

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Subject	Chapter 113. Social Studies						
Subchapter	Subchapter C. High School						
MLC/Course Title	Special Topics in Social Studies						
Publisher	Momentum Instruction, LLC						
Program Title	Mexican American Heritage						
Program ISBN	9780692613719						
Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	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."	The Mexican Revolution did not lead to a new governing philosophy that the authors characterize as socialism.		The reviewer's position is not a verified factual error but debatable opinion. However, text has deleted "that looked to a new philosophy called socialism," so this content no longer exists, making this complaint moot.  However, the socialist components to the Mexican Revolutionary program are well known, and even explicitly acknowledged by Calles and Cardenas, i.e. article 3 of the Constitution was amended to read that "Education imparted by the State will be socialist..." Calles' attacks on the clergy, as well as Cardenas' policies of land reform which had been attempted by Zapata in Morelos, were understood to be socialist; Calles openly said so himself. These open acknowledgements of the 1930s were institutionalized forms of political beliefs acted upon by Zapata, Villa, Magon, and others between 1900-1930. As Philip Russell states, "The terms 'class struggle,' 'socialist,' and 'anti-imperialist' all flowed freely easily from officials' tongues." (339)	Philip Russell, <i>A History of Mexico: From Pre-Conquest to Present</i> . Routledge, 2011.  EDSITEment. "The Mexican Revolution: November 20th, 1910." Online magazine. EDSITEment. National Endowment for the Humanities, n.d. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  La Botz, Dan. "A Brief History of Mexico Repression & Revolution." Online magazine. UE International. United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, n.d. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.
NA	272,308		Incorrect reference to "La Regeneración."	No such group existed. The authors may be referring to Regeneración, the official organ of the Partido Liberal Mexicano.		The reviewer's position is debatable, however, text has removed "La" from " <i>La Regeneracion</i> " in three places, and the word "Movement," so this content no longer exists.  (Author's Note: The magazine was cited as "La Regeneracion" in the U.S. Congress Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Britannica Macropedia discusses "the Regeneration group" at length in its entry on "Mexico". Likely due to Anglicization of Spanish, as well as how Magon occasionally uses <i>regeneracion</i> as a concept or body of people in his writings, some resources also use nominalized formats of the term.)	Grassroots Socialism: Radical Movements in the Southwest, 1895-1943. James R. Green, p.330.  American Social Leaders and Activists. Neil A Hamilton, p.140 "Flores Magon, Ricardo."  "Mexico," The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol.24, Macropaedia. 15th Ed. (1991).  "Investigation of Mexican Affairs: Hearing Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Sixty-sixth Congress, First[-second] Session, Pursuant to S. Res. 106, Directing the Committee on Foreign Relations to Investigate the Matter of Outrages on Citizens of the United States in Mexico, Part 23." U.S. Government Printing Office, 1920.
NA	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."	Francisco Madero did not align his group with an anarcho-syndicalist group that the authors fail to name. "Franco Madero" is an obvious mistake.		The reviewer's position is not verified factual error but debatable opinion. Additionally, "Franco Madero" was changed prior to Sept 2 and is not currently in the material in front of the SBOE, so this particular complaint is moot.  Philip Russell documents Madero's crossing paths significantly with Magon as part of the early PLM years. Before 1904, Madero helped finance Regeneracion before it grew more radical under Magon and was banned in Mexico. More information about Magon, Madero, and the PLM, including Madero's financial support of Regeneration magazine in the early years, is found in Philip Russell's <i>A History of Mexico</i> (p.236ff.) and <i>Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Culture and History</i> (371-372; Don. M. Coerver, et al). Madero departed from Magonism because of his beliefs in liberal democracy (as stated in the text), and some portion of PLM separated from Magon's leadership to support Madero in Mexico City by 1910. Madero himself said about Magon, "We pursue the same ideal, albeit in different ways." <a href="https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.wikimexico.com/articulo/regeneracion-o-democracia&amp;prev=search">https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.wikimexico.com/articulo/regeneracion-o-democracia&amp;prev=search</a> .  Additionally, publisher is voluntarily rewriting the first paragraph under "The Early Phase of Revolution" to read as follows: "Anti-Diaz Forces Mount. Before his run for president, Francisco L. Madero had associated with others protesting the regime of Porfirio Diaz, including a group called the Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM). The PLM initially had supported democratic reforms including land redistribution, one-term presidencies, and better legislation for industrial workers. Prior to 1910, however, it grew more radical and began advocating revolution for a whole new Mexico, with plans laid out in its newspaper, <i>Regeneración</i> . By 1906, publication of this newspaper had been banned in Mexico City for its challenge to the central government, and a segment of PLM leadership supporting its claims were exiled to the United States. As publication resumed there, and PLM plans became more revolutionary to include arming rebels against the Mexican government, the more moderate of their following left the party and remade some of these goals into a democratic plan for Mexican governance. Francisco Madero was among those who left, believing that Mexico could be reformed if the government would use its power to help laborers, Indians, and peasants instead of the clergy, property owners, and foreign businessmen. These kinds of goals were in Madero's mind when he ran for president in 1910."	(1) Barragan, Yasenia, and Mark Bray. "Ricardo Flores Magón and the Anarchist Movement in Southern California." Online historical feature. KCET Media. KCET Media/South El Monte Arts Posse, 29 May 2014. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (2) Carr, Barry. "Marxism and Anarchism in the Formation of the Mexican Communist Party, 1910-19." <i>The Hispanic American Historical Review</i> 63.2 (1983): 277-305. Web. (3) Coerver, Don M., Suzanne B. Pasztor, and Robert Buffington. <i>Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Contemporary Culture and History</i> . Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004. Print. (4) Fusco, Coco. <i>Corpus Delecti: Performance Art of the Americas</i> . London: Routledge, 2000. Print. (5) Lomnitz-Adler, Claudio. <i>The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón</i> . N.p.: MIT, 2014. Print. (6) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "A La Mujer." <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 24 Sept. 1910. n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (7) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "¿Gobierno?" <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 12 Feb. 1914. n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (8) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "Sin Jefes." <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 21 Mar. 1914. n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (9) Magón, Ricardo Flores, and David Poole. <i>Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution</i> . Ricardo Flores Magón. Montreal: Black Rose, 1977. Print. (10) "Mexico." <i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> . Encyclopaedia Britannica Online. (11) <i>Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.</i> , 2016. Web. 23 Sep. 2016 (12) Niemeyer, E.V., Jr. <i>Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916-1917</i> . N.p.: U of Texas, 2014. Print. (13) "Periódicos." <i>Archivo Digital De Ricardo Flores Magon RSS</i> . Archivo Magon, 2016. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (14) <i>Revolutions in Mexico</i> Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Washington: Gov. Print. Off., 1913. Print. (15) Russell, Philip L. <i>The History of Mexico: From Pre-conquest to Present</i> . New York: Routledge, 2010. Print. (16) United States. Cong. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. <i>My Library My History Books on Google Play Investigations of Mexican Affairs</i> . By Albert Bacon Fall. 66th Cong., 2nd sess. S 645. N.p.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1920. 3342. Print.

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	272			There is no "Regeneration Movement" in the literature of the Mexican Revolution, nor was there a group called La Regeneración, or "The Regeneration."		See response to Alleged Errors # 9 and 10 above, for edited paragraph.	<p>Ⓢ</p> <p>(1) Barragan, Yasenia, and Mark Bray. "Ricardo Flores Magón and the Anarchist Movement in Southern California." Online historical feature. KCET Media. KCET Media/South El Monte Arts Posse, 29 May 2014. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (2) Carr, Barry. "Marxism and Anarchism in the Formation of the Mexican Communist Party, 1910-19." The Hispanic American Historical Review 63.2 (1983): 277-305. Web. (3) Coerver, Don M., Suzanne B. Pasztor, and Robert Buffington. Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Contemporary Culture and History. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004. Print. (4) Fusco, Coco. Corpus Delecti: Performance Art of the Americas. London: Routledge, 2000. Print. (5) Lomnitz-Adler, Claudio. The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón. N.p.: MIT, 2014. Print. (6) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "A La Mujer." La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 24 Sept. 1910: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (7) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "¿Gobierno?" La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 12 Feb. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (8) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "Sin Jefes." La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 21 Mar. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (9) Magón, Ricardo Flores, and David Poole. Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution, Ricardo Flores Magón. Montreal: Black Rose, 1977. Print. (10) "Mexico". Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (11) Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2016. Web. 23 Sep. 2016 (12) Niemeyer, E.V., Jr. Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916–1917. N.p.: U of Texas, 2014. Print. (13) "Periódicos." Archivo Digital De Ricardo Flores Magon RSS. Archivo Magon, 2016. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (14) Revolutions in Mexico Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Washington: Gov. Print. Off., 1913. Print. (15) Russell, Philip L. The History of Mexico: From Pre-conquest to Present. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print. (16) United States. Cong. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. My Library My History Books on Google Play Investigations of Mexican Affairs. By Albert Bacon Fall. 66th Cong., 2nd sess. S 645. N.p.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1920. 3342. Print.</p>
NA	273		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.	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>The reviewer's position is not a verified factual error; the reviewer simply makes an undocumented dispute as to the historical facts. Prior to 1914, Wilson's policy of "watchful waiting" had shutting down U.S. arms dealers as one of its explicit tenets. The fact that some continued to operate under the radar does not negate that. Later on, this policy was reversed to support the Constitutionalist army, as stated in the text on p.193. Wilson's neutrality and arms embargo up until 1914 can be found in <i>Woodrow Wilson: A Life for World Peace</i> (Nordholt, 123). Following the lifting of the arms embargo, arms dealers across the border heavily supplied Mexican forces.</p> <p>The "resident Mexican population of Texas" is discussed in the narrative on the Mexican Revolution, i.e. refugees crossing the Rio Grande, Cristeros arriving in the 1930s, Magonistas and the Plan de San Diego of 1915, etc. Civil rights issues facing Mexicans in Texas are discussed at length in Chapter 7.</p>	<p>W., Schulte Nordholt J. Woodrow Wilson: A Life for World Peace. Berkeley: U of California, 1991. Print.</p> <p>Woodrow Wilson: "First Annual Message," December 2, 1913. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. <a href="http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29554">http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29554</a>.</p>
NA	276		"The first Mexican American veterans fought for the United States on the Allies' side, beginning in late 1917."	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. Ⓢ		This is not a verified factual error. The reviewer's unsupported complaint is occasioned by their misunderstanding of the semantics. Importantly, this statement in the text is specifically about the first "Mexican-American" veterans (not the first people of Mexican origin) to support the U.S. during a war. It would not have been accurate to call Mexican citizens who supported America prior to 1848, "Mexican-Americans" or "Mexican-American veterans." Additionally, Spanish support during the American Revolution is mentioned in the inset on p.72 and developed through the material on Galvez on p.87	<p>Preston, Julia. "The Truth About Mexican-Americans." The New York Review of Books. The New York Review of Books, 3 Dec. 2015. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.</p> <p>Téllez, Kip. A Word about Names: Why I Call Myself a Mexican-American. N.d. <a href="https://people.ucsc.edu/~ktellez/mxcallforwebsite.htm">https://people.ucsc.edu/~ktellez/mxcallforwebsite.htm</a>. UC Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz.</p>
NA	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." Ⓢ	Over 500,000 Hispanics lived in the United States during 1900. Of that number over 400,000 were of Mexican origin.		The difficulty of accurately assessing data has occasioned the need for utilization of various techniques to attempt to closely estimate accurate figures. The data cited by the reviewer are based upon the closest estimates. The current text is relating to estimates surrounding Mexican Immigrants, not overall population, and is supported by both Mexican immigrant statistics and commentary in <i>Beyond 1848</i> by Ricardo Romo where he details the difficulty of properly attributing data concerning the permeable border, and co-mingling of Mexican immigrants and Mexican-Americans prior to formal border control. Accordingly, the publisher is editing the text to read, "The overall Mexican population in America was approximately 400,000 in 1900, of whom about 100,000 were Mexican-born..."	Ornelas, Michael R. <i>Beyond 1848: Readings in the Modern Chicano Historical Experience</i> . Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Pub., 1993. Print.
NA	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>This does not constitute verified factual error but debatable opinion. Hundreds of thousands left Mexico for the U.S. as refugees or contract laborers. The latter is concurred by Public Reviewer's comment in Alleged Error #127 that in WWI, "The War resulted in the creation of the predecessor to the Bracero Program through the Temporary Admissions Program, a significant event in terms of US perceptions of Mexicans as laborers who could be brought to the US when needed and easily sent back to Mexico when they were no longer needed."</p> <p>See Ricardo Romo in <i>Beyond 1848</i> for facts about the 50,000 Mexican immigrants between 1900 and 1910, and "twice as many" between 1910-1920, of whom "Thousands of Mexican laborers traveled back and forth across the border, but an increasing number began to settle in the off-season in cities such as Los Angeles." And how the U.S. acted as a "safety valve" where "thousands fled across the border" during "times of political or social unrest" (117) He explains that not all of these were families fleeing revolutionary violence in their towns, but that 65-70% were single working males in the 1920s who were guest workers and temporary settlers.</p> <p>Additionally, publisher is voluntarily deleting "squatters and" and added "who found temporary residence" after tens of thousands of guest workers.</p>	<p>Gómez, Laura E. Manifest Destinies: The Making of the Mexican American Race. New York: New York U, 2007. Print.</p> <p>Ornelas, Michael R. <i>Beyond 1848: Readings in the Modern Chicano Historical Experience</i>. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Pub., 1993. Print.</p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	283		"On January 11, 1916, Pancho Villa tried to provoke war with the United States and instigate reconquista by executing 15 American miners in Chi-huahua, Mexico and waiting for U.S. forces to show up in retaliation."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but is debatable opinion that is not even supported. However, publisher is willing to voluntarily remove contested uses of the word reconquista in the text.  (It should be noted, however, that "reconquista" has occasionally been used by Chicano activists and intellectuals as referring to the irrendentist movement to return the Mexican Cession territory back to Mexico. As one example, there was La Marcha de la Reconquista performed by the Brown Berets in the 1970s. Jose Angel Gutierrez, in <i>The Chicano Manual of How to Handle Gringos</i> , also discusses a radio panel in 2002 called "Reconquista de Aztlan.")	Gutiérrez, José Angel. A Chicano Manual on How to Handle Gringos. Houston, TX: Arte Público, 2003. Print.  Katz, Friedrich. The Life and times of Pancho Villa. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1998. Print.
NA	288		"All of them [revolutionary figures] had worked hard for their agenda, but none were able to lead Mexico out of centralist control and into freedom."	federalist system with strong central control does not necessarily constitute a loss of freedom for the Mexican people:		This does not constitute a verified factual error, nor does it even allege one as "Loss" was never stated within the text. However, publisher is voluntarily deleting "and into freedom."  The reviewer's statement that "federalism with strong central control does not necessarily mean a loss of freedom for the Mexican people" frankly ignores the history of nineteenth and early twentieth century Mexico. The reign of the caudillo was an age of federalism with strong central control which inspired numerous Mexican states and indigenous communities to rebel, and ultimately brought about the Mexican Revolution (although Juarez tried to interrupt this pattern with liberty through the Constitution of 1857). The Porfiriato's "strong central control" spurred multiple factions of revolutionaries to fight for liberty, especially the Madero, Carranza, and the Constitutionalist army--who clearly believed the majority of the Mexican people needed freedom and reform. Actually, even Porfirio Diaz admitted this when he famously said Mexicans were ready for democracy. Villa and Zapata, among the most radical, staunchly opposed Mexico City's "federalism with strong central control" and desired to free the Mexican people in the north and the south. One follower said that Villa desired "the Indians of the region he leads be given possession of their own lands, and likewise those who have been despoiled of their property by hacienda proprietors, and that they be left in complete liberty..." (Russell, 306). Magon proclaimed "Land and Liberty," and the Plan de Ayala which Zapata labored for, proclaimed "Reform, Freedom, Law and Justice." Almost all the leaders of the Revolution were assassinated, as the text says, for the cause of freedom that the previous century (under federalism with strong central control) had not produced for them, especially land reform, which was one of the revolutionaries' most important goals. Many sources agree that no real form of liberty resulted until the PRI, among other things, made it impossible for the reign of the Caudillo/strongman/dictator to return, and upheld rights of workers.	Britannica Macropedia, "Mexico." Philip Russell, A History of Mexico: from Pre-Conquest to Present <a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/MexicanRevolutiontimeline.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/MexicanRevolutiontimeline.htm</a>
NA	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."	Explaining Mexican Revolutionary secular policy on religion because the Catholic Church supported "traditional principles of authority and hierarchy" is misleading.		This does not constitute verified factual error but debatable opinion nor is it supported. The reviewer misinterprets the text here. It is a widely understood principle that disestablishing the Catholic Church and taking away its privileges were part of liberal and revolutionary reforms in Mexico because 1) of the long-standing linkage between the Church, the king/ruler, and the army; 2) because of the privileges retained by the priesthood and upper class (especially land ownership) which, after three centuries of imperial rule, were not benefitting the lower classes; and 3) the alleged power and influence of the church over everyday people, especially Indo-mestizos. Discussion of this premise occurs throughout the book from Montesinos to Hidalgo to Santa Anna to Juarez and the Mexican Revolution, e.g. pp. 48, 73, 168,174, 184, 189, 295. Additionally the book discusses anticlericalism throughout e.g. 110, 168-169, 204, 216. Here, the authors do not say that the rationale for revolution or secularism was simply because Catholicism supported traditional principles and authority, as the reviewer asserts. The authors offer these sentences to clarify the preceding quote by President Calles that "The Catholic Church is a political movement and must be eliminated to proceed with a Socialist government..." The sentences explicate Calles' assumptions that traditional principles and structures have no place in the modern government he is planning, and therefore Catholicism is an obstacle to that end--leading to the Cristero War, which comes next in the text.  The history of anticlericalism and its links to intellectuals, reformists, and revolutionaries in Mexican history is available in TR Fehrenbach, <i>Fire &amp; Blood: A History of Mexico</i> . In particular he develops the cross-pollination of French Revolutionary thought into Mexico from as early as the Bourbon reforms, and through Ignacio Ramirez.	Catechism of the Catholic Church. N.d. Doctrine. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City.  Fehrenbach, T. R. Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico. New York: Da Capo, 1995. Print.  Iber, Simeon Tsetim. Principle of Subsidiarity in Catholic Social Thought: Implications for Social Justice and Civil Society .. New York: Peter Lang, 2010. Print.  McNabb, Vincent. "THE HIERARCHY AND CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES ON EDUCATION." Blackfriars 10.112 (1929): 1163-168. Web.  POPE PIUS XII. ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PIUS XII ON THE MISTICAL BODY OF CHRIST TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN, PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER LOCAL ORDINARIES ENJOYING PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE. N.d. Papal Letter. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City.
NA	296-320	Section 2: Revolution in Latin America and Beyond		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.		This does not constitute verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content not required. 100% of TEKS have been met for Special Topics in Social Studies. The course adopted by the SBOE is not MAS. This request by the reviewer is more germane to a discussion by the SBOE should it adopt an MAS course and wish to establish formal TEKS for that course. The scope of the book includes Latin American history for context and comparative analysis.	Rosado, Caleb. "The Concept of Cultural Relativism In a Multicultural World." Rosado Consulting for Change in Human Systems. N.p., 1994. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  San Diego State University. Why Learn World History. N.d. Curriculum Project. National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA. <a href="http://worldhistoryforall.sdsu.edu/shared/thinking.php">http://worldhistoryforall.sdsu.edu/shared/thinking.php</a>  Takezawa, Yasuko I., Audrey Smedley, and Peter Wade. "Race." Brittanica. Brittanica, 2016. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  "Finally, well-written historical narratives can also alert students to the traps of lineality and inevitability. Students must understand the relevance of the past to their own times, but they need also to avoid the trap of lineality, of drawing straight lines between past and present, as though earlier movements were being propelled teleologically toward some rendezvous with destiny in the late 20th century." UCLA Department of History Standards. N.d. Historical Analysis and Interpretation. National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA, Los Angeles. ☐

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	296-307			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.		This does not constitute verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content not required. 100% of TEKS have been met for Special Topics in Social Studies. The course adopted by the SBOE is not MAS. This request by the reviewer is more germane to a discussion by the SBOE should it adopt an MAS course and wish to establish formal TEKS for that course. Additionally, reviewer's complaint as to the historical accuracy is unfounded subjective opinion. Revolutionary socialism is "directly relevant to the history of Mexican-origin persons in the United States." Refugees fled Mexico because of revolutionary violence--and political, economic, religious policy. Labor union activity after 1900 was spearheaded by Mexican consulates and Marxist-Leninist ideology/organizations including the COM, IWW, and others--see especially Zamora, <i>Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas</i> , 1900-1920 and Zamora, <i>The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas</i> . The effects from the Plan de San Diego, Magonistas, and the PLM were also important on the U.S. side of the border, as were the role Mexican Revolutionary political exiles in Southern Texas, all of which require some background in international revolutionary thought.	Steinhauer, Jason. "The History of Mexican Immigration to the U.S. in the Early 20th Century." Web log post. Library of Congress. Office of the Inspector General, 11 Mar. 2015. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  "The Mexican Revolution and the United States in the Collections of the Library of Congress: Introduction." U.S. Relations with Mexico Post-Columbus, NM. Library of Congress, n.d. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  "The Mexican Revolution and the United States in the Collections of the Library of Congress : Order has its Advantages." U.S. Relations with Mexico Post-Columbus, NM. Library of Congress, n.d. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  Zamora, Emilio. <i>The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas</i> . N.p.: Texas A&M UP, 2000. Print.  Zamora, Emilio. <i>Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas, 1900-1920</i> .
NA	307-308			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.		Reviewer has misinterpreted the text where the description of destruction “of government altogether” and “a new social order with no authorities, no business, and no private property” is ascribed to “radical revolutionaries,” not to the PLM specifically. The description is in an opening paragraph about radical revolution in Mexico, which is followed by a section heading on Magon. Magon was explicitly anarchist prior to 1911, as he was exiled to the U.S. several years earlier and planned an assault with his segment of the PLM on Mexico City before Madero's election. See, for example, his 1910 article where he proclaims: "Revolution approaches! With angered eyes, and flaming hair, her trembling hands knock anxiously on the doors of our nation. Let us welcome her with serenity, for although she carries death in her breast, she is the announcement of life, the herald of hope. She will destroy and create at the same time; she will raze and build. Her fists are the invincible fists of a people in rebellion. She does not offer roses or caresses; she offers an axe and a torch." These types of proclamations were made to the PLM "comrades" in the United States with him, as well as their subscribers in both the U.S. and Mexico (e.g. as seen in 1905 article where he addresses PLM in multiple places <a href="http://archivomagon.net/wp-content/uploads/e2n49.pdf">http://archivomagon.net/wp-content/uploads/e2n49.pdf</a> )  Not all the PLM was radicalized. Rifts developed in the PLM concerning Madero v. Magon prior to 1911, which is evidenced by Madero's exit. Yet, <i>Regeneracion</i> articles to at least northern PLM culminate in the position stated in the text about no government at all, in addition to no private business, property, etc. as evident in the Magon article "Gobierno ?" (1914) where he proclaims at the end, "Mexicans: Death to Authority!" This document is included as an original source document in the text, so that students can analyze the claims and trajectory of this particular stream of revolutionary ideology. There is no verified factual error here.  See Publisher's Comments and Sources listed in Alleged Error# 9 and 10 for a further defense of this position, including Philip Russell's documentation of Madero leaving Magon and his branch of the PLM as they left the vein of democratic reforms (A History of Mexico, p.236ff) and Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Culture and History (371-372; Don. M. Coerver, et al).	(1) Articles prior to 1911 can be viewed here, as evidence of radical orientation. <a href="http://archivomagon.net/periodicos/regeneracion-1900-1918/">http://archivomagon.net/periodicos/regeneracion-1900-1918/</a> (2) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "A La Mujer." <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 24 Sept. 1910: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (3) <a href="http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bright/magon/works/regen/mujer.html">http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bright/magon/works/regen/mujer.html</a> (4) <a href="http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bright/magon/works/rgen/gobierno.html">http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist_archives/bright/magon/works/rgen/gobierno.html</a> Mexico: <i>An Encyclopedia of Culture and History</i> (Don. M. Coerver, et al) (5) <i>Philip Russell: A History of Mexico: From Pre-Conquest to Present</i> . (2011) (6) Barragan, Yasenia, and Mark Bray. "Ricardo Flores Magón and the Anarchist Movement in Southern California." Online historical feature. KCET Media. KCET Media/South El Monte Arts Posse, 29 May 2014. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (7) Carr, Barry. "Marxism and Anarchism in the Formation of the Mexican Communist Party, 1910-19." <i>The Hispanic American Historical Review</i> 63.2 (1983): 277-305. Web. (8) Lomnitz-Adler, Claudio. <i>The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón</i> . N.p.: MIT, 2014. Print. (9) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "A La Mujer." <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 24 Sept. 1910: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (10) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "¿Gobierno?" <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 12 Feb. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (11) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "Sin Jefes." <i>La Regeneracion</i> [Los Angeles] 21 Mar. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (12) Magon, Ricardo Flores, and David Poole. <i>Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution</i> . Ricardo Flores Magón. Montreal: Black Rose, 1977. Print. (13) "Mexico". <i>Encyclopædia Britannica</i> . Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (14) <i>Encyclopædia Britannica Inc.</i> , 2016. Web. 23 Sep. 2016 (15) Niemeyer, E.V., Jr. <i>Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916-1917</i> . N.p.: U of Texas, 2014. Print. (16) "Periódicos." <i>Archivo Digital De Ricardo Flores Magón RSS</i> . Archivo Magon, 2016. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (17) <i>Revolutions in Mexico Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations</i> . Washington: Gov. Print. Off., 1913. Print. (18) Russell, Philip L. <i>The History of Mexico: From Pre-conquest to Present</i> . New York: Routledge, 2010. Print. (19) <i>United States. Cong. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. My Library My History Books on Google Play Investigations of Mexican Affairs</i> . By Albert Bacon Fall. 66th Cong., 2nd sess. S 645. N.p.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1920. 3342. Print.
NA	309			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."		These are not verified factual errors but unsubstantiated subjective opinion. California was owned by Mexico until 1848 and was therefore primarily Spanish-speaking at the time of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. Additionally, Magon continues to be a popular icon, with Tierra y Libertad a popular motto among radicalists. The EZLN currently claims Magon as one of its ideological predecessors. In 1997, the indigenous group CFIP-RFM was founded on Magonista principles and named after Magon. In 2000, the "Magonista Days" celebrated the centennial of Regeneracion. However, content is being modified to delete "that continues to inspire radicalism today." on page 215 of the current content.	"A Look at the Popular Indigenous Council of Oaxaca-Ricardo Flores Magón (CIPO-RFM)." Interview. Libertarian Communist Federation. Northeastern Anarchists, 2006. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  Paddison, Joshua. "1848-1865: Gold Rush, Statehood, and the Western Movement." <i>Calisphere</i> . University of California, 2005. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.  Stacy, Lee. <i>Mexico and the United States</i> . New York: Marshall Cavendish, 2003. Print.  Vorpahl, Mark. "Anarchism & Marxism: Their Similarities & Differences." Web log post. <i>Workers Compass</i> . <i>Workers Action</i> , 2013. Web. 29 Sept. 2016.
NA	309		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. Every one 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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but debatable opinion as to the implementation of the Plan of Ayala. Paul Hart/Arnoldo de Leon, who express sympathy for the Zapatistas in <i>War Along the Border</i> , says that "the sanctity of private property" was at stake in the argument between Zapata and Carranza (22). Zapatistas seized land from hacendados. Redistribution of land in Morelos violated private property laws in place as well as permitted villages to reorganize themselves without these laws.  While this does not constitute an error, the publisher has voluntarily replaced "There would be no property lines or individual ownership either." with "Villages could decide for themselves whether they would break up their allotment into individual farms or hold their land in common." for clarification purposes.	León, Arnoldo De. <i>War along the Border: The Mexican Revolution and Tejano Communities</i> . College Station: Texas A & M UP, 2011. 22. Print.  <a href="http://bdm.mx/detalle/?id_cod=17">http://bdm.mx/detalle/?id_cod=17</a> Excerpts from Plan of Ayala: 6. As an additional part of the plan we invoke we state: that the land, mountains and waters that have usurped the landowners, scientists or chieftains in the shadow of tyranny and venal justice come into possession of these real estate course, the people or citizens with their corresponding titles of those properties, which they have been stripped, by the bad faith of our oppressors, keeping all trance, with arms in hand the mentioned possession and counterfeiters are created entitled to them, they deducted before special courts established to victory the revolution. 7. Given that the vast majority of Mexican pueblos and citizens are not more owners than the land they walk suffering the horrors of poverty without being able to improve in all their social status or to engage in industry or agriculture to be monopolized in a few hands lands, mountains and waters, for this cause They expropriated, prior compensation of the third of these monopolies to the powerful owners of them, so that the peoples and citizens of Mexico to obtain ejidos, colonies, and foundations for pueblos, or fields for sowing or work, and improved in all and for all the lack of prosperity and welfare of Mexicans 8. The landowners, scientists or bosses who oppose directly or indirectly This Plan, its assets will be nationalized and two - thirds that they would they correspond, they will go to war reparations, pensions and widows orphans of the victims who succumb in the struggle for this plan (translated from <a href="http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Constitucion/CH8.pdf">http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Constitucion/CH8.pdf</a> )  <a href="http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/ayala.htm">http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/ayala.htm</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	313-318			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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error. The reviewer fails to note the inclusion of the Good Neighbor Policy in the current content before the SBOE on page 218, so his complaint is moot. Additionally, his complaint is not a verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content that is not required under the course specified in Proclamation 2017 currently before the Board. This textbook has met 100% of the TEKS for Special Topics in Social Studies, which is the course that was adopted by the SBOE. The SBOE has not adopted a MAS course. This request by the reviewer would be germane to a discussion by the SBOE should it adopt a MAS course and subsequently wish to establish formal TEKS for that course, but it is not germane to the present Proclamation 2017 for Special Topics in Social Studies.	Good Neighbor Policy is covered on p. 218 of the new version of textbook Koppes, Clayton R. "The Good Neighbor Policy and the Nationalization of Mexican Oil: A Reinterpretation." <i>The Journal of American History</i> 69.1 (1982): 62-81. Web. <a href="http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2004/eiv31n27-20040709/eiv31n27-20040709_063-fdrs_good_neighbor_policy.pdf">http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2004/eiv31n27-20040709/eiv31n27-20040709_063-fdrs_good_neighbor_policy.pdf</a>
NA	324-353	Section 1, Mexican American Immigrants		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.		This complaint does not constitute a verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content that is not required under the course specified in Proclamation 2017 currently before the Board. This textbook has met 100% of the TEKS for Special Topics in Social Studies, which is the course that was adopted by the SBOE. The SBOE has not adopted a MAS course. This request by the reviewer would be germane to a discussion by the SBOE should it adopt a MAS course and subsequently wish to establish formal TEKS for that course, but it is not germane to the present Proclamation 2017 for Special Topics in Social Studies. Additionally, there is valid authority for the inclusion of broader coverage.	<a href="https://www.boundless.com/sociology/textbooks/boundless-sociology-textbook/culture-3/culture-and-society-29/ethnocentrism-and-cultural-relativism-186-4770/">https://www.boundless.com/sociology/textbooks/boundless-sociology-textbook/culture-3/culture-and-society-29/ethnocentrism-and-cultural-relativism-186-4770/</a> The importance of including a broad scope is found at <a href="http://worldhistoryforusall.sdsu.edu/shared/thinking.php">http://worldhistoryforusall.sdsu.edu/shared/thinking.php</a> Cultural Relativism-- <a href="http://www.rosado.net/articles-relativism.html">http://www.rosado.net/articles-relativism.html</a> "Finally, well-written historical narratives can also alert students to the traps of lineality and inevitability. Students must understand the relevance of the past to their own times, but they need also to avoid the trap of lineality, of drawing straight lines between past and present, as though earlier movements were being propelled teleologically toward some rendezvous with destiny in the late 20th century." <a href="http://www.nchs.ucla.edu/history-standards/historical-thinking-standards/3.-historical-analysis-and-interpretation">http://www.nchs.ucla.edu/history-standards/historical-thinking-standards/3.-historical-analysis-and-interpretation</a>
NA	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."	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.		This is not a verified factual error, as the reviewer's complaint is an undocumented statement regarding the period of time between 1914-1917. However, what is very clearly documented is how Mexican immigrants were allowed in under a special exemption for temporary farmworkers under the 1917 Immigration Act. As one website describes it, "[T]he Immigration Act of 1917 contained a provision granting entry to 'temporary' workers from Western Hemisphere nations who would otherwise be considered inadmissible. The Secretary of Labor was authorized to exempt such persons (in this instance, Mexicans) from the ban on immigrants over the age of 16 who could not read. In May 1917, with the nation officially at war with Germany, a temporary farmworker program for unskilled Mexican workers was created. It was later expanded to permit the employment of some of these laborers in non-farm work."  The text has been edited to reflect the specific actions implemented by the Immigration Act of 1917 and the initiation of the Temporary Admissions Program, to state, "Beginning in late 1917, Mexican workers who crossed the border..."	<a href="https://archive.org/stream/immigrationlaws01statgoog#page/n10/mode/2up">https://archive.org/stream/immigrationlaws01statgoog#page/n10/mode/2up</a>  <a href="http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&amp;context=hrpubs">http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&amp;context=hrpubs</a>
NA	333-335			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."		This is not a verified factual error but undocumented subjective opinion of the reviewer. The section on the Red Scare of 1917 is relevant because of the restrictionist mindset that was developed in this time towards immigrants, labor organizers, and people of different races. It forms an important backdrop to Mexican civil rights development and immigration reform discussed in the following sections. Additionally, this complaint is a subjective assessment of what content should and should not be included within the course specified in Proclamation 2017 currently before the Board. For example, one website says, "In the Red Scare that followed World War II, Mexican American activists working for civil rights were harassed, intimidated, vilified and indicted as subversives." This textbook has met 100% of the TEKS for Special Topics in Social Studies, which is the course that was adopted by the SBOE. The SBOE has not adopted a MAS course. This complaint by the reviewer would be germane to a discussion by the SBOE should it adopt a MAS course and subsequently wish to establish formal TEKS for that course, but it is not germane to the present Proclamation 2017 for Special Topics in Social Studies.	<a href="http://oregonstate.edu/dept/humanities/mexican-americans-caught-50s-039witch-hunt039">http://oregonstate.edu/dept/humanities/mexican-americans-caught-50s-039witch-hunt039</a>
NA	337-339			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 <i>La Prensa</i> (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.		None of these complaints constitute verified factual errors, but are simply requests for inclusion of additional content that is not required. The role of the textbook is not to judge or question historical facts, but to present them and encourage the reader to ask critical questions, investigate, discuss, and evaluate the facts. The discussion questions create opportunities for further investigation of each chapter.  Additionally, the reviewer fails to note that Mexicans serving in the U.S. military are given ample coverage on pp 198-200 (with Saenz on p.200), 236 as is the Bracero program which brought millions of Mexican immigrants to the U.S. on pp 234, 236-238. Mexico's neutrality in WWI is on p 198, and their alliance in WWII (including the Mexican Expeditionary Air Force) is mentioned on pp 236 and 238. Mexican civil rights and labor organizers are throughout later chapters, e.g. 240, 249-250, 251-254... It seems perhaps the reviewer did not read subsequent chapters or material that would have addressed their concerns.  Authors are voluntarily willing to add information about <i>La Prensa</i> and labor organizations between 1900 and 1930. However, this omission does not constitute a verified factual error.	<a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ee103">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ee103</a> * Stacy, Lee. <i>Mexico and the United States</i> . New York: Marshall Cavendish, 2002. Print. p. 450 <a href="http://www.tolerance.org/latino-civil-rights-timeline">http://www.tolerance.org/latino-civil-rights-timeline</a> <a href="http://archive.vancouver.wsu.edu/crbeha/ma/ma.htm">http://archive.vancouver.wsu.edu/crbeha/ma/ma.htm</a> <a href="http://www.iww.org/history/founding">http://www.iww.org/history/founding</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	339			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 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.		Text had already added information prior to Sept 2nd that addressed post-war discrimination on p.200, especially from Jose Luz de Saenz and his published work on Mexican-American veterans of WWI so this complaint is moot.  The word "Air" was accidentally omitted and the text is being change to add the word "Air" to the "Mexican Expeditionary Air Force"	
NA	346		"In 1945, the first Medal of Honor awarded to a Mexican American was given to WWII veteran Macario Garcia, by President Harry Truman."	Six preceded him.		The list of military honors and awards quite often are debated because of the fact that they frequently reference Hispanic award recipients, rather than exclusively Mexican-Americans, and even more specifically Mexican immigrants. Additionally, there are numerous types of awards, such as David Barkley's award of the Distinguished Service Cross, and finally some of these awards are granted posthumously so the dates the awards are issued may not always align chronologically. However, this error can be corrected and remove any confusion by amending the text to read as follows: "In 1945, a Medal of Honor was awarded by President Harry Truman to WWII veteran Macario Garcia, the first Mexican immigrant to receive this award."	GARCÍA, MACARIO (1920–1972). Macario García, recipient of the Medal of Honor during World War II, was born on January 2, 1920, in Villa de Castaño, Mexico, to Luciano and Josefa García, farm workers who raised ten children. In 1923 the family moved to Texas; they eventually settled in Sugar Land. Like the rest of his brothers and sisters, he contributed to the family's support by picking crops. He was working on the Paul Schumann Ranch near Sugar Land when he was drafted into the army on November 11, 1942. <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fga76">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fga76</a>  MARCARIO GARCIA (1920 ~ 1972). Medal of Honor Recipient Marcario Garcia was born into a poor family with nine other children on January 2, 1920, in Villa de Castano, Mexico. His family moved to Texas in 1923, eventually becoming farm workers in Sugar Land, near Houston. <a href="http://www.cemetery.state.tx.us/pub/user_form.asp?pers_id=11142">http://www.cemetery.state.tx.us/pub/user_form.asp?pers_id=11142</a>  <a href="https://prezi.com/gkpr9la4t0uh/macario-garcia/">https://prezi.com/gkpr9la4t0uh/macario-garcia/</a>
NA	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."	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."		This is not a verified factual error but an issue of semantics. Factually the rationale behind the need for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the efficacy, or more specifically the inefficacy, of the 14th Amendment's assurance of equal protection under the laws to afford everyone social justice and social benefits without discrimination. However, to clarify this the text is replacing "had declared" with "affirmed", and deleting the word "now."	"In the 1960s, Americans who knew only the potential of "equal protection of the laws" expected the president, the Congress, and the courts to fulfill the promise of the 14th Amendment. In response, all three branches of the federal government-- as well as the public at large--debated a fundamental constitutional question: Does the Constitution's prohibition of denying equal protection always ban the use of racial, ethnic, or gender criteria in an attempt to bring social justice and social benefits?" <a href="https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/civil-rights-act/">https://www.archives.gov/education/lessons/civil-rights-act/</a>  <a href="https://catalog.archives.gov/id/299891">https://catalog.archives.gov/id/299891</a>  <a href="https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&amp;doc=97">https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&amp;doc=97</a>
NA	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."	"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."	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.		This is not a verified factual error, but an undocumented debatable opinion based upon a misreading of the content. The text only attempted to draw the distinction between the influence of the papal system and the religious crusades, contrasted to the protestant beliefs of such persons as Roger Williams. However, as this is a much broader and more complex topic than can be addressed or conveyed in one sentence, and which could be easily misconstrued, Publisher is voluntarily deleting this content in the text, so it is no longer an alleged error and is moot.	<a href="http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/god-government-and-roger-williams-big-idea-6291280/?no-ist">http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/god-government-and-roger-williams-big-idea-6291280/?no-ist</a>  <a href="http://www.historytoday.com/jonathan-phillips/crusades-complete-history">http://www.historytoday.com/jonathan-phillips/crusades-complete-history</a>
NA	71	Mestizos "A person of mixed ancestry."	The definition of mestizo is incorrect.	A mestizos is the offspring of a Spaniard and Native American.		Text had already been amended prior to Sept 2 to address this concern, both in the text and in vocab definition in the margin on p.32. This alleged error no longer exists, so this complaint is moot. Additionally, this is not a verified factual error as there are differences of opinion regarding which terms are preferable and why, in discussions of racial and cultural identity. The fact that two "alleged factual errors" are presented in this compiled list that cite different definitions for Mestizos is proof that this issue is one of opinion, not a verified factual error. (See alleged factual error 53.)	
NA	71		"In reality, however, the Audencia 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."	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. This is in no way factual		This does not constitute a verified factual error, but merely an undocumented subjective opinion. <i>The Spanish Empire in America</i> (Haring, 1947) maintains that at least part of the Audiencia structure was to ensure royal control over its governors in the New World. While the viceroy served as part of the council, it still performed an important check and balance to viceroys and governors in the New World. Audiencia officials had executive and legislative privileges, oversaw the Royal Treasury, and corresponded with the Spanish monarchy directly. They handled civil and criminal cases, in which the Viceroy usually could not participate in. Individuals could (and did) submit reviews of the viceroy's performance, which ultimately led to limitations placed on the power of the viceroy by the mid-eighteenth century.  Additionally, text is amended to read, "Citizens could appeal directly through the Audiencia to the king in cases of abuse, and Audiencia officials often counseled the Viceroy on certain matters. Together, these structures ensured royal control over the vast Spanish colonies in Central and South America."	<i>The Spanish Empire in America (Haring, 1947)</i>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	45-94	Chapter 2 Spanish Colonialism Section 1: Exploration and Conquest Section 2: The Spanish Colonial System	Where is the borderland history?	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? ☹		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective desire of the reviewer that certain content be included that is currently not required. The course adopted by the SBOE is Special Topics in Social Studies course for which we met 100% of TEKS requirements. Desiring more coverage of borderlands in chapters 1 and 2 does not constitute a verified factual error. Additionally, the text includes content throughout the book on the Spanish borderlands and Mexican Texas, both in Chapter 4 (Texas Revolution and the Mexican-American War) and Chapter 5 (the American Southwest after Guadalupe-Hidalgo). Indeed, many of the Alleged Factual Errors in this chart address specific information reviewers have critiqued from those chapters regarding the Borderlands--size, population, boundaries, colonial history, governmental structures, Native Americans, important events, immigration, etc. Obviously, the reviewer did not read other chapters. In any event, the colonial settlement of California prior to independence in 1810 is covered sufficiently with map of settlement on p.59-60. Borderland/Tejano history begins on p104, where the rest of the chapter is devoted to the Borderlands and background to the Texas Revolution. Borderlands history continues through Chapter 5 and the development of the borderlands while changing hands from Mexico to the United States.	Tejano history is included pages 105-199
NA	94	"The large majority of the population needed more rights and privileges such as the ability to own land, trade freely, and better themselves."	Land ownership was allowed.	Individuals within the Spanish colonial system owned private property, including land. The assertion that individuals could not own property is false.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but a misreading of the content by the reviewer, as the sentence in question does not make a blanket statement that property ownership was not allowed. The sentence in question clearly states that the majority of the population did not enjoy this right under New Spain. According to R. Acuna, peninsulares with the highest privileges (land ownership, holding office, etc) were only .3% of the population by 1810 (Occupied America, 34). Criollos formed 18% of the population and had moderate privileges depending on "the more Spanish the subject appeared" (34). This means that at least 81.7% of the population under New Spain had no privileges including land ownership--and in the real percentage was probably higher. By the time of the Mexican Revolution in 1910, less than 3% of the MX population owned land, so land ownership has been a pervasive issue throughout Mexican history: <a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm</a>	<a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm</a>  <a href="http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045487/1913-03-03/ed-1/seq-28/#date1=1789&amp;index=0&amp;rows=20&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;language=&amp;sequence=0&amp;words=landowners+Mexico&amp;proxdistance=5&amp;date2=1922&amp;ortext=&amp;proxtext=&amp;phrasertext=&amp;andtext=Mexico+landowners&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1">http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045487/1913-03-03/ed-1/seq-28/#date1=1789&amp;index=0&amp;rows=20&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;language=&amp;sequence=0&amp;words=landowners+Mexico&amp;proxdistance=5&amp;date2=1922&amp;ortext=&amp;proxtext=&amp;phrasertext=&amp;andtext=Mexico+landowners&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1</a>  <a href="http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045462/1914-06-28/ed-1/seq-50/#date1=1789&amp;index=2&amp;rows=20&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;language=&amp;sequence=0&amp;words=landown+landowners+MEXICO+Mexico&amp;proxdistance=5&amp;date2=1922&amp;ortext=&amp;proxtext=&amp;phrasertext=&amp;andtext=Mexico+landowners&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1">http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045462/1914-06-28/ed-1/seq-50/#date1=1789&amp;index=2&amp;rows=20&amp;searchType=advanced&amp;language=&amp;sequence=0&amp;words=landown+landowners+MEXICO+Mexico&amp;proxdistance=5&amp;date2=1922&amp;ortext=&amp;proxtext=&amp;phrasertext=&amp;andtext=Mexico+landowners&amp;dateFilterType=yearRange&amp;page=1</a>
NA	106-112	Mexican War of Independence, 1810-1820	To omit discussion of the Spanish Borderlands during the Mexican War for Independence is reckless and erroneous.	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but a subjective request for the inclusion of content. This Alleged Error is almost identical to Alleged Error #36. See publisher's comments about Borderlands, which are covered in depth in Chapters 4 and 5. Additionally, the intention of this text is to provide students with an overview of the intertwined history of Mexico and the United States, and the evolution of the Mexican-American community. There is no requirement from Special Topics in Social Studies that this specific content be included, and an alleged error of omission does not constitute a verified factual error.	Bolton, Herbert. "Spanish Borderlands: Chronicles of America V23 Hardcover – May 23, 2010." Spanish Borderlands: Chronicles of America V23: Herbert E. Bolton: 9781161389326: Amazon.com: Books. N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Sept. 2016.  ☹
NA	116	Federalism is "a form of governing in which a national overarching government oversees smaller localized government systems."	The authors do not understand the term "federalism" within the context of Mexican History. That is a shockingly ignorant error.	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.		This is not a verified factual error but a request for the inclusion of content solely from one viewpoint. The TEKS for Special Topics in Social Studies do not require the definition of federalism to be provided solely in relation to MAS, as opposed to a classic definition. Definition of Federalism is government with coexisting sovereigns. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy says "Federalism is the theory or advocacy of federal principles for dividing powers between member units and common institutions. Unlike in a unitary state, sovereignty in federal political orders is non-centralized, often constitutionally, between at least two levels so that units at each level have final authority and can be self governing in some issue area. Citizens thus have political obligations to, or have their rights secured by, two authorities. The division of power between the member unit and center may vary." Our definition for federalism (A form of governing in which a national overarching government oversees smaller localized government systems) is perfectly in bounds for an understanding of both Mexican and U.S. systems--which as a Mexican-American student, is preferable.  Moreover, the fact that Mexican federalism has a more nuanced meaning was not left out of the text--in fact it was developed in three subsequent paragraphs on p.80 with specific details and explained exactly as the reviewer wanted: as "control...given to the states" and a "limit on the power of the executive branch of government." And again on p.84: "The 1824 Constitution permitted each Mexican state many freedoms while the central government, especially the office of the President, was left without such power." The accusation that the authors were "shockingly ignorant" is unfounded.	<a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/federalism/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/federalism/</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	106-125	Mexican War of Independence, 1810-1820	Discussion of the Mexican War for Independence is stunningly thin. Omitting the discussion of a critical aspect of Mexican American heritage is erroneous.	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>This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely a subjective request for inclusion of a particular amount of content. There is no requirement that this content be included, based on the text's qualification of 100% TEKS coverage for Special Topics in Social Studies.</p> <p>However, the sections on the First Mexican Empire and the First Mexican Republic are explained in detail on pp. 77-80. The rest of this Alleged Error is very similar to Alleged Errors #36 and #38. See publisher's comments there for more information about Borderlands coverage. Publisher has included much throughout the text on the Spanish borderlands and Mexican Texas, both in Chapter 4 (Texas Revolution and the Mexican-American War) and Chapter 5 (the American Southwest after Guadalupe-Hidalgo). Indeed, many of the Alleged Factual Errors in this chart have to do with information regarding the borderlands--size, population, boundaries, colonial history, governmental structures, Native Americans, important events, and immigration. It seems perhaps the reviewer did not read other chapters and was surprised to find detailed Borderlands history left out of the chapter on Mexican independence. Borderlands history, especially of Mexican Texas, is fully developed, starting on p.104.</p>	
NA	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."	The authors make an untrue claim in asserting Americans had self-rule and Spanish did not.	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>This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion. Regarding the statement in question about the Spanish colonies having no self-rule, the <i>Britannica Macropedia</i> says, "When a republican constitution was adopted in 1824, the Mexican people had had little or no previous experience in self-government." The Spanish government reflected a strict hierarchy including the viceroy, monarch/empire, and sometimes the Papacy, giving 81.7% of non-criollos very few rights or privileges (Acuna, p.34, Occupied America). In contrast, early Americans especially in New England experienced the ability to explore, claim land, charter their own states or create new ones, establish religious differences in their charters, choose their own religious affiliation, move/acquire property, start schools, start companies, elect leaders, etc. Under the Spanish Empire, such freedoms were not allowed prior to the Bourbon reforms, and even after constitutional monarchy and more enlightened forms of government began to be experimented with, the heavily royalist component of the Mexican population kept Mexican society very grounded in the monarchical and Catholic authority structure. This legacy continued until the era of Calles and the PRI. Whereas there are numerous examples of where the people themselves determined how to create a civil body politic by which they would govern themselves. The first example of self-governance being the Mayflower Compact. Additionally, the text has been amended to read, "This was because American colonies had experimented with self-rule prior to independence, but the Spanish colonies had not been permitted to, prior to theirs."</p>	<p>(Acuna, p.34, Occupied America)</p> <p>Britannica Macropedia</p> <p><a href="http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mayflower.asp">http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mayflower.asp</a></p> <p><a href="http://connecticuthistory.org/the-fundamental-orders-of-connecticut/">http://connecticuthistory.org/the-fundamental-orders-of-connecticut/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.americaslibrary.gov/jb/colonial/jb_colonial_subj.html">http://www.americaslibrary.gov/jb/colonial/jb_colonial_subj.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://history.state.gov/milestones/1750-1775/parliamentary-taxation">https://history.state.gov/milestones/1750-1775/parliamentary-taxation</a> ☒</p>
NA	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?" ☒	The notion that the Spanish did not have local representative government is false.	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 it colonial system.		<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error but an undocumented philosophical opinion. The bulk of the documentation clearly underscores and supports the content contained within the book. However, these two paragraphs are being edited to add this subjective minority perspective, including a more nuanced vocabulary to describe how the relationship between Spain and Mexico did not identically mirror that between England and the United States.</p>	<p>Cuello, José. "The Economic Impact of the Bourbon Reforms and the Late Colonial Crisis of Empire at the Local Level: The Case of Saltillo, 1777-1817." <i>The Americas</i> 44.3 (1988): 301-23. Web.</p> <p>Pearce, A. "The Origins of Bourbon Reform in Spanish South America, 1700-1763." (eBook, 2014) [WorldCat.org]. Springer, 2016. Web. 26 Sept. 2016.</p>
NA	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."	The authors again misrepresent and downplay the role of the crown in administrating the American colonies.	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>This does not constitute a verified factual error but an undocumented philosophical opinion. (see response to complaint on line 42.) Additionally, the reviewer is arbitrarily requiring the inclusion of content that downplays the role of the crown, which such content is not required. Finally, the text is being edited to replace the second sentence that starts with, "Except..." with "The Declaration listed the rightful grievances the colonists had against the King in justification for separating from England."</p>	<p><a href="http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html">http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html</a></p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	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."	The authors falsely assert that the U.S. Constitution is based on Judeo-Christian principles.	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>This is not a verified factual error but an undocumented debatable opinion. Additionally, reviewer has misinterpreted the text which reads, "It [the 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. This acknowledged the Judeo-Christian principles espoused within British common law—the legal philosophy underlying much of the political framework of American government."</p> <p>The sentences in question say the U.S. Constitution "acknowledged" the Judeo-Christian principles of the Laws of Nature and Nature's God found within the Commentaries on the Laws of England (i.e. Blackstone). It does not say that the U.S. Constitution is a Judeo-Christian document or taught those principles itself. It also references the "moral philosophy of the nation" reflecting those principles, which is most clearly seen in the language of the Declaration of Independence which references the Creator and "The Laws of Nature and Nature's God" as a reason for equality and the rights of man. As for British common law espousing Judeo-Christian principles, Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England clearly defined the Laws of Nature and the Laws of Nature's God as "The will of our Maker and the Revealed Will through His Holy Scripture, respectively." Regarding the claim that British common law was the legal philosophy underlying much of the political framework of the American government, it is a fact that Blackstone's Commentaries were the basis for common law in all of the 13 British colonies. The criticism is, therefore, not a verified factual error, but philosophical debate. Elias Boudinot drafted a Resolution to President Washington confirming the dependency on God's providence to create the Constitution, and George Washington issued a Thanksgiving Proclamation in response to this resolution documenting the same. Finally, John Quincy Adams in his detailed Jubilee of the Constitution on page 11 clearly connected the Constitution to the underlying principles found within the Declaration. "thus: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." This act [The Constitution] was the complement to the Declaration of Independence; founded upon the same principles, carrying them out into practical execution, and forming with it, one entire system of national government." ☐</p>	<p><a href="http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/blackstone_intro.asp#2">http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/blackstone_intro.asp#2</a></p> <p><a href="https://archive.org/details/jubileeofconst1839adam">https://archive.org/details/jubileeofconst1839adam</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.archives.gov/historical-docs/todays-doc/?dod-date=1123">http://www.archives.gov/historical-docs/todays-doc/?dod-date=1123</a></p> <p><a href="http://gwpapers.virginia.edu/documents/thanksgiving-proclamation/">http://gwpapers.virginia.edu/documents/thanksgiving-proclamation/</a></p>
NA	137		The authors mis-characterize the period between 176 - 1789 in a factually ambiguous way.: "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." ☐	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>This does not constitute a verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content that is not required. There is no requirement that this book present a treatise on the period of time between 1776 and 1789.</p> <p>Additionally, the text in the Sept 2nd edition submitted to TEA now reads, "The long process of debate and ratification that occurred between the U.S. Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the inauguration of the U.S. Congress in 1789 ensured that a majority of the populace was on board with exactly how the principles in the founding documents would govern."</p>	
NA	137		This passage misinterprets the facts of the War for Independence: "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."	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>This does not constitute verified factual error but undocumented subjective opinion that is based upon a misreading of the text. The text does not say that rigorous intellectual debates in Mexico did not occur. Indeed, the text's reference to the fact that "states were widely divided on the issue" confirms the reviewer's point that intellectual debates were still occurring over the nature of the government Mexico should have in 1824. The text does say that, in 1821, final decisions were not made on a few important issues, in order to stop the debate and defeat the Spanish. Britannica states the fact that, "independence had been the point on which republicans and conservatives could agree...Under various labels, two factions contended for control...The pendulum of power swung back and forth between the two groups." The events in Mexico between 1821-1823 clearly show that because empire/republic debate had not been settled, governmental turmoil begins immediately after Agustín is coronated (e.g. including the dismissal of Congress and subsequent assassination of Iturbide). Regarding the text's statement about setting a dangerous precedent, Britannica says directly after its description of Iturbide's assassination and the Mexican Constitution of 1824 that, "This first epoch of independent Mexican national life thus foreshadowed many problems of the succeeding republic."</p> <p>The text has been amended to read, "Mexico went through a different process. To unite against Spain, royalists led by Iturbide and insurgents led by Guerrero agreed to temporarily disagree on whether the best form of government would be an empire or republic. The Plan of Iguala signed between Iturbide and Guerrero allowed the royalist faction to make Mexico's founding document one of empire and Roman Catholicism, while permitting certain constitutional freedoms that liberals were fighting for. The Mexican Declaration of Independence was officially declared after the revolution was won, not prior to it, so that Iturbide and royalists wrote the First Mexican Empire into it. When Mexican delegates were suddenly sent to create a federalist system in 1823, therefore, they had to use force to topple their existing government, which set a precedent for future revolutions. They also had to specify the limits of state and national powers, which were widely debated. Ultimately, Mexican states were given sovereignty over the central government, and varied greatly in their political and social persuasions."</p>	<p><a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism-latin-america/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism-latin-america/</a></p> <p><a href="https://books.google.com/books?id=3MZ5CgAAQBAJ&amp;pg=PA34&amp;ots=DR-EDd_jH&amp;dq=how%20did%20mexico%20become%20a%20liberal%20democratic%20republic&amp;pg=PA33#v=onepage&amp;q=how%20did%20mexico%20become%20a%20liberal%20democratic%20republic&amp;f=false">https://books.google.com/books?id=3MZ5CgAAQBAJ&amp;pg=PA34&amp;ots=DR-EDd_jH&amp;dq=how%20did%20mexico%20become%20a%20liberal%20democratic%20republic&amp;pg=PA33#v=onepage&amp;q=how%20did%20mexico%20become%20a%20liberal%20democratic%20republic&amp;f=false</a></p>
NA	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."	This characterization is incorrect. Extensive Native American settled communities occupied various parts of North and South America within and outside of the area between Mexico and Peru.		<p>No Indian empire or civilization existed in North America to the extent of the Aztec, Inca, or Maya empires. The Iroquois Confederacy is commonly proposed to be the largest North American Indian conglomerate, and they were an allied power, not an empire. For more information on the size and extent of pre-Columbian societies, see Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquest and Cultures</i>. Additionally, Sowell reinforces the historical usage of the word "civilization," which is not being used as a term of racial superiority, but in its historical sense to define a society with central government, central defense, trade policies, written language, system of education, etc. ☐</p>	<p><a href="https://books.google.com/books?id=175c4xOptLYC&amp;pg=PA307&amp;dq=largest%20Indian%20empires%20in%20america&amp;pg=PA308#v=onepage&amp;q=largest%20Indian%20empires%20in%20america&amp;f=false">https://books.google.com/books?id=175c4xOptLYC&amp;pg=PA307&amp;dq=largest%20Indian%20empires%20in%20america&amp;pg=PA308#v=onepage&amp;q=largest%20Indian%20empires%20in%20america&amp;f=false</a></p> <p>Richter, Daniel K. The William and Mary Quarterly 41.4 (1984): 649-53. Web.</p> <p><a href="http://www.bxscience.edu/ourpages/auto/2009/4/5/34767803/Pre-Columbian%20population.pdf">http://www.bxscience.edu/ourpages/auto/2009/4/5/34767803/Pre-Columbian%20population.pdf</a> ☐</p>
NA	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."	A codices is not a scroll, but a book		<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error but an undocumented debatable position. Early Indian codices were written on long, folded sheets more similar to scrolls than modern books. For example, the Dresden Codex is described as being over 11.5 ft long, originally folded accordion-style but now laid out lengthwise on display. <a href="https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11621/">https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11621/</a> "The codices themselves were generally in the form of long strips of native paper (amatl) or sized deer skin folded up into the shape of a moderate sized book, hence the name codex." <a href="http://www.mexconnect.com/articles/4114-the-codices-of-ancient-and-colonial-mexico">http://www.mexconnect.com/articles/4114-the-codices-of-ancient-and-colonial-mexico</a> Additionally, the text has been amended to read, "Some tribes in Mexico and Peru formed civilizations and wrote down their history on long, folded sheets called codices, but not many of these manuscripts remain."</p>	<p><a href="http://www.famsi.org/mayawriting/codices/dresden.html">http://www.famsi.org/mayawriting/codices/dresden.html</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11621/">https://www.wdl.org/en/item/11621/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.mesoweb.com/resources/handbook/WH2004.pdf">http://www.mesoweb.com/resources/handbook/WH2004.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.mexconnect.com/articles/4114-the-codices-of-ancient-and-colonial-mexico">http://www.mexconnect.com/articles/4114-the-codices-of-ancient-and-colonial-mexico</a></p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	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."	Concerning the use of "few civilized tribes,"—This depicts smaller sociopolitical units as the norm, but larger empires existed at various times and locations throughout the Americas.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but a misreading of the reviewer of the content. This sentence, in context, is juxtaposing nomadic history from the sentence before, which relies on the oral method of transmission, to the history of Mesoamerican civilizations, which has also been handed down graphically through manuscripts. "Civilized" in the sentence, therefore, merely refers to the "larger empires" the reviewer is concerned about, and is clearly defined in the text on p.5 as "a state of organized social interaction and behavior that is structured with rules or laws." Additionally, "civilized" has been replaced with "settled" throughout the chapter.  See Alleged Error #47 above for edited sentence.	Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures: An International History</i> . Basic Books, 1999. (Especially Chapter5.)
NA	5	paragraph 1	he use of the terms "nomadic" and "civilized" in this section is highly problematic.	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 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). ☒		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion occasioned by a misreading by the reviewer. The chapter compares and contrasts Indian civilizations versus nomadic tribes. The goal is to introduce students to the basic pre-Columbian situation, sociologically, and differentiate Native Americans in New England who faced European conquest through isolated contact. The reviewer assumes a negative definition of the term civilized. The usage of the term civilized within this context is not used as a perjorative, but merely in the classic definition of those who lived within a civilization, which again definitonally there are certain concepts equated with this concept. Additionally, the term civilized is being replaced with settled throughout this chapter to avoid the misappropriation of a negative term being applied to the content.	Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures: An International History</i> . Basic Books, 1999. (Especially Chapter5.) Merriam Webster defines civilization as "1: a relatively high level of cultural and technological development; specifically : the stage of cultural development at which writing and the keeping of written records is attained"
NA	5	paragraph 1	The assertion that the development of writing is indicative of being civilized	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion. The term of civilization used within the text is being used according to its classic definition. Conversely, the reviewer is equating "culture" to "civilization." Any racism is being subjectively projected by the reviewer's personal beliefs and assumptions, as there is no judgment, either implied or explicit, related to the varying level of civilization by the text. The facts are simply a historical documentation of the progression and distinctions found within the time period.	Merriam Webster defines civilization as "1: a relatively high level of cultural and technological development; specifically : the stage of cultural development at which writing and the keeping of written records is attained"  Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures: An International History</i> . Basic Books, 1999. (Especially Chapter5.)
NA	5	paragraph 1	It is false to claim that the indigenous empires that produced codices were "migratory"	The indigenous groups that produced codices were not nomadic tribes as the authors claim. The Aztec-Nahuatl, specifically, produced codices were destroyed when burned by the Spanish. These codices were not lost in mountains, jungles, and plains as the authors state. ☒		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion. The fate of the Nahuatl codices—being burned by the Spanish—is specifically mentioned in the text on p.5. Additionally, the reviewer seems to have misunderstood the paragraph. The text does not call those who produced codices "nomadic," nor does it say those codices were lost to the mountains, etc. The text states that many of the codices produced in settled civilizations were lost/destroyed, and that the unrecorded history of nomadic tribes is hard to trace because of the migratory lifestyle combined with the great time and geography being accounted for.	<a href="http://www.houstonculture.org/mexico/zacatecas_indig.html">http://www.houstonculture.org/mexico/zacatecas_indig.html</a>  <a href="http://www.mesoweb.com/resources/handbook/WH2004.pdf">http://www.mesoweb.com/resources/handbook/WH2004.pdf</a>
NA	7	paragraph 1	"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."	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.		It is unclear whether the reviewer is questioning the statistics regarding racial classification, trying to say that Latin American demographic information is irrelevant especially for non-Mexican peoples, or implying that indigenous communities do not still exist in Mexico/Latin America. None of these criticisms make sense, given the facts.  1) The statistic about 1.7% is correct: <a href="http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf">http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf</a> 2) The existence of indigenous communities intact today throughout Latin America is obvious e.g. <a href="https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/none/being-indigenous-21st-century">https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/none/being-indigenous-21st-century</a> Additionally, Charles Mann notes indigenous resistance to modernization in 1491, "Even modern efforts to implant civilization in the South American tropical rainforest have been met with defeat." (332). Articles about the Machiguenga in Peru reveal similar resistance, and the desire to remain "undisturbed." <a href="http://www.amazon-indians.org/machiguenga-tribe.html">http://www.amazon-indians.org/machiguenga-tribe.html</a> 3) On the other hand, communities previously colonized by the Spanish may have a mix of indigenous and mestizo lineage which results in a blended lifestyle. As described in everyculture.org, "About one-third of Peru's 24.5 million inhabitants are Quechua Indians. Migration and urbanization in the past few decades have drawn many Quechua to Lima, the capital city of Peru. There is now a large indigenous and mestizo (mixed-race) population in Lima." The synopsis continues to describe how the Quechua blend indigenous and European customs, clothing, and religion, e.g. with some celebrating both indigenous holidays as well as Christmas and Easter, some speaking only Quechua, only Spanish, or both. <a href="http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LktbUMoM">http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LktbUMoM</a> ☒	<a href="http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LktbUMoM">http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LktbUMoM</a>  <a href="http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf">http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.amazon-indians.org/machiguenga-tribe.html">http://www.amazon-indians.org/machiguenga-tribe.html</a>  <a href="https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/none/being-indigenous-21st-century">https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/none/being-indigenous-21st-century</a> ☒

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	7	paragraph 1	The authors do not understand the term mestizo. No definition for the term is not provided but should be because even the author does not understand the term's meaning.	Mestizos are people of mixed-European and indigenous groups. Being mestizo is not a culture as characterized by the authors. Mestizaje is a combination of genetic characteristics that gives rise to a new group, neither completely European nor indigenous. There is no mestizo culture to practice traditional ways of living, Mestizos do not speak native languages, nor honor indigenous religious festivals. Being mestizo means one has indigenous ancestry but DOES NOT practice indigenous traditions. The author's seem to think being mestizo is a cultural identity. Additionally the authors characterize mestizos in the same way an Indian would be characterized.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion. Mestizo is defined in the text, with a definition provided from another expert reviewer. This updated definition is included within the edition currently before the SBOE as submitted on September 2nd. There are, however, differences of opinion regarding which terms are preferable and why, in discussions of racial and cultural identity. The fact that two "alleged factual errors" are presented in this compiled list that cite different definitions for Mestizos is proof that this issue is one of opinion, not a verified factual error. (See alleged factual error 33.)  Additionally, the reviewer is inaccurate that "Mestizos do not speak native languages, nor honor indigenous religious festivals. Being mestizo means one has indigenous ancestry but DOES NOT practice indigenous traditions." According to everyculture.com, the Quechua community of greater Peru has many "mestizo (mixed race)" individuals, who do practice indigenous traditions, speak their native language, and honor indigenous festivals. It is a complex community of indigenous and modern characteristics, e.g. "Although it rarely occurs, senators and members of congress can give speeches in the Peruvian Congress in Quechua." The authors understand that mestizo is primarily a racial or biological term, however not everyone uses it that way, including mestizos with strong indigenous ancestry i.e. <a href="http://corozal.com/culture/mestizo">http://corozal.com/culture/mestizo</a> .	<a href="http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LkviNp74">http://www.everyculture.com/wc/Norway-to-Russia/Quechua.html#ixzz4LkviNp74</a>  <a href="http://corozal.com/culture/mestizo">http://corozal.com/culture/mestizo</a>  <a href="https://www.britannica.com/topic/mestizo">https://www.britannica.com/topic/mestizo</a>  <a href="http://www.neh.gov/humanities/2010/septemberoctober/feature/the-united-states-mestizo">http://www.neh.gov/humanities/2010/septemberoctober/feature/the-united-states-mestizo</a>  <a href="http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mestizo">http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mestizo</a>  <a href="http://www.indians.org/welker/indios.htm">http://www.indians.org/welker/indios.htm</a>  <a href="https://notevenpast.org/the-disappearing-mestizo-by-joanne-rappaport-2014/">https://notevenpast.org/the-disappearing-mestizo-by-joanne-rappaport-2014/</a>
NA	8	paragraph 1	"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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely an undocumented subjective opinion based upon the reviewer's misinterpretation of the content. In no way is a description of physical diversity among indigenous peoples racist, nor is it meant to be racist or promote the idea of different human races. Neither is there any language which promotes the idea that "human cultural differences are biological." In fact, the description was provided for the opposite reason—to educate young students to expand their conception of indigenous peoples and go beyond popular images of indigenous people in media or entertainment. In particular, indigenous peoples of the Americas, with their vast array of cultural and physical diversity, should be appreciated and included in students' education. However, to avoid any confusion as to the content or its intent, this paragraph is being deleted, so the complaint is moot.	
NA	8	paragraph 1	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."	This is supposed to be a book about "Mexican American Heritage". Why on Earth are the natives of Ecuador and numerous other non-Mexico indigenous groups inserted into the discussion? The authors conflate all native American peoples as one when in fact the thousands of native groups each were distinctive and diverse to such a degree as to make any comparison nonsensical. Iroquois do not equal Maya.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for the inclusion/exclusion of certain content based upon the reviewers assumption that the course for which this book is written has TEKS for MAS; it does not. No such requirements for specific content exist. This paragraph simply highlights diversity among Indian tribes to broaden students' minds about physical appearances of indigenous peoples—not a monolithic group. Reviewer in above error has problems with this description, but this reviewer is arguing the opposite, that the text doesn't mention diversity enough. Indigenous peoples were obviously diverse, but to say that no comparisons among pre-Columbian peoples can be made is equally short-sighted.  This paragraph is being deleted, as stated in Alleged Error #54.	see above (line 55)
The University of Texas at Austin	210	First paragraph, last sentence	Within this context, the first several hundred thousand Latinos found a challenging but protective haven from tumultuous conditions at home.	Mexican Americans, after the Mexican American War & the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, were systematically divested of land and rights between 1850 and 1910. Saying they found a "challenging but protective haven" is factually incorrect.	Manuel Gonzalez, Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States. (2009) F. Arturo Rosales, Testimonio: A Documentary History of the Mexican American Struggle for Civil Rights. 2000 David Montejano, Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986.	This sentence was changed in the Sept 2nd edition submitted to the TEA and is no longer in the text, so this complaint is moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	210	First sentence in the section title The Gold Rush	"On January 24, 1848, nine days before the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed, a Swiss immigrant named John Sutter found a few nuggets of pure gold on his sawmill in the Sacramento Valley."	John Sutter was not the person who found gold on his property.	Manuel Gonzalez, Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States. (2009) Leonard Pitt, The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900. (1966)	The historical belief was based upon the fact that John Sutter owned the property on which the gold was found. While Sutter owned the property, another man, James Marshall, actually found the gold on Sutter's property. The question arose as to who should get the credit, the man who found it, or the man who owned the property on which it was found? The text is being amended to read, "On January 24, 1848, nine days before the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed, a few nuggets of pure gold were found on Sutter's Mill in the Sacramento Valley." This makes the argument about whether or not John Sutter was the person who found the gold moot.  <a href="http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist2/gold.html">http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist2/gold.html</a>	<a href="http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist2/gold.html">http://www.sfmuseum.org/hist2/gold.html</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	211	Middle of the first paragraph in the "Roughing it in the West" section	The sudden influx of settlers created a hostile, competitive climate, and the United States had not owned the West long enough to have reliable police or government presence.	It is factually incorrect to say there was no "reliable police or government presence" in California prior to its annexation by the United States. This reflects an anti-Spanish, anti-Catholic, anti-indigenous, and anti-Mexican bias.	Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966) Louise Pablos, <i>The Father of All: The de la Guerra Family, Power, and Patriarchy in Mexican California.</i> (2010) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush</i> (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but debatable opinion based upon a misreading of the content. The statement specifically refers to the presence of the U.S. police and government—not Mexican or California security. The need for reliable policing of miners is indicated in many primary source accounts, for example, the letter from S. Shufelt in the Library of Congress collection, "There is a good deal of sin & wickedness going on here, Stealing, lying, Swearing, Drinking, Gambling & murdering... Men make & lose thousands in a night... We are trying to get laws here to regulate things but it will be very difficult to get them executed." (A letter from a gold miner, Placerville, California, March, 1850; Holliday, J.S. <i>Rush for Riches: Gold Fever and the Making of California</i> (1999).  Text has been edited to say, "...and the United States, having just acquired this territory, did not yet have their own established governmental or police presence."	Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966)  Knapp Smith Clappe, Louise Amelia. <i>The Shirley Letters from California Mines in 1851-52.</i> N.p.: Project Gutenberg, n.d. The Project Gutenberg Ebook of The Shirley Letters from California Miners in 1851-52. Project Gutenberg, 1 Nov. 2007. Web. 24 Sept. 2016. Letter the Eighth  Hill, Mary. <i>Gold: The California Story.</i> N.p.: U of California, 1999. Print.  Eifler, Mark A. <i>The California Gold Rush: The Stampede That Changed the World.</i> NY: Routledge, 2016. Print.  Hurtado, Albert L. <i>Intimate Frontiers: Sex, Gender, and Culture in Old California.</i> Albuquerque: U of New Mexico, 1999. Print.  Herman, Daniel Justin. "Herman on Gutierrez and Orsi, 'Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush'" Rev. of 'Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush' H-California Resources Sept. 1998: n. pag. H-California. H-Net, Sept. 1998. Web. 24 Sept. 2016. ☐
The University of Texas at Austin	210	First paragraph	Between 1850 and 1910, the United States expanded and developed like never before: filling its acreage, educating its people, and confronting moral errors like slavery.....	This paragraph reflects an ideological bias that is based on factual and historical errors, omissions, and any perspective of Mexican Americans themselves.	Manuel Gonzalez, <i>Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States.</i> (2009) F. Arturo Rosales, <i>Testimonio: A Documentary History of the Mexican American Struggle for Civil Rights.</i> 2000 David Montejano, <i>Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986.</i> Nicole Guidotti-Hernandez, <i>Unspeakable Violence: Remapping U.S. and Mexican National Imaginaries.</i> (2011).	This is not an allegation of a verified factual error, but rather a broad philosophical opinion. This sentence merely introduces the very first paragraph to an entire chapter on U.S. Development and Expansion, including the industrial and agricultural revolutions. There are no factual errors specifically identified, nor can it be said that "omissions" have been made prior to any content has been substantively presented in the chapter, nor do the TEKS require the inclusion of a particular perspective.	
The University of Texas at Austin	211	Middle of the first paragraph in the "Roughing it in the West" section	Robberies were common, violence broke out, and grassroots organizations had to form to stop banditry and revenge killings.	This is a factual error because it glosses over the robbery, banditry and revenge killings that contributed to the divestment of Mexican land and property by Anglo American "forty-niners".	Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush.</i> (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Additionally, robbery, banditry, and revenge killings are noted in detail in the current edition of Sept. 2nd that is before the SBOE, including a section about the California divestment on pp149-150, and Mexican bandits who were heroes to their people on p.147. Clearly the reviewer is not looking at the current content. This complaint is moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	211	Last sentence on the page	Much abuse was directed towards immigrants, who were seen as getting rich off of American property.	The factual inaccuracy of this sentence stems from the omission of historical context that most of the Anglo Americans in California at the time were themselves getting rich off of land they took, often violently, from people who settled it before them.	Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush.</i> (1998) Manuel Gonzalez, <i>Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States.</i> (2009)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Additionally, there is no omission in the current edition of Sept. 2nd that is before the SBOE. The divestment of Californios is addressed with primary source quotes on pp.149-150. This complaint is moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	211-213	Sentence that begins on 211 and ends at the top of 213	In April 1850, California passed the Foreign Miner's Tax, which charged non-Americans \$20 per month to mine.1 After just a year, thousands of Mexicans, Chileans, and above all, Chinese, left California.	It is factually incorrect to refer to the Foreign Miner's Tax without describing its effect on Californios, Mexicans granted American citizenship by the Treaty of Guadalupe.	Manuel Gonzalez, <i>Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States.</i> (2009) Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush</i> (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Additionally, the Foreign Miner's Tax is addressed in detail on p. 147 in the current edition of Sept 2nd that is before the SBOE, making this complaint moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	213	Middle sentence of the second paragraph on the page	These provided jobs for those who were unwelcome at mining sites, especially Indians, who served as porters, the Chinese, who became cooks and laundrymen, and Irish and Germans, who produced cheese, bread, and alcohol.	The factual error in this sentence stems from the glossing over of the violence that made people "unwelcome at mining sites" and the racialized power undergirding their economic and political subjection.	Manuel Gonzalez, <i>Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States.</i> (2009) Leonard Pitt, <i>The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900.</i> (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush</i> (1998)	Reviewer continues to make allegations of error of omission by "glossing over" content. The current edition of Sept. 2nd includes Discrimination against Native Americans, Chinese, and Latin Americans throughout Chapter 5 and Chapter 7. See pages 147-149 for one section during the Gold Rush, as well as the inset on Mexican-American Antonion Coronel and Chilean Vicente Perez Rosales on p.152. Prejudice towards immigrants in general is discussed throughout Chapter 7, especially in the section on Restrictionism and immigration quotas 232-234. This complaint is moot.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	213	Last two sentences of the second paragraph on the page	In 1872, the Mining Act codified proper protocol for developing mines and legalized squatters' claims to land they were excavating. This helped stabilize mining communities and settle the thousands of migrants who had come.	These sentences omit the illegality of squatters occupying and divesting Mexican Americans and Native Americans in California of their land and property who settled the region long before the Anglo American incursions of 1849.	Manuel Gonzalez, Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States. (2009) Leonard Pitt, The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900. (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Additionally, the referenced divestment of Californios is discussed on pp.149-150 in the Sept 2nd edition submitted to TEA, making this complaint moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	213	Third sentence of the second paragraph	Many of their fledgling cities, which had been small, diverse communities run by military governors and visited frequently by Indians, suddenly found themselves burgeoning with international miners and shopkeepers.	This sentence presents a factual error because it assumes there was no local government outside of "military governors". In fact, there was a non-military politically elected governor named Pio Pico until 1846.	Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush. (1998)	There is no verified factual error in this sentence. Mexican governors--military, elected, or otherwise-- had to be replaced after 1848, and internal order was threatened by the overwhelming migration of miners and pioneers. See Publishers Comments in Row 59.  Additionally, reviewer fails to note that Pio Pico is mentioned as a California governor on p.147	Owens, Kenneth N. Riches for All: The California Gold Rush and the World. Lincoln: U of Nebraska, 2002. Print.
The University of Texas at Austin	213	Second sentence of the last paragraph	Californios were shocked to find their gigantic haciendas being squatted on by tens of thousands of new residents.	This sentence refers to "squatters" as "new residents" but does not discuss or include the definition of squatter listed in the margin. It's factually incorrect to not address the illegality of squatting.	Leonard Pitt, The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1900. (1966) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush. (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for inclusion of additional content not required. The definition for Squatter was in the original content and still is in the September 2nd Edition submitted to the TEA. The definition of Squatter on p.149 contains illegality. There is no requirement that it be repeatedly listed.	
The University of Texas at Austin	214	First full sentence on the page	Proper law enforcement and government bureaucracy had to form quickly to keep up with the pressing new needs of such activity, and Mexican citizens were permitted to fill these positions.	What is "proper law enforcement"? Does that law enforcement not include policing the illegal squatters? In addition to ignoring that Mexican citizens living in California before 1848 and stayed in 1849 were enfranchised US citizens according to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, this sentence is factually incorrect because it ignores the social and political structures that existed before the Gold Rush.	Manuel Gonzalez, Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States. (2009) F. Arturo Rosales, Testimonio: A Documentary History of the Mexican American Struggle for Civil Rights. 2000 Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush. (1998)	This asks questions and requests the inclusion of additional content. Neither of these constitute an allegation of a verified factual error. Additionally, it is a fact that Spanish/Mexican law enforcement for Las Californias had to be replaced with U.S. law enforcement for California after 1848, the latter of which was needed quickly to police the massive numbers of immigrants to California. This took several years, and vigilante justice reigned inadequately in the meantime. <a href="http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com/vigilante.htm">http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com/vigilante.htm</a>  Text has substituted "proper" with "U.S."	<a href="http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com/vigilante.htm">http://www.eyewitnesstohistory.com/vigilante.htm</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	214	Last sentence of the first paragraph	Despite racial tensions at the mining sites, the fact that Mexican-Americans were elected to high public office in Texas and California so soon after the Mexican-American War demonstrates that many Americans had a different attitude toward Latinos.	This sentence is factually incorrect because it discusses Mexican Americas as being elected to "high public office" and that means there were "different attitudes toward Latinos", but ignores the social and political history that quickly made this statement not true.	Manuel Gonzalez, Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States. (2009) F. Arturo Rosales, Testimonio: A Documentary History of the Mexican American Struggle for Civil Rights. 2000 Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush. (1998)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for inclusion of content that is not required. However, the reviewer fails to note that the text clearly discusses Mexican Tejas and Las Californias in great detail throughout Chapter 4, 5, 6, and 7. Both Mexican-Americans who prospered and those were discriminated against are mentioned. The facts about Mexican-Americans being elected to "high public office" in the American Southwest (including NM, not just Texas and California) are correct and not even disputed by the reviewer--i.e. H. Garfias, A. Coronel, R. Pacheco (all in the text).  Text has been amended to say, "Despite racial prejudice and discrimination in many areas, Mexican-Americans found ways to organize and initiate the first changes in the political and social structures of the American Southwest."	<a href="http://latinola.com/story.php?story=2616">http://latinola.com/story.php?story=2616</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	216	Last sentence on the page	The West was diverse, wild, and unmonitored, but immigrants, including many with Mexican heritage, got to take advantage of Manifest Destiny and forge their own future.	This sentence is a factual error because it presents the American West as an empty "unmonitored" wasteland. It is also factually incorrect to say that people of Mexican descent were able to "take advantage of Manifest Destiny" because they were part of what the idea of Manifest Destiny saw as in the way of Euro-American dominance over the land and something to be conquered.	Laura E. Gomez, Manifest Destinies: The Making Of The Mexican American Race. (2007)	This is not a verified factual error, but ideological and philosophical dispute. "The West" in this sentence refers to the entirety of the U.S. western frontier, not just the Mexican Cession region. The frontier was historically an "unmonitored" region with pioneers, outlaws, corrupt speculators, and vigilantes--see Mark Twain's "Roughing It" for a primary source of wild anecdotes, or Richard Henry Dana for historical descriptions of beauty and troubles in Spanish California specifically.  The reviewer's statement that no-one with Mexican heritage could benefit from Manifest Destiny is erroneous because the industrial and agricultural revolutions following U.S. expansion benefited the U.S. population writ large, as did increasing markets for ranchers, shopkeepers, and farmers in the Southwest, increased products and technology coming to the Southwest, the building of more schools and universities, the producing of more viable land through irrigation, and forthcoming healthcare and services which increased as the twentieth century neared. (See Paul Johnson's <i>A History of the American People</i> .) The biography of Paula Loyoso Taylor provides a good example of one fortunate Mexican-American experience, ( <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/flogy">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/flogy</a> ) as does Leo Carrillo ( <a href="http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/archives/la-me-leo-carrillo-19610911-story.html">http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/archives/la-me-leo-carrillo-19610911-story.html</a> ) and Carlos E. Castaneda ( <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fca85">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fca85</a> ). This in no way negates the discrimination and injustice that thousands of Mexican-Americans did face, especially under Jim Crow, which is discussed at length in Chapter 7. Challenges to Californios and Mexican laborers are also mentioned in this chapter on 147,149, 152, 159, 160, and 166. Challenges to Native Americans are discussed on 159-160.  For publisher's comments about the underpopulated and "unmonitored" aspect of the American West, see comments in Alleged Error #101 and #198. Additionally, the text is being voluntarily edited to state, "The West was wild and diverse, but many got to take advantage of..."	Paul Johnson's A History of the American People <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/flogy">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/flogy</a>  <a href="http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/archives/la-me-leo-carrillo-19610911-story.html">http://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/archives/la-me-leo-carrillo-19610911-story.html</a>  <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fca85">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fca85</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	216 - 217	Last & first sentence of the pages	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.	This sentence is a factual error because it claims there was "no pre-existing mold" which ignores and erases the centuries influence of Spanish conquest, indigenous empires, and slavery that existed before Euro-American incursions.	Pekka Hämäläinen, <i>The Comanche Empire</i> . (2008) Ramón Gutiérrez, <i>When Jesus Came the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846</i> . (1991)	This is not factual but a philosophical dispute. There was a great difference between unchartered states in the West and the much older, chartered states of the East Coast. Most of the latter had been established by particular religious and ethnic groups, with statutes heavily influenced by those characteristics. As Juan Gonzalez says in <i>Harvest of Empire</i> , "The new American states were all unprecedented social experiments into which were amalgamated the cultures, races, and political traditions of both settlers and indigenous peoples." And the kind of largescale immigration to the U.S. that characterized the West has the effect of "[immigrants] flinging themselves and their customs into the mix, recombining and redefining, ever so slightly, the locus of shared memories that make up the definition of America." (307)  Text has changed the sentence to read: "...and immigrants from all over the world to create something new."  Stating that there was no "pre-existing mold" in the West does not nullify the Spanish/Mexican heritage of those areas as much as say that in the entire American West (not just the Mexican Cession region), there was no influence forcing pioneers to convert or conform to a particular creed or orientation--as there had been in East coast colonies, for example. See Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> for more information on the pioneers and frontier mentality, and the Jackson Turner thesis that the ability to leave Eastern cities with their particular cultures and codes offered Americans a "safety valve." Regarding Spanish/Mexican heritage, it is particularly noted in the sections on ranching (161-162), and Catholic churches (205). Modern aspects of Mexican heritage--art, music, dance, food, Spanish language, etc.--are noted throughout Chapter 9 (e.g. 323, 324)	Johnson, Paul. <i>A History of the American People</i> . New York, NY: HarperPerennial, 1999. Print.  González, Juan. <i>Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America</i> . New York: Viking, 2000. Print.
The University of Texas at Austin	217	Last sentence, first paragraph	All were in the quest for self-betterment together, and the U.S. government aided this quest by creating laws that encouraged individuals to mine land themselves, purchase it, and keep the profits.	This is a factual error because, following the previous sentence, it claims that laws created by the U.S. government encouraged individuals to profit from land they mined without acknowledging the racialized exclusions of Mexican Americans, Asians, and Black Americans from these so-called opportunities.	Laura E. Gomez, <i>Manifest Destinies: The Making Of The Mexican American Race</i> . (2007) Richard J. Orsi and Ramón Gutiérrez, Eds., <i>Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush</i> . (1998) Manuel Gonzalez, <i>Mexicanos: A History of Mexican in the United States</i> . (2009)	This is not a verified factual error but allegation that the text omits certain content relating to racially based exclusions. The reviewer fails to note that the text contains content regarding Discriminatory laws including the Foreign Miners' Tax and Jim Crow laws are discussed in Chapter 5 (i.e. 147) and in Chapter 7 (e.g. 247-248). Yet, some members of minority communities did benefit from the Homesteading Acts passed in the 1800s. See Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> for some anecdotes. The inset on Nat Love on page p.162 provides one example of this.  Additionally, text is being voluntarily amended to read, "Many were in the quest for self-betterment, and the U.S. government aided this quest by creating laws that encouraged certain individuals to mine land themselves, purchase it, and keep the profits."	Johnson, Paul. <i>A History of the American People</i> . New York, NY: HarperPerennial, 1999. Print.
The University of Texas at Austin	217	Last sentence on the page	They even prohibited slavery, showing the Founding Fathers' commitment to abolition.	A basic Google search will show this sentence to be a factual error because the final, engrossed version of the Northwest Ordinance of 1784 struck out the abolition of slavery in the Territories.	<a href="http://history.house.gov/Historical-Highlights/1700s/Ordinance-of-1784/">http://history.house.gov/Historical-Highlights/1700s/Ordinance-of-1784/</a>	This sentence does not constitute a verified factual error but a complaint based upon a misreading by the reviewer. The sentence does not claim that the "entire abolition of slavery" was brought about by the NW Ordinance. It merely says that slavery was prohibited, which it was. The NW Ordinance in its final adopted form did include the following: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory" Go to: <a href="https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8">https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8</a> for information excerpted from the National Archives.  Additionally, the text is being voluntarily amended to say, "They prohibited slavery within these new regions, even though they could not bring about abolition entirely."	<a href="https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8">https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	218	Last sentence, middle paragraph	The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 repolarized the nation by nullifying the Missouri Compromise and inflaming sectional strife within Kansas and then throughout the nation.	This sentence is a factual error because it makes the claim that the nation was not still polarized after the Missouri Compromise and the Compromise of 1850. The deep divisions between those who wanted to maintain the economic and political power provided by slavery and those who sought abolition was as present as ever before the Kansas-Nebraska Act.	Frederick Douglass, "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July," <i>Speech Given July 5, 1852</i> . Elizabeth R. Varon, <i>Disunion!: The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859</i> . (2008)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a misreading of the content by the reviewer. The sentence does not say the nation was not polarized prior to 1854, but merely that it was polarized and that the nullifying the Missouri compromise served to further polarize the nation. "Repolarized" was intended to show nothing more than that the Compromise of 1850 strategy was no longer going to work. The reviewer's citing Frederick Douglass on this point, who claimed in this essay that American slavery was hypocritical to the Founding Fathers' principles--which this textbook clearly argues as well--seems inflammatory and irrelevant.  Additionally, this text is being voluntarily edited to replace "repolarized the nation" to "further divided the nation by...and then throughout the U.S."	Douglass, Frederick, Philip Sheldon Foner, and Yuval Taylor. <i>Frederick Douglass: Selected Speeches and Writings</i> . Chicago: Lawrence Hill, 1999. Print.
The University of Texas at Austin	219	First full sentence on the page	Opposing the South's secession, President Abraham Lincoln headed the Northern Union and rallied troops to force the South into reunification.	This sentence is a factual error because it misidentifies who President Lincoln represented. He was the President of the United States which included the states attempting to secede.	Elizabeth R. Varon, <i>Disunion!: The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859</i> . (2008)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a misreading of the content. This sentence does not address who President Lincoln represented. It only states that he opposed secession by the Southern states. Lincoln's opposition to secession is historically accurate, and in fact implies his belief that he had authority to force the South to reunify. This is, therefore, not a factual error. Additionally, the text has deleted "headed the Northern Union and"	<a href="https://www.nps.gov/liho/learn/historyculture/secessiontableofcontents.htm">https://www.nps.gov/liho/learn/historyculture/secessiontableofcontents.htm</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	222	Middle two sentences of the first paragraph	The Homestead Act expanded the ability of pioneers and farmers to settle the West by selling cheap tracts of land to anyone who agreed to farm or develop the land for at least five years. This included immigrants, women, indentured servants, and freed slaves who would become citizens with the passing of the 14th Amendment in 1868.	These two sentences are factually incorrect because, not only did it rely on the colonizing of Native American lands, many Mexican Americans, Mexican immigrants and African Americans were in effect excluded from the benefits of the Homestead Act.	Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001) Thomas R. Shapiro, <i>The Hidden Cost of Being African American</i> . (2004)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a debatable position. Immigrants applicable for naturalization, women, and African-Americans did have the opportunity by law to own land in the West after the passing of the Fourteenth Amendment. Limitations due to Jim Crow and restrictionist immigration policy are discussed in Chapter 7. Complicated issues concerning Native Americans are discussed in the Inset on the Dawes Act on page 160. See articles by the Friends of Homestead National Monument of America concerning who was eligible to Homestead: <a href="http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/07/was-homesteading-only-for-white-people.html">http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/07/was-homesteading-only-for-white-people.html</a> ; <a href="http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/08/you-can-but-you-cant.html">http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/08/you-can-but-you-cant.html</a> ; Also see Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> .  The text has been amended to read, "...tracts of land to those who..." Also, "immigrants" has been deleted from the second sentence.	<a href="http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/07/was-homesteading-only-for-white-people.html">http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/07/was-homesteading-only-for-white-people.html</a>  <a href="http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/08/you-can-but-you-cant.html">http://homesteadcongress.blogspot.com/2011/08/you-can-but-you-cant.html</a>  <a href="http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&amp;doc=31&amp;page=transcript">http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&amp;doc=31&amp;page=transcript</a>  Johnson, Paul. <i>A History of the American People</i> . New York, NY: HarperPerennial, 1999. Print. "

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	223	Third sentence, first paragraph.	Additionally, wage rates for farm workers were between \$10.00 and \$18.00 per month, which gave even the poorest a chance to rise from poverty.	This sentence is a factual error because, following the paragraph's topic, it claims "even the poorest a chance to rise from poverty" through the ability to purchase land when, in fact, many Mexican Americans were excluded from purchasing land.	Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001) David Montejano, <i>Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986</i> . (1989)	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a debatable position. The fact about wages is correct, with quote from indentured servant from Ireland being able to rise from poverty, cited from Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> .  Text has been voluntarily amended by deleting, " which gave even the poorest a chance to rise from poverty."	Johnson, Paul. <i>A History of the American People</i> . New York, NY: HarperPerennial, 1999. Print.
The University of Texas at Austin	227	Last sentence on the first paragraph	When faced with robust Manifest Destiny and the modern industrial might of nineteenth-century America, there was little chance that their lifestyle could coexist.	This is a factual error because in referring to Native Americans it claims "there was little chance that their lifestyle could coexist". The racist ideology of Manifest Destiny and the force of industry was, in fact, an enactment of genocide on the many different Native American peoples inhabiting the West.	Pekka Hämmäläinen, <i>The Comanche Empire</i> . (2008) Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001) Ned Blackhawk, <i>Violence Over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West</i> . (2006)	This does not constitute a verified factual error. Actually, the alleged error agrees with and affirms what the referenced text is claiming by noting that the lifestyles were incompatible. Further, the text clearly discusses the calamity brought upon the Plains Indians by the invention of the railroad and related policies on pp 159-160. Apparently, the reviewer misinterpreted the content and then failed to note the inclusion of content on pp 159-160.	
The University of Texas at Austin	228	Last sentence, first paragraph	While some charitable efforts were extended through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—for example, selling Indians food and supplies at reduced prices, or trading them guns for buffalo hide—such measures ended up enabling Indian-U.S. hostility and were unable to lift Indians out of poverty.	This is a factual error because saying BIA policies "enabl[ed] Indian-U.S. hostility" and were "unable to lift Indians out of poverty" obscures the fact that Euro American expansion to the West was intended as a violent act of genocide and BIA policies continued this through the breakup of Native American families, imposing of famine, and cultural erasure through the use of boarding schools.	Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001)	This is not a verified factual error as the content clearly notes that the ultimate impact of the BIA was to foster US hostility. This is not a statement of error but a request for inclusion of additional content stating that westward expansion was intended as a violent act of genocide. Additionally, this sentence is being deleted in the content along with the vocabulary word in the margin, making this allegation moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	239	Middle sentence, second paragraph	Racial and ethnic discrimination also became an issue as black slaves were freed, European indentured servants arrived, Chinese laborers flooded California shores, and Latin Americans crossed the southwestern border.	This is a factual error because "ethnic discrimination" was already "an issue" before the advent of industrialization and the railroad.	Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001)	This is not a verified factual error but merely an issue of semantics. Additionally, the Language in text has been changed to read, "Racial and ethnic discrimination was a continual problem as black slaves were freed, European indentured servants arrived, Chinese laborers immigrated across the Pacific, and Latin Americans crossed the Southwest border. "	
The University of Texas at Austin	248	Last half of the "ethnic hostility" section	In contrast, Mexican laborers were not reared to put in a full day's work so vigorously.	This sentence cannot be defended with any evidence and reinforces the stereotypes it's trying to explain. It's a factual error to make this unabashedly racist statement.	Nicole Guidotti-Hernandez, <i>Unspeakable Violence: Remapping U.S. and Mexican National Imaginaries</i> . (2011) Martha Menchaca, <i>Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans</i> . (2001)	This is not a verified factual error but a misreading of the content by the reviewer who was not relating this sentence to the prior reference about biased stereotypes. However, this sentence was deleted prior to September 2nd, and the entire inset was redrafted to expose and clarify the birthing of a racist stereotype by foreign industrialists in Mexico, making this complaint moot.  Additional editorial change to content will read, "Industrialists segregated their employees and demanded Mexican laborers work the most difficult jobs in the most difficult conditions, while giving the best jobs at higher wages to Europeans or Americans."	
The University of Texas at Austin	249-259	Sentence that begins on 249 and ends on 250	In addition, Indian and mestizo peasants—the majority of the Mexican population—remained poor and disenfranchised.	By this book's own poorly sourced and highly stereotypical logic this sentence is a factual error because it implicitly claims that the majority of Mexico was poor because they were lazy.	Nicole Guidotti-Hernandez, <i>Unspeakable Violence: Remapping U.S. and Mexican National Imaginaries</i> . (2011)	This is not an alleged factual error. The text at no point claims that the majority of Mexico was poor because they were lazy. The context is the regime of Porfirio Diaz which oppressed a large part of the Mexican population, especially Indian and mestizo peasants—thus leading to the Mexican Revolution and land reform goals. Citation about 2-3% land ownership: <a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm</a> .  In text, the sentence has been replaced with, "In addition, by 1910, less than 3% of the Mexican population were titled landowners, and only 10% of Indian villages retained land." ☐	<a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/Diaz.htm</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	98	First two paragraphs, under "Spanish Decline in the 1700s"	Omission of facts rather than factual error. Passages below are provided to contextualize the explanation.  "During the 1500s, Spain was powerful. The country had been dubbed by Pope Alexander VI as the nation meant to carry the torch of Catholicism to the entire western hemisphere. The Spanish were to subdue and convert the people of the New World and then move on to Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. With that commission, Spain's empire grew for two centuries through exploration and conquest. They became the wealthiest nation in Europe and the principal architect of the New World.  During the eighteenth century, however, Spain declined in power. Their mismanagement of colonial wealth caused them to lose hold of their empire. The Spanish were spending too much, making too little, and exploiting their colonies. Signs of Spanish demise had been heralded as early as 1588, when an upstart British navy defeated the formidable Spanish Armada."	The authors are discussing the decline of the Spanish Empire (and its connection to Mexican Independence), but their failure to adequately address the Caste System in their previous chapter removes one of the most important causal elements from the discussion. Without a solid understanding of the effects that the caste system had on New Spain's society and the subsequent resentments it engendered between groups, it minimizes the ability of the students to understand the social dynamics and political alignments that arose before and during (as well after) the Independence movement.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is not a factual error but alleged error by omission. However, the course is not MAS but special topics in social studies and does not require the inclusion of such information. There is adequate information about stratification and division within Mexican society in this text, including between royalists and liberals, and the tension between peninsulares, criollos, and mestizos and indians--e.g. pp. 46-47, 56, 68-69, 72, 80. More generally, issues related to socioeconomic inequality and racial disparity are discussed throughout the text as it is an integral part of Mexican-American history.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	110	First paragraph, first sentence	Using biased language rather than factual error.  "Between 1815 and 1821, the Mexican revolution continued mainly through guerrilla warfare—looting, burning, and the sacking of cities."	The selection of certain words like "massacre" and "sacking" to describe the actions of the Independence army are designed to deliberately prejudice the reader against those involved in the Independence movement. Such words underscore the author's belief in the illegitimacy of the protagonist and their cause, especially since they do not use similar language in describing the actions of the Monarchist forces (who were equally cruel in their actions).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a debatable opinion. It is commonly stated that from 1815-1821, Generals Victoria and Guerrero and led a guerrilla war campaign to continue the fight for independence. As mexicanhistory.org states, "For the next 5 years the movement was little more than guerrilla fighting by a number of independent bands without coordination. After awhile only two major bands remained, one led by Guadalupe Victoria with about 2,000 troops around Puebla and Vicente Guerrero with about 1,000 around Oaxaca." Britannica also states, "Scattered but dwindling guerrilla bands kept alive the populist, republican, nationalist tradition of Hidalgo and Morelos." Also, see Philip Russell's <i>the History of Mexico: from Pre-Conquest to Present</i> (2011) for a detailed account of the movement of guerrilla bands who "burned haciendas, looted towns, and drove off cattle in areas supporting the Crown." (122) Russell then describes the Spanish pursuit of them, with escalating violence including a "scorched-earth policy" on both sides. Similarly, Russell states, "Following Morelos' death, the nature of the independence struggle changed dramatically...The movement became more atomized, more rural, and lost its appeal to the urban elite...Rebels attacked, withdrew, and then hit another place...As historian Virginia Guedea commented, 'Civil order ceased to exist and the armed struggle, the guerrilla war, became the new way of life for everyone.' " (127)  The text has been amended by deleting "looting, sacking, burning of cities" in the description. Sentences have been edited to say, "Between 1815 and 1821, the Mexican revolution continued mainly through guerrilla warfare under two new revolutionary leaders, General Guadalupe Victoria and General Vicente Guerrero. These men sustained the insurgency against Spanish royalist troops, but the amount of violence on both sides alienated criollos and intellectuals who had supported Mexican independence at first..."	Philip Russell's <i>the History of Mexico: from Pre-Conquest to Present</i> (2011)
The University of Texas at El Paso	108	First paragraph	"Near the U.S. border, however, at the Wells of Bajan, Coahuila, the revolutionaries found out they had been betrayed by one of their own men and were ambushed by the Spanish army."	The authors' knowledge of historical geography is suspect as the Noria de Bajan, Coahuila, (the place where Miguel Hidalgo, the initial leader of the Independence movement was betrayed and captured) was located 600 miles from the U.S./ Mexico Border in 1811, hardly what anyone would refer to as "near" the border as the author claims.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute verified factual error, but debatable opinion. The issue of the border was heavily contested. However, that the Rio Grande was the border as accepted by President Lincoln is proven by his vehemence to defend this position in a speech to Congress. Additionally, "Near" is a relative term, and in consideration of Mexico and U.S. geography, with Acata de Bajan only 200 miles from Laredo TX, this would constitute near. The account of Hidalgo's betrayal describes his moving north towards Nuevo Leon to meet Elizondo and buy supplies from the United States--or, "to meet to rally support from Spanish Tejanos and U. S. partisans." These arrangements are not that far from the present day border of the Rio Grande--and it should be noted that this betrayal took place before the borderlands had been defined by Adams-Onis in 1819. However, due to the fact that the Rio Grande was not officially the U.S. border at that time, authors are willing to change the language to avoid this confusion. Additionally, the text is being amended to delete, "Near the U.S. border, however" and beginning the sentence with " At the Wells of Bajan..."	<a href="http://www.lmtonline.com/art_of_living/article_41f3bf3e-6dfd-5330-be87-a13d3167de6e.html">http://www.lmtonline.com/art_of_living/article_41f3bf3e-6dfd-5330-be87-a13d3167de6e.html</a>  maps.google.com  <a href="http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/lincoln/lincoln1/1:444?rgn=div1;view=fulltext">http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/lincoln/lincoln1/1:444?rgn=div1;view=fulltext</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	108	Second paragraph, under "Second Phase of War"	Inadequate amount of information.  "Following Hidalgo's execution, leadership passed to Father José María Morelos, a mestizo priest. Morelos preached even more radically than did Hidalgo, by adding abolition and redistribution of land to mestizos and slaves to the original goal of Mexican independence. In 1813, Morelos convened the Congress of Chilpancingo where Mexican representatives officially declared independence from Spain. War against Spanish forces ensued and, in 1815, Morelos was captured and executed as a traitor to Spain. He became the second hero of Mexican independence after Father Hidalgo, and was extolled by Napoleon who is known to have said, "With three such men as José Morelos, I could conquer the world."	The authors dedicate all of one short paragraph to the Morelos phase of the war, which is astounding. Jose Maria Morelos took over the leadership of the independence movement after the death of Hidalgo and is both one of the best military leaders of that war and arguably its most important intellectual. It was during his phase, that the Mexican Congress begins to take form and the philosophical underpinnings of Mexican Independence are articulated (in strong measure by Morelos himself). Dedicating one short paragraph to this era is as absurd as casually mentioning there was a Continental Congress in 1776 and then moving on to Yorktown. The authors do not even examine how the fall of Napoleon (and liberation of Spain from the French) negatively affected the independence movement in Latin America. They do cherry pick one of Morelos's documents (page 109) designed to curb infighting at the early stages of the independence movement that provides an erroneous philosophical image of Morelos.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	There is no verified factual error even alleged. Reviewer simply alleges that the lack of development of Morelos constitutes a verified factual error because the reviewer is subjectively requesting the inclusion of content not required. Reviewer appears to be under the mistaken belief that this is a MAS course. It is not, rather it is Special Topics in Social Studies. The text has received 100% of TEKS, so there is absolutely no requirement to include more information on any one topic in the text. Additionally, it is a shame that the reviewer feels the need to denigrate an important primary source by Father Morelos as "an erroneous philosophical image." What image does the reviewer believe is better to present? This is nothing more than subjective opinion. Morelos' document against a war between the castas is especially important in the context of rallying diverse peoples to the cause of Mexican independence from different races and social classes that made up insurgents. Acuna says, "On the eve of the Mexican Revolution [sic: War for Independence], Mexico did not yet have a set national identity...the new nation was racially diverse." (34) And "We should not romanticize this society as egalitarian. Though most of the inhabitants were non-European, the elites were recently immigrated Spaniards and/or their criollo children. The vast numbers of subjects were castas, those of mixed race" where "although there was diversity, race established privilege and the more Spanish the subject appeared, the more privileges that person had." (34). In this context, the primary source document authored by Morelos should be welcome. To hear Morelos' "Mexico first" call to independence straight from a primary source document, and have students deduce Morelos' virtues themselves, is better than adding another paragraph to support a "philosophical image."	Occupied America: A History of Chicanos, Rodolfo F. Acuna, p. 34
The University of Texas at El Paso	110	First paragraph	"Between 1815 and 1821, the Mexican revolution continued mainly through guerrilla warfare—looting, burning, and the sacking of cities. The two new revolutionary leaders, General Guadalupe Victoria and General Vicente Guerrero, led their men well, but alienated criollos and intellectuals who had supported independence at first."	Characterizing the insurgency from 1815-1821 as a series of crimes appears to be deliberately designed to prejudice the reader against the people leading the insurgent forces and by extension, the idea of Mexican Independence.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is an identical repeat of alleged error number 83. The text does not say this was criminal but highlights its effects on the Mexican aristocracy, including those who were pro-Revolution. It is a fact that guerrilla warfare alienated previous supporters for independence. Lucas Alaman, from whom a primary document appears on p.126, was a notable case. TR Fehrenbach wrote, "One young criollo of Guanajuato, Lucas Alaman, never forgot the horror as he hid with his family behind locked doors listening to the roar of the mob and the cries of the victims...Appalled by the massacre, the surviving criollos of Guanajuato refused to have anything to do with the government Hidalgo tried to erect in the city...Most Creole families were for freedom from the gauchupines but were horrified of anything that smacked of social revolution." ( <i>Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico</i> ) Similarly, Britannica states, "The Guanajuato massacre swung moderate and undecided support behind the viceroy's efforts to crush the Hidalgo rebellion, less a full-scale caste war ensue."  See Publisher's Comment #83 for edited sentences.	<i>Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico, TR Fehrenbach</i>
The University of Texas at El Paso		Should be somewhere in chapter 3.	Absence of historical fact.	There was considerable insurgent activity in Texas, especially the Gutierrez/ McGee expedition and the activities of Dr. James Long. These are completely missing from the narrative and are quite important as they are important precursors to understanding the future relations between the US and Mexico in that region, as well as the bonds the Texas borderlands had with encroaching American frontier.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This Alleged Error is almost identical to Alleged Error #37. See publisher's remarks there about the Borderlands coverage. About the Gutierrez-Magee expedition, there is absolutely no requirement to include such information, nor can omission of such unrequired content be deemed a verified factual error. Reviewer continues to mistake this course for a MAS course. It is not; it is Special Topics in Social Studies, for which the text received 100% of TEKS coverage.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso		Should be somewhere in chapter 3.	Absence of historical fact.	The authors fail to mention what was happening in places like New Mexico and California during the War of Independence. This exclusion is inexcusable as it ignores the effect that the War of Independence had upon the largest Mexican population in the region (45,000) that would one day form part of the United States. This includes the emergent trade routes between Santa Fe and the Western United States.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for additional content that is not required. However, the Early history of Texas, New Mexico, and California are discussed at length in Chapter 5, along with the Santa Fe Trail and related trade routes. Clearly the reviewer did not read the entire content.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	110-111	The two paragraphs under "Liberalism in Spain"	Insufficient analysis of historical time period.  "In 1820, a new King of Spain, Ferdinand VII, was forced to implement a constitution that would have enforced a lot of social reforms both at home and abroad—a constitutional monarchy where all men would be allowed to vote, have freedom of the press, participate in the free market, and own land. Royalists in Mexico were suddenly very upset because obeying the Spanish king would mean instituting these reforms and losing the special status they were fighting for. They reasoned that the only way to prevent such radical transformation from taking place was to immediately declare Mexico independence. If Mexico were independent, they would not have to implement the new Spanish constitution and lose their power and privileges.  Almost overnight, royalist forces that had been fighting Mexican rebels suddenly allied with the rebels. The commander of the royalist army, General Agustín de Iturbide, sought out the commander of the revolutionaries, General Guerrero, and signed a conspiratorial agreement to join forces on February 24, 1821. The agreement, the Plan of Iguala, stated that when Mexico was finally liberated from Spanish rule, there would be a new Mexican monarchy with an established Catholic Church and equality for all social and ethnic groups, including Europeans, criollos, Africans, Indians, etc. In this way, all of New Spain united for independence whether they were a radical insurrectionist or royalist clergyman. Everyone agreed that Mexico's first step was freedom and that the details could be sorted out afterwards."	The authors do not understand the relationship and history between Spanish Liberals and the Spanish monarchy and how that affected the independence movements in Mexico and the rest of Latin America. The first effort at forming a constitutional monarchy in Spain took place in 1812, and was originally designed to include participation from Latin American representatives. King Ferdinand VII was unwilling to compromise or curb his power and that effort as well as the one in 1820, failed.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error. The synopsis within the text of why former Royalists suddenly became conservatives in favor of Mexican independence is correct, and is commonly described in the literature. The reviewer is requesting a more detailed history of Spanish constitutional monarchy in 1812 that is simply not required content. However, the liberal reforms in Europe that were inaugurated in Mexico through Bourbon rule and polarized royalists in Spain from constitutionalists by the Napoleonic era are discussed in depth on page 72.	Britannica Macropedia gives a similar summary as the text that is being critiqued on p.76: "Mexican independence came about almost by accident when constitutionalists in Spain led a rebellion that, in 1820, forced Ferdinand VII to reinstate the liberal constitution of 1812. Conservatives in Mexico, alarmed that anticlerical liberals would threaten their religious, economic, and social privileges, saw independence from Spain as a method of sparing New Spain from such changes. They found a spokesman in Agustín de Iturbide...While ostensibly fighting Guerrero, Iturbide was in fact negotiating with him to join a new independence movement. In 1821, they issued the Plan de Iguala, a conservative document that declared that the Mexican nation was to be independent, that its religion was to be Roman Catholicism, and that its inhabitants were to be united without distinction between European and Mexican...In one of the ironies of history, a conservative Mexico had gained independence from a temporarily liberal Spain...Independence had been the point on which republicans and conservatives alike could agree."
The University of Texas at El Paso	111-112	The two paragraphs under "The War Ends"	"Volunteers from all over Mexico joined Iturbide's army, which ensured Mexican victory in the capital. Six months later, on August 24, 1821, General Iturbide and the captain of the Spanish army signed the Treaty of Córdoba that established Mexican independence. The treaty offered the Spanish royal family the chance to send someone to rule Mexico as the first Mexican emperor. In response, Spain not only refused the position, but rejected the entire treaty. They would not formally recognize Mexican freedom until fifteen years later, in 1836. Iturbide therefore became "Agustín I of Mexico," the first Mexican emperor. He marched into Mexico City on September 27, 1821, where the viceroy had already resigned. Iturbide and 34 others then formally signed the Declaration of Independence of the Mexican Empire, which established Mexico as an independent, centrally controlled nation. Not all the delegates at the convention signed the document. Notably, the two revolutionary generals who had led years of insurgency, General Victoria and General Guerrero, did not sign. Mexico was not united, but at last it was free."	The conclusion of Mexican Independence was clumsily written, and fails to mention the central role of Juan O'Donohu (the last Spanish viceroy) in helping consolidate Mexican Independence.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is an alleged error of omission, not a factual error. There is no requirement for such content in Special Topics in Social Studies. No MAS course was adopted. Additionally, the last viceroy's acceptance of Mexican independence—and his resignation—is mentioned in the text on p.76. The reviewer's request that more information be given about O'Donohu does not constitute a verified factual error.  Text is voluntarily being edited to add "the last Spanish viceroy, Captain Juan O'Donohu, ..."	
The University of Texas at El Paso	115	The two paragraphs under "Central America leaves the Empire"	"In 1823, Central Americans broke away from the First Mexican Empire to form the Federal Republic of Central America. . . . As a result, the First Mexican Empire lost one-third of its territory."	In addition, the author makes a claim that when the territories of Central America broke away from Mexico in 1823 to form their own nation, Mexico lost one third of its territory. In 1823, Central America accounted for 9% (176,000 sq mi) of total Mexican land (1,960,000 sq. mi) or 1/11th.... Hardly 1/3rd.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	While these numbers presented by the reviewer are questionable, in the absence of contrary authority text will be amended to replace "one-third" with "a significant part of its territory and population."  The loss of Central America, both in square mileage and in population, divested the First Mexican Empire of a significant portion of citizenry and territory. The 9% quoted by the reviewer is suspect. Additionally, the exact borders and square mileage of the Mexican Cession territory shifted many times in history—including with the independence of Texas in 1835—so that its square mileage and population can be thrown off in calculations, depending on the perspective of the one doing calculating—i.e. whether one includes Texas or not, the Rio Grande border or not, whether certain parts of Oklahoma and Colorado are included, etc. Calculating the precise square mileage of Central America's break away is difficult for similar reasons.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	114	First paragraph, under "Central America Breaks Away"	"When Iturbide was declared Emperor of Mexico in 1821, Mexico naturally assumed control over Central America and incorporated its five provinces into the First Mexican Empire."	The authors fail to illustrate the full territorial extent of the new nation of Mexico in 1821.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for additional content that is not required. However, the scope of the First Mexican Empire is discussed with map on page 112 of the original content, (now pp.76-77 in the September 2nd Edition.) Obviously reviewer completely failed to review content.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	115	Second paragraph, under "Central America leaves the Empire"	Absence of historical analysis.  "There was concern that Guatemalans would dominate Central American government and economy if they all stayed united, so in 1838, with civil wars breaking out all over the region, the five Central American states separated and became independent countries."	The author makes a further mistake in another part of the text suggesting that Central America broke away from Mexico in 1838. Considering that the first decade of Mexican independence (especially the presidency of Guadalupe Victoria) is very important for understanding much of the next 4 decades of Mexican history, not to mention the very important event that lead to the Texas Revolution and the Mexican American War, this section is shamefully thin and bereft of analysis. The author obviously does not understand that the increasingly poisoned relationship between Centralists and Federalists affected the ability of the Mexican nation to develop an effective government, which in turn negatively affected the borderlands.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	The sentences presented here have no verified factual errors. Regarding Central America's breaking away, the National Constituent Assembly, with representative from the Central American states, declared Central American provinces could rule themselves in 1838. Civil war increased in the following years as the Federal Republic dissolved. Regarding the "poisoned relationship between Federalists and Centralists" which led to ineffective government, this theme is explained in depth on p.80 and then resurfaces in the text throughout Chapter 3 and 4 especially regarding the Borderlands/Mexican Texas, and into the age of Juarez--e.g. 108, 109,116, 117, 121, 154, 168 , 188. The reviewer is requesting more on the topic, but this does not constitute a factual error and is not required by Special Topics in Social Studies.	*Slade, William F. "The Federation of Central America." The Journal of Race Development 8.1 (1917): 79-150. Web.  *Kohen, Marcelo G. Seccession: International Law Perspectives. NY: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.  *United States. Cong. House. Foreign Affairs. Boundary Between Mexico & Guatemala. By Chester A. Arthur. 48th Cong., 1st sess. H. Rept. 154. N.p.: n.p., 1884. 7-192. Print.  <a href="https://books.google.com/books?id=t6QZAAAYAAJ&amp;pg=PA120&amp;ots=e7fR6QkgKV&amp;dq=what+happened+to+mexico+when+the+federation+of+central+america+dissolved&amp;pg=RA5-PA1#v=onepage&amp;q=what+happened+to+mexico+when+the+federation+of+central+america+dissolved&amp;f=false">https://books.google.com/books?id=t6QZAAAYAAJ&amp;pg=PA120&amp;ots=e7fR6QkgKV&amp;dq=what+happened+to+mexico+when+the+federation+of+central+america+dissolved&amp;pg=RA5-PA1#v=onepage&amp;q=what+happened+to+mexico+when+the+federation+of+central+america+dissolved&amp;f=false</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso		Should be somewhere in Chapter 3, Section 1	Absence of historical fact.	1. ) The United States was certainly quite active, diplomatically speaking, in their relations with Mexico and were seeking to acquire Texas from Mexico, another undisputed fact that the authors sidestep.  2. ) It is interesting that the authors exclude the Adams-Onis Treaty from discussion as it is very relevant to events that will poison the relationship between the US and Mexico in terms of Texas.  The information, as it is presented here, would be barely adequate for a 4th-grade textbook.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Adams-Onis is mentioned in the text and "The Complicated History of Texas" inset on p113, as well as 117. Numerous attempts the U.S. made to acquire Texas from Mexico are on also on 113, with the whole goal of informing students--as the reviewer puts it--about "The United States was certainly quite active, diplomatically speaking, in their relations with Mexico and were seeking to acquire Texas from Mexico." Whether or not the analysis is on a 4th grade level is pure opinion, however.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	120-123	Sections labeled "Liberation in New Granada," "Viceroyalty of Rio de la Plata," and "Brazil"	Lack of relevancy.	The final four pages of Chapter 3 Section 1 are useless, as they have no bearing upon Mexican American issues.  Mexicans and Mexican Americans are their own people, and while they share many attributes with the other nations of Latin America (like a common language and imperial connection to Spain), Mexicans and Mexican Americans and their history are no more interchangeable with other Latin American nations than Irish and Australian history are to each other.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not contain any allegation of verified factual error. There is no requirement that each page contain the content anticipated by Dr. Herrera. He continues to operate under the mistaken belief that the SBOE has adopted a MAS course, rather than Special Topics in Social Studies. The text never suggests that the history of Mexico and Latin America are "interchangeable." It is interesting to note that he even concedes, "they share many attributes with the other nations of Latin America." This is precisely why the scope of this text includes portions of Latin American history to augment Mexican-American history and heritage.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	126-136	Quote is from first paragraph on page 126, under "Cautious Optimism"	"The United States was cautiously optimistic about Mexican independence from Spain. They were the first, in 1822, to recognize Mexican independence, calling Mexico "our sister republic" in formal speeches. That year, the first Mexican envoy was brought to the White House by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams and introduced to President James Monroe. Just a few years after that, the first U.S. ambassador was sent to Mexico. During this era, a number of the Founding Fathers of the United States made statements about the Mexican revolution and Latin American independence. They had a great desire to see Mexico free and prosperous, but were doubtful as to whether or not it would actually become so. 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 none."	These pages present the author's very jaundiced philosophical interpretation of the formation of the United States in an effort to compare it to Mexico's post-revolutionary formation. Much of the history should have been discussed in Chapter 2 and then referenced in Chapter 3, but even then, the amount of page space dedicated for this purpose (when other more relevant topics are minimized or excluded) serves little purpose.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, this is not a list of verified factual errors in the written text, but rather a personal wish list of what the reviewer would want included as if the text were their own, and if this were a MAS course with specific TEKS. His opinions would be germane to a discussion of the adoption of TEKS by the SBOE for a MAS course, should the SBOE ever elect to adopt such a course. The statements in question reflect the historical position of U.S. leaders towards Mexico as evidenced by the facts and quotes included in the text from Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, and others. See Publisher's Comments in Alleged Error#40.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	137	Last paragraph	"Lastly, Mexico created a republic whose executive branch was too weak to lead and protect the country. This led to instability and stagnation that encouraged dictators to oust the president, causing more instability and stagnation."	The author uses the word "dictator" when in actuality they meant to use something akin to caudillo or strongman. A person can only become a dictator once they are in power, not before. Thus a military or political leader can oust a sitting president and once they are in power they can become a dictator.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error, but merely a debatable opinion. According to vocabulary.com, the definition of dictator is, "a ruler with total power over a country, typically one who has obtained power by force." This would describe most of the caudillos and strongmen during nineteenth century Mexico. Whether or not to call an aspiring dictator as such, prior to accessing power, is a matter of choice. Additionally, words like "dictator" and "dictatorial" are often used to describe Mexican caudillos, including Santa Anna and Porforio Diaz. See, for example, history.com's usage of the word regarding Santa Anna who both "proclaimed himself dictator" and "assumed dictatorial power" <a href="http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/general-santa-anna-dies-in-mexico-city">http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/general-santa-anna-dies-in-mexico-city</a> Additionally, the text is being voluntarily edited to replace "dictators" with "military leaders"	<a href="http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/general-santa-anna-dies-in-mexico-city">http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/general-santa-anna-dies-in-mexico-city</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	138	Last paragraph, under "France"	"Once Spain formally recognized Mexican independence in 1836, however, France settled into trade relations with Latin America."	The authors continue to be inexact in their use of language by claiming that Spain freed Mexico in 1836. There is a difference between the year that Spain finally recognized Mexican Independence, and that fact that Mexico had already been free from Spain since 1821. ☹	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely occasioned by a cursory and incomplete reading of the text. Both the 1821 and 1836 dates are mentioned and defined in the text. The text is clear that Mexico won its independence in 1821 (p.76, 79, 84, 94, 95, 99). However, the statement that the Spanish "formally recognized" independence through the Treaty of Santa Maria-Calatrava in 1836 on p.95 is factually accurate and an important part of the history as well, because of Spain's attempts to reconquer Mexico through 1829.	The Recognition of the Spanish Colonies by the Motherland William Spence Robertson The Hispanic American Historical Review Vol. 1, No. 1 (Feb., 1918), p. 81 <a href="https://www.jstor.org/stable/2506014?seq=12#page_scan_tab_contents">https://www.jstor.org/stable/2506014?seq=12#page_scan_tab_contents</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	142-145	Entire section, under "Latin America's Perception of the Monroe Doctrine" as well as entire page on John Quincy Adams (143) and entire page on Andrew Jackson (144)	Lack of relevance to Mexican American history.	The rest of the chapter offers a salvageable summary of Mexican views on American intentions, but without greater details of American diplomacy during that era, the discussion lacks the necessary context. Section 2 spends so little page time on the relevant history to the topic that is of little use.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	There is no verified factual error listed here, it is merely a subjective request for inclusion of content that is not required. Reviewer continues to mistakenly treat this course as though it is MAS. The course and TEKS adopted by the SBOE is Special Topics in Social Studies.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	152	First paragraph, under "APACHES AND COMANCHES IN TEXAS"	Using biased language rather than factual error.  "There might have been permanent peace except that Comanches descending deeper into Texas massacred Apaches and burned down the Spanish missions."	The selection of certain words like "massacre" and "sacking" to describe the actions of the independence army are designed to deliberately prejudice the reader against those involved in the independence movement. Such words underscore the author's belief in the illegitimacy of the protagonist and their cause, especially since they do not use similar language in describing the actions of the Monarchist forces (who were equally cruel in their actions).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This criticism is virtually identical to Alleged Error #83. See comments regarding the use of the word "massacre" in history.  Additionally, the text has been voluntarily amended by replacing "massacred" with "attacked" Apaches	see line #83
The University of Texas at El Paso	151	First paragraph, under "Sparse Settlement in Northern Mexico"	"The Spanish army did not defend the border."	The authors further claim that the Spanish army did not defend the border. This coupled with a one-dimensional focus on the mission system in California (while ignoring similar initiatives in Texas, New Mexico and Arizona) underscores either the author's historical ignorance or a deliberate omission. Are they not aware that the origin of cities and towns like Tucson, San Antonio, El Paso, Santa Fe and Nacogdoches are the result of the establishment of missions? Are they also not aware about the establishment of a defensive line of presidios to defend these frontier communities?  There were multiple initiatives by the Spanish government to settle the frontier and to maintain peace between these communities and the Native American tribes with whom they came into contact. This included establishing missions to Hispanicize the local tribes, material inducements and military action (for instance, they can examine Hugo O'Connor's campaigns against the Apache in the 1770's). While the war of Mexican Independence greatly affected security in this region, the author's statement is just ignorant.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is not a verified factual error, but a complaint of omitted text that in the reviewer's subjective opinion should be included. This position is based upon a cursory and incomplete review of the text as Missions are in fact covered to a great extent in Chapter 2, including friars' intentions to settle Native American tribes, on pp58-60, and a map of California missions. Additionally, missions in NM, TX, CA are all noted on pp. 104-106. Presidios are mentioned and defined on p.60. The question is not whether the Spanish made efforts to defend the frontier, but whether they were successful. Regarding the northern border of New Spain, <i>Britannica</i> says, "The northern boundary of New Spain remained largely indeterminate until the Adams-Onís Treaty of 1819," and "Throughout the 18th century, there were incessant boundary disputes between Spain, Britain, France, and subsequently the United States, and some territories changed hands several times." Spain's difficulty in populating and funding the frontier is also tied to its financial downturn and political instability as the nineteenth century approached. De la Teja treats the difficulty of Spain handling its frontier extensively in <i>Choice, Persuasion, and Coercion: Social Control on Spain's Northern American Frontiers</i> (2005). The claim that the northern area of New Spain was characterized by sparse settlement in the frontier, underdeveloped markets and funding, and undefended borders leading to significant Apache/Comanche troubles, is very common in the historical literature. The General Colonization laws were enacted by Mexico precisely for these reasons. <i>Britannica</i> says about Mexican Texas that "some 30,000 U.S. immigrants had populated that previously desolate area." In <i>Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings</i> , Jesus de la Teja quotes a historian saying, "Only an expanding, pragmatic, decentralized, adaptable culture could have penetrated the region and put down roots in the face of the Apache-Comanche threat. And this was precisely what Spain lacked. Spain failed to put people in Texas." The lack of funds to support the presidios and military governors is also commonly cited. Again, see de la Teja's description of Texas prior to 1821 where he describes its poverty and lack of defense, including the "nonpayment of the garrison," the high turnover in commanders, "barely enough corn," and "a destitute and desperate military." (81). Also see Colin Woodard, <i>American Nations</i> , who discusses coastal California's large haciendas yet sparse population, which he attributes as one factor leading to its inevitable loss.	Choice, Persuasion, and Coercion: Social Control on Spain's Northern American Frontiers (2005).  Colin Woodard, <i>American Nations</i>
The University of Texas at El Paso	155	First paragraph	Factual inaccuracy and lack of historical fact.  "For the most part, Tejanos and Americans lived in partnership with each other, working to deal with hostile Indians and better each other's businesses. As Americans began to pour in, Tejanos accepted American settlers because they were the gateway to selling their products and supporting themselves. . . American immigrants brought slaves, paid homage to the Catholic Church, which was required by Mexican law, and became Mexican citizens. Some married Tejano women and learned Spanish. In the early years, Stephen Austin was especially respected as a Mexican citizen because he spoke Spanish fluently and interacted appropriately with the Mexican government."	The author fails to note that the Mexican government had a notable problem with large numbers of illegal squatters from the United States coming into Texas and also fails to note that many of the legal settlers from the United States did not respect the terms of their settlement contracts, which expected them to embrace Catholicism, learn Spanish and become Mexican citizens (in page 155 the author incorrectly noted that Anglo American settlers were respectful of these requirements, which is a blatant inaccuracy).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again this is not a verified factual error but a request for inclusion of content and objection based upon debatable opinion. Many Tejanos, especially the Tejano elite who for many years had been seeking attention and reforms from Mexico City (i.e. Seguin/Zavala), had a pragmatic alliance with Americans based on trade and constitutional freedoms granted to Texas by the Constitution of 1824. Note Jesus de la Teja's statement that "Tejano society was complex and led by an elite that represented the region in Spain's legislature, the cortes, and in Mexico's congress." ( <i>Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings</i> ) and "The possibility that Tejanos had their own agenda separate from, but compatible with, the recently arrived Anglo-Americans has been ignored or dismissed (80)." After empresarios including Austin came, many political and economic interests were shared between them and Tejanos, even though illegal immigration, "ill behavior toward Mexican Texans," and general Anglicization of Texas was disturbing to the latter. Having had to first agree to Spanish requirements for colonization, Austin transmitted citizenship requirements to his colonists and followed suit himself, conducting all his business in Spanish. Squatters, of course, did not regard Mexican requirements faithfully, but empresarios such as Austin valued their Mexican identity and did encourage intermarriage, Catholic conversion, and valuing Mexican citizenship. Reflecting intent to integrate with Tejanos and the Mexican system, Austin himself said in 1832, "It is not our interest to separate [from Mexico] if such a thing can be avoided, unless indeed we should float into the Northern Republic with the consent of all parties, ourselves included." <a href="http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/pubarker.htm">http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/pubarker.htm</a>  However, due to the well-known difficulties Tejanos had with Anglo colonization, and the problem that illegal squatters presented, publishers certify that content will timely be edited to include this perspective.	<a href="http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/pubarker.htm">http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/pubarker.htm</a>  <i>Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations</i> EDITED BY JAIME E. RODRIGUEZ O. AND KATHRYN VINCENT, p. 80
The University of Texas at El Paso	154	Should be somewhere under "Conflict in Texas Begins"	Absence of historical fact.	The Fredonia Rebellion and its fallout is absent as well as its role in prompting General Manuel Mier y Teran's inspection tour of Texas in 1828. The results of Mier y Teran's inspection tour prompted passage of the Law of April 6, 1830, which restricted the further immigration of US citizens into Texas.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error. The reviewer is attempting to subjectively amend the TEKS as adopted by the SBOE and require the inclusion of certain content. This argument would be germane to an issue concerning content to be included within the TEKS should the SBOE ever elect to adopt a MAS course. However, a subjective request for the inclusion of content does not constitute error. 100% of TEKS were met in this text for Special Topics in Social Studies, which is the course contained within the Proclamation currently before the SBOE.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	156	Second paragraph	Correct quotation, but absence of essential information needed to provide accurate historical context.  "The first revolt broke out in 1832 at the Battle of Velasco, when Mexicans trying to enforce the 1830 Reforms in east Texas also tried to prevent an American uprising."	At this point, it would have made sense for the author to focus on the political turmoil in Mexico at the end of President Guadalupe Victoria's term of office. This turmoil, and some of its most important players, like Lorenzo de Zavala and Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna are an important part of the causal factors that lead to the Texas Revolution. The abolishment of slavery in Mexico in 1829 and its subsequent handling in terms of Texas required more than one throw-away line, as it is also an important causal element in the events leading to the Texas Revolution. The authors mention the Velasco revolt but fail to connect the event as part of the greater revolt that took place in Mexico that brought Santa Anna to power (whom the Texans allegedly supported).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, this is not a statement of verified factual error but a subjective request for the inclusion of content. However, the reviewer fails to note that turmoil in Mexican politics during this era is discussed at length pp107-110 and 113-116. The Age of Santa Anna with his vacillating political orientations, his new Constitution in 1836, independence movements within Mexican states, general impoverishment of the government and rotating leadership to address that situation--all are addressed throughout Chapter 4. Lorenzo de Zavala's biography appears on 109, and is mentioned on 114.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	168	Second paragraph and image to the left	Inaccurate photo of Zavala with lack of information provided on his significance.	Zavala gets a brief mention and is then absent from the rest of the chapter except for a ridiculously inaccurate picture attributed to him on page 168. Zavala was never a military officer nor did he ever sport facial hair, the image used was that of Pedro Jose de Zavala, a Spanish Peruvian Royalist officer who fought against Peruvian independence, which underscores the author's general ignorance of both geography, history and basic research skills.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is not a statement of factual error but a request for the inclusion of content that is not required. However, Lorenzo de Zavala is discussed in text, and a full inset is devoted to him on p.109. Facts of his biography are correct. The photo incorrectly attributed to Lorenzo de Zavala is being replaced.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	155 and 159	Entire sections under "Cracking Down on Texas" and "Civil Revolt"	Absence of historical fact and context.	1. ) The author ignores the complexity of issues that prompted both Tejanos and legal and illegal Anglo Texans to revolt against the Mexican government, as well as the conventions held in 1832 and 1833 to petition the Mexican government for reforms. Texas was part of the state of Coahuila and Texas, but many wanted Texas to be a separate state. This is one issue that was supported by many Tejanos and Anglo Texans. Anglo Texans wanted a repeal of the Law of April 6, 1830, so that people from the U.S. could once again legally immigrate to Texas, and a lifting or easing of custom duties to facilitate trade. There were even laudable resolutions advocating for the establishment of free public education. Stephen Austin left for Mexico City after the Convention of 1833 to present the petition to Mexican authorities.  2. ) By this point, Tejano support for separate statehood had eroded, as they rightfully suspected long-term Anglo Texan intentions although some families like the Seguin, De Leon, Navarro and Ruiz sided with their Anglo neighbors. The stories of these families, four of the most prominent Tejano families who supported the Texas Revolution, and their subsequent role and treatment at the hands of their Anglo Texan compatriots are naturally completely absent from this narrative -- a humorless piece of irony when one considers the alleged theme of this book.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Additionally, the Sept 2nd edition submitted to the TEA includes all the points mentioned, and are adequately addressed in the chapter, including the involvement of Tejanos in the Texas Revolution. A new footnote has been added on page 110 which provides a hyperlink to mini biographies of eight Tejano defenders of the Alamo. Zavala's complicated history with Texas (and prior history with the Yucatan) is spotlighted on p. 109. Therefore, this complaint is moot.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	160	Entire section under "The Texas Revolution"	Absence of historical fact and context.	The section concerning the Texas Revolution is an absolute disgrace and the author should rightly be embarrassed by its slipshod quality. 1. ) The first phase of the war (1835) is given a slight treatment and does not even take the time to explain the evolution of the fighting into an all-out revolution. 2. ) The text does not examine the deteriorating relations between the United States and Mexico as a result of the actions of the United States charge d'affaires, Col. Anthony Butler, who had speculative interests in Texas and involved himself in the internal politics of Mexico. The worst type of diplomat, his actions, which included bribe attempts in conjunction with his instructions to purchase Texas for the U.S., played a huge role. This certainly affected the Mexican government's willingness to listen to Texan petitions and to question their actual motives. 3. ) The authors fail to discuss that the Mexican government had a legal right to label many of the people involved in the Texas Revolution as land pirates or filibusters, since many were in Texas illegally, thus giving them zero legal standing to either be in Texas or to engage in a war against the Mexican government. 4. ) This is augmented by the author's failure to recognize that of the 60 men who signed the Texas Declaration of Independence, only six enjoyed a legal right as either citizens or legal resident of Mexico to actually revolt against the central government. The vast majority of the signatories arrived after the Law of April 6, 1830, had passed and were thus living in Texas illegally. 5. ) In addition, the authors do not understand the structure of that government as they incorrectly deduced that Houston's appointment as commander in chief of the Texan forces also meant he had been appointed president of the Texan government. That position was granted on an interim basis to David G. Burnet (with Lorenzo de Zavala serving as his Vice President).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	None of these constitute verified factual error but requests for additional material not required or debatable opinion.  1) The events of 1835 are well-documented in the original text, and a timeline added in the new edition. 2) The reviewer's insistence that the authors include details about Anthony Butler and the background of those declaring independence is again personal preference. 3) The perspective of the reviewer that Mexico had a right to categorize American settlers as pirates (leading to execution) is subjective opinion, especially considering the report from Juan Almonte that Texans asked for, but were denied, an honorable surrender prior to the siege of the Alamo (Todish, 1998). Additionally, the reviewer's assertion that the Mexican government had a right to label many of the people in Texas as pirates warranting execution is extreme and debatable. As generalissimo, Santa Anna decreed Texans pirates so he could finally quell Texan rebellion by executing them--on a "punitive" mission, as TSHA describes it. This was an edict, not a decision made freely by the Mexican government, and it was contested by Santa Anna's own general, Urrea, at Goliad. Additionally, Anna ordered the execution of Anglos who were rightfully in Texas as well as Tejano citizens of Mexico, including the Tejano defenders of the Alamo. <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qdt01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qdt01</a> 4) Troublesome political relations between Mexico and the U.S. prior to Texan independence are noted in the account on p.108-110, as is the diverse backgrounds of those desiring independence from Mexico (Texans, Coahuilans, Central Americans, and various indigenous groups throughout Mexico).  Text has been voluntarily amended by deleting "the president" so it reads "Sam Houston was named the head of the revolutionary army."	Todish, Timothy J.; Todish, Terry; Spring, Ted (1998). Alamo Sourcebook, 1836: A Comprehensive Guide to the Battle of the Alamo and the Texas Revolution. Austin, TX: Eakin Press  <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qdt01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qdt01</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	162	Third paragraph, entire section under "The Alamo & Goliad"	Insufficient historical analysis of Santa Anna and the Alamo.	<p>1. ) Starting in 1836, the author is not aware that as Santa Anna was marching towards San Antonio, a second Mexican force under the command of General Jose de Urrea was sweeping up the Texas coast. This is important because the author similarly is unaware that Santa Anna was not present at the Battle of Coleto Creek (i.e. Goliad II).</p> <p>2. ) The author is also unaware that the distance between the Rio Grande and San Antonio requires more than a day to for an army of the 1830's to cross.</p> <p>3. ) The author is also unaware, that Santa Anna's troops arrived at San Antonio on February 23 and besieged the Alamo until the final attack that took place on the morning of March 6.</p> <p>4. ) The author is also unaware of basic vocabulary, as the word executed, in the context of a battle, would correctly be used for describing people who would have been captured or surrendered, disarmed and in a helpless state. The defenders of the Alamo were certainly well armed and they died almost to a man with the exception of the small number (about six) who were captured or surrendered... now those people were executed. In the case of Coleto Creek, the ill fate of those combatants was greatly influenced by the serious errors in judgement by the Anglo commander, James W. Fannin.</p> <p>5. ) The author incorrectly stated that Santa Anna led his troops in the battle. The only troops from the Alamo that participated in that battle were those of Col. Juan Morales, who led a 500-man detachment to reinforce Urrea's 350 men.</p> <p>6. ) The author states that 500 men were massacred at Goliad, while scholarly sources do not exceed 400. Sources indicate that Fannin did not have much more than 300 men with him at Coleto Creek and some of the soldiers captured in earlier engagement added to those killed, while others were spared for a variety of reasons.</p>	<p>A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera</p>	<p>Of these six allegations, five are not verified factual errors but debatable opinion regarding how the narrative of the Texas Revolution should read. Only Allegation #1 merits a correction.</p> <p>1) The text has been edited to include the account of General Urrea at Goliad and ensure that any content implicating Santa Anna's direct presence there has been deleted. Edited paragraph will be amended to read: "Texans sent messengers to warn Americans who were stationed at Goliad, another armed mission a few miles away, that the Mexican army was coming and they should retreat. Santa Anna's troops under General Urrea encircled them first, however, and captured the Texan rebels in a two-day battle at Coleto Creek. General Urrea petitioned for clemency for the Texas prisoners of war, but Santa Anna ordered their execution at Goliad on March 27 and had their corpses desecrated. Including the massacre at the Alamo, the death of over 500 Americans with a number of allied Tjamos solidified a Texan resistance."</p> <p>2) This allegation is not a verified factual error, as the text never states that the Rio Grande was navigable in a day by an army in the 1830s. The fact that the river was crossed multiple times by the Mexican army is simply a part of narrating the war history. However, for purposes of clarity, publisher is willing to voluntarily delete the phrase, "...crossed the Rio Grande and..."</p> <p>3) This allegation is an accusation but not a verified factual error, as the text never states or implies that the Alamo was a single-day battle or occurred in isolation during the Texas Revolution. The March 6 battle is the most famous event and is, therefore, given the most attention.</p> <p>4) This allegation is not a verified factual error, as the massacres at the Alamo and Goliad are commonly reference execution, especially considering Santa Anna's declaration of Texas revolutionaries as pirates deserving no quarter/surrender. In the case of Coleto Creek, the word is especially deserved, regardless of whether, as Dr. Herrera argues, the Texans' executions had any bearing upon their commander's actions or not. Additionally, the word "execution" was already modified in the text prior to Sept 2, and is not in the material currently before the SBOE, making this complaint moot.</p> <p>5) This allegation is not a verified factual error, and the reviewer's overall concern that the role of Santa Anna be deleted or minimized during the account of the Texas Revolution is extremely questionable. Santa Anna was in San Antonio, the general in charge of the Mexican army, and is commonly said to have led the siege on the Alamo. i.e. Britannica writes, "Santa Anna quickly gathered an army to crush the revolt. He met with initial success when he trapped a small Texas garrison at the Alamo and totally eliminated it." His orders to General Urrea to execute the Texan prisoners at Goliad—orders that were obeyed against Urrea's protests—make the Goliad massacre even more directly attributable to him.</p> <p>6) This is debatable opinion, not a verified factual error. Reviewer cites no sources to rebut the number of those who died in the Alamo and Goliad. Regarding his criticism of the stated number—"over 500 Americans,"—THSA online cites 189-257 for the Alamo, and 342 massacred on March 27 at Goliad. This leads to a total of over 500 U.S. casualties as is stated in the text. It should be noted that Santa Anna himself initially reported 600 American casualties.</p> <p><a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qeg02">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qeg02</a>  <a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qea02">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qea02</a></p>	<p><a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qeg02">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qeg02</a>  <a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qea02">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qea02</a></p>
The University of Texas at El Paso	165	Second paragraph, under "San Jacinto"	<p>"Seven weeks later, on April 21, 1836, Santa Anna led the Mexican army back to Texas to deal a final blow."</p> <p>Entire section lacks historical facts.</p>	<p>1. ) The author starts the section leading to the Battle of San Jacinto by implying that Santa Anna and his army left Texas and then came back. This of course is untrue as his forces pursued the Texas Government and Houston's army in the direction of the Louisiana border.</p> <p>2. ) The author fails to mention that Santa Anna was especially keen to capture Lorenzo de Zavala, whom he regarded as a traitor.</p> <p>3. ) The authors fails to mention the Runaway Scrape.</p> <p>4. ) The author fails to note that Santa Anna was only leading about 20 percent of his effective forces at the Battle of San Jacinto (the actions of the other 80 percent are well documented and required some explanation).</p> <p>5. ) The author implies that Santa Anna had a legal right to cede territory, which he did not and by extension implies that the Mexican government had violated the treaty signed by Santa Anna. Even Houston knew that the treaty with Santa Anna was not legally binding, and hoped that Santa Anna would convince the rest of the Mexican government to accept the treaty.</p> <p>6. ) The author's ignorance of historical geography is once again demonstrated as Texas was always drawn with the Nueces as its southern boundary. The land between the Rio Grande and the Nueces was properly part of the state of Tamaulipas.</p>	<p>A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera</p>	<p>None of these constitute verified factual errors but are either subjective requests for inclusion of content not required and/or debatable opinion. The allegations of errors continue to be based upon the text not including content Dr. Herrera subjectively thinks should be included. Additionally, Points 5 &amp; 6 are debatable opinion; the points Dr. Herrera is arguing are the very arguments that led up to the Mexican-American War in the first place. The text does not state that the U.S-Mexico boundary was not the Nueces; rather, it considers the historical debate and historically documented insistence by Polk, and later Lincoln, that the Rio Grande was. Controversy over these exact claims that are being summarily asserted by Dr. Herrera are both discussed and invited within the text, especially by the primary documents included from Senator Thomas Corwin and Abraham Lincoln's Spot Resolutions.</p> <p>Additionally, the text is voluntarily being amended to say: "Seven weeks later, on April 21, 1836, Santa Anna led the Mexican army back through East Texas to finally end the Texas insurgency. On the way, 900 men led by Sam Houston..."</p>	<p><a href="http://militaryhistory.about.com/od/mexicanamericanwar/a/MexicanCause.htm">http://militaryhistory.about.com/od/mexicanamericanwar/a/MexicanCause.htm</a></p> <p><a href="http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/lincoln/lincoln1/1:444?rgn=div1;view=fulltext">http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/lincoln/lincoln1/1:444?rgn=div1;view=fulltext</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.history.com/topics/mexican-american-war">http://www.history.com/topics/mexican-american-war</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.britannica.com/event/Mexican-American-War">https://www.britannica.com/event/Mexican-American-War</a></p>
The University of Texas at El Paso	166	Second paragraph under "Post-Revolution"	<p>"The failure of the Mexican government to recognize Texan independence in 1836 directly led to the Mexican-American War."</p> <p>Entire section is biased against Mexicans, white washed, and lacks historical facts and contexts.</p>	<p>1. ) The author commences the post-revolution section by squarely placing the blame for the Mexican American War on Mexican intransigence on accepting the independence of Texas. In essence, the author whitewashed the very well documented agency of the United States in setting up the conditions for provoking that war.</p> <p>2. ) In addition, author fails to recognize the legal basis (Santa Anna did not legally have a right to grant Texas its independence) for which the Mexican government considered Texas a province in open rebellion rather than an independent nation. Important events like the Cordova Rebellion and the Cherokee War are completely absent from the narrative.</p> <p>3. ) This leads to one of the most egregious omissions in this text, and it deals with the treatment of both Tejanos and the Cherokee in the post war period. They talk about bad treatment for Tejanos as an aside, but are not willing to explore what actually happened and what that entailed. The fates of both the Seguin and De Leon families (two of the elite Tejano families who actually supported the Texas Revolution) are ignored and provide the blueprint to why relations between Anglos and Tejanos deteriorated by a combination of racism, greed and outright chicanery. The De Leon's endured murder, despoliation and exile all because Anglo settlers wanted their lands. The Cordova Rebellion was sparked due to this ill treatment and the fact that in the Texas Republic, those of Mexican decent suddenly became second-class citizens. The Cherokee War, which was tied to the Cordova Rebellion, was tied into the failure of Houston to enforce the promises he had made to the Cherokee, as Anglo settlers encroached upon their lands in Northeast Texas.</p> <p>4. ) The authors attempt to blame the victim to justify mistreatment by suggesting that the behavior of some Tejanos and Cherokees justified general discrimination and despoliation against them. Erasmo Seguin, Antonio Menchaca, Francisco Antonio Ruiz, Jose Gregorio Esparza, the Flores brothers (Salvador and Manuel, founders of Floresville, Texas), Juana Navarro Alsbury, Placido Benavidez and Manuel Tarin are among the notable Mexican Americans of this era that fail to merit even a brief mention in this section.</p>	<p>A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera</p>	<p>Dr. Herrera's complaints are subjective opinion or alleged errors of omission, not verified factual errors concerning historical facts presented in the text. Additionally, he fails to note that the role of U.S. provocation in the Mexican-American War is prominent in the text, as is the question over whether Santa Anna had the legal right to grant independence.(p.113 "Mexico Dismisses the Treaty") Maltreatment of Tejanos and Native Americans post-war are both mentioned in the text on 114, under the Lone Star Republic, as are details about Seguin's negative experiences in the U.S. after 1848 (on p114 and 117). Additionally, this is a historically disputed issue, and not a verified factual error. For example, the validation for going to war against Mexico was stated to Congress by Pres. Polk as: the "cup of forbearance has been exhausted, even before Mexico passed the boundary of the United States, invaded our territory, and shed American blood upon American soil." (p127) President Paredes countered this aggressive claim with his declaration of defensive war, which is mentioned in the text and included as a primary document on p.129 and p.133. Also, Texans had their own reasons for wanting independence, then U.S. annexation, and then war. These three perspectives are summarized on pp. 113-114 and presented for student analysis. It should be noted that this chapter serves only as a general introduction to the Texas Revolution and the Mexican-American War; it does not, has no requirement to, and could not serve as an exhaustive wish list of events that each perspective could desire included.</p>	<p>See for a comparison of general events in the Texan Revolution and Mexican American War: The American Pageant: A History of the Republic (13th edition, AP edition). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2006. Also, with more details about Texas, The Stream of American History, Baldwin and Kelley. NY American Book Co., 1965.</p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	168-169	First section under "Political and Economic Instability in Mexico"	Lack of historical facts and contexts.	The section dealing with the disorders within the Mexican government offers a way too simplistic overview of the changes of government.  The changes in president number is essentially wrong (it was in reality, a little more than half that number) and denotes a misunderstanding. They should rather count associated administration rather than who effectively fronted the presidency (i.e., most of the time that Santa Anna was listed as president, in reality he had one of his confederates like Valentin Gomez Farias actually engaging in the day-to-day governance). ☹	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, allegation of content that Dr. Herrera subjectively would like included if this were a MAS course. The multiple administrations of Santa Anna are standard in basic literature, as is mention of instability and great turnover rate in this era in general. It is personal preference on the reviewer's part if they desire Farias to receive credit for administrating Santa Anna's first term. It is subjective opinion if the reviewers want the authors to "rather count associated administration rather than who effectively fronted the presidency." Notably, this era in history is referred to as "the Age of Santa Anna" (not the Age of Farias or any of his vice-presidents/administrators).	<a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fsa29">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fsa29</a>  <a href="http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/santaanna.htm">http://www.tamu.edu/faculty/ccbn/dewitt/santaanna.htm</a>  <a href="http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Antonio_Lopez_de_Santa_Anna.aspx">http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Antonio_Lopez_de_Santa_Anna.aspx</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	169	Last paragraph, entire section under "Defaults on U.S. Loans"	"In his State of the Union Address of 1845, Polk made the argument that Mexico did not have any intention of paying these claims, and that American honor would be damaged if they let Mexico continue to abuse their good faith. Tensions were mounting."	The authors also suggests that monetary claims played a legitimate and primary reason for instigating the Mexican American War, when in actuality it was a pressure tactic used for political gain (the United States was fond of advancing dubious claims along with legitimate claims to inflate the monetary amounts that nations like Mexico owed and thus hold their economies hostage).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, this does not constitute verified factual error, but mere philosophical preference of Dr. Herrera. The authors don't make the suggestion he alleges regarding monetary claims; the text merely includes the State of the Union address by Pres. Polk for student analysis of a historical document. The alternative side is mentioned throughout the text as part of the Mexican perspective of the war (bottom of 125, 129, 139). Additionally, U.S. opposition to war and Manifest Destiny is mentioned on pages (120 text/inset, 131) with primary documents included from both Mexican and U.S. leadership who opposed the war. (i.e. Lucas Alaman, President Paredes, Thomas Corwin, Abraham Lincoln).	
The University of Texas at El Paso	172	Entire section under "Reprisal in Texas"	Absence of historical fact.  "Hostilities heightened in 1842 when General Rafael Vásquez led 500 Mexicans into San Antonio and occupied it for two days. Tejano commander Juan Seguín drove him out, but not before blood was spilled. Six months later, 1,400 Mexican soldiers invaded San Antonio, and Texas Rangers had to fight them off."	While the two Mexican expeditions to San Antonio are mentioned, the authors fail to note the Somerville and Mier expeditions (which were Texan invasions of Mexican lands) and further distort history by claiming that the Santa Fe Expedition was merely a trading mission.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, allegation of content that Dr. Herrera subjectively would like included if this were a MAS course. The text never implies that the Santa Fe expedition was "merely a trading mission"--no evidence is presented here specifically to that criticism, either.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	172	Second paragraph under "Reprisal in Texas"	Inadequate language used to describe history.  "These petty crimes in combination with the border invasions of 1842, prompted Texans to reconsider joining the United States."	The authors use an insulting term (these petty crimes) to characterize the continued border disturbances and again label Mexicans as criminals and offer a further justification for future events.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Dr. Herrera mistakenly understands the use of the term "petty" to be belittling rather than accepting its accurate use within criminal offenses. "Petty crimes" is a technical term referring to minor offenses that are less serious than felonies. More importantly, nowhere does the text state or even imply that Mexicans were "criminals" as the reviewer accuses. Border offenses including skirmishes and smuggling were described by President Tyler and cited by President Polk as a reason to consider Texans' application for annexation. The border raids of that time were one reason why Sam Houston hoped to awaken American interest in protecting Texas (or as TSHA puts it, "Sam Houston, early in his second term (1841-44), tried without success to awaken the interest of the United States." For information on the raids, skirmishes, and minor border offenses, See Attack and Counterattack by Joseph Nance for painstaking research into border offenses. The raids of 1842 are discussed at <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qem02">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qem02</a> and in the description of Sam Houston's 1841-1844 presidency at <a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fho73">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fho73</a> .  Text is voluntarily being changed from "petty crimes" to "offenses"	<a href="http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/petty-crime">http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/petty-crime</a>  <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qem02">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qem02</a>  <a href="https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fho73">https://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fho73</a> .  Cox, Karen D. "Establishment of New Mexico's American Identity: A Survey of Governance and Events Highlighting The Kearny Code, the First American Rule of Law and the Civil War Battles in New Mexico." *Thesis. Ashland University, 2013. James Madison Foundation. Web. 27 Sept. 2016.  Philip E. Lampe. MEXICAN AMERICANS: A SOCIOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION. Thesis. University of the Incarnate Word, 2013. N.p.: n.p., n.d. University of the Incarnate Word, Feb. 2013. Web. 27 Sept. 2016.  <a href="http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29647&amp;st=Texas&amp;st1=">http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29647&amp;st=Texas&amp;st1=</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	174-178	Starting on the third paragraph on page 174	Inadequate historical analysis of President Polk.  "In 1844, Polk's brand of Manifest Destiny was especially controversial. He did not simply value freedom, he wanted to acquire more territory under the auspices of creating more freedom," along with entire section.	The section "Manifest Destiny" closes with the United States presidential election of 1844 and proceeds to avoid examining James Polk's close relationship to Andrew Jackson and his ambitions for annexing Texas, which predate even the Texas Revolution. The authors add a laughier by ascribing the value of "freedom" to a southern slaveholder who was intent on using his presidency to increase the spread of slavery through territorial conquest.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This is not a verified factual error. Additionally, reviewer fails to note that the examination of Manifest Destiny and its implications for slavery are thoroughly discussed in the text, for critical review on pp. 117 and 120. Additionally, criticism of Manifest Destiny's lust for land is invited through analysis of Thomas Corwin's speech on p.133. Andrew Jackson's attempts to purchase Texas prior to the Texas Revolution are mentioned on p.113. However, Dr. Herrera's subjective opinion that certain derogatory content about Presidents Polk and Jackson should be included within the text is not required and, therefore, does not constitute verified factual error.  Text has voluntarily amended language by replacing "He did not simply value freedom" to "It was alleged he simply wanted to acquire..." ☹	
The University of Texas at El Paso	180-205	Section two titled "The Mexican-American War (1846-1848)"	Absence of historical facts and context throughout entire section.	1. ) There is zero discussion about the state of ethnic relations in Texas during the Texas Republic. Considering the formative importance of this era in setting the patterns of relations and cultural development of the Southwest, the absence of this in a book centered on Mexican American history is akin to ignoring a study of how slavery affected social relationships in the South. In other words, this war essentially creates the first Mexican Americans, so one would imagine that their reaction to being annexed to the United States (before the war for Tejanos and after the war everyone else in the Southwest) would be an important component of the section.  2. ) In terms of causality, the idea that the Texas/Louisiana border was that grossly undefined between France and Spain in the is a load of malarkey and is used to advance the long discredited idea that the U.S. had legitimate claims to Texas because of the Louisiana Purchase. J. Q. Adams, who negotiated the cession of Florida knew it to be so and cynically used it as a bargaining chip in getting the Spanish to give up Florida. Adams coincidentally promised the Spanish that the U.S. would give up all claims to Texas if they yielded Florida.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	Again, allegation is not a verified factual error but a wish list of content that Dr. Herrera subjectively would like included if this were a MAS course. Many concerns raised by Dr. Herrera's reviews about racial relations in the state of Texas are addressed in other chapters he must not have read. Dr. Herrera clearly has strong opinions about the Mexican-American War, but those opinions do not constitute verified factual error. This book attempts to present the facts of the war and surface different perspectives of those facts for student analysis. Both U.S. and Mexican perspectives are clearly outlined. The "state of ethnic relations in Texas" is fully developed in Chapters 5 and 7, which are devoted to racial relations and civil rights after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo formally creates the first "Mexican-American" community in the U.S.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	190	First and second paragraph	Lack of historical context.  "In December 1846, Stephen Kearny arrived and fought Californios at San Pasqual, near San Diego. He then helped subdue Los Angeles. On January 13, 1847, Mexican governors signed the Treaty of Cahuenga, which ended hostilities and initiated U.S. rule of California. The stunning seizures of California and New Mexico prompted much emotional reaction from Americans, who were reading daily updates about the war in the newspaper."	1. ) The authors failed to acknowledge that while Kearney took New Mexico without a shot, the subsequent resistance was considerable as both the Mexican and Indigenous inhabitants of New Mexico began to experience problems with the American authorities.  2. ) Second, California's resistance was not that weak. While the battles in California were small in comparison to the ones in the rest of the war, the author should have noted that the Mexican Californians did not all submit passively.  3. ) The author also did not notice nor inquire as to why Commodore Sloat attacked California in the summer of 1846. Sloat had orders in hand from Polk to invade California even before hostilities commenced. At the time it took many months (more than half a year) for a ship to travel from the East Coast of the United States to the West Coast through Tierra del Fuego (i.e. southern tip of South America). This is an important point in discussing causality and preemptive intent on the part of Polk's government since Sloat's orders predated the start of hostilities and indicate that Polk had zero intention of avoiding a war with Mexico.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	These do not constitute verified factual error, but mere allegations that "The author fails to (1) or did not (3)" which are both omissions of content that Dr. Herrera subjectively would like included if this were a MAS course. The allegation in (2) is simply incorrect; the Text does not call California's resistance weak. Most historical synopses of the war concur that U.S. conquest occurred very quickly. For example, Britannica states that "Without major difficulty, U.S. troops captured New Mexico and Upper California." Philip Russell in <i>The History of Mexico</i> adds that "Many wealthy Mexicans not only did not contribute to the war effort but actively welcomed the invaders." (208). Complicated divisions within Mexico--racial, political, socioeconomic--are also discussed by Russell as reasons why resistance to the U.S. could not always be counted upon by Mexico. Additionally, in the current text, preemptive actions by the U.S. government prior to the Mexican-American War's official inception is discussed at length, including Polk's aggressive brinkmanship along the Rio Grande border. Criticism of that aggression is also noted in the text, i.e. by Thomas Corwin and Abraham Lincoln's primary documents.  Text has been voluntarily amended by adding, "While some Mexican Californians resisted American forces, on January 13..." Deleted "stunning" Added phrase "--both positive and negative--" after "emotional reactions from Americans"	<a href="http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/russell/">http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/russell/</a>  The History of Mexico: From Pre-Conquest to Present, Philip L. Russell, p. 208
The University of Texas at El Paso	193	Second column, to the right of the section "Monterrey and Saltillo"	Incorrect image.	The author inserted an erroneous image for General Winfield Scott. The image that is used is a Civil War era image of General Winfield Scott Hancock (no relation to Gen. Scott).	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	A correct image of General Winfield Scott will replace the current image.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	200	Bottom of page, under "War's End, 1848" titled "Cession Territory Map"	Misleading map.	The map of the Mexican American War shades Northwestern Mexico (i.e. New Mexico and California) a different color from Mexico, distorting their status as part of the territory of Mexico.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	The map has been deleted from content so there is no potential error which may be cited.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	203	Paragraph directly above section titled "Effects of the War on the United States"	"Although some faced discrimination, many now had freedom and could begin to benefit themselves economically."	The author added this statement in reference to those Mexicans who were now incorporated into the United States after the war, and it deserves to be challenged.  Any reasonable historian would argue that very few of these new Mexican Americans experienced either an enhancement of their political or economic freedoms as part of the United States. The average Mexican American experienced a degradation of their political power through a combination of legal maneuvers, economic swindles and even local and state sponsored violence that quickly made them second-class citizens in their own homes. Even the few elite Mexican families in the region were not immune to such pressures and usually if there was any political or economic parity it was in regions in which they managed to hold a significant population majority to counteract the swell of Anglo American settlers.	A Review of Chapters 3 and 4, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Herrera_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Jose' Maria Herrera	This sentence is no longer included in the content currently before the SBOE that was submitted to the TEA as of September 2nd, making the reviewer's complaint entirely moot. [However, were the sentence still present, it would still not constitute a verified factual error but an academic dispute as evidenced by anecdotes about Paula Loyosa Taylor, Leo Carillo, Maria Latiga de Hernandez, and others. It is biased and hyperbolic to say "no reasonable historian" would agree that there was any enhancement to the Mexican-American condition, or that "the average Mexican-American experienced a degradation of power," especially when 60,000 Mexican-Americans lived in the more established areas of New Mexico and Arizona, as opposed to the 20-30,000 in South Texas and the California frontier. Prior to the Mexican Revolution, the majority of Mexican-Americans were not immigrants at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder but what has been called middle class establishment. Additionally, the text discusses those who were adversely impacted, such as Californios who lost large parts of their lands, and Mexican laborers who faced significant challenges during the agricultural and revolution. Specific stories of both discrimination and prosperity are told together throughout this chapter.]	Rosales verifies the existence of this middle class by repeatedly referring to them as "The Establishment"  Chicano!: The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement, Francisco Rosales
The University of Texas at El Paso	264	Second paragraph	"As almost one million Mexican refugees and exiles crossed the border to find economic opportunity and escape religious persecution, the United States rallied to incorporate them,"	Though almost one million Mexican refugees did cross the border, the chapter does not discuss this incorporation in any way.  1. ) The text does not mention at all the recruitment by U.S. agriculture, mining, and railroads who sought low-paid labor.  2. ) The text fails to discuss the experiences of Mexican immigrants during this time period, including segregated schools and exclusion from other opportunities, the immigration debates focused on whether Mexican immigrants could be assimilated, and other specific historical facts about U.S. attitudes towards Mexicans and Mexican Americans during this time period.  Section 1 of Chapter 6 in general lacks historical analysis and accuracy.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	Although the omission of this content would not constitute a verified factual error but a request for inclusion of additional material not required, the reviewer's complaints are moot since all of this information is contained as main subjects of Chapter 5 and 7 in the original content as well as edits in Sept 2nd edition which was submitted to the TEA--including the "incorporation" of the Mexican-American community, the recruitment of laborers by agriculture, mining, and railroad companies, and segregation in schools and society. It is likely the reviewer did not read this material, or they would not have made this allegation.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	272	Second paragraph, also underneath the picture of Francisco Madero next to the second paragraph	"Díaz, however, had no intention of giving up the presidency, and imprisoned his main competitor, Franco Madero."	His name was Francisco Madero, not Franco.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This error has already been corrected and is not in the Sept 2nd edition which was submitted to the TEA, so this complaint is moot.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	308	First paragraph, under "Ricardo Magón and the PLM"	"Magón was the founder of the La Regeneración movement that inspired Madero,"	La Regeneración was the name of a newspaper, not a movement.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This alleged error is identical to the Error cited on line #9 and has already been corrected.	<p>Ⓢ</p> <p>(1) Barragan, Yasenia, and Mark Bray. "Ricardo Flores Magón and the Anarchist Movement in Southern California." Online historical feature. KCET Media. KCET Media/South El Monte Arts Posse, 29 May 2014. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (2) Carr, Barry. "Marxism and Anarchism in the Formation of the Mexican Communist Party, 1910-19." The Hispanic American Historical Review 63.2 (1983): 277-305. Web. (3) Coerver, Don M., Suzanne B. Pasztor, and Robert Buffington. Mexico: An Encyclopedia of Contemporary Culture and History. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2004. Print. (4) Fusco, Coco. Corpus Delecti: Performance Art of the Americas. London: Routledge, 2000. Print. (5) Lomnitz-Adler, Claudio. The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón. N.p.: MIT, 2014. Print. (6) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "A La Mujer." La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 24 Sept. 1910: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (7) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "¿Gobierno?" La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 12 Feb. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (8) Magon, Ricardo Flores. "Sin Jefes." La Regeneracion [Los Angeles] 21 Mar. 1914: n. pag. Anarchy Archives. Pitzer College, 16 Feb. 1998. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (9) Magón, Ricardo Flores, and David Poole. Land and Liberty: Anarchist Influences in the Mexican Revolution, Ricardo Flores Magón. Montreal: Black Rose, 1977. Print. (10) "Mexico". Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (11) Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2016. Web. 23 Sep. 2016 (12) Niemeyer, E.V., Jr. Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916–1917. N.p.: U of Texas, 2014. Print. (13) "Periódicos." Archivo Digital De Ricardo Flores Magon RSS. Archivo Magon, 2016. Web. 29 Sept. 2016. (14) JRevolutions in Mexico Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Washington: Gov. Print. Off., 1913. Print. (15) Russell, Philip L. The History of Mexico: From Pre-conquest to Present. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print. (16) United States. Cong. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. My Library My History Books on Google Play Investigations of Mexican Affairs. By Albert Bacon Fall. 66th Cong., 2nd sess. S 645. N.p.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1920. 3342. Print.</p>
The University of Texas at El Paso	319	Last paragraph	The text states that Latin American "Revolutions continued...still aligned against America and the prosperous West, and hoping that the right peasant leader or military strongman could restore the honor and success their nations were due."	The text fails to explain how this is connected to Mexican Americans.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error. The reviewer again mistakes the course adopted by the SBOE for which this proclamation was issued to be a MAS course, rather than Special Topics in Social Studies. However, the history of Mexico—especially the Mexican Revolution, which would be included within these revolutions, and which bolstered the first great migration of Mexican-Americans—has direct relevance.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	270	First paragraph	"While the United States emerged from civil war in the 1860s and experienced a boom of agricultural and industrial growth well into the 1900s, Mexico descended into civil war in the 1900s after decades of instability and economic depression."	Through this comparison between the US Civil War and the Mexican Civil War, the text presents the US as prosperous while ignoring:  1. ) That the U.S. remained (and in some way remains) torn over the Civil War.  2. ) The creation of Jim Crow and segregation.  3.) The thousands of lynchings that occurred following the war.  Mexico is consistently placed in a negative light in comparison to the United States. This does nothing to assist students in understanding Mexican American heritage.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error. There is no basis to require the inclusion of particular information in the current TEKS adopted by the SBOE upon which this proclamation is based. However, much of the referenced content is included in the book. In chapter 7 especially, Jim Crow, segregation, and American prejudice are explored fully. Lynchings, for example, are discussed on pp147, 196, 200, and 228. Discrimination and Civil Rights are given their own chapter for deeper analysis by students.  The Mexico-U.S.comparison critiqued by the reviewer follows the section on the industrial revolution which is described in Chapter 5. These sentences summarize large-scale trends of economy, industrialism, and politics that can be made between the U.S. and Mexico in the late 1800s to early 1900s. See Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> . The purpose is to lay a foundation for students to understand political, economic, and social factors surrounding largescale Mexican immigration that will begin mainly in the American Southwest ca. 1890 and the ensuing Mexican Revolutionary period. For example, <i>Britannica</i> mentions dropping food prices and the dropping of rural and urban standards of living as factors motivating the Mexican Revolution and resulting immigration.  Additionally, the language is being changed to: The U.S. emerged from its own civil war in the 1860's with numerous residual problems, but soon thereafter experienced a...1900s. Concurrently, Mexico...	Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i>
The University of Texas at El Paso	276	Both paragraphs, under "WORLD WAR I"	Omission of historical content rather than factual error. The only statement to refer to Mexican Americans regarding WWI reads as follows and is the last sentence of the page:  "The first Mexican-American veterans fought for the United States on the Allies' side, beginning in late 1917."	This page is devoted to WWI yet only has one sentence about Mexican Americans. The War resulted in the creation of the predecessor to the Bracero Program through the Temporary Admissions Program, a significant event in terms of US perceptions of Mexicans as laborers who could be brought to the US when needed and easily sent back to Mexico when they were no longer needed. There is no mention of this.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error, but rather a subjective request for the inclusion of additional content that is not required under this proclamation for special topics in social studies. Additionally, the Sept 2nd edition includes information about Mexican-American WWI veterans is highlighted on p.198-199 and the Temporary Admissions Program is on p.230, so this complaint is moot.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	281	Second paragraph, under "Mexico-U.S. Relations Strain"	"Many were sharecroppers or tenant farmers, ranchers, traders, or officials in city government [in Texas]. In New Mexico and Arizona, much of the population and leadership were Mexican, Indian, or of mixed ancestry."	It is unclear what the authors are referring to here. What historians have written about in-depth is the loss of political, economic, and social status of Mexicans incorporated into the United States following 1848.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute verified factual error but is actually a non sequitur. The context of the cited section is specifically the Spanish population/heritage in the American Southwest between 1850-1910- describing the community in Texas, California, and NM/AZ. The reviewer's concerns about "the loss of political, economic, and social status of Mexicans incorporated into the United States following 1848" have already been addressed throughout Chapter 5, i.e. pp. 149-150, 152, 160-161, 166.... It appears the complaint the reviewer has is solely based on the lack of content they would like to see included, which such content is actually included; it is just not in the one chapter they were assigned to review. In short, the reviewer failed to note these sections because they only reviewed Chapter 6.  Sentence regarding the sharecropper and tenant farmers in Texas is supported by <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/aeefmu">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/aeefmu</a> Sentence regarding the diverse backgrounds of NM at time of admission (i.e. Mexican, Spanish, Native American...) is supported by <a href="http://newmexicohistory.org/people/1847-taos-rebellion">http://newmexicohistory.org/people/1847-taos-rebellion</a>	<a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/aeefmu">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/aeefmu</a> <a href="http://newmexicohistory.org/people/1847-taos-rebellion">http://newmexicohistory.org/people/1847-taos-rebellion</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	281	Last paragraph, under "Mexico-U.S. Relations Strain"	"After the Mexican Revolution broke out, large numbers of Mexican-Americans still felt loyal to their homeland and planned to return,"	The authors conflate Mexican immigrants with Mexican-Americans, which are two different identities.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute verified factual error, but debatable opinion. Additionally, the Sept 2nd edition already changed this sentence to refer to "Mexican immigrants" rather than "Mexican-Americans," so this complaint is moot.  Support for this statement can be found in Chapter 4 in <i>Chicano</i> where F.A. Rosales discusses the "Mexico Lindo" population in the U.S. See especially his remarks that, "With massive immigration, the growing presence of Mexicans in the U.S. created large <i>colonias</i> (colonies) in urban centers. The Mexican ambience had been transplanted to such an extent that these little Mexicos came to be seen as "el Mexico de afuera"...Nationalism intensified in the immigrant colonias that emerged from the 1890s to the 1920s...No matter how long the immigrants lived in the U.S., the pain from these violations was not alleviated by...the notion that soon they would be back in Mexico."(56) Eventually, by the 1930s, "many of these young single males, unaccompanied by their families, had left (83)."	FA Rosales, <i>Chicano! The History of the Mexican-American Civil Rights Movement</i> . Arte Publico Press. (1997)
The University of Texas at El Paso	282	Last paragraph, under "Plan de San Diego, Texas"	Correct quotation, omission of facts contextualizing the race war.  "... a race war broke out and Texas Rangers began imprisoning and executing Mexicans and Mexican-Americans indiscriminately,"	1. ) In their discussion of el Plan de San Diego, they ignore more recent historical works, such as Benjamin Johnson's Revolution in Texas: How a Forgotten Rebellion and Its Bloody Suppression Turned Mexicans into Americans.  2. ) Though the quote is correct, the authors do not discuss the effects of this violence from the race war on the Mexican American community.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error, but a request for inclusion of material not required. Reviewer even admits that the quote is correct. Additionally, these complaints are moot since the Sept 2nd edition already includes the Plan de San Diego and the ensuing race war in Texas on pp 195-197.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	282	Second paragraph, under "Plan de San Diego, Texas"	"By 1914, a revolutionary plan concocted in a Mexican prison made it into radical hands in Texas. The plan called for a Mexican and Mexican-American alliance to re-conquer the Mexican Cession by massacring Americans all across the Southwest."	The Plan never mentions Reconquista but right wing, anti-immigrant websites do.  See <a href="http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&amp;psid=3692">http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&amp;psid=3692</a> for the text of the Plan.		This is not a verified factual error but an ideological bias. The text of the Plan itself says that insurrectionists were to "proclaim the <i>independence and segregation</i> of the states bordering the Mexican Nation, which are Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Upper California, of which states the republic of Mexico was robbed in a most perfidious manner by North American imperialism..." It further stipulates that "The movement having gathered force, and once having <i>possessed ourselves</i> of the States above alluded to, we shall proclaim them an independent republic, later requesting (if it be thought expedient) <i>annexation to Mexico</i> ." The Plan goes on to describe "the necessary army corps" to be formed. Following apprehension, conspirators of the Plan were obliged to stand trial in the U.S. for conspiring "to steal certain property of the United States of America, contrary to the authority thereof..." It is, therefore, definitionally accurate to use the word "re-conquer" based upon the actual language within the Plan.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	283	First sentence following "Massacre in Columbus, New Mexico"	"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."	As above, the Plan never mentions Reconquista but right wing, anti-immigrant websites do.  See <a href="http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&amp;psid=3692">http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&amp;psid=3692</a> for the text of the Plan.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	See response to complaint 130 above. Additionally, the content in the text is being changed to delete "and instigate reconquista." The edited sentence is merely a statement of fact.	Text of the plan and some historical background and analysis is in the PDF: <a href="http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/Supplements/excerpts/Spring%2013/9780803264779_excerpt.pdf">http://www.nebraskapress.unl.edu/Supplements/excerpts/Spring%2013/9780803264779_excerpt.pdf</a>
The University of Texas at El Paso	298	First two paragraphs of the page, under image labeled "Dust Storm"	"The Great Depression, which rocked the worldwide economy beginning in 1929, was a tipping point for lesser-developed nations. For almost a decade following 1929, the United States did not have enough internal economy to support its dependents. Mexicans who fled the Revolution in its early phase were able to cross the U.S. border and find work in Texas or California, but those who fled later could not..."	1. ) The chapter is supposed to cover 1910-1940 yet devotes only two paragraphs to the Great Depression. It lacks any nuanced discussion of the repatriations, has nothing on the deportation campaign under President Hoover, and no mention of how the Great Depression helped strengthen the American identity of the Mexican American community.  2. ) There are numerous historical monographs that would be useful here, including Francisco Balderrama's and Raymond Rodriguez's Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the 1930s and Camille Guerin Gonzalez's Mexican Workers and the American Dreams: Immigration, Repatriation, and California Farm Labor, 1900-1939 as well as many scholarly articles.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	These are all mere suggestions of content to be included, and the reviewer does not have the authority to amend the TEKS already formally adopted by the SBOE. There is no allegation of a verified factual error in this complaint; accordingly, this does not constitute an error, and should not be listed as verified factual error. [However, the publisher is willing to voluntarily include some of this information, such as repatriation, prior to the deadline for the final submission under the proclamation.]	
The University of Texas at El Paso	313-318	Starts on page 313, under "From "Moral Diplomacy" to "Good Neighbors" through to "Chapter Summary" on page 318	Omission of facts and relevance to Mexican American history rather than written factual error.	These pages discuss US policies around diplomatic relations, including "Moral diplomacy" and the "Good Neighbor Policy." There are two sentences on Mexican Americans in this six page section.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a subjective desire for a higher % of coverage of certain content. The course for which this proclamation was issued is for Special Topics in Social Studies and there is no requirement for the inclusion of such content. Additionally, it is completely appropriate to include content on larger U.S.-Latin relations in a course on Special Topics in Social Studies to educate students about Mexican-Americans. Both the "Mexican" and "American" aspects to one's heritage should be explored to appreciate one's personal heritage, as well as those in other Spanish-speaking communities that augment Mexican-American concerns. ☐	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at El Paso	268-320	Critique of Chapter 6: 1910- 1940: Revolution and World War as a whole	Omission of facts regarding historical events, policies, and processes that took place.	There is a glaring absence of most of the events, policies, and historic processes that shaped Mexican Americans during this period. For example: 1. ) The rise of US commercial agriculture/ mining/ railroads and the recruitment of Mexican laborers to the Southwest 2. ) The Temporary Admissions Program, a guest worker program, that lasted from 1917-21. 3. ) The culture/ music brought by Mexican immigrants 4. ) Spanish language newspapers that flourished in this time period 5. ) Americanization of schools/ segregated "Mexican schools" of the 1910s-1920s 6. ) Mexican American efforts to gain equal education for their children 7. ) The rise of civil rights organizations such as LULAC, founded in 1929 8. ) On-going immigration debates about the desirability of Mexican immigrants and their children that occurred throughout the 1920s 9. ) Immigration laws, such as the 1924 Immigration Act and how it reflects the place of Mexican immigrants in the United States 10. ) The repatriations/ deportations of the 1930s and their influence on Mexican American identity 11. ) The New Deal and its influence on Mexican American identity 12. ) Labor organizing, including cannery workers and agricultural workers, in the 1930s	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	Again, omission of such facts do not constitute verified factual errors. However, the reviewer obviously did not do an accurate review of the content, as the information listed is already included within the text. 1) agriculture/mining and recruitment of MX to Southwest is on pp160-164, 234-237 2) Temporary Admissions Program of WWI is on pp. 230 3) Mexican culture/music is on 324 4) Spanish-speaking newspapers are mentioned on 109, 150, 232, 251, 254 5&6) Mexican/white Segregation of schools is discussed on 198, 247, 252-255, with discussion of educational pioneers including Hector P. Garcia and LULAC. Additionally, a primary source doc from Hernandez v. Texas is included on p.253 7&8) An entire chapter is devoted to immigration issues, including the Immigration Act of 1924 and the desirability of MX workers during WWI and WWII. 9) Repatriation in 1930s is mentioned on p. 234 11) Labor organizing among the MX-Amer community is discussed on 249-250 and 291-292 with a primary document from the IWW which organized MX laborers on p.213	
The University of Texas at El Paso	268-320	Critique of Chapter 6: 1910- 1940: Revolution and World War as a whole	Omission of facts regarding Mexican American representation in the text.	There is no mention of or quotation from a Mexican American in the entire chapter.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	Again, the reviewer treats this proclamation as though it is for a MAS course with MAS TEKS. There is no requirement of such content, and this is not a statement of verified factual error. However, the content currently before the SBOE does in fact include quotes from Mexican Americans, e.g. pp 152, 159. Chapter 6 includes an excerpt from Ricardo Flores Magon as a primary source document, as well as a line from a famous Tejano song during WWI on p.199.	
The University of Texas at El Paso	268-320	Critique of Chapter 6: 1910- 1940: Revolution and World War as a whole	Omission of facts regarding gender representation in the text.	There is a total absence of women. The research on women in this time period includes the work of Vicki L. Ruiz, Cynthia E. Orozco, and many others.	A review of chapter 6, Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Leyva_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Yolanda Chávez Leyva	This does not constitute a verified factual error but merely a request for content not required. This complaint is entirely moot. Mexican and Mexican-American women have been added throughout the Sept 2nd edition submitted to the TEA in addition to content that was already present in the original edition. Those with their own insets are not limited to, but include: La Malinche, Josefa Ortiz de Dominguez, Lucy Gonzales Parsons, Ladies LULAC, Maria Latiga de Hernandez, Frida Kahlo, Joan Baez, Susana Martinez, Ellen Ochoa. Other Mexican-American women discussed in the text include: Delores Huerta, Sandra Cisneros, Selena Quintanilla, Hilda Solis. Latinas mentioned: Antonia Novello, Sonia Sotomayor, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Isabel Allende.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	101	Second column, top right entitled "Enlightenment"	"a European period of heightened intellectual focus on reason and rationality over religion,"	This statement is a one-sided caricature of a complex historical movement. To support its claims, the book focuses on French Enlightenment thinkers. Even among French thinkers like Montesquieu, whom the book itself (p. 101) identifies as a major Enlightenment figure, a strong critique distancing from religion was not universally shared. The Enlightenment movement consisted of thinkers from different nations with varied views about the relationship of reason and religion. To give just one example, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, whose renowned article "What is Enlightenment?" helped to define the Enlightenment's essence for his and later generations, devoted much effort to reconciling religion and reason in his philosophy.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	While we agree with the reviewer that this is a complex historical movement, this complaint does not constitute a verified factual error. It would be impossible to fully address this issue here; an entire book could be written that would be insufficient to address all the nuances of this issue. While this does not constitute a verified factual error, publisher is replacing the definition to meet with the reviewer's request for a broader definition that encapsulates some of the divergent views to state, "While enlightenment is often viewed as a European period of heightened intellectual focus of reason and rationality over religion, many different understandings of Enlightenment existed, from the Scottish Enlightenment of reason through revelation, to differing positions held by the French, such as Montesquieu's unwillingness to share Voltaire's disdain for religion." The rationale for having provided more attention to Voltaire's version of the French Enlightenment was due to the anti-clericalism that is later seen in Mexico, and because of the influence of the French on the Spanish throne in the 1700s, in royalist occupation of Mexico in 1860, and on educated royalists and revolutionaries. For example, the figure of Jose Maria Luis Mora, who was educated in French liberalism, was influential at this time. <a href="https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.biografiasyvidas.com/biografia/m/mora_jose_maria_luis.htm&amp;prev=search">https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.biografiasyvidas.com/biografia/m/mora_jose_maria_luis.htm&amp;prev=search</a> This form of enlightenment questioning of monarchy and the authority of the Catholic Church mobilizes Royalists in Mexico to fight for Spain during the War for Independence and with the French during the occupation. Additionally, French Revolutionary thought also influences the Haitian Slave Revolts, which is mentioned in the text.  Additional voluntary edits being made to the text include changing "The French in particular" to "One French philosopher, Voltaire, argued that freedom in Western Europe demanded both the abolition of absolutist kings and the Catholic Church." Delete next sentence. Change next sentence to start, "Another philosopher, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, espoused a similar sentiment when he said..." In the next paragraph, replace phrase about Voltaire with "while in Germany, the philosopher Immanuel Kant tried to harmonize religious and secular systems of thought."	Rand, David. "The Haitian Revolution." The Haitian Revolution. Accessed March 25, 2015.  <a href="http://scholar.library.miami.edu/slaves/san_domingo_revolution/individual_essay/david.html">http://scholar.library.miami.edu/slaves/san_domingo_revolution/individual_essay/david.html</a>  <a href="https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.biografiasyvidas.com/biografia/m/mora_jose_maria_luis.htm&amp;prev=search">https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&amp;sl=es&amp;u=http://www.biografiasyvidas.com/biografia/m/mora_jose_maria_luis.htm&amp;prev=search</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	296	First paragraph, under "Worldwide Revolution	"Ever since the days of the French Enlightenment, philosophers had speculated about a new world order free from religion, central authority, and unequal wealth."	As noted above, this statement is a one-sided caricature of a complex historical movement. To support its claims, the book focuses on French Enlightenment thinkers. Even among French thinkers like Montesquieu, whom the book itself (p. 101) identifies as a major Enlightenment figure, a strong critique distancing from religion was not universally shared. The Enlightenment movement consisted of thinkers from different nations with varied views about the relationship of reason and religion. To give just one example, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, whose renowned article "What is Enlightenment?" helped to define the Enlightenment's essence for his and later generations, devoted much effort to reconciling religion and reason in his philosophy.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not state a verified factual error. (see answer to 137 above) Additionally, the content of the book specifically references French Enlightenment Philosophers, of which German Immanuel Kant is not included. Citations that defend the rationalist and secularist trends cited in the book's current definition are found in common definitions of the Enlightenment: such as Stanford University's Encyclopedia of Philosophy: "Kant defines enlightenment as humankind's release from its self-incurred immaturity; "immaturity is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another." ... Enlightenment philosophers from across the geographical and temporal spectrum tend to have a great deal of confidence in humanity's intellectual powers, both to achieve systematic knowledge of nature and to serve as an authoritative guide in practical life. This confidence is generally paired with suspicion or hostility toward other forms or carriers of authority (such as tradition, superstition, prejudice, myth and miracles), insofar as these are seen to compete with the authority of reason. Enlightenment philosophy tends to stand in tension with established religion, insofar as the release from self-incurred immaturity in this age, daring to think for oneself, awakening one's intellectual powers, generally requires opposing the role of established religion in directing thought and action." <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/</a>  Britannica Macropedia says, "Fed by currents of rationalism from England and Europe, the Enlightenment in Spain and Mexico spurred the spread of new scientific knowledge...Political liberalism became a factor when the American and French revolutions called into question the divine right of kings...New ideas...created administrative confusion between the old Habsburg and the new Bourbon administrative systems...Continental events stimulated rivalries in Mexico as contradictory commands were received from the mother country."  However, this sentence is being voluntarily changed to, "The French Enlightenment had encouraged philosophers from different streams to speculate about a new world order with greater freedom and equality."	Stanford University Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <a href="http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/">http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/</a>  Britannica Macropedia, "Mexico" (1991)
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	101	First column, second paragraph	The text refers to John Locke as "working from the Puritan tradition"	1.) The book's identification of the English philosopher John Locke as an Enlightenment thinker "working from the Puritan tradition" (p. 101) contradicts its own claims about religion and the Enlightenment. 2.) The book's description of John Locke as "working from the Puritan tradition" is misleading. Locke was born to Puritan parents, but Locke's thought had little in common with the thought of the Puritans who founded New England. Unlike the New England Puritans, Locke believed that the sole purpose of government should be to advance secular and civil rather than spiritual and religious interests, and argued that government ought to be based on principles of natural law available to those of all religions rather than on Biblical principles only shared by Christians and Jews. 3.) The book neglects to mention that Locke believed in a strict separation of church and state. For instance, Locke's belief that religious practices are not entitled to exemption from generally applicable laws suggests that he would almost certainly disapprove of the types of exemptions many religious conservatives in the United States today have supported in Supreme Court cases like <i>Burwell vs. Hobby Lobby Stores</i> . The book's attempt to convince students that Locke, a crucial figure in the founding of our government, subscribed to Biblical principles on government is inconsistent with historical fact.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a disputable academic debate. First, the text does not say Locke "is" a "Puritan" but correctly identifies his work as within "the Puritan tradition" as is commonly understood. The entirety of this alleged error is based upon the opinion of the reviewer. The reviewer's discussion of "religious conservatives in the United States today" and "Hobby Lobby" is a rather bizarre and unwarranted jump from a brief classification of John Locke. Nor does Dr. Lester's assessment of Locke and Locke's views on Biblical principles provide an accurate analysis and understanding of Locke's writings. The text includes the views expressly stated by Locke himself in His Second Treatise of Civil Government in Chapter 11, Section 135. Locke explains, "Thus the law of nature stands as an eternal rule to all men, legislators as well as others. The rules that they make for other men's actions, must, as well as their own and other men's actions, be conformable to the law of nature, i.e. to the will of God, of which that is a declaration, and the fundamental law of nature being the preservation of mankind, no human sanction can be good, or valid against it." In Section 136 he cites Hooker for clarification of the connection between the law of nature (the will of God) to the law of scripture, clarifying that "Human laws are measures in respect of men whose actions they must direct, howbeit such measures they are as have also their higher rules to be measured by, which rules are two, the law of God, and the law of nature; so that laws human must be made according to the general laws of nature, and without contradiction to any positive law of scripture, otherwise they are ill made." Hooker's Eccl. Pol. l. iii. sect. 9. Clearly, Dr. Lester's position is at best nothing more than disputed opinion, and, therefore, does not constitute a verified factual error. Additionally, to state that "the book neglects to mention" is again not a verified factual error, but simply a subjective desire for the inclusion of content that is not required for the course.	<a href="http://history.hanover.edu/texts/locke/j-12-016.html">http://history.hanover.edu/texts/locke/j-12-016.html</a>  <a href="http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1746&amp;context=sulr">http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1746&amp;context=sulr</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	101	First column, first paragraph, under "Reading the Philosophes"	"French revolutionaries believed that people needed to be free from state and religious authority always telling them what to do. One philosopher, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, espoused this sentiment when he said, 'Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains.'"	1.) To advance its agenda of convincing students that a turning away from religion and unequal private property during the Enlightenment is connected to the development of Communism, the book makes a connection between the Enlightenment and the French Revolution riddled with errors. . . (See also quote from page 296 above.) Rousseau was not an Enlightenment thinker. His <i>Discourse on the Arts and Sciences</i> was a severe critique of major Enlightenment thinkers and their philosophies. Rousseau did not believe in freeing citizens from state and religious authority; his <i>Of the Social Contract</i> famously advocates a legally binding civil religion. Rousseau was a critic of excessive inequality of property, but in <i>Of the Social Contract</i> and other works he supports the right to private property.  2.) The book's assertion that Rousseau would have supported the French Revolution is problematic. Rousseau claims in <i>Of the Social Contract</i> that his ideas on political reform are only fit in practice for small, homogeneous countries like Corsica. When commissioned to provide recommendations on reforming Poland's government, Rousseau's recommended reforms were more moderate than those he proposed in <i>Of the Social Contract</i> and more moderate than those the French revolutionaries adopted.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is not a verified factual error but simply disputed opinion presented by Dr. Lester. This sentence does not even call Rousseau an Enlightenment thinker. Additionally, Edmund Burke's belief that French Philosophers were responsible for the French Revolution was subsequently adopted by many Historians, including De Tocqueville and Lord Acton. Many historians perceive the French Revolution in 3 separate stages with each stage being credited to a main philosopher, irrespective of whether these philosophers would have agreed with how their writings and beliefs were used to impact the course of the revolution. Montesquieu is credited with the first stage, Rousseau with the second, and Voltaire with the third. So whether Rousseau would have supported the Revolution or not is irrelevant to the fact that his writings are routinely accepted to have had a direct impact upon the revolution. Additionally, the goal of the people to be free from oppressive control from any source being a centerpiece of the French Revolution is clearly seen from the first 4 articles of the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. "1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good. 2. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression. 3. The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body nor individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation. 4. Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law."	<a href="http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/rightsof.asp">http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/rightsof.asp</a>  <a href="http://www.historytoday.com/maurice-cranston/french-revolution-ideas-and-ideologies">http://www.historytoday.com/maurice-cranston/french-revolution-ideas-and-ideologies</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	136	First column, under "the Laws of Nature and Nature's God"	". . . first referenced by Lord Bolingbroke and then his former student Thomas Jefferson."	The text misspells Lord Bolingbroke's name.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	The correct spelling is "Bolingbroke." Additionally, while Jefferson was a student of Bolingbroke in the sense that he studied his writings, it is true that he never physically studied under him. Therefore, the text regarding Bolingbroke, including the spelling of his name and Jefferson's association with him, "first referenced by Lord Bolingbroke and then his former student Thomas Jefferson." is being deleted and replaced with "as clearly defined by Sir William Blackstone in his Commentaries on the Laws of England." Therefore, this spelling error of his name will no longer be contained within the text, nor the potentially confusing status of Jefferson as a student.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	136	First column, under "the Laws of Nature and Nature's God"	"The Laws of Nature and Nature's God": "A foundational premise prescribing that nature encompasses certain laws, obligations, and reasoning that align with Biblical laws and rules by which humans should maintain a certain respect and reverence, first referenced by Lord Bolingbroke and then his former student Thomas Jefferson."	1.) Jefferson never studied with Bolingbroke, who lived in England and died when Jefferson was eight. 2.) Jefferson did copy a substantial number of passages from Bolingbroke's work into his commonplace book. The passages Jefferson copied from Bolingbroke's work included criticisms of St. Paul's theology and moral thought, the Book of Revelation, and the divine origin of the Ten Commandments. That is, while the book claims Bolingbroke was a defender of the Bible, Bolingbroke's work in fact made him infamous among his contemporaries in England for his strong and provocative condemnation of fundamental elements of the Bible and central tenets of Christianity. 3.) The phrase "laws of nature and nature's God" was commonly used by Deists at Jefferson's time, who were critical of religion derived solely or primarily from Biblical rules and laws. Had Jefferson meant to refer to the Biblical rather than deistic conception of God, he could have used more conventional designations of the Biblical God such as "Supreme Judge," which was also used in the Declaration. 4.) Jefferson's private letters, most famously a letter to his nephew Peter Carr, argue that fundamental principles of political and personal morality are available to and can be practiced by all including those who believe in no organized religion. Jefferson's project of creating a Bible that retained Jesus's moral teachings but excised references to miracles and the supernatural are inconsistent with the text's depiction of Jefferson as an orthodox or conservative Christian. The omission of this information indicates the book's purpose of deceiving students about the Biblical roots of our system of government.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	Again, none of these are statements of factual error. Numbers 1) and 2) have been addressed as this content has already been deleted (see comment 141). As to the definition and understanding of "the laws of nature and nature's god" Sir William Blackstone wrote extensively on this issue and he very clearly defined these terms and even distinguished them from the alternative term of natural law, which did not hold the same level of connection to biblical truths. Blackstone wrote the commentaries on the laws of England and was the most read legal jurist in America during the time contemporaneous to the drafting of the Declaration of Independence. Blackstone often referred to the law of nature and nature's god interchangeably as the law of nature and the law of revelation. He defined these terms clearly, "as man depends absolutely upon his maker for every thing, it is necessary that he should in all points conform to his maker's will. This will of his maker is called the law of nature....But in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason; whose office it is to discover, as was before observed, what the law of nature directs in every circumstance of life....This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine providence; which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce it's laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures....Yet undoubtedly the revealed law is of infinitely more authenticity than that moral system, which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law. Because one is the law of nature, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other is only what, by the assistance of human reason, we imagine to be that law." Blackstone's Commentaries, Book One, Part One, Section the Second Dr. Lester's statements about this issue is clearly nothing more than debatable opinion and does not amount to a verified factual error. If anything, this book opted to take a more generalized approach to this issue than if they had opted to use the clear definitions from Blackstone.	<a href="http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/blackstone_intro.asp#2">http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/blackstone_intro.asp#2</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	289	Second column, under "separation of church and state"	""the separation of church and state": "a post-Constitution phrase coined by Thomas Jefferson emphasizing the intent that the government should not be involved in the business of the church; often used interchangeably in casual context with the Establishment Clause, which is part of the First Amendment to the US Constitution."	Jefferson used the term "high wall of separation between church and state" in his 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association. The passage's implication ("post-Constitution") that Jefferson's phrase and thought had nothing to do with the Constitution is misleading. Jefferson's views on a strict separation of church and state were shared by James Madison, the most influential drafter of the First Amendment. Madison and Jefferson believed that the Constitution not only limited government involvement with religion as the passage suggests, but that it also placed strict restrictions on government sponsorship of religion. Madison, for instance, opposed government providing payment of military chaplains because it would violate the separation of church and state.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This again is not a verified factual error but merely a debatable opinion. (Jefferson didn't say "high" wall, Black did.) The phrase Separation of Church and State was, in fact, not included within the Constitution or the Bill of Rights. It first entered the lexicon of constitutional phrases in 1879 in Reynolds v United States but was only viewed as obiter dicta since Jefferson's letter to the Danbury Baptist in 1802 served no legislative intent. Jefferson was not even present during the debate and ratification of the Bill of Rights, and his meaning in his letter to the Danbury Baptists was clearly distinguishable to how it is currently understood. This current definition did not show up on the scene until 1947 in Everson v BOE. This decision was written by Justice Hugo Black. The court's creation for the first time of this high and impregnable wall was so clearly credited to Justice Black, not Jefferson, that it is routinely called the "Wall that Black Built." Madison was in fact present at the ratification of the Bill of Rights and his testimony in the congressional record underscores his belief that religion (which he defined as "our duties owed to God" in the VA Const. Art. I, Sec 16) is preeminent above that of the civil authorities. He made this position clear in his Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments. "It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage and such only as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society." This idea of a superior or preemptive right is distinguishable from what the SCOTUS created in 1947. The Court's created definition in 1947 did not even align with the actions Jefferson took as Governor of the Commonwealth of VA, revealing that this modern interpretation is distinguishable from the beliefs of both Madison and Jefferson. Again, this is nothing more than a heavily debated opinion piece and does not constitute a verified factual error.	<a href="http://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/academics/founders/Madison'sMemorial.pdf">http://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/academics/founders/Madison'sMemorial.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.nhinet.org/ccs/docs/va-1776.htm">http://www.nhinet.org/ccs/docs/va-1776.htm</a>  <a href="https://www.loc.gov/loc/cib/9806/danpre.html">https://www.loc.gov/loc/cib/9806/danpre.html</a>  <a href="http://www.belcherfoundation.org/wallace_v_jaffree_dissent.htm">http://www.belcherfoundation.org/wallace_v_jaffree_dissent.htm</a> <a href="https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/330/1">https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/330/1</a>  <a href="http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-03-02-0187">http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-03-02-0187</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	498	Glossary: 8th definition on the page	(See above quotation.)	(See above explanation.)	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	Quoting a glossary definition to the same alleged error #143 does not qualify as a separate factual error. See comments above for why this is debatable opinion, not verified factual error.	<a href="http://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/academics/founders/Madison'sMemorial.pdf">http://www.law.gmu.edu/assets/files/academics/founders/Madison'sMemorial.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.nhinet.org/ccs/docs/va-1776.htm">http://www.nhinet.org/ccs/docs/va-1776.htm</a>  <a href="https://www.loc.gov/loc/cib/9806/danpre.html">https://www.loc.gov/loc/cib/9806/danpre.html</a>  <a href="http://www.belcherfoundation.org/wallace_v_jaffree_dissent.htm">http://www.belcherfoundation.org/wallace_v_jaffree_dissent.htm</a> <a href="https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/330/1">https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/330/1</a>  <a href="http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-03-02-0187">http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-03-02-0187</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	217	Third paragraph, under "The New Movement West"	". . . [the passage of the Northwest Ordinance] even prohibited slavery, showing the Founding Fathers' commitment to abolition."	Claiming the Northwest Ordinance as evidence of the Founding Fathers' views is problematic because the Ordinance was passed by the Confederation Congress prior to the Constitution's ratification. The text neglects to mention reasons besides a belief in abolition that would have motivated southern states to support the Ordinance's slavery ban. Since effective tobacco cultivation required slave labor, the ban served the economic interests of southern tobacco farmers by preventing a source of economic competition. Had abolition of slavery been the primary object of members of the Confederation Congress as the text claims, it is hard to understand why the legislators in the Congress who also participated in drafting the Constitution did not simply abolish slavery in the Constitution or why George Washington was the only Southern plantation-owning founder to free his slaves.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is a repeat of the complaints alleged in line #72. See the responses and edited content. The content as edited no longer contains the language concerning the Founding Fathers, accordingly making this complaint moot.	<a href="https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8">https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=8</a>

## Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	218	Second column, third paragraph, under "The Civil War Interrupts Settlement"	"As support for slavery waned in the U.S. in the 1840s and 1850s, various legislators attempted to abolish slavery peacefully and democratically through popular vote in each state. Ultimately, however, the effort to forestall war and secession over slavery and states' rights failed."	<p>1.) The passage provides no evidence for the alleged waning of support for slavery in the U.S. of the 1840s and 1850s.</p> <p>2.) Worse, the text fails to mention various developments during these decades that aimed at extending and reinforcing slavery. For instance, the text makes no mention of the Supreme Court's notorious Dred Scott decision, and only passing reference to the Fugitive Slave Act. Southern support during these decades for conquering new territory and incorporating new states where slavery would be practiced is similarly omitted.</p> <p>3.) Many Southern politicians supported the Mexican War because it would add new slave states to the Union, and attempts to purchase or conquer parts of Latin America including Cuba and Nicaragua for similar reasons. In 1860 Mississippi Congressman L.Q.C. Lamar expressed a desire to "plant American liberty with southern institutions upon every inch of American soil.</p> <p>4.) The text's claim that holding popular votes in each state was intended to "abolish slavery peacefully" is the opposite of historical truth. The idea of popular sovereignty was introduced by Democratic Presidential candidate Lewis Cass in 1848, who secured his nomination primarily with support from southern defenders of slavery. The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, which allowed for popular sovereignty in Kansas and Nebraska, did not restrict slavery, but extended slavery. The Act undermined the Missouri Compromise's ban on slavery in states north of the 36°30' latitude. ☐</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>These complaints do not constitute verified factual errors but rather the request for additional content not required, or debatable opinion. Additionally, much of the concerns have been made moot because this section was rewritten prior to Sept 2 to explain slavery's role in the Civil War and popular sovereignty more fully. To address the reviewer's concerns more specifically:</p> <p>1) Importantly, the sentence in question says that support for slavery waned "in some segments of the U.S." in the 1840s and 50s. This is most clearly evidenced by the growth of the abolitionist movement, which was strong by 1840. See <a href="http://www.history.com">www.history.com</a>'s article on "abolition" with its statement that, "Although abolitionist feelings had been strong during the American Revolution and in the Upper South during the 1820s, the abolitionist movement did not coalesce into a <i>militant crusade</i> until the 1830s." The growth of the Free Soil Party also reflected this, as did the formation of the Republican Party by 1860 (absorbing abolitionist Whigs, Democrats, and Free Soilers), and the Wilmot Proviso and other abolitionist measures that were articulated after the gag rule was repealed. Uncle Tom's Cabin also greatly affected the American public in the 1850s, not just adding to the ranks of abolitionists but also strengthening the resolve of believers to work harder for it. Similarly with the 1857 Dred Scott, which, as Britannica states it, "ironically strengthened the antislavery movement, because it angered many whites who did not own slaves." <a href="https://www.britannica.com/event/American-civil-rights-movement">https://www.britannica.com/event/American-civil-rights-movement</a>.</p> <p>2) This is a request for additional material not required. However, discussion about slavery spreading in this period occurs in the text in the section on Manifest Destiny on pp 117&amp; 120; it also appears in the discussion of Texas' annexation on pp. 117; as well as the annexation debate following the Mexican-American War on pp136; and where Latin nations like the Yucatan (p116), Cuba (p175), or El Salvador (p.79) applied for U.S. annexation.</p> <p>3) is a statement and not a verified factual error we can address.</p> <p>4) This does not constitute verified factual error but debatable opinion. The reviewer's argument that Lewis Cass personally desired to extend slavery is debatable, as is her accusation that popular sovereignty proponents desired the federal government to recuse itself from the slavery question for a variety of reasons, and Cass lost elections to Polk and Zachary Taylor for not being sympathetic enough to slave owners.</p> <p>See column to the right for continued response. -----&gt;</p>	<p><a href="https://www.britannica.com/event/American-civil-rights-movement">https://www.britannica.com/event/American-civil-rights-movement</a><a href="http://www.history.com/topics/black-history/abolitionist-movement">http://www.history.com/topics/black-history/abolitionist-movement</a></p> <p>Continued from 4): To address the reviewer's specific concern, however, that the Kansas-Nebraska Act be portrayed as empowering slave owners rather than restricting their power, publishers are voluntarily willing to edit the passage on popular sovereignty and the Kansas-Nebraska Act as follows: "In the 1840s and 1850s, various legislators such as Stephen Douglas and Lewis Cass argued that slavery was not an issue that the federal government should be deciding, and that if certain citizens desired abolition, this could be brought about democratically through popular vote in each state. A new political party, the Free Soil Party, similarly believed that the solution to brewing sectional strife was for the federal government to "divorce" the question of slavery altogether. A common view of moderate abolitionists was that if slavery were forbidden by voters in newly forming states—especially in the Mexican Cession—then slavery could be contained in the South and eventually die out.</p> <p>Ultimately, however, the effort to forestall war and secession over slavery and states' rights failed because of the efforts of slavery's defenders. The Compromise of 1850 admitted California, Utah, and New Mexico as free states but admitted Texas as a slave state and strengthened the Fugitive Slave Act, which demanded free soilers return runaway slaves. Moral outrage over slavery increased through pamphlets and the writings of abolitionists, yet the popular sovereignty strategy of letting citizens decide whether new states should be free or slave led to disaster. When the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 nullified the Missouri Compromise and turned the decision of slavery in those states over to the voters, pro-slavery and anti-slavery factions both moved into Kansas, which inflamed sectional strife within the state and then throughout the nation..."</p>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	218-219	Second column, third paragraph, under "The Civil War Interrupts Settlement"	"The Southern Confederacy seceded under the leadership of Mississippi Congressman and Mexican-American War veteran, Jefferson Davis. He argued that the U.S. national government had grown too strong, as exemplified in its demands for abolition. Opposing the South's secession, President Abraham Lincoln headed the Northern Union and rallied troops to force the South into reunification."	<p>1.) The text does not tell students that Lincoln in 1860 did not run on a platform of abolishing slavery, and in his 1859 address at Cooper Union expressed support for the enforcement of fugitive slave laws. Many esteemed historians have argued that Southern secession was based on exaggerated fears about abolition, and a belief that Lincoln would not properly respect the power of slave states. Since the Constitution contains no provision allowing for states to secede from the Union, the claim that Lincoln sought to "force" the South to reunify is biased as it gives the impression that Lincoln rather than Southerners were acting unlawfully.</p> <p>2.) The text also does not identify a fundamental contradiction in the Southern support for states' rights. Perhaps no piece of antebellum legislation gave the federal government more power and interfered with states' rights more than the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act supported primarily by Southern Congressmen. States' rights apparently meant little to these Southern Congressmen when these rights came into conflict with instead of supporting their interests in protecting slavery.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>These do not constitute statements of verified factual error but rather merely requests for additional information that is not required to be included based on the reviewer's subjective opinion. Additionally, the text never implicates that Lincoln was in the wrong, nor that the Fugitive Slave Act was insignificant in the build-up to Civil War.</p>	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	85	Second paragraph, under "ATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE"	"Importing slaves became illegal in the United States in 1808, but domestic slavery did not end until 1863, under the Emancipation Proclamation."	The text mistakenly states on page 85 that the Emancipation Proclamation ended all slavery in the United States. The Proclamation freed only those slaves in territories that were at the time in rebellion.	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	Text is being changed to "Importing slaves became illegal in the United States in 1808, but domestic slavery did not end until 1865 with the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution."	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	220	First sentence in italics	"In this proclamation, issued by President Abraham Lincoln, all American slaves were freed,"	Similarly, the text mistakenly states on page 220 that the Emancipation Proclamation ended all slavery in the United States. The Proclamation freed only those slaves in territories that were at the time in rebellion.	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	Text is being changed to add "in rebellious states" after slaves and before were. Text will read "...all slaves in rebellious states were freed."	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	355	Second paragraph	<p>"The Thirteenth Amendment in 1865 came first, constitutionally abolishing slavery."</p> <p>(Factually CORRECT, but INCONSISTENT with previous two passages from the text.)</p>	The text does correctly state that the Thirteenth Amendment ended slavery on page 355, but never reconciles this statement with its previous mistakes.	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	This is not a verified factual error. The reviewer even concedes "The text does correctly state..." It is factually documented and undisputed that the 13th Amendment ended slavery. There is no basis to list this statement as error. [NOTE: Reviewer is using the first draft edition, not the current edition before the SBOE, evidenced by their citation to the incorrect page number for this content. Also, the two alleged errors immediately preceding this complaint have been separately addressed.]	<a href="https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/13thamendment.html">https://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/13thamendment.html</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	219	First column, second paragraph	"Slavery had been abolished, but the root issue of how strong the national government should be, compared to state governments, would remain unresolved for many years."	The text's account of the period of Reconstruction is deeply biased and contains misleadingly claims that Reconstruction was the cause rather than the effect of discriminatory laws in the South. . . The passage gives students no indication that protecting the newly won freedom of slaves was a major challenge in the aftermath of the Civil War.	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error but is merely an assessment based upon the reviewer's subjective interpretation of the content. This complaint completely overlooks the inclusion within the text that addresses Reconstruction and discusses the difficulty of protecting the new freedoms of former slaves at length, including the Freedman's Bureaus set up to procure them (p.246), and the rising up of the KKK to destroy them. (p.248)</p> <p>Additionally, the text is voluntarily being changed to say, "Slavery had been abolished but discriminatory practices continued. Likewise, the issue of how..."</p>	<a href="http://www.archives.gov/research/african-americans/freedmens-bureau/">http://www.archives.gov/research/african-americans/freedmens-bureau/</a>

## Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	356	Fourth paragraph, under "Roots of Racial and Ethnic Hostility"	"Civil rights moved along a good trajectory after the Civil War, but stalled between 1880 and 1930 because racial inequality had deep roots. Additionally, revolutionary activity in this period encouraged more racial and ethnic hostility."	<p>1.) The text perversely implies that Reconstruction was responsible for Southern racism in the aftermath of the Civil War rather than the other way around. The text does not mention the notorious Black Codes passed by Southern legislatures from 1865-1866 that substantially undermined the political and economic rights of newly freed slaves, or that this legislation led the United States Congress to approve military rule of the these states through the Reconstruction Acts.</p> <p>2.) The text's allegation on page 356 that revolutionary activity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was a major cause of "racial and ethnic hostility" receives no serious support or defense in the text. The text is unbalanced because it ignores the possibility that victims of oppression may have turned to radical forms of political protest and radical political organizations when they could not secure reform through mainstream electoral politics, and fails to mention that radical political organizations were at times in the forefront in protesting racial inequality. To give just one example, the Communist Party USA provided crucial legal support to the accused African-American teenagers in the Scottsboro Boys case.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>The reviewer here has misinterpreted the text and imposed their own opinion to assert verified factual errors.</p> <p>1) The text never says that Reconstruction caused Southern racism. In fact, the text says the opposite--that Reconstruction was "well-intentioned" but "ultimately failed" (247) by the 1880s because "racism had deep roots" that were not removed by the Reconstruction effort. Racist action in the antebellum South is described on 246-248 with military rule by "federal troops" mentioned on 246 and the military force provided through the Force Acts against the KKK on 248.</p> <p>2) The sentence the reviewer criticizes here is an introductory sentence referring to the longer sections that are forthcoming on the Red Scare and restrictionism ca. 1917. The text develops material on the urban labor movement and revolutionary events between 1880-1930 which enable pre-existing racial prejudice among mainstream America, which results in restrictionism and a blind eye in civil rights for minorities/immigrants. Regarding the reviewer's comments about the role of radical organizations, it would be wrong (and racist) to say that African-Americans and Mexican-Americans became Communists or "radicals" to secure racial equality. Much of the Civil Rights movement denies this, for example the work of Martin Luther King Jr. While Communist Party affiliation may have some place in a more drawn-out discussion of the fight for African-American rights (e.g. the ACLU and Scottsboro Boys), it is a particularly weak claim for Mexican-Americans. Zamora, for example, criticizes the Socialist Party in Texas for being almost as racist as other American political parties, and therefore, more disappointing to the cause of Mexican-American rights; he credits the IWW for some helpful activity but otherwise credits Mexican labor unions for civil rights efforts, not the Communist Party USA (<i>Chicana Socialist Labor Activity in Texas: 1900-1920</i>). R. Acuna similarly dismisses the Socialist Party and the AFL labor movement as unhelpful, saying in this context, "all white workers were racist" (<i>Occupied America</i>). In the U.S., the reviewer's overall concern that the failure of mainstream politics can cause minorities to affiliate with "radical forms of protest" or "radical political organizations" has validity and is very true in the 1960s and 70s Civil Rights Era and Chicano Movement, but less so in the pre-1930s. Zamora, for example, cites a 1000 membership of Mexican Texans in the Socialist Party--out of a population between half and one million Mexican-Americans in Texas at that time.</p>	<p>Zamora, Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas: 1900-1920.</p> <p>R. Acuna, <i>Occupied America</i>, 2014.</p>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	357	First paragraph, under "Anti-Reconstruction & Jim Crow Laws"	"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. While freed slaves were being mass registered for the Republican Party by Republican governors, southern white citizens had been disenfranchised."	<p>1.) Once white Southerners regained full representation at Reconstruction's end, though, the rights and equality of African-Americans were eroded by discriminatory legislation. To the extent that civil rights of African-Americans received protection after the Civil War, it was due to the Reconstruction policies the book identifies as a failure. The claim that Reconstruction "failed" is unbalanced because it does not note that the protection of the safety and rights of African-Americans and the ability of African-Americans to vote and hold elected office in the South were greater in many respects during this period than they were for almost a century or more after Reconstruction ended.</p> <p>2.) Finally, the passage does not acknowledge the perspective of Unionists at the time and many subsequent historians that Southern whites had lost the franchise because they committed treason by seceding from and waging war against the Union.</p>		<p>This commentary is similar to Alleged Error #202. See Publisher's Reponse there for more remarks. The reviewer's perspective regarding southern male disenfranchisement for treason has been incorporated. However, their claim that "the protection of the safety and rights of African-Americans and the ability of African-Americans to vote and hold elected office in the South were greater in many respects during this period than they were for almost a century or more after Reconstruction ended" is personal opinion and quite debatable--it certainly does not constitute a verified factual error of the stated text, nor does it affect Mexican-American heritage. As an aside, the actions of the KKK (noted on 248) and subsequent lynchings would seem to disqualify at least the "safety" portion of this argument. Edited sentences now read:</p> <p>"Forcing civil rights on Southern states during Reconstruction--while well-intentioned--ultimately failed to accomplish its objectives mainly because it bypassed ordinary representational avenues and tried to alter the biased beliefs of millions of citizens, including veterans and previous legislators from the South. While freed slaves were being registered to vote by Republican governors in the South, southern white males had been disenfranchised, largely on accusations of treason for seceding from and waging war against the Union.</p> <p>For comments regarding Reconstruction's general failure, read Eric Foner's comments about the devastation on the black population, e.g. "What remains certain is that Reconstruction failed, and that for blacks its failure was a disaster whose magnitude cannot be obscured by the genuine accomplishments that did endure." See Foner's comments about Radical Reconstructionists like Thaddeus Stevens whose desire to disenfranchise Southern white males caused white supremacy to take over the South.</p>	<p>Eric Foner, <i>Reconstruction: America's unfinished revolution, 1863-1877</i> (1988)</p> <p>Carter, Dan T. <i>When the War Was Over: The Failure of Self-reconstruction in the South, 1865-1867</i>. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1985. Print.</p> <p>Holt, Thomas. <i>Black over White: Negro Political Leadership in South Carolina during Reconstruction</i>. N.p.: U of Illinois, 1979. Print.</p>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	362	First paragraph, under "Negative Experiences"	"Also fueling racial and ethnic hostility were everyday, negative experiences between people of different cultures. In Texas, California, and New York, this was especially common as different groups judged and misjudged others based on their lifestyle, standard of living, or religious practices. To some, foreigners seemed to bring poverty, crime, disease, and a tax burden. Others attributed alcoholism or other negative traits to groups they observed committing the offending behavior."	The text essentially blames the victims of injustice for their own persecution. . . By identifying discrimination with misjudgment and misunderstanding, the text minimizes the extent and severity of discrimination, and the profound suffering that it often caused. Perhaps even worse, the text does not attempt to examine the accuracy of the negative stereotypes it applies to foreigners, and minority racial and ethnic groups. The book thus gives readers the impression that those discriminating had a legitimate basis for the stereotypes they held, and that "foreigners" might have deserved the discrimination practiced against them. This is group character assassination by insinuation.	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error but an assumption of the content based upon the reviewers own subjective assessment. At no point does the text blame the victims. The reviewer fails to note that on page 250, the text uses words like "misjudged" and "inaccurate" to convey that prejudicial attitudes were wrong, as well as stating the obvious that prejudice is wrong outright--i.e. "It led many to fear others prejudicially, simply because of their national origin." The text also specifically condemns racist attitudes at the end of the paragraph the reviewer is critiquing, by attributing much prejudice to Mexico-U.S. relations, which were unarguably bad in the 1910-1920 period (i.e. the Plan de San Diego, Pershing's invasion, the Zimmerman Telegram) The text says, "Situations like this occurred because of <i>inaccurate</i> perceptions between ethnic groups, which were in turn often based on political baggage that countries such as Mexico and the United States had with each other." It is the reviewer's subjective opinion that this description is character assassination and blaming the victim.</p> <p>Voluntarily change text as follows: After "religious practices" add, "Fear and bigotry fueled most of these unjustified stereotypes. Some feared that foreigners would bring poverty, crime, disease, and a tax burden. Alcoholism or other negative traits were attributed to malign certain groups of people, irrespective of whether or not those people had ever been observed committing the offending behavior." ☐</p>	<p>For comparison, See mainstream historical sources for examples of standard language concerning racial relations/hostilities: i.e. Britannica (Jim Crow): "Throughout the country, but especially in the South, conditions for African Americans were quickly deteriorating." <a href="https://www.britannica.com/event/Jim-Crow-law">https://www.britannica.com/event/Jim-Crow-law</a></p> <p>Encyclopedia.com (Segregation): "Segregative systems may also be distinguished as compulsory or voluntary, as deliberate or spontaneous, and as influenced positively by attraction or negatively by disdain." <a href="http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Segregation.aspx">http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Segregation.aspx</a></p>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	374	Second paragraph, under "Chapter Summary"	"Among the American public at large were scuffles between different racial and ethnic groups who misjudged and misunderstood each other."	(See above explanation.)	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	Not a verified factual error. The rationale of 154 does not apply to the statement cited here. There is no blame shifting in this comment. See Baldwin and Kelley, <i>The Stream of American History</i> (1965), for information exploring sociological changes due to immigration to the U.S. that is similar to this passage, (e.g.456-458)	Baldwin and Kelley, <i>The Stream of American History</i> (1965)

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	217	First paragraph	Regarding the opening of the West in the last half of the 19th century: "All were in the quest for self-betterment together, and the U.S. government aided this quest by creating laws that encouraged individuals to mine land themselves, purchase it, and keep the profits. This was unique in the history of the world and undergirded many people's decisions to come. . . . The Immigration Act of 1882 imposed a 'head tax' of 50 cents per immigrant in order to pay inspectors, doctors, and government officials who were now staffing the ports.	The text does not mention the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 which preceded the passage of the Immigration Act of 1882, and forbid the entry of Chinese immigrants into the United States.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error. Additionally, the reviewer fails to note that the exclusion of the Chinese by Immigration law in 1882 is mentioned on p.157.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	236	End of second paragraph	"Overall, it was generally easy to enter the country, and only about 2% of newcomers were denied entrance."	The 2% exclusion figure is at best highly misleading and, at worst, a gross manipulation of statistics since it does not account for the blanket denial of entry to all potential Chinese immigrants. Had these immigrants been included, the exclusion rate would be significantly higher.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is not a factual error. It is not true that the U.S. denied all kinds of immigrants arriving at Ellis Island, nor is it fair to exclude "potential immigrants" as the reviewer is suggesting. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 prohibited Chinese from entering the country, but the quoted statistic is for newcomers at Ellis Island, not for an acceptance rate for those around the world who wanted to come. The quoted sentence and statistic also is firmly contextualized in a paragraph about entry to Ellis Island, not immigration more generally. Encyclopedia.com cites the 2% rate of newcomer denial, saying "Historians have calculated that despite a growing number of excludable categories, only about 2 percent of Ellis Island migrants failed to gain entry." <a href="http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Ellis_Island.aspx">http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Ellis_Island.aspx</a> This statistic is also cited at History.com <a href="http://www.history.com/news/9-things-you-may-not-know-about-ellis-island">http://www.history.com/news/9-things-you-may-not-know-about-ellis-island</a> , and <a href="http://sydaby.eget.net/swe/ellis_island.htm">http://sydaby.eget.net/swe/ellis_island.htm</a>	<a href="http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Ellis_Island.aspx">http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Ellis_Island.aspx</a>  History.com  <a href="http://www.history.com/news/9-things-you-may-not-know-about-ellis-island">http://www.history.com/news/9-things-you-may-not-know-about-ellis-island</a> , and  <a href="http://sydaby.eget.net/swe/ellis_island.htm">http://sydaby.eget.net/swe/ellis_island.htm</a>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	226	First paragraph, under "RAILROAD LABORERS"	"Many immigrant groups also had 'bosses' who translated English and maintained control of their groups, sometimes leading strikes if workers were taken advantage of or went unpaid. It was tremendously difficult work, but some diaries kept by laborers reveal they considered it more exciting than simple fieldwork and more likely to lead to skilled jobs later on."	The mistreatment of Chinese is whitewashed in this passage. . . In addition to romanticizing dangerous and grueling labor, the passage ignores that Chinese railroad workers worked longer, and were paid less than their white counterparts.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is not a statement of verified factual error but a request for the inclusion of more information regarding the mistreatment of the Chinese railroad workers. While there is no requirement that such content be included, the text will be voluntarily edited to state, "While many immigrant groups had bosses who ...unpaid, it was still tremendously difficult and dangerous work. Also, certain immigrants, such as the Chinese railroad workers, worked longer hours for less money than did European immigrants."	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	223	First paragraph	"One Irish immigrant recorded, 'You can, as soon as you get into regular employment, save the price of an acre and a half of the finest land in the world every week! And in less than a year, you will have enough money to start to the West and take up an 80-acre farm which will be your own forever.' Land ownership was a unique opportunity, arising from the U.S. acquisition of territory as well as its desire to sell it off."	This passage romanticizes the economic opportunities for and conceals economic exploitation of farmers in the last half of the 19th century. . . From this account, the reader would never suspect that western farmers' feelings of economic exploitation by railroad companies, large landholders, and financial institutions were sufficiently widespread to spark the rise of the Greenback and Populist Parties.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for additional material not required. Much material regarding industrialism's effects on Mexican-Americans was included in original content. Additionally, more material has been added to Chapter 5 and Civil rights injustices are addressed in Chapter 7 in the Sept 2nd edition submitted to the TEA, making this complaint moot. Further, this chapter is about the draw for immigrants from all over the world, setting up the immigration restrictionism, the population explosion, the quest for civil rights, etc. It is logical that these elements to Mexican and American heritage require development.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	380	First paragraph, under "Introduction"	"Between 1945 and 1991, major wars all across the globe were ultimately the result of Communist countries trying to spread their system and the United States trying to prevent it."	The Cold War does offer many examples of aggression by the Soviet Union and Communist countries, but the suggestion that all the major wars of aggression during the Cold War were attributable solely to Soviet and Communist aggression is a significant exaggeration. The following sentences include only a partial list of interventions most scholars would agree were initiated by the United States. During the Eisenhower administration, the United States undermined popularly elected governments it perceived as radical in Iran and Guatemala. During the Kennedy Administration, the United States attempted to overthrow the Cuban government through the Bay of Pigs invasion, and undermine or destabilize popularly elected governments in British Guiana and Brazil. The Johnson administration sent United States military forces to intervene in the political affairs of the Dominican Republic, and provided assistance to the overthrow of the Sukarno government in Indonesia. During the Nixon administration, the United States sought to undermine or destabilize regimes in Cambodia and Laos.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error. The reviewer seems to have misread the sentence. The text does not say "all major wars across the globe were ultimately the result of Communism" but that "major wars all across the globe were ultimately the result of ..." Text has changed wording to state, "...1991, some of the major wars around the globe were...."	Carson, Basic Communism: Its Rise, Spread, and Debacle in the 20th Century. American Textbook Committee, 1990.  Rollie Poppino, International Communism in Latin America: A History of the Movement 1917-1963. University of CA-Davis, 1964.
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	385	First paragraph	"The loss of Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain and the subsequent fall of Southeast Asia to Communism motivated the United States to take action between 1950 and 1990. Wherever the Soviet army went, capitals were overtaken, religion was outlawed, economic and environmental abuse occurred, schools and information were controlled, and food, medical care, and housing suffered. Afterward, missile bases and nuclear weapons were built to defend the regime. All over the world, the USSR was coercing allegiance to this new order, and the United States felt compelled to resist it." ❏	The text's claim that support for Communism was solely the result of Soviet aggression also ignores indigenous support for Communist regimes. To take only the case of Vietnam, religious persecution, unequal distribution of land, and the general incompetence of the governments of Ngo Dinh Diem, and his successors were significant contributors to the rise of Communism among South Vietnamese.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for inclusion of additional content. The reviewer fails to note that the text discusses indigenous support for Communist regimes elsewhere, including in Mexico. This paragraph is introducing the Cold War and Soviet Communism for the first time, to students who may never have studied it before. It is not intending to exclude the Chinese and distinctive elements of Chinese Communism. Historically, the USSR influenced the turning of China to Communism, and the attempt of Communism to spread through Central Asia, so it is important to understand the foundational aspects of Soviet Communism. Additionally, the Soviet link is important to setting up the rise of Che Guevara and Fidel Castro.  Change "Wherever the Soviet Army went" to "Wherever communism arose, capitals..." change the last sentence to say, "All over the world, communistic regimes were springing up, and..."	Richard Pipes, Communism: A History. Modern Library Chronicles: 2003 Carson, Basic Communism: Its Rise, Spread, and Debacle in the 20th Century. American Textbook Committee, 1990.

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	384	First paragraph	"China then sponsored Communism's advance into Southeast Asia, especially Vietnam, an event Americans attempted to thwart from 1954 to 1975. After the U.S. lost this important ground, Communism spread into Laos, Burma, and Cambodia where millions more died under revolutionary takeover. This spread of Communism into bordering areas was called the domino theory, and motivated U.S. containment efforts."	1. ) This passage provides a simplistic account of the Vietnam War and Communism in Asia. . . The text neglects to mention that prominent American politicians and scholars during the early 1960s and subsequently questioned if the domino theory was accurate. President Kennedy's and Johnson's Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara admitted in his 1995 memoir, for instance, that he believed the domino theory undergirding the Vietnam War was wrong. The text offers no explanation of or support for its claim that Southeast Asia was "important ground" in the Cold War.  2. ) The passage also neglects to mention that many foreign policy analysts at the time and subsequently claim that the 1969 bombing campaign of Cambodia authorized by the Nixon administration contributed to the undermining of the government of Prince Sihanouk and the eventual takeover of power by the brutal Khmer Rouge regime.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	These are not verified factual errors, but alleged errors of omission by alleging the text "neglects to mention." There is no requirement that such content be included.  However, the anti-domino theory quote from McNamara's memoirs is being voluntarily added to the text, as well as a statement about Vietnam War demonstrators protesting high death tolls/injustice.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	385	Second paragraph, under "Sovietizing Latin America"	"Although the Cold War officially began after World War II, Latin America had already experienced decades of anti-Western thought and revolution. From the Mexican-American War in 1848 and the Banana Wars of the early twentieth century, opposition to the U.S. was already a rallying point among many Latin Americans."	The text ignores and misrepresents indigenous support for Communist and other radical political movements in Latin America. The attempt to attribute sympathy for radical political reform and movements solely to "anti-Western thought" is both vague and unbalanced claim. The passage does not encourage students to consider that intervention of the United States in Latin America may not always have been justified, and may have at times fueled legitimate resentment of the United States and its policies.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a subjective request for the inclusion of content that is not required. The reviewer fails to note that the text does not ignore indigenous support for Communist and other radical political movements in Latin America—in fact, this is a main idea, particularly when discussing the push for land redistribution in Mexico (202,211), the Morelos Commune (215), Tlaxcala (280), and the EZLN (314), but also Sandino in Nicaragua (216) and the tenente revolution in Brazil (212). Connection is again made in Chapter 9 for its legacy today (323). More importantly, resentment towards the United States for its policies in Mexico and in Latin America more broadly is a thoroughly covered subject throughout the text (173-174, 182-183, 209, 211, 218-222)  The text is deleting "anti-Western thought" and replacing it with "radical political movements"	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	388	Second paragraph, under "The Cuban Revolution"	"In 1959, Cuba was a modern, literate nation with a growing middle class. Like most Latin nations, it still had a heavy export economy, but progressive health, education, and technology were being developed. This stopped suddenly when Cuba was radicalized by Che Guevara and Fidel Castro, who turned the nation into a base for Communist revolution in the 1960s."	The text ignores scholarly claims that the decline of the sugar industry and the educational system, the rise in illiteracy, and the political repression that occurred during the regime of Fulgencio Batista led many Cubans and members of the military to withdraw their support from the Batista government in favor of Castro. Indeed, the text contradicts itself later on the same page calling the period before Castro's rise "two decades of dictatorship and turmoil."	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This does not constitute a verified factual error but a subjective request for inclusion of material not required. Additionally, reviewer fails to note that Batista's dictatorship is mentioned, as well as refugees who fled it. (p272-273)  After "as the United States had feared." add sentence to text, "A dictator, Fulgencio Batista, stifled civil liberties, jailed his opponents, and ran a very corrupt regime."	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	388	Last paragraph, under "Guevara and Castro Create the Revolution"	"In December 1856, Castro led a small guerilla army with his brother Raúl as well as Che Guevara, which was successful."	The text mistakenly claims the Cuban revolution began in 1856 rather than 1959.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This error was corrected prior to Sept 2 and is not in the material currently submitted to the TEA. This complaint is, therefore, moot and not a verified factual error.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	398	First paragraph	"Many fled rural areas where guerilla movements took over villages and mountainsides. Not only did this cause major strain on urban cities that could not provide enough jobs or resources for the majority of the population, it also caused the growth of crime, as citizens found it difficult to get what they needed. Mafias, crime rings, black markets, gangs, and gun violence all proliferated in Latin cities in order to provide money, goods, and protection."	The text attributes the rise of the mafia in Latin America to Communism, but fails to note the significant involvement of the United States mafia in the Cuban economy under the Batista regime, and the elimination of this involvement following the Cuban revolution.  The general lack of discussion pertaining to radical movements in Latin America and political repression and economic injustice sponsored by the United States is evident in the text's treatment of reformist and revolutionary movements.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required, so it is not a verified factual error. There are no factual errors in the text cited here. The course is special topics in social studies and has no requirement to include such content. Additionally, Chapter 8 is devoted to discussing the facts surrounding what the reviewer deems "political oppression" and "economic injustice sponsored by the United States," without these subjective labels or conclusions. Facts concerning U.S. involvement in Nicaragua, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Puerto Rico, and Cuba are discussed, along with trade relations and incorporation of immigrants from these nations and others. Between Chapter 6 and Chapter 8, the text discusses many swings of "revolutionary movements" from the political Right and political Left, in Cuba, Nicaragua, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina. These topics are chosen because of their relationship to the larger narrative about rocky U.S.-Latin relations, and as they affected Spanish-speaking immigrants to the U.S. which diversified the Latino population/concerns but also augmented many concerns raised by the Mexican-American community for years (270, 280). The text does not consider personal opinions about whether Communism was a legitimate "reformist" movement, which is a subjective opinion the reviewer seems to be implying. It does raise the point, however, that many joined Communism to oppose U.S./Western influence (269, 280), and because suffering people truly believed communist economic policy would lead to long-awaited prosperity (275, 280).	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	389	Second paragraph, under "The Bay of Pigs & Cuban Missile Crisis"	"It became clear how much of a threat Communism was, and how far revolutionaries were willing to go to beat American influence in the world."	The text does not note that Castro may have supported installation of missiles in part to defend his regime against being overthrown by the United States. The passage fails to mention, for instance, the Bay of Pigs invasion and the continued efforts of the Kennedy administration to undermine the Castro regime during Operation Mongoose that preceded the installation of missiles.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required. Actually, it is material that is even speculative, "Castro may have..." It is not a verified factual error. The Bay of Pigs event is mentioned in the text on p.272-273. The proposed edits by the reviewer do not impact Mexican-American heritage. The course is special topics in social studies and has no requirement to include such content.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	387	First column, second paragraph, under "Guatemala"	"In 1950, the Guatemalan president Jacobo Arbenz believed it was time to nationalize the Guatemalan economy, starting with the banana industry, which was Guatemala's key source of income. The United States owned the banana farms, factories, and railways, but Arbenz seized all the property and prepared to redistribute the land to peasants. The U.S. suspected that Communist control and communes were forthcoming, so President Eisenhower organized a small military force and ordered the overthrow of Arbenz in 1953. Eisenhower then helped install a new president, Carlos Castillo Armas, who was willing to work with the United States and allow them to use Guatemala as a base for training contras, or anti-Communist rebels."	<p>1.) The text commits a factual error by claiming that the United States as opposed to United States companies, and in particular the United Fruit Company owned banana farms and factories in Guatemala.</p> <p>2.) The text does not note that Arbenz was popularly elected, the belief of many Guatemalans that the United Fruit Company wielded disproportionate political and economic influence, the extent of the inequality in wealth and land that Arbenz was attempting to address, and Arbenz's stated willingness to compensate the Company for its losses. Without this context, the text gives students the unbalanced and misleading impression that Arbenz's overthrow was a morally justified response to Arbenz's redistributionist policies.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>These do not constitute verified factual errors, but are merely requests for the inclusion of additional content and debatable opinion. It is entirely subjective to allege that the lack of inclusion of content necessarily conveys an assumption that Arbenz's overthrow was morally justified. The complaint about control only being through private companies, rather than the government itself, is debatable opinion. Common reference to "US Control" is made when discussing this issue surrounding favorable treatment from Guatemala being sought for factories and railways. Additionally, it is referenced that there was government sponsorship, directly involving the U.S. See, for example, the University of Maryland's statement that, "The United States government was also interested in bananas, and had sponsored initiatives" and that "The United Fruit Company was well connected to the Eisenhower administration. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his New York law firm, Sullivan and Cromwell, represented the company..."</p> <p>However, the text is voluntarily being edited to include this perspective, including deleting "The" and adding the word "companies" before and after "United States" respectively, to verify that it was U.S. Companies who owned the banana farms, factories, and railways.</p>	<p>LaFeber, Walter (1993). <i>Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America</i>. New York: W. W. Norton &amp; Company.</p> <p>University of MD <a href="http://www.umbc.edu/che/tahlessons/pdf/historylabs/Guatemalan_Coup_student_RS01.pdf">http://www.umbc.edu/che/tahlessons/pdf/historylabs/Guatemalan_Coup_student_RS01.pdf</a></p>
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	393	Second paragraph, under "Chile"	"In 1973, the Chilean Supreme Court and Congress permitted the military, run by General Augusto Pinochet, to put the country under martial law to restore order. A very violent turnover ensued, but Chileans permitted it because they expected the army to call for elections as soon as they subdued the revolutionaries. Instead, a military dictatorship remained for 16 years who repressed unions and basic civil liberties. The nation had swung from one end of the political spectrum to the other almost overnight."	<p>1.) The passage's claim that the Chilean population "permitted" the military coup receives no substantiation in the text. More disturbingly, the text's implication that the thousands of Chileans who were illegally detained, tortured, or murdered during the coup and its aftermath "permitted" these human rights violations is profoundly offensive to victims of this persecution.</p> <p>2.) The text omits evidence suggesting possible CIA involvement in a plot to kidnap pro-democracy Chilean general Rene Schneider, and United States involvement in concealing the extent of human rights abuses under the Pinochet regime.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error but is a request for the inclusion of certain content. There is no requirement to include material concerning "possible CIA involvement" in a Chilean kidnapping, or detail U.S. coverage of the Pinochet regime.</p> <p>However, the text is being voluntarily edited to state, "In 1973, the Chilean Supreme Court and Congress permitted the military, run by General Augusto Pinochet, to put the country under martial law to allegedly restore order. A very violent turnover ensued, and a military dictatorship remained for 16 years which repressed unions and basic civil liberties. The nation had swung from one end of the political spectrum to the other almost overnight."</p>	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	391	Second paragraph, under "Nicaragua"	"Concerned that Nicaragua would follow the path of Cuba, U.S. President Ronald Reagan stopped economic trade with Nicaragua and organized a guerilla army of contras to disrupt the Sandinista regime."	<p>1.) The text does not note that the administration of President Carter had severed aid to the Somoza regime that preceded the Sandinista regime because of its human rights abuses.</p> <p>2.) The text does not mention the passage of the Boland Amendments by Congress that forbid assistance to the contras for the purpose of overthrowing the Sandinista regime. On a related note, the text makes no mention of the Iran-contra affair, and that the funding to the contras at the heart of the affair broke the law by violating the Boland Amendment.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>This is a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required, so it is not a verified factual error. The proposed edits by the reviewer in no way impacts Mexican-American heritage. Additionally, the course is Special Topics in Social Studies and has no requirement to include such content.</p>	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	395	Last paragraph, under "Grenada"	Although this kind of direct American involvement had not occurred in Central America since the 1920s, the changeover in control was positive for citizens . . . They avoided the kind of chaos that other Latin nations were experiencing. The event inaugurated the turning of the tide of Communism in Latin America."	<p>Through this statement, the text continues its factually problematic account of the Reagan administration's anti-Communism activities.</p> <p>1.) The claim that Grenada was the first direct U.S. involvement since the 1920s is factually incorrect because the U.S. committed over 22,000 troops in its 1965 intervention in the Dominican Republic, and the United States occupation of Nicaragua did not end until 1933.</p> <p>2.) The text does not provide any serious support or defense for its dubious claim that the invasion of Grenada "inaugurated the turning of the tide of Communism in Latin America." Communist revolutions in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Peru, for instance, lasted well beyond the invasion of Grenada.</p> <p>3.) The text never explains why if direct intervention in Latin America was crucial to "turning the tide" against Latin American communism, Johnson's much larger military intervention in the Dominican Republic did not contribute to or have the effect of preventing or rolling back communism in Latin America.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is hard to escape the conclusion that the book's claim stems from a desire to venerate Ronald Reagan and exaggerate his accomplishments.</p>	<p>Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage</p> <p><a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a></p> <p>Dr. Emile Lester</p>	<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error. The U.S. intervention in Grenada and the notion of subsequent turning the tide of Communism in Latin America is supported by Michael Reid, in <i>Forgotten Continent: The Battle for Latin America's Soul</i>. Yale University Press, 2009.</p> <p>However, the text is being voluntarily edited to read, "Although this kind of direct American involvement in Central American affairs commonly caused trouble in the first half of the twentieth century, the changeover in control was positive for citizens in Grenada. They avoided the kind of chaos that revolutionary socialism was causing in other nations."</p>	<p>Michael Reid, <i>Forgotten Continent: The Battle for Latin America's Soul</i>. Yale University Press, 2009.</p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	397	First paragraph	"By the 1980s, Ronald Reagan took a more definitive stand against Communism by calling it an 'evil empire' and opposing its spread directly. Building up America's military and boosting its economy allowed him to intimidate the Soviet government, which was running out of money."	This and other passages on President Reagan omit crucial information. 1.) Ronald Reagan himself never claimed that he or his policies had won the Cold War. 2.) The book does not identify other significant causes of Soviet economic decline besides the desire keep pace with the Americans such as the Soviet-Afghan war, or the role Mikhail Gorbachev played in ending the exclusive power of the Communist Party in Russia. 3.) It does not note that the Reagan Administration's military buildup was based on an assessment by United States intelligence agencies in the early 1980s that the Soviet Union was becoming stronger, not weaker. 4.) The fact that levels of Soviet military spending remained constant during the 1980s belies the book's claim that the military buildup under the Reagan administration bankrupted the Soviet economy. 5.) Moreover, the text dishonors Reagan's legacy by misrepresenting the true nature of his accomplishments. While Reagan's approach toward the Soviet Union in his first term was notable for increased military spending, his second term was notable for its open and positive response to Gorbachev's reforms and willingness to negotiate with Gorbachev. Hawkish foreign policy advisers inside and outside the administration were often harshly critical of Reagan's significant attempts at rapprochement with Gorbachev. Many foreign policy analysts have argued that Reagan's peace overtures and willingness to negotiate with Gorbachev enabled Gorbachev to carry out more widespread reforms in Soviet domestic and foreign policy. Emphasizing Reagan's role as an aggressive Cold Warrior, as the book does, ignores his legacy as a leader of efforts at negotiated peace. ☐	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	The text does not claim that President Reagan won the Cold War or promote Reagan in any way. The reviewer has made a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required, so it is not a verified factual error. The course is special topics in social studies and has no requirement to include such content.	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	399	Begins at "Ronald Reagan 40th U.S. President June 12, 1987"	Entire page. (Not a matter of factual error, but a lack of relevancy.)	The text does not explain how including Reagan's speech at the Berlin Wall on page 399 is relevant to Mexican-American history.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	Reviewer even admits that this is not a factual error, but makes the mistake of thinking this course is MAS rather than Special Topics in Social Studies. The fall of Communism is foundational history and therefore is important for all American students to learn. It affects Mexican-Americans by influencing radical socialist movements as initiated by Magon and Zapata during the Mexican Revolution, and the Vietnam War protests and related Chicano events in the Vietnam era. Communist ideology is carried on by indigenous groups such as the EZLN today who may be mentioned in Spanish-speaking intellectual or media circles. The fall of Communism also touches the Mexican-American community because many other Latino groups in Spanish-speaking communities have personal experience or family members who have had experience with communist regimes. ☐	
The University of Mary Washington, Dept. of Political Science and International Affairs	396	Last paragraph	"In the 1970s, U.S. President Nixon signed the first nuclear weapons limitations with the USSR that slowed the arms race."	The text does not mention the atmospheric testing ban negotiated with the Soviet Union by the Kennedy administration in 1963.	Denying Diversity: A Review of Mexican American Heritage  <a href="http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf">http://masfortexas.org/images/Lester_MAHreview.pdf</a>  Dr. Emile Lester	This is a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required, so it is not a verified factual error. The course is special topics in social studies and has no requirement to include such content. The course allows the content to paint in very broad strokes.	
Librotráfico	Cover to end of the book.	From the cover to the end of the book.	Throughout the entire text, these terms are used incorrectly: Mexican American, Hispanic, Chicano, Latino,	No simple line edits could fix these errors. The book is entirely flawed.		There is no statement of verified factual error specifically identified. Reviewer fails to cite to even one specific example and identify what the correct labels should be, which cannot academically be done since there is great diversity of term usage among MAS experts. According to Juan Gonzalez in "Harvest of Empire," labels for ethnic communities are in continual flux, "So, to each his own labels." Gonzalez accepts "Latino" and "Hispanic," and uses them interchangeably. In his introduction, he states that he uses "Americans," "North Americans," and "Anglos" interchangeably, which of course is wrong and racially insensitive--U.S. citizens of Anglo or English ancestry are considerably small. He uses "Mexican-Americans" and "Chicanos" to refer to Mexicans born and raised in the U.S., while Rosales uses "Mexicans" to refer to immigrants or working class Mexican-Americans, "Chicanos" for those who identify with Mexican-American nationalism, and "Mexican-Americans" or "the Establishment" for middle-class Mexican-Americans who do not self-identify with Mexico. In the 1970s, Zamora used "Chicanos" for his discussion of Mexican immigrants and laborers prior to 1930, but then changes this population group to primarily "Mexicans" in "The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas." Acuna, in Occupied America, similarly uses "Chicano" as an umbrella term for his audience, but uses "Mexicans" to refer to Mexican-Americans prior to 1935, when he suddenly begins using "Chicanos" after p.223. Even the educational term, "Mexican-American Studies" (MAS) shows a preference for this term, hence being the one the authors have adopted consistently to refer to those with Mexican origin or ancestry in the U.S.	Juan Gonzalez, Harvest of Empire F.A. Rosales, Chicano! E. Zamora: Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas: 1900-1920 (1975) E. Zamora: The World of the Worker in Texas Acuna, Occupied America (2014)
UTSA Mexican American Studies (SOMOS MAS)	240-266	Entire chapter	Error of omission: This entire chapter focuses on Mexico's path to modernization, from 1850-1910. The title of this book is Mexican American Heritage, yet the authors do not ONCE discuss Mexican Americans and their experience in the U.S.	To focus on the cultural, sociopolitical and economic experience of Mexican Americans in the US., at least beginning from 1848 (not 1850), with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Such an analysis would offer insight to the ways in which Mexican Americans, as new citizens of the nation-state, became incorporated into the U.S. politically and economically and how they responded to the changes of annexation.	David Montejano (1987). Mexicans and Anglos in the Making of Texas. Austin: UT Austin Press.  Jose F. Moreno (1999). The Elusive Quest for Equality: 150 years of Chicana and Chicano Education  Martha Menchaca (2001). Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans. Austin: UT Austin Press.  Arnoldo de Leon (1983). They called them greasers: Anglo attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900. Austin: UT Press.	This is not a verified factual error but merely a request for content not required. Additionally, this chapter was reworked prior to Sept 2 in order to more clearly identify the touchpoints between America's path to modernization and the Mexican-American community. The reviewer's concern is already addressed in the material before the SBOE. Moreover, even on its own, the industrialization of the American West should be an important part of Mexican-American heritage since it encouraged the immigration and employment of so many Mexican immigrants, which is also discussed in the text. The course is not MAS, but rather Special Topics in Social Studies, and as such does not require the inclusion of specific MAS content proposed by reviewers' opinions. Even if this chapter had not already been changed, this would not constitute a verified factual error.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
Somos MAS	381	Paragraph two	Error of omission. Paragraph discusses "Taking over Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and others, the USSR turned their governments into Communist regimes and cut off their contact with the Western world." No mention of Mexican Americans ☒	Delete the entire section and focus on communism as it affected Mexican American activists and union members.	UTSA oral history collection: Emma Tenayuca interview.	It is illogical to expect the mention of Mexican-Americans in every sentence, as a standard of relevance to the Mexican-American community or to Mexican-American students of social studies. The interpretation of communism is reviewer's subjective opinion. There is no requirement for such content as 100% of TEKS for Special Topics in Social Studies were met.	
Somos MAS	382	Second paragraph	Anti-communist rhetoric presented as fact: "Many communist countries display numerous pictures of their leaders or reminders of patriotic duty so that citizens will remember to think loyally at all times. Communism exists on a spectrum of intensity, and different kinds of communism have been observed across the world, but the inability to speak, worship, vote, and conduct business freely are common identifying characteristics. Many communist countries also have conspicuous government officials who police public spaces to control daily activity."	Move from broad generalizations to one or two specific, proven examples.		Reviewer does not deny the fact that Communist countries currently, and historically, have these attributes. This is not a verified factual error but simply a subjective request for how they would like the content presented. Historical description of communist regimes and their attributes can be found in Richard Pipes, <i>Communism: A History</i> .	Richard Pipes, <i>Communism: A History</i> . Modern Library Chronicles: 2003 Panne and Paczkowski et al, <i>The Black Book of Communism</i> . Harvard: 1999.
Somos MAS	381-401	381-401	Not one mention of Mexican Americans in a textbook about Mexican Americans.	Remove entire chapter.		Reviewer mistakenly assumes this is a MAS course with required MAS TEKS. It is not. The SBOE did not approve a MAS course, and there is no requirement for the inclusion of content beyond that listed in the TEKS for this course, which is Special Topics in Social Studies. This does not constitute a statement of verified factual error.	
Somos MAS	384	Vietnam War section	No mention of the contribution of Mexican Americans in the Vietnam War. No figures on enlistment rates, volunteer rates, casualties, or medal of honor recipients.	Detail the service of Mexican Americans in Vietnam and the effects of their service.	Income and Veteran Status: Variations Among Mexican Americans, Blacks and Anglos  Harley L. Browning, Sally C. Lopreato and Dudley L. Poston, Jr.  American Sociological Review  Vol. 38, No. 1 (Feb., 1973), pp. 74-85 ☒	This is a subjective request for inclusion of material that is not required, so it is not a verified factual error. The course is special topics in social studies and has no requirement to include such content. The course allows the content to paint in very broad strokes.  Authors are willing to voluntarily add Mexican-Americans and their service in Vietnam War.	
Our Lady of the Lake University	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."	This view of racial and cultural difference stems from 19th century ideas we now know as scientific racism, which has been disproved 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. The authors set up this paragraph with the suggestion that they are making a cultural comparison with European and Asian societies. No meaningful comparison is being made between societies as there is no information about them presented in a comparative analysis. More importantly, passage sets forth an antiquated and essentialist concept of race as the division of human species based on differences in physical features defined by heredity. The correction would be to completely rewrite this section. ☒	Gould, Stephen Jay. 1981. <i>The Mismeasure of Man</i> . New York: Norton.  <a href="http://www.understandingrace.org/about/index.html">http://www.understandingrace.org/about/index.html</a>	This Alleged Error is a repeat of Errors #54 and #55 above. See comments and the fact that this paragraph is being deleted.  Yet, the paragraph in question here has no racial overtones or judgment. It is presented as a simple description of physical diversity within indigenous peoples from North to South America—primarily to diversify a student's image of pre-Columbian peoples from the Plains Indian image that is stereotypically portrayed in television, films, etc. Additionally, the application of Stephen Jay Gould's "Mismeasure of Man" here is inappropriate because Gould's thesis is that Darwinism provided a scientific pretext for people to judge non-white races as inferior, and view races as separate species, which circulated widely until Darwinism was reformed. This has nothing to do with Mexican-American heritage or the fact that indigenous diversity should be described and appreciated in all its forms.	
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 10		Pantheistic definition: "A belief that plants, animals, and objects in nature have spirits that should be honored and sometimes feared."	This definition more closely represents the anthropological definition of "animism" not pantheism. Correct the definition. Pantheism is a European philosophical belief that God exists throughout the universe.	Segal, Robert Alan. 2006. <i>The Blackwell Companion to the Study of Religion</i> . Malden, MA: Blackwell	Content is being changed to read: "Nomadic Indians had a wide range of religious beliefs. Many societies held pantheistic beliefs, regarding the universe as a manifestation of the divine, while others were animistic, believing that objects in nature have spirits which can be honored or communicated with. Many indigenous groups had a mix of both, with emphases on the connection between earth and spirit." See Jace Weaver, <i>Native American Religious Identity</i> for descriptions of Native American religions in Western philosophical terms (while recognizing that indigenous peoples themselves often do not use these categories of thought to self-describe).  Correct definition in margin to say: pantheism: a belief that the universe is an expression of divinity, usually non-anthropomorphic; a philosophy stressing the unity of physical and spiritual spheres, as an expression of one substance Add animism: a belief that natural objects (plants, animals, bodies of water, etc) contain spirits which should be honored ☒	Jace Weaver, <i>Native American Religious Identity: Unforgotten Gods</i> (Orbis Books, 1998).

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 10		<p>“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.”</p>	<p>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 as part of capitalistic ventures. In this way, they are attempting to justify these actions by defining Native peoples a savage, warlike, and greedy. This does not match up with the evidence, which is very complex regarding Indigenous warfare. 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. Remove this passage. It contains both factual errors and errors of interpretation. ☒</p>	<p>Brooks, James, and Omohundro. Institute of Early American History &amp; Culture. 2002. <i>Captives &amp; Cousins : Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands</i>. Chapel Hill, NC</p> <p>Thornton, Russell. 1987. <i>American Indian Holocaust and Survival : A Population History Since 1492</i>. The Civilization of the American Indian series, v. 186; <i>Civilization of the American Indian series</i>, v. 186. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.</p> <p>Chacon, Richard J., and Ruben G. Mendoza. 2007. <i>North American Indigenous Warfare and Ritual Violence</i>. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.</p> <p>Carrasco, David. 1999. <i>City of Sacrifice : The Aztec Empire and the Role of Violence in Civilization</i>. Boston: Beacon.</p>	<p>This section was already rewritten in the Sept 2nd edition that was submitted to the TEA, so this complaint is moot.</p>	
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 11		<p>“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.”</p>	<p>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. Remove this passage. It is misleading in its interpretation of Jared Diamond’s thesis.</p>	<p>Cameron, Catherine M., Paul Kelton, and Alan C. Swedlund. 2015. <i>Beyond Germs : Native Depopulation in North America</i>. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.</p>	<p>This is not a verified factual error as the reviewer makes the allegation that the text argues that indigenous people of the Americas were lacking in innovation or intelligence. The text does not say that. The reviewer further alleges that 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.” Again, nothing in the text of the book makes that argument. They are not even looking at the current content as Diamond’s name has been removed from this paragraph. There is commonly cited information about the decimation of Indian tribes due to disease. There is no language that could be twisted to imply an allegation of inferiority.</p> <p>The text supports a description of the conquest of indigenous peoples similar to <i>Britannica Macropedia</i>’s article on “Mexico,” where it argues that Spanish success “was the result of a combination of factors: the hatred of conquered tribes for their Aztec overlords; Montezuma’s belief that Cortes was a returning god; Cortes’ personal qualities; European horses and arms--crossbows, muskets, and steel swords; disease; and the aid of Cortes’ interpreter, Malinche. Each of these is presented in the text. Additionally, the current sentence in question removed Diamond’s name from the text prior to Sept 2 and is no longer in the text, making this complaint moot.</p>	<p>Britannica Macropedia, "Mexico"</p>
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 12	<p>he subsection: “Religion and Social Customs”</p>	<p>There is scholarly literature related to Native American cultures that examines the variety and complexity of their religious and social view. Here the authors argue that there is no information on this subject.</p>	<p>A more robust analysis of the Native American religion and social customs is needed.</p>	<p>Harrod, Howard L. 1995. <i>Becoming and Remaining a People : Native American Religions on the Northern Plains</i>. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.</p> <p>Niezen, Ronald, and Kim. Burgess. 2000. <i>Spirit Wars : Native North American Religions in the Age of Nation Building</i>. Berkeley: University of California Press.</p> <p>Erdoes, Richard, and Alfonso Ortiz. 1984. <i>American Indian Myths and Legends</i>. New York: Pantheon Books.</p> <p>Carrasco, David. 1990. <i>Religions of Mesoamerica : Cosmvision and Ceremonial Centers</i>. Religious traditions of the world; Religious traditions of the world. San Francisco: Harper &amp; Row.</p>	<p>This does not constitute verified factual error. The reviewer clearly misinterpreted the text. Nowhere does the text suggest there isn’t scholarly literature on Native American religion or social customs. We summarize some of that information, both different beliefs and commonly held beliefs. This is not a verified factual error.</p>	<p>Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures</i>.</p> <p>Charles Mann, 1491: <i>New Revelations of the Americas Before Columbus</i>.</p> <p>Jace Weaver, <i>Native American Religious Identity</i>.</p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 12		<p>"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."</p>	<p>Native American agricultural systems ranged from complex systems that helped sustain large 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. The passage is incorrect and needs significant revision detailing the vast trade networks that existed throughout the Americas and the broad diversity of Native American communities and civilizations.</p>	<p>Gabriel, Kathryn. 1991. Roads to Center Place : A Cultural Atlas of Chaco Canyon and the Anasazi. Boulder: JohnBooks.</p> <p>Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2014. An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States. Revising American history. Boston: Beacon.</p> <p>Cameron, Catherine M. 2013. "How People Moved among Ancient Societies: Broadening the View." American Anthropologist 115 (2): 218-231. doi:10.1111/aman.12005.</p> <p>Trigger, Bruce G., Wilcomb E. Washburn, and Richard E. W. Adams. 1996. The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.</p>	<p>This does not constitute verified factual error. The reviewer fails to note that the trade networks of Mesoamericans are discussed for the Olmec (11), Maya (12-13) and Inca in the text, including the complex system of the vertical archipelago (21-22). Urban communities are also discussed at length, including the Maya city states and central state functioning of Maya, Inca, and Aztec. The fact that complex systems existed for some peoples in some locations, however, does not negate the facts of the paragraph in question, especially when applied to the indigenous peoples outside the heart of the Maya, Aztec, and Inca empires. Significant limitations existed and are important to understanding both the Spanish conquest of Mexico and broader European conquest of North and South America. Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures</i>. Regarding the diversity of Native Americans, the authors believe that this is inherent in the development of sub-sections including the Olmec, Teotihuacan, Maya, Aztec, Inca—as well as the diversity of nomadic tribes presented on pages 6 (physical and geographical diversity) and 8 (religion/social practices).</p> <p>Additionally, the text is being voluntarily edited to state, as "Indians in North and South America who were nomadic lived on what they could hunt or gather instead of choosing to herd, ranch, or raise food sustainably on farms; many migrated across large distances to do so. In settled communities where Indians could farm, agriculture could be challenging without animals to pull loads or provide manure for fertilizer. While there was a lack of horses, oxen, and carts, that meant they could not carry heavy loads of goods or people. This in turn would limit their ability to trade and migrate. Some Indians in South America used llamas to help transport goods, and other societies used canoes, but both could only carry small loads, slowly. In addition, without being able to travel long distances by horse or wagon, communication was limited to scouts or foot-runners. This could make it difficult to know what was going on in distant locations." ☐</p>	<p>Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures</i></p> <p>Charles Mann, 1491: <i>New Revelations of the Americas before Columbus</i></p>
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 14		<p>"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."</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The majority of Native American societies were not nomadic. They lived in seasonal villages, settled towns, and city-states. Delete this section. ☐</p>	<p>Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. 2014. An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States. Revising American history. Boston: Beacon.</p>	<p>This is not a verified factual error but a debatable position that misapplies the context of the text. Only a minority of indigenous peoples were consistently non-migratory, like the Pueblos. Additionally, this statement is referring to the entire indigenous age--thousands of years, during which even tribes like Nahuatl migrated (as believers in Aztlan, for example, maintain).</p> <p>Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures</i> for information on nomadic and civilizational Native American societies writ large, as well as features of migratory peoples. Also see Thomas Sowell, <i>Migrations and Cultures</i>, where he argues that migration is a constant feature of communities worldwide—a method of survival based on warfare and environmental change. In this context, even "non-migratory" peoples including Pueblos and Aztecs, have a history of migration--sometimes largely unrecorded, however. Charles Mann, <i>Before Columbus: The Americas of 1491</i>, also analyzes Indian "civilizations" and distinguishes those in Mesoamerica and Peru (e.g. Olmecs, Toltecs, Aztecs, Incas) from nomadic people groups (who could be absorbed into those empires).</p> <p>Text is being voluntarily changed to replace "the majority of Indians" with "many indigenous peoples" and delete "continuously"</p>	<p>Thomas Sowell, <i>Conquests and Cultures</i></p> <p>Charles Mann, 1491: <i>New Revelations of The Americas Before Columbus</i> (2006)</p>
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 14		<p>"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."</p>	<p>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. Use Mesoamerican civilizations or Pre-Columbian</p>	<p>Trigger, Bruce G., Wilcomb E. Washburn, and Richard E. W. Adams. 1996. The Cambridge History of the Native Peoples of the Americas. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.</p>	<p>This does not constitute verified factual error, but debatable opinion. It is fairly common for "Latin American" to be used as a geographical term that makes sense to readers, not as a historical term that must refer to Spanish colonialism or afterwards. For example, there is a famous archeological academic journal called "Latin American Antiquity." This quarterly journal states it is devoted to the special reports on archaeology, prehistory, and ethnohistory in Mesoamerica, Central America, and South America, and culturally related areas. However, if the standards used by this reviewer were applied, then it is erroneous for it to be named as such, and should instead be "Mesoamerican" or "Pre-Columbian" Antiquity. Other educational resources also refer to Latin American Civilizations when talking about pre-Spanish eras. e.g. <a href="http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/ancient-civilizations.htm">http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/ancient-civilizations.htm</a> <a href="http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/spring08/MacFarlane/south.html">http://iml.jou.ufl.edu/projects/spring08/MacFarlane/south.html</a> , <a href="https://www.eduplace.com/ss/socsci/books/content/lessons/6/ils_gr6_c06_l2.pdf">https://www.eduplace.com/ss/socsci/books/content/lessons/6/ils_gr6_c06_l2.pdf</a> , Therefore, this is not an error, but mere opinion.</p> <p>Additionally, text is voluntarily being edited to substitute "Early Latin American" with "Pre-Columbian"</p>	<p><a href="http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Publications/tabid/113/Default.aspxhttp://www.latinamericanstudies.org/ancient-civilizations.htm">http://www.saa.org/AbouttheSociety/Publications/tabid/113/Default.aspxhttp://www.latinamericanstudies.org/ancient-civilizations.htm</a></p>
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 26		<p>"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."</p>	<p>The issue of Moctezuma II or other Aztec peoples believing Hernan Cortes was Quetzalcoatl is a historiographical debate that is being asserted as fact. Delete this section or offer a discussion of the debate.</p>	<p>Nicholson, H. B. 2001. Topiltzin Quetzalcoatl : The Once and Future Lord of the Toltecs. Mesoamerican worlds. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.</p>	<p>This is not a verified factual error, as reviewer even admits that this is a debate. However, the text is being voluntarily amended to say, "The prophecy of Quetzalcoatl as ancient and trusted legend is alleged by some to be an important reason why the Spanish were not immediately driven off by an Indian population that far outnumbered them."</p> <p>Britannica Macropedia mentions "Montezuma's belief that Cortes was a returning god" Mexicanhistory.org mentions the comet of 1517 and the end of the 52-year cycle on the calendar, which prompted Montezuma II to consider whether the Spanish were part of Quetzalcoatl's return <a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/aztec.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/aztec.htm</a></p> <p>TR Fehrenbach, in <i>Fire and Blood</i>, writes extensively on Cortes and Montezuma II, mentioning that the Mexica scribes themselves recorded the apocalyptic context of Cortes being a divine messenger of Quetzalcoatl</p>	<p>Britannica Macropedia, "Mexico"</p> <p>Quetzalcoatl's return <a href="http://mexicanhistory.org/aztec.htm">http://mexicanhistory.org/aztec.htm</a></p> <p>TR Fehrenbach, <i>Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico</i> (2014)</p>
Our Lady of the Lake University	P. 32		<p>"No other civilization created, singlehandedly, such a reign of terror."</p>	<p>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. Delete this statement.</p>		<p>This statement was deleted prior to the Sept 2nd edition and is currently not in the text, so this complaint is moot.</p>	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
Our Lady of the Lake University	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."	Meaningless comparison based on anachronism. 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. The comparison is meaningless. Delete section.		This does not constitute a verified factual error, but merely a subjective request for the exclusion of content. There is no requirement that such content be either included or excluded. However, the text is deleting the sentence, "It mirrored, most closely, European socialism."	
Our Lady of the Lake University	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."	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. ☹	Liebmann, Matthew. 2013. <i>Revolt: An Archaeological History of Pueblo Resistance and Revitalization in 17th Century New Mexico</i> . Tucson: University of Arizona Press.	This does not constitute a verified factual error but is merely debatable opinion. While the authors acknowledge the tragedy of Acoma and the difficulties Pueblos had with the Spanish at times, the account of Juan de Oñate's initial settlement is told differently, depending on the source. NewMexicohistory.org, for example, gives a positive account of official Spanish settlement efforts between May 1598 and December 1598, and further back to Oñate's father Cristobal, under whom relations were unofficial but mostly peaceful (ca. the 1540s). Similarly, R. Acuna concurs that intermarriage and peaceful relations existed in early Santa Fe (e.g. "Although tensions existed, there is evidence that the newcomers commingled with the natives and often intermarried." p29). The violent affair did not begin until December 1598 when revolt began; some blame Juan de Oñate, but others say rebellion was "after the Acoma Indians had treacherously assaulted and killed many of the Spaniards." <a href="http://newmexicohistory.org/people/biography-of-don-cristobal-de-onate">http://newmexicohistory.org/people/biography-of-don-cristobal-de-onate</a> .] However, the text is being edited to state, "In 1598, Juan de Oñate was appointed by the viceroy to colonize Santa Fe, and subsequently incorporated that area into New Spain." Additionally, reviewer is incorrect that the text does not mention Spanish-Pueblo tension or the Pueblo revolt against the Spanish in 1680. It can be found on p105, beginning with "The Pueblos, however, revolted in 1680 and burned down the missions and haciendas to drive the Spanish out..."	<a href="http://newmexicohistory.org/people/biography-of-don-cristobal-de-onate">http://newmexicohistory.org/people/biography-of-don-cristobal-de-onate</a> Rodolfo Acuna, <i>Occupied America</i> .
Our Lady of the Lake University	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."	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. Delete this section or provide a historically accurate account. ☹	Thompson, Stephen P. 1999. <i>The Reformation</i> . Turning points; San Diego, Calif.: Greenhaves.	The reviewer's comments are not grammatically correct which makes their allegations difficult to ascertain. They do not constitute verified factual errors but debatable opinion. While the statement in the text is clearly not intended to be exhaustive as it involves a complex topic, the content included in the text is historically documented. This paragraph is specifically referring to the English, Dutch, and French expeditions to North America in the 1600s, and why those systems differed significantly from Spain's a century prior, religiously and economically. The rise of Protestant beliefs is an important part of that explanation, especially as conciliar movements within the Catholic society (e.g. in Ockham and Erasmus) were often put down in favor of Counter-Reformation theology which more logically supported the Papacy and divine right of kings. Constitutional monarchy eventually found a place in many nations, but ultimately, immigrants such as the Pilgrims separated away for even more political and religious freedom, and many monarchs saw Protestantism as an inherent threat to their power. Dutch society which had embraced Protestantism early, was one of the first nations to be able to experiment and enrich themselves through capitalist ventures, i.e. New Amsterdam.  Text is being voluntarily amended to say, "Events in 16th and 17th centuries, including the Protestant Reformation, significantly changed Western Europe so that settlers were looking for religious freedom and business ventures." ☹	Diarmaid MacCulloch, <i>The Reformation: A History</i> (2005) Max Weber's <i>The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism</i> <i>The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of History and Reform</i> , by Robert Olson (1999)
Our Lady of the Lake University	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."	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. Delete this section or provide a historically accurate account.	Thompson, Stephen P. 1999. <i>The Reformation</i> . Turning points; San Diego, Calif.: Greenhaves.	This is similar to Alleged Error #193 above. See citations listed there. It is widely held that Protestantism had a decentralizing effect on politics, religion, and economy throughout parts of Western Europe in the 16th and 17th century. Catholic progenitors and pre-Enlightenment thinkers also had an influence, but Protestant nations including the British and the Dutch experienced decentralization faster and on a greater scale, as seen in the expansion of capitalist activity and greater roles for Parliament or conciliar institutions. Within those societies, smaller communities including the Pilgrims in the early 1600s desired even more political and religious freedom, and broke away to find it. This led to different models and structures in the New World.  Additionally, the text is voluntarily being amended to read, "For a variety of reasons, parts of Western Europe began to experience a decentralization of power in politics, economics, and religion. This encouraged a new kind of colonialism in the New World where the goal was to settle, trade, and produce goods for sale, rather than find precious materials and officially incorporate indigenous peoples into the kingdoms of Europe." See Diarmaid MacCulloch, <i>The Reformation</i> , esp. that Protestantism "tore apart the fabric of European society" on 550-551, and exploring a "link between religion and capitalism" that would explain why "Protestant England the Protestant Netherlands undoubtedly became major economic powers... while formerly entrepreneurial Catholic areas stagnated" (604-605). See Max Weber's <i>Protestant Work Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism</i> for his thesis that while the urge to colonize and acquire wealth is universal, Protestantism enabled modern capitalism and exerted causal influence. Weber responds to Karl Marx's link between modern capitalism, colonialism, and Protestant civilization.  The <i>Story of Christian Theology</i> , by Robert Olson for his synopses on conciliarism, and democratic movements within medieval Catholicism, and their ultimate expression in Protestant systems that had more consistent theological justifications.	Diarmaid MacCulloch, <i>The Reformation: A History</i> (2005) Max Weber's <i>The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism</i> <i>The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of History and Reform</i> , by Robert Olson (1999)

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at San Antonio	p. 146	p. 146	The text also describes Spanish territory as being in need of US intervention out of concern for Latin republics that recently acquired independence from Spain. The text reads: "When the United States noticed how much trouble Mexico and New Latin Republics were having getting on their feet, they were concerned that European powers would move in and take advantage." (146) The text then gives a limited reading of the Monroe Doctrine that argues that the policy was designed to protect Latin America from outside invasion and exploitation. The text reads: "The United States took a protective stance and leadership role in the western hemisphere through the Monroe Doctrine, beginning in 1823"(146)	as Juan Gonzalez points out, the mandate was ignored by European nations: "Notwithstanding the Monroe Doctrine's strong language, European government successfully pursued more than a dozen major interventions into Latin America during the rest of the century, and numerous minor ones with only occasional US opposition"(39). Gonzalez continues to note that "worse than the many US failures to honor its own policy was how subsequent presidents turned doctrine into its opposite"(39). This includes the seizing of Mexico by the US government and military. In the Mexican American Heritage, the explanation of the Monroe Doctrine also suggests that the doctrine protected Mexico when in fact, it opened the door for US expansion and exploitation of Latin America. ☒	Gonzalez, J. Harvest of Empire	<p>This is a philosophical preference suggested by the reviewer, not a factual error. The sentence the reviewer has quoted is an articulation and summary of a particular historical perspective introduced in the text (i.e. primary quotes and source documents by Jefferson on p.86, 88 and John Quincy Adams on p.97 and Jackson, p.98). It is not error or publisher preference. A Mexican perspective of the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. interference is mentioned in multiple places, and is given its own section on p.96. The particular sentences the reviewer criticizes are in a concluding paragraph summarizing the U.S. perspective (i.e. protection) and are immediately followed by the Mexican rebuttal, i.e. "This looked suspicious to many in Mexico and throughout Latin America, who worried that their strong and prosperous neighbor to the north would take advantage of them just like other foreign powers had." (See 99, 100, 178 for rearticulations of the Mexican disapproval of the Monroe Doctrine). The reviewer's accusation is therefore premature and taking one sentence out of context.</p> <p>U.S. intervention in Latin America more broadly due to the Monroe Doctrine, and the mixed results that received, are also explicitly opened up for student analysis and debate on 179-183. The morphing of the Monroe Doctrine by Teddy Roosevelt, as a pretext for more intervention, is developed on 179. The reviewer's quoting Juan Gonzalez to say that Europeans ignored the Monroe Doctrine is acknowledged and discussed in this text on p94-95--but is irrelevant to the reviewer's argument that the publisher should have discredited Monroe as hypocrisy.</p> <p>Text has been amended to add phrase "toward its own borders, and assumed a leadership role..." after "protective stance"</p>	<p>Nuanced discussion of Monroe and America's obedience to it (or not) throughout the nineteenth century is in Paul Johnson, <i>A History of the American People</i> .</p> <p>For the European attitude towards Monroe Doctrine, <i>Juan Gonzalez, A Harvest of Empire</i> .</p>
The University of Texas at San Antonio	pp.110-117	pp. 110 and 117	One crucial missed opportunity comes when the authors describe the revolutionary figure and 2nd President of Mexican, Vicente Guerrero as alienating "criollos and intellectuals who had supported independence"(110). The text never mentions that Guerrero was Afro Mexican who personalized efforts to abolish slavery, but instead suggests that Guerrero worked to abolish slavery to please his constituents (117). The text, not only erases Guerrero's Blackness, but also critiques his fight against slavery as a political move while never mentioning that slavery was abolished in Mexico by 1829, 36 years before the US. In fact, the text completely ignores slave trade in Mexico and the political and cultural history that remain from these histories	The text should highlight that Guerrero was Afro Mexican who personalized efforts to abolish slavery,	Gates, HL. Black in Latin American Horne, G. African Americans and the Mexican Revolution	<p>This is not a factual error, but merely a request for the inclusion of additional information that is not required to be in the book. Additionally, the text commends Mexico for abolishing slavery prior to the U.S. on p.88. The history of slavery in Mexico is also noted in the text in the discussion of repartimiento (48), early attempts at abolition/slavery reform(48-51), the Plan of Iguala (76), and the Constitutions/political leaders ensuring rights for Indians and mestizo peasantry (e.g. 74,168, 211). It is also alluded to in the sections on Indian-slave revolts, the Atlantic Slave Trade, and indigenous movements for land redistribution.</p> <p>Authors are voluntarily amending this content to add Guerrero as Afro-Mexican, and make adjustments to incorporate the reviewer's perspective about Mexico's abolition of slavery.</p>	
The University of Texas at San Antonio	p. 138	p. 138	"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 of 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 actions 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"(138). ☒	The text describes Mexico as inadequate for self government in desperate need of US intervention but does not mention the US's role in helping to create this environment through occupation and later exploitation of the nation's economy.	Gonzalez, J. Harvest of Empire	Does not allege a factual error but merely requests the inclusion of additional content that details that the US was instrumental in creating this environment. Such inclusion of content is not required. This portion of the text is discussing the years leading up to the Monroe Doctrine, 1821-1823--not 1848 and post-occupation. By saying, the U.S. had a "role in helping to create this environment through occupation and later exploitation of the nation's economy," the reviewer projected a subjective opinion about post-1848 occupation onto this passage, which is actually a summary of the section comparing the US system post-1776 to the Mexican system post-1821--in other words, the two systems after winning their independence from Europe. The U.S. was involved very little with Mexico during this time,economically. If anything, Mexico's impoverished circumstances in 1821 had more to do with Spain than the U.S.	
The University of Texas at San Antonio	p. 150	p. 150	According to the text, "Texas was a "predominantly American development" and constantly refers to Mexico's inability to "settle their northern frontier well" because they left it "largely undeveloped, unprotected, and unmonitored,"	The text should maintain that Native Americans were in the region at this time	Acuña. R. Occupied America	<p>This is not a factual error but a request for the inclusion of additional content. Reviewer's concern about "Texas being a predominately American development" incorrectly omits the phrase about Texas "which by 1835, had become" a predominately American development. The text does not say that Texas was originally American, or that Native Americans weren't in the land--the latter is noted on 104-105, 130, and 139, including in its own inset. The text says that the development of Texas occurred mostly by American hands by 1835, which is upheld by the common statistic that Anglos outnumbered Tejanos 10:1 by approximately 1830, and as R. Acuna himself states, "Mexico grew increasingly alarmed at the flood of immigrants from the United States." The Anglo development of Texas is a generally understood claim as both Spain and Mexico invited American immigrants to settle in Texas, partly because Native American presence (Comanche/Apache) was a major problem for them. (See TR Fehrenbach's these in <i>Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans</i> for his argument that not defeating the 20-30,000 Apache and Comanche in the area was one of the main reasons why both Spain and Mexico ultimately lost Texas.)</p> <p>Nor should the text's claim that Spanish Texas (not "Mexican" Texas as the reviewer asserts) left their northern border "undeveloped" and "unprotected" and "unmonitored" be considered factual error. Again, Fehrenbach supplies that there were only about 1700 Spanish citizens in Texas prior to 1800, and that for many years these colonists had been cut off from the rest of Spanish settlers in Mexico whose settlements were farther south by hundreds of miles. Additionally, Native Americans "had hundreds of Spanish colonists killed in the north, and thousands along the fringes of old Mexico" down towards Jalisco. Similarly, Jesus F. de la Teja notes the "sparse population" in the frontier prior to 1821 (48) and says "Spain failed to put people in Texas" (79) example. (<i>Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings</i>). TSHAsays, "Spain was unable to persuade its own citizens to move to remote and sparsely populated Texas." <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/uma01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/uma01</a> Britannica calls Texas prio to Anglo immigration "previously desolate" with a northern boundary that "remained largely indeterminate" until Adams Onis in 1819 partly due to the Spanish not filling their territory. Colin Woodard concurs in <i>American Nations</i> , and provides a population density map of Spanish settlement for analysis.</p>	<p>TR Fehrenbach's <i>Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans (2014)</i> Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S-Mexican Relations (Rodriguez and Vincent,1997) <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/uma01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/uma01</a> Britannica Macropaedia, "Mexico"</p>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at San Antonio	p. 156	p. 156	The authors suggest that as a result of Mexican paranoia, "Mexico City started to build garrisons in Texas and station soldiers in customs houses, military forts, and other public places to keep closer tabs on commoners" and "Texans knew they were being monitored for compliance and deeply resented this power grab "(156). According to the authors, the motive behind the Mexican American War was Mexico's fear of the US rather than the US's acquisition of Mexico's resources through military brute.	This version of what started the Mexican American War leaves out the economic gains that were motivating the US to go war.	Acuña. R. <i>Occupied America</i>	Again, not a factual error but merely requesting the inclusion of additional content that is not required. The text in fact does talk about economic motives for war in the Manifest Destiny section on bottom of p.119. (e.g. "Many pointed out the trade benefits that would be gained. Accessing the Pacific was important to the United States' trade interests in Asia, and businessmen insisted that acquiring Santa Fe would be an asset to the American economy. America already had two small steam engines transporting goods across Ohio and Virginia. Some speculated that owning territory all the way to the Pacific coast would one day lead to a railroad across the whole country. The economic benefits seemed limitless.") Economic motives also come up in the section discussing the Santa Fe Trail and U.S.-Mexico trade in the Southwest on 105-106.  Yet, the text never states or implies that Mexico was "paranoid" or that "fear of Mexico" was the reason for war, as the reviewer argues. Nor does the text eschew the aggressive policies of Polk, the arguments his opponents raised against "Mr. Polk's War", or the U.S. desire for territory that underlies the start of the Mexican-American War (all in pp.117-121, 124-125, 129, 133, 139). The text states facts about Mexican fortification just prior to outbreak as well as describes their well-founded concerns over Texas becoming predominately Anglicized—which Acuña himself states as "alarming" for Mexico—see Publisher comments above, for Alleged Error #198.  Finally, the reviewer citing Rodolfo Acuña's <i>Occupied America</i> and stating that it is a factual error to not state that the start of the war was due to "US's acquisition of Mexico's resources through military brute" is clearly not a verified factual error, but simply a philosophical viewpoint which is clearly debatable. See a sample of Rodolfo Acuña's subheadings regarding the Mexican-American War for a sample of this very biased philosophical viewpoint, i.e. "Legacy of Hate: The Conquest of Mexico's Northwest," "Follow the Money," "The Border Crossed Us: In the Entrails of the Monster." His bias is revealed plainly in statements throughout, such as "The United States acted arrogantly in foreign affairs, partly because it had a homogeneous people who believed in their cultural and racial superiority." (45) Ironically, Acuña himself admits an inconsistency here by noting that Polk did not push for more territory because "the war was already unpopular in many circles." (51). His academic sensibilities are also thrown into question by statements such as, "the Stephen Austin's and Sam Houston's of this world" were "wannabes who staked out foreign territories for U.S. expansion." (41). ☐	Acuña, <i>Occupied America</i> (2014)
The University of Texas at Austin	352	1st paragraph	"...to incentivize immigrants—Latinos in particular—to become naturalized and assimilated so they could enjoy basic American freedoms."	Immigration policy during the late 1950s and early 1960s did not seek to incentivize immigrants. This is wrong.		This does not constitute a verified factual error, but merely a misreading of the content by the reviewer. The text says that the civil rights legislation and immigration laws in the mid-1960s incentivized immigrants in the U.S. to become naturalized citizens, not that it incentivized immigration—(nor does it mention the 1950s). The Civil Rights Act provided an incentive because it protected those who were U.S. citizens by law. The related legislation, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, prohibited racial discrimination in voting for U.S. citizens and therefore provided an incentive for immigrants to naturalize and gain the right to vote. Immigration legislation like Immigration Act of 1965 incentivized immigrants to at least pursue permanent resident status because U.S. citizens and permanent residents were more likely to receive visas for their family members to immigrate. Additionally, the 1965 law broke with past legislation that made it harder for minorities to immigrate and become citizens. The text also mentions the 1966 law which quickly naturalized Cuban immigrants fleeing Castro, as an example of U.S. desire to promote naturalization among its immigrant population. <a href="http://www.history.com/topics/us-immigration-since-1965">http://www.history.com/topics/us-immigration-since-1965</a> <a href="http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/geopolitical-origins-us-immigration-act-1965">http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/geopolitical-origins-us-immigration-act-1965</a>	<a href="http://www.history.com/topics/us-immigration-since-1965">http://www.history.com/topics/us-immigration-since-1965</a> <a href="http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/geopolitical-origins-us-immigration-act-1965">http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/geopolitical-origins-us-immigration-act-1965</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	354	Introduction, 1st paragraph	"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."	This is absolutely incorrect as various civil rights efforts and organization began during this time period. One of the largest groups being the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC).		This is not a statement of verified factual error, but an oversight on the part of the reviewer. LULAC and early civil rights organizations are discussed within the text. This paragraph is about U.S. prejudice growing in this time period, both motivating civil rights groups but preventing their widespread acceptance in contrast to more favorable reception after WWII.  Text is being voluntarily amended to read, "...set back broader acceptance and implementation of civil rights ideology because of..."	
The University of Texas at Austin	357	1st paragraph, 1st sentence	"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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error. While the reviewer's statement is true, it in no way serves to nullify the statement within the text. This sentiment was expressed earlier in the description of what Reconstruction was, p.246. Support for the text's original statement that Reconstruction failed to eliminate racism and inequality because it used government authority to trump the beliefs of millions in the South who wanted white supremacy, is reflected in mainstream history sources such as: <a href="http://www.ushistory.org/us/35.asp">http://www.ushistory.org/us/35.asp</a>  Language in the text is being voluntarily changed to read: "Forcing civil rights on Southern states during Reconstruction failed to accomplish its objectives mainly because it bypassed ordinary representational avenues and tried to alter the biased beliefs of millions of citizens, including veterans and previous legislators from the South."	<a href="http://www.ushistory.org/us/35.asp">http://www.ushistory.org/us/35.asp</a>
The University of Texas at Austin	360	2nd paragraph	"Gompers believed that minorities, especially illegal Mexican workers, threatened Americans by taking their jobs and driving down wages."	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.		This statement is true but is irrelevant as it does not nullify the statement in the text. Accordingly, it does not constitute a verified factual error. Samuel Gompers' disapproval of undocumented immigration—and his restrictionist tendencies more generally—are commonly understood, e.g. <a href="http://immigrationtounitedstates.org/523-samuel-gompers.html">http://immigrationtounitedstates.org/523-samuel-gompers.html</a> Acuña concurs by saying the AFL "paid lip service to organizing Mexicans" but "allowed a racism...that excluded them" because Gompers was "paranoid" (168) and "At heart, Gompers feared Mexicans would move to the cities and there take jobs held by whites." (177). The AFL evolved its position but not until the CIO put pressure on them to admit black and Mexican-Americans, which was after Gompers worked with restrictionist legislators in the 1920s (Acuña 203). E. Zamora in <i>Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas, 1900-1920</i> (1975), further argues that American labor unions did almost nothing for Mexican-American workers in early 1900s Texas—rather, he argues it was Mexican labor unions and Mexico intervention through their consulates that primarily benefited Mexican laborers in this time period. Acuña agrees because, at that time, "white workers were just plain racist" (177). Zamora expresses a higher opinion of IWW's work among Mexican-Americans in Texas, but Gompers famously opposed the IWW because of its affiliation with Russian anarchism. <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/980470?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents">http://www.jstor.org/stable/980470?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents</a> Lastly, the reviewer is requesting additional content that is not required to be included.	<a href="http://immigrationtounitedstates.org/523-samuel-gompers.html">http://immigrationtounitedstates.org/523-samuel-gompers.html</a> Acuña, <i>Occupied America</i> (2014) E. Zamora, <i>Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas, 1900-1920</i> (1975) <a href="http://www.jstor.org/stable/980470?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents">http://www.jstor.org/stable/980470?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents</a>

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	363-365	Pages 363 to 365	It is not one single line but the omission of several key points on pages 363 to 365.	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but a request for content not required. Civil rights groups are already in the Sept 2nd edition submitted to the TEA, with an expanded section on LULAC on 252-254. Latina leaders and their organizations have also been added throughout the text, i.e. 254, 274, 292, 301, making these complaints moot.	
The University of Texas at Austin	371	2nd paragraph	"The fight for black civil rights during the terms of Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson had become the advent of civil rights for all."	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.		There is nothing in this statement that alleges the content in the text to be factually erroneous. It is unclear if the reviewer is simply making an observation of the shift in the conversation or requesting some type of additional content. Neither way does it constitute an allegation of a verified factual error.	
The University of Texas at Austin	380	2nd paragraph.	"The United States tried to contain Communism because it caused famine, natural disaster, and civil war with casualties into the millions."	Communism did not cause natural disasters.		This is not a verified factual error. While it may not be a direct causal factor, there are clearly documented examples of indirect causation, such as the destruction of the Aral Sea. This would be an example of a Communist-caused natural disaster. So was massive pollution and toxicity dumping throughout western Siberia, and the Chernobyl disaster (which was also a crisis of humanity). Each caused massive environmental destruction and occurred due to a failure of Soviet government projects to "police itself." Additionally, the text is being voluntarily edited to state, "The United States tried to contain Communism because it left in its wake famine, natural disaster, and civil war with casualties into the millions." http://www.ce.utexas.edu/prof/mckinney/ce397/Topics/Aral/The%20Aral%20Sea%20Disaster.ppt http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx http://www.multinationalmonitor.org/hyper/issues/1990/09/ridgeway.html	http://www.ce.utexas.edu/prof/mckinney/ce397/Topics/Aral/The%20Aral%20Sea%20Disaster.ppt http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx http://www.multinationalmonitor.org/hyper/issues/1990/09/ridgeway.html
The University of Texas at Austin	380-401	This also does not have a single line but problems arise on pages 380 to 401.	Again, no single line but major omissions beginning from page 380 to 401 affect the overall argument of the text about Mexican Americans.	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.		This does not constitute verified factual error, but a subjective request for the inclusion of content not required. The reviewer's dismissal of the Cold War era and "non-Mexican American Latino groups" reveals a lack of concern for academic rigor and multiculturalism. The Cold War era significantly impacted Mexico, the United States, Latin America, and world relations, thus making it an important part of Mexican-American education; the Mexican-American veterans from the Vietnam War, for example, would be saddened to think of a generation of Mexican-American students who were not educated in what they fought for—similarly for Chicano activists who protested the war and found a hospitable climate for their petitions in a Cold War social climate. Also, the rapport between Mexican-Americans and non-Mexican Latinos would be greatly enhanced if Mexican-American students had a broad education that included Latin American history and Cold War scenarios that brought many Latino groups to the United States. It is a shame that the reviewer can find no meaning in these pages of texts and "sidebars." Additionally, the reviewer mistakenly believes this to be a MAS course; it is not. It is Special Topics in Social Studies and does not require the inclusion of such content. This does not constitute an allegation of a verified factual error. ☐	
The University of Texas at Austin	403-404	403 beginning with the 3rd paragraph to the end of the 1st paragraph on 404.	"In the midst of the counterculture and societal turmoil which gave rise to it, a sector of revolutionaries started to march toward their own ends. They believed different groups fighting for their own ends—feminism, civil rights, alter-native 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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error, but is a complaint occasioned upon the reviewer misconstruing the content. This paragraph is specifically about countercultural activists, NOT "various civil rights groups" or their causes. Civil Rights groups with reformist platforms are discussed at length in Chapter 7 and also at the end of Chapter 8; many are given their own sections to develop "the diversity of groups and goals." See, for example, LULAC (251-252), GI Forum (239, 292), MALDEF (292), Viva Kennedy Clubs (255, 291), Martin Luther King (257-258), Chavez/Huerta and the labor movement (291-292). Additionally, civil rights reformers outside the countercultural stream are discussed from pp251ff., e.g. Dennis Chavez (251, 254), Henry B Gonzalez (260), Hector Garcia (239-240, 251, 255, 292). However, the text does distinguish the Civil Rights Movement from New Left countercultural activists such as the authors of the Port Huron Statement who desired to martial civil rights causes for their own ends. The reviewer's injunction to not make this distinction, on the assumption that both groups are the same, is a personal perspective open to debate, but does not constitute factual error. F.A. Rosales, for example, describes an entire segment of Mexican-Americans who "profoundly desired social mobility" but "looked with disdain at their brothers and sisters" (Chicano! 252) and "hated the movimiento," "were indifferent to it," or "became too sophisticated for it" (250). In contrast, he describes the 1960s Chicano Movement as a "revolutionary vanguard which knew best what its people needed" (250) and could "convert a cowed raza" (240). Elsewhere, Rosales also describes how the Chicano Movement "lapsed into extremes of nationalism and socialism" because "activists religiously believed our own propaganda" and middle class Mexican-Americans "with a modicum of power within the system...were made uncomfortable during this era because of militancy...and welcomed its demise." (268). It seems clear that Rosales is making a clear distinction between Mexican-Americans who desired change and <i>movimiento</i> activists, similar to how this text distinguishes them.	FA Rosales, Chicano! The History of the Mexican-American Civil Rights Movement. Arte Publico Press, (1997)
The University of Texas at Austin	404	1st real paragraph on page beginning with "Educated, Urban Warfare."	"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."	As noted above, this passage collapses various groups into a single notion of "violent" "radical" students.		This again is in essence the same complaint as in line 208. This paragraph of the text describes actions of radical countercultural groups around the world, which have been well-documented. (e.g. 1968: <i>The Year that Rocked the World</i> by Mark Kurlansky) Additionally, the reviewer mislabels the content as it does not say that all protests and protesters were either radical or violent. See above comments to Alleged Error #209 for publisher's rationale in dividing civil rights reformers from Chicano Movement activists.  Text has edited language by changing "Western civilization" to "their societies" ; changing "its" to "the"  For first-hand accounts of who joined radical movements and why, see <i>A Generation Divided: the New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s</i> . For sympathetic treatment of why Chicanos saw themselves in a different light than traditional Mexican-American civil rights reformers, see F.A. Rosales' discussions of "Establishment" Mexican-Americans, and "vendidos"(pejorative) running for office from the LRUP, and "Chicanismo" leaders in <i>Chicano! A History of the Mexican-American Civil Rights Movement</i>	1968: <i>The Year that Rocked the World</i> by Mark Kurlansky <i>A Generation Divided: the New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s</i> . (Kirkpatrick) F.A. Rosales: <i>Chicano!</i> (1997)

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Texas at Austin	405	1st real paragraph on page under the Chicano Movement	<p>"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."</p>	<p>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." These are absolutely factual errors and cannot be put forth in textbooks for students to read.</p>		<p>This does not constitute verified factual error. The reviewer simply presents a subjective opinion on this issue without providing any authority for this claim of error. The content in the text does state that a common starting point for the Chicano Movement of the 1960s is the Plan de Espiritual de Aztlan, which F.A. Rosales confirms when he says "The identity envisioned by movimiento leaders, and bolstered by El Plan Espiritual de Aztlan, had an impact everywhere the Chicano Movement was proclaimed" (253). The text also states that the beginning of Chicano Studies through the Plan de Santa Barbara was important, and university-related outreach to the community by MEChA, MAYO, Brown Berets, and others. Acuna affirms this when he says, "The Plan de Santa Barbara capsulized these movements that spread throughout the Southwest, Pacific Northwest, and Midwest with varying degrees of success" due to the efforts of mostly "first-generation college students, who were the children of immigrants" and youth inspired by "the farmworker movement" (342). These then led to campuses becoming "laboratories" of Chicano thought, and then "foci of Chicano activism and were a training ground for Chicano leaders and cultural workers within the community" such that "in the 1980s and 1990s, most elected officials and labor and community organizers came out of the Chicano student movement, as did most artists and musicians." (Acuna, 342). Chicano literature also validates that educating and mobilizing the community was an important part of extending Chicanoism, as it had been since the early days of <i>El Defensor</i> and other Chicano Spanish-language newspapers. As E. Zamora puts it, "the waging of a massive educational program" was necessary, "to prepare the Chicano masses for the class struggle, essentially within the existing racial order." (<i>Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas</i>, 1975). This effectively occurred when, according to Acuna, "in Texas, the MAYO focused on off-campus strategies toward achieving Brown Power and successfully took over local government and school boards." (341). It seems likely that the reviewer is misinformed about what is and is not "absolutely factual error" concerning the 1960s and 70s Chicano Movement.</p> <p>Additionally, the rejection of Anglo-Americanism, racially and culturally, was central to JAGutierrez, RGonzalez, and key Chicano leaders. See F. A. Rosales for a full treatment of this subject, especially chapter 14 where he discusses Chicanos abandoning the idea of being "white Americans with Mexican ancestry" and embracing a "new Chicano identity." He explains this further by saying "Chicano activists legitimately understood the contradiction of trying to be white or Anglo...the work of Mexican philosopher Jose Vasconcelos, <i>La Raza Cosmica</i> (The Cosmic Race) with its message of a new hemispheric bronze people, resonated." (253). Also see Acuna's remarks about Chicanos rejecting being "liberated by white women." (340). This kind of separation from Anglo-Americanism was popularized by JA Gutierrez in his infamous "Kill the Gringo" speech and, more recently, his "Chicano Manual on How to Handle Gringos."</p> <p>Text has been amended to change "largely originated from the university" to "gained momentum through the efforts of college-educated Mexican-American youth" Also, text has deleted "resided in, but was untouched by, white American society" and changed to "self-determining, especially on political, educational, and cultural matters."</p>	<p>Acuna, Occupied America (2014)  E. Zamora, Chicano Socialist Labor Activity in Texas: 1900-1920 (Journal de Aztlan, 1975)  FA Rosales, Chicano! The History of the Mexican-American Civil Rights Movement (1997)  Gutierrez, J.A. "Chicano Manual on How to Handle Gringos" (2004)</p>
NA	270		<p>Page 270  This page illustrates the overuse of the verb "to be" which indicates the lack of attention to good English usage and highlights the authors' poor writing skills. The consistent use of passive voice creates difficulty for the students and teachers in understanding the actions portrayed and more importantly the actors depicted.</p> <p>The use of the word "common" in line four of the first paragraph illustrates the poor use of English. What is a "common Mexican"? Similarly, the use of "the great flowering of the Mexican-American community" resonates as a diction error and a bad choice of words. This Section is entitled "The Mexican Revolution" at the top of page 270 with the sub-heading "Background to Revolution" listed at the bottom of the page with no white space in between and with no clear indication that this is a second level heading.</p>	<p>Errors in use of the English language.</p>		<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC.</p>	
NA	271		<p>Page 271  The first paragraph on this page demonstrates the wordiness and vagueness exhibited throughout this textbook coupled with awkward writing hampering student comprehension and understanding. Incorrect punctuation not only demonstrates bad English but also sends mixed signals to the students. The attempt to identify and define selected words in the margins fail in part due to the lack of capitalization and the lack of consistency in the use of periods after the definitions. The first words defined in Chapter 6 "labor camps" begin with the words "a place where people are imprisoned" without capitalization at the beginning and with no period at the end of the statement.</p> <p>Yet the next words identified "Standard Oil" are capitalized with the opening word of the definition "an," not capitalized and followed with the words "by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1911." This definition statement ends in a period; however, throughout Chapter 6, these definitions are neither capitalized nor punctuated. This utter lack of consistency and disregard for good punctuation sets a bad example for Texas students.</p>	<p>Errors in the use of the English Language.</p>		<p>This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC.</p>	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
NA	272		<p>Page 272 The use of passive voice, the lack of consistency and the over use of the verb "to be" continues on this page. Errors in parallelism and use of slang are evidenced in the first paragraph with the use of the slang "a lot" and the overuse of the word "This" at the beginning of sentences creating an unclear reference. The phrase in paragraph two "broke him out of jail" uses incorrect English and if meant as slang is totally inadmissible. The use of such language borders on "street" language and has no place in a student textbook.</p>	Errors in the use of the English language.		This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC.	
NA	273		<p>Page 273 This page illustrates the lack of depth and perspective presented in the textbook. Unclear references in general with several pronoun-reference mistakes especially in using the pronoun "They." Omission of facts and information is prevalent throughout. Spanish names such as the phrase "Plan de San Luis Potosi" in the second paragraph require italics. The English used on this page exemplifies the lack of clarity throughout the textbook and the lack of documentation.</p>	Errors in the use of the English language.		This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC.	
NA	274		<p>Page 274 This page further demonstrates the mediocre, surface quality of the information and the awkwardness of sentences provided in the textbook. A single sentence punctuates the lack of attention to word usage, structure and seriousness of purpose: "One of their main tactics was to seize the railroads and supply lines, hijacking them in order to roll troops, on cars, set on fire into cities where Huerta's troops were stationed." What does this sentence mean? How are students and teachers to interpret bad English grammar which leads to lack of understanding. The same overuse of the word "to be," diction errors, and lack of italics for foreign words punctuates the overall lack of quality in this textbook.</p>	Errors in the use of the English language.		This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC, nor does the sentence read the way the reviewer has copied it.	
NA	275		<p>Page 275 This page illustrates the lack of clarity and the neglect of reader accessibility. The lack of white space evidenced throughout the textbook, clearly viewed here in the subheading entitled "Wilson Decides to Intervene." A shift in topic occurs but without signaling clearly to the students and teacher. The use of "there" in the second sentence is another of many instances of using "There" at the beginning of a sentence which should be used only to indicate location and direction.</p> <p>Recommendation: The textbook Mexican-American Heritage needs definitive removal from consideration as a textbook for use by students in the state of Texas. The textbook deserves disapproval and should be banned from use as a reference, resource, or on any type of list sanctioned by the SBOE of the state of Texas.</p>	Errors in the use of the English language.		This does not constitute a verified factual error as anticipated by the TAC.	

**Proclamation 2017 Publisher's Response to Factual Errors Reported by Public**

Affiliation, if applicable	Page(s)	Error Location	Alleged Error	Explanation/ Suggested Correction	Reference or Source of Suggested Correction	Publisher Response to Public-Reported Error	Publisher's Reference or Source
The University of Houston	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. ☐		This does not constitute a verified factual error. The reviewer's complaints are not even clear: what above noted passage? Reviewer simply makes subjective observations without any authority. It appears they are saying that the text needs to include additional content describing the political divisions between liberal, conservatives, federalists and centralists when distinctions between liberals and conservatives are made in this chapter (with vocab definitions supplied on p.77) as are federalists (defined p.80) and centralists (e.g. p.154, 184). These terms are also used in future chapters. No inclusion of more content is required. Reviewer also asserts that the description of Mexico at the time of independence is in error when it is not. Historical sources commonly discuss the factors listed in the text as motivating Mexico towards revolution, usually attributing them to the non-reformist nature of Spanish government between the conquistadors and 1800. Acuna in <i>Occupied America</i> says, "Three hundred years of mercantilism had left New Spain without its own commercial or manufacturing infrastructure (34) and that "Mexico did not yet have a set national identity," was "bankrupt with little chance for stability" (40), was plagued by racial troubles towards Indians and mestizos (34-35, 40), and had the problem of 81.7% of Mexicans having little to no access to land (33-34). More academically speaking, Britannica Macropedia describes the Mexican Republic in 1824 as having "a precarious economy" with "depleted capital reserves" and a terrible national debt with "insufficient public monies," in addition to "reduced available funds for education and other social and cultural improvements" despite Mexican leaders' desires to give them. The article also suggests that "in many ways, [Indians and peasants] were worse off during the 19th century than they had been under the paternalism of the Spanish crown" because of "political instability" and "restrictive state legislation that excluded the great mass of peasantry from the political process."  The text is voluntarily being edited to state, "Lastly, average American citizens were permitted to express themselves in avenues outside government such as businesses, churches, and voluntary associations. Americans could express disapproval by voting, choosing where to spend their money, or creating new options if they did not like the ones they had. The government of New Spain, in contrast, did not incentivize these democratic options, so revolutionary action became the standard way to voice dissent and the need for reforms. On the eve of independence, civil liberties and economic opportunities were still limited. The majority of people did not have access to good education, land ownership, or freedoms of religion and speech. Additionally, the central government faced financial trouble. These were some of the obstacles the young Mexican republic had to overcome, after achieving independence."	Britannica Macropedia, "Mexico" R. Acuna, <i>Occupied America</i>
The University of Houston	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error. The requirement for the inclusion of either "retired" or "former" do not generally lend themselves to such titles. Porter did resign from the U.S. Navy prior to serving as commander in chief of the Mexican Navy, as required by law. However, he did remain in a naval capacity as the highest ranking officer. Moreover, it is not mandatory that a resigned member of the government or military be referred to as "retired" or "former" in historical narrative (i.e. "former" President McKinley, "retired" General Dwight D. Eisenhower...). Additionally, David Porter is listed online in sources as "Commodore David Porter" i.e. <a href="https://www.geni.com/people/Commodore-David-Porter-USN/6000000012889632712">https://www.geni.com/people/Commodore-David-Porter-USN/6000000012889632712</a> However, for purposes of clarity, authors are voluntarily amending the text to read, "by a former U.S. Commodore, "	<a href="https://www.geni.com/people/Commodore-David-Porter-USN/6000000012889632712">https://www.geni.com/people/Commodore-David-Porter-USN/6000000012889632712</a>
The University of Houston	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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but undocumented debatable opinion. TSHA online says, "There were only three settlements in the province of Texas in 1820: Nacogdoches, San Antonio de Béxar, and La Bahía del Espíritu Santo (later Goliad), small towns with outlying ranches." Tejano population numbers on the eve of the General Colonization Laws vary in historical sources, with THSA offering 2500 ( <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/npm01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/npm01</a> ), 5000 by Rodriguez/de la Teja ( <i>Myths and Misperceptions</i> ) and Russell ( <i>The History of Mexico</i> ).  Text has been amended to say, "...there were an estimated 2500-5000 Tejano citizens. Many of them had been sent involuntarily by the government to hold the area from French or Native American encroachment, both of which the Spanish before them had encountered."  (citation for this last statement comes from TR Fehrenbach, <i>Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans</i> )	<a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/npm01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/npm01</a> Rodriguez/de la Teja ( <i>Myths and Misperceptions</i> ) Russell ( <i>The History of Mexico</i> ). TR Fehrenbach, <i>Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans</i>
The University of Houston	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."	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.		This does not constitute a verified factual error but an undocumented debatable position. Historian Colin Woodard in "American Nations" uses "El Norte" to refer to the Spanish frontier, or the "norteno" population of the Mexican North/American Southwest from approximately 1560 onwards. However, the text has voluntarily deleted the "El Norte" term, so this complaint is moot.	<i>American Nations: A History of the Eleven Rival Regional Cultures</i> , Colin Woodard. Penguin Books, 2012.
The University of Houston	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.		This error has already been corrected in the Sept 2nd edition; it is not currently in the text so this complaint is moot.	
The University of Houston	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. ☐		This does not constitute a verified factual error but debatable opinion. Additionally, this sentence was amended in the Sept 2nd edition; it is not currently in the text so this complaint is moot. Additionally, Tejanos (as residents of Mexican Texas) were allowed 11 leagues of land, per one to Anglo immigrants, i.e. "Titles were limited to residents and were not to exceed eleven leagues to an individual." <a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ugm01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ugm01</a>	<a href="https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ugm01">https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ugm01</a>