. For instance, Mexico never declared war on the United States despite the U.S. declaration of war and the U.S. military invasion of Mexico.⁷

⁶. *Handbook of Texas Online*, Arnaldo De León, "Mexican Texas," accessed June 02, 2016, <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/npm01>. Uploaded on June 15, 2010. Modified on May 9, 2016. Published by the Texas State Historical Association.

⁷. Consult the following for historical literature originating in Mexico: Josefina Vázquez, *Mexicanos y norteamericanos* *Mexicanos y norteamericanos ante la guerra del 47* (Mexico, D.F.: Ediciones Ateneo, 1977); Jaime E. Rodríguez O., Kathryn Vincent, *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S* (Wilmington, Del.: SR Books, 1997).

- P. 214 **FE/IE/OE** The authors' interpretation of continued Mexican political representation between 1850 and 1910 upends the established framework for studying the transition from "Mexican pueblos to American towns," as historian Albert Camarillo so aptly described in 1979. The Mexican pueblos were not underdeveloped "outposts," nor did the Mexican leadership maintain effective political representation throughout the period in question. Towns like San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and San Diego, for instance, were dynamic urban centers and served as hubs for lucrative industries like ranching, trade and construction, and the political, economic and social transition was not free of racial violence. Also, the transfer of political influence and property was noticeable soon after the 1846-48 war and was near complete by the 1890s.
- P. 216-7 "Yet with no tradition of English law or Puritan morality, nor Southern slavery and aristocracy, the West offered the chance for Latinos, Indians, black Americans, indentured servants, and immigrants from all over the world to create a culture for themselves without any pre-existing mold." **FE/IE** California was not an empty socioeconomic or political space prior to United States migration.
- P. 219 "By then, President Abraham Lincoln had already proclaimed freedom for all slaves in the **Emancipation Proclamation**, and this had to be extended into the South." **FE** The Emancipation Proclamation did not free all slaves, but only with territories within rebellion.
- P. 217-223 **OE** The mention of migratory workers is dwarfed by the disproportionate attention given to the Western movement, the civil war, settlement policies and the emancipation proclamation in a sizable section that includes pp. 217-223. As a result of this focus, the text does not provide sufficient explanation of the international and domestic migration of Mexicans, their settlement patterns and their experience as migratory workers which the authors note in three sentences on page 223.
- p. 223-37 **OE** The pattern of assigning a small portion of the text to Mexican historical experiences while dedicating much attention to large trends in American history continues in the discussion of the railroads, American Indians, homesteading, the "transportation revolution," the "Indian Wars," the "industrial and Agricultural Revolution," "Industrial and Agricultural Revolution," "Cowboys and the Cattle Industry," "Multicultural Cowboys," "Mechanization of Agriculture," George Washington Carver, "Irrigation Transformation," and "Population and Immigration Explode," for a total of fourteen pages. These topics and themes have varying levels of relevance, but the authors fail to explain this. For instance, the section on cowboys makes no mention of Mexican "vaqueros" and the importance of the cattle industry on the Mexican American historical experience.
- P. 244-66 **OE** This chapter is redundant as it revisits topics and themes previously addressed, for example, the Diaz regime. A more serious problem lies in the

authors' failure to address the Mexican American historical experience in twenty-two pages. The section largely examines Mexican history between 1850 and 1910, with a focus on how the paths of U.S. and Mexican diverged. The section also includes treatment of the Spanish-American war, the Roosevelt Corollary, "Taft's Dollar Diplomacy," "Wilson's Moral Diplomacy," and "The Eve of the Mexican Revolution," and only once mentions a Mexican from the northern territory, Ignacio Zaragoza.

- P. 242 **FE** Abraham Lincoln was not "one of the only Congressman to vote against the Mexican American war in 1846." Two votes were cast against it and at least one abstained. Also, vigorous opposition was evident in the debates prior to and during the war.
- P. 270-95 **OE** Redundancy in coverage and errors by omission throughout this chapter when the authors fail to access the vast scholarly literature and digitized primary records in Spanish on transnational Mexican work and living conditions as well as civic action among both Mexican Nationals and descendants of colonials throughout the Southwest. For instance, the authors fail to reference any scholarly books and articles on Mexican American history or the vast digitized Arte Público collection published by EBSCO that includes digitized records of Spanish-language newspapers from the 1880s to the late twentieth century.⁸
- Error by omission is also evident in the amount of space devoted to the histories of Mexico and the United States at the expense of a comprehensive treatment of Mexican-origin persons in the United States.
- P. 270. "Ultimately, their Revolution resulted in a completely new form of government that looked to a new philosophy called socialism to solve the country's political, economic, and social problems." **FE** The Mexican Revolution did not lead to a new governing philosophy that the authors characterize as socialism.
- P. 272, 308 **FE** Incorrect reference to "La Regeneración." No such group existed. The authors may be referring to Regeneración, the official organ of the Partido Liberal Mexicano.
- P. 272. "Before his run for president, Franco Madero had associated with a revolutionary group called *La Regeneración*, or "The Regeneration." This group was inspired by a radical Russian philosophy called **anarchism**, and called for total overthrow of the Mexican government." **FE** Francisco Madero did not align his group with an anarcho-syndicalist group that the authors fail to name.
- P. 272 **FE** "Franco Madero" is an obvious mistake.

⁸.EBSCO, "Own a Piece of History, Arte Público Hispanic Historical Collection," EBSCO Electronic Newsletter, 2016, <https://www.ebscohost.com/archives/featured-archives/latino-hispanic-series-one>, Accessed June 6, 2016.

- P. 272 **FE** There is no “Regeneration Movement” in the literature of the Mexican Revolution, nor was there a group called La Regeneración, or “The Regeneration.”
- P. 273 **OE** Resident Mexican population of Texas is excluded in the discussion of the Mexican Revolution. For example, the authors failed to note that Madero established ties with leaders in the Mexican community. Part of this association involved the printing of the Plan de San Luis Potosi with the printing press of La Prensa (San Antonio: 1913-55), one of the most important Spanish-language papers in the American Southwest and Mexico printed by Ignacio Lozano.
- P. 273. **FE** The U.S. government did not try to “shut down the arms dealers selling weapons across the border,” in fact they allowed some gun dealers to operate in the United States while denying others. This is one way that the United States influenced Mexican politics throughout the early 1900s, including the Mexican Revolution.
- P. 276 “The first Mexican American veterans fought for the United States on the Allies’ side, beginning in late 1917.” **FE** Mexican-origin persons began establishing a substantial record of U.S. military service much earlier, at least since the Civil War. Prior to the Civil War, Spanish participated in the American Revolution, and Mexicans at the Battle of New Orleans, 1815.
- P. 281 “The overall Mexican population in America was still small, however—fewer than 100,000 in 1900—and with little border control in the Southwest, the line between “Mexican” and “Mexican American” was still blurry.” **FE** Over 500,000 Hispanics lived in the United States during 1900. Of that number over 400,000 were of Mexican origin.
- P. 281 “Between 1910 and 1930, as fighting continued, hundreds of thousands came, and the Mexican American population became very diverse. Mixed in with permanent settlers were tens of thousands of squatters and guest workers.” **FE** No evidence of “thousands of squatters” and no guest workers program existed. The U.S. government suspended the literacy exam, head tax during, and labor contract law during World War I and later to allow the flow of farm workers. This was not a guest worker program.
- P. 283 “On January 11, 1916, Pancho Villa tried to provoke war with the United States and instigate *reconquista* by executing 15 American miners in Chihuahua, Mexico and waiting for U.S. forces to show up in retaliation.” **IE** The word “Reconquista” is not in its correct historical or chronological time; it is a presentist notion that reflects current opposition to the Mexican American social cause for equal rights and dignity.
- P. 288 “All of them [revolutionary figures] had worked hard for their agenda, but none were able to lead Mexico out of the centralist control and into freedom.” **IE** A

federalist system with strong central control does not necessarily constitute a loss of freedom for the Mexican people:

- P. 290 “Not only did Catholicism by its nature support traditional principles of authority and hierarchy, but overturning the old government required overturning the religion it was affiliated with; they were viewed as one and the same.” **IE** Explaining Mexican Revolutionary secular policy on religion because the Catholic Church supported “traditional principles of authority and hierarchy” is misleading.
- P. 296-320 Section 2; Revolution in Latin America and Beyond
OE The section once again reflects redundancy and limits its treatment of the Mexican American historical experience, preferring instead to focus on Latin American and U.S. history without demonstrating direct relevance to Mexican Americans.
- P. 296-307 **OE** The long narrative on Marxism, Leninism, and “revolutionary socialism” in Latin America is not directly relevant to the history of Mexican-origin persons in the United States, nor is it historically factual to suggest that radical thought makes a major contribution to underdevelopment and a cultural and political rift with the United States.
- P. 307-8 **FE** The Partido Liberal Mexicano did not openly embrace an anarcho-syndicalist programme of action until 1911, nor did the organization call for the destruction “of government altogether” and “a new social order with no authorities, no business, and no private property.
- P. 309 **FE** No factual evidence exists to support the following: “California was primarily Spanish-speaking until the Gold Rush in 1848” and Flores Magón “continues to inspire radicalism today.”
- P. 309 “He then attempted to join the plantations into a commune run by the peasants. The goal was for farmers to work only a few hours per day, making only what was needed for all to survive, without wages or profit. Everyone would have enough without utilizing female labor, child labor, supervisors, or a police force. There would be no property lines or individual ownership either. This did not work out as planned, but Zapata’s troops kept southern villages in and federal troops out.” **FE** The Plan de Ayala did not include elimination of private property as indicated by the above passage, and indeed called for former titles to private property owners who lost their land through fraud or government actions had the right to reclaim such lost land.

- P. 313-18 **OE** The authors fail to incorporate the recent literature that incorporates Mexican American history into the history of U.S. diplomacy and Mexico's attempt to use the Good Neighbor Policy to influence U.S. domestic policy in race relations.⁹
- P. 324-53 **Section 1, Mexican American Immigration**
- OE** The authors once again spend an inordinate amount of space addressing Latin American and U.S. history at the expense of a closer examination of the Mexican-origin population.
- P 331 “Between 1914 and 1918, Mexican workers who crossed the border legally received **visas**, or guest worker permits that allowed them to work for six months before they had to return to Mexico.” **FE** No work visas were granted between 1914-1917, and after 1917 the head tax, literacy test, and labor contracts were suspended to allow Mexican workers into the United States.
- P. 333-5 **OE** The authors continue to address topics without explaining their relevance to Mexican American history. An example is the section on “Restrictionism and the Red Scare.”
- P. 337-9 **OE** The authors repeat the views of restrictionists without questioning them: “The first deportations of Mexican laborers occurred to offload the overabundant labor supply, especially those who worked for the cheapest wages.” Restrictionists also said that Mexican culture threatened national identity and accused them of being disloyal and a political threat to national unity. The authors also fail to take into account the voice of the Mexican and Mexican American community on immigration, deportations, inequality, discrimination, and poverty, including the articles and editorials appearing in *La Prensa* (San Antonio: 1913-55), the WWI diary by José de la Luz Sáenz, the two-volume work by Alonso Perales, and the article by Emma Tenayuca and Homer Brooks. The authors also fail to acknowledge Mexico as an important wartime ally, the 15,000 Mexican Nationals who served in the U.S. military, the diplomatic work of Ezequiel Padilla in support of the Good Neighbor Policy, the Bracero Program as a wartime measure that contributed over 500,000 workers to the U.S. labor market, and Mexico's permission to set up radar installations along its coasts. Also, the authors overlook the work of Mexican consulate offices and Mexican American leaders in combatting discrimination in the United States, all with the blessings of the State Department.
- P. 339 **FE/IE** Mexico formed the Mexican Expeditionary Air Force (not the Mexican Expeditionary Force), or the 201st Air Squadron that saw limited action. The 15,000 Mexican Nationals that served in the U.S. military represent a more significant military contribution by Mexico. Their participation contributed to popular Mexican support for the war, but it did not necessarily help “to heal some

⁹. Zamora, Gonzales, del Castillo

of the racial and ethnic tensions.” For instance, public establishments continued to refuse service to Mexicans, including Mexican soldiers, including members of the 201st Air Squadron training in Texas. This created serious diplomatic problems and even led to protests in Mexico and the American Southwest.

- P. 346 “In 1945, the first Medal of Honor awarded to a Mexican American was given to WWII veteran Macario Garcia, by President Harry Truman.” **FE** Six preceded him.
- P. 352 “...the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had declared that all American citizens, regardless of race, religion, or ethnicity, now had equal political, economic, and social rights before the law.” **FE** The Constitution guarantees equal rights under the law to everyone residing in the United States. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 affirmed these rights and granted the Justice Department the special authority to enforce the Constitution. The authors suggest otherwise with the statement that the Act of 1964 declared that everyone “now had equal political, economic, and social rights before the law.”
- P. 352 **IE** Immigration policy during the late 1950s and early 1960s did not seek “to incentivize immigrants—Latinos in particular—to become naturalized and assimilated so they could enjoy basic American freedoms.”
- P. 354 “The period between 1880 and 1930, when immigration and revolutionary activity were at their peak, set back early civil rights because fears about the political ambitions and values of immigrants and minorities were strong. Due to both real and imagined events, it became easy to stigmatize entire groups. Segregation, ghettos, and non-assimilated enclaves encouraged this.” **IE** Various civil rights efforts and organization began during this time period.
- P. 357 “Forcing civil rights on Southern states during Reconstruction failed because it bypassed representational avenues and trumped the beliefs of millions of citizens, including veterans and previous legislators from the South.” **IE** Reconstruction policies sought to re-establish a united nation on the basis of the authority given to the federal government by the United States Constitution and the Civil War victory.
- P. 360 “Gompers believed that minorities, especially illegal Mexican workers, threatened Americans by taking their jobs and driving down wages.” **FE** Gompers agreed to allow the entry of Mexican Americans into AFL unions and appointed the first Mexican American labor organizers to demonstrate his sincerity. However, he also allowed local unions and state federations to restrict membership according to nativity.¹⁰

¹⁰. Emilio Zamora, *The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas, 1900-1920* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2009).

- P. 363-5 **OE** The authors fail to discuss the significance or even mention major leaders and organizations that argued for equal rights for Mexican Americans in the 19th and 20th centuries. Women leaders and their organizations are especially missing.
- P. 371 “The fight for black civil rights during the terms of Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson had become the advent of civil rights for all.” **IE/OE** The scholarship of civil rights efforts during the Post-World War II Era has shifted the conversation from a White/Black binary to one that incorporates the diversity, cross-racial alliances and antagonisms, and regionalism of civil rights efforts.
- P. 380 “The United States tried to contain Communism because it caused famine, natural disaster, and civil war with casualties into the millions.” **FE** Communism did not cause natural disasters.
- P. 380-401 **OE** No discussion of Mexican Americans within this chapter. However, some non-Mexican Latino groups received coverages through short side bars, but the vast majority of the text was about Cold War Politics relates to Asia, and Latin America.
- P. 403-404 “In the midst of the counterculture and societal turmoil which gave rise to it, a sector of revolutionaries started to marshal circumstances toward their own ends. They believed different groups fighting for their own ends—feminism, civil rights, alternative lifestyles, and religions—could together bring about a larger revolution. In 1962, a radical student group published the Port Huron Statement which declared that the university was the new hub for revolution, and that students’ goal should be ‘to build a base for their assault upon the loci of power.’”² To do this, both they and the academic community should reach out to allies in the labor, civil rights, and local community as well as “import major public issues into the curriculum.” This became a strategy of activism in the 1960s and 1970s. Campaign by campaign, contemporary demands from different segments of society could all be part of bringing down the entire political and economic establishment.” **FE/IE** This passage collapses various civil rights groups missions and efforts into sharing a stated goal of “bringing down the entire political and economic establishment,” and ignores the diversity of groups and goals such as reform as opposed to upending certain aspects of society.
- P. 404 “**Educated, Urban Warfare.** Using civil rights and anti-war disturbances as a springboard, revolutionary students launched their own violent campaigns against American police, government, and authority. A violent protest during the Democratic National Convention was carried out in Chicago in 1968 with hundreds injured. This was followed by the Days of Rage in 1969, where a small group of militant students—an educational *foco*—carried out an even more violent street assault. In 1971 and 1972, the same organization bombed several government buildings, including the U.S. Capitol and the Pentagon. For several years, revolutionary students stirred up violence in the streets, attacked police and

private property, and encouraged peers to be arrested for the greater cause. In fact, all around the world—Germany, England, France, Mexico—radical student activists took to the streets in large urban centers to protest Western civilization and its attack of Communism in the Cold War.” **FE/IE** As noted above, this passage collapses various groups into a single notion of “violent” “radical” students.

P. 405 “In the 1960s, a Mexican American pride movement called the **Chicano movement** largely originated from the university and, like the Port Huron Statement called for, extended into labor, civil rights, and other community venues. The heart of the Chicano movement revolved around creating a Mexican American community that resided within, but was untouched by, white American society.” **FE/IE** The authors make the unfounded statement that the Chicano movement began at the universities and “extended to labor, civil rights, and other community venues.” They commit another error when they claim that the Chicano Movement basically sought to create a community “that resided within, but was untouched by, white American society.”

P. 405 From a sidebar: “**WHAT IS A CHICANO?** Originally a derogatory term, the term “Chicano” is now a preferred term by many Mexican Americans, although people disagree on its exact definition. Some use the term almost synonymously with “Mexican American” while others use it to refer more specifically to American-born descendants of Mexican immigrants. Sometimes “Chicano” is used to mean Mexican Americans who take special pride in their heritage, those who support more rights for Mexican Americans, or those who rebel against the system. In the historical context of the 1960s, when the term “Chicano” began to be associated with an entire movement, the word carried with it a specific connotation of separating from the white American community. One famous Mexican American journalist defined “Chicano” as “a Mexican American with a non-Anglo image of himself.” [This definition is the one used and explored in the rest of this chapter.]” **FE/IE** Chicano is not a preferred term of identification today, and was only accepted by some members of Mexican origin community during the 1960s and 1970s. Chicano is rarely used in a synonymous manner with Mexican American. The issue of separating from “white American community”, while some minor groups might have expressed such a sentiment, did not encompass the vast majority of Chican@ Movement organizations. For example, the Ku Klux Klan did not represent the vast majority of “white Americans” during the 1960s and 1970s.

P. 406 “The ideas motivating the 1960s Chicano movement began in Mexico during the Revolution.” **FE** The intellectual foundations for many Chican@ Movement organizations and groups emanated from a variety of intellectual and political ideals not just the idea of the “Cosmic Race Theory.”

- P. 408 “**Plan de Santa Barbara.** In 1969, MEChA declared the Plan de Santa Barbara, which called for **Chicano Studies** to be implemented in all California public schools. The document emphasized that Chicano Studies should be organized along similar lines as Mexican *indigenismo*, rather than the typical Anglo core curriculum. MEChA activists insisted that Mexican American students needed a Mexican American education that was unique and separate from what other students were required to study, and one that was taught in Spanish. In this way, Alurista and MEChA parted from mainstream activists pursuing educational reform through the G.I. Forum, LULAC, and associated groups. Chicano activists wanted something different than desegregation and access to good schools. They wanted schools within a school and a statement that they were unique from, not the same as, other American students.” **FE/IE** The Plan de Santa Barbara indicated that Chicano Studies should be open to all students, and particularly emphasized supplemental support for student success including cultural relevant courses and content. The educational reform of the 1960s inclusion on racial, gender, and ethnic studies was distinct in general from previous educational reform efforts. So a false dichotomy is presented between the MEChA’s goals, and LULAC’s and the American G.I. Forum’s efforts because of a lack of historical context about general reforms related to United States education.
- P. 411-412 “During the Vietnam War, the Brown Berets set up chapters in cities with significant Latino populations to mobilize larger numbers for what they called *la Causa de la Raza*, “the Cause” or “liberation” of “the Race.” **IE** The authors consistently translate Raza into Race when it is obvious that Spanish-speakers most often mean “the people,” and not race when they use the term.
- P. 412 **FE/IE/OE** The Brown Berets were not the principal organizers of the various school walkouts or the Chicano Moratorium. Various civil rights organizations, and individuals organized walkouts, and marches during the Chican@ Movement.
- P. 415 “The result of advancing *La Causa de La Raza* was a Mexican American separatist movement that sought to work outside the American system.” **IE** The last effort at separation from the United States was the Plan de San Diego during 1915. No Mexican American or Chican@ civil rights organization advocated for that as has been included in this textbook claiming it advocated working outside the American system.
- P. 415-416 “Chicanos, on the other hand, adopted a revolutionary narrative that opposed Western civilization and wanted to destroy this society. Two sets of Mexican American activists, with similar hopes for their community, were pursuing two different approaches.” **FE/IE** While differences existed between Chican@ and Mexican American organizations concerning political tactics and senses of identity, Chican@ civil rights organizations did not oppose “Western civilization and wanted to destroy this society.”

P. 417 “In 1982, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Plyler v. Doe* that the children of illegal immigrants were constitutionally protected by the Fourteenth Amendment, MALDEF began to advocate on behalf of these children, especially in the state of Texas, to make sure that they received access to public schooling.” **FE** The *Plyler v. Doe* ruling decided that non-United States citizen children had the right to an education, and MALDEF was involved in educational issues prior to this case.

P. 417 “On a lay level, educational reformers were also making progress. In 1978, a Bolivian immigrant with Aymara Indian ancestry, Jaime Escalante, became famous for helping an underprivileged class of Los Angeles Latinos learn calculus and pass the AP Calculus exam. He became so successful that his graduates became the largest proportion of those entering the University of Southern California from East Los Angeles. Escalante avoided political and social agendas and instead pushed for “hard work, and lots of it, for teacher and student alike.”⁵ Several Latino teachers followed in his footsteps and, while they were not always appreciated for evading the Chicano movement, they helped get hundreds of Mexican Americans into college.” **IE** The last sentence is an assertion that is not based on facts.

P. 428-429 “Today, a variety of contemporary issues face the Mexican American community which have their roots in the last century of modern history. The Mexican Revolution, Civil Rights era, and the Cold War opened problems that have been challenging to solve. Economic disparity between the United States and Mexico is one major issue because it is responsible for the high rate of Mexican immigration which has continued since 1930, and which in recent years has been predominantly illegal rather than legal. Illegal immigration has since caused a number of economic and security problems in the United States over which people are divided on how to solve. Poverty, non-assimilation, drugs, crime, and exploitation are among some of these problems. Studies have shown that the Mexican American community suffers from a significant gap in education levels, employment, wages, housing, and other issues relating to poverty that persist through the second, third, and fourth generations. Civil rights measures meant to address these issues have created new problems including a draw for more illegal immigrants and a high price for taxpayers. Fortunately, Mexican Americans have made significant gains in political and civil arenas, and their concerns are being debated very seriously. As more Mexican Americans involve themselves in these areas, they help shape the answers for today and the questions for the future.”

FE/IE The authors have never demonstrated the line of causality between important events from the past and contemporary Mexican American society. For example, “The Mexican Revolution, Civil Rights era, and the Cold War opened problems that have been challenging to solve.” “Poverty, non-assimilation, drugs, crime, and exploitation are among some of these problems.”

The authors continue with their unsubstantiated line of reasoning when they add that, “Civil rights measures meant to address these issues have created new problems including a draw for more illegal immigrants and a high price for taxpayers.”

P. 434-435 “**English-Only**. Currently, English is the most accessible language for navigating one’s way around the United States. It is also increasingly the language of international business, spoken by 1 billion people worldwide. Some worry that promoting Spanish as a national language will lead to the Spanish-speaking community not putting as much effort into learning English well, or even at all, and therefore hindering their employment and higher education pursuits. With time, this could lead to a bigger division between the English-speaking and Spanish-speaking populations, with two sets of governments, schools, marketplaces, and institutions. Dual languages are likely to create “separate” but not “equal” spheres, which could result in the Spanish-speaking community feeling more marginalized. Some also worry that Spanish-speaking communities could, over time, become more connected to the world of Mexico rather than to the United States, threatening the stability of the country.” **IE/OE** There is a lack of intellectual framing related to the issue of language use and the related politics related to English and Spanish. The use of rhetorical questions is problematic as they are assertions of likely outcomes (future facts) that are not substantiated with current research concerning language use.

P. 435 “**Bilingual Advocates**. Advocates of **bilingualism** argue that promoting Spanish will help Spanish-speaking immigrants and children traverse American society better. They will not have to worry about making errors while voting, signing financial agreements, or conversing with important people. Government, schools, and public spaces will be easily navigable. Latino children in Spanish-speaking schools will benefit because they will not have to learn English in order to learn everything else. They will also stay connected to the world of their parents and ancestors. Proponents point to other countries such as Canada and Switzerland that have multiple national languages as proof that having two languages does not necessarily lead to “two societies.” In some cities like Los Angeles and El Paso, more than 70% of the population already speaks Spanish, so making Spanish an official national language would simply formalize what is already a practical reality for them. Other advocates say that institutionalizing Spanish would be an issue of respect—a public sign that Spanish-speakers are as equally valued as English-speaking citizens.” **IE** The authors mistakenly assert that bilingual advocates are seeking to make Spanish a national language.

P. 437-8 “For the last several decades, Latino researchers have found that after initial progress between first and second-generation Mexican Americans, education and income levels stall in subsequent generations. Unlike other immigrant groups

whose college enrollment increases through the second, third, and fourth generations, third and fourth-generation Mexican Americans are not more likely to go to college or earn higher wages than their parents. In some cases, wages and total years of schooling actually decrease by the third and fourth generations. This data has been concerning to many.” **FE** According to the Pew Research Center, Hispanics have surpassed whites in college enrollment for recent high school graduates.¹¹

¹¹See Pew Hispanic Research Center, “Among recent high school grads, Hispanics college enrollment rate surpasses that of whites,” <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/09/04/hispanic-college-enrollment-rate-surpasses-whites-for-the-first-time/>

- P. 438-9 “Additionally, cultural messaging plays a role. Chicano philosophy, which pervades urban Latino areas, often reinforces the idea that rebellion against the establishment is part of the true Mexican identity. High school and college youth may refuse to attend class, speak English, or learn certain subjects because they perceive injustice in the school system—sometimes led by well-meaning Latino adults. This hinders prosperity because adequate employment depends on many years of intense study, especially in the English language, and increasingly in fields such as computer science, engineering, marketing, and management. Avoiding these subjects, or rigorous education in general because it is deemed “white learning,” all but condemns adherers to a life of struggle. In instances where Latino faculty guide Mexican Americans into successful pathways, such as Jaime Escalante’s calculus challenge in East Los Angeles, more youth end up going to college and finding careers. This requires viewing assimilation as a good thing rather than a betrayal of one’s roots. This is statistically more common among Cuban-Americans, whose heritage promotes a positive view of business and advancement. They are therefore receiving a different kind of cultural messaging and, by the third and fourth generations, are not displaying the same educational, employment, and income trends that Mexican Americans are.” **FE/IE** As noted above, Hispanics entering college have surpassed white students that are recent high school graduates. Also, the authors assert as fact the false statement that Mexican American and Cuban American cultural outlooks concerning education, business, and “advancement” are inherently different. This statement stereotypes both communities and casts them in opposition.
- P. 440 “Lingering mistrust of Americans, the free market, and the climb to prosperity hindered some from pursuing the education and “Americanization” perceived in many professions.” **IE** An assertion of a false fact that is not based on any scholarship by the authors.
- P. 442 “To begin with, trade policy and employment opportunities in Mexico drive Mexican immigration.” **IE** Economic forces within the United States also help drive immigration as the economies of both nations are interconnected.
- P. 442- 443 “For the last two decades, 80–85% of Mexican immigration has been illegal, which, in addition to 2.5 million unauthorized Central Americans crossing the Mexico-U.S. border, has been increasingly tied up with an illegal drug trade. This is affecting security and well-being in in the United States.” **FE/IE** The author commit a serious error when they posit that immigration from Mexico and Central American nations “has been increasingly tied up with an illegal drug trade” and “is affecting security and well-being in the United States.” This offers teachers and students a superficial and incomplete treatment of the subject. Moreover, they make these highly questionable observations without citing scholarly sources.

- P. 446 “Many illegal immigrants—even children and the elderly—have become pawns of traffickers who smuggled them across the border in exchange for making them drug couriers. Some then continue in the drug trade because of poverty or gang involvement.” **IE** There is no basis in fact of immigrants being used as mules. While some instances have occurred or a smuggler claims to be such a victim, the reality is that risking drug cargoes that are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars is usually left to criminal smugglers because of their expertise in such operations, and the liability for failure.
- P. 461 “The Aztlán movement, with its assertion that Indo-Hispanics have an ancient, blood connection to the land in the American Southwest was also popular. The underlying hope that this land would be returned to indigenous or mestizo control, and that it would ideally return as a collective inheritance rather than in private lots, reflects the indigenous value of collective ownership and the rejection of the private property system that Europeans brought. Resistance to profiting off that land, by developing business on it, for example, reflects further rejection of the European business and wage labor system.” **FE/IE** There is no Aztlán Movement, and the generalized assentation of land rights efforts is simplistic, and wrong about the notion of issues related to private property, and capitalism is not based on any facts.
- p. 461-462 “While a thoroughly indigenous mindset is uncommon, Many Mexican Americans with Indian heritage remain skeptical of modern society, especially Western politics and economics which are based on private property, wage labor, and systems of government that are foreign to the Indian way of life. In Mexico, Indians were the ones to spearhead Mexican independence, with many continuing the fight against the European system of management through the 1800s. Many were martialed by Cold War guerilla movements in the 1900s and continue resisting encroachment to this day because they have not yet achieved the control they have been fighting for since the days of Father Hidalgo. There exists sympathy for this movement in Spanish-speaking intellectual circles, and in the *indigenismo* movement in art and education, even in the United States. Those less connected to Indian heritage may still feel an attachment to “their people” or “the way it was” before European values changed things. They may feel connected to indigenous wisdom, ways of doing things, or achievements. Symbols, such as the Aztec symbols used on the Mexican flag and currency, may invoke a deep sense of national pride based on what one’s indigenous ancestors stood for.” **FE/IE/OE** As noted in the introduction to this report the authors use of Samuel P. Huntington’s framework of a clash of civilizations forces them to utilize factual and interpretative errors. This paragraph is an example of the such errors through its homogenous argument that of *indigenismo* as the prevailing cultural belief system that is anti-Western. Despite the qualification in the opening sentence to the paragraph, “While a thoroughly indigenous mindset is uncommon” the sentence continues with “Many Mexican Americans with Indian heritage remain skeptical of modern society, especially Western politics and economics which are

based on private property, wage labor, and systems of government that are foreign to the Indian way of life” ending with a generalized depiction of Mexican Americans. Omission errors occur because of the diversity of sociopolitical and cultural belief systems and practices the Mexican American community engages.

- P. 464 “Although representative government was difficult to achieve in Mexico, the age of independence seeded the idea that regular people deserved to be heard and have their vote counted. Mexican Americans knew this intuitively when they immigrated to the United States. At first, immigrants to the U.S. were focused on obtaining a job and wages, but they soon acquired the desire to vote, assemble, and express criticism in order to change things. This was the result of Protestant values underlying the constitutional system in the United States, which the Founding Fathers created.” **FE/IE/OE** The authors ignore the historical scholarship related to Mexican political thought during the Mexican War of Independence that included Spanish communities that are part of the United States today, and the development of Mexican and Mexican American political and intellectual thought that crossed borders. The authors falsely assert that Mexican immigrants were intellectually empty vessels who migrated to the United States. Again the authors incorrectly portray liberal-republican traditions as emanating solely from Protestantism.
- P. 4675-466 “Also missing from most discussions is the broader context of the war in international circles and the results of the war which controversially prospered many Mexican Americans like the Californios.” **IE** No evidence that Californios prospered as a result of the United States acquisition of California.
- P. 466 “The rocky history of Mexico through the age of Santa Anna and dozens of caudillos that ended with Porfirio Díaz contributed to a sense that Western ideas were not good, and that politicians, business, and trade could be corrupt and exploitative.” **IE** As throughout the rest of the textbook, the authors make generalized assertions of Mexicans and Mexican Americans adopting anti-Western ideas.
- P. 469 “America acquired a growing laborer population as many Mexicans overstayed their visas to take on more work. Some urban cities, like Los Angeles, became predominantly Mexican American cities with very poor sections where education, healthcare, and services were lacking, especially for illegal residents who feared deportation. This prompted Mexican Americans to join the civil rights movement that lobbied for desegregated education, Latino admission into unions, better political representation, and restricted immigration.” **FE/IE** The demographic depiction of the Mexican American community is one solely of immigration, and fails to note the significant number of native born Mexican Americans. Concerning the issues of civil rights and political equality, Mexicans and Mexican Americans engaged such efforts dating back to the late nineteenth century to the assertion that such efforts emanated from immigration is false.

P. 470

“It was difficult to achieve civil rights, and many Mexican Americans learned that they had to really fight in order to be heard. Some who felt more solidarity with Mexico than the United States joined the counterculture to fight for Latino respect. College youth attempted to force their campuses to provide *indigenismo*-oriented curriculum, Spanish-speaking faculty, and scholarships for poor and illegal students. Many in Latino neighborhoods protested the government’s action in Vietnam to protest their frustration with American society in general. Some walked out of class to prove that they were a minority that would be heard, or else they would form a separatist system of their own to rival the traditional American system. During the Cold War, as the United States fought Communism worldwide, these kinds of separatist and supremacy doctrines were concerning. While solidarity with one’s heritage was understood, Mexican pride at the expense of American culture did not seem productive.” **FE/IE** This passage much like many others engages in the use of false facts through generalized depictions of the Mexican American community. The issues of curriculum reform, the Vietnam War, Cold War, Communism, and Mexican pride varied from individual to individual, and various groups within the Mexican American community. The problem throughout the text, and on display with this passage is the homogenous depiction of the Mexican American community’s political beliefs.

Appendix

Sidebar Analysis

1. Page 5. The reference to nomadic people as having no permanent home is incorrect. Nomads claimed general territories as theirs and recognized other territories as the domain of other nomads.
2. p. 6. “Terminology” is contradictory when the authors state at the beginning that Native American is the preferred term by indigenous people in North America for the past decades. However, at the end of the paragraph it states, “This book has adopted the most common terms of “Indian” and “indigenous people” to reflect Latin American usage, but as the history and culture of pre-Columbian people becomes better known and increasingly talked about in the 21st century, language and vocabulary will most likely continue to change.” This is problematic because the authors only refer to the use of self-referents in relation to the Pre-Columbian time period, and argue that they were no longer sovereign peoples in subsequent periods. Their culture, society, and religion does not end with the entrance of Europeans into the New World.
3. p. 16. The image on the top left is labeled “Giant Warrior Stone Head,” without acknowledging its Olmec origin and our inability to know much more.
4. p. 39. The first definition on the left inaccurately compares the Incan *mita* to socialism. Also, in the second definition the authors fail to account for the meaning of the term socialism, stating it represents, “A way of organizing society based on collective ownership of production, emphasizing equality over achievement, and causing individuals to become dependent on the state for all things from food to health care; eliminates the individual’s opportunity to provide for oneself.” This definition is a

definition for communism. Socialism does not advocate collective ownership, it advocates for state control or regulation of major industries.

5. p. 80. The definition for the Spanish Inquisition provided on the left side of the page provides a very simplistic view of the Inquisition omitting the trials and opportunity to confess and convert.
6. p. 99. The map at the top of the page is inaccurate, it omits Spain's settlements in California.
7. p. 101. The definition for social contract is vague. The concept speaks to the obligations of the state to the governed and the obligations of the governed to the state. The definition in the proposed textbook omits the important fact that the state has obligations to its people.
8. p. 104. The authors provide a brief description of the "American Revolution" at the top of the page, but they focus on taxation and trade and leave out another major cause of the American Revolution, the Proclamation of 1763. The proclamation placed limits on the borders of America and ended further Westward Expansion. It undermined the very reason people came to America, land.
9. p. 110. The first definition on the left side of the page for "guerilla warfare" is inaccurate when the authors state that it constitutes, "looting, burning, and sacking of cities." The concept involves more than small group attacks and hit and run tactics. It represents low-scale fighting with tactical advantages in a situation of general warfare.
10. p. 151. The definition for Tejanos found on the right side of the page states, "People of Mexican descent living in Texas, from as early as the Spanish occupation." The use of "Mexican descent" constitutes a fallacy because Tejanos were a regional population in

the Spanish colony of New Spain, Mexicans in the independent republic of Mexico and Texas was a province and then a state in Mexico.

11. p. 152. In “Apaches and Comanches in Texas” at the top of the page, the proposed textbook notes that many tribes came to Texas, but does not provide an explanation for their migration. Their movement was in large part due to the push of Westward Expansion. This prompted Native American tribes further and further west.
12. p. 153. The definition of “Californios” does not speak of their displacement. It only makes reference to “confused land ownership, and omits fraud, intimidation, violence and market forces.
13. p. 177. In the section titled “U.S. Slavery and Sectional Strife” the authors minimize the importance of slavery as the cause for secession and suggest credence to the inaccurate “Lost Cause” theory.
14. p. 219. The authors define the Emancipation Proclamation with the following statement: “President Lincoln’s announcement on September 22, 1862 declaring that all persons held as slaves were free.” The statement is incomplete because it fails to acknowledge that the order freed African Americans living in states in rebellion (Confederate States) and but not the slaves that remained in the union.
15. p. 223. The authors define a “migratory workers” as a, “person who works in a country other than their own temporarily or seasonally.” This is an error. Most of the hundreds of thousands of migratory workers may have been U.S. born or long-term Mexican and African American residents. One example of this is the “Great Migration” of African Americans from the South to the North.

16. p. 224. The Dawes Act is obviously inaccurate and demeaning towards Native Americans. The authors state that, “the U.S. government tried to include Indians in the homesteading program through the Dawes Act.” The Dawes Act, however, sought to reduce the amount of land owned by Native Americans so that it could be sold to the public. The authors further state that, “Most natives were not ready to adopt a modern agricultural lifestyle based on the nuclear family, and tried to cling to some semblance of tribal life even while their reservation lands were being subdivided and sold.” This statement ignores the fact that land provided to them was not suited for farming. Moreover, the authors do not provide a rational or historiographical basis for disparaging the way of life of Native Americans.
17. p. 230. A subsection at the top of the page entitled “Multi-Cultural Cowboys” notes that cowboys represented many different races, but fails to acknowledge or explain that the cowboy evolved from the Mexican “Vaquero”.
18. p. 248. A subsection at the top of the page entitled “Ethnic Hostility” points out that, “Stereotypically, Mexicans were viewed as lazy compared to European or American workers. Industrialists were very driven, competitive men who were always on the clock and continually concerned about efficiency. They were used to their workers putting in a full day’s work, quietly and obediently, and respecting rules, authority, and property. In contrast, Mexican laborers were not reared to put in a full day’s work so vigorously. There was a cultural attitude of “mañana,” or “tomorrow,” when it came to high-gear production. It was also traditional to skip work on Mondays, and drinking on the job could be a problem. The result was that Mexican laborers were seen as inferior and kept in low-paying, unskilled jobs that did not provide a pathway upward.” The authors fail to

make use of the vast literature on stereotypes to offer a critique of the demeaning and unsubstantiated anti-Mexican views in history. The authors' use of the term "stereotypically" suggests that they are attributing these views to others, but their uncritical use of anti-Mexican views allows them to stand and reinforces the stereotypes. Consequently, the statement appears as a conscious-stated falsehood that promotes a racialized view of an entire people.

19. p. 260. The authors use an incomplete definition of "Dollar Diplomacy." They define it as, "Foreign policy that extends a countries international influence by using financial power in order to ensure the financial stability of another country or region, resulting in the protection of commercial and financial interests between the two countries."

Historians also use the term to demonstrate a dependency that the richer country enjoys over the poorer one, making it financially indebted to the other.

20. p. 288. The subsection "CROM" at the top of the page inaccurately states that, "Karl Marx taught that labor unions and mass strikes were tools to get money and power to flow downwards, from owners to workers." On the contrary, he did not simply advocate the shifting of money and power to the working class, he also called for establishing equality between them; otherwise they a constant state of conflict would exist.

21. p. 313. The textbook claims that "Platt Amendment" "established the terms under [which] the United States would leave the government and control of Cuba [to] its people and end U.S. occupation." In addition to the obvious grammatical errors, this statement is inaccurate because Cuba did not completely become independent from the United States; the latter continued to reserve the right to intervene in Cuba's internal affairs and to maintain Guantanamo Bay under its control.

22. p. 359. The textbook defines “eugenics” as follows: “a set of beliefs and practices based upon the possibility of improving the human race by controlling the genetic quality of the population through increased production of positive traits and/or reduced production, even sterilization, of people with undesired traits.” The failure to acknowledge that this was a debunked theory, encourages the student to believe that the view is valid.
23. p. 387. The authors mis-characterize the “Contras” as, “anti-communist rebels opposed to the left-wing, socialist governments.” They disregard the historical record that they were not established to oppose communism but that the State Department sought to overthrow the Sandinista government.
24. p. 392. In the “Nicarguan-Americans,” the authors mistakenly claim that the Sandinistas constituted a communist regime when they were in fact socialist.

Appendix
Chapter Question Analysis

Part I Indigenous Era

1. Select two Indian tribes from the chapter to research. Organize your discoveries in a way that allows you to present the findings to a chosen audience for understanding of similarities and differences in appearance, heritage, habits, and traditions.
2. From the indigenous tribes identified in the chapter, choose a custom for which you can relate and describe the relationship between it and your own beliefs or traditions.
3. Assess the value and importance of the Maya and suggest your opinion for why the Mayan culture is still enduring today.
4. Refer to the Popol Vuh original source; create an artistic rendering representing the creation story. Using the written word or fine arts, share your representation with an audience.
5. Describe a technological discovery or application from this chapter and examine its impact on modern technology.
6. What would be the cultural impact from the possibility that indigenous peoples may have been parallel to other ancient civilizations versus being descendants of them?

This section does deal with the indigenous populations of the Americas and does seem to have useful discussion questions for students.

Part II Spanish Colonialism

1. How is Spanish colonization related to the fall of Constantinople?
2. Would you have been willing to join the Conquistadores in setting sail for the New World? Why or why not?

3. Explain how Christopher Columbus was feeling when he wrote his 1493 letter to King Ferdinand.
4. Which explorer do you believe to be most successful in creating alliances and/or settlements in the New World?
5. Considering California Missions, examine and discuss the variation in the treatment of Indians. How did the treatment impact long-term relationships and perceptions of the Catholic Church by Indians? What were some possible benefits of the Mission colonization? What were some of the negative consequences?

The problem with the discussion questions in this section is not that there is something inherently wrong with the questions but the lack of questions that address the indigenous peoples view of colonialism. This omission in itself is a rhetorical tactic. There is no balance of opinion from those that view the colonization as genocide, rape, and oppression.

Part III Age of Independence

1. How did King Charles III of Spain impact the future of Spanish expansion and colonization? How would Spain have been affected had he not acted in the way that he did at the time?
2. Discuss the intent, meaning, and importance of the U.S. Constitution to Americans at the time of its composition. What challenges wrought the authors and thinkers of the time?
3. Discuss the intent, meaning, and importance of the Bill of Rights. Explain the necessity for each article at the time of its composition.
4. Explain the appeal of the Declaration of Independence to U.S. Immigrants. What hope, encouragement, or optimism can one find within the intent of the document?
5. Select a passage from the Declaration of Independence or the US Constitution. Discuss how the actions of U.S. citizens and the local, state, and federal governments have either met or failed to meet the ideals espoused in the founding documents. Further your argument by citing current newspaper articles or local, state, or federal legislation to reinforce your claim.

This question using a logical fallacy in its presentation. This is what is considered an “either/or” fallacy, which oversimplifies how to read the Constitution and the duty as a citizen. It leaves someone to believe that there are only two choices when dealing with the Constitution. This question promotes a literal interpretation of the Constitution that ignores the fact that the document has been amended 27 times and is constantly being challenged. It is not simply an either/or choice here.

6. In 1823, Central America broke away from the First Mexican Empire. What problems prevented Central America from solving their differences and establishing a federal government similar to the United States? What actions could have changed their course? What advantages would they have seen had they succeeded?
7. Explain the delicate nature of government in Mexico and Central America due to loyalty to tribal heritage and cultural differences among people. What role did their similarities and differences take as they struggled for freedom or power?

This question uses a “genetic” fallacy which assumes an argument based on assumed stereotypes of a culture or people. By referring to Mexico and Central America as having “tribal heritage” and highlighting “cultural differences” it makes the reader believe that Mexico and Central America are less “civilized” cultures than the United States or “developed” nations. This question is, first of all, calling indigenous forms of government substandard then using that definition to discredit Mexican and Central American governments, which then employs the Post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy that a conclusion that assumes that if 'A' occurred after 'B' then 'B' must have caused 'A.'

Part IV The Mexican-American War

1. Can you explain how the location and geography of Texas affected Mexico’s ability to govern and defend it?
2. How would you compare the United States journey to Independence with the Mexican War of Independence? What are the key differences that contributed to the alternate outcomes?
3. What impact did the General Colonization Laws have on the future of Texas?
4. How were the Republic of the Yucatan and Texas alike? Different?

5. Considering the Mexican View and the Texan View of the Alamo, how would you summarize their differing perspectives?

6. What can you say about the role of Indian inter-tribal warfare and the consequences of that on the governance and settlement of Texas and New Mexico?

This question employs a circular argument fallacy. It assumes that “Indians” were responsible for their own genocide and that led to the difficulty of “settling” Texas and New Mexico. This question answers itself and does not allow for a more nuanced approach to thinking about colonists or “settlers” and how they might be taking place in “land grabbing” or the illegal practice of claiming lands that were not negotiated with the indigenous peoples whose land they were “settling” on.

7. Summarize the main idea behind Manifest Destiny. What is your opinion? How do you think the public response to the idea of Manifest Destiny impacted the United States’ success in expansion across the western territories?

8. What was President Polk’s strongest argument for war with Mexico?

9. How might the outcome in California have been different if General Mariano Vallejo had not been **submissive** to U.S. forces? Would it have ultimately made a difference in the outcome of the Mexican-American War?

This question uses the “hasty generalization” fallacy. It oversimplifies the situation and places all of the Mexican-American War’s outcome on General Mariano Vallejo and removes the role that the Americans had in instigating the Mexican-American War. It also uses the word “submissive” to describe Vallejo, which plays on the readers sense of ethos or automatically creates an unfavorable view of Vallejo to create an automatic dislike of Vallejo and his choices. In other words, this question leads the reader to believe he is responsible for what happened and not the Americans.

10. Did the Gadsden Purchase have any long-term benefit to the United States? Explain.

11. What were the immediate benefits of the outcome of the Mexican-American War to **those of Mexican heritage** who were already living in the newly acquired U.S. territories? What were some of the downfalls?

This question on the surface seems like an appropriate and balance question but it is doing two things that lead the reader to believe that the Mexican peoples benefited from the Mexican-American War and it ignores that the fact these people were Mexican citizens, by referring to the people as of “those of Mexican heritage” ignores the fact that they were citizens of Mexico. This is erasing a connection to Mexico immediately after that was changed for them because of this war. These people were not of “Mexican heritage,” they were Mexican. The second part of the problem with this question is that it positions the benefits first and tacks on the downfalls at the end, making it more of afterthought.

Part V Two Paths Diverge

1. Do you think The Gold Rush was a good or bad thing? Explain why it is suggested to be an impetus to freedom in America.
2. What impact did the Gold Rush have on immigration? How did Manifest Destiny provide opportunities for diverse populations?

This question is simply odd in its construction because it juxtaposes “Manifest Destiny” with “diverse populations”. This question employs the Ad populum fallacy, which plays to a reader’s sense of patriotism or belief that Manifest Destiny is patriotic and therefore good to all peoples. This question ignores the “diverse populations” that were adversely affected by Manifest Destiny, mainly the Native peoples and Mexicans that were killed and having their legal lands rights threatened by this policy.

3. Explain how the Northwest Ordinances and the Preemption Act empowered pioneers.
4. Create a timeline identifying the parallel influence of pioneer settlement and the Civil War. Summarize the impact of the Civil War on western development.
5. How did western settlement impact the lifestyles of the American Indians? How could expansion have been handled differently? Would it have been possible for greater harmony to exist between pioneers and Indians?
6. Describe the most valuable contributions to modern technology that resulted from western expansion.

7. What would the purpose of government intervention and regulation of marriage and funerals, such as in 1857 Mexican Constitution? How does such secularization benefit a government and/or citizens? What is your opinion about the issue?

This question is phrased in such a way that leads the reader to question the role of the government in services usually reserved for the church and pits it against the 1857 Mexican Constitution. This brings about the “separation of church and state” argument in the United States.

8. What is the relationship between the U.S. Civil War and the Battle of Puebla? Why do you think President Lincoln aided General Ignacio Zaragoza?
9. Explain the complexity of the relationship between the Mexican and American governments after the Mexican-American War, specifically during Taft’s presidency.
10. What is the difference between the United States support of Mexico during the French invasion and the lack of U.S. support to Cuba during the Ten Years War? What could have been done differently in Cuba to maintain positive relations?

11. How would you summarize the impact that Yellow Journalism had on the American public?

12. What is your opinion of modern bias in written, oral, and visual media in today’s news and political culture? Research examples and provide a bibliography with information attributed to source materials.

These two questions are their own seem like good questions to get a student to think about the impact of journalism on a culture. The fact that these two questions are paired together are circumspect. By placing these questions together is creating a “circular argument” fallacy. It is leading the reader to believe that all modern journalism is “biased” and “Yellow Journalism”.

13. Select a current political article from a reputable local or national newspaper. Evaluate the validity of the source based on language, corroboration with other sources, and information about the author. Provide a bibliography with information attributed to source materials.

14. What impact did the Gold Rush and the Northwest Ordinances have on the abolition movement, if any?

Part IV 1910-1940: Revolution and World War

1. Do you agree with the actions of Porfirio Díaz? What positive outcomes were a result of his rule and decisions? What outcomes were negative, in your opinion? What would you have done differently in his place?
2. What was the importance of La Regeneración? Explain why their platform would have been attractive to the masses. How closely do you think Franco Madero aligned with the philosophy of anarchism?
3. Would it have been better had President Wilson not intervened with Huerta in 1913? Why or why not?
4. What would you recommend to the leader of a free country struggling with a recession?
5. Which person in this chapter would you most like to spend a day with and why?
6. What is your opinion of Cárdenas repealing the right for international businessmen to own, operate, or administrate any of the oil rigs across Mexico and creating PEMEX?

In the phrasing of this question, it leads the reader to believe that international businesses have a “right” to operate in foreign lands. This is problematic because this leads one to believe that sovereign rights are superseded by capitalist ambitions. Using the word “right” leads one to believe it is on par with “human rights”.

7. Create a poster comparing the American Revolution with the Mexican Revolution. Use visual images to facilitate appreciation of multiple perspectives. Provide a bibliography with information attributed to source materials.

Part VII Immigration and Civil Rights

1. What information would you use to support or oppose immigration restrictions after the assassination of President McKinley?

This question conflates several incidents involving anarchism with immigration. On its face it seems a legitimate question, but the problem is that McKinley's assassin was U.S. born and not an immigrant. Even though there was a response for changing the Immigration laws because of "Anarchism" and specific advocates for Anarchism (Emma Goldman) being immigrants but to conflate the two with nuance leads a reader to believe McKinley was assassinated by an immigrant.

2. What would you cite to defend the actions of Mexican immigrants in 1911 for fleeing their country to find work in the United States?

This question leads one to believe that fleeing a war-torn nation is something to be defended and not seen as "refugees". This question turns refugees fleeing war as a crime when entering the U.S. By calling them "immigrants" it ignores the possibility that they were refugees, which changes the political condition of these people.

3. How would you explain the reluctance of America to become involved in World War I?
4. Select a President from the Civil Rights Era and explain whether or not you would have acted the same way under the given circumstances. Which decisions do you support and what would you have done differently?
5. Write three new titles for this chapter based on what you know.

6. Compare and Contrast Assimilation, the National Origins Formula, and the Braceros Program. How would you improve the immigration policy?

The second part of this question is a good question, but the problem is that it is prefaced with one overall approach, and two different programs that seem to sum up the entirety of immigration policy in this country. This is a strange question to ask for this specific chapter. It ignores immigration policies after the 1950s.

7. Can you elaborate on the reason why Southern states may have resisted Civil Rights for freed slaves? Imagine that you are a Southern businessman fearful of a multiracial society and write a letter to your Northern brother explaining your fears. Research and include images from the period in your presentation. Provide a bibliography with information attributed to source materials.

This question is a great rhetorical exercise if this question would be juxtaposed with a freed man's account, but only focusing on the Southern response only serves to almost excuse racism for Southerners here. This question uses the soft word "resisted" instead of denied and "fearful" to gain sympathy for a Southerner's cause.

8. Compose and perform a dialogue or monologue that will communicate the thoughts of a young mother during the Red Scare.

9. Considering Civil Rights in America in the historical context discussed within the text: identify a problem, gather information, list and consider options, consider advantages and disadvantages, choose and implement a solution, and evaluate the effectiveness of the solution.

This construction of this question conflates the struggle for Civil Rights as a problem. Rather than presenting a question as to "what would you do as a civil rights worker and list tactics to help civil rights" it asks the reader to identify a problem with Civil Rights. This question is either written badly or it is a specific political tactic to drive a reader's mind to Civil Rights and problem.

Part VIII The Cold War Era (Almost every question in this section is problematic)

1. How is The Cold War different than previous types of foreign policy and war engagement?
2. Compare the conditions of poverty in Latin America to those in Communist governments? Why would Communism be appealing to Latin American people?

This question presents Latin America countries as living in poverty and then saying the same of Communist governments, leading the reader to believe this is true of all Latin American and Communist countries.

3. Explain how the soviet communist government would prevent occupied countries from escaping communist rule? What were the most important things that these countries lacked that prevented them from escaping communism on their own?

This question assumes that all of the countries in the Soviet Union were occupied countries and assumed that they all wanted to “escape” communism. This obviously lacks a nuanced view of what happened during the Soviet Union’s reign and creates a “straw man” fallacy where the obvious answer to this question is capitalism.

4. How did containment impact U.S. foreign policy? What difficulties did the U.S. encounter in the attempt to suppress communist expansion in Asia?
5. Discuss the concerns related to arming Latin leaders and training contras to combat communism. What dangers are involved? Can you predict future problems or concerns with the foreign policy? What were the advantages?

This question ignores how these contras were funded, mostly with the CIA working with drug cartels and ignores that these decisions to get involved were done illegally.

6. Explain how Ernesto “Che” Guevara disrupted the ability of Nicaragua and the U.S. to protect the Americas from communism. What were his motives? How was he instrumental in causing Cuba to fall to Soviet communism? Why do you think Guevara is revered as a hero, despite his contributions to the long-lasting difficulties in Cuba and other Latin American countries, nearly casting the world into nuclear war?

This question leads one to believe that Che Guevara is somehow connected to escalating U.S./Russian conflict. There is no evidence of this but this leads the student to believe that he is somehow the cause of nuclear war during the Cold War Era.

7. Why do you think Nicaraguans believed that Sandino’s Marxist policies would improve their circumstances? How does subsidization of goods increase a country’s likelihood for food shortage and starvation?

This question links back to the idea of Latin American countries were eternally poor and does not tackle the reason these governments were so deficient, primarily it does not discuss the role of U.S. foreign policy in the role of Latin American poverty. The second part of this question suggests that Communism leads to food shortage and starvation playing to a reader’s pathos or emotions, which over-simplifies the situation in Nicaragua.

8. How does guerilla warfare impact civility and humanity in war?
9. What did President Reagan do differently in Grenada and why did it help turn the tide of Communism in Latin America?

10. How did Communism in Latin America contribute to already existing hardships in certain countries?

This question places all of the blame of its problems on Communism and once again links back to the idea of Latin American countries were eternally poor and does not tackle the reason these governments were so deficient, primarily it does not discuss the role of U.S. foreign policy in the role of Latin American poverty.

11. Find an example to illustrate how universities and curriculum strategize and radicalize to promote counterculture movements. Create a bibliography from your research and use computer software to create a written, graphic, or visual product to share with the class.

This question doesn't even try to hide its hatred of universities and critical thinking because it literally calls university curriculum as radical and blames it for creating countercultural movements, which ignores that a common motto of the counterculture movements was "Turn on, Tune In, and Drop Out" which was an attack on the universities curriculum in the first place. But because of the 1960s, universities have been seen as more liberalized. This bias is so recognizable that the fallacy is blatantly obvious here.

12. Why do you think there continues to be an enduring frustration and focus on cultural and racial differences in modern society? What is your advice for restoring a positive emphasis on such differences in order to celebrate them instead of feeding into a fear submission or elitism based on race and culture? Is it possible to celebrate historical heritage, culture, and traditions while not judging one another on the basis of bloodline "purity" or variations? If so, how soon or distant do you believe that it can occur.

This question leads one to believe that cultural and racial studies are designed to promote fear and elitism and division. This type of question draws negative opinions about racial and cultural studies work.

13. Are Chicano Studies beneficial to Mexican-American culture? Explain. How did César Chávez challenge this vision?

This question leads the student to question the validity of the study of Mexican American peoples, which is in contradiction to the point of this book even being written. But the worst part about this question is that it misleads the student to believe Cesar Chavez challenged the goals of the Chicano Movement, which he did not.

14. What progress has been made to benefit the Mexican-American community through political activism?

Part IX Contemporary Issues

1. How have the actions of U.S. citizens and the local, state, and federal governments either met or failed to meet the ideals espoused in the founding documents?

This question is repeated from an earlier chapter. Repetition is usually used to hammer home a particular point. This question using a logical fallacy in its presentation. This is what is considered an “either/or” fallacy, which oversimplifies how to read to the Constitution and the duty as a citizen. It leaves someone to believe that there are only two choices when dealing with the Constitution. This question promotes a literal interpretation of the Constitution that ignores the fact that the document has been amended 27 times and is constantly being challenged. It is not simply an either/or choice here.

2. Consider the current topic of U.S. immigration as it relates to the historical context discussed in this text. Identify a problem, gather information, list and consider options, consider advantages and disadvantages, choose and implement a solution, and evaluate the effectiveness of the solution.

3. How does economic disparity in Mexico impact immigration to the U.S.? What policies should the U.S. consider in order to discourage illegal immigration, encourage legal immigration, and/or encourage economic prosperity in Mexico?

4. What would happen if the United States adopted Spanish as the second national language? What are the benefits? Can you think of another way to solve the problem of clear communication for all people in the United States?

This question positions the concept of multilingualism as a problem when according to most research states that multilingualism is actually beneficial to a society. (See Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication) In discussing “clear communication” this has been debunked as coded language referring to a nationalist agenda in promoting an English-only agenda. This is directly from Samuel P. Huntington’s discredited thesis on Latinos in the United States and their danger to society.

5. Suggest three policies that would benefit Mexican-American’s success in U.S. culture? How would those same policies benefit the U.S. as a whole?
6. What is your opinion about building a wall to reduce illegal immigration across the U.S.-Mexico border? Is there a better solution to illegal immigration? What are your strongest opinions on illegal immigration, amnesty, and legal immigration?
7. Describe the picture in your head from this poem about the Statue of Liberty by Emma Lazarus:

“Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame,
With conquering limbs astride from land to land;
Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand
A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame
Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name
Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand
Glow world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command
The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame.
“Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp!” cries she
With silent lips. “Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

8. What did Cesar Chavez mean when he said that, “Preservation of one’s own culture does not require contempt or disrespect for other cultures.”

This question is positioned after Emma Lazarus' poem to juxtapose "white" American culture with Chavez's quote in order to support the argument that "white" American culture should not be challenged. They are hijacking Cesar Chavez's quote and using it out of context to support their argument. This is another rhetorical fallacy.

9. Use technological resources to research women's suffrage in both the United States and Mexico. Who were the heroes of each respective movement? What challenges are still ahead, if any? Compare suffrage in the United States and Mexico with that of other Latin American countries. Create a bibliography from your research and use computer software to create a written, graphic, or visual product to share with the class. Be sure to include visual images for the time period referenced.
10. Research immigration statistics from several reputable sources to cite the illegal population in the U.S., both total numbers of persons identified as illegals and number of persons identified as Mexican citizens who are in the country illegally. What factors might make these numbers vary from one source to another? What perceptions and/or policies might change if the numbers turned out to be significantly higher than reported? Use a graphic to demonstrate your findings and present both written and oral presentations of your report. Develop a bibliography with information attributed to source materials.

This is a good assignment but the opening of this question already uses the term "illegal populations" and narrows immigration to "Mexican citizens in the country illegally." This leads a reader to believe that all Mexican immigration is illegal and that the majority of "illegal immigration" is Mexican.

Summative Discussion and Evaluation

Select a topic of interest from the text (or assigned by instructor). Use a variety of available media sources and research strategies to write an essay and develop an accompanying oral presentation discussing a topic or creating an argument in favor of or against an issue. Apply social studies methodologies encompassing a variety of research and analytical tools to explore questions or issues thoroughly and fairly to include multiple perspectives. Locate, analyze, organize, synthesize, evaluate, and apply information about the selected topic, identifying, describing, and evaluating multiple points of view. Evaluate effects of major political, economic, and social conditions on a selected social studies topic. Construct a thesis that is supported by evidence; apply the conventions of usage and mechanics of written English; use social studies terminology correctly; use appropriate oral communication techniques; recognize and evaluate counter arguments; develop a bibliography with ideas and information attributed to source materials and authors using accepted social science formats such as Modern Language Association Style Manual (MLA) and Chicago Manual of Style (CMS) to document sources and format written materials; and use computer software to create written, graphic, or visual products from collected data.