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Abstract

The Strange Career of Bilingual Education: A History of the Political and Pedagogical Debate Over Language Instruction in American Public Education, 1890-1990

by

Carlos Kevin Blanton

This dissertation is an analysis of the history of the modern bilingual education movement of the 1960s, the older bilingual tradition of schooling in this nation since the nineteenth century, and the early to middle years of the twentieth century when English-Only pedagogy appeared as a dramatic aberration to the American bilingual tradition. The historiography and interpretive battles of this subject are examined and explained in the Introduction. Chapter One offers a brief historical sketch of bilingual schooling in Texas during the nineteenth century. Chapter Two evaluates the role of the Progressive Education Movement in Texas and the destruction of the long-held practice of bilingual schooling. Chapters Three through Five demonstrate the influence of the Americanization Movement in Texas, the practice of English-Only pedagogy, and the role of intelligence testing in the education of Mexican Americans. Chapter Six examines the developments in language instruction during World War II and the post-war changes in pedagogy. Chapter Seven analyzes the Mexican American response to the English-Only language policies of Texas and relates that response to the community's sense of cultural identity.
Finally, Chapter Eight documents the birth in the 1960s of the official bilingual education movement.

This study has several important implications for the controversial issue of bilingual education and the study of education in American history. Too often, the judgments of respected historians and the opinions of nativists virtually agree on the same assumptions and complaints regarding bilingual education. This is largely because historians have neglected to write the history of bilingual education and the development of public school language policy and pedagogy. This work, largely through the case study of Texas offers a glimpse of bilingual instruction that demonstrates its former rich acceptance and widely disseminated practice in everyday American life. The bilingual tradition was not an aberration; rather, the more recent practice of English-Only is the true fluke in American education history. With this massive reorientation in historical conceptualization, perhaps attitudes regarding modern bilingual instruction can become more reflective and sophisticated, and less based on misinformation and passion. Also, the tolerance, spirit of democratic localism, and implicit multiculturalism inherent in the practice of bilingual instruction all offer new ways in which to view the American past, causing a re-evaluation of the validity of the American melting-pot metaphor, the traditional myth arguing for rapid and relatively painless immigrant assimilation.
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Introduction:
On Studying Language in History

Any attempt to historicize the development of bilingual instruction in Texas schools is limited by the paucity of secondary literature on the history of bilingualism and education in Texas and the nation, and the absence in that literature of any kind of interpretive synthesis. Some scholars, not many of them historians, have written of the past phenomenon of bilingual instruction; there are, however, very few attempts to fully define or explore in any meaningful manner America's nineteenth-century bilingual tradition in schooling. American historians have largely refused to examine social life through the prism of language and education. By not doing so, they have contributed to the widespread and erroneous myth that language diversity and bilingual education are of recent significance and form no great part of the common experiences that have shaped this nation. Historians have largely failed to engage with the work of sociologists, linguists and other social scientists who have written of the history of language issues in American life. This introduction will begin by examining how scholars in a variety of fields approach the history of languages theoretically. Then it will briefly examine the historiography of bilingual education in the United States during the nineteenth century as well as the general patterns of its existence.

* * * * *
In addition to public laws and policies, the study of language also includes broader avenues of social relationships. The study of the history of language is an attempt to reconstruct the social interactions between individuals while vividly illustrating dimensions of racial, class, and national identity. These daily processes and exchanges, while bound by the dominant historical and cultural context shaping them, are mostly unreflected upon. Students of the connections between history and language have utilized the theoretical writings of linguists, anthropologists, sociologists, and philosophers to piece together the fabric of social life relating to the all-encompassing uses of language; languages everyday and formal, sanctioned and criminalized, and powerful and powerless.

Much of the literature on the history of bilingual education in the United States discusses specific laws dealing with the use of non-English languages. But these efforts fail to conceive of language as being anything more than just an instructional or communicative medium. Crucial historical context is often left out in these stories. In my particular undertaking, the theoretical work of Pierre Bourdieu on the historical context of language is influential. Arguing against structuralists in the fields of linguistics and anthropology, Bourdieu contends that language as a historical phenomenon should not be viewed as a static and unchanging thing that is to be understood and deciphered
only in an ideal linguistic exchange. Rather, language should be historicized to illustrate its subtle reflection of varying conceptions of class, race, and national identity invoked by its articulators.

The history of the evolution of the French language offers a good example of this approach. Bourdieu notes that only after the Revolution were the regional, non-French languages within France considered corrupted. The word *patois* before the Revolution merely meant an unknown speech. After the Revolution *patois* came to mean a type of barbarous slang in the minds of cultural nationalists who, already in possession of the one national language, were able to achieve a cultural and social dominance over the lower classes and rural inhabitants that matched their growing economic and political dominance. Thus for Bourdieu, the creation of the French language and its institutionalization through the growth of the state educational system and the French Academy was not a neutral and natural progression of an idiom governed by predictable linguistic rules and patterns. Rather, it was a reflection of tremendous shifts in political and economic power at a specific time in France's history. In regulating the very means of communication between individuals in both public and private venues, the growing French state created its own linguistic market.¹

Germane to the present study is how language is dealt with in education. Staying with the example of France, Bourdieu claims of its revolutionaries that "To induce the holders of dominated linguistic competencies to collaborate in the destruction of their instruments of expression...it was necessary for the school system to be perceived as the principle (indeed, the only) means of access to administrative positions which were all the more attractive in areas where industrialization was least developed." For Bourdieu, the linguistic unification of France was fueled by shifts in economic power created by the rise of industrialization. Historian Eugen Weber documents Bourdieu's contentions. Weber argues that in the 1860s at least one-fifth of the entire French population could not actually speak French and that the rise of public education as a means of nationalizing the nation, an idea originally born of the Revolution, was conceived by its proponents as most significantly pertaining to school instruction in the "correct" French language and its resultant destruction of regional dialects. The linguistic unification of France dramatically accelerated in the middle of the nineteenth century with the implementation of compulsory school attendance and increased vigilance in the exclusive use of French for instruction. Weber, while admitting that this

---

2 Ibid., 49.
came at a sometimes painful price, nevertheless avoids Bourdieu's dire judgments of exploitative power relationships by claiming that this state-directed linguistic unification was imposed not "through persecution...[but instead] through the peasants' growing appreciation of the usefulness of a less parochial language and of the skills learned in the schools."  

In several instances Weber unintentionally addresses the phenomenon of bilingual education in nineteenth century France. For Weber, instruction in the native dialect or patois was simply parochial resistance to the inevitable and obviously reasonable end-result of French linguistic dominance. Weber also viewed much of the French instruction received by students in non-French-speaking regions to be useless in that it was taught as an academic second language like Latin or Greek. Although French officials sanctioned the use of bilingual translations of the local dialect to French in order for children to better gain mastery of the national language, Weber only briefly notes this phenomenon without apparent interest. Weber identifies a type of intensive "French-Only" instruction utilized in the public schools of the isolated provinces in France and in the colonies resembling what is known today as "immersion" instructional policy, but he fails to significantly describe the pedagogy or its political impact other than to say that

---

4 Ibid., 314.
5 Ibid., 312.
it "was logical...[and] the logic inescapable."
Indeed, pedagogy is absent from Weber's work. Weber's implicit characterization of the bilingual character of France as nothing more than an obstacle on the road to inevitable national unity remains unreflective and unsatisfying.

Weber's theory of linguistic unification ultimately owes more to the idea of modernization than it does to the public school system. Many studies of nationalism and the imposition or creation of a universal vernacular language argue that modernization gave rise to nationalist impulses and the mechanisms by which this nationalism could be achieved. By modernization Weber and other authors mean the revolution in communications and especially print media that occurred in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries throughout Europe and the New World. The spread of the French tongue through newspapers and other print media was indispensable to the linguistic unification of France. Weber is not alone in this assessment. Benedict Anderson, a prominent historian of nationalism, has recorded that "The general growth in literacy, commerce, industry, communications and state machineries that marked the nineteenth century created powerful new impulses for

---

6 Ibid., 490. Although it is rich with primary sources, Weber's work illustrates the lack of engagement that historians have had for bilingualism and bilingual instruction. In conceiving of bilingual education as nothing more than an aberration, Weber misses a valuable window into the past.

7 Ibid., 468-70.
vernacular linguistic unification." While this may be true, it still ignores the unique role played by the educational system of the state in fostering linguistic unity. Other observers incorporate the role of education in their modernization theses more significantly, although they define modernization in loose and general terms.  

One final theoretical thread useful in discussing the fabric of language and education is that of colonialism. Scholars and intellectuals in Third World countries have grappled with the cultural and social effects of European colonialism. One of these intellectuals, Frantz Fanon, wrote extensively about the colonial imposition of a foreign language to a subjugated people who, more often than not, were also darker. Fanon captured this function of language in a colonial setting when he claimed, "Every colonized people—in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality—finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country." Capturing the charged racial dynamic of this discursive incident, Fanon went on to state, "The Negro of the Antilles will be proportionately whiter—that is, he will come closer to being a real human being—in

---

direct ratio to his mastery of the French language." For
Fanon, deconstructing the racialized meaning of language in
colonial life was an effort to combat racism and political
domination. In this colonial setting, the category of
language involves more than conceptions of national identity
and class; it also involves conceptions of race.

Third World colonialism was also used as a construction
for better understanding race relations in the United States
as a type of "internal" colonialism. In the 1970s a number
of Chicano scholars explored the writings of Fanon and other
colonial theorists to better understand their own experiences
with racism and economic stratification. One of the leading
theoreticians of Mexican American history is Mario Barrera.
He maintains that the once prevalent ideas of Mexican
American schoolchildren being unable to master the English
language due to cultural deficiency failed to consider the
possibility of instruction in languages other than English
because of internal colonialism. It was impossible to
conclude that "the 'deficiency' here is not in the minority
racial group but in the educational system itself," because
the very ethnocentrism that fueled the idea that Mexican
American children could not learn was a useful tool for

---

10 Frantz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks, trans. Charles
11 For a brief discussion of this historiographical trend
in Chicano scholarship see Camille Guerin-Gonzalez,
"Conversing Across Boundaries of Race, Ethnicity, Class,
Gender, and Region: Latino and Latina Labor History," Labor
History, 35 (Fall 1994), 555.
subjugating this colonized people. Barrera believes that the racism of internal colonialism has been utilized by whites against Mexican Americans in the Southwest primarily to maintain and expand economic domination. Although not nearly as concerned with language or the politics of language as was Fanon, Barrera does include the intersection of language and education as an element of internal control that he claims is a part of the "episode in the territorial expansion of Europe and European-derived societies that began in the fifteenth century." This has resulted in the exploitation of Mexican American labor by means of "a system of class segmentation...that bound Chicanos to a structurally subordinate position in society."

The theoretical ideas mentioned above, some of which bear little direct relationship to the history of bilingual education in Texas, do illustrate the complexity of language-related topics in history. Bourdieu's insistence upon historicizing the patterns of language in everyday life along with his desire to utilize the category as a mechanism for illustrating exploitive power relationships in the linguistic unification of France is insightful and highly useful, as are the studies of nationalism and modernization. In the United States the issues associated with bilingual education can be readily related to the works of Frantz Fanon and Mario

---

13 Ibid., 218.
Barrera, which explain the blending of racial discrimination and class exploitation. None of these works tell the story of bilingual instruction in Texas. They do, however, offer intriguing and important ways of thinking about the issues to be explored later in this study.

* * * * *

The scholarly literature in the field of bilingual education did not begin to include the history of its practice until the 1960s. These historical works, which have defined and redefined the parameters of the scholarly field of the history of bilingual education, reflect various arguments about the bilingual education tradition in the United States. Often they were written by early supporters of bilingual education who discovered some utility in the historical record of bilingual instruction in American life as they simultaneously constructed the nation's initial bilingual education programs of the modern era. They merit some attention before any attempt to begin outlining the history of bilingual education in Texas may be undertaken.

Although there are several authors who helped create the field in the 1960s, Joshua Fishman deserves primary consideration. Approaching the topic of language maintenance among ethnic groups in the United States, Fishman necessarily dealt with the concept, still illegal in many states but then gaining ground in higher pedagogical circles, of bilingual instruction. In order to meet his desire for maintaining the numerous foreign languages still present in the United
States, Fishman proposed that "nothing would seem better calculated to strengthen it than the preparation of cadres of young and rigorously educated bilingual-bicultural cultural leaders" and that "Ethnic group schools are in the best position to accomplish this—but are frequently unable to do so without assistance." Fishman argued that from the earliest days of colonial exploration the diversity of languages in American life represented a fatal flaw in the traditional melting-pot metaphor of rapid immigrant assimilation. "Theoretically, the American melting pot should have been more successful," claimed Fishman who went on to conclude, "It may be that ethnicity is one of the strongest unrecognized facets of American life." For Fishman and others, the preservation of language diversity was indicative of cultural pluralism, tolerance, and democracy.

14 Joshua Fishman, "Planned Reinforcement of Language Maintenance in the United States: Suggestions for the Conservation of a Neglected National Resource," in Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups, ed. Joshua Fishman (The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1966), 383. This collection of essays edited by Fishman represented a watershed of sorts in that it advocated federally directed bilingual education both as a compensatory measure to aid in the immigrant child's progress in school and as a means for language maintenance. It also introduced in one volume the work of several scholars such as Joshua Fishman, Heinz Kloss, and Nathan Glazer, who were involved with the development and critique of the federal government's efforts at bilingual education.

A crucial essay in *Language Loyalty* by Jane Macnab Christian and Chester C. Christian, Jr., dissected the language issue with regard to Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Dealing with the dilemma of institutionalized failure for Mexican Americans in the public school system, these authors supported both bilingual and bicultural education. Addressing the cultural aspect, they foreshadow the accusations of future Chicano internal colonialists by arguing that vernacular instruction to native Spanish-speakers in the Southwest was suppressed because it was "the language of a 'conquered' and largely 'lower' socioeconomic group."\(^{16}\) This cultural part of bilingual-bicultural education, while important politically, was meaningless to the pedagogical community without its linguistic counterpart, the "lingual" aspect of bilingual education. The authors summarized the growing linguistic justification for bilingual education by remarking of bilingualism that "The more languages and cultures to which he becomes able to respond in terms of their greatest subtleties, the more complete, authentic, and adaptable an individual he can be."\(^{17}\) In other words, not only did vernacular instruction for native Spanish-speakers make good political sense in reversing historical exploitation, but it also made for smarter and more capable students. The first proposition, the cultural


\(^{17}\) Ibid., 302. Original italics included.
argument, could be readily agreed to in the early days of the Great Society, but the "lingual" aspect of bilingual education was more controversial in academic circles.

Fishman's *Language Loyalty in the United States* preceded the official bilingual education movement. After the federal government de-criminalized bilingual education in 1967 and provided some small amounts of research money toward its pedagogical development, the literature on bilingual education changed in tone and direction. The work on bilingual education and the history of vernacular instruction came to take on a more institutionalized form. Representative of this shift is the pioneering work of Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer. Andersson, a decades-long champion of second language instruction in the elementary grades for English-speaking children, was the director of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory at the University of Texas. It was through this policy and research institute that Andersson helped shape the modern bilingual education movement. Funded by federal grants from the U.S. Office of Education, Andersson and Boyer in 1970 published a two-volume set of materials pertaining to bilingual education. They suggested program goals and rationales, and proposed guidelines to ensure a successful program. Theirs was very much a "how to" publication that was imperative in the first few years after the passage of the Bilingual Education Act. Even though its authors viewed their materials as merely a "preliminary effort...to be
improved after more study and research," it remains significant that the first part of the two-volume set begins with a forty-page history of the bilingual tradition of instruction in American schools and the second volume is primarily two hundred pages worth of historical appendices pertaining to that tradition. The history of bilingual education was as important to the movement's leaders in the 1960s as was its current pedagogical research.\(^{18}\)

Another influential and institutional type of scholarly work in the early years of bilingual education's de-criminalized existence took the form of a government study by U.S. Department of Commerce researcher Arnold Leibowitz. Published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Leibowitz's lengthy treatment outlined the destruction of the bilingual tradition through English-Only laws that, beginning at the turn of the century and achieving full force during World War I, were adopted in the local and state levels at the direction of a nativist and colonially-minded federal government. Leibowitz in 1971 lent credence to the internal colonial model of Chicano academics by concluding of the federal government's push of English-Only legislation that it "was framed and operated in the same way as when it was framed and formulated by a government dealing with a colonial people." Except in this instance as

---

befitting the internal colonial scheme, English-Only was also applied to "groups that did not have a colonial status but were outside the conventional image of an American at the time."\textsuperscript{19}

The most influential and thoroughly historical treatment of bilingual education in the United States is Heinz Kloss's \textit{The American Bilingual Tradition}. Kloss described through extensive legal research the existence of the bilingual tradition and its destruction during World War I. Before Kloss, much of the research on the history of bilingualism in American education was conducted in essays, book chapters, appendices, and institutional documents. With this effort he gave the field needed depth. Kloss's importance is the attachment of historical significance and substance to the bilingual tradition of the nineteenth century, especially through the example of German communities in urban areas of the Midwest.\textsuperscript{20}

In the late 1970s and 1980s the published record of scholarly consensus on bilingual education's history began to fracture. On the one hand, there remained the traditional supporters of the idea of bilingual education. However, a


\textsuperscript{20} Heinz Kloss, \textit{The American Bilingual Tradition} (Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Press, 1977). Although Kloss presents a wealth of data, he is content to examine language generally in American life and not focus solely on educational matters. Consequently, a great deal regarding pedagogy and intellectual context is ignored.
political opposition to bilingual education had formed and that opposition began to work its way into the literature. Works now criticized the contemporary bilingual education movement implicitly by explicitly questioning its past. For example, in 1981 Shirley Brice Heath reinterpreted the American bilingual tradition's significance as substantially less than what Kloss, Fishman, and Andersson had previously asserted. Heath argued that language maintenance was overrated (as was the concept of ethnicity) in American life and that immigrants chose to learn English and assimilate in a rapidly industrializing and modernizing world where English skills were regarded as an economic asset.

In making this claim, Heath came full circle in disregarding Fishman's fulminations of the 1960s as to the fallacy of the melting pot metaphor. To Heath, one's language choice was entirely a personal response "shaped by socio-economic forces."21 Responding to Leibowitz's position, Heath argued that "numerous diverse languages and varieties of English have been maintained in communities across the United States, and there has never been federal legislation to eliminate them."22 Authoritatively, Heath claims to speak

---

22 Ibid., 6. Here Heath scores only debater's points. Leibowitz and others do not, as she would have them, argue that the federal government decreed through statute that English was the official language or that any other language was illegal. In doing so Heath misrepresents the argument about the detached but effective role of the federal government in weeding out bilingual instruction in American
for the majority of Americans in concluding of the work of the bilingual pioneers mentioned earlier that "the majority of U.S. citizens do not seem to see the Bilingual Education Act as reviving a valuable tradition we have lost, but rather as an aberration in American history."\textsuperscript{23} Brice's conflation of scholarly opposition to bilingual education with highly speculative and personal interpretations of public opinion and collective memory is evident. Academic research was becoming more overtly politicized.

Throughout the 1980s there appeared other studies highly critical of the bilingual education of the past. One influential researcher skeptical of the bilingual tradition is Steven Schlossman, who, like Kloss, focuses on German bilingualism in Midwestern cities. Schlossman argues that although the previous research does illustrate a definite bilingualism in public education, the phenomenon was never a unified and national movement, the pedagogy was too crude and unreflective to constitute much of a link with the modern techniques of language instruction used today, and it was a political aberration that owed its existence to the American democratic spirit of experimentation and localism. Schlossman advances impressive research implying that the

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 18.
previous generation of scholarship on the bilingual tradition was guilty of romanticizing the past for the political and practical purposes of building more support for bilingual education. He concludes, "One can easily romanticize this process, yet it would be foolish to do so; the process legitimated haphazard planning, inadequate supervision, gross organizational blunders, and pedagogical about-faces that doubtless confused children greatly."²⁴ Instead, Schlossman argues that only through "a community-by-community basis" (exactly the hodgepodge pedagogical diet he earlier rails against) can the true tradition of bilingualism in education be maintained.²⁵ Schlossman argues in essence that there is a bilingual tradition, but its importance has been overemphasized by researchers more interested in defending modern bilingual education than in giving an accurate picture of the past.

In contrast to the spate of criticism regarding the bilingual tradition in American education, there were also studies that used historical analysis to bolster support for

²⁴ Steven L. Schlossman, "Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education? German in the Public Elementary Schools, 1840-1919" American Journal of Education, 91 (February 1983), 180. The research on the bilingual tradition in Texas presented in the next chapter refutes several of Schlossman's criticisms. The evidence for his own conclusions is rather opaque and surprisingly can be used to support the opposite contention with equal vigor.

²⁵ Ibid., 181. For an additional article by Schlossman that questions the historical accuracy of supporters of bilingual education see "Self-Evident Remedy? George I. Sánchez, Segregation, and Enduring Dilemmas in Bilingual Education" Teachers College Record, 84 (Summer 1983), 871-907.
contemporary bilingual education. Some of this work was openly, even brazenly, supportive of bilingual education. Just as the political opposition to bilingual education began to build, Joshua Fishman, who in the 1970s was very active in the bilingual education movement, wrote an international comparison of worldwide bilingual education programs with those of the United States. Operating in a field now with institutionalized parameters and only a somewhat contested history (although in 1976 much less so), Fishman forthrightly declared that "This is a partisan volume" and that his book was "unabashedly in favor of bilingual education." 26 Fishman's sense of the history of bilingual education in the United States had become even more explicitly favorable of the bilingual tradition when he claimed that previous immigrants' "Anglification" replaced a vibrant multiculturalism and that "only the xenophobia of World War I days has erased that fact from our historical consciousness." 27

In the 1980s and the 1990s new attention to the bilingual tradition was being drawn from quarters outside academia. The increasing politicization of bilingual education and opposition to it from political leaders and grassroots conservative activists stands at stark odds with the position of the research community. As the pedagogical

27 Ibid., 120.
experts argue for more bilingual education, they are faced with a situation in which political support is shifting away from them. There is research, some of it of dubious nature, that contradicts the main body of the previous three decades of scientific findings on the efficacy of bilingual education. But for the most part, the language experts still support bilingual education and the political activists—ironically opposite to the way these camps stood in the 1960s—oppose it. Given that the heat of debate on bilingual education is no longer in academic journals as much as it is in the public press, it is fitting that journalists are the latest commentators on the bilingual historical tradition. In addition to currently maintaining a "Language Policy Website & Emporium" to air grievances on the internet with California's recent English-Only referendum movement, journalist and bilingual education advocate James Crawford synthesizes the field's academic literature in books designed for a wider audience. Crawford also incorporates historical documents in his work as well as securing contributions from other scholars pertaining to the nature of language politics.  

The previous works highlight the interpretive issues central to the development of the history of bilingual

---

education. The early research struggled mightily to carve out a new field of inquiry in bringing to light connections between the nation's forgotten bilingual past and what they saw as the educational shortcomings of their own present. Early researchers in this vein, like Fishman, Kloss, and Andersson, sought to give current bilingual education programs that were just beginning a "useable past" that would in some measure both point directions for bilingual educators and rally support for their cause. This work took place at the time that the nation was beginning to rethink ethnicity and the traditional notions of the American melting pot. The bilingual past uncovered by this generation of scholarship would receive both support and criticism from later research in the 1980s. In many ways, this later research took its cue from the then-forming political opposition to bilingual education that was introduced into the political arena with its first legislatively determined cutbacks in the late 1970s. The sharpest criticism in the academic community regarding the nineteenth-century bilingual tradition appeared as conservative political activists began grassroots campaigns for English-Only legislation in the 1980s that would re-criminalize bilingual education. While most academics in the 1990s still give credence and support to the bilingual tradition, the debate has begun to reach into the general public with the writings of journalists and activists on both sides. Clearly, there is no better time for
historians to engage in this scrutinization of America's bilingual past.

* * * * *

Although this study will focus on the history of language instruction in Texas, a national perspective is necessary background. The research regarding the nineteenth-century bilingual tradition is widely scattered over different fields and approaches the topic from a number of perspectives. Some of the works are ethnic studies while others are education histories. Some deal primarily with immigration, others with law; a few are purely local histories, while some of these sources are government reports. In a multiplicity of ways they all attempt to come to terms with the history of bilingual education. This review of prior research highlights several important questions: Is there a genuine bilingual tradition? If there is a bilingual tradition then what makes it significant? What was the political rationale or justification for support of bilingual education by non-ethnic public school officials? In other words, why did they allow it when the same type of officials would later call for its dismantling? Which immigrant and ethnic groups did this bilingual instruction affect, how uniform were the wishes and desires of each, and how similar or dissimilar were these situations?

The most fundamental and elementary of questions regarding the bilingual tradition is whether or not it existed to any significant degree. No serious researcher of
immigrants, schools, and language has taken the position that there is no history or tradition of bilingual instruction in American education. The debate has been one of determining how serious or significant was that tradition. The starting point for any study into the question of the bilingual tradition is Heinz Kloss's *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Kloss, who deals mostly with German Americans in the Midwest, documents the importance of this tradition showing that it was not only ethnic parochial schools that instructed in both the mother tongue and English, but that some of the largest public school systems in the United States operated in this manner for several decades. Kloss notes that in Cincinnati, especially, bilingual instruction was so advanced that organizationally it resembled bilingual education programs of today. Cincinnati public schools instituted bilingual instruction for their large numbers of German American students in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Their programs, like many modern-day bilingual education programs, phased out the mother tongue by the fourth grade. Between 1870 and 1914, Cincinnati consistently enrolled over 10,000 students per year in classrooms that utilized both the English and German languages. In the earlier grades German instruction was used one half of the school day while all-English instruction began after three years.29

---

Much like the bilingual education programs today, the aims of this type of educational bilingualism was to "mainstream" children into English-Only, multi-ethnic classrooms by the late elementary years.\(^{30}\) In other words, these programs were intended to be (and were) transitional in nature, not permanent. These programs represented the desire of the immigrants to be incorporated into the English-speaking world, not to isolate themselves from it. This was not just language or cultural maintenance, although that was also important. The only German instruction in Cincinnati beyond the elementary years was a language class offered in the high schools. The example of Cincinnati dramatically illustrates that these bilingual practices were a part of a loosely knit multicultural past that is now mostly forgotten as debates rage today over that very same multiculturalism.\(^{31}\)

\(^{30}\) The phrase "mainstreaming" refers to transferring the bilingual student into a non-bilingual classroom. Federal law and the separate laws of many states make mainstreaming mandatory after a certain baseline of English language proficiency can be scored on a standardized test.

\(^{31}\) Ibid. Kloss makes similar arguments regarding the bilingual programs of the public school systems of other Midwestern cities such as Cleveland, St. Louis, and Indianapolis. Although Kloss never argues such, Schlossman's caution to bilingual scholars that none of these programs were centrally coordinated into a national bilingual education movement deserves to be reevaluated. These programs were locally administered and supervised and, as Schlossman indicates, represent the primacy of nineteenth-century democratic localism more than they do national sympathy with Germans or non-English-speaking immigrants. That being so, Schlossman's interpretational overreach (because of a lack of central coordination, the bilingual tradition is vastly diminished in importance and in historical significance) is quite puzzling. I take the position that while other large metropolitan school systems at this same time, notably New York, were imposing English-
Can these bilingual practices be significant if they were ineffective or intellectually sterile? Just as bilingual education today still remains subject to the "effectiveness debate," it is important for the purposes of this study to determine just how effective and pedagogically thought-out this bilingual tradition may have been.\textsuperscript{32} If there is not to be found any sophistication regarding its methods and justification, then perhaps critics are correct to disparage the significance of this tradition of bilingualism in the classroom.

The charge has been leveled that these programs were full of "pedagogical about-faces" and "haphazard planning."\textsuperscript{33} It is of course true that they differed widely in intent and in methods. Some of these large Midwestern public schools mixed English and German together and others stressed mostly German at first and then gradually phased it out as English was phased in. Modern methods of teaching English as a second language (ESL) did not exist at that time, and much of the language instruction, as it also was for English speakers, was done by rote and drills utilizing grammatical

\textsuperscript{32} The "effectiveness debate" is about the effectiveness of bilingual education. In other words, does bilingual education work? If so then how, why, and to what degree?

\textsuperscript{33} Schlossman, "Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education?," 180. Schlossman is the leading critic not of whether there was a bilingual tradition but over the significance of that tradition and its alleged lack of resemblance to modern practice.
translations—much how an adult would practice today upon taking a foreign language class as an academic subject. However, it is untrue that just because they were experimental and highly varied they lacked pedagogical sophistication. Schlossman himself, in attempting to show the pedagogical invalidity of these school systems, invalidates his own point by discussing at length the career of St. Louis public school superintendent William Torrey Harris. Harris instituted the bilingual policy for the German American population in the St. Louis public school system in 1864; and within ten years his bilingual program went from 450 students to over 15,000 students, representing 47 percent of the total enrollment in the elementary schools of St. Louis.34

The career of William Torrey Harris is of some use in evaluating the pedagogical substance of St. Louis’s bilingual programs. Harris was an intellectual of some renown, a prominent if not leading proponent of Hegelian philosophy in the United States. In addition to his intellectual credentials, Harris accrued some impressive pedagogical ones as well. William Torrey Harris was no pedagogical lightweight. He rose to the administrative pinnacle of American public education by becoming the director of the United States Bureau of Education in the late nineteenth century. Harris sanctioned, indeed created, the St. Louis

bilingual program in the 1860s even though he believed "there was never any question that the common language must be English." He did so because the goal of incorporating newcomers into the social and cultural fabric of American life meant that "in certain circumstances bilingual traditions should be encouraged."\(^{35}\) Harris's views on Americanizing through bilingual education were upheld in St. Louis's highly politicized school bureaucracy for over two decades despite the fact that Germans, most of them in Missouri being Republicans, were on the losing side of post-Reconstruction era politics. These views also did not sully Harris's national reputation as an educator with a keen eye toward the education of immigrants.\(^{36}\)

Schlossman's argument that these programs were pedagogically unsophisticated is also contradicted by his discussion of Harris's desire for his bilingual program to include non-German, English-speaking children in the same bilingual classes as the German children. Harris sought to distinguish the St. Louis program from Cincinnati's where they segregated the bilingual classes. Harris viewed this experiment in retrospect to be a surprising success.\(^{37}\) By mixing German and non-German students in the same classes he

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 61.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 76-77. Even though the bilingual program was scrapped by Democratic politicians in the late 1880s, the school system retained about one hundred German instructors and allowed for school facilities to teach German outside of school hours.

\(^{37}\) Schlossman, "Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education?," 164 and 182.
succeeded in accomplishing a feat some bilingual educators today dream about. Even though the classroom methods may not have had the benefit of modern-day teaching aids, testing procedures, and psychological evaluations, the St. Louis effort is an example of sophisticated pedagogical thinking far ahead of its time.38

Another important question is why public school officials, usually not ethnic themselves, would allow for dual language instruction in the public schools then when it is such a controversial choice in many quarters today? Many have stressed the political power of German Americans in securing these privileges, but there is more to it than

---

38 Some explanation is necessary here. There are bilingual education proponents today who argue for applying bilingual education techniques in classrooms of non-English-speaking children combined with monolingual English-speakers. This is called two-way bilingual education or dual language instruction. It is a controversial idea that has not received widespread acceptance in the general public or among some language experts. Certainly, federal guidelines prohibit any bilingual education program from retaining a child in bilingual classes if that student has achieved a minimum level of standard English proficiency. This is unless, of course, the child's parents request it and also if the school district is willing to comply. Nevertheless, two-way bilingual education is a dream for many proponents. Indicative of this attitude, Joshua Fishman in his Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective, p.ix, maintains of Anglo-Americans that "They need bilingual education more than they know; and only if they come to believe in and implement such education for themselves and for their monolingual charges will bilingual education really come into its own and attain its unique humanizing potential [original italics included]." See also James Crawford, Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice, 211-22. That this two-way bilingual education, a reality in St. Louis schools over a century ago, is the site of rigorous intellectual and pedagogical debate among scientific researchers today is further evidence of the high level of pedagogical thinking and creativity involved in the St. Louis effort that dated from 1864 to 1887.
simply that. While political power was an important factor, equally important was the attitude of Anglo public school officials who saw the bilingual schools in much the same light as William Torrey Harris: they were prime mechanisms for "Americanizing" immigrants. The reason the St. Louis and Cincinnati public school systems implemented English-German bilingual instruction in the curriculum was to get German American children to attend the public schools and abandon their private academies and parochial schools.

In yet a third major northern city, Baltimore, public school officials in 1874, hoping to assimilate the large number of German Americans, began an experimental bilingual school that offered instruction in both English and in German. By 1876 there were six such schools with 3,000 students; by 1897 there were seven schools at 6,780 students; and by 1900 seven schools maintained a combined enrollment of 7,600 German American children. The school district officially discontinued the bilingual schools in 1904. However, even though they were no longer listed on the official school reports, these bilingual schools seem to have, nevertheless, covertly continued in semi-official existence until the outbreak of World War I.39 There is some evidence that the Baltimore school system opened up its English-German bilingual schools to non-German-speaking children in an effort to broaden its appeal much in the way

Harris desired for German American and English-speaking children to be integrated in the same classes, thus addressing assimilation of immigrant populations by meeting them halfway.\textsuperscript{40}

The accommodationist position of school officials in cities like Baltimore, Cincinnati, and St. Louis could not have been affected without substantial political strength in the German community. Its political muscle in the mid-nineteenth century was unlike other non-English-speaking groups at the time as evidenced by the fact that German Americans were the only group to succeed in demanding bilingualism from the public school systems of large cities. The availability of bilingual English-German instruction depended upon the political clout of the German community to overcome standard curricular inertia and nominal resistance. German Americans also had political clout outside the cities. Bilingual instruction was also obtained for rural areas and was protected in numerous states by constitutional stipulation and state legislation. In the 1830s the Ohio state legislature decreed that any community possessing at least seventy-five taxpayers who petitioned for English-German language public schools would be allowed to form them.\textsuperscript{41} The federal courts throughout the later decades of


\textsuperscript{41} Arthur Charles Aaronson, "The Involvement of the Federal Government in Providing Public Instruction for Non-English-Speaking Pupils From 1800 to 1980" (Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1980),
the nineteenth century upheld similar laws in Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. Although the individual specifics of language instruction in each state is beyond the scope of this study, nineteenth-century bilingual instruction for Germans generally did not signify an academic course as much as the method of instruction. This is especially so since several states in the 1890s—Wisconsin, Illinois, and Massachusetts—dealt defeat to English-Only legislation that would have outlawed foreign languages as a method of instruction and limited their use as a course of study.

In response to critics like Schlossman who speak of the bilingual tradition in solely urban contexts, it is important to recognize that it was also rural; Germans had political power outside of the large Midwestern metropolis. Often rural German American farming communities could establish at least partial German instruction in the public school systems of the nineteenth century because of state laws that permitted locally controlled schools rather than centralized ones. Rural areas with a foreign-born population depended upon teachers who more often than not came from the same ethnic group and may have been foreign-born themselves. A

27. See also Steven Mintz, Moralists and Modernizers: America's Pre-Civil War Reformers (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 114.
42 George H. Parmele, et al., American Law Reports, Annotated 70 (1931), 1314.
federal education department publication of 1919 noted that over one-half of the rural teachers in Nebraska were foreign-born. This bulletin then argued that the variety of languages present in the public and non-public rural schools in Nebraska was not conducive to preparing the nation for entry into armed world conflict.\textsuperscript{44}

However, German Americans remained powerless to demand bilingual education in places where their political influence was weak. Famed historian of immigration Oscar Handlin concluded of Boston's German community that "A German school system therefore remained a chimerical hope in the minds of isolated individuals" since German American ethnic identity, in spite of the obvious glue of language, supposedly diminished in Boston more quickly than did Irish ethnicity.\textsuperscript{45} Boston and New York were among the first cities to outlaw foreign languages as mediums of instruction in their public schools by requiring English-Only instruction.\textsuperscript{46}

One question that has been neglected in the scholarship about the nation's bilingual tradition is how non-German groups fit into the pattern outlined by the German American community's successful demands for bilingual instruction.

\textsuperscript{46} English-Only pedagogy as the federally sanctioned alternative to bilingual education is the subject of Chapter Four.
Immigrant groups such as Italians, Czechs, and Poles did not have the political power to effect responses of accommodation from local school officials. This was so for three reasons. First, they either did not arrive in such large enough numbers or with the kind of resources as had many Germans. Second, they arrived later than the Germans after public education was becoming immune to political influence as a result of centralized bureaucratic control, a by-product of the growth of the politics of reform and Progressivism. The Germans came at a time when education was still very much a purely local function subject to local politics. And third, most German immigrants came to the United States while nativism was (with some exceptions) more localized and not yet so institutionalized into mainstream political parties or broad-based movements. Italians, Poles, and Czechs, on the other hand, arrived in the United States at a time when nativism and the Americanization Movement occupied a higher place in American politics. For example, in 1916 a Cleveland educational survey reported that despite the large and recent

\[\text{47 This third point certainly deserves more analysis than I have given here. I will present my argument on the degree and type of nativism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Chapter Three. German Americans have always faced nativist demands that they stop speaking and teaching German in the schools, that they refrain from German language periodicals, or that they conduct religious services in English and not in German. These nativist impulses are as old as the German American presence in the forest frontiers of America. However, as difficult as this nativism may have been at certain peak periods, it did not coalesce into the national broad-based movements replete with scientific racism that the "New Immigrants" contended with at the turn of the century.}\]
influx of southern and eastern Europeans (referred to in derogatory terms), German remained "the only foreign language in which instruction is given in the public elementary schools." 48

However, these other ethnic groups did not differ from the Germans in their desire for vernacular education whether in a public, private, or sectarian school environment. These groups would have literally jumped at the chance to send their children to public schools if their languages had been used temporarily as a medium of instruction or at the very least as a separate course of study. As it was, many of these ethnic groups felt forced to utilize parochial schools, especially the Catholic ones, since only there could their children be taught something of their own language, history, and culture in addition to English and other core academic subjects. A Polish newspaper editor in Milwaukee complained in 1907 of the public schools that "if they would add Polish language to their curriculum in Slavic neighborhoods, many parents would send their children to public school." 49

In previous scholarship, particularly the early work of Joshua Fishman, ethnic parochial schools of the past were seen primarily as a means of language maintenance. Yet this position is overly simplistic. 50 Whatever motives Polish,

48 Herbert Adolphus Miller, The School and the Immigrant, Cleveland Educational Survey (Cleveland, Ohio: Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, 1916), 41.
50 Fishman, Language Loyalty in the United States, 97.
Italian, or Czech communities may have had in sending their children to parochial schools, the parochial schools themselves were often interested in more than just language maintenance. They were also attempting to Americanize the newcomers through English instruction. Polish Roman Catholic schools in Chicago during the school term of 1901 took in thousands of pupils who studied religion, Polish history, and the Polish language through the medium of Polish while arithmetic, American history, and vocational education were taught in English. Cleveland's Hungarian and Slovakian Catholic schools operated much the same way. However, historian Lizbeth Cohen argues that fifteen years later, under the direction of a new Archbishop, the Chicago Catholic Diocese "set out to prohibit any new national churches, to introduce English into existing ethnic churches,...to build a new seminary to train all priests who would then be assigned to parishes irrespective of ethnicity, and to standardize and expand the parochial school system." She argues that the immigrant response to this and other types of forced Americanization was ironically the revitalization of ethnic identity and culture.

Agencies outside the realm of formal education provided educational services to the immigrant. Institutions such as Hull House—Jane Addams's immigrant and poverty community

---

center-involved themselves in the issue of bilingual instruction. Like the churches, their response to the issue of vernacular instruction varied. After calling for legislation to end the growing number of bilingual parochial schools in Chicago during the 1890s and 1900s, Addams later came to the realization "not only that the bilingual school was much more successful than the public school in preserving the family unit and parental authority, but also that the truancy, nonattendance, and drop-out rates in the bilingual schools were considerably lower than those of immigrant children attending public schools." ⁵³

At the turn of the century nativism as a force shaping politics and everyday life progressively became more potent. However, this is not to say that nativism, a fear of immigrants and their cultures, totally dominated the social or political discourse. If anything, nativism from the 1860s to the 1890s remained the equivalent of a dull throb rather than the sharply defined and burning issue it became in the 1910s and the 1920s. The shaky but continued existence of limited bilingual education programs bears this notion out. John Higham, one of the preeminent scholars of nativism, has written that, between the Civil War and the 1890s,

⁵³ Rivka Shpak Lissak, Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 52. Despite the fact that Lissak acknowledges this shift in Addams's attitudes toward bilingual instruction and ethnic schooling, she concludes that these views regarding immigrant culture did not differ substantively from those of other Americanization advocates.
"xenophobia remained fragmentary" and achieved very few concrete political victories. There were flashpoints of nativism that were regionally significant, such as the anti-Chinese reaction in the Pacific Coast, anti-Mexican sentiment throughout the Southwest, or general immigrant-bashing in the industrial Northeast. However, by the latter 1890s as the political impulse of Progressivism germinated in the political parties, new and powerful nativist organizations like the American Protective Association and the Immigration Restriction League formed and came to exercise an ever-increasing role in American politics and daily life. But local efforts at bilingual education in rural and urban America successfully defied this incipient and still-forming nativist ideology. Their existence is reminiscent of Robert Wiebe's "island communities." These island communities, not by any means exclusively limited to or defined as ethnic communities, represented true Jeffersonian principles of local control and passive, tolerant, and pluralistic government. This was to change with the arrival of Progressivism both in politics and in educational thought.

The previous questions have dealt with immigrant responses to the educational system mostly in the Northeast.

56 Wiebe, The Search for Order, 58. This is the subject of Chapter Two.
and Midwest. Apart from this framework remains the region of the American Southwest, where the language situation was more directly confrontational and pressing due to the large numbers of non-English-speaking people already living in the territories annexed by the United States through war and purchase. The dominant groups involved were French-speakers of Louisiana and Spanish-speakers from both the former Mexican territories and independent Texas. French in Louisiana posed not nearly the same significance as did Spanish in the Southwest, however. The state of Louisiana protected its French heritage through constitutional guarantees for bilingual English-French schools before and shortly after Reconstruction, when Francophones in Louisiana had greater political power. However, unlike the situation with Spanish-speakers in the Southwest, it was not long before French as a primary language began to vanish from everyday life. French did continue into the twentieth century, especially in the "Cajun" southwestern corner of Louisiana and mostly in the form of dialect.  

Spanish-speakers of the Southwest had a more difficult time with native language instruction than did German American immigrants. Unlike Germans, who were perceived as

---

especially threatening only during World War I, Mexicans in the Southwest, especially in Texas, suffered a type of institutionalized animosity, a "legacy of Hate." This hatred was expressly written into the content of the educational curriculum by the victorious Anglo community. German was considered a civilized language, whereas the legacy of hate between Anglos and Mexicans—dating from the War for Texas Independence and the Mexican War—devalued Spanish and Spanish-speakers in the minds of many Anglos. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo after the war in 1848 did not impose English as the sole language of schools in the new territories. In granting Mexican citizens of the newly occupied territories the right to organize their own schools, practice their own religion, and practice their cultural traditions without interference, the treaty implicitly supported the continuance of education and schooling in the Spanish language.

New Mexico offers a direct testimony to the contradictory nature of language policy in the Southwest. Both Mexican American and Anglo citizens of New Mexico had difficulty simply obtaining any degree of public education

---


because of the territorial government's inability to utilize public lands to support the schools. Nevertheless, bilingual education, when given a chance to exist, prevailed. In 1891 the territorial legislature overhauled the educational system by requiring teachers to "know" English but to also "know" both Spanish and English in regions where only Spanish was spoken. No method of instruction was mandated outright, just a vague intimation of support for what would have to be some sort of bilingual instruction.\textsuperscript{60} When New Mexico fully entered the union as a state in 1912, its new state constitution on the one hand claimed that the schools should "always be conducted in English" while on the other hand stipulated that teachers "become proficient in both the English and the Spanish languages...to qualify them to teach Spanish-speaking pupils and students."

This would "facilitate the teaching of the English language and other branches of learning to such pupils and students."\textsuperscript{61} As did William Torrey Harris of St. Louis's bilingual system, the New Mexico constitution supported bilingual education not for language maintenance but as a means to better teach English, thereby "Americanizing" the Mexican student. Of the 133 New Mexico public schools in 1876, 111 were conducted

\textsuperscript{60} Lynne Marie Getz, \textit{Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850-1940} (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 17.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 27. These are direct quotations from Articles VII and XXI of the 1912 New Mexico Constitution quoted by Getz. See also Bill Piatt, \textit{Only English? Law & Language Policy in the United States} (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), 12.
mostly in Spanish, 10 in English, and 12 in both Spanish and English. By 1889 there existed 344 schools; 143 were taught exclusively in English, 106 exclusively in Spanish, and 95 were bilingual schools.  

Much like their ethnic counterparts in urban centers of the Midwest and Northeast, Mexican Americans of the Southwest consciously chose schools for their children on the availability of native language instruction. This necessarily excluded many public schools that were rapidly beginning to shift to English-Only school policies. Such attitudes are also borne out in attendance figures. Where there were records of both Spanish and English instruction, attendance was much better than those that taught only in English. Because of this lack of support for English-Only public schools, many Anglo leaders and school authorities believed that Mexican Americans did not care for education. Historian Guadalupe San Miguel Jr. explains the roots of these stereotypes. He examined Mexican American school attendance and found that because of cultural factors such as language and the rapid increase of visceral race discrimination, significant numbers of Mexican Americans of varying social and class strata from the earliest days after annexation depended upon private schooling, both non-sectarian and parochial. In the 1850s the Mexican children of Los Angeles, California attended the private and non-

---

sectarian school of "José R. Nielson, an Anglo linguist" who "taught in both English and Spanish." 63

While Catholic schools were obviously a persisting element of the Spanish and Mexican heritage whose powerful influence was often acknowledged by contemporaries, insufficient attention has been paid to the scores of Protestant schools that developed in the Southwest to aid in the assimilation of Mexicans. Methodists, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians from the 1870s to the 1930s sponsored many missionary schools and academies for Mexican Americans who were dissatisfied with the public school system. According to San Miguel, some of these schools taught either bilingually or taught primarily in Spanish with a type of ESL offered apart from other content areas of instruction. 64

Clearly, there was a significant bilingual tradition in the United States before World War I, particularly for German American children of the urban and rural Midwest. School officials and local politicians accommodated the wishes of German Americans for bilingual schools for a variety of reasons, chief among them being the expectation that bilingual education would aid in more rapid assimilation, or Americanization. Also, the German American community had the political power to gain support for bilingual instruction. Other ethnic or language groups did not often have similar

64 Ibid., 8-9.
political clout to achieve public funding of bilingual education for themselves. These other non-English-speaking groups then turned to private education, especially Catholic parochial schools for bilingual instruction. In the Southwest most Spanish-speakers' basic civil rights, including educational opportunity, were limited by a legacy of conflict and mutual hatred. Texas is an ideal test case for the national experience with the bilingual past in that it incorporates the German American experience of the Midwest and Northeast and the distinct Mexican American experience of the Southwest.
Chapter One:
The Nineteenth Century Bilingual Tradition in Texas

Bilingual education has a rich history in Texas that begins with the Spanish conquest of the geographically broad territory then known as Tejas and continues on through the periods of Texas independence and statehood. During these years, instruction in more than one language for those who did not understand the dominant language (an effectively simple and generalized definition for bilingual education) was utilized by the linguistically dominant group both to assimilate the other and to unify the language of society. Also important in the shaping of these bilingual practices in Texas schools throughout this period was that Democratic and Jeffersonian notions of localism and limited government allowed for a great deal of localistic determination of all things pertaining to education. Despite the state's occasional vague proscriptions to the contrary, education in languages other than English was tolerated as a purely local matter. So strong was this civic disposition of vernacular freedom in the classroom that it lingered in spite of the admonitions of educational leaders until World War I. Another motive for bilingual instruction in Texas schools was simpler; it was just easier and more effective to meet students halfway in their own language than to superimpose a new language in its place. This later motive implicitly recognizes at least some rudimentary value in the other's language and implies a tacit yet psychologically significant
nod of respect for the other's culture. While this does not suggest twentieth-century-style multiculturalism in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, it does signify the open-ended relationship of competing cultures at certain points in time.

Texas' experience with the "bilingual tradition" begins with Spanish missionaries. While various Spanish explorers traveled through parts of the region in the sixteenth century, no permanent missions, towns, or schools were founded until the early eighteenth century. Historian Carlos Castañeda notes that the early Spanish missionaries in Texas were ordered by the colonial Viceroy of New Spain "to instruct and order the priests and missionaries in charge of natives to incline and direct the Indians, through the gentlest and kindest means, to the study of the Spanish language." The ultimate purpose was to displace competing languages and customs. Spanish was seen as the prime mechanism for true conversion to Christianity, the ultimate and only salvation for "savages."¹ This was, however, neither a new development nor unique to Texas. Spanish King Ferdinand in 1503 decreed that all indigenous peoples of the New World under his rule would be taught in the Spanish language as a means of culturally consolidating the empire.²

² N. Thomas Greenberg, "Culture Begins With the A. B. C.'s: Education Came to San Antonio With the Cross, the Rifle, the Plow and the Tool Chest. No Matter from Whence
What is more important here is not why the Spanish sought to propagate their language but rather how they chose to do so. Both the Spanish churchmen and their political rulers in the colonial bureaucracy viewed bilingual education as a means of maximizing the potential for Christianizing Native Americans. In 1724 an order from the Viceroy for New Spain directed "all missionaries to learn the various dialects of the tribes that were congregated in the different missions" since this was "always the first step in the great work of evangelization and conversion." Castañeda argues that the missionaries were already doing this on their own. In attempting to "reduce to writing and to try to systematize the primitive dialects spoken by the natives," the fathers took native languages seriously. One missionary noted that simply overcoming the language barrier was their first and foremost problem. These early attempts by Spanish missionaries to systematize the unwritten languages of the Native Americans in order to better teach them Spanish were ultimately intended as a means of Christianization.

Although it is difficult to determine the ultimate effectiveness of this type of transitional-oriented bilingual instruction because of the absence of full records, extant

---

They Came, They Wanted Their Children to be Educated," in San Antonio...A History for Tomorrow, ed. Sam Woolford (San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Company, 1963), p. 46, Institute of Texas Cultures (hereafter this repository will be abbreviated by ITC), Education in Texas File.

evidence suggests its success. Castañeda uses the account of one missionary in 1760 to demonstrate the high level of success the missionaries had in mastering the native dialects and then using them to educate Indian youngsters at the mission schools in Spanish. Another scholar used the record of a different missionary to show that in 1777, the mission population of San Antonio had by and large become assimilated into Hispanic cultural life and spoke fluent Spanish. 

However, the Spanish experiment with bilingual instruction in Texas did not survive the missionary system. The crown secularized its missions late in the eighteenth century as part of an effort to modernize its medieval colonial administrative system. This secularization involved an intensification of Spanish at the expense of the previously tolerated and utilized native languages. King Carlos IV decreed that all schools throughout the whole of the American empire, completely abolish any role for native languages. However, one scholar has noted that wherever missions survived, this royal decree was silently ignored. In Texas the Crown began abandoning the missions in 1792. The local Franciscan fathers of the missions in San Antonio wrote to the Viceroy in support of this abandonment, saying

---

that the Hispanicization of the indigenous tribes since the 1710s had succeeded so completely that there were practically no non-Christian Indians within a 150-mile radius of San Antonio. The San Antonio population consisted of racially mixed people who were mostly Hispanic in culture, dress, and language.\(^7\) Apparently, the missionaries' efforts to apply indigenous languages in an academically rigorous and systematic manner achieved the perceived success of the Spanish goals of cultural, linguistic, and spiritual assimilation of the surrounding Native American population.

The first relatively successful attempts at providing public schooling in Spanish Texas occurred at about the time the missions' educational functions disappeared due to secularization. By the time these initial Spanish efforts in Texas occurred, there were no longer large numbers of Indians willing to be mission converts or, for that matter, enough missionaries to do the Christianizing. As in the United States frontier, education in the barren and wild outposts of Texas remained a luxury, not a necessity. What little existed was private in nature and consisted of individual tutors, church schools, and the practice of sending children out of the territory for formal schooling. However, there were numerous efforts in San Antonio at the time of secularization to create a free, publicly supported school system. In 1789 Don Jose Francisco de la Mata, a local San

Antonio citizen, presented to city authorities a petition to begin such a school under his instruction. The aspiring teacher asked for "formal authorization of his school by the proper authorities...in order to prevent the undue interference of parents with his educational methods." His previous attempt at a private school failed because "the parents of those to whom he had administered mild punishments were accustomed to threaten him in a most insulting manner in the very presence of their children." The San Antonio townspeople were suspicious of the hierarchical authority of educators and formal education.

The localism and defiance of authority by San Antonio citizens juxtaposed with their insistence on some sort of public education confounded officials and stymied the development of a stable system. Various other attempts in the 1790s and 1800s failed. In the 1810s when the subject of public education was entangled in the politics of the revolution against Spain, a military junta loyal to the crown which controlled San Antonio persisted in educational efforts. Only this time, they decided to make education compulsory and fined parents of delinquent schoolchildren. Despite the intentions of Spanish officials, a stable public

---

8 I. J. Cox, "Educational Efforts in San Fernando de Bexar," Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association, 6 (July 1902), 28. This journal would later become the Southwestern Historical Quarterly. The article title is misleading in that the author refers to San Antonio with the archaic name San Fernando de Bexar. This was the name of one of the several small villas which eventually made up the town of San Fernando and later the city of San Antonio which was originally one of the neighboring missions.
education system could not be maintained in this largest outpost of Spain's Eastern frontier. In this frontier society where most everyone was sufficiently Hispanicized to know Spanish, education was thought of as a luxury compared to the daily survival of hostile Indian attacks, disease, and starvation.  

There were both similarities and differences among the frustrated Spanish attempts at public education and the efforts of their Mexican successors. Like their Spanish predecessors, Mexicans were not indifferent to education. Indeed, the scarcity of education on the frontier made it that much more valued. Unfortunately, it was difficult to attain. Mexican officials responsible for education at the local and the state level (Texas was at the time a department of the Mexican state of Coahuila) attempted to curtail localism by centrally directing curriculum, class administration, punishment, and teaching methods. However, the Mexican public school system educated a less homogenous population than the Spanish before them because of the immediate colonization of eastern Texas by Anglos from the United States. The arrival of Anglo settlers, who by empresario contract agreed to be law-abiding Mexican citizens, made language a problem in Mexican education for the first time since the missionaries of a century before.

---

9 Cox, "Educational Efforts in San Fernando de Bexar," 30-34.
Important correctives should be made to the historiography of Spanish and Mexican education. For decades the historical consensus, based largely on the published recollections of contemporary Anglo travelers and settlers, has remained mired in stereotypes of the lazy, corrupt, and uncultured Spaniard and Mexican as the prime cause for the lack of educational progress in Texas. The reality is less one-sided and more complicated. The so-called failures of the Spanish and Mexican authorities were ultimately joined by continued failure, if not outright neglect, by Anglo officials until the era of Reconstruction. Actually, the attempts by Spanish and Mexican citizens to create a viable public education system were more successful and significant than previously thought. Recently, historian David J. Weber has defended Mexican public education arguing that its shortcomings had more to do with frontier conditions and not "indifference to learning" or because they were, in the words of one early Anglo commentator "entirely controlled by the priests." In fact, maintains Weber, "conditions of schools on the Mexican frontier resembled those of states such as

---

10 Daniel Tyler, "The Mexican Teacher," Red River Valley Historical Review, 1 (Autumn 1974), 207. This remains the best introduction to the idea that previous interpretations of Mexican and Spanish education are lacking in objective perspective.

11 Cox, "Educational Efforts in San Fernando de Bexar," 62. Cox complained of these educational efforts, "The Mexican, who, unfortunately, groaned under the despotic and savage sway of the ambitious sons of Iberia has never occupied himself in perfecting this most important institution, which would already have placed him on a level with the most cultured nations."
Kentucky and Tennessee when they were at a comparable state of development and only a limited number of young boys attended small, short-lived private schools.\textsuperscript{12}

Mexican pedagogy was by today's standards fairly advanced; quite possibly it was more advanced than the near anarchy of educational policy that followed in the Texas Republic. The poverty of the new nation, in direct contrast to the high expectations for education, forced Mexican educational planners to urge upon localities a variety of efforts to maximize resources and increase attendance. One of these ideas involved the Lancastrian system of education. Born out of the English industrial world, Joseph Lancaster's ideas about the education of younger students by older or more knowledgeable peers had the benefit of increasing class size without necessarily increasing the teaching load. In this system one teacher could theoretically handle 150 students with a handful of peer tutors. San Antonio public schools implemented the Lancastrian system, enforced compulsory attendance for young boys, and—in keeping with the Mexican republican rhetoric of the day—urged students to address one another as "citizen" in public.\textsuperscript{13} One commentator on the Lancastrian system in Mexico's northern provinces argued that its "resultant recitation, dictation, and rote


learning of several different groups simultaneously produced a cacophony of sounds akin to the whirring of machinery to English factories from whence Joseph Lancaster's idea had come.\textsuperscript{14}

Mexican laws concerning discipline, punishment, curriculum, and teaching methods were incredibly detailed because they attempted to insulate teachers from the personal and political pressure of parents. As Andres Tijerina has argued of Mexican school officials, "they closely guarded the teacher's instruction as well as the student's performance."\textsuperscript{15} Town charters in San Antonio for the Mexican public schools monitored every conceivable part of the school day: the schedule of subjects to be studied, how students were to be evaluated, how competitions functioned, and how students were to sit in class.\textsuperscript{16} The local officials in charge of day-to-day educational matters "approved the curriculum, examined children who were ready to advance, made regular visitations to the schools, and curtailed the leisure time of the appointed maestro."\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} Tyler, "The Mexican Teacher," 218.
\textsuperscript{15} Andres Tijerina, Tejanos & Texas Under the Mexican Flag, 1821-1836 (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1994), 60. Tijerina's statement about the complexity of Mexican education law and its concern for everyday minutia is well taken. Otherwise thought of as a byproduct of the regulatory state of the twentieth century, Mexican centralization of pedagogical matters reflects a certain high degree of policy sophistication.
\textsuperscript{16} Cox, "Educational Efforts in San Fernando de Bexar," 54-55.
\textsuperscript{17} Tyler, "The Mexican Teacher," 212.
\end{flushright}
As stated before, Mexican officials did not initially concern themselves very much with the subject of language since all Mexicans spoke Spanish. However, the influx of English-speaking immigrants into Texas, many of them illegal, complicated their tasks. The distant state government tried to dictate the specific substance of instruction and teaching methods to local teachers. Title VI of the 1827 Constitution of the State of Coahuila and Texas mandated that "The method of teaching shall be uniform throughout the state" and that "Congress shall form a general plan of public education and regulate by means of statutes and laws all that pertains to this most important subject."¹⁸ That language is not specifically mentioned in spite of the already large number of English-speaking colonists by the late 1820s indicates an unwillingness by the state government to dictate too strictly, a lack of engagement with the subject of education for Anglo immigrants, or perhaps a lack of engagement with education in Texas. However, the first empresario contracts negotiated by Moses Austin and signed by Stephen F. Austin as well as those of later empresarios were very clear and direct on the point of official language: "The official

¹⁸ "Constitution of the State of Coahuila and Texas: Preliminary Provisions," in Frederick Eby, Education in Texas: Source Materials. The University of Texas Bulletin, No. 1824 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1918), 30. This source book is a collection of primary documents, some in whole form and others in fragmentary form, pertaining to the history of education in Texas. Professor Eby's contribution to the history of Texas with this mammoth collection of translated and hard-to-find primary documents is so great as to be virtually inestimable.
communications with the government, and with the authorities of the state, instruments, and other public acts, must be written in the Spanish language, and when new towns are formed he shall promote the establishment of schools in the Spanish language, in such towns."\textsuperscript{19} In a scheme to finance schools with state aid, the legislature of Coahuila and Texas decided to issue land grants for towns petitioning for money to build schools (the Texas Republic later had a similar policy). The town of Nacadoches in receiving its public lands was reminded by the Vice Governor that "the Castillian language...shall be expressly taught."\textsuperscript{20}

While the national and state governments may have wished to promote an all-Spanish policy, Anglo Texans such as Stephen F. Austin desired educational bilingualism to better assimilate the new Anglos into Mexican life. In fact, Austin endorsed educational trilingualism. Stephen F. Austin's papers contain a remarkable document written while he was a deputy in the Coahuila state legislature during the early 1830s. This was the draft of a legislative bill proposing a


\textsuperscript{20} "[Land Grant to Nacadoches for Primary School], Decree No. 240," in ibid., 49. This enactment was accomplished on May 2, 1833, the day after another bill was passed that stipulated the manner in which legal testimony could be given to courts in a "foreign language," the compensation of the interpreters, and how the process was to be administered. So while the Mexican officials demanded Spanish instruction on the one hand, they certainly were not blind to the realities of the language problem in their foreign-sounding borderland.
school. This bill outlined his plans to support a trilingual "Institute for Modern Languages" in his colony seat of San Felipe de Austin.\(^{21}\) Austin's reverence for schools was legendary in Texas. The small settlement of San Felipe de Austin maintained between three and four schools at a time when most comparable towns in the United States were viewed as successful if they managed to maintain just one.\(^{22}\) Austin, who was damingly praised by famed biographer Eugene C. Barker as having "possessed the faculty, rare in Americans of any time, and in his own day almost unknown, of sympathy with an alien race, and willingness and ability to adapt himself to its national mannerisms and insensibilities." supported the cause of public education as a means of Mexicanizing his Anglo colonists.\(^{23}\)

Austin was a Mexican sympathizer and a Mexican nationalist. His desire for an institute of languages went beyond mere "sympathy" with the Mexican government; his avocation of this school to ultimately help Anglo newcomers learn Spanish was based as much on national loyalty as it was on expediency. In his legislative bill for the school,

\(^{21}\) Mattie Austin Hatcher, "Plan of Stephen F. Austin for an Institute of Modern Languages at San Felipe de Austin," The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association, 12 (January 1909), 231. It is unknown whether Austin's draft of the school bill was ever presented to or considered by the legislature.

\(^{22}\) Max Berger, "Stephen F. Austin and Education in Early Texas, 1821-1835," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, 48 (January 1945), 394.

Austin began by stating that "public schools for the teaching of modern languages, and especially that of Spanish, are of prime importance." He continued: "These colonies are composed of both foreigners and Mexicans; and the necessity for disseminating the national language among the former is evident." That Anglo settlers had not begun this type of school on their own, claimed Austin, was not "because of a lack of willingness to contribute" on their part, but rather the "want of a legal and permanent arrangement which would give a legal existence to the institution."24

Austin then went on to stipulate that Spanish, English, and French coursework would be offered by this institute, whose students would primarily be English-speaking. Austin even planned to have a multi-lingual administrative staff.25

Austin remained a steadfast champion of bilingual education in educational matters beyond this language institute that never came to be. In letters to various Mexican and Texan acquaintances, he demonstrated his desire to find bilingual instructors for the colony's schools in order to better impart the Spanish language. Austin's letters to Mexican schoolteachers concerning school supplies such as English-Spanish and Spanish-English dictionaries and grammar books for two-way translation show that he intended that both languages be used in some way.26

---

26 "Letters of Buchetti to Austin," in *ibid.*, 105.
legislature seemed little concerned to enforce its Spanish-Only decrees because other bills also provided for bilingual education. In legislation reorganizing the San Felipe de Austin town government, the state articulated an educational mission contrary to its earlier Spanish-Only pronouncements by declaring that the newly reorganized ayuntamiento "shall promote the establishment of a school in the capital of the municipality, for the purpose of teaching English and Spanish languages." 27 No clear reason for or even acknowledgment of the contradiction with the official Spanish-Only policy was given. The earlier land grant for Nacadoches schools that insisted upon "Castillian" Spanish, reflected only Spanish-surnamed individuals listed on petitions and support rolls for education in that municipality, which would make Spanish-Only policy not very controversial. 28

The tangled role of Stephen F. Austin's plans for education and how the legislature and governor in Saltillo reacted to the language dilemma in Texas ultimately provokes as many questions as it answers. Perhaps the state only meant to insist on Spanish-Only when it was subject to no real controversy? Or perhaps it was only through Austin's great political influence in Mexico that this accommodation to bilingual education was effected at all? The real importance of Mexican policy toward bilingual education was

28 "Contributions for Building Church and School," in ibid., 45-46.
its signal lack of decisiveness. Austin's intriguing support for bilingual and trilingual education is important but strangely ignored by most historians. Neither Austin nor his contemporaries seem to have seriously reflected on the significance of his views regarding language and education.

Austin's biographer, Eugene Barker, is correct in pointing out that at the very least there were many in Austin's colony who did not share his enthusiasm for being a Mexican citizen or for speaking the Spanish language. There were private schools for the children of Anglo settlers, the wealthier of whom traveled to the United States for formal education.  

29 Mexican official Juan Nepomuceno Almonte in his famous report to the national government on the deteriorating position of native Mexicans vis a vis the Anglo newcomers wrote that what was needed was "a good establishment for public instruction where the Spanish language may be taught, otherwise the language will be lost." Almonte concluded that "Even at present English is almost the only language spoken in this section of Texas."  

30 However, the notion of a total, complete, and inevitable culture clash between Anglos and Mexicans of Texas is untenable.  

Children of America's

31 Ray Allen Billington, *The Far Western Frontier, 1830-1860* (New York: Harper & Row, 1956), 120. In a rather chauvinistic vein, Billington argues that the Mexicans possessed of autocratic Roman traditions and that Anglo settlers were derived from more liberal doctrines owing to their descent from Northern Europe. He goes on to claim of this clash of cultures, "Between these two civilizations—one
western frontier at the turn of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century spent their early years in daily contact with French-Canadian trappers, Spanish officials, and numerous tribes of Native Americans, getting a true multicultural education.\textsuperscript{32} Still, Austin's dream of assimilating his Anglo settlers into the mainstream of Mexican life and culture through bilingual education was overly ambitious and never fully implemented.

The years of the Republic of Texas ultimately produced an ironic partial reversal of Mexican policy on the school languages: there was a new official language, but the same unofficial tolerance of another language. In other words, the official language changed to English after independence, but the Spanish tradition was still tolerated. In 1837 under President Sam Houston an act was passed to incorporate the municipalities of San Antonio, Victoria, and Gonzalez. This act provided legal sanction for those city governments to start up their own publicly financed schools. In the following years of chaos (Mexico militarily occupied San Antonio twice during the tenure of the Republic of Texas), however, there remains no record of public schools being

\textsuperscript{32} Barker, The Life of Stephen F. Austin, 22. See also John C. Duval, Early Times in Texas or, the Adventures of Jack Dobell ed. Mabel Major and Rebecca W. Smith (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1936), xvii.
established. In the charter for the city's incorporation there were provisions regarding the nature and conduct of the public schools. This town incorporation charter which stipulated that civic administrative personnel were to be conversant in both English and Spanish made mention only that the schools should teach English as well as accept children of the poor and admit girls as well as boys. This charter left all supervisory power over the proposed schools with the bilingual municipal authorities. President Houston's approval of English instruction did not lead to the setting up of a bureaucracy to oversee its implementation. Interestingly, the requirement that English be taught did not actually prohibit the use of other languages in the still-hypothetical schools. The 1837 incorporation charter of Nacadoches, which also applied to seventeen other towns across the state, made no mention of any specific language to be taught or not taught in the municipal schools of those towns.

33 Eby, Development of Education in Texas, 108-09. Eby claims the only municipality that actually acted upon the powers conferred upon them by the legislature to start up common schools was Galveston in 1847. This school was discontinued after a couple of years of existence due to sharp criticism of the taxes levied by the city in order to finance it. See also Texas State Teachers Association, 100 Years of Progress in Texas Education (Austin, Texas: TSTA), 7.


35 "An Act: To Incorporate the Town of Nacadoches and Other Towns Herein Named," in ibid., 1298.
In the following years there were many tentative and futile attempts to establish a system of public schools in the independent nation. Mirabeau B. Lamar, the second president of the Republic of Texas, is generally credited with being the father of its public education system. In 1839 and 1840 he championed two bills that created a legal and financial superstructure for the local creation of public schools. One act reserved roughly thirteen thousand acres of land in each county for the maintenance of the public schools.\(^\text{36}\) The next legislative action created a system of administration in each county headed by county judges and their deputies acting as commissioners of the schools. This first school system of Texas made no provision for the language of instruction. The only stipulation mentioning language at all was the desire for the county judges to select teachers possessing "good moral character and capacity to teach reading, writing, English grammar, arithmetic, and geography."\(^\text{37}\) By implication this vague directive could mean English-Only instruction, but then it could also be interpreted as not prohibiting Spanish instruction as long as "English grammar" was taught. Ironically, this stipulation resembled the vague dicta by Mexican state officials who previously requested that Spanish be taught but refused to


say how or in what context; whether it would be allowable accompanied by another language, by itself, as a course of study, or as the medium of instruction.

As the public school system evolved during the statehood era of Texas's history and finally became more visible shortly before the Civil War, the language of instruction remained a minor issue. In some instances it was worthy of direct mention by state legislation, but only peripherally at that. Texas's general ambivalence on the language question persisted, an attitude inherited from their Mexican predecessors and peppered by the occasional vague English-Only proscription. The Lamar education reforms, while providing the blueprint for education in Texas, did not result in the creation of many permanent schools. The reforms were simply enabling legislation that allowed counties to form public schools where and when they could get around to it. Many rural counties without towns large enough to have educational systems of their own simply went without schools. Caldwell County was organized in 1848, almost a decade after Lamar's school laws, but it did not establish schools until 1854 when their establishment became mandatory. In fifteen years of operation under Lamar's system of county-wide land grants, only forty-one of the Republic and then state's counties had even completed the preliminary land survey (the only thing they needed to do)

---

necessary to receive public education funds. A bill in 1848 added a new component to public financing of the schools by reserving a portion of the state's annual budget for educational matters. However, these new efforts had little effect. Education was still primarily seen as a home function or one of private and religious instruction—not a proper concern of the state government. As one historian has written, "'Free Schools' and compulsory attendance as we have them to-day, controlled in every particular by the government, appeared an intolerable tyranny." It seems perfectly reasonable for the state to have not restricted instruction to only English when there were so few schools in the first place and when its authority in such matters did not exist as it does today.

The school law of 1854 increased the state's burden of financing a still largely fictional public school system and designated a statewide supervisory role for the state treasurer, who would serve as Superintendent of Common Schools. It allowed county officials to divide their county into districts that would then obtain funding on the basis of student population. However, this law allowed private and religious schools to obtain as much state money as the public schools. One historian has noted, "Throughout the entire state and with but few exceptions the people resorted to the use of private schools which under the law could be

---

39 Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 92.
40 Ibid., 104-07, quotation on page 105.
designated 'common schools.'

According to Guadalupe San Miguel, a historian of Mexican American education, the legislature tried again in 1856 to clarify the language muddle when it specified that English as a subject must be included in the school curriculum of every public school. Although the state had so insisted before, it still had not remarked upon the degree of English in the classroom or clarified in what methodological context (English as the medium of instruction or as a foreign language) until this piece of legislation. This law did not strictly prohibit bilingualism in the classroom in that it defined English as a course subject which theoretically could allow another language spoken or used in the teaching of English, like teaching English as an academic foreign language in the way Latin, Greek, or German, would have been taught. The dominant private and parochial schools were completely unregulated as to language use or curriculum.

\(^{41}\) Ibid., 120-21.

\(^{42}\) Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Let All of Them Take Heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910-1981 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1987), 6-7. San Miguel is the only historian of modern times to examine the education history of Mexican Americans in Texas in detail. Implicit in his work is analysis on the politics of language issues and their effect upon Mexican Americans, although this is not his sole or ultimate focus.

\(^{43}\) Eby notes that the first institution to receive a charter from the Republic of Texas was the University of San Augustine. The use of the words "college" and "university" is misleading. In that day college usually referred to high school type institutions while universities often offered only limited education beyond the high school. This Presbyterian school consisted of a college for older students and a grammar school for children under the age of twelve.
After the Civil War the state began to assert itself more vigorously in the realm of language and vernacular education in its patchwork school "systems." Even though the state was spared the wartime destruction of other portions of the Confederacy, public education (to the extent that it existed) was nevertheless devastated by Texas's sizable financial obligations to the Confederate cause. In 1866 the state legislature passed a new school law that made minor revisions in the 1854 bill and addressed the language issue more directly. This new law stipulated in rather terse words that "No school shall be entitled to the benefits of this Act unless the English language is principally taught therein." Yet this was still imprecise due to the nebulousness of "principally." Before this law could take effect, however, the state constitution was nullified by the federal government as Reconstruction temporarily shifted power to the United States Congress.

It offered a full compliment of coursework in the sciences, classics, and in mathematics. French was the medium of conversation and instruction in this school. Methodists involved with the school broke off over a doctrinal dispute and formed neighboring competitor Wesleyan College shortly after the University of San Augustine's founding. That and the assassination of the University of San Augustine's president resulted in the dwindling of both institutions. In Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 96-98.

Texas State Teachers Association, *100 Years of Progress*, 8. For the notion that public education was so rare a thing before the Civil War that the resulting wartime chaos had no especially damning effect see Michael Allen White, "History of Education in Texas, 1860-1884," (Ed.D. diss., Baylor University, 1969), chapter four.

"An Act Regulating the Public Schools," in Eby, *Education in Texas*, 464.
The Reconstruction period illustrates the state's desire for English in the classroom only where not opposed by localities. The Reconstruction school law of 1871, while not requiring that English be the "principal" language taught in the school as did the 1866 law, nevertheless reflected the growing concern that the schools should stress English. This 1871 Republican law allowed for the examination of teachers by a Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed by the Governor, compulsory attendance, a local property tax to help finance the schools, and gave the state superintendent discretion to determine the content of curriculum. On this last point arose the language issue. Superintendent Jacob C. De Gress, a Prussian immigrant, determined that "Teachers shall be permitted to teach the German, French and Spanish languages in the Public Schools of this State, provided the time so occupied shall not exceed two hours each day."\(^4\) However novel this limited and quite specific sanction of bilingual education was, it did not survive long.

Because of the politics of race and Reconstruction, the Republican school law of 1871 was summarily vanquished by Democrats in the new constitution of 1875. They also abolished the office and the duties of Superintendent of Public Instruction and consequently the sanction of limited bilingualism in the classroom.\(^5\) The county judge, not any

---

\(^4\) "Rules and Regulations for the Government of the Public Free Schools in the State of Texas," in ibid., 540. See also Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 159-62.  
\(^5\) For interpretation that the 1876 law was beneficial to ethnic groups even though it eliminated sanctioned
far-removed and central bureaucratic apparatus, had ultimate authority over teacher examinations.\textsuperscript{48} Even had there been a strong English-Only policy from either the central educational agency or the legislature, its enforcement would have depended ultimately on the local county officials who may have felt political and pedagogical pressures from their constituents to maintain bilingualism in the classroom. The revolutionary Republican laws regarding ethnic and racial minorities and the schools also had been still largely dependent upon local enforcement.\textsuperscript{49}

Reconstruction only led to more indecisiveness in Texas. The Republican-sponsored school law of 1871, on the one hand, acknowledged the role of Spanish, French, and German in the public schools, but, on the other hand, also specifically limited their roles in the daily curriculum. The Democratic-sponsored legislation of 1876, out of partisan and ideological reactions, chose to dismantle the administrative apparatus that determined this limited degree of bilingualism while they supported all English instruction. However, in fighting the battle against centralization in the name of localism, the Democrats unintentionally served the wishes of the state's ethnic communities, who desired local control to

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{48} "School Law of 1876," in Eby, Education in Texas, 695 and 699.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{49} Barry A. Crouch and L. J. Schultz, "Crisis in Color: Racial Separation in Texas During Reconstruction," Civil War History, 16 (Spring 1970), 41.}
ensure a dizzying array of individual bilingual education practices. The desire for local control and the desire for all-English instruction conflicted; consequently, the confused and informal Texas bilingual tradition continued. The Democratic Party, when it took control of post-Reconstruction politics, muddled the issue of language policy. Part of this was simple inattention to the issue, but another part had to do with the ideological preferences for localism and decentralization that ultimately allowed bilingual instruction to flourish without any specific governmental sanction. The result was that even more bilingualism was now effectively allowed than with the pro-bilingual education policies under Republican De Gress during Reconstruction.

The new school law of 1876 was attractive to ethnic communities because it created a "community system" of schools that were not immediately supervised by state appointed inspectors. Rather, ultimate school supervision was accomplished by any group defining itself as a community and willing to supplement partial funding from the state. The tradeoff of such a system of low financial support was that any group defining itself as a community, possessing a schoolhouse, and willing to put up some financial means could elect their own teachers, teach what they wanted without effective state supervision, and could use the facilities to teach religion as long as it was done after school hours. This system even circumvented to some degree the authority of
the county judge; the school trustees of a community school had considerable leeway over daily management.\textsuperscript{50} So although the Democrats had in mind Jeffersonian notions of self-rule and decentralized power when they constructed the community system, it contributed ironically to the further fragmenting of clarity on the language issue. The Democrats continued to support meaningless English-Only pronouncements that were unenforceable in their own schools. Until the 1890s the "community system" held sway over public education in Texas, and even afterwards it predominated in several rural and ethnic pockets until the 1910s.\textsuperscript{51}

Language was a oft-discussed issue by local educators during the 1870s and 1880s. Some comments regarding language may be found in the reports issued to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction by local authorities. The State Superintendent (for a time in the late 1870s and early 1880s also known as the Secretary of the Board of Education) was not a true regulator of education but rather a distant clerk who made technical recommendations and excelled in the rhetoric of the New South and its mantra of progress. This official collected reports from county judges who were directly responsible for the daily management of the


\textsuperscript{51} In this period there existed three main systems of school organization: the community schools, the county schools (or common schools), and the district schools. They will be more fully described in Chapter Two.
countywide school system and also of the community system. After distributing questions about the status of education in the counties and soliciting suggestions for improvements, the chief state official published the replies in a biennial report. The transparency of the English requirements by the state is evident in these reports. Wrote Duval County Judge James O. Luby in 1880 of his large Mexican American student population, "English being the common medium [of the schools], coupled with the sly digs of the clergy, do not make the people out here receive the benefits conferred upon them with rapturous joy." Luby reiterated this claim: "Not one Mexican in fifty speaks the English language west of the Nueces river, nor ever will, unless education is made compulsory...When they know our language they will adopt our customs." In requesting a change in the state's lack of compulsory attendance legislation, Luby maintained that it was necessary to combat the Mexican's "fond reverence for the time-honored crooked stick" which was bad for young children since "their associations with older shepherds...is anything but conducive to their morals." After stating these problems, Luby went on to stress one of the local innovations in boosting his county's educational system: "The children are instructed in English and Spanish, and those that have attended school have made rapid progress." So state

---

52 James O. Luby, "Duval County-1880," in O. N. Hollingsworth, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Second Biennial Report of the State Board of Education for the Scholastic Years Ending August 31, 1879 and 1880 (Galveston,
officials, despite the vague pronouncements insisting on instruction in English-Only, knew of the bilingual tradition and refused to interfere with it.

Although there was throughout the nineteenth century a tremendous amount of complicity among Texas education authorities in allowing the existence of these bilingual schools, they did not necessarily favor them. In 1886 Superintendent of Public Instruction Benjamin M. Baker remarked upon the bilingualism rampant in Texas schools among Spanish-speakers and German-speakers when he claimed that "Investigation disclosed the truth of some of the charges, but the superintendent in a majority of the instances found himself powerless to remedy the evil." Stating his firm belief that while he did not "hold it objectionable to teach other languages than the English in the schools...they should be pursued as studies, while the language of the school should be English." This was as specific as any Texas official had ever been in any previous era in defining the English requirement as the medium of instruction. After recommending that the state legislature seriously look into the matter, he went on to suggest further that if local "superintendents are given sufficient power, and the mode of their selection removed safely from local influences, it will
not be difficult for them to establish the English as the sole language for the schools." 53

Baker's statements are a watershed marker of sorts. For decades the state sacrificed its own desire for all-English instruction at the alter of Jeffersonian and Democratic localism. Even the novel Reconstruction experiment that more decisively clarified the language requirement ultimately failed to clearly shape or mold local practice. Texas lived a lie of sorts in pronouncing, with ever-increasing vigor as the twentieth century approached, the legal necessity of total English instruction while it continued to tolerate local bilingual instruction and some totally non-English instruction. These two desires, English-Only and localism, clashed throughout the nineteenth century in both Mexican and Texan government. That is, they clashed until the 1890s when the reforming and centralizing tendencies of Progressivism began to manifest themselves in educational policy, resulting in the Progressive Education Movement. The influence of this broad set of principles can be seen in Baker's desire to increase the regulatory powers of his office and that of local school officials at the expense of other "local influences." This movement represents the

Texas: Galveston News Steam Book and Job Printing Establishment, 1881), 13. By "crooked stick" Luby means the shepherd's stick.
professionalization of education: the notion that local liberties retard progress and can only be circumvented through righteous regulation by professional and reforming education experts. It is this Progressive political and social context that sewed the seeds for the destruction of the bilingual tradition in Texas.

* * * * *

The role of the ethnic communities of Texas in making the bilingual tradition possible looms large. Ethnic communities chose to use their own language at times exclusively while at other times using a mixture of both English and their native tongue in their schools. This varied upon local circumstance as well as whether the school was private and secular, parochial, or public. Like the earlier mentioned studies of the national bilingual tradition, the degree of bilingualism in Texas' ethnic communities depended upon their size, political strength, and their geographic location. While the laws, proscriptions, and sanctioning of bilingualism in the classroom are important in telling the history of bilingual education in Texas, so is the part played by the various ethnic communities themselves.

The most significant non-English-speaking group in nineteenth-century Texas education were Mexican Americans. The rate of growth for the Mexican American population of Texas from the War for Independence through the 1880s, however, lagged behind that of Anglos, African Americans, and
European immigrants. Nevertheless, they represented a dominant majority of the population in a number of counties in South Texas from the border to San Antonio and along the Rio Grande River to New Mexico. However, between 1890 and 1910 a mass migration of laborers from Mexico arrived in Texas, more than tripling the 1887 population of 83,000 to an estimated 300,000.54 Public schooling for Mexican Americans, especially in sparsely populated southern and western Texas, was not an especially pressing problem for educational policymakers of the nineteenth century. A result of the impoverished public schools was that Mexican Americans and newly immigrated Mexicans in Texas throughout this period emphasized private education, secular and non-secular.55

Brownsville, for example, made several attempts at creating a countywide public school system before the Civil War and failed to establish anything of permanence. After the Civil War, Brownsville and Cameron County public education struggled mightily to lure students. However, there were several private parochial schools of long-standing success. This was truly bilingual and binational education in that much of the private school population came from Matamoros, the corresponding town across the river in Mexico. One of the Catholic schools was founded in the 1850s by nuns

55 San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed," 8-9. San Miguel concludes that until the turn of the century Mexican Americans were little involved in whatever few impoverished public schools that did exist.
from France, who upon their arrival to Texas were taught both English and Spanish in crash courses arranged for them in Galveston by the Texas bishop. There were also very significant Protestant efforts at schooling in Brownsville. Of two large Presbyterian schools certified by both national and southern church associations one indicated clearly that the medium of instruction was Spanish while English (highly sought after) was taught separately as an academic course, similar to the way bilingual education in the early grades would function today.

El Paso had three Catholic schools: two for Mexicans and Mexican Americans, and one for Anglos. These schools accommodated the language needs of Mexican American students and Mexican national students with Spanish instruction and a type of English as a second language course. These schools consistently enrolled hundreds of students through most of the 1890s and 1900s. In Laredo a Methodist school called the Holding Institute began in the 1880s advertising its openness to different methods of teaching English to Spanish-

---

56 Milo Kearney, Alfonso Gomez Arguelles, and Yolanda Z. Gonzalez, A Brief History of Education in Brownsville and Matamoros (Brownsville, Texas: University of Texas-Pan American-Brownsville, 1989), 5.
57 Melinda Rankin, Texas in 1850, introduction by John C. Rayburn (Waco, Texas: Texian Press, 1966), viii.
speakers. This involved the hiring of U.S.-born Mexican Americans as teachers.\textsuperscript{59}

San Antonio offered several private schools that catered to Mexican American students. One of the most significant Catholic schools in San Antonio was the Ursuline Convent of Saint Mary's, whose clientele consisted mostly of the daughters of the Mexican American upper class. Later a boy's school was introduced.\textsuperscript{60} One nun described the structure of the curriculum as well as its content. The first and second groupings of students were technically supervised by the nuns but mostly taught by a Spanish-speaking aide. One nun claimed, "The M.[exican] Assistant hears 1, & 2, classes. I have 3d class. The Mexicans learn the Spanish grammar, & some learn English lessons...My hours are, from 9 3/4, to 11 1/4, English class from 2 to 2 1/2 same class say French lessons. From 2 1/2, to 4 1/2, Mexicans who know English pretty well, read & say lessons, arithmetic." Even though the nun in question did not feel comfortable with her own ability to instruct in Spanish to purely Spanish-speakers, she seemed to feel no compunction about the idea of Spanish instruction for those who did not know English. Her description of the daily curriculum also indicates that instruction in Spanish was a bridge not only to English but

\textsuperscript{59} San Miguel, "Culture and Education," 8.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., "Let All of Them Take Heed," 9.
also for mainstreaming successful students into her regular English and French classes.\footnote{61}

There were also a number of private, non-sectarian schools. One of these schools, financed privately by the Mexican American community of Jim Hogg County in South Texas, utilized almost solely Spanish instruction. Called Colegio Altamirano, this institution began in the 1890s and continued in operation until the 1930s when the state's language policy had hardened significantly.\footnote{62} One historian and observer of the time noted that many of the private, non-sectarian schools for Mexican Americans who were frustrated with the public schools at the turn of the century sometimes completely ignored English instruction and taught only in Spanish.\footnote{63}

Often these private, non-sectarian schools grew out of Mexican American cultural, political, and social organizations. As the web of labor control tightened, culminating in greater levels of social isolation and physical segregation, some Mexican Americans in the 1890s and 1900s formed organizations called mutualistas that, in addition to providing insurance, charity, and a public forum

\footnote{61} "J. M. J. Letters: From Our Beloved Sisters: Who Quitted St. Mary's, April 17th, 1852, to Commence the Mission of San Antonio. Ursuline Convent Saint Mary's, 1853," ITC, Education in Texas File-Religious. This was a reproduction of an original letter. For more information on this source see Catherine McDowell, ed., Letters From the Ursuline, 1852-1853 (San Antonio, Texas: Trinity University Press, 1977).

\footnote{62} San Miguel, "Culture and Education." 10.

for cultural enlightenment such as orations, poetry, and political activity, also established their own schools. Historian Emilio Zamora found that in some instances, these schools allowed members of the Mexican American community to attend who were unable to provide for the meager tuition. Often Spanish instruction was provided by young educated female teachers recruited from Mexico. These mutualistas, formed in response to exploitive economic conditions as well as exclusionary and racist practices in the public schools run for Anglos, were organized in large cities and small towns throughout the state. 64

Although the public schools in the state were inadequate for many Anglos as well as for most Mexican Americans throughout the nineteenth century, there were some public school systems in isolated areas that thrived on enthusiastic Mexican American participation. For example, in Arnoldo De Leon's groundbreaking study The Tejano Community, he discovered that the extensive county-wide system of schools in rural and isolated counties of South Texas (like those of Duval County from the 1870s to the 1890s) took special pains to meet the needs of its Mexican American community. Perhaps this was because the county was sparsely populated and at this time largely devoid of Anglo residents. Whatever the reason, these schools, in addition to using Spanish culture and language in the classroom, also utilized bilingualism

64 Emilio Zamora, The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas (College Station, Texas: University of Texas A&M Press, 1993), 100-3.
outside the classroom in the way of recitations, competitions, and theater productions for the community. These outside events served to establish a firm connection to the larger community and remained a vital part of local cultural life. In the 1880s the lead teacher and director of public schools in the town of San Diego, the county seat, was Luis Puebla, a former Mexican college professor educated in ancient and modern languages as well as mathematics in Washington, D.C.\footnote{Arnoldo De Leon, The Tejano Community, 1836-1900 (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1982; reprint, Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1997), 188-90.} Duval County Judge James O. Luby in an 1880 report to the state superintendent of education wrote of the tremendous success of bilingual instruction in Americanizing Mexican American children. Luby implicitly suggested that English-Only schools succeeded only in driving away eager students and parents from public education.\footnote{O. N. Hollingsworth, Second Biennial Report, 13.}

Another important group involved in the bilingual tradition of Texas were the German Americans. German immigrants came to Texas in large numbers beginning in the 1830s and 1840s and continued through the early years of the twentieth century. Accounting for roughly one-half of all European immigration to Texas in the nineteenth-century, it was a varied population spread over different geographic regions of the state that was both rural and urban. German immigrants were to be found in significant numbers in larger cities like San Antonio, Houston, and Galveston where they
constituted roughly one-third to one-fifth of the municipal populations by 1880. This immigration was also rural, concentrated in the lush, cotton-growing counties of South Coastal Texas (Austin, Colorado, De Witt, Guadalupe, Washington, and Fayette) as well as the dry, broken, rocky hills of Central Texas ranch counties (Gillespie, Kendall, Medina, and Comal).\textsuperscript{67} Although German American migration continued into the first decade and a half of the next century, demographers have estimated their peak numerical, political, and cultural influence to be in the 1880s.\textsuperscript{68}

German immigrants were among the first Texans to establish successful and long-standing public schools in the state. The German American community of Austin deplored the inaccessibility of public education and established there one of the first successful free public schools in the state.\textsuperscript{69} The state's flagship newspaper, the State Gazette, editorialized that in "doing for themselves what the town ought to do for the children of the whole population," the Germans were going far to "elevate the minds of their offspring, and make them intelligent and useful American citizens." The State Gazette condemned the "jaundiced opposition" to the German American school from the state Know Nothing Party. The paper indicated that the opposition stemmed from the fact that this school was to be trilingual.

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., "The German Element in Texas: An Overview," Rice University Studies, 63 (Summer 1977), 9.
\textsuperscript{69} Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 130-31.
rather than monolingual in English; it was to be "a public school in which the English, German and Spanish languages will be taught."\textsuperscript{70} The school's charter from the state legislature was approved without any mention of curriculum content or language stipulations.\textsuperscript{71} This demonstrates the tacit sanction that the state gave to localities and ethnic groups interested in multilingual education. A year later the State Gazette claimed that the free education of the sixty or so initial students exemplified the spirit of cooperation necessary for greater educational progress.\textsuperscript{72}

The German Americans had older schools elsewhere in the state. In the Hill Country region, Germans in the town of Fredericksburg attempted very early to institute a free public school system. In 1852 they levied municipal taxes for the purposes of funding such a school, but the state courts—in true ante-bellum, Democratic fashion—declared the novel method of using local taxation to fund public schools unconstitutional. The city fathers of New Braunfels were not daunted by this court ruling and lobbied for a special charter from the state legislature to allow them to levy local taxes for their schools.\textsuperscript{73} The twenty-year charter was

\textsuperscript{70} State Gazette, October 24, 1857.
\textsuperscript{71} "An Act to Incorporate the German Free School Association of the City of Austin," in Eby, Education in Texas, 358-59.
\textsuperscript{72} State Gazette, July 3, 1858.
\textsuperscript{73} New Braunfels Herald, June 12, 1975, ITC, German Public Schools-New Braunfels File. Hereafter this file cited as GPSNB. See also Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 133-34.
finally granted in 1858 and the school was named the New
Braunfels Academy.  

This Central Texas region known as the Hill Country
provided numerous other examples of bilingual instruction.
Bilingualism continued even after the New Braunfels Academy
became transformed into the New Braunfels Public School. Up
to 1892 the minutes of the public school's board of directors
had been kept in German and later translated into English.  

In Comal County (containing New Braunfels) a group of
educators formed an organization in 1872 that met
periodically to sharpen their theoretical and practical
understanding of teaching methods. This continuing education
convention that discussed the "praxis" of their profession
did so completely in German and made available copies of
their discussions in both English and in German. In 1868 in
a small rural school nearby, two teachers taught a group of
rural German American children. One teacher, Lizzie
Crawford, taught English for two and one half days while
Clemens Conrad Sr., the other instructor, taught German for
the week's remaining two and one half days. These examples
illustrate the willingness of the state to accommodate German
American citizens who were more than eager to establish their
own schools at their own expense. The state's lack of
decisiveness regarding bilingual instruction speaks more

74 "An Act to Incorporate the New Braunfels Academy," in
Eby, Education in Texas, 359-60.
75 New Braunfels Herald, November 9, 1972, ITC, GPSNB.
76 Ibid., November 23 and 30, 1972, ITC, GPSNB.
77 Ibid., February 22, 1973, ITC, GPSNB.
loudly than its few scattered and sudden English-Only announcements.

This German American bilingual tradition existed outside the Hill Country as well. Shortly after the Civil War, a largely rural German-speaking population in Austin County in the South Coastal Plains attended a common school partially dependent upon state funds. This school in the small town of Shelby was staffed by a German teacher in the 1860s whose method for teaching English was unique: "English instruction involved translating the reading selections into German and keeping a notebook of the English words which were not understood." 78 English, in other words, was taught as an academic course, like a foreign or second language. By the 1880s the public schools of Shelby still continued to make heavy use of the children's native German by using it in daily language and usually as a medium of instruction along with English. 79

Other municipalities provided German American bilingual schools outside the public school system. In San Antonio, for example, there existed a bilingual private and nonsectarian school that succeeded for decades as one of the city's leading educational institutions. The German-English School of San Antonio was founded in 1858, and the second article in its charter (first was the prohibition of religious instruction) stipulated that, "The German and the

---

79 Ibid., 34.
English language would have equal status, and instruction in all other subjects would be distributed as evenly between them as was practicable. Rote, mechanical teaching methods were discouraged by the school. For the mostly German population that attended, the school showed remarkable flexibility in its bilingual program. After some initial experimentation, they discovered that not all students excelled in mastering a bilingual environment at the same rate and they used such observations to form their sophisticated pedagogical methods. Language instruction regularly constituted one-half to two-thirds of the total academic curriculum in all grade levels. The school mixed the non-German, English-speaking students into classes with German-speakers. It was hoped that in "Learning both languages, the pupils would not be divided by arguments over nationality." It was found that non-German children picked up German rapidly in their new environment while the school still succeeded in teaching the German-speakers English; it was dual language instruction. After the Civil War when the German-English school was almost the only school in San Antonio, it even succeeded in implementing a third language, Spanish, into its core curriculum. This school continued until sometime in the 1890s when it began to decline as the

---

80 Christa Carvajal and Annelise M. Duncan, "The German-English School in San Antonio: Transplanting German Humanistic Education to the Texas Frontier," *Yearbook of German-American Studies*, 16 (1981), 92.

81 Ibid., 96.
public schools rose. It was known as one of the premier private schools in the state during the 1870s and the 1880s. Another significant immigrant language group immersed in the bilingual tradition was the Czechs. Today Texas claims the largest rural population of Czech Americans in the country and ranks second among states in the total number of persons claiming full or partial Czech ancestry. Most of these Czechs, a Slavic rather than a Germanic people, immigrated in the mid- to late-nineteenth-century. Also like the Germans, their rate of immigration tapered off in the early twentieth century. They settled in the German-laden areas of South Coastal Texas in Austin, Fayette, Colorado, Washington, and Lavaca Counties. Because of their proximity to the more numerous and powerful German-speaking population and the historical confluence of languages in their crowded geographical home in the Old Country, many Czechs were fairly

---

83 Jordan, "A Century and a Half of Ethnic Change," 411-12. The Czechs were the most numerous of Slavic immigrants to Texas. The Poles and Sorbs (alternately called Wends) were other Slavic groups who came in statistically significant numbers and who also involved themselves in bilingual schools.
conversant in German and often mistaken for Germans by outside observers.\(^85\)

The schools in which Czech was spoken and sometimes used as the medium of instruction were both public and private. Language maintenance was doubly important for the Czechs given their minority relationship to Germans in the Old Country and again in many parts of Texas. Indeed, some Czechs feared the possible "Germanization" of their language and thus expected the schools to not only aid in learning English, but also to preserve their separate culture.\(^86\) One such example occurred in 1876 shortly after the creation of public schools in Lavaca County, where it was rumored that the schoolhouse in a predominantly Czech area was razed by Czech Americans due to intense dissatisfaction with the hiring of a German teacher.\(^87\) Due to the inability of the existing public schools in Ellis County (in West Texas) to make lessons comprehensible for immigrant Czech students, the local Czech American community in 1911 organized a Roman Catholic parochial school where Czech was the medium of instruction and English was taught as a second language.\(^88\) Dogged Czech American determination to preserve their


\(^88\) Valek, "Czech-Moravian Pioneers of Ellis County," 62.
language and culture sometimes effected the linguistic patterns of neighboring German-speakers, Anglos, Mexican Americans, and even African Americans. A Czech-speaking visitor to rural Fayette County in the early 1890s recalled his surprise at being greeted by a black porter speaking flawlessly in the Moravian dialect of the Czech language. The porter laughed at this surprised reaction and explained that the pervasiveness of Czech culture was such that many of the African American families in that area spoke better Czech than they did English.\(^{89}\)

In a few regions of South Coastal Texas where Czech Americans exercised local political power independent of German Americans, the public schools were made to serve the linguistic needs and desires of their community. The 1871 Reconstruction school law required that the examinations for teaching certificates test for proficiency in the English language. This made sense in light of the position taken by then Superintendent De Gress regarding the legal sanction of non-English language instruction up to two hours a day only. In preserving a limited form of bilingualism, these steps were taken to ensure that English would still be mostly taught. Czechs in Fayette County, politically strong enough at that time to have elected a Czech American county judge, appealed to the state board of education to allow one of their Czech-speaking instructors of long tenure to take the examination in Czech or German, in either of which he was

\(^{89}\) Machann and Mendl, Krasna Amerika, 174.
fluent, since he did not feel at that time as if he had command enough of English to pass the certification test. The state said no. A resolution was reached when the county notified the authorities that the teaching assistant was an American fluent in English. Because the assistant understood enough English, the longtime Czech teacher was permitted to continue another year. The next year the teacher in question, after great personal application, managed to pass the English portion of the exam. After another decade at this school, this Czech instructor relocated to another school closer to his home in which he taught in Czech, German, and English.\textsuperscript{90}

Fayette Countians entertained spirited debate amongst themselves regarding the degree of bilingualism in the schools. Ultimately the bilingualists, those who favored eventual assimilation through learning English, won out over those who desired instruction only in Czech for the purposes of cultural maintenance. Speaking for the position that bilingualism in the classroom meant a greater chance for assimilation into an English-speaking nation, Fayette County Judge August Haidăšek declared, "The idea that a person who does not know the English language can be as useful an American citizen as one who knows it is truly ridiculous."\textsuperscript{91} Although his rhetorical veneration of English would later

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Estelle Hudson and Henry R. Maresh, \textit{Czech Pioneers of the Southwest} (Dallas, Texas: South-West Press, Inc., 1934), 176-77.}
\footnote{Machann and Mendl, \textit{Krasna Amerika}, 226.}
\end{footnotes}
represent the position of those who wanted to eliminate all languages in the schools except English, the judge represented the assimilationist position, which at this time was pro-bilingual education.

There were other smaller groups in Texas that also played a role in this bilingual tradition. In the South Coastal area of Karnes County, the town of Panna Maria—recognized as the oldest Polish settlement in the United States—believed that Polish language and Catholicism were inseparable. The first successful school organized in Panna Maria in the 1860s was a Catholic parochial school whose main purpose was to preserve Polish culture, religiosity, and language.92 Into the 1920s the state's education agency regarded the Poles in this town a distinct educational problem due to their very low attendance in the English-Only public school as compared to the bilingual parochial school.93

Whereas the Polish settlement mentioned here was primarily interested in maintaining Polish culture, the following example of Dutch schooling illustrates the polar opposite desire of rapid linguistic assimilation. Dutch settlers who in the 1890s formed the town of Nederland in Jefferson County desired that their children eventually learn English. Unfortunately, the teacher the settlers hired did

92 T. Lindsey Baker, "The Early History of Panna Maria, Texas," Graduate Studies, Texas Tech University, 9 (October 1975), 46-47.
not understand Dutch. But the issue was resolved by securing for the teacher a student who knew enough English to act as an interpreter. Not as pedagogically planned or thought-out as were most other instances in the Texas bilingual tradition, this example illustrates the more temporary and expedient nature that bilingual practices in the schools could take in the nineteenth century and echoes current bilingual education practices of today.  

These early practitioners of bilingual instruction in Texas justified their actions pedagogically. They believed that bilingualism meant better education and greater possibilities for academic enrichment. They also believed that, in addition to its pedagogical soundness, bilingual instruction meant a greater chance to ultimately learn English while at the same time preserving the language of the home. To claim that this bilingual tradition, especially in the case of Texas, was simply a defensive desire for language or cultural maintenance is incorrect. This mischaracterization has been used to view today's efforts at

\footnote{Nederland Diamond Jubilee, 1898-1973 (Nederland, Texas: Nederland Publishing Company, 1973), 45, ITC, General File-Education in Texas, State Dutch. While current pedagogical practices within the area of bilingual education are beyond the scope of this study, the type of instruction found with the Dutch of Nederland—a monolingual teacher or one who doesn't understand the language in question aided in the classroom by an uncertified teacher's assistant who acts as interpreter—is actually quite common today. In some school districts that can not attract enough certified bilingual teachers to adequately serve their need, this often becomes the next option. This obscure point is further evidence against those who argue that our bilingual past is so far removed from modern bilingual education as to not warrant any true historical significance or comparison.}
bilingual education as more of the same cultural maintenance. However, such an interpretation fails to acknowledge the agency displayed by these communities both in their assimilation into a new national culture and how they tenaciously preserved some part of their ancestral identity. It was never an either-or proposition. Texas bilingual schooling, much like the national tradition, demonstrates the richness and complexity of the history of bilingual education in America.
Chapter Two:
Progressive Education in Texas, 1880-1930

In the last chapter the nineteenth century Texas bilingual tradition was reviewed and explored. The three chapters that follow are organized along major themes—the Americanization Movement, the rise of English-Only pedagogy, and a eugenic-based science used in part to help justify English-Only pedagogy—each of which was born and nurtured during the Progressive era in the final years of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. The purpose of this second chapter is to examine the meaning of Progressivism and its general impact upon education. This chapter will lay the political, organizational, and intellectual groundwork for understanding the next three chapter topics.

The difference between Progressivism and Progressive education deserves some comment. Progressivism has been subject to much historiographic controversy. Perhaps the most useful analysis of Progressivism as a general movement comes from historian Robert Wiebe in his The Search for Order, where he notes that Progressivism was a product of the growth of cities and the middle class. Wiebe holds that the processes of industrialization and urbanization created a new and somewhat anxious middle class that desired greater order to their chaotic new surroundings. As the urban middle class increased in stature and organizational power, the autonomy
of more traditional urban powerbrokers and insular rural communities declined. This quest for order tempered more traditional Jeffersonian democratic notions of governance and status by the professionalizing middle class and led to more trust in organizational bureaucracy and regulation. In attempting to create a more stable social order, these Progressives generally conceived of their aims as devoid of class interest and saw themselves as purveyors of harmony over discord.¹

Historian of education Lawrence Cremin notes that at its most basic and fundamental level, Progressive Education is not much more than simple Progressivism within the sphere of education. Cremin argues that Progressive Education attempted to broaden the curriculum in a pluralistic fashion to more firmly link the school to the evolving urban character, which was becoming more ethnically diverse and troubling to many white Anglo-Saxon Americans. The Progressive reverence for professional hierarchy and the role of experts is illustrated by the rush to embrace the possibilities for science and psychology in the formulation of educational policy. The Progressive educators envisioned themselves, says Cremin, as utilizing the schools for social and cultural improvement. Cremin, perhaps, takes Progressive Education too much at face value and on its best terms. But

despite the trends that shifted decision-making power away from local communities and toward middle-class, professional, and bureaucratic structures, the achievements during Progressive Education's dominance broadened the roles played by schools in such a way as to partially fulfill its lofty goals of ensuring greater opportunity through education for all children.²

The previous chapter described in Texas the localism that underlay the management of education. These notions of local dominance in educational decision-making were at odds with the rise of Progressive Education, which advocated shifting the control and direction of education away from local interests and communities to a smaller number of middle-class educational experts with professional training and in administrative bureaucracies. When this shift in power initially occurred in education it was mixed with other political battles of Progressivism such as the criticism of machine politics, child labor, and juvenile delinquency. Cremin notes that initially, Progressive Education's national existance consisted of a general revolt against "pedagogical formalism" and machine politicization of schools by ward bosses without professional credentials.³

---

³ Ibid., 179.
The early advocates of Progressive Education were tied to good government politics which, in the movement's beginnings, represented the interests of wealthy elites and the growing middle-class. In 1895 a nationally renown group of educators called the Committee of Fifteen met in Cleveland to formulate a report that stated unequivocally in Progressive tones that schools should be "absolutely emancipated from partisan politics, and completely dissociated from municipal business." This report, much like Progressive Education reformers of future years, would conceive of its own politicking as disinterested and objective while seeing the efforts of its opponents as uncultured and backward. In New York, for example, Progressive reform in the schools was advocated by the Public Education Association. This organization, active through the 1950s, was created by good-government activists and run by representatives of the city's elite families shortly after New York voters scored an electoral victory in a mayoral race against the Tammany Democratic machine in 1894.5

Progressive solutions mandated a shift in educational decision-making power away from localistic, working class,

---


and machine influenced groups to a combination of the growing middle class and wealthy elites. In 1911 the state of Pennsylvania approved of a new city charter and public school system for Pittsburgh. It overrode the previous domination of schools exhibited by small neighborhood businessmen, manual laborers, and ward politicians. The new school board, unratiﬁed by the voters of Pittsburgh, was represented exclusively by "ten businessmen with city-wide interests, one doctor associated with the upper class, and three women previously active in upper-class public welfare." 6 Another historian has noted of this "restructuring of urban school politics to promote more representation by elites on school boards" that the results were duplicated in Philadelphia, St. Louis, Chicago, and Boston. 7 The city of St. Louis in 1897 under not local, but state legislative action, underwent a school board reorganization upon which a preponderance of families from the social register cropped up on the school board. 8 The city of Cleveland, a latecomer to the onslaught

---


8 Elinore Mondale Gersman, "Progressive Reform of the St. Louis School Board, 1897," History of Education Quarterly, 10 (Spring 1970), 15. Gersman notes a striking similarity in the groups of people that Wiebe identifies as middle class and those that Hays refers to as elites and persuasively suggests that due to differences in semantics
of big-city school board reorganizations, commissioned a survey of its public schools through the resources of the Russell Sage Foundation of New York and personnel from New York's Public Education Association, both advocacy groups for Progressive educational reforms. Not surprisingly, the recommendations of the survey were to strip the local governing board of schools from its wide-ranging oversight capabilities. The survey noted that the board "overlooked the fundamental principle that in a public service corporation policies should be determined by the board but put into execution by the professional administrative officers."\(^9\)

It should be stressed that while the leadership of many of these early Progressive era educational reformers may have initially been from the old elite "Mugwump" class, the educational changes themselves paved the way for the already significant growth in the professionalization of middle-class education workers. Once the crucial issue of control was wrested away from local interests, the initial elite reformers allowed for the greater voice in educational matters by these middle-class professionals. For example, in 1910 the National Education Association, long a mainstay of

university educators, became dominated by primary and secondary public school teachers. The professionalization of teachers and academic disciplines proceeded at a rapid pace once the structural changes mandating greater bureaucratic and professional control created the opportunity for their ever-increasing influence. Even though the political context of the educational battles lends some credibility to the notion of social control against working-class urbanites from the upper and middle classes, the resultant increase in professionalization brought to the Progressive Education Movement a cultural coherence and language "of learned values and habitual responses...by which middle class individuals shaped their emotional needs and measured their powers of intelligence." Once professional organizations and the individuals who were disciplined and conditioned by that culture rose to predominance within its ranks, Progressive Education as a movement became institutionalized and homogenous rather than eclectically cohesive. In allowing itself to become overly institutionalized and isolated, Progressive educators stifled creativity and cut themselves off from the grassroots

10 Wiebe, The Search for Order, 120.
political reformers, which, among other reasons, sowed the seeds for its own eclipse by the 1950s.\textsuperscript{12}

Compulsory Education was the most significant causative factor in all of these structural changes in education. The organizational changes relating to locus of control and professionalization owed origin to the vast change in the type and number of students beginning to attend the already overworked urban schools. The northeastern states first experienced a wave of compulsory attendance laws in the antebellum years, but now the whole nation grappled anew with compulsory attendance during the high tide of Progressivism.\textsuperscript{13} Stated baldly, Cremin gives ultimate credit to compulsory attendance legislation for the arrival of the innovations, ideas, and programs that ultimately became Progressive Education; compulsory attendance meant that those "who in former times might have dropped out of school now became public charges for a minimum period."\textsuperscript{14} After the passage of a state compulsory education law in 1903 New York City was inundated with swarms of children, many of them the sons and daughters of immigrants.\textsuperscript{15} Although Progressive Education can

\textsuperscript{12} Cremin, \textit{The Transformation of the School}, 185 and 350.
\textsuperscript{14} Cremin, \textit{Transformation of the School}, 127.
\textsuperscript{15} Cohen, \textit{Progressives and Urban School Reform}, 68.

Reinforcing the strong connection between the issues of compulsory education and child labor, the 1903 compulsory education law of New York was alternately referred to as the "child labor law of 1903." See Julia Richman, "What Can be
be criticized for various deficiencies, expanding the opportunity for education to unprecedented numbers of immigrants through compulsory education, even if that opportunity was limited, remains as great a legacy as any other reform of the Progressive Era.

Aside from the initial transference of decision-making authority away from ward politicians to middle-class and bureaucratic professionals, the issue of compulsory attendance became "a cardinal article of the progressive creed."\(^{16}\) There were thousands upon thousands more pupils in New York's public schools than before the Progressive initiative. The New York Times reported that in 1905 alone (two years after major compulsory education legislation), between 60,000 and 75,000 children could not attend school due to a lack of space. Historian David Tyack notes of New York that between 1899 and 1914 there was a 60 percent increase in enrollment.\(^{17}\) Now that children stayed in school longer, the size and number of the high schools was expanded. To illustrate this point, only four percent of total school-age children in 1890 attended high schools across the nation.

\(^{13}\) "Done in a Graded School for the Backward Child," Charities, (November 5, 1904), 129.
\(^{16}\) Cohen, Progressives & School Reform, 67.
\(^{17}\) Tyack, The One Best System, 230.
whereas over sixty percent did so by the middle of the 1930s.\(^{18}\)

Schools across the country reoriented curriculum away from traditional academic skills and toward what historian Richard Hofstadter has termed a "life-adjustment" curriculum: homemaking, vocational, and industrial courses. This meant, wrote Hofstadter, "that in a system of mass secondary education, an academically serious training is an impossibility for more than a modest fraction of the student population."\(^{19}\) For many immigrant children, Progressive Education's curricular revolution seemed to consist mainly of having "a clean head." Added were daily lessons on the joys of "nail brushes, hair ribbons, shoe polish, pins, buttons," and hygienic practices.\(^{20}\) Progressive Education brought great educational opportunity to many, but for some its wonders were muted. Progressives argued that certain pupils were inherently uneducable and therefore in need of "special" curricula. New York City superintendent Julia Richman argued that those suffering from "defective mentality of congenital

---


\(^{19}\) Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), 350. Hofstadter argues that courses on life-adjustment skills amounted to giving up on the possibility of a more substantial academic education for the many, the dumbing down of both curricula and standards.

origin" must be given instruction that would "fit him to become a decent, self-respecting wage-earner and a credible member of society."21 The exclusion of large numbers of students from core academic subjects through administrative labelling was an important organizational tool for order. One historian has echoed this sentiment with the claim that "conflict between compliance with the law and satisfaction of teachers' concerns for order was resolved through the special classroom."22

Progressive Education also changed the way people thought about the relationship between children and learning. It was believed by Progressive educators that the most fundamental aspect of teaching was tailoring an approach to learning based on the personality and makeup of the individual child. Progressive educators broke with the traditional method of instruction that was curriculum-based and not child-centered. A significant aspect to the early Progressive Education critique was that the use of "singsong drill, rote repetition, and meaningless verbiage" represented a passive method of learning that stifled the individual child's potential creativity and spontaneity.23 Earlier pedagogical thinkers believed that to educate, a teacher must repeat lessons and concepts until they are allowed to

21 Richman, "What Can be Done in a Graded School," 131.
23 Cremin, The Transformation of the School, 5.
absorbed into a child's vacant and unformed mind. This passive form of learning did not draw from everyday "real world" experience.24

Progressive Education was many things to many different people in multiple contexts. Organizational changes such as the shifting of school decision-making power to a middle-class and professional bureaucracy, compulsory education, the intellectual shifts of pedagogy, and the social significance of the immigrant's increased presence are general categories that the Progressive Education Movement encompasses. Nationally oriented elites sought organizational management of the local schools as an extension of other Progressive reform issues and accomplished their goal through an alliance with the evolving middle class, especially the education professionals. By the period of World War I, the original educational reforms had so altered the breadth and scope of public schools that the educational professionals in the bureaucracy transferred the impetus of reform away from elites, political activists, and the electoral venue and into the universities, teaching colleges, education associations, and state educational agencies. Progressive Education thus became institutionalized.

* * * * *

Progressive Education was a major force in Texas education from about 1880 to 1950. It is difficult to determine the beginning of the Progressive Education Movement in Texas. What, in fact, was Progressive Education in Texas? What did it achieve and how? Progressivism arrived in the South during the last decade of the nineteenth century, but it did not achieve full political expression until the first few decades of the twentieth century. It was articulated as a response to the perceived failures of the blindly pro-business and passively ineffectual New South mentality to achieve a truly "new" South. In this the Progressives were greatly influenced by the crusading zeal for reform inherent in the New South's arch-enemy, Populism. The Progressives, then, sought to change southern society with a greater degree of commitment to activism than New South leaders. This is reflected by Progressives' curbing of local control on public issues such as education by increasing centralized state power and the authority of professionals over parents.

Texas had a slightly different Progressive experience because of its unique geographic, historical, and demographic situation. As a southwestern state as well as a southern one, Progressive Education in Texas demonstrates the distinctive reformist and political attitudes of both. For example, the Southwest dealt with Mexican Americans, not African Americans. In this distinction, southern and southwestern Progressivism were incongruent. The Mexican was
at different times white and non-white, citizen and alien, powerful and powerless, wealthy and poor, respectable and peon. The African American living in the South (or anywhere else for that matter) experienced no such complexity of classification.25

The initial inklings of Progressive Education first appeared in Texas, as in the nation, in the 1880s. It became the dominant way of thinking in the educational establishment by the 1890s after some heated philosophical battles in the previous decade over policy issues. Even though the rhetoric of the Texas Progressives and their conservative opponents differed little, the Progressive position took a firmer commitment to truly restructuring society by means of the school, whereas the rhetoric of the New South leadership gave lip service to this goal but remained perfectly happy to allow the schools to reflect purely local wishes. Progressive educators represented a cadre of leadership that sought the replacement of such localism with professional, middle-class, and bureaucratic control of educational issues. However, like the national experience, infiltration of the educational establishment by Progressives did not mean that

25 Mexican Americans were alternately white and non-white in the system of racial classification operating in Texas. It depended upon context. For the best introduction into the ways in which Mexican Americans fit into or confounded pre-existing racial hierarchies imported by southern and midwestern Anglo newcomers see David Montejano, Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1987), 222-8.
the goals and methods of Progressive Education met with acceptance by the general public. Only during the 1910s did the ideas of Progressive Education claim broad political support in Texas. The "progress" of Progressive thought in education among the voting public can be illustrated through the analysis of several key issues over the span of several decades.

The educational establishment in Texas in the 1880s and 1890s was a still-forming and loose collection of like-minded individuals from different backgrounds. 26 Not all Progressive educators held institutional positions of employment in education. One example was Anna J. Hardwicke Pennybacker who wrote one of the first histories of Texas to be officially authorized and used as a text in the public schools. Her book was taught for years and went through numerous revisions during the 1890s and 1900s. 27 Pennybacker's history was a pioneering attempt to come to terms with the state's past. Her book helped create an entire new discipline for the curriculum of the public schools of Texas. In addition to serving on the educational boards and conferences that

26 By "educational establishment" I mean a group of individuals who shaped educational policy. By the 1890s this body of people had become decidedly Progressive in outlook. Although by referring to them as an "establishment" of thought and action, I have given them perhaps more cohesive structure than they may have ever felt with one another.

proselytized for the new Progressive Education, Pennybacker was also active in women's organizations across the state. She was president of both the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs and its national group, the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Pennybacker was a guiding influence for future educational leaders such as Annie Webb Blanton, who would greatly mold Progressive Education in Texas during the 1920s.28

Many of the leaders of Progressive Education in Texas were able to affect change through institutional channels such as the State Department of Education. It became a regulatory institution that exerted an increasingly significant influence in advancing Progressive causes. In earlier decades the state superintendent was essentially a clerk who solicited information, compiled educational statistics, and warned leaders whenever the perpetually low school fund dipped to crisis levels. The experience of a powerful state authority vested with strong enforcement powers during the Reconstruction era only served to reconfirm the fears of many Texans of a strong educational executive. The whole notion of a statewide supervisor was done away with when Redeemer Democrats ascended to power in 1874. After a brief period of administrative anarchy, state leaders in 1884 re-approved the existence of a state superintendent of

instruction, but "the functions of the office were comparatively few and secretarial in character." The superintendent's duties, however, did increase incrementally over time. In 1893 the office was charged by the legislature to be involved with the certification of teachers. In the 1890s the method of school organization shifted from county and community to the state agency. The legislature continued to add duties in the 1900s and the 1910s until the State Superintendent's office resembled a regulatory agency capable of overriding local interests. But the state's role in education, the early proponents of Progressive Education believed in the 1880s, was merely to "compel the location, establishment, and maintenance of a sufficient number of schools for the education of the children, and enforce efficiency in the schools provided."  

As the Texas State Department of Education felt its actual regulatory powers grow in the 1910s and 1920s, it became more partisan in its support for Progressive Education reform issues. State superintendents of the late nineteenth century had mostly made mostly general recommendations, but in the twentieth century they became increasingly bold in advocating specific articles of legislation and in condemning others. An indication of the shift was Superintendent Annie

---

Webb Blanton who in the 1910s and 1920s won the elected position by arguing that she was more Progressive than her opponent, Superintendent W. F. Doughty. Although he had personal connections to the controversial Governor James Ferguson and anti-prohibition elements (considered enemies by Texas Progressives), he had also supported Texas' first compulsory education law. Despite Doughty's credentials, Blanton described his supporters in unflattering terms as standing ignorantly in the way of real educational reform.\textsuperscript{31}

Blanton transferred her campaign zeal to her office, becoming a tireless, almost hyperactive supporter of a myriad of Progressive causes. The crowning legislative achievement of her administration, an issue that she played a large part in popularizing, was the Better Schools Amendment. This amendment to the constitution raised the cap on local taxation for support to the public schools. Most school districts in small towns and rural areas were limited to a tax rate of fifty cents per one hundred dollars in land evaluation for local property taxes used directly to fund their own schools.\textsuperscript{32} This disproportionately hampered rural

\textsuperscript{31} Cottrell, Pioneer Woman Educator, 47-48. For some of Blanton's campaign literature alleging connections between Doughty and the liquor interests, German sympathizers, and un-American organizations see "Concerning the Race for State Superintendent of Public Instruction," Annie Webb Blanton Vertical File, Center for American History at the University of Texas.

\textsuperscript{32} F. M. Bralley, Seventeenth Biennial Report of the State Department of Education for the Years Ending August 31, 1909, and August 31, 1910 (Austin, Texas: Austin Printing Company, 1911), 11.
schools, while urban schools, under a different organizational system, were subject to no such constitutional limitations. The amendment which passed overwhelmingly in November 1920, raised the allowable level to one dollar per one hundred in evaluation. It also made the top cap completely determinable by the state legislature rather than through altering constitution.\textsuperscript{33} Blanton went beyond just recommending the measure in her standard biennial report, however. She established a political action group in Austin, the Better Schools Campaign, with herself as chairperson. She raised money for this lobbying group by soliciting through her "non-partisan" State Department of Education office. In statewide education bulletins published by her agency she asked for campaign contributions of fifty cents from grade school teachers, seventy-five cents from high school teachers, and one dollar from school administrators and college professors! Contributions were actually listed in an official state report.\textsuperscript{34}


Blanton offered a variety of ways in which to draw voters to the campaign. Her suggestions went from wearing tags of support on "tag day" to purchasing advertisements in media outlets. There were to be posters, parades, and lecture circuits. These suggestions were all published in the statistical section of the state's reports. Blanton even published sloganeering lyrics to popular tunes that one could sing (or better yet give to students to sing in class) in support of the need for the Better Schools Amendment.35

The State Department of Education cooperated a great deal with universities in Texas as it became entrusted with policy matters pertaining to education, finance, organization, administration, and daily performance. The move toward state certification of teachers usually required at least a university or teacher's college education. Those who taught were becoming increasingly professionalized. As early as the 1880s the state superintendent avidly championed expansion of the state's teachers colleges and the availability of Summer Normal Institutes, held in each Texas senatorial and United States congressional district every Summer for the purposes of continuing teacher education. These institutes were well attended and available to both

---

35 Ibid., 108-11. Songs such as Battle Hymn of the Republic, Keep the Home Fires Burning, Yankee Doodle, Dixie, Bonnie Blue Flag, Smiles, Tipperary, Long, Long Trail, and most significantly The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You were given new lyrics to popularize the issue.
white and African American educators. But many teachers were left untouched. As one superintendent said in the 1890s, "The great mass of teachers who enter the work each year is made up of persons who have had no educational advantages beyond those afforded by country schools."  

The level of professional qualifications necessary to meet state standards were constantly revised upward. By the 1910s authorities did not celebrate participation in professional training; they expected it. Superintendent Bralley said in 1912 that "The old idea that just anybody can teach the pupils of the lower grades is fast disappearing from our minds." By the 1920s, participation in teacher-training institutions was perceived as minimally necessary to teach in the public schools. Even emergency certificates issued in times of teacher's shortages came to be viewed as unjustifiable. Higher education was becoming indispensable to the very existence of public education in Texas.

Progressives generally saw themselves as participants in a fundamentally beneficial restructuring of society. The

---

39 Blanton, Twenty-Second Biennial Report, 43.
father of education history in Texas and one of the most prominent supporters of progressive-ness in Texas schools was Frederick Eby. He taught history and philosophy of education at Baylor University from 1900 to 1909 and then taught at the University of Texas until the 1950s. Eby noted that after the school reorganization efforts of 1884, something significant shifted in the decade of the 1890s: "By that date all the fundamental features of our present educational system had become permanently established." By then the first Progressive steps taken in the 1880s were beginning to bear fruit. The Progressive Education outlook continued to dominate educational policy issues in the state, culminating in the late 1940s when Texas led southern states in far-reaching educational restructuring with the Gilmer-Aiken school laws of 1949.

But what was Progressive Education in Texas? Part of the answer to this question can be obtained by examining the rhetoric of Progressive Education and just how words used by

---

40 "Frederick Eby," Education in Texas File-Biographies, Institute of Texas Cultures, San Antonio.
41 Frederick Eby, Education in Texas: Source Materials. No. 1824 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Bulletin, 1918), v.
42 Although it is the culmination of decades of Progressive Education incremental reform, there is a surprisingly small amount of research devoted to the history of Gilmer-Aiken. See also, Carlos Kevin Blanton, "'A Form of Reform': Texas Higher Education Under Governor John Connally, 1963-1969" (MA thesis, Southwest Texas State University, 1995), 12-13; and Walter P. Webb, H. Bailey Carroll, and Eldon Branda, eds., The Handbook of Texas, 3 vols. (Austin, Texas: Texas State Historical Association, 1952, 1976), 1:692.
previous generations of educational leaders shifted in emphasis and in degree under the lexicon of progressiveness. Progressives and especially Progressive educators used the word progress as an object in describing their general course of action which separated them from their political opponents. That which was labeled progressive was understood to be inherently good and beyond dispute. To legitimize something was to refer to it as progressive and to denounce something was to simply indicate that it was not progressive. For example, a Texas history textbook used in the public schools and written by two of the state's leading historians, Eugene C. Barker and Charles W. Ramsdell, included a thematic chapter on the history of Texas education. This chapter had sections entitled "Defects of our School System" and "Recent Progress in the Public School System," which basically gave a litany of what the authors viewed as progress and lingering un-progressive-ness in the state's school system. They championed the compulsory education law (the book's second edition was only a few years after its passage) and other measures such as legislative appropriation increases, the

43 Eugene C. Barker, Charles Shirley Potts, and Charles W. Ramsdell, A School History of Texas (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Petterson, and Company, 1928), 324-27. Barker achieved academic fame by producing a number of graduate students along with a lauded biography of Stephen F. Austin. One of the University of Texas' most important archival centers, the Center for American History, bore his name for many years as the Barker Center for American History. Ramsdell was one of the nation's leading scholars in Southern History and Reconstruction. Potts was Dean of the law school at Southern Methodist University.
free textbook law, rural aid, and constitutional amendments regarding finance. These examples of progressivism gave "every reason for the friends of education to be encouraged." It also lionized the work of lobbying organizations such as "the women's clubs" and the "State Teachers' Association" that aided the State Department of Education's "directing and leading in educational progress."\footnote{Ibid., 325.} One wonders how the opponents of these political issues felt upon reading in their child's schoolbook that their efforts were merely obstructionist roadblocks on the path to true enlightenment.

The state agency itself was certainly not immune to utilizing the politically loaded lexicon. As early as the 1880s and 1890s, the reports of the state agency justified the need for immediate policy change by publishing damning statistics regarding Texas' educational standing against other states. State rankings became a rallying cry for Progressive educators in Texas. In a 1906 state report, Texas ranked 36th among all other states in white male illiteracy, 38th in average attendance, 38th in number of days schools taught, 36th in per capita expenditures, and 28th in funds received by direct local taxation. Superintendent R. B. Cousins concluded that "after making due allowance for disadvantages arising from our bi-racial condition, sparse population, etc., every true patriot and intelligent citizen must recognize the fact that there is
much work that ought to be done for the public schools of Texas." Cousins then exhorted for Texas patriots to "make an honest effort to place Texas where she belongs in comparison with other States of the Union." 45

For some, the notion of Progressive Education meant more than average days attended or expenditure per capita; for rural citizens it meant a fundamental rebirth of older notions of civic, moral, and societal responsibility and order. The rhetoric of Progressive Education that infiltrated the supposedly non-partisan state agency broadened from purely policy matters to more philosophical issues. Claiming that "The need for renewed social life in the rural communities is pathetically real," one journalist appealed to a convention of county superintendents in 1912 to "Awaken the popular consciousness of social needs." Since the spelling bees, barn raisings, and schools sponsored by the "the great land owners" that had produced Washington and Jefferson had passed into memory, this representative of Farm and Ranch magazine argued that truly modern schools must replace these older democratic socializing agents. Social

45 R. B. Cousins, Fifteenth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Years Ending August 31, 1905, and August 31, 1906 (Austin, Texas: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., Printers, 1906), 11-12 and quotations from 12. Cousins became President of South Texas Teachers College in Kingsville, Texas, later Texas A&M University, a key pedagogical laboratory in the development of English-Only pedagogy for Mexican Americans.
and intellectual leadership now passed on to education leaders.46

The most important Progressive Education goal was compulsory education. Not coincidentally, it was also one of the most controversial and final elements of the Progressive Education reform agenda in Texas to be electorally implemented. Compulsory attendance was accomplished on the eastern seaboard and in heavily industrial states in the 1890s or early 1900s, usually accompanied by or spurred on by child labor laws. However, in Texas, as in the rest of the South, compulsory attendance bills proved difficult to pass. Not until the 1910s did they pass in the South generally and in Texas. Even when it did become law, it remained a controversial issue eliciting various degrees of compliance due to long-established patterns of rural child labor.47

Compulsory education was widely seen in Texas as the benchmark of Progressive Education, the measure by which one could judge whether the state was truly "Progressive" or


not. It was only after educators—following long debate—had solidified behind compulsory attendance and its attendant social and political assumptions that it became subject to successful public agitation by Progressive organizations. Then after its passage, compulsory attendance became an accepted idea that was adjusted upwardly in steady incremental fashion as educational progressivism in Texas and the rest of the South continued.

The achievement of a compulsory attendance bill in the state legislature in 1915 had been a product of years of debate and argument in education circles of Texas. Since the 1870s, after the failed attempt that Republicans during Reconstruction made in enforcing a compulsory attendance policy, authorities were met with frequent suggestions that it be tried again. South Texas education representatives in the 1870s and 1880s in particular were dogged in support of compulsory education.

---


50 It is ironic that South Texas local education officials supported compulsory education so vigorously during the 1870s and 1880s because by the 1910s and 1920s, when compulsory attendance finally became a reality it was these very same counties that vigorously resisted it due to the recent arrival of commercial agriculture in South Texas and the need for children, mostly Mexican Americans, to work in the fields.
superintendent of Cameron County schools, bluntly called for such legislation: "The present system of education is a humbug. Nothing short of a compulsory education will do any good. [The] County judge has no time to attend to the school as he ought to." The educational statistics submitted to the state by the overburdened county judge bore out these comments. In his county's schools, the illiteracy rate rose as the length of school term decreased. Duval County Judge James O. Luby echoed Haynes' sentiments. The South Texas leader complained of inadequate compensation of teachers and envisioned compulsory attendance as a solution: "Compulsory attendance would obviate the necessity of providing for compensation [of teaching salaries] on the basis of attendance. While parents are not compelled to send their children to school, and allow them to grow up in ignorance, the present school system will not decrease the illiteracy to the extent desired by our law-makers. Let us have compulsory attendance, by all means."\(^{52}\)

The opponents of compulsory attendance in the late nineteenth century were more numerous than its supporters, however. Many southerners, still tilting at the windmills of Reconstruction days, saw compulsory attendance as merely

---


\(^{52}\) James O. Luby, "Duval County," Ibid., 91.
another example of the growing coerciveness of government. Yet even those who would not ordinarily support the coerciveness of compulsory attendance were beginning to see its need. Judge Thaddeus M. Rhodes of Hidalgo County noted that the private schools of the area drained much-needed support away from his financially strapped public schools. He then concluded, "The wonder is that we make any progress at all. Our English speaking population does not exceed 200, and to this small ratio of our population do we look for support. We can only do our best to overcome the indifference of the majority of the people, and there is but one remedy which I could suggest, but which I do not recommend, and that is compulsory education." 53 There were others who sounded awfully tempted by compulsory attendance. R. L. Stanfield of Bexar County equivocated, "I am almost ready to say that I believe it would be advantageous in this county to have compulsory education. Some classes pay so little attention to the education of their children that I am often tempted to believe that the law ought to interfere." 54

To a rural, localistic Democrat who still recalled the battles of Reconstruction, the realization that public schooling suffered harm without compulsory education, a

---


fundamental tyranny of the "radical" Republican rule, must have been galling indeed.

Although there was no compulsory attendance policy from Reconstruction until 1915, education officials were very concerned with low attendance rates and attempted to increase them by other means. In the first decade of the century, measures were undertaken to increase school attendance by lowering the allowable age of public schooling from seven to seventeen years instead of eight to seventeen years. This, of course, did nothing to actually force people to send their children to school, but it did create a higher overall attendance figure that buttressed the sagging nature of the state's bottom-dwelling educational statistics.\(^{55}\) The state's rankings versus the other states was decidedly mediocre. In terms of average attendance per pupil, Texas ranked thirty-eighth in 1905 and 1906. Most disturbing was that Texas could not rationalize it because of the lack of a compulsory attendance law since Louisiana, South Carolina, and Delaware all managed to exceed Texas' attendance number without compulsory attendance laws in their states. On average, Texas schoolchildren went to school one month less than the children of the nation.\(^{56}\) For the school years of 1907 and 1908, the counties along and close to the Rio Grande River (Cameron, Duval, El Paso, Hidalgo, Nueces, and Webb) had only


40 percent of their total school-age census population (6,868 out of 16,799) enrolled in the public schools, and only 29 percent of those enrolled attended school regularly.57

To educators these dismal numbers justified the Progressives' goal of obtaining compulsory legislation. The State Superintendent of Education F. M. Bralley, threw the support of his agency behind compulsory attendance. The need for such action, claimed Bralley, "is recognized by everyone."58 In the 1910s the compulsory education issue shifted from being a debate among educators to an issue of public debate among voters. The Progressive Education advocates now sought support from the general public and in doing so became a full-fledged popular reform movement.

In Texas as in other states the issue of child labor was tied to the issue of compulsory attendance. In his advocacy for some type of compulsory attendance law, Superintendent Bralley in 1912 noticed that "The progress of child labor legislation in recent years made in the different States has tended to emphasize and to reinforce compulsory attendance."59 Unlike other states such as New York where child labor bills and compulsory attendance bills were simultaneously agreed upon, Texas was much slower to incorporate the educational

58 F. M. Bralley, Eighteenth Biennial Report, 57.
59 Ibid., 57.
ramifications of the child labor issue. The original 1903 child labor law in Texas forbade any manufacturing job for children under twelve.\textsuperscript{60} By the 1920s this was increased to age fifteen.\textsuperscript{61} But the law did not cover agricultural labor, which accounted for the bulk of non-attendance figures. Despite the fact that Texas had a child labor law in effect several years before those of other southern states, in 1911 it remained with Florida, Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina as the only states in the country not to have a compulsory education law.\textsuperscript{62}

Compulsory education did finally arrive in Texas. In 1915 a compulsory attendance law was passed after decades of support and encouragement from the state agency and Progressive organizations. Ironically, this crucial step in the Progressive agenda was shepherded through the legislature by James Ferguson, a popular and progressive-sounding governor who, nevertheless, earned the enmity of middle-class and reformist impulses of the Texas Progressive community for opposing Prohibition, for his demagogic oratory, and for meddling with the governance of the University of Texas.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{60} Pennybacker, A History of Texas for Schools, 270.  
\textsuperscript{62} Bralley, Eighteenth Biennial Report, 57. For analysis of the slow rate of success on the child labor front across the South, see William A. Link, The Paradox of Southern Progressivism, chapter 6.  
\textsuperscript{63} For a complete examination of Progressives and Governor Ferguson see Gould, Progressives & Prohibitionists, 185-88.
Even the textbooks authorized for use in the state's public school's heralded the passage of the compulsory attendance legislation as a symbol of "progress" in the state. Referring to the poor national rankings of the state, the textbook A School History of Texas, written by two of the state's major historians boasted that this "very serious defect" was in the process of being corrected by the new compulsory attendance law.64

Although not without faults, the compulsory attendance bill of 1915 was still somewhat effective. Ferguson felt that higher education received the lion's share of attention and resources from the legislature, and in his gubernatorial campaign of 1914 he made the improvement of public education his central issue.65 The law took effect in the 1916 fall semester, but compliance was staggered, with the state requiring at least 80 days of attendance for the first year and then raising it to 100 days minimum beginning September 1, 1917. It covered children from ages eight to fourteen years.66 There were exemptions such as for those attending state-approved private or private parochial schools, for the physically or mentally ill, for the "feeble-minded," for those residing more than two and one half miles away from the

64 Baker, Potts, and Ramsdell, A School History of Texas, 324-27.
65 Lewis L. Gould, Progressives & Prohibitionists, 185.
nearest public school, and for children aged twelve or older who had completed the fourth grade and whose families were sufficiently in need of their labor.\textsuperscript{67} The law gave broad jurisdiction and enforcement power to local school attendance officers. It also specified the punishment of delinquent parents, beginning with fines of five dollars. Children guilty of habitual truancy faced possible juvenile detention at a boys or girls school.\textsuperscript{68}

The compulsory attendance law was a compromise between localism and centralization. Its strength was that it gave broad powers to county or district attendance officers to administer the law. The measure also gave power to the state's education agency in developing guidelines about how to administer the law and gave the agency the power to determine exemptions. On the other hand, this legislation did have some weaknesses in enforcement that could be legally manipulated by recalcitrant school districts or counties. The whole enforcement mechanism rested upon the ability of local attendance officers, hired by the county or district school trustees, to do their job. The state agency had no inspectors of its own who could intervene directly in the localities. The portion of the law regarding the election of such officers stipulated that only after a petition, several public notices, and an open meeting, could the school

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 5-7.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 10-15.
trustees decide that they needed a countywide attendance officer. In other words, if a school district decided that it did not want to comply with the state law, it could just claim that it did not need an attendance officer or that one could not be hired because there was not enough time before the start of the school term to complete all of the proper protocol.\(^6^9\)

However, despite these flaws the 1915 compulsory attendance law proved popular in following years. It was incrementally raised during the 1920s. Indeed, the 1920s were more progressive for education in Texas than were the "Progressive" years of the 1910s.\(^7^0\) Progressive Education had permeated the educational thought and discourse of those outside the educational community. No longer was the issue about the feasibility or the necessity of a compulsory attendance bill; the debate in the 1920s concerned how much to raise the attendance requirement. In the 1920s State Superintendent Annie Webb Blanton recommended amendments to the compulsory education law that would have raised the number of school days minimally required from 100 days to 120

\(^{6^9}\) Ibid., 8-9.

\(^{7^0}\) In many respects this argument takes its interpretive cue from George B. Tindall and his notion that southern progressivism, especially "business progressivism," actually became stronger in the 1920s, a decade often mischaracterized as one where conservatism and anti-progressive issues dominated. For a Texas study conforming to Tindall's thesis, see Norman D. Brown, *Hood, Bonnet, and Little Brown Jug: Texas Politics, 1921-1928* (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1984), 7.
in the school year of 1923-24, then from 120 to 140 in 1924-25, and finally from 140 to 160 in 1925-26. And as if that was not enough, she advocated increasing the age limits of eight to fourteen to ages seven to sixteen. Even the exemption age was to be raised to fourteen years from twelve. Blanton did not achieve the lofty goals that she recommended, but the average attendance rate did rise from 117.8 days in 1918-19 to 136.5 days in 1921-22.

By the time compulsory education arrived in Texas and the ideas of Progressive Education achieved dominance, the powers of the state superintendent and the surrounding bureaucracy had dramatically increased. Superintendent Blanton in the early 1920s reported on her agency's degree of enforcement of compulsory attendance violations and the fraudulent claims made by outlaw school districts in order to receive state funding for children that were not in school. In a section of one of her biennial reports, Blanton claimed to have evidence based on her own personal investigations that pointed to gross violations of the law by several South Texas school districts with large Mexican American populations. After assuredly infuriating local school districts, political leaders, and business interests,

71 Annie Webb Blanton, Twenty-Second Biennial Report, 10. Despite Blanton's exertions the minimum number of school days mandated by compulsory education throughout the 1920s remained at 100.

Blanton's investigations reduced the school census roll for Zapata County to 699 from their originally submitted 1,642.\(^73\)

In areas where Mexican American youths were routinely encouraged to enter the workforce, school officials helped supply local agribusiness its labor pool by routinely ignoring the compulsory attendance laws.\(^74\) Thus, the non-attendance of Mexican Americans in South Texas became an issue due for the compulsory attendance policy and the increasing degree of oversight assumed by the state superintendent and agency. Blanton challenged the negligence of other local South Texas school districts in crusade-like fashion. An investigation in Corpus Christi's Nueces County turned up several thousand phantom students that the local school district used to obtain greater levels of funding. Blanton reduced this county's claim from 6,043 pupils to 3,652. Other investigations in Johnson, Refugio, Cameron, Jim Wells, and Starr Counties (all of them in South Texas with large Mexican American populations except for Johnson County in Central Texas) yielded many similar incidents of fraudulent use of state funds via systematic and gross indifference to compulsory education laws.\(^75\)

\(^73\) Annie Webb Blanton, Twenty-Second Biennial Report, 141.


\(^75\) Blanton, Twenty-Second Biennial Report, 142-44.
While legally on shaky ground in enforcing actual attendance, the state agency was well within its jurisdiction in tackling census fraud and financial malfeasance. However, while she could use her agency to investigate, Blanton had no prosecutorial power. Apparently, neither the local legal authorities nor the state attorney general felt as if non-compliance with the compulsory education laws in the fraud case warranted legal sanction. But even though Superintendent Blanton met fierce resistance in her crusade to make localities obey state law and not willingly commit fraud, the fact that she was engaged in the effort at all as head of the state's regulatory agency for education, shows for Texas a significant shift in the conceptualization of the powers of her office and the role of education. School control, oversight, and supervision denoted power; that power was now shifting from local communities to a centralized state bureaucracy, a hallmark of Progressive Education nationally and in Texas.

Another issue that touched upon the competition between localism and centralization was school organization. Before compulsory attendance legislation ever became an issue, the debate over school organization filled the pages of the agency's reports. From the 1880s to the 1900s, all state superintendents vigorously supported the one form of school organization that stripped local authorities of their

\[76\] Ibid., 144.
traditional complete autonomy over the administration and management of schools.\textsuperscript{77}

For decades after Reconstruction, Texas maintained roughly three types of school systems: a community system, a district system, and a county system. County schools were run by the county judge who acted as the de-facto local school superintendent, or they operated with a full time superintendent of county schools who was specially appointed by the county judge. This system survived well into the twentieth century was also known as the common or country schools; for decades this was the largest system of school organization in Texas. However, its importance declined as Texas became less rural and isolated.\textsuperscript{78} Also, while educational leaders did not vilify county schools, they disapprovingly noted that they were more inhibited by the state constitution on finance matters than other systems.\textsuperscript{79}

The system favored by educational progressives was the district system because it was under direct supervision by the state agency and was not as hobbled as the common schools in the area of finance. The schools did have local control in the form of the election of trustees from within the

\textsuperscript{77} Eby, \textit{The Development of Education in Texas,} 172-78.

\textsuperscript{78} Texas remained a dominantly rural state through much of the first few decades of the twentieth century. For a firsthand account of how ungraded, county schools functioned in this period see William A. Owens, \textit{This Stubborn Soil: A Frontier Boyhood} (New York: Lyons & Burford, 1986'), 59-61.

school district to form a local school board, but the
district's boundaries had to meet the state agency's
approval. The school districts were permanent and could not
be dissolved without state involvement. For these reasons,
state superintendent after state superintendent
enthusiastically approved of this system of school
organization.

Progressive educators in search of a more Progressive
school organization reserved their greatest ire for the
remaining method of organization, the community system.\(^8^0\)
Originally, something very much like the community system
predominated in Texas before the Civil War.\(^8^1\) The community
system continued immediately after Reconstruction when
Democratic lawmakers, distrustful of what they saw as
tyrannical elements of Radical Republican rule, devised a way
of organizing schools that would ensure and maximize local
control.\(^8^2\) The community schools were organized by any group
of adults wishing to define themselves as a community. Under

\(^8^0\) Ibid., 28-30; and Ibid., 17.
\(^8^1\) Eby, Education in Texas, 830.
\(^8^2\) For a similar analysis of the community system's role
as a post-Reconstruction ideological mainstay of Redeemer
Democrats see Thad Sitton and Milam C. Rowold, Ringing the
Children in: Texas Country Schools (College Station, Texas:
Texas A&M University Press, 1988), 6-8. There are some
dissertations that also discuss the community schools as a
point of contention among education reformers. See also,
Michael Allen White, "History of Education in Texas, 1860-
1884," (Ph.D., diss., Baylor University, 1969), chapter 6;
and Lee Wayne White, "Popular Education and the State
Superintendent of Public Instruction in Texas, 1860-1899."
(Ph.D., diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1974), chapter 5.
this system language minorities were able to create their own school systems and provide varying types of bilingual instruction. To form such a school, any self-defined group of parents submitted to a figurehead superintendent (often the county judge who already acted as superintendent of county schools) a list of children comprising the district. The judge would appoint three trustees who could be removed by community petition and they would manage the school for one year, after which the whole process would have to be repeated again the next year. The children usually were put up in one-room structures that were not originally designed as schoolhouses such as church basements, abandoned homes or stores, town halls, etc. The advantages to such a method of organizing education was that it shifted almost complete power to the locals wishing it. Should the trustees appointed by the judge not have conformed to parental wishes regarding the content of instruction, method of instruction, or anything, the school could very easily be dissolved. Also, this system put the onus of finance on the state and not the locality because under this system the one-year community school district did not have any legal authority to tax. All of the funding for these community system schools, therefore, came from the state fund. The only thing the parents of the community district had to do was to find any
structure in which to conduct class and to file the yearly paperwork with the already over-burdened county judge.83

Despite the fact that the state authorities very early on favored the district system of organization, the published reports of local county judges reflect the support that the community system had in specific localities. Judge B. Brucks of Medina County in Central Texas, which possessed a significant Alsatian (German and French) population echoed this sentiment when polled by the state superintendent as to which system he found preferable by claiming, "In this county, sparsely populated as it is, the community system works well." This unadorned pledge of support for the community system, especially in counties with large populations of Mexican Americans or other ethnic, language-minority groups, was repeated in many superintendent reports.84

This did not diminish the state educational establishment's desire to end the community system for being allegedly inefficient, corrupting, fraudulent, and tantamount to not educating. State Superintendent of Education Oscar H. Cooper in the late 1880s alleged that the community system

83 Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 169-70 and 172-73. Eby, the true Progressive educator that he was, wasted precious little space describing advantages of the community system. He alternately scolded the figures of the past for putting up with it for so long and apologized for what he felt were misguided Redeemer excesses.
fostered "local bickerings, sectarian rivalry, and even personal quarrels, [that] frequently lead to the organization of two or three weak and inefficient schools, where one good strong school would better meet the needs of the locality."
He also argued that their lack of permanence and their inability to financially support themselves without state aid was a hindrance and would not maintain the black and white racial segregation in schools any better than would the more efficient district system.85

Despite the constant pressure by state superintendents and other high-placed educational and political leaders, the community system only started to decline in the mid-1890s. It lingered on in several stubborn pockets, especially those with large numbers of non-English-speakers, well into the 1900s. State reports increasingly referred to the community system in unflattering terms. It was described as an unbelievably archaic relic of the distant past, yet it persisted despite the criticism and opposition from the experts. According to Eby, the number of counties in which the community system predominated was consistently shy of 100 (often 80 to 90) from the 1880s, when the state superintendents began their negative campaign against it, to the middle years of the 1890s. The counties in which the

85 Oscar H. Cooper, Special Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 29. Keeping a lid on the specter of racial mingling in the schools was regularly trumpeted by supporters of the community system as one of its "special" benefits.
district systems proliferated had numbered mostly over 100 by
the 1880s. In the middle of the 1890s when the community
system first began to decline, the counties with district
systems began to consistently number around 200.86

In the early years of the 1900s the community system,
now obviously on the wane, clung tenaciously to thirty or so
counties every year until the legislature finally ended
it...three times!87 The first attempt came in 1897 when the
Twenty-Fifth Legislature decided to kill the community system
by mandating that all public schools in the state be
organized under its favored competitor, the district system.
But a "courtesy" amendment was also agreed to which gutted
the spirit of the bill by allowing individual representatives
and senators to personally exempt counties in their own
districts from having to comply with the law. The number of
community schools dropped to the thirties in the late 1890s
and held there for roughly a decade more.88

The Twenty-Ninth Legislature upon encouragement from the
Progressive educational establishment tried to end the
limping community system in 1905 by specifically outlawing it
for the 1906-07 school term. However, yet another amendment
was slipped into this bill that allowed for the community
school localities themselves a final vote on whether or not
to form a district. Through a majority of county voters, a

86 Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 211.
87 Ibid., 211.
referendum of sorts, this legislative maneuver kept the community system in business with some areas for a short while longer. Now only thirteen counties defied the wishes of high-placed educators in Austin. These thirteen counties overwhelmingly represented areas where linguistic minorities such as Germans, Czechs, and Mexican Americans had utilized the community system to implement bilingual schools at the local level. Increasingly frustrated, Superintendent Cousins minced no words in referring to the community system as "primitive," "impractical," "inhibitive," and "a mere experiment."  

Cousins, however, accused this system of more than generalized backwardness. Finally getting to what appeared to have been for years the real issue, Cousins attacked the community system by alleging that it reinforced ethnic tribalism. Cousins wrote that ethnic communities favored this system since they believed that it best allowed for "people of different nationalities inhabiting the same neighborhoods in Texas each to have a separate school of its own." Cousins argued that this was pedagogically tragic, "suicidal," "treason," and "repulsive to every man that loves his country." He concluded that "The German children continue to be German and to speak German, and frequently

---

99 Ibid., Sixteenth Biennial Report, 17. These thirteen were Cameron, Camp, De Witt, Duval, Fayette, Houston, Lee, Limestone, Matagorda, Panola, Trinity, Washington, and Webb counties.
grow to maturity ignorant of the language of their country. The same is true of the Bohemians." Cousins concluded with a rhetorical flourish: "Must Texas educate Germans, or Bohemians, or Mexicans? Are we not rather to educate Texans?-Americans?"  

No doubt this reflected the nativist element inherent in Progressive Education. Of course the rising tide of nativism and its attendant breakers of Americanization and English-Only pedagogy in the early twentieth century put Cousins in good company. If there were any room for doubt as to who the "enemy" was on this issue, Cousins removed it by alleging of the community system's supporters that their "arguments usually set forth in favor of a continuation of this plan condemn it in awful accents." In pursuit of the higher goal of Progressive Education, Cousins sought to gain political support by turning to the xenophobic side of Progressivism. His example would be followed by other Texas Progressive educators in later years.

One final issue central for Progressive Education in Texas was the reorganization of the curriculum. As was the case with Progressive Education nationally, there also came to be in Texas the sentiment that school work should have

---

90 Ibid., 19. Original italics used.  
91 Ibid., 19. My own italics supplied. Not all advocates of Americanization were nativists. However, Cousins' words confirm fears shared by many others advocating Americanization in Texas and across the nation. Chapter Three explains this more fully.
more direct relevance to modern life. Progressive Frederick Eby described the new curriculum best: "The new curriculum betokens a desire to serve the community more immediately, to fit the student for life, to bridge the gap between the school and the practical world." In addition to the gradual inclusion of new subjects such as science, modern languages, higher mathematics, and English literature during the 1890s and 1900s, it was felt that more practical coursework would best fit the Progressive ideal of reconnecting school to community. Vocational subjects gradually became as accepted a part of the curriculum as arithmetic. For the first time the teaching of health and health-related topics became officially recognized by educators. There was also a sense that the state had more of a responsibility to educate young citizens in civic virtue and history, especially Texas history.

Progressive educators insisted (after a spirited debate in the educational community) that high school be the desired end of public schooling. The exclusivity of earlier high schools in Texas was reflected in their classical array of courses, which served to prepare a select few for a university education. Progressives wanted high schools to be the end point of mass public education and saw its function as not to prepare a few for university, but to educate generally and practically a broad-based citizenry. By the

---

92 Eby, The Development of Education in Texas, 256-57.
1880s the Texas Association of Superintendents officially endorsed the principle of free and available public high schools as did the Texas State Teacher's Association.93

Even the early supporters of high schools in Texas did not go so far as to argue for their mandatory accessibility because they feared that some localities would feel burdened. Superintendent Oscar H. Cooper supported the spread of high schools as necessary "to the formation of good citizenship," but he only supported them as long as they were not a burden to local taxpayers. Cooper's written sentiments are a study in the art of qualification. "It would be desirable," Cooper started, "if it could be done without too great inconvenience." He then hedged, "to authorize trustees of the districts in each justice's precinct to provide for higher instruction in some one school, situated near the center of the precinct, which might be attended by the children within the scholastic age who had passed beyond the subjects which could be advantageously taught in the ungraded country school."94

The teaching of health-related topics to students in Texas was part of a regional health movement. In many southern states where preventable diseases and ailments flourished, state educational agencies in conjunction with outside philanthropic organizations sponsored public

93 Ibid., 250.
94 Cooper, Special Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 36.
awareness campaigns to popularize and teach measures that would help prevent illness.\textsuperscript{95} Prior to the 1900s, however, Texas educational reports did not mention health education to any significant degree. Health education and state directed campaigns to eradicate preventable hygienic ailments, especially hookworm, first appeared in Texas in the late 1900s and early 1910s. The State Health Officer addressed a gathering of county school superintendents in 1911 and after describing in graphic detail the symptoms and manner of infection from hookworms, he urged cooperation between his office and local authorities. He then insisted that school superintendents promise to ensure sanitary privies and help him spearhead an information campaign in their counties.\textsuperscript{96}

Progressives sought to further the cause of democracy by socializing the citizenry with an educational curriculum that stressed the everyday, practical, and relevant. Part of this revolution emphasized vocational education, which would benefit students wishing to take their place in industry, crafts, or other skilled occupations. In its ideal expression, vocational training would prepare students for occupations that they would have normally chosen upon leaving

\textsuperscript{96} Ralph Steiner, "Rural Hygiene and School Sanitation," in Bralley, Proceedings of the County Superintendent's Institute, 16-24.
school. In many respects, Texas' efforts at bringing vocational and industrial education to its public schools was a part of Progressive Education's desire to refashion the schools into more socially responsive and reflective institutions. Texas used the bulk of its vocational education for the purpose of agricultural education. Federal legislation created agricultural land grant colleges in 1862 with the Morrill Act and continued to expand the scope of federally funded agricultural science by offering assistance to states for the creation of agricultural experiment stations, offering research funds, extending of the Morrill Act to African American population unable to attend segregated land grant institutions with their own facilities, and providing money to states for the training of teachers of agricultural science and home economics. Although it was not as widely publicized as agricultural education, mechanical education for industry and manufacturing was also a part of the vocational movement in curriculum. Industrial vocational education in Texas was a response to the promise of federal aid with the passage of the Smith-Hughes bill in 1917.


The vocational education programs in San Antonio public schools for manufacturing and industrial training were nationally recognized. An educational researcher on an investigation of San Antonio's public education system in the 1910s argued that its vocational education system was impressive enough to be "ranked among the more progressive cities of the country." However, the investigator found that San Antonio's vocational programs were so intensive that they overshadowed or choked off instruction in other fundamental subjects. The investigator from the University of Chicago gently chided the city's schools for their inability to integrate the practical with the ideal: "A third kind of failure is the teaching of the supposedly technical information, mathematics, science, drawing, and design, together with social studies like history and geography, without any real or vital relation between these studies and the fundamental things of the vocational world to which they are supposed to refer." 

By design or not, San Antonio's vocational programs perpetuated the racial segregation of African American and Mexican American students. There is no doubt that there was a higher degree of emphasis upon industrial education in the San Antonio schools attended by non-whites. This was noted,

September 1, 1916 to August 31, 1918 (Austin, Texas: State Board of Education, 1920), 203.
100 Ibid., 27-28.
although without any whiff of criticism or semblance of
concern by the University of Chicago investigator who
casually observed that San Antonio's education officials were
generous and more progressive than many of the most
progressive cities in the country due to the extra time given
to African Americans for vocational education.\footnote{101} One modern
historian has argued that San Antonio's system of shepherding
Mexican Americans into positions of manual labor served to
create and perpetuate "the myth of the Mexican as someone who
was only suited to be (almost as a result of genetic makeup)
a semiskilled or skilled worker."\footnote{102}

One last curricular innovation championed by Progressive
educators in Texas was the birth of Texas history as a
required subject. Although history as a subject was routinely
taught in the earliest of schools, the Progressives sought a
history that was both more patriotic and relevant to the
present. This inclination to self-consciously propagate
history as a Progressive and community-affirming function was
as much a part of the national Progressive agenda as was
vocational education.\footnote{103} The conditions were never better for
the birth of Texas History than in the late nineteenth
century when the original settlers of the state were aged and

\footnote{101} Ibid., 26-27.
\footnote{102} Richard A. Garcia, Rise of the Mexican American
Middle Class: San Antonio, 1929-1941 (College Station,
\footnote{103} David Glassberg, "History and the Public: Legacies
(March, 1987), 964-65.
publishing recollections of the events of their lifetime. The state's major historical society and its quarterly publication were founded in the 1890s just when the Progressive sentiment in education was beginning to manifest itself. It remained steadfastly open to the participation of non-academics and public leaders. It was founded by academics, civic leaders, and prominent Texans.

The original works on Texas history from the 1890s to the first decades of the twentieth century were written at a time when commercial agriculture and industry were creating a socio-economic context that allowed for a greater degree of racial segregation and class segmentation for Mexican Americans than ever before. With this socioeconomic backdrop, the Texas history taught to the state's schoolchildren, such as the Progressive Anna Pennybacker's *History of Texas*, emphasized the Texas War for Independence against Mexico and the evil-ness of the Mexican Santa Anna. The Texans were portrayed as valorous and freedom-loving in contrast to the Mexicans, who were portrayed as cowardly, vicious, corrupt, and tyrannical. Other works of history were little different in interpretation.\(^{104}\) This veneration of the Alamo served to mirror and reinforce the political and cultural control that white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants had finally, by the late nineteenth century, solidified in Texas.

\(^{104}\) Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas*, 305-06.
It seems almost no wonder that this period, according to one cultural demographer, marked the demographic and cultural high point of Anglos in Texas.\textsuperscript{105}

This birth of Texas history also took place at the same time that the practices of segregation and disfranchisement were being codified into law in Texas as in the rest of the South. As segregationist practices gained in strength, a protégé of pioneer cinematographer D. W. Griffith, who created the film \textit{Birth of a Nation}, produced a film a mere six months later entitled \textit{The Alamo and Its Martyrs}. It utilized the same actors who played the African Americans on \textit{Birth of a Nation} and alleged that Santa Anna and the Mexicans, in addition to the standard crimes they were usually charged with, also wanted to rape white women.\textsuperscript{106}

Through an examination of the Texas experience with Progressive Education one can see that the movement sought to reform society by reforming education. The acceptance of Progressive Education came first from the education community in the last decades of the nineteenth century after some internal debate. An educational establishment consisting of bureaucrats, teachers and professors, public officials,


authors, and well-placed citizens interested also in other Progressive reforms sought to better society through the betterment of education. Through the issues of compulsory attendance, centralization, school organization, and curricular change, a definite movement away from local, rural, multicultural, and localistic traditions can be charted. In contrast, Progressive Education emphasized a perspective beyond the purely local, sought to produce a more culturally homogenous population, and emphasized the principle of ever-greater state regulatory supervision of educational matters by a professional class of experts.

Although this transformation was not complete or even sufficient by the expectations of many Progressive educators, its agenda succeeded. It reshaped public education in Texas between 1880 and 1930. This varied and all-encompassing intellectual paradigm of Progressive Education is critical for understanding the history of bilingual education and language instruction in Texas. Progressive Education is the prism by which the historian can examine this entire rich period of education in Texas, especially the new and important innovations regarding Mexican Americans and language pedagogy. It was in this period that Americanization became a dominant mode of action and English-Only pedagogy was formalized in Texas, officially displacing foreign languages in the classroom both legally and pedagogically. The Americanization movement (Chapter 3),
English-Only pedagogy (Chapter 4), and the scientific rationalization of educational practices through the use of intelligence testing (Chapter 5), must be seen in the context of the triumph of Progressive Education in Texas.
Chapter Three:  
The Americanization Movement in Texas, 1918-1940

Out of the myriad of complimentary and clashing reforms collectively called Progressive Education came a number of ideas on how to assimilate immigrants through public schooling. Gaining strength during the first two decades of the twentieth century was one specific approach: The Americanization Movement. It was built on contradictory tensions, becoming a compromise between diametrically opposed ideas. Its meaning changed over time. Americanization was a common, informal idea throughout most of the nineteenth century. By the early twentieth century, however, it came to signify a formal process of shedding foreign-ness and was learned through a traditionally American institution such as a church, school, or workplace. To become acculturated or assimilated was the end goal of Americanization.

At the turn of the century it was postulated that "Old" immigrants quickly assimilated into mainstream American culture and society. The Americanizers simply assumed that the alleged similarity amongst "Old" immigrants (Germans, Irish, British, French, Scots-northern Europeans) to native United States citizens from the time of independence to the middle of the nineteenth century made rapid assimilation simple. But the "New" immigrants (Italians, Slavs, Russians, Hungarians, Turks, Poles—southern and eastern Europeans) of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was believed, were so dissimilar to the racial pool and culture
of native-born Americans that easy assimilation was either impossible or highly unlikely. These were the historical assumptions about immigration and ethnicity upon which most Americans, especially the Americanizers themselves, operated. The congressional investigation of immigration from 1907 to 1911 called the Dillingham Commission based its work on these notions as did the administrators of the 1920 federal census. They set the tone for policy changes regarding Americanization and immigration restriction during the 1910s and 1920s.¹

The historiography of the Americanization Movement is as conflicted as that of Progressivism, but there is even less scholarship on the subject of Americanization. Edward George Hartmann in The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant (1948) viewed the movement as partially successful and its goals beneficial and positive both to immigrant and nation. He concluded that unlike the Ku Klux Klan and other nativist or racist movements, Americanization "did not stress a negative program of restriction or repression as the means of solving the immigrant question," and that it was based upon "faith in the ultimate assimilative capabilities of the immigrant and

of his eventual transformation into a patriotic, loyal, and intelligent supporter of... 'America's priceless heritage.'"²

Later scholars have been more critical of the success and the aims of the movement. John Higham in Strangers in the Land (1955) argues forcefully that the movement's goals and motives consisted of both the positive and the negative: "Americanization, even in its most coercive aspect, involved an appeal to the foreign-born." But he judged Americanization to be ultimately unsuccessful in its goal of redeeming the immigrant in the minds of the native-born American public because of the overwhelming support for immigrant restriction during the 1920s.³ Historians of the 1960s and 1970s went further than Higham in their denunciations of the Americanization Movement. For these historians Americanization was only about maintaining white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant cultural hegemony through forced conformity with no concern at all for the immigrant. Devoid of nuance and historical complexity, this scholarship grouped all Americanization and Americanizers as merely fronting for the real issues of nativism, racism, and economic or social control.⁴ More recent scholarship maintains the largely

critical outlook on Americanization, but also examines the role of Americanization within more of a regional focus, often on the Americanization experience of a single immigrant group.\(^5\)

On the issue of immigrant assimilation three separate and competing strands of thought existed: nativism, cultural pluralism, and Americanization. Cultural pluralists and Americanizers represented the major intellectual camps within the Progressive Education Movement; unadulterated nativism was outside the movement but gained strength through the popular issue of immigration restriction. The nativists viewed any positive attributes of the "New" immigrants to be completely outmatched by the negative ones. The cultural pluralists, on the other hand, remained optimistic about the potential contributions of immigrants and believed that the nation would be strengthened by them. The Americanizers bridged both nativists and cultural pluralists by their skepticism of the possible immigrant contribution to the fabric of American life unless they underwent a systematic catechism of instruction by leading American institutions,

instilling the proper respect, sentiments, and values. The Americanizers played rhetorical lip service to the contribution of immigrant cultures while all the while teaching conformity. Cultural pluralists welcomed diversity of cultures as an additive thing that was bound to make the country stronger. The nativists saw all immigrant cultures as alien and destructive of American values.

The nativist position is, for the purposes of this chapter, the least important of the three competing approaches even though it is the one that ultimately succeeded in the 1920s with the passage of severe immigration restriction, itself a repudiation of both cultural pluralism and Americanization. Nativism had always been a part of American history, erupting significantly every few decades in certain regions, but what is interesting about the nativists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is that they developed a full pseudo-science of race that justified (for many) the exclusion, potential expulsion, and sterilization of large numbers of the New immigrants due to alleged racial difference. Prescott F. Hall of the Immigration Restriction League testified to the Dillingham Commission that "breeding" with "alien dependents, delinquents, and defectives" from "races and countries, or parts of countries, which have not progressed, but have been backward, downtrodden, and relatively useless for centuries"
would be tantamount to a "watering of the nation's lifeblood."\(^6\)

Starkly opposite the nativist position was the cultural pluralist position. The spirit of Progressive Education in the early years of the century fostered a certain cultural pluralism among influential thinkers and educators. Two key examples are Jane Addams and John Dewey. Addams founded her famous settlement project, Hull House, to help immigrant communities adapt to American life. By today's standards Addams would certainly be judged guilty of a certain degree of insensitivity regarding immigrant cultures. On the whole, however, she did not wish to eradicate or homogenize all cultural differences. Decrying the "superficial standard of Americanism" she felt that most public schools exhibited toward the immigrant, Addams typified the cultural pluralist position by stating, "I believe that if these people are welcomed upon the basis of the resources which they represent and the contributions which they bring, it may come to pass that these schools which deal with immigrants will find that they have a wealth of cultural and industrial material which will make the schools in other neighborhoods positively envious."\(^7\)


Perhaps the most evocative and well known representative of the pluralist ethic within Progressive Education was John Dewey. Dewey explored the theoretical and philosophical dimensions of education within American society and studied an experimental laboratory school that he and his wife founded in 1896 while at the University of Chicago.\textsuperscript{8} He made his position quite clear in a letter to another cultural pluralist, Horace Kallen of Columbia University, that he sympathized with Kallen's attacks upon Americanization, "I never did care for the melting pot metaphor, but genuine assimilation to one another—not to Anglo-Saxon-dom—seems to be essential to...America."\textsuperscript{9} Dewey agreed with Kallen that the Americanization campaigns of World War I made a mockery of American patriotism. At a speech to the National Education Association in 1916, Dewey labeled harsh Americanization programs as treasonous, "I find that many who talk the loudest about the need of a supreme and unified


\textsuperscript{9} J. Christopher Eisele, "John Dewey and the Immigrants," \textit{History of Education Quarterly,} 15 (Spring 1975), 71. Although Dewey is regarded as one of the principle founders and thinkers of the Progressive Education Movement, he often found himself at odds with it on matters such as Americanization.
Americanism of spirit really mean some special code or tradition." Dewey argued that this lack of cultural diversity was "false to the spirit of America."\(^\text{10}\) In order to gain any meaningful understanding of the complexities of Progressive education, one must avoid the conflation of assimilation and Americanization. The cultural pluralists like Addams and Dewey advocated the immigrant's prompt assimilation into national life and culture, as did the Americanizers, but just not so totally. Dewey himself praised the schools for this role.\(^\text{11}\)

Americanization was advocated by organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Society of the Colonial Dames, and the Sons of the American Revolution. Just as the cultural pluralists were not all angels, the Americanization advocates were hardly all demons. Higham captures the paradoxical nature of Americanization with the defining observation, "The impulse of fear and the impulse of love ran throughout its whole course, clashing in principle though in practice sometimes strangely blended."\(^\text{12}\)

Two very influential thinkers of the Americanization wing of Progressive Education were pedagogical theorists Ellwood Cubberley of Stanford University and Emory Bogardus of the University of Southern California. Cubberley defined the new education's job in dealing with the immigrant: "Our

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 73.
\(^{12}\) Higham, Strangers in the Land, 237.
task is to break up these groups or settlements, to assimilate and amalgamate these people as a part of our American race, and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law and order, and popular government." Cubberley likened the new educators to state-sponsored Americanization agents.\textsuperscript{13} Emory Bogardus mirrored Cubberley's attitudes regarding the schooling of the immigrant. After giving an exhaustive racial history of the United States, he defined Americanization by simply stating, "In the case of the foreign-born, Americanization means giving up one set of well-known and, in part, precious loyalties for another set of loyalties, more or less unknown."\textsuperscript{14} No divided loyalty to another culture could be acceptable.

Shortly before and during World War I, the Americanization camp overshadowed and triumphed over the cultural pluralists for the direction of Progressive Education. This was short-lived, though. As the country returned to "normalcy" in the 1920s, Americanization as a broad-based effort died out. Perishing with it was some


\textsuperscript{14} Emory S. Bogardus, \textit{Essentials of Americanization} (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1920), 13-14. Bogardus offered a catalog of separate racial categories including one for "the mountaineer" prevalent in the southern Appalachian Mountains of the United States.
remnant of the belief that immigrants could continue to be assimilated; restrictionism became one of the potent political issues of the decade. The experience of Americanization in Texas, however, offers a different story.

* * * * *

The Americanization Movement in Texas, a period in which immigrant and language minority groups faced intense pressure to conform to a culturally accepted white, Anglo, Protestant Americanism, lasted from World War I to World War II. However, the roots of Texas' Americanization Movement went farther back. Just as Progressive Education was first an intellectual critique of the educational status quo in the late nineteenth century before becoming a full-fledged popular movement in the 1910s, so to the idea of Americanization existed in Texas, and especially in educational circles, throughout the nineteenth century. However, these reformist and centralizing ideas, more often than not, were contradicted by the local control of education. As a result, bilingual instructional traditions in local communities—whether they be in the Spanish, German, Czech, or Polish language—were tolerated and even tacitly encouraged.

By the turn of the century, however, conceptualizations of assimilation and what it meant to be an American had shifted; no longer would the benign suggestions to take up American ways suffice for Progressive-minded educational and political leaders. All prior accommodations made to
immigrant or ethnic communities were now discontinued as archaic, pre-modern, and unpatriotic. By the 1910s and 1920s, the state through its educational system pursued a policy of teaching Americanism in special curricula to immigrant and especially Mexican American school children. Anglo American habits from the mastery of English to other aspects of life—like one's place in a racially segregated society—were also soon taught by the schools.

There were several reasons for this shift in idea and policy. The arrival of World War I and the anti-German hysteria it spawned loomed large as did the fear of economic radicalism. But most important was the racial identity of those to be Americanized. By the middle of the 1920s the public hysteria concerning German-Americans and other European immigrants in Texas had died down. However, anti-Mexican sentiment in the state remained and grew even stronger.\(^\text{15}\) So as Americanization waned throughout the nation during the late 1920s and 1930s, it continued a vibrant existence in Texas, specifically regarding the Mexican

\(^{15}\) Thomas E. Simmons, "The Citizen Factories: The Americanization of Mexican Students in Texas Public Schools, 1920-1945" (Ph.D. diss., Texas A&M University, 1976), iii-iv. There is little written about the Americanization Movement in Texas. My periodization, that Americanization was at first more of an anti-German, wartime measure and only shortly after World War I became a movement that focused specifically on the Mexican American through a systematic application of specialized pedagogy and curriculum, is supported by Simmons' work.
American. The concern about Mexican Americans assimilating, or never assimilating was strong in Texas.\textsuperscript{16}

The leaders of nineteenth-century Texas were aware of the ethnic diversity of the region. Resultingly, little was mandated or enforced regarding the content, management, or even language of early public schools. Local leaders often allowed ethnic communities to establish their own schools. To the extent that any type of "Americanization" was needed, the simple process of education was thought to be enough; the mere availability of schooling was itself viewed as something of a triumph. That many schools were at least partially conducted in a different language did not seem to bother these local education leaders who regarded bilingual instruction as the least the school could do for children who spoke no English. This local tradition of bilingual instruction, tacitly sanctioned by the lack of a powerful central educational system or corpus of law necessitating any kind of enforcement, continued for many years. In some regions of Texas, the use of bilingual techniques of teaching

\textsuperscript{16} San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed", 58. San Miguel examines the whole educational experience of Mexican Americans, but especially the experience of segregation and the legal battles of the Mexican American community to combat it. As such, San Miguel examines pedagogy as a logical outcome of racist and or nativist intent rather than an independent intellectual factor in the creation of educational policy. San Miguel and Simmons remain the only significant commentators upon the specific educational dimensions of the Americanization Movement in Texas.
continued well into the twentieth century, right up to the first effective English-Only law in 1918.\textsuperscript{17}

This common-sensical approach of reaching out through language in order to better educate—then thought of as synonymous with Americanizing—was not limited to the public schools of Texas. There were numerous private schools of sectarian and non-sectarian variety that also served the needs of language-minority children who either had no access to public schooling or felt little need to become Americanized. Some of these schools were parochial and advertised their educational benefits as the teaching of English for commercial and assimilative purposes.\textsuperscript{18} There were other schools run by Mexican Americans who distrusted or felt excluded by the segregationist practices of Anglo-run public schools. They were non-parochial and, as one contemporary observer put it, "altogether Mexican in spirit and sentiment."\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} For an example of this attitude in a predominantly rural county see Joseph Fitz Simmons, "Nueces County," in Oscar H Cooper, Sixth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Scholastic Years Ending August 31, 1887, and July 1, 1888 Being the Thirteenth Report from the Department of Education (Austin, Texas: State Printing Office, 1888), 309. For an example of this attitude in an early twentieth century urban setting see J. F. Bobbitt, Report on the Survey of the San Antonio Public School System (San Antonio, Texas: San Antonio School Board, 1915), 159-66; and Richard A. Garcia, Rise of the Mexican American Middle Class: San Antonio, 1929-1941 (College Station, Texas A&M University Press, 1991), 176-67.


\textsuperscript{19} Jovita Gonzalez, "Social Life in Cameron, Starr, and Zapata Counties," (MA thesis, University of Texas, 1930),
There is a distinction that should be made. There were different types of Americanization, some of which were positive and others of which were negative. Two types of Americanization can be classified: "Additive" and "Subtractive."\textsuperscript{20} Examples regarding the nineteenth-century bilingual tradition demonstrate "additive" Americanization in that they consciously chose not to discard the immigrant child's language, ethnicity, or culture; they added the English language, civic instruction, and standard core academic subjects in English while simultaneously nurturing the native language and preserving some semblance of the child's native culture. The "subtractive" concept of Americanization emphasized total and complete submersion; it was immediate linguistic and cultural conformity. It directly taught that any type of foreign-ness was not only un-American but also dangerous to the very idea of democracy. The additive model leaned to the culturally pluralist perspective of Americanization advanced nationally by Jane Addams and John Dewey. The subtractive model was nativist; it leaned toward the rational concern for and the irrational fear of immigrants, their culture, and their language. This form of subtractive Americanization, exemplified by Emory

\textsuperscript{70} Gonzalez also mentions many privately financed Mexican American schools that attempted, with as much Spanish language instruction as possible, to bridge the language gap. \textsuperscript{20} Guadalupe San Miguel Jr., and Richard R. Valencia, "From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The Educational Plight and Struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest," Harvard Educational Review, 68 (Fall 1998), 358.
Bogardus and Ellwood Cubberley, gained momentum in Texas with the rise of Progressive Education and became dominant during the passions of World War I.

Earlier in the state's past the most often practiced model of Americanization was the understated and locally-oriented additive model. But many educational leaders in the early twentieth century feared the popularity of ethnic schools because of what they alleged to be those schools' lack of interest in providing sufficient English language instruction. In addition to competing with Mexican-run private schools, these education officials also saw themselves as competing with the Mexican American child's parents. To properly Americanize one had to decrease the influence of the home and substitute the school for it.\textsuperscript{21} This was subtractive Americanization. Also, the school officials were contradictory in the type of Americanization they pursued for different language groups. They desired ethnic European immigrant children to learn English quickly, but to also mix socially with other whites. Speedy assimilation was also exhorted for Mexican Americans, but they were provided separate and inferior schools, segregated from whites. This separation prevented the inter-cultural exchange and contact that would have (theoretically) aided in the process of Americanization. The state's top educational

policy-makers lent their open support to such local segregationist practices with official state approval.22

But before they could convince political leaders to act on the perceived need for Americanizing the state's immigrants, educational leaders first had to convince themselves of the danger posed by the traditionally tolerant attitude toward different languages in the schools. The political climate for this was opportune. Already in the 1890s the Texas legislature had passed legislation barring foreign citizens from owning property in the state. This law was quickly amended by the next congress, but the public's concern over immigrants and foreigners was visibly demonstrated.23 That concern later extended into the educational sphere. In 1905 the state legislature, sure of the growing regulatory power of the state board of education, issued the strongest law concerning language in state history. This represented the first true English-Only law in Texas. Before, there were halfhearted and unspecified laws mandating English. This almost purely rhetorical position became a more convincingly real position with the 1905 language law. This legislation, for the first time, specifically spelled out the dimensions of proper and improper language use in Texas public schools. All school

23 Anna J. Hardwicke Pennybacker, A History of Texas for Schools, Revised Edition. Also for General Reading and for Teachers Preparing Themselves for Examination (Austin, Texas: Percy V. Pennybacker, Publisher, 1908), 264.
lessons, instructions, recitations, songs, etc., were to be conducted in English. The only exception was the use of a foreign language in the exercises (not instructions to the exercises) devoted to studying that language as an academic subject. The degree of specificity of the 1905 law marks a clear break from past policies, but there were still no proscribed criminal penalties for breaking the law.

In years past, the fact that there was no enforcement mechanism would have rendered this 1905 English-Only law utterly ineffective. There had been other specific laws regarding language, but they quickly foundered due to lack of enforcement. However, even though the actual bill proscribed no hard and fast penalties, it still found a great deal of institutional support from the state's educational establishment, growing increasingly powerful and Progressive in these decades. In the 1909 biennial report, Superintendent of Public Instruction Superintendent R. B. Cousins railed against the schools still practicing bilingual instruction through the dated community system. Cousins argued that inculcating true American ideals and patriotism was not served by these few remaining ethnic schools (then only in thirteen counties) and that "the demands of reasonable statesmanship, of patriotism, condemn such a policy as not less than suicidal" for both the state and the

---

24 "Chapter Fourteen: Teachers' Certificates and Examinations. Article 2782, Instruction Must be Given in English," in Complete Texas Statutes (Kansas City, Missouri: Vernon Law Book Company, 1920), 467.
nation. As if the point was too subtle for his readers, Cousins brayed quite literally that "The arguments usually set forth in favor of a continuation of this plan condemn it in awful accents." Through direct intervention in the organization of schools throughout the state, Texas' educational bureaucracy managed to phase out the community system and thus legally ended the remaining vestiges of the state's rich nineteenth-century bilingual tradition.

By the 1910s the literature describing Texas school conditions from both the state's Department of Education and the university research community put much stress on the Americanizing potential (or lack of it) in their evaluations of schools. A 1916 report on education in rural Travis County noted that the recent coming of large numbers of Mexican Americans to work in the cotton fields, combined with the presence of equally substantial European ethnics already there, served to dilute the Anlgo population and degrade the primary social institutions such as the churches and schools. This particular report, only nominally about educational conditions, seemed, as did other reports, to be more concerned with the growing foreign-ness of the county and the need to segregate this foreign element. E. E. Davis illustrated the increasing connection between Progressive politics and Americanization when he listed the enemies of

---

education in rural Travis County as being "the selfish landlord, the restless tenant, the movement from country to town, the negro and the Mexican, and white foreigners of un-American spirit."²⁶ Davis reinforced the desire of statewide education officials to stamp out any foreign-ness through a curriculum that would emphasize the teaching of Americanism. Davis noted that civics in Travis County should be taught earlier than the traditionally accepted seventh grade because only one student in seventeen in rural Travis County schools (or 142 out of 2,489 total scholastic population) ever got to the seventh grade level. That only sixteen African American children got to the seventh grade and that no Mexican American children were then studying above fifth grade level was of particular concern for Davis.²⁷

The specter of World War I, combined with one of the twentieth century's longest and bloodiest revolutions just a stone's throw from the Texas border, created a mood of fear, panic, and suspicion in the state. Education researcher E. E. Davis typified this fear when his tone regarding Americanization shifted after the war. He claimed that of Austrian, Czech, Dutch, German, Swedish, Swiss, and Mexican peoples (among other ethnicities) of Williamson County that their "mother tongue and foreign customs [are] almost as strongly entrenched as in the very heart of the Fatherland."

²⁶ E. E. Davis, A Study of Rural Schools in Travis County, Texas. Bulletin of the University of Texas, no. 67 (Austin, Texas: Publications of the University of Texas, 1916), 15.
²⁷ Ibid., 36.
Davis concluded from this that these people's "Clannishness, intolerance, exclusiveness, and group demarcations are distinctly contrary to Americanism. American ideals stand for homogeneity of language, customs, and for freedom from social stratifications." Such views girded the subtractive notion of Americanization, the idea that true Americanism can only grow in the complete absence of all other outside traditions.

The wartime hysteria first targeted German Americans, who saw themselves excluded from the mainstream because of their ethnic heritage. In Colorado County, for example, the traditionally powerful "white man's party," principally intended to disfranchise African Americans, in 1918 purged "several men whose purposes and ideals were as foreign to America as the kaiser's." Texas newspapers carried stories on national congressional hearings that investigated local San Antonio German American groups alleged to be disloyal to the United States government as well as guilty of spreading treasonous propaganda.

---

29 "A Loyalty Party in Colorado County. How a Situation Which Was Serious Has Been Met. All Candidates in County Primary Must Testify That They Are Americans Before They Can Get on Ticket," Houston Post, March 4, 1918.
Texans were equally fearful of the revolutionary turbulence from Mexico, which sometimes spilled over into their state. One newspaper article in 1918 hysterically charged that the mobilization of Mexican soldiers along border towns for the purpose of fighting banditry was suspicious and was perhaps connected to recently alleged communications between revolutionary leaders in Mexico and Germany. A birthday note from Mexican revolutionary leader Vestuziano Carranza to Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany set off paranoia in Texas. Adding to this suspicious atmosphere, Texas feared possible raids (either by Mexican bandits or by government soldiers) and then questioned whether any of this was connected to the theft of twenty rifles from a San Antonio store the week before.\footnote{"Mexicans Along Border Get Arms. United States Army Officers View Matter Seriously. Troops Being Mobilized at Ojinaga for Alleged Purpose of Running Down Bandits,"\ ibid., March 6, 1918.}

Education was affected by this anti-German and anti-Mexican mood. Progressive Frederick Eby concluded in 1925 that "The war revealed the fact that large groups of foreign peoples living in Texas were lacking in loyalty to their adopted country. They had not been Americanized. The startling amount of illiteracy...and other weaknesses were a revelation of the inefficiency of our educational work." Eby also noted that "A new emphasis was given to patriotism, the study of history, government, American ideals, American
literature, and physical training."\textsuperscript{32} The anti-German sentiment that the war fostered would be felt in the daily lives of adults and children. One rural school teacher recalled a young German American student crying on the first day of class. When asked what was wrong he sobbed "I'm German! The big boys won't play with me because I'm a German." When asked if he would like his mother to come and walk him back to school, he replied, "She can't come because she's sick, but anyway, she's German too."\textsuperscript{33} This was part of a national hysteria on the issue of German and German speakers in the public schools.\textsuperscript{34}

There was also the fear of economic radicalism seeping into Texas from Mexican revolutionaries. In an educational report on the 1916-18 school years, Superintendent W. F. Doughty gave maximum importance to the newly perceived need to Americanize the foreign element in their midst. He argued that in keeping with the "progressive movement" across the nation to invest time and resources more heavily in education, exemplified by the passage of the state's first compulsory education bill, Texas could mold "a citizenship so intelligent and capable that 'bolshevikism' can never

\textsuperscript{32} Frederick Eby, \textit{The Development of Education in Texas} (New York: Macmillan Company, 1925).

\textsuperscript{33} Thad Sitton and Milam C. Rowold, \textit{Ringing the Children In: Texas Country Schools} (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University, 1987), 123.

seriously interfere." Doughty's choice of the word "bolshevism" was not without local reference. Labor strife of the 1900s and the 1910s in South Texas warranted attention from the state's leaders. Mexican Americans and immigrant Mexican workers in Texas during this period were not averse to participating in labor unions and, partly owing to the influence of revolutionary radicalism (similar to IWY style anarcho-syndicalism) across the border, even turning to socialism.  

As Progressive as he sounded and acted in his successful lobbying for the state's first compulsory education law, Doughty found himself portrayed as the enemy of Progressivism as a result of his political allegiance to Governor James Ferguson. Ferguson also trumpeted Progressive reforms, but he earned the ire of other Progressives for opposing prohibition and for meddling in the affairs of the University of Texas. Doughty's alliance with Ferguson naturally entailed opposition to prohibition and thus gained him the

---

support of German, Czech, and Mexican regions of the state that regarded prohibition as a form of cultural warfare. This opened Doughty to charges of disloyalty and corruption when Ferguson was impeached by the Texas Legislature and resigned in 1917. Doughty's former Progressive supporters abandoned his reelection efforts when he failed to publicly sever his ties to Ferguson and endorse Ferguson's successor, former Lieutenant Governor William P. Hobby, the new champion of the Progressives. The choice was "between honest and clean government and the other kind as exemplified in Ferguson," claimed one editorial.\textsuperscript{38}

In 1918 Annie Webb Blanton, then president of the Texas State Teachers Association, vice-president of the National Education Association, and professor of education at North Texas State Normal College, successfully challenged Superintendent Doughty for the head of the state educational bureaucracy.\textsuperscript{39} She charged that Doughty's connections with Ferguson meant association with political scandal and conservative South Texas bosses who stole elections with tainted Mexican American votes along with the state's other anti-prohibition (and presumably disloyal) block, those of German decent.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{38} "Mr. Doughty's Lame Excuse," Houston Post, June 21, 1918.


\textsuperscript{40} For more on the politics of ethnicity (Mexican and German) and the aversion that Texas Progressives had for it
The race for the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1918 was particularly vicious. Blanton's campaign strategy was to associate herself with Progressive gubernatorial candidate William P. Hobby as well as to cast aspersions on Doughty's ties to Ferguson and presumably disloyal Texans. She intermingled the potent issues of prohibition, wartime loyalty, anti-Germanism, and anti-communism with education policy by charging that Doughty "was on the 'Red' list of the breweries...[who]...were allied with the German-American alliance, whose declared purpose was to control the public schools and Universities in the interest of German kultur." Blanton then promised to "put the great Public School system of Texas solidly in the 'American' column" since she had "no hyphenated connections." 41 By

see Evan Anders, Boss Rule in South Texas: The Progressive Era (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1982). A newspaper in Fort Worth published a cartoon during the war portraying Milwaukee mayor and socialist Victor Berger, identified by the cartoon as "the foreign element" standing triumphantly on a bloodied body representing the "100% American Vote." Berger holds what appears to be a large club dripping with blood and gore and the label "hyphen" inscribed on it. It was reprinted in the official news magazine of the Texas State Teachers Association. See R. L. Paschal, "News, Note and Comment," The Texas Outlook, 4 (January 1920), 7. 41 Campaign flyer, "Concerning the Race for State Superintendent of Public Instruction," Annie Webb Blanton Vertical File, Center for American History, Austin, Texas. It appears as if Ms. Blanton is a very distant ancestor of mine.
German "kulture" Blanton disingenuously referred to German bilingual education.

The Texas Democratic Party was held in the Spring of 1918 as American soldiers prepared for trench warfare in Europe, revolutionary survivor Carranza consolidated his military rule in Mexico, and the United States Congress investigated German American individuals and institutions accused of disloyalty. Under these conditions, the stridency of Blanton's rhetoric was perhaps not unusual. One significant measure was passed by the legislature during the heat of this primary campaign season: the state's first truly effective English-Only law. A bill was introduced into the Thirty-Fifth Texas Legislature stating that the English-speaking heritage of the founding fathers, heroes of the Texas War for Independence among others of "the great Anglo-Saxon races who speak and write the English language—our own mother tongue," should be preserved in the time of crisis by ending what was termed "the costly and useless luxury of spending thousands of dollars teaching the language of our German foe—the language that is being used in our country in seditious propaganda to undermine the patriotic efforts of our government to secure world-wide democracy." In the ensuing debate the use of German in the schools was branded as "un-American" and yet another element of German "kultur."
The act proposed the total elimination of German from Texas
public schools including its academic study in the high school or as a means of bilingual instruction. \(^{42}\)

The legislature sent the signal that any whiff of hyphenate Americanism would no longer be tolerated. The proposed English-Only law did pass, although it was watered down on several counts. The original bill targeted specifically the German language. A substitute resolution was later advanced that sought to ban all foreign languages below the high school level, but it failed by a large margin. Instead, a compromise measure passed demanding more vaguely that "teachers in public free schools...conduct school work in the English language exclusively." They avoided the stigma of hysterically banning all foreign languages by simply reinforcing the current existing English-Only statute. But this time they included criminal penalties for violating the law and gave themselves ultimate curricular power to determine all future language policy. \(^{43}\)

The reaction to the issue of curtailing the German language in the public schools was overwhelmingly favorable. One state senator of San Antonio suggested to his local Americanization board that aliens be made to speak English to prove their Americanism and that such "Americanism should be taught in public schools the same as arithmetic or geography." \(^{44}\) Superintendent Doughty, running hard for


\(^{43}\) Ibid., 295.

\(^{44}\) Quoted in Simmons, "The Citizen Factories," 81.
reelection, lent some support to the legislation and defended his tenure as education chief by stating that he had always supported the singing of "patriotic songs" and class instruction "devoted at intervals to the teaching of loyalty, love of country and State."45 In an odd twist, south Texas representative J. T. Canales of Brownsville, a maverick Progressive of Mexican American ancestry who favored prohibition and opposed the Jim Wells political machine in Brownsville as well as the Texas Rangers, heartily supported the English-Only legislation targeting Germans. Asked sarcastically by an opponent if he would also support the prohibition of his own Spanish, Canales replied, "If we were at war with Spain, yes."46 The war had created a situation in which opposition to English-Only, for the first time, became a referendum on one's very patriotism.

This was the context for Annie Webb Blanton's successful campaign against incumbent Superintendent W. F. Doughty for the top education job in the state. She won partly on her idea of Americanization, an open suspicion of those with foreign names or those who spoke a language other than English. Her triumph over Doughty coincided with a Progressive sweep of the statewide elections. During the

46 "Teaching German May be Forbidden. House Committee on Education Favors Poage Resolution. Speech of German Editor Caused Felix McCord to Change Attitude and Oppose German in Schools," Ibid., March 6, 1918.
war Blanton kept up the pressure for schools to impart English and to Americanize the small strangers in their midst, often conflating the two. Using her office as a bully pulpit, Superintendent Blanton cast herself as the Abraham Lincoln of statewide educational circles by stating that "the nation can [not] endure half-native and half-alien today any more than it could endure half-free and half-slave a generation ago, hence, the timeliness of the movement among public schools of the country to shape their courses in such a way as to help in a program of Americanization." Arguing that "Americanization is active patriotism," Blanton also wrote that it was the duty of the public schools of Texas to make out of foreign clay "100 percent pure Americanism." 47

Superintendent Blanton's advocacy of a new English-Only law became more strident in her second term as she sought to close the generous loopholes in the 1918 English-Only law for private schools. The climate was still favorable for Americanization immediately after the war as demonstrated by the Texas Legislature's invitation of Major General Joseph T. Dickman to discuss the enemy at home as well as he enemy across the ocean.48 The new English-Only proposal pushed by Blanton, hidden within another bill that would upwardly

revise the compulsory education mandates, essentially stripped private sectarian and parochial schools of their ability to disregard state curricular mandates, specifically those mandates that all classes be conducted in English exclusively. Blanton, who worried of the example set by "Mexico, Russia, and...every other uneducated, or poorly educated nation," urged Texans to support her recommendation to Americanize through the extermination of outside languages in the elementary classroom since "No school which educates future Texas citizens has a right to object to such requirements, and the future safety of our democratic institutions demands that they be made." 49 Blanton generated applause with a recommendation for such a law at the 1920 meeting of the Texas State Teachers Association. 50 It passed in 1923 along with other supposed "Progressive" reforms such as the white primary and the prevention of ballot interpreters. By then Superintendent Blanton had left office, but remained responsible for the ultimate popularization of the issue. These new laws specifically targeted the Mexican American population and had the support

50 Annie Webb Blanton, "Texas Conditions and Demands," The Texas Outlook, 5 (July 1921), 8. This was a published text of Superintendent Blanton's speech to the Texas State Teachers Association on November 25, 1920.
of Progressive organizations like the Texas League of Women Voters. 51

Blanton wanted to institutionalize Americanization in the curriculum of each school through the Department of Education and a statewide Illiteracy Commission. Conceiving of Americanization as an important component of an illiteracy commission's job, Superintendent Blanton articulated her belief in a fictional conversation with an opponent: "If you desire to be one with us, stay, and we welcome you; but if you wish to preserve, in our state, the language and the customs of another land, you have no right to do this which our state will grant to you." The superintendent scolded her fictional (and silent) adversary that unless their foreign children spoke only English in school, then "you must go back to the country which you prize so highly, and rear your children there." 52 Blanton was not alone in her sentiments. One university educational researcher agreed with Blanton and went even further in clinically defining the need for Americanization by labeling ethnic enclaves in Texas to be illustrative of "social, cultural, and educational retardation." 53


53 Davis, A Study of Rural Schools In Williamson County, 8.
The attack on foreign languages in Texas schools in the midst of the super-patriotism of World War I succeeded. The study of German dropped dramatically during and after the war. Blanton reported that just before the war in 1918 there had been 102 public and private high schools in Texas accredited to teach German; after the war 78 programs were scrapped while the remaining 24 programs had very few students willing to take them. As a result, Blanton urged the substitution of Spanish for German in many high schools.\(^5^4\) The irony that the English-Only bills she championed eliminated the speaking of Spanish in Texas schools by its most proficient speakers did not to occur to her. While the total number of students enrolled in Spanish classes in Texas high schools more than tripled from 13,012 in the school year 1917-1918 to 44,689 in 1925-1926, the total numbers of those taking German decreased markedly. Between 1917-1918 and 1921-1922, the total number of Texas high school students enrolled in German went from 3,977 to 294 and barely rose to 550 by 1925-1926.\(^5^5\)

By the middle of the 1920s, anti-German sentiment was no longer a prominent issue for most Texans. Likewise, it ceased to be much of a dilemma for education officials as well. Policy-shapers like E. E. Davis still accused European

\(^{5^4}\) Annie Webb Blanton, *Historical and Statistical Data as to Education in Texas, January 1, 1919-January 1, 1921*. Bulletin 133 (Austin, Texas: Department of Education, State of Texas, 1921), 44.

ethnics of isolation and foreign-ness, but the widespread fear and suspicion of German Americans had died down. This is not to say that the bitter sentiments against German Americans evaporated immediately after the war, however. As a political issue in the larger public, nativism was kept alive in Texas during the early 1920s by the revitalized Ku Klux Klan. Xenophobia directed at German Americans by the Klan continued. After the war in 1921 the Houston Klan rode by train to a German American Mayfest celebration in Brenham and marched with banners and signs reading "Speak English or quit speaking on the streets of Brenham." The Klan in Texas kept the issue of nativism alive throughout the 1920s. In the 1922 primary election the Klan candidate for United States Senate, Earle Mayfield, alleged that his opponent, former governor Jim Ferguson, competed for black and German votes. Ed R. Bentley, the anti-liquor and Klan candidate for Superintendent of Public Instruction, lost to S. L. M. Marrs by only 21,000 votes in 1922.57

By and large, however, the national wartime xenophobia directed against German Americans declined appreciably by mid decade. But after the war the Americanization Movement did not die in Texas. Ironically, the movement in Texas actually picked up steam in the 1920s. Americanization was to manifest itself in educational curriculum as it never had

56 Quoted in Thad Sitton and Dan K. Utley, From Can See to Can't: Texas Farmers on the Southern Plains (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1997), 54.
before or since. But no longer did it focus on "white" ethnics like German or Czech Americans; Americanization now specifically targeted Mexican Americans. After World War I the Americanization Movement in Texas substituted for its anti-German suspicions newer, scientific, and racial fears concerning Mexican Americans.

The reasons why the nativism directed against German Americans during the war declined so precipitously after the war are complex and still not fully understood. While some residue of the wartime suspicion remained, very rarely in the educational curriculum were German Americans, or any other European ethnic group, singled out after the war as having need for any special governmental program of Americanization. In stark contrast, the recipe for the Americanization of these white, European ethnic groups, for the most part, consisted of not much else than simply speaking English. It was for them a simple Americanization. The Americanization that came after the war targeting Mexican Americans contained an entire scientific, sociological, and pedagogical approach so complex that it mandated for the teachers of such children special instruction in teachers colleges and special research by the educational community. But why were the state's other ethnics, the European hyphenates, exempted from this process? There are few historical and theoretical attempts to come to terms with this difference between the way immigrant Mexicans and other immigrant groups were treated.
The latest research on acculturation and language status argues that German Americans had as much, if not better, social mobility as all other English-speaking white people in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Historian Walter Kamphoefner writes that most German Americans before World War I maintained usage of the German language where they could in their homes, schools (through bilingual education), and churches. By the 1940s the second generation of German Americans, the children of those who immigrated and who themselves were often born and schooled in the United States, maintained the German tongue to a remarkable degree even though the World War I era decimated most bilingual instruction. Under traditional ways of thinking about immigrant assimilation, this would mean that they would have been handicapped or marginalized. However, Kamphoefner found that in fact German Americans had just as much social mobility and even higher rates of economic stability and home-ownership than did non-German English-speakers. Despite their stubborn clinging to the German language in the private sphere (not just the schools), they seemed not to have been handicapped by it in the second generation.58

German Americans by the second generation were making the transition from the working to the middle classes. Historian Alwyn Barr in a quantitative analysis of economic

---

mobility among blacks, Mexican Americans, and German Americans in San Antonio, Texas, from 1870 to 1900 found that the German immigrant group made rapid and substantial gains toward the middle class while Mexican Americans—largely because of race, he postulated—remained employed in exploitive manual labor. This was similar to the lack of economic mobility exhibited by African Americans. The slight economic mobility of Mexican Americans he found differed only marginally from the statistical baseline of inertness, the African American sample. But why did the German immigrants of San Antonio, as committed as were Mexican Americans to the maintenance of their native tongue, advance, while Mexican Americans did not? Barr postulated that "the presence of more distinct ethnic groups such as Negroes and Mexican Americans apparently enhanced the chances for occupational advance by European immigrants and reduced the level of prejudice against them."\footnote{Alwyn Barr, "Occupational and Geographic Mobility in San Antonio, 1870-1900," \textit{Social Science Quarterly}, 51 (September 1970), 403.} German Americans made the jump to middle class and whiteness whereas the Mexican American became racialized, blackened, an "other" race with African Americans. Contemporary accounts of the racial status of Mexican Americans note: "Because of their strongly marked racial characteristics, the Mexicans are easily recognizable; and they have been forced to constitute a separate class in
the population."60 So the Mexican American in the mind of the Anglo American constituted a different race while the German American, who was as ethnic and foreign in culture as was the Mexican American, was accorded the status of racial whiteness. Other historians have supported similar quantitative models of Mexican American social and class immobility despite having taken as full advantage of education in a given period as other groups.61

Segregation and Americanization for the Mexican American child became synonymous. Mexican Americans became in the early decades of the century, especially with the influx of midwestern and southern Anglo farmers into the Rio Grande Valley and South Texas, more intensely segmented, segregated, and discriminated against. The practice of segregating those that were not legally defined as African American was so common as to be almost second nature to those in education

60 Lewis W. Newton and Herbert P. Gambrell, Texas: Yesterday and Today With the Constitution of the State of Texas (Dallas, Texas: Turner Company Publishers, 1949), 325. The understanding of Mexican Americans being a type of weak link in the chain of racial being capable of definition as either white or black according to the interplay of class background owes much to the pioneering theoretical and historical work of authors Mario Barrera and David Montejano. See Mario Barrera, Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979); and David Montejano, Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1987).

circles. The Texas Outlook, the monthly publication of the TSTA ran an artist's rendition of a new "Mexican ward school" in 1920 that was intended solely for Mexican Americans in McAllen. They felt that such nice facilities for Mexicans warranted attention and praise.⁶²

Previously, Mexican Americans had been foreigners with some citizenship; now they were foreign races without. The interviews conducted during the late 1920s in South Texas by University of California at Berkeley economist Paul S. Taylor dramatically illustrate this racialization of the Mexican American. The issues of language and race in the case of the Mexican American child intersected. One prominent businessman in a small South Texas town remarked to Taylor of the instruction given to Mexican American children, "We provide schools which are separate for several reasons: difference in language, most of the Mexicans here are of the pelado type; difference of color and race; difference of locality in which each group resides. We admit some Mexicans to American schools in the higher grades, and some others who live near other schools and are of the better type."⁶³

⁶³ Paul Schuster Taylor, An American-Mexican Frontier: Nueces County, Texas (New York: Russell and Russell, 1934), 303. The world pelado literally means "shorn," "bald," "crewcut" according to Velasquez's dictionary. But like many Spanish words, pelado has multiple meanings which vary according to spoken context. Taylor claims in another work that the word apparently means something akin to "penniless Indian." In this particular instance, the word seems to refer to specific Native American (most likely of Central Mexico) physiological characteristics as opposed to European ones. For more on the interpretation of the multiple
The ability to speak English was considered more important than any potential scholastic aptitude in Spanish. All subjects were sacrificed to the unfortunate notion that one's command of English represented the only avenue for learning. One of the state's educational experts announced that "The unfortunate thing about these foreign communities in Texas is not the amount of illiteracy found in them so much as the fact that they still cling to their foreign languages and customs." The public schools were the new missions, Progressive teachers the new missionaries, and the catechism was now Americanization; except this time nothing but English-Only was allowed. One young and sympathetic teacher characterized how schooling was for this group of students: "I have never felt that we have given the Mexicans a chance. When you see an inferior race that can't help themselves, the missionary spirit makes you want to do something to Americanize them." For many, educating Mexican Americans was all Americanization. A Harlingen principle of a "Mexican School" postulated that, "certainly Americanization and citizenship cannot be separated—

meanings of related Spanish words (for example, "pachuco" and "chingar") in a Mexican and trans-national context, see Octavio Paz, "The Pachuco and Other Extremes" and "The Sons of La Malinche," in The Labyrinth of Solitude, trans. by Lysander Kemp, Yara Milos, and Rachel Phillips Beisnash (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1985), chapters one and four.

64 Davis, A Report on Illiteracy in Texas, 17.
65 Taylor, American-Mexican Frontier, 202. This patronizing attitude is an accurate reflection of those "sympathetic" Anglos concerning Mexican Americans in 1920s South Texas.
therefore, it would follow that education and Americanization
are working toward the same end."\textsuperscript{66}

The degree or amount of segregation was never uniform
and subject to great debate among educators. One Texas
school superintendent argued for extended
Americanization/segregation for Mexican American children:
"These children need five or six years of Americanization
before being placed with American children."\textsuperscript{67}
Americanization and segregation became institutionalized in
the educational curriculum for Mexican American
schoolchildren. One pedagogical journal printed an article
in 1932 as to the degree of segregation that would be best
for the Mexican American child, stating that in South Texas
school systems, the length of segregation ranged from grades
one through three to grades one through seven, with some
towns allowing limited "admission to the American school" for
those meeting the necessary "residence, language ability, or
social position."\textsuperscript{68} One educator who generously argued for
the segregation of children on more of an individual basis
remarked that "the better classes [who] are white, both in
body and spirit," deserved some sort of equality with whites,
while the other Mexican American students, "the ill-clad,
unclean, poverty-stricken children of peon extraction,"

\textsuperscript{66} Mrs. J. T. Taylor, "The Americanization of Harlingen's
Mexican School Population," \textit{The Texas Outlook}, 18
(September 1934), 37
\textsuperscript{67} Wilson Little, \textit{Spanish Speaking Children in Texas}
(Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1944), 61.
\textsuperscript{68} Basil Armour, "Problems in the Education of the
Mexican Child," \textit{The Texas Outlook}, 16 (December 1932), 29.
deserved a cleansing program of Americanization and little else.⁶⁹

The inability of many Mexican American children to speak English in school served not to create but to reinforce pre-existing racist ideology. In this instance, education perpetuated the existence of a pre-determined and racially defined underclass by identifying language difference as the central focus of all schooling. Taylor interviewed one small town educator and was given a long, tangled explanation of the basic hopes and all-too-visible limitations of 1920s style Americanization in Texas: "When you educate a Mexican he is pretty close to the white man. The Mexican has not the bodily odor and is not so black as the Negro, so people are less favorable to the education of the Mexican than the Negroes because education removes the differences...The inferiority of the Negroes is biological; that of the Mexicans not so much so if any."⁷⁰ Where to start? This statement illustrates the contradictions the Mexican American posed to Anglo conceptualizations of racial order and hierarchy. The assumption of impermanent inferiority and hence the potential for education to elevate is the basis for Americanization. However, when one is darker than usual or smells more like work and less like perfume, then

⁶⁹ E. E. Davis, "King Cotton Leads Mexicans Into Texas," The Texas Outlook, 9 (April 1925), 8.
Americanization—it was keenly believed—could do nothing. When the United States Congress in the 1920s held hearings on the closing of the loophole in immigrant restriction pertaining to Mexicans, serious doubts were raised by scientists and congressmen about the ability of the Mexican to ever become truly American; the mere idea of Americanization for them was deemed ludicrous. One scientist testified that "on biological grounds, no degree of education or social action can effectively overcome the handicap" of being "an inferior or distant race."  

All Americanizers, including relatively unsympathetic ones, deplored the economic conditions that Mexican Americans lived under and blamed it as much as anything else on the need for Americanization in the first place. But the desire to Americanize through the schools could not be realized if children were not in the schools. Mexican American children formed a large segment of the laboring population of farmworkers. This fact was not lost on local school administrators who on the one hand were charged with the enforcement of compulsory education and the Americanization of Mexican American students and on the other hand felt ill at ease in interfering with the pool of cheap child labor utilized by local agricultural interests. School administrators usually sided with the local business

---

interests, ironically limiting their ability to Americanize. Explained one local school superintendent of his non-enforcement of compulsory attendance laws on Mexican American students, "The board...told me they preferred to keep the Mexicans ignorant." One Anglo laborer said, "I am for education and educating my own children, but the Mexicans, like some whites, get some education and then they can't labor. They think it is a disgrace to work. The illiterates make the best farm labor? Yes, that is exactly it."

This was not a new problem for education officials. When the Progressive legislation regarding compulsory attendance was first put into law in the 1910s, the state agency had already been reporting census fraud in South Texas counties for over a decade. The count of children enrolled (defined by the state as scholastics) determined the amount of money a school district was funded by the state. Therefore if one could count every possible child available, including Mexican Americans, in order to maximize funding, and then not force large numbers of laboring students to actually come to school, it meant in effect increased funding for those Anglo children in attendance as well as less need for higher school taxes for those agricultural businesses using the child labor. As early as 1907-1908 Superintendent R. B. Cousins decried the lack of attendance in school districts close to the border. These counties (Cameron, Duval, El Paso, Hidalgo, Nueces, and Webb) maintained only 29

percent of their total enrolled number of students (which itself represented less than half of school-age children in residence) in regular attendance.\textsuperscript{73} This problem continued on through the Great Depression years of the 1930s. One teacher who resented that people would "hold up their hands in horror" when informed that she/he taught in a Mexican school anonymously wrote to The Texas Outlook that of the total of $1,700 funding that the state gave to support the Mexican school, the local school authorities used it for their "white" schools: "I receive for my five months' work four hundred and twenty-five dollars. What becomes of the twelve hundred and seventy-five dollars' difference? I can tell you: It goes to maintain good schools for the Americans. One of the trustees admitted that they would be 'hard up' if it were not for the Mexicans!"\textsuperscript{74}

The state education agency in the early 1920s increased pressure upon local school systems to try to raise their ludicrously low rate of attendance regarding Mexican American children. It did so not through positive reinforcement or by gentle reminders; rather, it attempted to shake up these outlaw school systems with the proposition that they change


\textsuperscript{74} "These Mexicans as a Teacher Sees Them," The Texas Outlook, 14 (March 1930), 37. This outraged teacher ended this letter with the irony that "No wonder they remain loyal to Old Mexico and shout 'Viva Mejico!'" As sympathetic as this teacher was to the plight of the students, though, the fear that Mexican Americans were not Americanizing as much or as well as they should is implicit in the statement.
their ways lest they have their population counts lowered by the State Department of Education.\textsuperscript{75} Americanization advocate Annie Webb Blanton saw lack of compliance with the law, regardless of its segregationist motives, as a hindrance to proper Americanization. She admitted that her suspicions of South Texas census fraud dated long before she set out to systematically investigate the schools and determined that the problem was widespread.\textsuperscript{76}

The most significant investigation involved populous Nueces County, which included the city of Corpus Christi and also a large number of outlying commercial cotton farms that employed many Mexican American children. After failing to garner the cooperation of the local school officials who resented her activities and considered her ignorant of local social conditions (including employment and seasonal migration). Blanton conducted her own independent investigation in 1921. She concluded that Nueces County authorities misreported their actual scholastic population by over 5,000 students.\textsuperscript{77} Blanton also undertook investigations in other South Texas counties. Two school districts of Cameron County, the Villanueva district and the Brownsville district, were also found by Blanton to have padded the


\textsuperscript{77} Blanton, Twenty-Second Biennial Report, 141-3.
census rolls with phantom students. The Villanueva roll was reduced from 960 students to 409 and the Brownsville roll was reduced from 4,992 to 3,505. Blanton proudly announced in her agency's educational publications that the investigations cost only $2,388.34 and saved the state $101,380.50 in over-appropriations to the offending school districts.\textsuperscript{78} Superintendent Blanton was not concerned with Mexican American children, but rather the exposure of graft and enforcement of Progressive Education's legacy. Part of this legacy, the Americanization of Mexican Americans, could not take place without school attendance.

The drive to Americanize the Mexican American through the public schools continued through the 1920s and into the 1930s. State Superintendent S. M. N. Marrs was Blanton's successor and he kept up the Americanization drumbeat. In 1929 he requested the creation of a specific bureaucratic arm of his agency to specialize in providing Americanization to deal with the "illiteracy" problem. His proposed "division of Americanization" sounded much like a division of Mexican American education.\textsuperscript{79} The prime directive of Americanization policy in the Texas public schools was language (the subject of the next chapter). Foreign languages were to be eradicated and the English language was to be put in their place regardless of how many years it held Mexican American

\textsuperscript{78} Blanton, \textit{Rural Aid Appropriations School Statistics}, 20.
children back or how many times they repeated the first
grade. There was another component of Americanization that
deserves mention, however: health and hygiene.

The arrival of health and hygiene education was part of
the Progressive Education Movement's program for reforming
curriculum. However, for Mexican Americans undergoing
Americanization, the life skills of health-cleanness,
sanitation, and food preparation, for example—often loomed
more important than did core academic subjects like math or
science. In interviews conducted in South Texas in the late
1920s, one person "connected with the educational system" was
questioned about integrating Mexican American students and
replied, "I would not object to the Mexicans from the fourth
grade on after they learn English. I would tell them to keep
clean; I would make them cleaner than the whites."\textsuperscript{81}

The Americanization impulse in the curriculum sought to
address the concern of whites that Mexican American were not
clean enough to go to school with white children. It should
be noted that hygiene was a subject dear to the hearts of
many Progressive educators in Texas (and throughout the
South) with regard to poor whites. One might be tempted to
simply pass off the health curriculum as applied to Mexican

\textsuperscript{80} This is not an unknown or uncommented upon phenomenon, but much of the historical literature that analyzes
Americanization hardly mentions cleanness. Most studies
usually discuss Americanization from the perspective of labor
control. For one such Texas study on the use of
Americanization to create workers for industry, see Mario T.
Garcia, "Americanization and the Mexican Immigrant, 1880-
\textsuperscript{81} Taylor, \textit{Mexican Labor in the United States}, 442.
Americans as one small part of a larger whole. After all, not all teachers of Mexican American children made health a racial issue. Some of these educators undoubtedly regarded good health and health instruction as simply "the foundation and beginning of an education." However, the health and hygiene instruction by many teachers of Mexican Americans was very much a part of the Americanization Movement and thus carried with it the assumptions associated with racial segregation: racial impurity and inherent filth. One historian has noted that this Americanizing health curriculum, often focused on sanitation, was applied to all Mexican American children regardless of class, whereas it applied to whites mainly in rural and poverty-stricken areas. All this reinforced the "stability of segregation" by teaching Mexican Americans "that they were dirty and that this was a permanent condition—that they could not become clean."  

A standard routine of teaching sanitation rather than academic subjects was the daily inspection. One principal of La Feria's Mexican school in the Rio Grande Valley of South Texas noted that "Health is probably stressed more than any other subject in the Mexican elementary schools of the Valley." The most common of these health inspections included fingernails, hands, hair, teeth, clothes, and

---

83 Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas*, 231.
general appearance. Another school district in the Rio Grande Valley town of Donna in the 1930s made use of the daily health and dirt inspection exclusively on the students of their Mexican building. Immediately after the morning inspection for dirt and odor, those children found guilty of not being completely clean were "required to wash before they are permitted to begin the day's activities." Furthermore, the teacher added that "If the clothing worn by the child is hopelessly tattered or insufficient, he is supplied with clean clothing from the store which the teachers always keep on hand to use in emergency cases." The other schools in Donna that were for whites did not stress this daily sanitation check.85

Often by the 1930s this desire to Americanize through hygiene reflected the growth of more benevolent attitudes. The heightening of the social awareness of widespread poverty during the Great Depression shaped the Americanization activities of the 1930s in stark contrast to the nativist reaction infused in the spirit of the Americanization Movement of the 1920s. One educator remarked that dietary poverty particularly afflicted the Mexican American population of his region. He noted that "In some of the Valley towns various clubs assist the schools in furnishing

milk or soup to undernourished Mexican children. The Sugar Land school district south of Houston valued clean hands and faces so much that it went so far as to construct washbasins for its Mexican American children. The free food and free washing facilities may have been part of the same racialized understanding of Mexican Americans, but at least in the 1930s they arose out of more benevolent impulses than they did in the 1920s.

The state sought to popularize its own approach to teaching Mexican Americans how to be good Americans. The State Department of Education by the 1930s felt as if it had enough experience with the curricular specifics of Americanization to publish a guide on health and sanitation lessons for Mexican American children. These involved routine things such as the proper use of a comb, how to clean oneself, washing hands before meals, and other common-sense health tips. It also urged teachers to instruct these children to button their coats when it was cold, to not throw rocks, to not play in the street, and how to properly behave in a movie theater. This pedagogical guide included a health curriculum that curiously (Mexicans after all came from a livestock/cattle culture) included sections on milk, such as "The Value and Care of Milk." In it were twenty-two
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87 E. K. Barden, "Six-Point Creed for Americanization Schools," The Texas Outlook 21 (May 1937), 27.
suggestions on how to introduce milk to Mexican Americans since allegedly few of them "will have had some experience with the care of cows and milk on the farm." Other Americanization methods by the public schools that specialized in Mexican Americans included the teaching of potential adults who worked day jobs.\textsuperscript{90}

The Americanization Movement in Texas was directly influenced by the national movement and the explosion of xenophobic hysteria unleashed by World War I. Americanization in Texas was a complex movement involving the intersection of race, economics, and culture in addition to the security crisis felt in the wartime context of the movement's origins. Unlike the national movement that declined immediately after the war, Americanization in Texas gained momentum and lost its anti-German component as it focused almost entirely upon Mexican Americans. In doing so, it followed the pattern of other reforms arising from the Progressive Education Movement. It achieved some popularity among educators, it then broadened its support with the public, then after it ceased as a political issue it persisted as an embedded and institutionalized part of the education curriculum. Mexican Americans were in school to learn English and little else. Americanization in Texas after World War I also used language difference to promote

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 229.  
\textsuperscript{90} T. H. Shelby, et. al., \textit{A Survey of the Los Angeles Heights Public Schools. University of Texas Bulletin, No. 3048} (Austin, Texas: Publications of the University of Texas, 1930), 24-5.
the racial segregation of Mexican Americans, accepted their economic exploitation, and attempted to correct their allegedly inherent filth. By the 1930s the general assumptions of the Americanization Movement in Texas remained unchallenged while its application was softened slightly in tone. But even though it evolved, its language component, English-Only (the next chapter), remained its most lasting and popular legacy.
Chapter Four:  
The Creation, Growth, and Dominance of English Only Pedagogy, 1900-1940

The confluence of the ideology of Americanization and its intellectual parent, the Progressive Education Movement, created the context for the development within scientific pedagogical circles of a new way to teach English to non-English-speaking children. This new method of instruction has been referred to by some as English-Only pedagogy. Simply put, English-Only pedagogy was the use solely of English instructions, directions, and drills in the education of non-English-speaking students; it was an entire system of learning for young linguagae minority children. It was similar to what is called today an "immersion" method of learning a new language. Some scholars have alternately called what I name English-Only as "sink-or-swim" or "submersion" language pedagogy. English-Only purposely disregarded use of the native language as an unnecessary hindrance for mastery of the English language. The intent of such a method of learning was to assimilate immigrant children rapidly by substituting English for their native languages.

The development of English-Only pedagogy in the United States has received even less attention from historians than the little-studied nineteenth-century bilingual tradition. In fact, the existing historiography on English-Only was mostly written by education scholars focusing on the
resurgence of English-Only in the 1980s and 1990s. One historian of bilingual education assumed that English-Only pedagogy was equated with "the crusade for Anglo conformity" and that it suddenly appeared in the twentieth century without reference to Progressive Education or the changing conceptions of assimilation found in the Americanization Movement.¹ Others attempting to examine English-Only do so in very cursory fashion and come from fields outside of history.² Scholarship on the history of bilingual instruction ignores the role of English-Only pedagogy in the destruction of early bilingual education and focuses instead on the more spectacular circumstantial factors of World War I or the general factor of nativism.³


³ There are numerous histories of bilingual education that ignore English-Only completely. One such study is Stein's Sink or Swim which argues simply that racism and ethnocentrism resulted in the imposition of English-Only. See also Heinz Kloss, The American Bilingual Tradition (Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Press, 1977). Kloss's classic study of the bilingual tradition in American education centers on legal analysis and neglects the influence of pedagogical theory by focusing on World War I hysteria and anti-foreign backlash. Closer to realizing the true context of English-Only's origins are more recent scholars like Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Let All of Them Take Heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Education Equality in Texas, 1910-1981 (Austin, Texas: University of
The origins of English-Only pedagogy must be explained. The problem of overcoming language barriers in education is as ancient as education itself. From antiquity until recent times, scholars spoke a national or regional vernacular but wrote and read in scholarly languages such as Latin, Greek, or Hebrew. It was quite natural for scholars to develop bilingual and biliteral techniques of teaching languages that heavily involved reading and translating academic languages into vernacular form. In the United States as in most Western nations, the teaching of a language second to the native tongue involved a pedagogical technique called the "grammar-translation" method. This method entailed learning the foreign language by breaking down sentences into component parts and translating them in writing to the native tongue. The verbal speaking of the second or third language learned in such a manner mattered less than the ability to read, write, and understand that language. Learning a new language was an exercise in written, not spoken, literacy. As one language scholar noted of the grammar-translation method, "The foreign language is never spoken, and pronunciation is considered unimportant." The advantage of


4 Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood, The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940), 832.

5 Charles Hart Handschin, The Teaching of Modern Languages in the United States. United States Department of
this grammar-translation method of second language
instruction, claimed one educator, was that through it "a
child might learn more than one foreign tongue while learning
to read, write, and correctly use his own." 6 Under the
grammar-translation method, language was language; English
for English-speakers was taught much the same way as was
English to non-English speakers or as second languages to
English-speakers.

By the turn of the century, this grammar-translation
method of instruction had begun to fall out of favor. This
came about because of the problems of its application to
large numbers of children who did not understand English in
the absence of mass numbers of bilingual teachers. Before,
it had been most often used for teaching school students how
to read and write a second language (usually a dead, archaic
one like Latin) by translation. This grammar-translation
method of speaking another language was criticized for its
"tiring, grinding, mechanical drill." One critic went on to
conclude that "The process of building sentences by declining
pronouns or by conjugating verbs is equally futile in
teaching a person to speak English." 7 One pedagogical
theorist on language charged of the grammar-translation

6 Mary R. Alling-Aber, An Experiment in Education.
7 Also the Ideas Which Inspired It and were Inspired by It
 isNew York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1897), 159.
7 Henry H. Goldberger, Teaching English to the Foreign
Born. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of
method that "there is no pedagogical theory back of it, and it tends to laziness on the part of the teacher and the lack of interest in the student." Another thinker agreed that the grammar-translation method was "more or less discredited" but went on to reinforce its usefulness with classical languages.

The scientific study of language and child psychology by Progressive educators created a new set of ideas about how children learn, how language is acquired, and the best and most efficient manner of teaching language. Progressive pedagogical thinkers believed that the older methods of language teaching through grammatical study and translation exercises were wrong. They stressed a need to break with traditional ways of teaching that utilized rote, mechanical, and unanalytical exercises such as those characterized by the grammar-translation method. Also, the biliteracy inherent in the grammar-translation method came to be regarded as a handicap. G. Stanley Hall wrote that children acquire languages at a very early age and that such instruction was "greatly reinforced by appeals to the eye, not in the form of the written or printed word, but through pictures." Hall concluded that the only place for teaching languages through grammar-translation methods was for Greek and Latin.

---

8 Handschin, The Teaching of Languages, 95.
10 G. Stanley Hall, "The Ideal School as Based on Child Study," The Forum, 32 (September 1901), 29-30. While this period is critical from a language acquisition standpoint, it is largely so for the native, primary language. The notion of primary and secondary languages is important here. If a
Hall synthesized the ideas of French linguist Francois Gouin, who in the 1880s and 1890s revolutionized the way in which educators conceived of teaching foreign languages. From the mid-nineteenth century to the twentieth century, France implemented policies to foster national unity through the teaching of French in the remote, non-French speaking provinces.\(^\text{11}\) Out of this educational backdrop Gouin, a scholar scarred by his inability to learn sufficient German to further his education in German universities, developed new ideas on teaching a second language that ignored grammar-translation and substituted in its place what he viewed as a more "natural" method.\(^\text{12}\) All of the later American educational literature on language and especially language acquisition framed the debate with Professor Gouin's terminology and generally agreed with his conclusions. American linguists redefined Gouin's theories of language.

---


pedagogy into "direct" and "indirect" categories. The "direct" method of teaching languages was in effect Gouin's new "natural" system, just with a new name. This method abstained from the use of any native-language referent in the teaching of a foreign language; the native tongue was completely banned. What Americans came to refer to as the "indirect" method was classified as any system involving translation of a concept, idea, or word from the native language to the second language or visa versa. It was not an immediate and spoken association of word with meaning, thus it was indirect.  

Under the direct method a second language was best learned as naturally as possible, or orally as a child learns it. Frank V. Thompson, one of Gouin's American backers, acknowledged that when the indirect method was put into practice it would "make use of the pupil's vernacular in teaching a second language." This would necessarily involve a complicated "triple association of idea, native expression, [and] English expression."  

Gouin and his American followers like Thompson thought this unwise. Thompson concluded that "The interposition of the native expression between the English expression and the object or idea acts as a retardant

---

13 Handschin, The Teaching of Languages, 97-100.
in the process of acquiring ability to use English as a means of communication and results in the hesitation so often noted in the speech of those who learn a language by the indirect method."\(^{15}\) Thompson argued that the direct method used "the new language to be taught both as end and as means" and operated under the idea that "teachers applying the direct method speak only English in teaching English to pupils."\(^{16}\) The child's native language would not be used in the attempt to teach them a second language. These ideas derived from Gouin seemed more popular in the United States than in Europe.\(^{17}\)

The direct method offered a way to teach non-English children in only English, the one language they did not understand, and it did not require the teacher to know any language but English. The American practitioners of Gouin's ideas made some important modifications. Gouin had limited his criticism to the academic grammar-translation method and tailored his pedagogical approach of learning a second language to adult learners; adults were to learn as children, not visa versa. The American champions of the direct method, or English-Only as it became in the United States, went out of their way to reverse this formula. The way they used English-Only required five- and six-year-old children to learn their second languages as Gouin, a university

\(^{15}\) *Ibid.*, 188-89.
\(^{16}\) *Ibid.*, 188.
professor, learned his. Only the language to be learned was practiced, thus killing the bilingual tradition. The use of English instructions in conjugating Spanish verbs in a high school Spanish course full of non-Spanish-speaking American students would be a form of the indirect method. All conversational Spanish in the same class with not a word of English spoken would represent the direct method. Gouin argued that learning languages was essentially the same for adults as it was for children; teach only with direct methods and await the sure-to-follow success.

An important distinction was drawn by conscientious educators who advocated English-Only pedagogy but sought to avoid the perception of devaluing other languages and cultures. Almost every author on the subject of language pedagogy remarked upon the additional good will an instructor could accrue through some knowledge and use of the student's native language as a token of acknowledgment to the immigrant child's culture.¹⁸ Some schools advocated having more bilingual and bicultural teachers, not to practice the time-honored bilingual education of the nineteenth century but to build a type of psychic, intimate understanding with ethnic students. A group studying Cleveland's educational system in 1916 argued that knowledge of a few words of a group's language "might prove of inestimable value in establishing a sympathetic relationship between the teachers and the

children, but more especially between the parents and the school." 19

All pedagogical experts, however, sternly warned that any foreign languages had absolutely no place in the actual classroom lessons and instruction. Henry Goldberger, a Columbia University specialist in teaching English to non-English-speakers and one of Gouin's chief American disciples, insisted in a federal publication that "the teacher must refrain from using the foreign language in teaching." In spite of the bond of sympathy it might engender, Goldberger claimed, "Every time the teacher resorts to translation in making clear a word or a sentence, she is making it easier for herself at the expense of the pupil's progress. The more English the pupil hears and uses the sooner will he be able to speak." 20 For this reason ethnic teachers were not desired; it was also widely believed that they lacked professional training and conduct, were insufficiently Americanized, were afflicted with inferiority complexes, were caste-ridden, were religiously bigoted, and would resort to use of the native language and thus retard their students by making it easy on themselves. And this came from the "sympathetic" educators. 21

As the pedagogical equivalent of "tough love," the direct method required much from its pupils. The total absence of the native language, it was argued, would stimulate a fluent acquisition of English. Ideally under the direct method, students would not just learn to speak English, they would also learn to "think" in English. The native language's further growth, like an unwanted weed, would be halted.\textsuperscript{22} Of the use of English-Only in the classroom, one Americanization expert postulated that "the pupils will need to make a special effort to understand—an exertion which will expedite the process of learning the English language."\textsuperscript{23} The Herculean effort by young students was illustrated by one expert: "Each morning the teacher should greet the children with 'Good Morning.' She should not be disturbed if at first the children do nothing but look at her. She should not tell them in Spanish what Good Morning means. She simply repeats 'Good Morning' each morning until the children hear the expression so many times that they begin to respond more or less unconsciously."\textsuperscript{24}

In practice, the direct method of English-Only required almost as much from the instructor as it did from the pupil. In directly associating an action sentence with his or her

\textsuperscript{22} Thompson, Schooling of the Immigrant, 205.
\textsuperscript{23} Bogardus, Essentials of Americanization, 283.
own visual action, the instructor literally pantomimed the sentence under the direct method of English-Only. Because of the need to act out the component sentences of the lessons, some observers alternatively referred to this method as the "dramatic" method. In addition to acting out a simple sentence or sequence of words, many pedagogical experts advocated the use of pictures or visual representations to help establish cognitive links.\(^{25}\)

Direct method lessons were hallmarks of Progressive Education. One educator railed against the lack of pedagogical foresight that induced some teachers to ignore the relevancy of content by including lesson texts "with their ridiculous, 'I am a little buttercup'" phrases for the "husky Poles and Swedes" attending adult night classes.\(^{26}\) One specialist echoed Gouin's arguments about children learning language best naturally and informally, in this case while in the schoolyard playing: "Help these children to do vigorously activities in which the English language plays a large part." English-Only was very much English by osmosis.\(^{27}\)

The direct method's use of English-Only instruction conflated the study of foreign languages at later grades with


\(^{26}\) Thompson, Schooling the Immigrant, 184-85; and Lewis Wilbur Smith, "Americanization in the Thornton Township High School," The School Review, 28 (November 1920), 671.

\(^{27}\) J. L. Meriam, "Play and the English Language for Foreign Children," The Journal of Educational Sociology, 4 (June 1931), 130.
the study of English by non-English speakers in the lower grades. To most pedagogical thinkers, if English-Only direct methods worked for American students in high schools spending an hour a day learning Spanish, for example, it would thus work for non-English-speaking children attempting to learn English in the first grade. An often overlooked fact by these thinkers was that very few high school foreign language teachers of classes of English-speakers ever used the pure direct method. Those that did made no age distinctions. One American educator teaching in China wrote to a teaching journal about the tremendous success he had in teaching English as a second language via the direct method to Chinese students at the university level. This need to wipe out the native language intruded into all content areas of instruction in an English-Only classroom. As one early English-Only advocate who experimented with Gouin's theories in the New York public schools maintained, "The teacher here should make every lesson a lesson in English."29

However, some supporters of English-Only remained somewhat skeptical of the method's overall worth. Henry Goldberger, one of the most significant champions of English-Only instruction, indicated that the debate between the indirect and direct method was moot in that "For most

teachers there is no difficulty in deciding the question because they know no foreign languages." This is a very significant point. Even had all American educators decided that the indirect method was best, who would teach it? Some educators who did not regard the direct method as gospel still urged its widespread implementation since the logistical implications of the indirect method, if comprehensively and uniformly applied, would have been staggering. It would have necessitated large numbers of bilingual teachers and schools that were found naturally in very few areas such as in Puerto Rico.  

The idea of instructing foreign-speaking children how to speak English without any native language referent was first attempted in the nation's territorial (colonial) possessions. Perhaps the most important pedagogical laboratory was the public school system of Puerto Rico. In the 1900s it had been turned into a huge experiment in which English would be made the language of instruction for all subjects. The failure of this policy was made evident by the policy shifts on language that reinstated bilingual education on the island in later years.  

---

the 1900s also instituted an official English-Only policy.Officials in charge of the education of Native Americans by the 1890s had already begun to utilize English-Only methods. Such attempts at enforcing "no Indian" language policies ranged from positive reinforcement to beatings to halt the native tongue's use. American educators in Hawaii went so far as to attempt to close down after-hours, foreign language schools organized by Japanese laborers for the pedagogical reason (among other more ideological ones) that the extra instruction in Japanese taxed and confused the minds of the Japanese immigrant children, hampering their mastery of English.

The expectation that children would get much learning out of an English-Only experience was fairly low. Educators made it quite plain that the spoken English was the first and most fundamental of objectives over reading, writing, and

---


other academic subjects such as math and science. Regarding the academic limitations of such an exclusive focus on spoken English, Goldberger came closest to the point: "Since the problem with most foreign-born people in America is to train them to speak rather than to read or to write, the direct method is advocated."  

English-Only institutionalized academic failure. A New York school principle estimated that his Gouin-inspired English-Only method expended the first two years of the child's school work in teaching five hundred to six hundred English vocabulary words, the amount he believed native English-speaking children possessed coming into their first school year. It took immigrant schoolchildren all of two full years to get to doing first grade level work just in the spoken language. One researcher noted that in French-speaking areas of Louisiana, English-Only instruction unnecessarily created poor promotion rates by assuming that French-speaking children in the first grades automatically needed at least two years to complete the first grade without regard to individual performance.

To organize the language groups together in order to benefit from the specialized English-Only curriculum meant to segregate by ethnicity. New York City in the 1900s was one

---

of the national leaders in creating special classes for non-English-speaking children where they obtained the "special" English-Only curricula. These special classes were known by a multitude of appellations by school officials and immigrant children alike; "Soup schools," "C classes," or even "Stamer classes" were just a few of the names to describe what was, in effect, pedagogical segregation. This segregation could last a few months for the very bright or several years for children who were not able to master English quickly.\footnote{Leonard Covello, The Heart is the Teacher. The Teacher in the Urban Community, A Half Century in the City Schools (Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams, & Company, 1970), 22-27.}

In the public schools of New York City, English-Only classes were experimented with as early as the passage of compulsory education and child labor laws in 1903.\footnote{Julia Richman, "What Can Be Done in the Graded School for the Backward Child," The Survey, 13 (September 1904), 129-30.} The non-English-speaking students were divided into different gradations of age and expectation: The special language class, "Grade C," was reserved for young students who knew no English upon entering school; "Grade D" referred to those students who had not finished elementary level work and, nearing age fourteen, were soon to quit school; "Grade E" consisted of older students with academic promise, but who due to late arrival in the country and previous education in another language, needed special intensive English instruction to enter the upper grades. By the 1904-1905 academic year there were approximately 250 such graded
schools for language minority children in New York City.41
The most common type of immigrant language school provided by
New York City education officials was the "C Grade" level.
Regarding the "C Grade" schools, one longtime champion of
English-Only pedagogy claimed "Then the so-called 'C class'
was formed for the sole purpose of enabling pupils to attain
a knowledge of English sufficient to understand what was said
and to express themselves so as to be understood." This
school principal concluded that "Language is the main
subject, and spoken language receives the greater part of the
time."42

New York City was not alone in these pedagogical
innovations. By 1901 the city of Cleveland had organized a
series of "Steamer classes" in its public schools so that
immigrant children "be given an opportunity to learn the
language before they are placed in a class of 40 or more
other children and expected to carry on regular grade work."
Regarding method, the Cleveland authorities maintained that
"There is a special educational technique for teaching a new
language which is far different in its methods from that
employed in teaching subject matter to pupils in their own

41 Francesco Cordasco, "The Children of Immigrants in the
Schools: Historical Analogues of Educational Deprivation,"
42 John H. Haaren, "Education of the Immigrant Child," in
P. P. Claxton, Education of the Immigrant: Abstracts of
Papers Read at a Public Conference Under the Auspices of the
New York-New Jersey Committee of the North American Civic
League for Immigrants, Held at New York City, May 16 and 17,
1913. United States Department of Interior, Bureau of
Education, Bulletin, 1913, No. 51 (Washington, D.C.:
language. This has been amply demonstrated in the special classes of several of our cities, notably New York and Boston, and still more strikingly illustrated in the schools of Porto [sic] Rico and the Philippines."\(^{43}\)

Experts on foreign languages were not immune to the wartime hysteria. English was elevated to a mythic, sanctified status in the efforts of school officials to immunize the immigrant from subversiveness. One series of night classes organized for industrial laborers viewed that central for Americanization was simply instruction of English through the "so-called direct method as opposed to the indirect method." Success was all-important to the Americanizing language teachers since "the only sound basis for true Americanism rests upon a workable knowledge of English and a true understanding of our institutions."\(^{44}\) Pedagogical thinkers did their part by railing against the German language. In arguing for the need of the schools to teach the Spanish language instead of the suddenly tainted German language, linguist Lawrence Wilkins rebutted the claim by his pro-German colleagues that "the study of the German language produces more brain loops than does the study of any other modern language." Wilkins argued that, "The study of German, because of the cumbersome and awkward word order of the language, made for indirectness rather than directness in

\(^{43}\) Miller, The School and the Immigrant, 72-73 and 76.  
\(^{44}\) Charles F. Towne, "The Organization of Lessons in English for Americanization Classes," School and Society, 12 (September 11, 1920), 184 and 186.
English expression." Wilkins concluded his assault upon the language of Goethe: "We have had far too much teaching of German in our schools. It was fast becoming the second language of our nation. And I personally believe that it was taught chiefly for the purposes of furthering propaganda originating in Berlin." 45 Tough talk for a linguist!

The rhetoric of the language instructors paled in comparison to that exhibited by the federal government. Historian Ernest May notes that President Woodrow Wilson actively sought to disassociate himself from American ethnic groups and discussed the possibility of outlawing the teaching of German in 1915 with his cabinet. He wrote to an Irish-American opponent of his neutrality policies, "I would feel deeply mortified to have you or anybody like you vote for me. Since you have access to many disloyal Americans and I have not I will ask you to convey this message to them." 46 Wilson believed that "Any man who carries a hyphen about with him carries a dagger that he is ready to plunge into the vitals of this Republic." 47 The federal government through Fred Clayton Butler, director of Americanization, linked its concern with the potential for economic radicalism to alleged

45 Lawrence A. Wilkins, "Spanish as a Substitute for German for Training and Culture," Hispania, 1 (December 1918), 206 and 208.

One army psychologist held that "School and society had done little to prepare the minds of these ignorant and unintelligent laborers to withstand the pernicious doctrines that were being preached by the radical, the soap box orator, and the unscrupulous agitator." These were, he claimed, the "I.W.W., the Anarchists and the Bolsheviks.\footnote{Charles Scott Berry, "Some Problems of Americanization as Seen by an Army Psychologist," School and Society, 13 (January 22, 1921), 101.}

The Wilson war effort succeeded in banning the teaching of German in schools but achieved those goals indirectly. The federal government worked hard to explicitly encourage individual states to outlaw any native language (of bilingual) instruction and replace it with the direct method of English-Only pedagogy which they felt would better Americanize the potential subversives that were immigrant children. Butler urged states to criminalize bilingual instruction (the indirect method) while mandating English Only pedagogy (the direct method). Butler's official instruction manual on how to best accomplish such goals at the state level was couched plainly: "State laws should be provided, if necessary, making English the primary language of the schools of the State, both public and private. All of the subjects of the school should be taught in English, and the school itself should be conducted in English in order
that the future citizens of America may learn not only to talk but to think in the language of this land."\(^{50}\) Butler's implicit appeal was very effective on many state legislatures. Twenty-four states during 1918-1919 either created laws or strengthened previous laws that pertained to the express sanction of English-Only pedagogy.\(^{51}\) As the states rushed to heed the call by the federal government, some pushed Americanization so completely that they violated the United States constitution.\(^{52}\)

* * * * *

The very idea of English-Only instruction (or something very similar to what linguists like Gouin and company had in mind) was not exactly new to Texas. Previous chapters demonstrate the desire that educators and lawmakers in Texas expressed throughout the nineteenth century for ensuring, either through legislative action or administrative code,

---


\(^{52}\) Paul Finkelman, "German Victims and American Oppressors: The Cultural Background and Legacy of Meyer v. Nebraska," in *Law and the Great Plains: Essays on the Legal History of the Heartland*, ed. by John R. Wunder (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996), 33-56. The state of Nebraska outlawed any semblance of the German language during World War I for public and private schools. These private school efforts were found by the United States Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. However, the court did agree with the Americanization aim for public schools.
that English be taught exclusively in the state's classrooms. These desires themselves went unenforced, the casualties of Democratic, post-Reconstruction political orthodoxies. However, as the Progressive Education Movement in Texas gained strength in the early years of the twentieth century, the more effective central regulation and enforcement of education policy served as the tool by which the age-old predisposition for English-Only could finally be turned into concrete policy.

By the 1900s the desire of statewide lawmakers and education leaders to educate only in English was visible. The first real step in that direction was a 1905 English-Only law. This 1905 legislative act had been the most specific language policy ever issued by the state; it defined language as the medium of instruction and reiterated that all lessons be conducted exclusively in English. The act did everything but prohibit the already quite limited study of modern foreign languages, nor did it specify punishment for violating the law.\textsuperscript{53} However, the only semblance of enforcing the English-Only law was the determination of whether or not teachers had the "ability to speak and understand the English language sufficiently to use it easily and readily in conversation and in giving instruction in all subjects prescribed." This was handled through teacher certification.

by local educational leaders and not state-appointed bureaucrats. There was insufficient bureaucracy to enforce the very thing, the elimination of the bilingual tradition, that these Progressives so desperately desired.\(^{54}\)

The 1905 English-Only law signaled a definite shift in attitude by educational leaders and policymakers on the question of language in the classroom. Before, languages other than English were tolerated. Now those languages were viewed as such hindrances that the state's education bureaucracy felt compelled to actively oppose their use for instruction. In most instances the state meant the bilingual tradition in Texas schools, but they also extended the ban on languages to their study as academic courses in the upper grades. The state's top leadership in educational matters talked about the shift away from the old modes of schooling dependent "upon a mistaken application of the doctrines of local self-government," to a new kind of direction and greater coordination from the state. The "mistaken application" referred to by Superintendent Cousins was the bilingual schooling in community schools still prevalent in ethnic communities throughout the state. This shift also coincided with the rising concern for immigrant assimilation and Americanization. In state documents, Mexicans, Germans, and Czechs were singled out for clinging to antiquated school

organizations because they allowed for some bilingual instruction.\textsuperscript{55}

The 1905 English-Only law addressed these Progressive, organizational, and cultural shifts in educational policy. Although it was not perfect, it was the state's first decisive effort since Reconstruction to tightly regulate the language used in the classroom. Unlike its short-lived Reconstruction counterpart, this 1905 law had the opposite purpose, to eliminate the bilingual tradition, not to protect and institutionalize it as the 1871 law attempted. It served its purpose and appears to have been fairly effective. In the 1910s the Brownsville public schools on the Texas-Mexico border went completely English-Only.\textsuperscript{56} There are even pre-World War I records of Mexican American families protesting the recent arrival of English-Only pedagogy in the public schools of South Texas.\textsuperscript{57}

World War I was the watershed event in the hardening of language policy in Texas. World War I hysteria in Texas was particularly vicious to German Americans. The most lasting educational ramification of this crisis was the 1918 English-Only law for the public schools, almost entirely based on


\textsuperscript{57} José E. Limón, "El Primer Congreso Mexicanista de 1911: A Precursor to Contemporary Chicanismo," \textit{Aztlan,} 5 (Spring-Fall 1974), 90-91.
anti-German sentiment. Unlike the pedagogical and organizational reasons put forth in 1905 for the previous English-Only law, the 1918 law was justified by legislators on the basis of defending the culture of those who died at the Alamo from "the language that is being used in our country in seditious propaganda to undermine the patriotic efforts of our government to secure world-wide democracy." Of teaching German in the schools they added, "This un-American and unpatriotic practice has already been discontinued in some of the other states. It is high time that kulture of the kind of Germany be cut out."  

In terms of what the two laws required of teachers and students, they were remarkably similar. The 1905 English-Only law described how the actual pedagogy of English-Only was to work—only English could be used in both the content of lessons as well as the instructions to those exercises. The 1918 law reiterated these pedagogical mandates with even greater detail; it required all school work to be done in English and forbade the use of non-English primers or textbooks.  

---

58 "Relating to Teaching German in the Public Schools," Journal of the House of Representatives of the Fourth Called Session of the Thirty-Fifth Legislature Convened in Obedience to the Proclamation of the Governor February 26, 1918 and Adjourned Without Day March 27, 1918 (Austin, Texas: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., Printers, 1918), 86 (first quotation) and 87 (second).  
But the real difference between the 1905 and 1918 laws was enforcement. The World War I legislation offered specific criminal penalties for the law's violation instead of vague indeterminate threats. The legislature decreed that a teacher or administrator who violated the English-Only law was to be charged with a misdemeanor. Conviction carried with it several possible punishments that could be handed down separately or together: a fine between twenty five and one hundred dollars, revocation of state teaching certification, and automatic dismissal. The offense was not considered cumulative; it began anew each day in which a non-English word of instruction was uttered.\textsuperscript{60}

The English-Only regulations had a quite definite chilling effect on language teachers and ethnic communities. This 1918 English-Only law was on the criminal law books as article 288 of the Texas Penal Code and would remain in force, albeit with several modifications over the years, until the late 1960s.\textsuperscript{61} The 1918 law was very effective, perhaps too effective. Superintendent Annie Webb Blanton noted without any sense of urgency or concern that out of 78 legally credited schools in Texas that could teach the subject of German prior to World War I, only 24 (roughly 76


percent) bothered to make the necessary changes in their German programs after the war to comply with the state. These schools opted instead to simply drop the entire course from the curriculum.  

Ironically, the 1918 English-Only bill was given lukewarm and last-minute support from Superintendent Doughty and passed only after his opponent in the Democratic Primaries used it and the widespread panic over German "kultur" to oust him from office. This successor, Annie Webb Blanton, became the champion of the English-Only movement in Texas.  

She was a true believer of English-Only's supposed pedagogical and Americanizing promise. After the wave of hysteria that created the context for the 1918 law had passed, Blanton did not consider the battle over foreign languages in the classroom finished.  

Blanton viewed the wartime English-Only law as of limited effectiveness due to its application solely to the public schools. As early as the summer of 1921, Blanton—surrounded by supportive colleagues at the Texas State Teachers' Association (she was a recent past president of the

---

63 Campaign flyer, "Concerning the Race for State Superintendent of Public Instruction," Annie Webb Blanton Vertical File, Center for American History, Austin, Texas.
organization)—first went on record as favoring the extension of English-Only into the heretofore untouched sphere of private education. To a throng of applauding teachers, Annie Webb Blanton promised a revision in the compulsory attendance law that would "include in that law the provision that the medium of instruction shall be the English language, not only in the public schools of the state, but in private and parochial schools. (Applause.)" 65

Blanton's renewed calls for an expansion of English-Only's scope were done in the name of Americanization. As the hysteria regarding Germans died out, Blanton justified the need for this tremendous expansion of state control over education on the basis that new Texas immigrants (not of German or European extraction) were not assimilating or becoming true American citizens. Learning English was all-important in this understanding of Americanization; those who were not properly Americanized were most likely illiterates as well. As early as 1920 she authored a state report arguing that the lessons of the war demanded a united and educated citizenry: "The need for Americanization was brought forcibly before the American people by the Great War. The draft and other war activities revealed many unassimilated and unamalgamated groups of nationalities who had not caught the vision of America, who knew nothing of its

Institutions, and who could not even understand its language."  

Superintendent Blanton conflated literacy and Americanization and in doing so viewed the imparting of English by the public schools to be of cardinal importance. She often pointed out the linkage between illiteracy and the need to Americanize the foreign-born population in her reports. The only literacy that counted at all was in English; all else was treason. Claimed Blanton, "If you desire to be one with us, stay, and we welcome you; but if you wish to preserve, in our state, the language and the customs of another land, you have no right to do this which our state will grant to you." For those who wanted to hold on to some part of their ancestral culture and language her advice was to "go back to the country which you prize so highly, and rear your children there."  

Even though the wartime crisis had ended, Superintendent Blanton sought to further the English-Only requirement to private schools. Trading on residual wartime patriotism, Blanton talked of the necessity of remembering "the stalwart khaki-clad youths of America whom American mothers and

---

fathers bravely sent forth as sacrifices" when considering the necessity of another English-Only law. 69 Blanton evoked the post-World War I red scare as well as the old crisis rhetoric against illiterate, unassimilated immigrants in her push for English-Only in the private schools of the state. The Russian and Mexican Revolutions in particular made good boogey-men. Still conflating the meaning of the words literacy and Americanization, she warned educators across the state that "The history of Mexico, of Russia, and of every other uneducated, or poorly educated nation or state, gives evidence that a people without education, or with insufficient education, soon lose possession of their most valuable natural resources, to better educated or more skilled leaders from without." 70

Although Annie Webb Blanton was ultimately successful in making the expansion of English-Only a public issue, she did not actually succeed in getting the legislation passed. Ironically, it was enacted just after her term of office ended in 1923. So neither the 1918 nor the 1923 English-Only legislation that she worked so hard to popularize and recommend actually became law during her tenure. She made recommendations regarding the 1923 provision to the Thirty-Sixth and Thirty-Seventh Legislatures, but met with no

69 Ibid.
immediate success." Superintendent Blanton did not let legislative setbacks dampen her enthusiasm for the issue of English-Only, however. Her recommendations to the legislature from 1920 onward reflect a consistent and highly charged articulation of deep concern. At the end of her term Blanton scolded her readers by noting that "In certain counties along our borders are many men and women, born and reared in the Lone Star State, who speak a foreign tongue and cherish the habits and ways of another country." More directly she then claimed "There are many communities in Texas in which the children are trained in private or parochial schools in which the medium of instruction is a foreign tongue. Many of these children become adults without having learned to read or write the English language." It is significant that Blanton singled out Mexican Americans as opposed to Germans in her advocacy of the 1923 legislation.

Superintendent Blanton's successor was S. M. N. Marrs. The 1923 English-Only law passed under his tenure. In fact, the popularity of the measure was such that parliamentary procedure was suspended and the bill was approved by acclamation without any changes by both the Texas House and Senate in March of 1923. While committed to the cause of

---

72 Blanton, A Hand Book of Information as to Education, 22.
73 S. L. Staples, General Laws of the State of Texas Passed by the Thirty-Eighth Legislature at the Regular Session Convened at the City of Austin, January 9, 1923 and
Progressive Education, including English-Only for private schools, Marrs pursued his duties in a more low-key fashion than did Blanton. Gone was the passionate, pugnacious, and inflammatory rhetoric that characterized her writings on Americanization, illiteracy, foreigners, and English-Only. Marrs recorded the passage of the 1923 English-Only legislation in plain, simple language. The law was added as an amendment to the compulsory attendance regulations.74

Marrs favored the pure direct method in teaching English to small Mexican American children, but did not apply the same "tough love" to older white students wishing to study a foreign language. He wrote that the teaching of foreign languages in high schools would mandate some use of non-English words from the instructor. Marrs allowed the teaching of foreign languages (say Spanish to white, high school children) to be pedagogically flexible, unlike the instruction given to six year old Mexican Americans. The white high schoolers were allowed to use a great deal of their native English in learning Spanish or French (the indirect method) while Mexican American small children were not allowed to experience any translation into Spanish or instructions in Spanish in their lessons (the direct method). Marrs allowed the inconsistency when the language pedagogy the state officially subscribed to allowed for no such

Adjourned March 14, 1923 (Austin, Texas: A. C. Baldwin & Sons, State Printers, 1923), 256.

differences. In other words, he gave the oldest white students a break in studying another language while not budging an inch for the youngest of Mexican American children. He also urged that English-Only be applied vigorously on all school grounds such as playgrounds as well as inside the classroom.\textsuperscript{75}

The 1918 and 1923 laws were terribly effective. They were so totally successful that they soon had to be revised to correct excessively zealous application of the law. The laws as written prohibited the study of other languages as academic subjects. In trying to tackle the German and Spanish languages involved in the bilingual tradition, the state legislature's intimidating 1918 and 1923 English-Only laws had the effect of virtually outlawing those languages period, even if they were academic courses for older students. Consequently, the state legislature quietly passed several piecemeal revisions attempting to rectify the collateral damage on modern language study.

The first backtracking on the English-Only statutes was the 1927 revision. In 1927 the state legislature decided that its earlier wisdom of outlawing foreign languages taught in any language but English and the banning of foreign language texts in the elementary grades needed to be changed. This 1927 correction allowed for "the Spanish language in

elementary grades in the public free schools in counties bordering on the boundary line between the United States and the Republic of Mexico and having a city or cities of five thousand or more inhabitants according to the United States census for the year 1920."  

The 1927 correction in the English-Only laws did not alter the way English-Only functioned. The law's enforcement went unchanged as did the stipulation that any other language could be taught only in the high schools. This revision targeted the teaching of Spanish on the border in public schools populated overwhelmingly by the same Mexican American students that the 1923 English-Only law had specifically targeted. Under the quiet leadership of Superintendent Marrs, his agency neither crusaded for such changes nor trumpeted their success as had Superintendent Blanton. The legislature explained that "under the present law it is unlawful to teach Spanish in the elementary grades in the public free schools of the state." The meaning of this open statement is purposely vague. The legislature would never backtrack on the sanctions against the bilingual tradition openly. But they were becoming more sympathetic to the special needs of the schools in areas with large Mexican American populations. Such sympathy would allow Spanish to be taught as an academic course in the elementary grades on

---

76 "Chapter Three, Teachers and Schools. Article 288. Shall Use the English Language," in 1928 Complete Texas Statutes Covering the Revised Civil and Criminal Statutes, 1925 (Kansas City, Missouri: Vernon Law Book Company, 1928), 1066.
the border. This would allow conversational Spanish to take place and could very conceivably be used as a catch-up or remedial period. They claimed it was of "inestimable value" that citizens so geographically situated be schooled in the Spanish language. The legislature therefore concluded that it was "imperative that instruction in such a language be begun at the earliest possible period." 77

The next revision of the English-Only laws came in 1933. Like its predecessor, this revision sought to correct the excesses of the 1918 and 1923 laws that had swept into its broad net the academic study of foreign languages. This 1933 modification extended the previous exemption of border counties to the rest of the state except that it also broadened it to include all modern languages other than Spanish. The 1933 revision stated that "it shall be lawful to provide text books, as now provided by law, for and to teach any modern language in the elementary grades of the public free schools above the second grade." The study of Latin and Greek was still reserved for the high schools. It explained that "the present law greatly hinders the teaching of foreign language by restricting it to high school

77 "Spanish Language May be Taught in Schools in Certain Counties, Chapter 188," in Emma Grigsby Meharg, General Laws of the State of Texas Passed by the Thirty-Ninth Legislature at the First Called Session Convened at the City of Austin, September 13, 1926 and Adjourned October 8, 1926 (Austin, Texas: Secretary of State), 267.
grades."^78 Although the legislature said "foreign language," it may as well have said native language.

From the late 1920s until World War II English-Only was in full effect. It was not substantively altered by the 1927 and 1933 revisions; restrictions were simply removed from the study of language as an academic course. Of educational leaders immediately after Blanton, only Marrs commented tellingly on language policy. In an article on the teaching of Spanish in Texas, Marrs admitted that the Texas of the early era was bilingual. He noted that in the 1850s one of the first schools in Texas, Baylor University, offered Spanish "as a foreign language course," although it was not used "as medium for teaching the other subjects" and hence not truly bilingual.^79

Superintendent Marrs's recollection of history only extended to Spanish as a subject of study and not the use of Spanish as the method of instruction. He also noted that Spanish was recently taught as an academic course in elementary schools in San Antonio and all along the border with Mexico. Writing in 1930 before the final English-Only revision of 1933, Marrs observed that the 1918 English-Only law eliminated many of the state's Spanish programs. He then


^79 S. M. N. Marrs and Mary Nash, "History and the Status of the Teaching of Spanish in Texas," The Texas Outlook, 14 (February, 1930), 3.
showed concern for the fact that some Mexican American students were avoiding the public schools because of the lack of Spanish instruction and attending temporary private schools instead. Marrs claimed that "As late as the current year we have signs of the determination of some to have Spanish schools. A Superintendent in a small town in the lower Rio Grande Valley discovered one morning that a group of his grade pupils had been sent to a school organized overnight in which Spanish was to be used exclusively." Recent court decisions regarding the curricular freedom of private schools which de-fanged the 1923 act, and the willingness of many Mexican American parents to patronize schools unrecognized by the state (this 1923 English-Only provision could only be truly enforced if compulsory attendance was enforced), added to the hope that the 1927 revisions would make English-Only public schools more acceptable to the Mexican American community.  

Thus a series of state laws, enacted and then revised, employed variations of English-Only pedagogy to teach English to the foreign-tongued. The growth and dominance of English-Only in Texas represents a period roughly from 1900 to 1940, especially during and immediately after World War I, and was primarily applied to the Mexican American student. But English-Only in Texas was more than simply language policy instigated in Austin to be followed unquestioningly and uniformly by teachers and students. The development of the

---
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formal pedagogy of English-Only in all its local contexts and permutations is as important to its daily practice as are the politics and legal underpinnings. The actual pedagogical theory of English-Only in the period from World War I to World War II was significantly influenced and informed by the perceived social problems of the day as well as the curricular tie to the concept of Americanization. But before turning to its social ramifications, something of English-Only's theoretical justification in Texas must be explained.

English-Only pedagogy in Texas was not solely an ideological or racist subterfuge. Behind its use was a body of academic research and theory. However, English-Only in the hands of state and local educators very quickly became used for racist and nativistic ends. This is certainly not to say that the science behind the pedagogy was hollow or meant nothing in its own right. Its scientific background was accepted by the well-intentioned and by those of lesser motives as incontrovertible and ultimately Progressive. A careful analysis shows that English-Only as a pedagogical practice was a much more nuanced thing than solely a crude excuse to segregate Mexican Americans and label them inferior, which it undoubtedly also was.81

The Texas educational establishment touted English-Only as Progressive. The ways in which the content of English-

81 The classic work on the subject of Mexican American education history devotes little energy to examining the pedagogy of English-Only. See San Miguel, Let All of Them Take Re...
Only lessons were shaped owed much to John Dewey and Progressive curricular reform. Echoing Dewey, one instructor wrote that English-Only should be applied very flexibly with regard to the individual student’s capabilities: "By giving each child individual attention and by shifting him from one group to another as often as is necessary we feel that he has a chance to advance as rapidly as he can without any serious drawback." 82 One federal English-Only publication noted with a Dewey-like touch: "Thus, phases of home life are dramatized in school, conversation, and reading—all primarily for the purpose of leading the children to use the English language." 83 A teaching manual for language instruction published by the State Department of Education quoted Progressive pedagogue G. Stanley Hall's plea for flexibility and for teachers to "resist the extremists who insist there is only one best and exclusive method." 84 Even Mexican American leaders and intellectuals subscribed to the idea that the way in which the schools taught English was the correct and obviously Progressive course of action. 85

The theoretical debate in Texas over the so-called direct method of language instruction based on the ideas of French linguist Francois Gouin was initially confined to the academic study of modern languages in the upper grades. The direct method was the use only of Spanish in teaching Spanish, French for French, or English for English as was the case of English-Only pedagogy. The indirect method utilized other languages and was often linguistic short-hand for many different types of bilingual instruction. The theory made no distinction between five-year-old students and adults aged forty.

Shortly before World War I, the state's educational leaders considered a complicated series of pedagogical options that could be used to teach high schoolers to speak foreign languages. By 1915 teaching manuals were already advocating the study of foreign languages using "the direct method of presentation."86 Utilizing the terminology that was introduced by Gouin's American partisans, Texas educational pamphlets debated the pedagogical options with an air of academic detachment. Among the final educational manuals authorized by Superintendent W. F. Doughty after his election defeat to Annie Webb Blanton and the advent of the 1918 English-Only law, was published a guide on the teaching of modern languages in the high school. Doughty discussed the use of the "Grammar-Translation Method" (the indirect method

or bilingual education), the "Natural Method" (a less structured type of direct method), and the "Direct Method" (Gouin's direct method to the letter). Doughty recommended that language teachers use the direct method since under it, "To speak the language is not the end, but rather the means to the end."\(^{87}\)

The direct method in teaching foreign languages to white high schoolers was applied differently to them than it was to Mexican American five- and six-year-old children. With the dictum of Progressive leader G. Stanley Hall to remain flexible in regard to method, Superintendent W. F. Doughty hedged his recommendation of the direct method to high schoolers with the qualification, "Generally speaking, there is no doubt but that the direct method is the one for teachers to adopt. If they are not prepared to teach it, let them prepare themselves to teach at least a modified form of the direct method."\(^{88}\) Elsewhere he illustrated a lack of full commitment to the direct method. In a publication regarding the teaching of Latin, Doughty argued that even though the indirect method had been used for centuries, recent pedagogical conventions meant that the direct method should be now officially recommended. However, Doughty warned of

\(^{87}\) W. F. Doughty and Rebecca Switzer, Texas High Schools, Modern Languages. Bulletin No. 82 (Austin, Texas: Department of Education, State of Texas, 1918), 7.

\(^{88}\) Ibid., 8. Doughty, less mindful of political tact since his recent electoral trouncing, remarked puckishly on page six of this 1918 publication that one of the official aims of the study of foreign languages in war-hysteria Texas was the development of "a sprachgefühl (a feeling for the language)."
direct method "extremes" and, along with a University of Texas professor, suggested a moderate course utilizing some native language translation that he called the "semi-direct" method.\textsuperscript{89} Doughty's Latin expert furthered the muddiness of the direct method's supposed triumph by noting its limitations and preferring the grammar translation method. The direct method—the theoretical backbone of English-Only—was not applied fully to older, white students studying foreign languages.\textsuperscript{90}

English-Only was applied on Mexican American children to the extreme. It was less flexible, less fair. The distinctions between the adult English-speaking student of a foreign language and the young five or six year old student learning English was not to be made under direct method theory. One scholar observed that ideally, "English should be taught to foreigners as a foreign language; foreign-speaking children, learning English, should be looked upon by instructors as being in the same position as American children who are learning French or German."\textsuperscript{91} But this standard, as indicated by Doughty's hedging on fully applying the recommended direct method to white, English-speaking high school students, was unevenly enforced. Even if it was to be applied to all fairly and equally, the direct method still placed an unfair burden on the younger minds. One non-Texas

\textsuperscript{89} W. F. Doughty and J. P. Buck, Texas High Schools, Latin. Bulletin No. 81 (Austin, Texas: Department of Education, State of Texas, 1918), 16.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 19.
\textsuperscript{91} Meriam, Learning English Incidentally, 1938.
observer of language instruction caught on to something that Texas language experts failed to realize; the defects of the direct method lay "in attempts to apply the method in unmodified form to the teaching of English at the primary level on the assumption that the problem at this point is essentially identical with the problem of teaching a foreign-language at a more advanced level."\(^{92}\)

The coexistence of official direct method, English-Only, and its unfairly selective application continued on through the next several superintendencies. In a manual on high school language curriculum, Superintendent Blanton highlighted this easing of the direct method for what would have been older, white students by stressing that for them grammar, not constant verbal repetition, was the ticket to language mastery: "A well directed study of the grammar is absolutely essential to secure accuracy in reading, writing, and speaking a foreign language. This study should be continuous throughout the four-year course, particular emphasis to be given to it during the first two years."\(^{93}\) She put reading and writing the foreign language before speaking it and held grammatical work to be singularly important. Of oral work in a foreign tongue, Blanton warned that it was


only valuable "provided a disproportionate amount of time is not thus consumed."\(^9^4\)

This lack of consistent application of the Progressive direct method of learning languages continued through the rest of the 1920s and on through the 1930s. Seeking to ease high schoolers' pain, discomfort, and embarrassment from uttering alien sounds around their peers, Superintendent Marrs formulated a curriculum guide that assumed that for high schoolers, spoken foreign language fluency would be unattainable. But he warned, "The fact that the acquisition of fluency is almost impossible, does not, however, justify the exclusion of conversation from the classroom."\(^9^5\) To ease the teacher's load, Marrs stated that even though "the direct method is the preferable plan," it also was a bit unrealistic: "Very few teachers, however, use the so-called modern or pure direct method."\(^9^6\) He added, "Occasionally, when acceptable methods break down, the teacher resorts to translation, and so substitutes English for Spanish in the classroom."\(^9^7\) In very un-direct method fashion, Superintendent Marrs did all he could to de-emphasize the spoken word for the written one. He created a curriculum of modern languages in the high schools that stressed the ability to translate and read as central goals in the first
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\(^9^4\) Ibid., 93.
\(^9^6\) Ibid., 13.
\(^9^7\) Ibid., 17.
two years; spoken skill was not required until the third year of study.\textsuperscript{98} In effect, the state wielded two separate policies on teaching language: older (high school age) white students were allowed indirect methods and the youngest and most vulnerable of Mexican American children were mandated to learn in a pure direct method of instruction popularized by a middle-aged French scholar's efforts to pass his German exams!

The direct method did not become publicly recognized as synonymous with English-Only until the middle 1920s when Mexican American children officially became a "problem" in the state educational community. They became a significant enough of an issue to garner specialized deliberation from the State Department of Education in pedagogical handbooks. Even during World War I, German American children never achieved such status as to warrant singling them out for special pedagogical publication. The Progressive bent of the state agency demanded that "no special interest shall be given undue privilege in the organization and manipulation of its courses of study."\textsuperscript{99} But it was with regard specifically to the Mexican American child that the direct method of language instruction realized its full theoretical exposition as English-Only without the corrupting "indirect" or

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., 11.
"grammar-translation" influences in high school language study.

One of the first educational attempts to specifically deal with Mexican Americans came in 1924 with the Texas Educational Survey Report, a multivolume series of statistical reports on education commissioned by the legislature. Mexican Americans occupied a prominent place in many of the reports. Advice was offered to make lessons more Progressive. Several sample lessons were taken from innovative school districts. One of the authors argued that, unlike the European immigrants who came before, the Mexican American child was in need of specialized instruction: "It was further suggested that special curricula be provided for Mexican children, and for negro children." One of the authors argued that, unlike the European immigrants who came before, the Mexican American child was in need of specialized instruction: "It was further suggested that special curricula be provided for Mexican children, and for negro children." The survey commission asked local educators what they were doing to meet the problem. They found that "much good work was being done in various communities of the state in handling the non-English speaking children." The commission members were convinced that local efforts in South and West Texas needed to be disseminated to the broader statewide audience. As the commission gave attention to the Mexican

102 George A. Works, "Chapter XIII: The Non-English Speaking Children and the Public School," The Texas Outlook,
American student, school administrators and teachers on the front-lines were already organizing regional associations to keep abreast of new pedagogical innovations and to allow for standardized curricula.\textsuperscript{103} The Valley Superintendents Association was formed in 1924 and in 1926 came the Lower Rio Grande Valley Elementary Principals Association. One participant wrote, "One of the major problems confronting the Valley School's is that of the proper instruction of the foreign-speaking child."\textsuperscript{104}

The pedagogical ferment in South Texas created a context in which the State Department of Education under Superintendent Marrs based state policy on what the Valley schools were doing. In 1930 the organization of Valley superintendents, after a few years of planning with administrators and teachers, published in the State Department of Education a special curriculum for Mexican American children in the first three grades. This was accepted by Marrs as the official state-approved curriculum. The Valley educators started with the familiar direct method justification of using the foreign language as the medium of expression. They warned of bringing Spanish into the

\textsuperscript{103} J. Lee Stambaugh, "The Valley Superintendents," The Texas Outlook, 9 (June 1925), 29.  
\textsuperscript{104} E. C. Dodd, "The Lower Rio Grande Valley Elementary Principals Association," The Texas Outlook, 12 (June 1928), 30.
classroom, "Such methods are entirely unsuited for teaching foreigners English...the method should be one which emphasizes the spoken word, not the written word. Understanding and speaking the language should come first."  

English-Only as it applied to Mexican Americans was a direct method application that demanded almost as much from the specially trained teacher as it did from the pupil. While the teaching of object nouns was made easier by pictures, the teaching of verbs, or "action words," must have been exhausting. The teacher was to pantomime the verb she was to be teaching, all the while repeating it slowly with emphasis on enunciation over and over until the children learned the desired verb: "In teaching the action words the teacher first performs the act several times herself, at the same time telling what she does." Then the teacher was instructed to call upon the students to dramatize her action while repeating the sound.  

Unlike the treatment accorded other white students, the state decided to use the direct method totally and completely in the curriculum specially designed for Mexican Americans. Dewey-like and Hall-like admonitions of Progressive methodological flexibility were ignored; absolutely no exceptions were to be made. It was not enough that the children learn English, but they would have to learn to

---
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"think" in English as well. One teacher from San Marcos in Central Texas wrote that the inability to "think" in English would always render the Mexican American mentally handicapped.107 Unlike the advice given to use the native language in a pinch with high schoolers, teachers of tiny Mexican American children were to "Never give the Spanish word first for we do not wish the children to translate from Spanish to English, but to think in English."108

Such a total application of the direct method in the form of English-Only to such young pupils had unduly harsh, almost draconian effects. One of the side-effects of such an English-Only policy was the practice that "English must be used not only in the classrooms but also in the corridors and on the premises." This school superintendent from El Paso remarked that any Mexican American "who is habitually neglectful or is willfully indifferent or is defiant in the observation of this rule...should be suspended from school until he is willing to return with the assurance of abiding by the rules of the school." This was done to help the "Spanish-speaking pupils become acquainted with English."109 Even the playgrounds were policed. One manual argued that teachers and administrators should "Strive to popularize English to such an extent that there will be much use of it

107 Sadie Perry, "They Must Think in English," The Texas Outlook, 26 (June 1942), 13.
on the playground. Supervised play makes this more possible and also gives opportunity for the increase of the English vocabulary."\textsuperscript{110}

One of the aspects to learning a new language is learning new ways in which the mouth must be contorted and the tongue be positioned. In a guide for teaching the Czech language to high schoolers, one suggestion for accurate pronunciation was to "Explain the formation and position of the tongue, lips, and jaw in making the different sounds, because many pupils can not learn pronunciation by imitation only."\textsuperscript{111} However, for Mexican American elementary school pupils, the teacher was encouraged to stick their hands in the child's face, grab the tongue, the lips, and the jaw to show the proper way to pronounce words. The manual advised that "the teacher should have him come close to her while she shows him just how to place his teeth, tongue, and lips in order to utter the sound correctly." If unsuccessful the teacher was to "Have the child then repeat the sound again and again, endeavoring to place the organs of speech as they should be, until he is able to give the sound correctly."\textsuperscript{112}

In high irony, the state, while trying to eradicate the Spanish spoken by its native Spanish-speaking population, was counter-intuitively endeavoring to get its monolingual

\textsuperscript{110} Marrs, Yoe, and Wygal, A Course in English, 34.


\textsuperscript{112} Marrs, Yoe, and Wygal, A Course in English for Non-English-Speaking Pupils, 34.
English-speaking students to learn to speak Spanish. As early as the 1920s the publication arm of the TSTA received a letter from a national business group urging the teaching of Spanish. Complaining of the wasted opportunities of studying Spanish from overly academic and grammar-based courses in the high schools, one teacher advocated making the course more conversational via the direct method. Although the state professed to be interested in the utility of Spanish, their teaching methodology was not so inspired since emphasis was on the written, not the spoken word.

Texas teachers were encouraged to make the English-Only system of teaching as Progressive as possible by paying close attention to the individual child and everyday life concerns. Elma A. Neal, a teacher in San Antonio, developed a pedagogical system for teaching young Mexican American children how to speak English using the Progressive ideas of relating the content of the English lessons to everyday, local life concerns. Neal also held that the Mexican American children were not inherently handicapped due to bilingual ability. Neal favored the direct method for the reason that it "calls for direct association between the object and the English work." However, she also realized
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113 O. K. Davis, "Teach More Spanish," The Texas Outlook, 12 (February 1928), 68-69.
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that many practitioners of English-Only did not utilize the method properly due to reliance upon old, sterile recitations that were "largely literary in content and foreign to the child's experience," instead of the more Progressive lessons based on "a practical vocabulary" that was in turn "based on the everyday experiences of the child." Neal believed the direct method of English-Only the most Progressive of approaches, arguing that bilingual instruction would entail a triple or "three track association which retards the language process and accounts for the hesitation noted in the speech of those who learn a new language by this method."\textsuperscript{116}

Neal's emphasis on a "practical vocabulary" represents one local innovation by Texas educators to make English-Only work, something that, by the middle 1920s, they admitted to having trouble doing. The State Department of Education agreed with Elma Neal. It reaffirmed Neal's approach of using a Progressive variety of content lessons for language: "The teacher must keep in mind that she is to make English function in every activity of the day." In English-Only every activity was an English lesson. The most important factor to consider in the instruction of the non-English-speaking child was that "Drill, drill, and more drill is an absolute essential here."\textsuperscript{117} All lessons were by the book: "Teach the children English by the direct method and not by

\textsuperscript{116} Elma A. Neal, "Adapting the Curriculum to the Non-English Speaking Child," The Texas Outlook, 11 (June 1927), 40.

\textsuperscript{117} Marrs, Yoe, and Wygal, A Course in English, 19. Original italic included.
translation of their language into the English. Train them to think in English. This is absolutely essential if they are to acquire any facility in the use of English."\textsuperscript{118}

The question of English-Only's effectiveness proves difficult to answer since, even though its deficiencies were significant and under an unceasing process of being corrected, few records actually address its daily experience. Were children able to keep up with a fast-talking teacher speaking in a different language? A cursory examination of the data on Mexican American age-grade ratios, dropout rates, and failure rates indicate overwhelmingly that the educational achievement of this group of students was exceptionally poor when compared to white students.\textsuperscript{119} The number of Mexican American children enrolled in the state's schools by the 1940s were disproportionately concentrated in the first grade. The first grade numbers across the state for the Mexican American population were roughly twice that of the second grade, a staggering statistical anomaly that suggests a shocking failure or drop-out rate.\textsuperscript{120} Most were not getting past the first grade in the normal one year. This was not an insignificant number of failures as the Mexican American student population between 1922 and 1928 grew in percentage of the total scholastic population at a

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 33. Original italics included.
\textsuperscript{120} Wilson Little, Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1944), 39.
rate five times that of all other whites and more than nine times that of African Americans.  

Its most ardent practitioners implicitly acknowledged English-Only to be a failure. One teaching manual casually observed that "Teachers may very easily acquire the habit of talking so much that little opportunity is left for the children." It sounds as if teachers' performances of English-Only left many blank stares, downcast eyes, and empty faces. A teacher from El Paso stated the failure of English-Only pedagogy quite bluntly: "In schools which follow a more or less formal type of procedure Mexican children sometimes spend four years or more below the second grade without mastering enough English and reading to attempt a more advanced type of work. Eventually these children become discouraged and bored with endless repetition of incomprehensible stories and meaningless routine. Apathy and indifference follow, if not behavior problems, until teachers consider them slow or mentally incapable of progress."

The unfairness of English-Only did not go unnoticed. It had disastrous consequences for a good many Mexican American students. A Del Rio teacher noted the cruel unfairness of asking a non-English speaking child to learn as many as 3,000
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English words (in the 1930s this was taken as the usual number of words known by the average student upon completion of the first grade) by the end of the first grade when he or she started off with only 500 words and the English-speaker started off with some 2,000 words. She argued that the lack of success in school meant that "Personal egotism has been crushed under the unnecessarily severe burden and instead [there] are engendered anti-social feelings of inferiority and the inescapable psychic consequences of hopeless comparisons under such unequal circumstances...leading to suicide, whether partial or complete, to the instinct for self improvement—the only really indispensable factor in the educating process."124

Often well-meaning instructors who were trained under the educational and cultural assumptions inherent in English-Only could not help from making matters worse. An anthropologist conducting interviews in South Texas in the 1950s quoted one Mexican American parent who recalled a teacher's visit to his home: "She burst in here like a rooster without even waiting for an invitation. Then, she started telling me what to do. This is my home and I will decide what is done here. And she tried to tell me not to speak the language of my forefathers. She does not understand nor does she want to. My children go to school to

---

124 Dorothy M. Kress, "The Spanish-Speaking School Child in Texas," The Texas Outlook, 18 (December 1934), 24. One assumes that "partial suicide" is not desired, even partially so.
learn, but they are merely taught not to respect their parents. It is an evil thing. I no longer blame my children for not liking the school."  

That English-Only was regarded by educational leaders to be something of a failure was not an earthshattering conclusion from the 1920s on through the 1940s. Not only did the state's educational leaders know this sad fact, they continued to base the entire pedagogical development of English-Only around it; they knew it would fail, expected it to. The evidence seems so overwhelming today that one wonders if they wanted it to fail? Cheering on the practitioners of English-Only, one teacher opined that in many cases the diligent and talented Mexican American first-year student might "make good second grade pupils by mid-term of the following year instead of staying in the first grade two or three years."  

In the educational literature, this teacher's argument that the successful Mexican American child be held back (or fail) only one semester is by far the most optimistic of prognostications regarding their inevitable failure of the first grade.

Other observers were less generous in the degree of failure to be expected from Mexican American students. One succinctly characterized the main tenets of educating this type of student as "the welfare of the child, the mastery of

---

the English language, and the mastery of specified academic subject matter." He went on to claim that "These objectives are not necessarily incompatible; however, a disastrous situation results if the latter proposition becomes the dominant aim of the school." English-Only in this border town did not serve to gain students access to academic achievement. If anything, it served to instantaneously preclude even the remotest possibility of academic achievement by writing it off as automatically unreachable. The teacher summarized the practice of his border town school by stating that "we have substituted in the place of an absolute academic program a wider and more significant concept of education." Much like the historian Hofstadter's idea of anti-intellectualism, the "wider" concept of education was not to include real academic work.\footnote{J. Austin Burkhart, "I Teach in a Border Town," \textit{The Texas Outlook}, 23 (December 1939), 34.}

On some occasions institutionalized failure was directly related to social conditions like poverty. One teacher in 1934 forcefully argued that assuming the average school starting age of a Mexican American child was seven, under normal circumstances "about 25 per cent of the non-English speaking children could make the first grade in one year; 50 per cent in two years. The other 25 per cent was nearly a total loss unless we could provide nourishment and medical attention for them."\footnote{J. T. Taylor, "Americanization of Harlingen's Mexican School Population," \textit{The Texas Outlook}, 18 (September 1934), 38.}
One of the ways in which the institutionalized failure of English-Only was transmitted to new teachers was through their training in teachers colleges. Important for the curricular development of English-Only was the creation of the South Texas State Teachers College in Kingsville, Texas, in 1925. The educational establishment hoped the college would lead the way in developing pedagogical ways of dealing with Mexican Americans. The TSTA reported of the college's birth that its location was ideal for study of Mexican Americans who would soon "present a distinct and growing problem for the students of education."\textsuperscript{129} The Texas Educational Survey Report's section on Mexican American education anticipated that the new school should give "special consideration to the training of teachers for work with non-English speaking groups of children."\textsuperscript{130}

The new South Texas State Teachers College in Kingsville did take up the cause of English-Only and Mexican American study. Recruiting Dr. L. F. Heinmiller, an education professor from New York University, the school began building its education department on a solid experimental footing with coursework available in teaching methods, observation, and practice. The experimental classes were conducted in the direct method of English-Only instruction.\textsuperscript{131} The laboratory
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experimental schools were able, in controlled conditions, to create such a learning environment that the beginners they recruited, potentially the brightest Mexican American children in town, would take no more than two years to complete first grade level work.\textsuperscript{132} The University of Texas offered similar coursework in its education department during the 1930s under the course title "Education 252" under Dr. Herschel T. Manuel.\textsuperscript{133} It also offered another course in the educational psychology department under Dr. George I. Sanchez called "Education of the Spanish-speaking child."\textsuperscript{134}

Starting in the middle 1920s the shift in the emphasis on Americanization from European immigrants to Mexican Americans saw its most visible curricular manifestation in the pedagogy of English-Only. The manuals and guidebooks instilled in the daily lessons of English-Only language exercises also included the related ideas of Americanization. Indeed, for many educators of Mexican Americans, English-Only pedagogy was most valuable because its focus was really on Americanization, they alleged, and not about teaching other academic skills. One teacher commented that "In launching an Americanization program for such a group first place has been given to the substitution of English for Spanish in school

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., November 23, 1926.
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life." More succinct was a Valley principal in the 1930s who claimed of her attempts at teaching English to Mexican Americans that because "Americanization and citizenship cannot be separated," it followed that "education and Americanization are working toward the same ends." The Americanizing aspects of English-Only instruction became embedded in the statewide curriculum in the 1920s and remained so throughout the 1930s and until the 1940s. The Great Depression did not change the Americanization content in English-Only lessons; the way teachers taught Mexican Americans in the 1920s was continued with little modification in the 1930s. Citizenship and hygiene were the topics stressed most after the acquisition of English. One Harlingen principal argued in defense of the no-Spanish rule on her campus that it was effective in teaching English and it also had the salutary effect of "giving lessons in good citizenship." She boasted of the curricular obsession with hygiene, "a subject that must be taught, not stressed."

However, the most significant social ramifications of the application of English-Only pedagogy to Mexican Americans

135 Laura Frances Murphy, "An Experiment in Americanization," The Texas Outlook, 23 (November 1939), 23.
was that it served as a convenient tool for maintaining and/or establishing segregated schools. Language was racialized. One author justified the pedagogical segregation of Mexican Americans on the basis that they were much poorer students in need of special curricula. He also justified separateness on the "race prejudice" of white students who regarded Mexican Americans to be a race as wholly distinct from themselves as were African Americans.\textsuperscript{139} In some respects, the Mexican American's racial distinctiveness in the eyes of many Texans made the language barrier a double hurdle for respectability, a double racial marker. One educational researcher observed that "While the negro's standard of living is equally as low as that of the Mexican, the negro is not such a serious social problem... (1) The negroes speak the English language while the Mexicans do not; (2) the negroes have a separate school system while the Mexicans are legally classed as white and are entitled to school privileges along with other whites."\textsuperscript{140} The existence of the second point was a problem for whites desiring to racially segregate Mexican Americans until the first point, language difference, solved the Mexican's elusive classification.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{139} Meriam, Learning English Incidentally, 22-24.
\textsuperscript{140} E. E. Davis, A Study of Rural Schools in Travis County, Texas. Bulletin of the University of Texas 1916, No. 67 (Austin, Texas: Publications of the University of Texas, 1916), 12.
\textsuperscript{141} Inhabitants of Del Rio Independent School District v. Jesus Salvatierra, 33 S.W. 2d 790 (Texas Civil Appeals, 1930). The Salvatierra case was brought by LULAC against a
In fact, it was viewed by many that the Americanization content of English-Only language pedagogy was so specialized that it could best be taught to Mexican American children in segregated classrooms. One observer of educational segregation in San Antonio schools came to the conclusion that "Better results in Americanization are secured in Mexican Schools than in mixed schools." She went on to unreflectively contradict the standard English-Only rationale for the no-Spanish rule in the defense of Jim Crow:

"Evidently, Mexican children do not profit much by associating on the playground with American children."\(^{142}\)

The practice of segregation for special language pedagogy was widespread. There were other means of justifying school segregation such as cleanliness, Americanization, or simple racial distinction regardless of the law. A principal at a Mexican school in the Valley conducted a study of neighboring school districts and found varying levels of segregation. Two towns in the sample segregated only through the first three grades. Two towns segregated grades one through four, eight in the first five grades, and one school segregated to the seventh. The high schools were not studied but the author assured readers that

\(^{142}\) Quoted in Reynolds, The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children, 12.
many towns maintained separate junior high and high schools as well. The only school in the Valley without pedagogical or any other type of segregation was Brownsville because it contained an almost entirely Mexican American population. This school principal plainly stated the pedagogical reasons for such widespread segregation, "It seems that segregation in the first few grades is best for the Mexican child in order to enable him to become adjusted to and to aid him in overcoming his language handicap." 143

The national emergence of English-Only pedagogy was shaped by the national Progressive Education Movement and by the United States federal government during World War I. However, in Texas English-Only laws were also passed after the war, but applied only to Mexican Americans. The pedagogical makeup of English-Only centered upon assumptions regarding language acquisition; these assumptions were not fully applied to some students while they were ruthlessly applied to others. Mexican American children were taught utilizing the full letter of Gouin's language pedagogy to such extremes as expulsion for the utterance of a Spanish word, wildly gesticulating pantomime sessions, and hands in their face. All other foreign language students in the state operated under a much relaxed system of semi-direct or outright indirect approaches. That young Mexican American students performed miserably under English-Only and that

their failure was not at all unexpected is prima facie condemnation of the practice. Despite this well-documented history of failure, English-Only remained Texas's legally proscribed way to teach non-English-speakers until the 1960s. It has recently (1998) resurfaced in California after some three decades of legal bilingual education there.
Chapter Five:
Intelligence Testing and the Race Science of English-Only, 1910-1940

One of the hallmarks of the English-Only system of mis-education was its use of the racial science of intelligence testing throughout the 1920s and 1930s to justify its pedagogical recommendations of segregation and "special" language instruction. Intelligence testing was an analytical phenomenon originating in the early years of the twentieth century in the international scientific community. It proposed to answer how and why some persons were seemingly bequeathed with more intellectual capacity than others and, more importantly, how such mental gifts could be quantified. In the United States the attempt to measure mental capacity was popular and influential in the formation of Progressive educational policy. Unfortunately, it lead to policy implications that were racist and eugenic.

The subject of intelligence testing fills a significant shelf in the history of science and racism. Some works have deftly exposed the intersection of science with race and have proven popular in both historical, and general intellectual circles. They have also shown the international dimension to the testing phenomenon as well as its peculiarly American manifestations.¹ But the subject of mental measurement is not

¹ For the definitive statement on the sordid history of intelligence testing see Stephen Jay Gould, The Mismeasure of Man (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1981). For an influential work on eugenics, see Daniel J. Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity
only reserved for works of history. In recent years it has taken on added relevancy in popular culture with the publication of the best-selling book *The Bell Curve*, a work that argues for the inheritance of lower intelligence for racial minorities due to genetic and cultural reasons. A number of academic and non-academic commentators have attempted to either refute *The Bell Curve* or to synthesize its policy and historical implications. Even fewer studies, however, have attempted to specifically historicize the educational impact of American intelligence testing on working-class racial minorities and ethnic groups. This

---


chapter will examine the intelligence testing of Mexican Americans in Texas and demonstrate how it affected the state's peculiar educational policies.

The attempt to measure intelligence has been something of an American pastime. It was common in early America and was often determined by examining the individual's degree of outward moral conformity. Those who did not conform to certain societal mores were believed to be either insane or simple-minded. Often the condition was thought to be brought on by excessively sinful living, not by pre-determined genetic forces. Phrenologists in the early nineteenth century, however, were among the first pseudo-scientists to contend that mental traits were predictable. They believed that this could be effected by examining the bumps on the head. In the mid-nineteenth century Louis Agassiz, a Harvard taxonomist, became a leading international proponent of polygeny, the idea that different races of peoples originated from ultimately different sources with different attributes. Agassiz postulated that the allegedly obvious gap in intellectual capacity between Caucasian and Negro individuals warranted the designation of different races as essentially

---


separate species of mankind.\(^6\) As early as the 1880s the connection between the "New" immigrants and higher rates of intellectual deficiency and insanity were being drawn by medical experts.\(^7\) In 1911 the Dillingham Commission on Immigration published a report by anthropologist Franz Boas of Columbia University who measured the size of craniaus of immigrants to determine if those cranial sizes changed (presumably for the better) after living in the United States for some time.\(^8\)

It was from such previous scientific claims with all their attendant racial assumptions of the superiority of white, northern Europeans as well as the intellectual paradigm operative on all educational matters, Progressive Education, that the science of intelligence testing arose. One of the hallmarks of the Progressive Education Movement was the flowering of quantified, experimental, and scientific pedagogy. Earlier scientific theories linking racial determinism to intelligence crudely dealt with cranial lumps, the pointy-ness of the top of the skull, or the refutation of biblical creationism. But by the 1900s scientific testing became favored by Progressives. By scientific testing I mean that psychology, sociology, and other disciplines bent on

---


quantifying human experience replaced philosophy and religion as the prime disciplines of pedagogy; the art of teaching became the science of teaching. The dean of this scientific pedagogical movement was American psychologist G. Stanley Hall.  

Hall embodied the spirit of Progressive Education in that he advocated scientific experimentation in pedagogy. He was widely influential and produced a cadre of students who influenced research on educational matters, especially on intelligence measurement. In 1908 Henry Goddard, one such Hall student, introduced to the United States a form of mental measurement from France called the Binet-Simon test. Goddard utilized the Binet-Simon methods to test the intelligence of selected families in New Jersey; it was widely publicized and influential. This limited application was very much in line with the original tests designed by French psychologist Alfred Binet in 1904. Binet had insisted that his intelligence scale was an objective test whose sole purpose was to determine which of those children tested were in need of some sort of institutionalization. He tested only those with obvious and widely acknowledged difficulty in learning and dealing with the outside world. Binet never tested the intelligence of "normal" children nor did he feel that any one test was capable of such a venture. His test

---


10 Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, 77.
was intended as a clinical tool for determining when to institutionalize, not a magical calculus to mark permanent mental status. However, this limited scope was not preserved by American researchers who used his tool for different ends.\(^\text{11}\)

Another of Hall's students who achieved great fame in the field of intelligence testing was Lewis Terman. In 1916 Terman borrowed the basic Binet-Simon testing procedures and revised them with several different aims in mind. He broadened the test to determine the mental capacity of not just obviously slow children but all members of society. Terman wanted to quantify all levels of intelligence according to the same scale and thought that such measurements could be stable, permanent, and unquestionable markers of intellectual ability. Terman was also the first to popularize Binet's formula by which intelligence could be determined: The raw number was obtained by dividing mental age (determined by performance on the tests) by chronological age to come up with a figure referred to as the intelligence quotient, or IQ.\(^\text{12}\) Terman, a Stanford professor, renamed his 1916 revision the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale.\(^\text{13}\)

Spreading the gospel of Terman's newfound IQ science was Harvard psychologist Robert Yerkes, a disciple of the


\(^{12}\) *Ibid.*, 155 and 175-76.

nineteenth-century American eugenecist, Francis Galton.¹⁴ Yerkes achieved academic and popular accolades for collaborating with Terman and applying Terman's Stanford-Binet exam to thousands of soldiers in the United States Army during World War I. A group of IQ scientists led by Yerkes was commissioned by the United States Army and assigned to the Personnel Branch of the Operations Division, General Staff in 1918.¹⁵ These scientists formed the National Research Council, a branch of the National Academy of Sciences created to aid in the war effort. Yerkes had the support of Surgeon General of the Army William C. Gorgas but very little support from the rest of the military establishment.¹⁶ Very likely this was due to his troubling findings. In one study Yerkes concluded that roughly one-third of the total army personnel of the first and second regiments (enlisted men and officers) scored so low that he recommended they be immediately discharged in order to keep them from endangering the mentally capable soldiers.¹⁷ The IQ scientists viewed their efforts as integral to the war effort.

¹⁴ Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, 80.
since "The victories of war, no less than those of peace, are frequently due to the superior intelligence of the victor." 18

These wartime IQ tests (or army Alpha-Beta tests) offer an illuminating glimpse at the racial and eugenic implications of the new IQ science. One historian notes that according to Yerkes and his colleagues, a full 89 percent of the black men they tested scored in the "moron" range. For Yerkes, this was a clear reflection of the group's low innate intelligence compared to the white soldiers of Anglo-Saxon decent. 19 These wartime IQ tests shaped the field of intelligence testing; they offered supposedly scientific proof of racially determined differences in intelligence. So influential were these IQ tests that their condemnation of the intellect of "New" immigrants of southern and eastern Europe went a long way to justify the later immigration restriction of the 1920s. Yerkes's results spoke decisively to African Americans. Yerkes claimed that "education alone will not place the negro race on a par with its Caucasian competitors." 20 The American IQ scientists from the 1900s to

---


19 John L. Rury, "Race, Region, and Education: An Analysis of Black and White Scores on the 1917 Army Alpha Intelligence Test," The Journal of Negro Education, 57 (Winter 1988), 52. The words "moron," "idiot," and "imbecile," were clinical terms used to describe the degree of feeblemindedness, not as the pejorative terms they are today, See Gould, Mismeasure of Man, 158-59.

the 1920s (Terman, Yerkes, and Goddard), much like their counterparts of the 1970s through the 1990s (Herrnstein, Murray, and Arthur Jensen), were radical political conservatives who in effect argued that no amount of educational opportunity could account for or make up for the inherited IQ deficit of racial minorities.\textsuperscript{21}

The political implication of the works of Goddard, Terman, and Yerkes was eugenic, the assignment of IQ levels to entire racial groups who were to be kept away from others of "normal" intelligence at all costs. The so-called science of IQ became entwined with the so-called science of racism. Terman directly and unabashedly pointed to the eugenic implications of the new IQ science in his own work. In 1916 Terman wrote that certain races of people inherited genetically deficient IQs and that "No Amount of school instruction will ever make them intelligent voters or capable citizens." Of these cognitively handicapped races, Terman got down to brass tacks when he claimed that this level of feeblemindedness was "very, very common among Spanish-Indian and Mexican families of the Southwest and also among negroes." Regarding a specific course of action for the schools in dealing with such laggards, Terman specified, "Children of this group should be segregated in special classes and be given instruction that is practical."

Displaying his racist and eugenic beliefs, he also wrote that

"they should not be allowed to reproduce" and that "they constituted a grave problem because of their unusually prolific breeding." Terman concluded, "They cannot master abstractions, but they can often be made efficient workers."²²

Terman's racism should be distinguished from other types of racism. Terman authoritatively invoked the magical cloak of science behind his pronouncements. In doing so, he attempted to shut off debate on the question of race and IQ with his "scientific" charts, graphs, and tables. Other scholarly and influential figures of the period such as Emory Bogardus, one of the nation's leading Americanization theorists, did not go as far as Terman. Bogardus agreed that Mexican Americans were "as a class...illiterate and subject to narrow visions."²³ However, the subtle difference between the two is that Bogardus the sociologist speculated than an Americanization program could produce good Americans out of what had been inferior Mexican people; Terman the intelligence psychologist knew a priori that Mexicans (he made no distinction between Mexicans and Mexican Americans)

would always be a poor, dumb subspecies of mankind who inherited their low mental abilities.

The notion of educational opportunity was for these hereditarian IQ scientists a false hope. The lack of educational achievement was and always would be caused by the simple lack of IQ. One specialist in the field of mental testing argued that "Since inferior mentality is largely responsible for school failure, and since all studies show that IQ remains relatively constant, we must conclude that the chief cause of failure in the elementary schools cannot be removed...The average failure is not due to poor teaching, to poor health, or to poor attendance, but to lack of ability."\(^{24}\) The IQ scientists brushed aside arguments that immigrant children were handicapped by language in the testing process. This new scientific orthodoxy permitted no such imprecision of causality regarding school failure. One IQ researcher concluded in an analysis of New York City ethnic schoolchildren that "no connection can be traced between school progress and the language difficulty."\(^{25}\)

Those who scored low did so because they were hardly educable. This was a conservative reaction within the scientific, Progressive establishment in education; it was a reaction against Progressive Education's most lasting and


profound educational reform: compulsory education. The result was giving up on the academic education of certain groups of children (as indicated previously in Chapter Four with English-Only) and substituting rudimentary "life skills" courses in the place of academics. Historian Richard Hofstadter described this under-analyzed and often misunderstood countercurrent within Progressivism as "anti-intellectualism." This conservative reaction within Progressive Education, claimed Hofstadter, caused Progressive educators to believe that "in a system of mass secondary education, an academically serious training is an impossibility for more than a modest fraction of the student population." As a result, educators came to defend racially segregated education as an appropriate response to varying levels of intelligence. The IQ science demanded "separate" pedagogy for allegedly backward racial groups, creating a potential subterfuge for school segregation.

* * * * *

The IQ science emerged in Texas in the 1920s only after it achieved full bloom across the nation. As such, it came to Texas with well-established hypotheses regarding the intellectual poverty of all people of Mexican ancestry whether they were immigrants or American citizens. In fact, the Mexican American presence in Texas's educational circles was nationally recognized and commented upon as a significant

---

part of the larger regional problem of education in the Southwest. One southwestern educator stated these claims flatly, "The Mexican child has always been a problem in the public schools and will continue to be one of the problems that our schools face." 27 Pedagogues across the nation pioneered explanations for the massive and widespread prevalence of Mexican American failure, non-attendance, and language difficulty. In the 1920s one of the first groups of pedagogical thinkers to offer explanations and possible solutions for the Mexican American problem were the IQ scientists.

Shortly after World War I the IQ scientists used their new tools to explain why Mexican Americans did not do well in school. One of the first and most influential of such studies was conducted by social psychologist Kimball Young. Studying California students of various ethnic backgrounds, Young explained that the reason for under-achievement by Mexican Americans was not language difficulty. Young succinctly claimed that, "Retardation is in terms of native capacity." 28 This early IQ study was very informed by eugenic sentiments. Warning about the eventual amalgamation of such intellectually marginal peoples with native "Old" immigrant

28 Kimball Young, Mental Differences in Certain Immigrant Groups: Psychological Tests of South Europeans in Typical California Schools With Bearing on the Educational Policy and on the Problems of Racial Contacts in This Country (Eugene, Oregon: University Press of Oregon, 1922), 96.
stock, Young argued "That the biologically inferior tend always to mix with their kind...is not so. The History of the Jukes, the Kallikaks, the Nams and others proves to the contrary." Young was referring to several prominent eugenic studies, especially Goddard's eugenic tract of the Kallikak family of New Jersey. Goddard's deliberate use of photos which were doctored in order to make the Kallikak family appear less intelligent has only recently been exposed.  

Most of the IQ research was conducted in order to determine certain specific questions regarding school policy. One such question was the attempt to quantify the degree of Mexican American backwardness. Don Delmet, a school superintendent in California, published an article from his USC master's thesis on the degree and specificity of retardation prevalent among Mexican American schoolchildren, based on his use of Terman's Stanford-Binet tests. Delmet concluded, "On the whole, the subject scores made by grades 3 to 8 inclusive on the Stanford Achievement Tests show age retardations from about 2 years and 2 months to 4 years and 10 months." Most of the national studies corresponded to the range of two to four years of retardation. Psychologist Thomas R. Garth, in a study of the performance of Mexican

---

29 Ibid., 80.
30 Gould, Mismeasure of Man, 170-73. With help from a photography expert, Gould demonstrates that the photos of the institutionalized members of the family were left as they were while the mouths of their rural kin in separate photographs were darkened and made to look gaping while their eyes were made to look like dark, menacing slits.
31 Delmet, "A Study of the Mental and Scholastic Abilities," 278.
American servicemen in the army Alpha-Beta tests, argued that "This places the average Mexican just two years behind the average American." Garth offered some encouragement, however: "It would appear that his intelligence is at least not below that of some other foreign born men as for instance Greek, Russian, and Italian."\textsuperscript{32}

Other educational ramifications of IQ science were the implementation of "special" curricula and physical segregation. Terman in the 1910s had argued for strict segregation since he alleged that it was physically impossible for certain groups of people (Mexican Americans, for example) to comprehend true academic lessons. In the 1920s Terman continued with his previous recommendations. He argued of slower students that "the curriculum beyond the eighth grade should be almost entirely vocational."\textsuperscript{33} For some, "special" curricula did not necessarily mean vocational education. USC language expert Junius Meriam cited the low IQ scores of Mexican American children as support for his own language pedagogy methods. Meriam rhetorically asked, "Free from all the convictions of the traditional school with its curriculum of 'readin', 'ritin', 'rithmetic'; free to do what one's conscience dictates as the most serviceable schooling possible for these brown-skinned foreign-tongued children; what would an earnest school man and his teachers attempt?"


Meriam's answer was four hours of supervised "play" that consisted of classroom games, stories, handwork, dance, songs, and playground time all through the first four grades. In terms of measuring this education with the education given to non-segregated, English-speaking children, Meriam noted that any such comparison would be unfair since the method and goals of the two were so completely different.\textsuperscript{34}

Recommendations of segregated education also appeared in the national IQ literature on Mexican Americans. Meriam conducted his research at an experimental laboratory school at a labor camp for migrant workers outside of Los Angeles. The cornerstone of this research was that it be conducted in an entirely segregated institution. In fact, Meriam was very much the Progressive educator in that he argued that such segregation was completely necessary from a pedagogical standpoint in order to implement his "special" play curriculum whereby the English language (and presumably little else) would be learned incidentally, a by-product of an English-Only classroom with extremely low formal expectations.\textsuperscript{35} Kimball Young argued that mental defectives (minorities) should be segregated from those of older, native stock on the basis of intelligence. In his study of California children Young argued for precisely such a segregation into "special" English classes when local school

\textsuperscript{34} Junius L. Meriam, "An Activity Curriculum in a School of Mexican Children," \textit{The Journal of Experimental Education}, 1 (June 1933), 305 (quotation) and 306.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Ibid.}, 304.
administrators determined "the influx of children born abroad constituted an immediate problem." 36

Another question the national IQ tests attempted to answer with regard to Mexican Americans was how such mental inferiority was inherited. One scientific explanation went that inheritance was passed on to succeeding generations through "germ plasm." Vaguely defining germ plasm as "a thing independent of disease and circumstance, capable of producing mutations and combinations," one IQ researcher noted that it had been shown that inferior traits could be eliminated from people by selective breeding as one might practice with horses or cattle. 37 One Arizona study attempted to correlate IQ with a wide range of physical characteristics commonly used to mark racial difference such as skin color (exposed and unexposed), hair color and texture, face width, tooth structure, nasal index, stature, height, etc. It was found that the greater the amount of indigenous (Native American) blood or germ plasm, the lower the children scored on the tests. IQ scientists concluded that those of Native American germ plasm had lower intelligence, which produced less academic success. 38

36 Young, Mental Differences in Certain Immigrant Groups, 67.
38 Franklin C. Paschal and Louis R. Sullivan, "Racial Differences in the Mental and Physical Development of Mexican Children" in Comparative Psychology Monographs, Volume 3, Walter S. Hunter, ed. (Baltimore, Maryland: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1926), 61-66 and 73.
The new IQ science first spread to Texas after World War I in the form of curiosity and debate provoked by Terman, Yerkes, and their Army Alpha-Beta tests. In 1919 a Texas educational bulletin appeared that recounted and contrasted the performance of the state's draftees on Yerkes's IQ tests with the performance levels of other states. 39 Immediately after the war's end the publication arm of the Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA) was already running advertisements from the World Book Company for the sale of Terman's Stanford Revision of the Binet-Simon Scale. Their potential was allegedly boundless. The ad recommended that "Mental ability should, indeed, be the fundamental basis for all grading, classification, and promotion. A mental test for every pupil for every year ought to become the rule." 40

In the early 1920s the new IQ science, while nationally popular, had not yet made a lasting imprint in the state educational establishment. In a study of Karnes County, educational researcher E. E. Davis examined large numbers of European enclaves (people of Polish, Swedish, and German background) as well as Mexicans that totaled close to one half of the rural county's total population. Davis made mention in several different parts of the study of the generally accepted notion that Mexican Americans had low

40 Advertisement, "Are Your Pupils Properly Graded?" The Texas Outlook, 5 (August 1921), 18.
intellectual capacity, but nothing beyond school failures were offered in support of his contention. The idea of low mental inheritance for Davis was to be casually observed, not to be proven. In another study, however, Davis argued against the inheritance of low intellectual capability by conceding that "It is most likely that the case works both ways. To some extent illiteracy may beget farm tenancy and farm tenancy may beget illiteracy." He argued that feeblemindedness and farm tenancy bred one another, "The mentally inferior are more likely to become tenants than they are to be homeowners." Even the law in the early 1920s failed to recognize a role for testing in the legal determination of feeblemindedness. A petition from a resident of the county was enough to bring a competency hearing.

The first real splash that IQ testing made in the state's educational establishment came in the middle 1920s from two comparatively sophisticated IQ researchers from the University of Texas, Helen Lois Koch and Rietta Simmons. Commissioned by a state educational research agency called

---

41 E. E. Davis, A Study of Rural Schools in Karnes County. University of Texas Bulletin, No. 2246 (Austin, Texas: Publications of the University of Texas, 1922), 7-12.
the Texas Educational Survey Commission, Koch and Simmons conducted a series of tests on the state's different racial groups. They operated independently from the State Department of Education and were supported by Governor Pat M. Neff and other statewide political leaders. Koch and Simmons popularized the notion of measuring the innate intelligence of schoolchildren, especially comparing the performance of separate racial groupings. Their findings and recommendations were endorsed by the state and commented upon favorably by numerous local school districts wishing to scientifically justify "special" pedagogical classification of Mexican American children. These findings were published in a variety of influential forums: a statewide report by the survey commission, a nationally renowned monograph series in psychology, and the monthly magazine of the TSTA. Unlike Terman, however, these Texas IQ scientists remained somewhat skeptical about their ability to produce accurate measurements of true intelligence. They claimed,


"Our intelligence tests are apt to measure environmental factors as well as 'innate abilities'."\(^{46}\) This was a very perceptive insight by Koch and Simmons and one that most IQ researchers would not recognize until the 1930s. In the 1920s most researchers in the IQ measurement community felt that innate intelligence could easily be measured. As such, many of this era's test questions were quite sloppy and naive in design. They measured educational achievement more than innate intelligence.\(^{47}\)

Despite the cautious attitude of Koch and Simmons, there were several methodological flaws in their testing practices. They oversimplified the complex issue of socioeconomic status by claiming to have taken account for it with the use of a rural-urban background designation. As inadequate as this designation might have been, Koch and Simmons also failed to analyze all the children tested through this rural and urban

---

\(^{46}\) Koch and Simmons, "A Comparative Study of the Performance of White, Mexican, and Negro School Children," 193.

\(^{47}\) Supposed to measure "innate" IQ, many of these questions in fact quizzed test-takers more on their knowledge of consumer-oriented and culture-specific issues geared to persons of middle class, urban, and northeastern background. For examples taken from the army Alpha-Beta tests see Gould, Mismeasure of Man, 200.

"Crisco is a: patent medicine, disinfectant, toothpaste, food product"

"Christy Mathewson is famous as a: writer, artist, baseball player, comedian"

The answers are "food product" and "baseball player." Such were the frivolous questions that labeled an entire generation of immigrants and minorities congenitally stupid.
filter, their only socioeconomic control. The white and Mexican testing data were broken down in rural-urban groups, but the African American scores were analyzed without any socioeconomic or class indicator because they did not bother to test rural African Americans. Such methodological omissions cast a shadow over the intentions of the whole enterprise.

The Mexican American sample also contained questionable methodological errors. None of the Mexican American children were pre-tested in order to discover the level of bilingualism and English language usage they may have had. Koch and Simmons explained that their tests were designed so as to render the knowledge of English completely unnecessary to take the exam. Curiously, they added that even though English ability was superfluous, translators were nevertheless provided for the Mexican American youngsters; they translated simple commands and instructions such as "Stop," "Go," and "Whole Page." In addition to translating the exam, the interpreters extemporaneously made up hand signals and non-verbal gestures to communicate what they could not literally translate. They also admitted that whenever the interpreters corrected a child's mistake in the test-taking process, it "tended to confuse or embarrass the pupil." Even though Koch and Simmons insisted that their

49 Koch and Simmons, "A Comparative Study of White, Mexican, and Negro Children," 194.
tests made "small demands upon the linguistic powers of subjects," their contrary efforts build a healthy modicum of skepticism from even the most detached observer about the charade-playing abilities of the test proctors. Apparently the instructions were not getting across, which would doubtless cause the hesitation, confusion, and anxiety scored against the student in the determination of innate IQ.50

Unlike with African Americans Koch and Simmons dealt with the subject of class within the Mexican American sample. Mexican Americans occupied a very malleable place in the hierarchy of race in the 1920s. This malleability refers to the idea that the racial categorization of Mexican Americans depended in part upon their class status. Those of poor backgrounds were treated as definitive racial groups to be separated from whites. Those of middle or more elite class background were referred to as white or in possession of purer "Spanish" blood.51

For both Mexican Americans and African Americans the pigmentation levels of "light," "intermediate," and "dark" were used as categories of analysis; no attempt was made to analyze "white" scores through such a pigmentation filter.

50 Ibid., 206-7.
51 This understanding of Mexican Americans as the weak link in the chain of racial being—capable of definition as either white or black according to the interplay of class background—owes much to the pioneering theoretical and historical work of authors Mario Barrera and David Montejano. See Mario Barrera, Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979); and David Montejano, Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1987).
The results were confusing. In several different places in the study, the authors claimed that the lighter the pigmentation the higher the score; conversely, the darker the pigmentation the lower the score. They concluded for the Mexican American children that "The most lightly pigmented Mexicans tend to react more successfully to the tests than do the darker Mexicans." This observation was repeated with African Americans: "The lighter the Negro the better, usually, his performance on our tests." Directly in between these two conclusions Koch and Simmons inserted the all-important disclaimer, "Our results, however, are not very decisive."^{52} Koch and Simmons were sure about the mental inferiority of African Americans but were more hesitant about sweeping statements regarding Mexican Americans. For this group that was not quite black or white, the issue was more complex. In addition to detailing the socioeconomic poverty of Mexican Americans (the African Americans were ignored), Koch and Simmons also doubted their own ability to accurately define the pigmentation levels. Koch and Simmons determined this three-tier gradation by examining faces, hands, and necks. For Mexican Americans especially, this would have been complicated by the use of cosmetics or by the amount of time the children may have spent in the sun (all related to class). In spite of their general conclusion that lighter skinned persons eventually scored more intelligent than those

---

^{52} Koch and Simmons, "A Study of the Test Performance of American, Mexican, and Negro Children," 83 and 107.
of darker hues, Koch and Simmons plainly admitted on several different occasions that the pigmentation groupings of their Mexican American sample failed to conclusively demonstrate that pigment mattered at all in the measurement of intelligence. After all of that work, the results were inconclusive. Inexplicably, Koch and Simmons ignored the fact that their own research indicated "none of the color groups to be consistently superior." They still went ahead and concluded that lighter colored people were smarter.\(^5^3\)

Although Koch and Simmons were influential and their work published prominently, the limits of their scholarship illustrate how inadequate this early IQ science really was. Koch and Simmons confused their a priori assumptions with legitimate scientific conclusions. Nevertheless, they appear to have been much more thoughtful and sophisticated than many of their IQ-testing colleagues. Another participant in the emerging IQ science was University of Texas professor William H. Sheldon. He regarded white scores as the bar of "normal" intelligence to which all other races would have to meet. Like Koch and Simmons, Sheldon regarded African Americans at the bottom of the respective IQ barrel with whites (of American or English ancestry) at the top and the Mexican American in a tenuous middle position. Sheldon concluded that the average Mexican American child had an intellectual

\(^{53}\) *Ibid.*, 83-84.
ability 85 percent that of the average white child.\textsuperscript{54} Sheldon conducted his IQ exams without much sensitivity or foresight. His racial antipathy toward his subjects affected his judgment. When faced with the prospect of testing small Mexican American boys and girls in a language they did not understand, Sheldon explained that he translated what was not readily understood with "a sort of Spanish-English dialect colloquially called 'spic,' or mongrel Spanish."\textsuperscript{55}

Some other early IQ tests either conducted by Texas researchers or by others upon Texas schoolchildren sought to determine the degree of Mexican American mental retardation and why it was so. University of Texas researcher O. K. Garretson concluded that the average Mexican American was ten and one half months behind average white intelligence and that there were 30 percent more Mexican Americans exhibiting IQ retardation than the whites.\textsuperscript{56} Citing the work of Koch and Simmons in his own study that utilized Mexican American schoolchildren from Texas, the prolific IQ scientist Thomas R. Garth found that the average Mexican American child was mentally retarded by slightly over one year. Garth found

\textsuperscript{54} William H. Sheldon, "The Intelligence of Mexican Children," \textit{School and Society}, 19 (February 2, 1924), 141-42.

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Ibid.}, 140.

that over 80 percent of Mexican Americans allegedly exhibited such feeblemindedness.\textsuperscript{57}

The new IQ science was anything but exact. Garth, a psychologist from the University of Denver, was one of the nation's leading IQ figures with regard to Mexican American intelligence and used Texas students to build his national studies. Garth was concerned with the "tendencies peculiar to racial germ cells and not to environmental influences alone." But in trying to define just what the germ cell or "germ plasm" was, Garth only produced confusion. Upon determining the degree of Native American and Spanish "germ plasm" in the Mexican American children he was studying, Garth noted that he "took at its face value the classification of the white teachers of the several schools who said that they knew the subjects to be Mexicans [of mixed blood].\textsuperscript{58} This is the only way he was able to differentiate the mixed germ plasm of Mexican Americans from the pure germ plasm of specific Native American tribes or unadulterated Spaniards (a massive contradiction). Like Koch and Simmons, Garth also had trouble in obtaining the desired conclusion regarding lower IQ and racial amalgamation from his own research.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57} Thomas R. Garth, "The Intelligence of Mexican School Children," \textit{School and Society,} 27 (June 30, 1929), 794.
\textsuperscript{58} Thomas R. Garth, "A Comparison of the Intelligence of Mexican and Mixed and Full Blood Indian Children," \textit{The Psychological Review,} 30 (September 1923), 389. Garth received a grant for this work from the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences in 1921.
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Ibid.}, 400-401.
The state accepted the conclusion of the IQ researchers in the 1920s and made segregated classrooms a part of the curriculum where it stayed long after these tests and studies came under serious academic challenge from more sophisticated scholars. As late as 1936 former State Superintendent of Public Instruction Annie Webb Blanton, then a professor of educational administration at the University of Texas, repeated the conclusions that Mexican Americans were well below the average white in IQ. Contradicting Koch and Simmons's findings that urban Mexican Americans scored much higher than rural ones, Blanton argued that all Mexican Americans were intellectually deficient regardless of socio-economics or geography. She also concluded that "they are one or more years too old for the grade in which they are classified" and inferred that such low educational achievement was synonymous with low IQ. 60

In local communities with significant numbers of Mexican American students, the work of this early IQ science (especially that of Koch and Simmons) was utilized regularly in the 1930s to predetermine school status. In the South Texas town of Donna, IQ tests were given to all Mexican American children once a year. 61 In the Valley town of La Feria, one school principal wrote that his school used IQ tests often. Citing works by Koch and Simmons as well as by

---


Garth, the administrator was well aware that Mexican Americans were considered to be of lower intelligence. However, this principal argued that occasionally a Mexican American student measured well against the white scores. He also questioned the precision and sophistication of the IQ science, "Language handicap is partly responsible for the lower scores Mexican children sometimes make on intelligence and achievement tests."\(^{62}\)

Some early IQ scientists attempted to refine their studies in the late 1920s and early 1930s in order to answer criticism that their results confused educational achievement with innate capability. Garth concluded that low scholastic achievement was indicative of low intellectual capability and that the influence of environmental factors was not borne out by his evidence.\(^{63}\) However, it is significant that Garth by the 1930s had to defend the nature of his results from arguments that it confused innate IQ with educational achievement. Others in the IQ establishment like Garth re-examined their own methods in response to criticism that they measured language handicap rather than true IQ and denied any compelling evidence for such criticism.\(^{64}\)


The IQ science conducted in the early 1920s when the movement was in full bloom showed fissures in its foundation by the late 1920s and early 1930s. The newer IQ scientists alleged that in the zeal to label minorities and ethnic peoples as intellectually defective, these scholars stripped from the science much-needed social context. The social context now being brought into the field was a growing sophistication of the test questions and methodology, a skepticism regarding the quantification of "innate" intelligence, and a realization that socio-economic and educational background could radically alter test scores and make group comparison almost impossible. Prodded in part by vigilant minority scholars who exposed the systematic mistesting of minority children, the larger academic community in the decades from the 1930s to the 1960s looked for more sophisticated methods to isolate environmental factors. Testing did not diminish in importance; it was just done with a more critical eye toward external influences.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{55} The work of Texas researchers such as George I. Sánchez and Herschel T. Manuel during this period will be examined later. Two African American scholars who influenced the shift toward critical scrutiny of IQ testing were Horace Mann Bond and Allison Davis. See Horace Mann Bond, \textit{The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order} (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934), chapter fifteen; and Allison Davis, \textit{Social-Class Influences Upon Learning} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948), 46-59. For secondary analysis of the work of African American scholars who in the 1930s and 1940s questioned IQ testing see William B. Thomas, "Black Intellectuals, Intelligence Testing in the 1930s, and the Sociology of Knowledge," \textit{Teachers College Record}, 85 (Spring 1984), 477-501; and Michael Ackerman, "Mental Testing and the Expansion of Educational Opportunity," \textit{History of Education Quarterly}, 35 (Fall 1995), 292-95.
One of the first things to change about IQ science from its heyday in the 1910s and early 1920s was its sense of absolute certainty. One textbook on intelligence testing dedicated to Lewis Terman in the 1940s illustrated this loss of confidence in the enterprise of IQ science when its author claimed that one should not assume "that every IQ should remain 'constant' within the limits of a 5-point range of variation." This author exposed another chink in the armor of testing: "A second source of error comes from the tendency to think of an IQ as something resident in the child, not dependent upon the test used in deriving it." While these sentiments were not something that Terman and his cohorts would have disagreed with per se, their popularization of the new IQ science in the 1910s and 1920s never made such potential limitations public knowledge.\textsuperscript{66}

The shift in the 1930s was influenced by the changes in the nation. The Great Depression brought a renewed emphasis upon economics and class as a major factor in human life. As such, much newer scholarship alleged that the IQ science derived innate intelligence numbers on the basis of prejudicial, class-based testing procedures. This notion of cultural prejudice informed much of the more sophisticated and critical testing done from the 1930s to the 1960s.\textsuperscript{67} One study of Italian American children in New Jersey in the 1930s


\textsuperscript{67} Davis, \textit{Social-Class Influences in Learning}, 47-49; and Bond, \textit{Education of the Negro}, 314-16.
illustrated the degree of importance that environmental factors were beginning to play. This scholar attempted to isolate school achievement, nationality, the language spoken in the home, and socio-economic status in his intelligence testing in order to more conclusively demonstrate the wide disparity of scores within a single group like Italian Americans.68

Cultural anomalies that inhibited fair comparison were brought out for discussion in this shift of the IQ science. In studying language ability and bilingualism one study noted that such environmental influences meant more for educational achievement in some ethnic communities than in others, especially when language was involved. In the newer work increased attention was drawn to refining non-verbal tests to more accurately measure any possible language handicap. The skepticism toward the validity of group (racial) IQ differences exhibited by the younger members of the rapidly changing IQ research community set the stage for more culturally or socially based reasons (sociology) for the differences in scores. The old eugenic surety was dying fast and the new lack of certainty regarding mental measurement was rapidly gaining strength in academic circles.69

In regard to the Mexican American, the national literature began to point away from innate mental deficiency and toward the idea of social ills such as poverty and language handicap as the reasons for low IQ scores. Even in the later works of the old-line IQ pioneers, tacit approval was granted to the young dissidents who stressed the relevancy of flexible culture over static intelligence. USC Sociologist Emory Bogardus devoted an entire chapter on the socio-economic cleavages within the Mexican American community in Kimball Young's edited monograph on American social attitudes. Bogardus obviously contradicted the earlier work of Young, an early race scientist.\textsuperscript{70}

The notion of language handicap rather than innate racial inferiority as the culprit in low test scores became a dominant theme as the purpose of IQ testing shifted from determining eugenic policy to developing more sensitivity toward social and cultural issues. One of the first salvos of criticism against the old IQ science for its mishandling of language in racial comparisons of test scores was unleashed by a Columbia University education professor, Rudolf Pinter, in the late 1920s. Pinter boldly stated that "Any attempt to make direct comparisons between different racial groups must be done without language. It is perfectly absurd to imagine that any real comparisons can be obtained

by translating tests from one language to another." Pinter pointed to the obvious obstacle with which some children labored on IQ exams by taking them in a language they did not understand. If one wanted to compare racial IQs, claimed Pinter, there was only one way to do so and it was "testing adequate samplings of national groups within their own countries that we may approximate some knowledge of racial or national differences in intelligence." The Columbia University critic was not radical. Pinter did not dismiss the whole enterprise of IQ testing; he just pointed to flaws and shoddy methods that undermined IQ testing's scientific credibility.

By the 1930s the dominant position in the field of intelligence measurement regarded the language handicap as especially difficult to isolate from the test data. So-called retardation by bilingualism replaced retardation by germ plasm. One textbook stated that "Children who grow up in an environment where two languages are concurrently used suffer some word-concept confusion," and that "There can be no doubt that the child reared in a bilingual environment is handicapped in his language growth." A few scholars were

---

71 Rudolf Pinter, "Non-Language Tests in Foreign Countries: Racial Differences," *School and Society*, 26 (September 17, 1927), 374. See also Rudolf Pinter and Seth Arsenian, "The relation of Bilingualism to Verbal Intelligence and School Adjustment," *Journal of Educational Research*, 31 (December 1939), 255-63.


more skeptical about the influence of the language handicap. Margaret Mead, a noted Anthropologist, experimented with IQ testing on Italian American schoolchildren in the late 1920s when the previous generation of IQ science was beginning to experience serious criticism. Mead was more radical in her critique of the previous IQ literature when she argued that "Classification of foreign children in schools where they have to compete with American children, on the basis of group intelligence test findings alone, is not a just evaluation of the child's innate capacity." She argued that the language factor was not adequately addressed in previous IQ tests, thereby severely limiting their practical validity.\(^{74}\)

While scholars around the country debated the degree of importance that bilingualism and language difficulty posed for IQ tests, Texas scholars led the way in rethinking the language handicap. In doing so they thrust their work on Mexican Americans in Texas into the forefront of national debate regarding the influence of language in testing.\(^{75}\)

\(^{74}\) Margaret Mead, "Group Intelligence Tests and Linguistic Disability Among Italian Children," \textit{School and Society}, 25 (April 16, 1927), 468.

the Texas challengers to the IQ science establishment, this
debate was about nothing less than the complete
rehabilitation of the innate intelligence of the Mexican
American child. They did so by identifying Mexican American
low scores as having more to do with a "language handicap"
than with "an indication of lower native capacity."  

An article by a University of Texas professor of
educational psychology, Herschel T. Manuel, and Edinburg
Junior College professor Carrie E. Wright, cleared the way
for shifting the burden of low Mexican American educational
achievement from racial heredity to a recognized language
handicap. Manuel and Wright differed from previous research
by claiming that the chief cause of low scores was language,
not heredity. Foreshadowing the bilingual education movement
of some four decades later, Manuel and Wright in the 1920s
even flippantly questioned whether or not the public schools
should "carry on instruction in Spanish in the early grades"
for Mexican American children.  

Manuel and Wright came to their conclusions by
subjecting the previous generation of IQ testing practices to

Sánchez, Segregation, and Enduring Dilemmas in Bilingual
Education," Teachers College Record, 84 (Summer 1983),
871-907.

76 H. T. Manual and Carrie E. Wright, "The Language
Difficulty of Mexican Children," Journal of Genetic
Psychology, 36 (1929), 466. All forms of testing
(intelligence and achievement) lost some luster after the
1920s. For Texas comment on this see Jarmon Alvis Lynch,
"Achievement Tests and the Dewey School," The Texas Outlook,
14 (January 1930), 62-64.

77 Manuel and Wright, "The Language Difficulty of Mexican
Children," 461.
rigorous critical analysis. They conducted a study of comparative experimentation in which "a Spanish translation of a standardized English reading test was made and used as a rough equivalent of the original." They tried to see if crafting a carefully translated test by a team of language experts would produce a version that would be as close to the English original as possible. It was found by the team that many words and phrases lost meaning or changed meaning in the translation.\textsuperscript{78} Not only could they not succeed in simply translating the full meaning of test in all its subtlety, but they also found that education only in English without any Spanish language instruction in the schools was causing a "dual" language handicap in Spanish as well as in English. The low test scores were not due to innate low intelligence, but to the complexities of the language issue for which the flawed IQ tests did not account. Mexican Americans children still scored low on tests and still did not succeed in schools, but now the interpretation of such results changed from race to culture.

Herschel T. Manuel published his groundbreaking research in teaching manuals and in academic journals. In one pedagogical journal Professor Manuel addressed the problem of Mexican American education by somberly noting that "On the average the Spanish-speaking children are about a year and a half below the English-speaking children of the same age in

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 461-62.
arithmetic, and in reading a little over two years below." Manuel offered several explanations for this institutionalized failure that de-emphasized IQ as an explanation and emphasized social factors such as language, poverty, racism, nativism, and the failure of Americanization. In addition to noting the "extreme poverty" and economic exploitation common to many Mexican American laborers of the time, Manuel also tackled the language issue: "They are taught from the beginning in a language which is foreign to them and, in most of the public schools at least, have little or no contact with written forms of their own native language until they enter high school." Manuel reiterated the significance of the language handicap as one of the main reasons for the low IQ scores whose validity he discounted. Among all other factors that Manuel considered negative (racism, poverty, Americanization, and nativism), he gave primary emphasis to the idea of a dual language handicap. In 1930 Manuel reiterated his efforts to rehabilitate the innate intelligence of Mexican American boys and girls by avoiding two common errors: "In the first place, it is grossly unfair to assume that conditions found in the lowest social group or even at the average are
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79 Herschel T. Manuel, "The Educational Problem Presented by the Spanish-Speaking Child of the Southwest," School and Society, 40 (November 24, 1934), 693. One line of demarcation separating the IQ scientists of the 1910s and 1920s (Garth, Sheldon, Terman) and the social scientists of the 1930s and 1940s (Manuel and Sánchez) is the change in terminology referring to Mexican American identity—they went from being called Mexican to Spanish-speaking.

80 Ibid., 693 (quotation) and 694.
characteristic also of children at the proper end of the scale. In the second place, it is wrong to imagine that present cultural conditions are an adequate measure of innate possibilities."\(^{81}\)

But Manuel was not alone. Accompanying him on his mission to undermine the racist assumption that Mexican American children were mental defects was a University of Texas professor of educational psychology and history, George I. Sánchez. A native New Mexican (he directed the New Mexico State Department of Education for a time in the 1930s), Sánchez was also active in Mexican American politics and leadership organizations and was the model of an activist scholar. Sánchez took on the IQ science establishment early in his career.\(^{82}\) One of his earliest articles from the 1930s discovered that in addition to the meaning slippage common in all translations—as earlier demonstrated by Manuel—there were a number of vocabulary words that, pedagogically speaking, were impossible for non-English-speaking children to master in the IQ tests. As many as 114 words used in the Stanford-Binet tests (for ages three to eight) were not even included in the vocabulary lists learned by Mexican American children in the corresponding grades. So these children were being tested on words they were not yet even taught.\(^{83}\)

\(^{81}\) Herschel T. Manuel, "The Spanish-Speaking Child," The Texas Outlook, 14 (January 1930), 47.


Sánchez exhibited obvious disgust for the IQ establishment's attempt to hide racist intent behind the curtains of science. So Sánchez attempted to draw back that curtain and expose the flawed science for what it was—poorly constructed but convenient rationalizations for racism. He took on the big names of the field with apparent relish. Regarding the claim of IQ science giant Thomas R. Garth that half of Mexican American children were of inferior IQ, Sánchez commented scathingly, "Such a wholesale indictment of a people would be indefensible—yet such are the results of test application. Who would champion the thesis that half or more of Spanish-speaking, or any other such, group is dull, borderline, and feeble-minded when it is generally accepted that only 7 per cent of 'normal' groups may be so classified? However, such a champion would find test-results to support his cause."

Sánchez offered an environmentalist critique of the racialized results of IQ testing similar to the conclusions of Herschel Manuel, his colleague at the University of Texas. His critique stressed racism, poor educational opportunities, poverty, flawed tests, and language as the keys to deciphering low performance in intelligence measurements. He feistily claimed that "The frequent prostitution of democratic ideals to the cause of expediency, politics,

---

vested interests, ignorance, class and 'race' prejudice, and to indifference and inefficiency is a sad commentary on the intelligence and justice of a society that makes claims to those very progressive democratic ideals."\(^8^5\) Sánchez was no radical, however. He was not willing to seriously question the entire educational system, just the racism inherent in it. He severely criticized the IQ science but did not abandon hope for its potential to reform itself by shedding its racist and eugenic heritage. He best stated this cautious position in one article: "While it would be shortsighted to propose the abandonment of mental tests in the bilingual problem, and nothing herein contained should be so interpreted, a note of caution in their use is in order."\(^8^6\)

The work of Manuel and Sánchez embedded itself in the official curriculum of the State Department of Education in the 1930s and 1940s. This did not mean that IQ measurements were not used, only that they were used in more sophisticated and sympathetic fashion. One statewide education manual from the late 1930s said of Mexican Americans in a very matter-of-fact tone that "Intelligence tests administered in Spanish show that the majority of them are of normal mentality."\(^8^7\) By the late 1920s the commonly practiced method of testing prospective students in the elementary grades was to mark the

---

\(^8^5\) Ibid., 770.
\(^8^6\) Ibid., 771.
test scores of Mexican American children who presumably may have been suffering from a language handicap apart from the other scores. 88

The shift in IQ science did not translate into measurable gains for Mexican Americans in their quest for greater educational opportunity. If anything it meant that the Mexican American child was still regarded a problem. By not challenging English-Only pedagogy—the centerpiece of the entire educational system for Mexican Americans—the new shift simply eased the sharp edges of the IQ club, which nevertheless still remained a club. Instead of carrying about them a presumed IQ deficiency, Mexican American children were now presumed to be carrying about them a cultural deficiency of language. In removing the alleged flaw of low IQ from the Mexican American child, the new shift simply posited another flaw in its place to explain the failure of the educational system: deficient culture. Educational theorists substituted the blame from racial inheritance directly to cultural inheritance; from "germ plasm" to the "dual language handicap."

Proof of this melancholy assessment is offered by way of legal testimony in the Salvatierra case of 1930. This case was the legal linchpin of the segregation of Mexican American children in public schools in Texas from 1930 to the 1960s.

In it the Texas courts decided that segregation was legally acceptable as long as it was not done for reasons of racial exclusion. The only segregation permissible was segregation by or for pedagogy, or more specifically, segregation by English-Only pedagogy. In defense of his school's strict segregation of Mexican American students from the Anglo students, the superintendent of public schools in Del Rio, a small border town in southwest Texas, answered a question posed about their intelligence level in telling fashion. He said, "So far as mentality is concerned there is no perceptible difference in the mentality of children of Spanish or Mexican descent and those of children of Anglo-Saxon parentage, but there is a little difference in temperament." They were not considered less mentally capable as whites. But by temperament the superintendent meant that the Mexican American children exhibited great frustration at learning verbal subjects (due to language handicap which he discussed at length) while they excelled at non-verbal subjects such as mathematics and art. This educator in sworn testimony rejected any belief whatsoever in the innate mental deficiency of Mexican Americans. And yet the result of his statement—the defense of racial segregation—was still the same. When Mexican American children were first tested with IQ tests, their supposedly innate low IQ scores were reason enough to segregate them on a pedagogical basis. The defect in intellectual ability was proved by later science to be illusory, but the dire social consequence, pedagogical
segregation, remained. Only now such segregation was justified through a modified science alleging a cultural inability of Mexican Americans in the subject of language. After Salvatierra in 1930, the only legal basis for segregating Mexican Americans was pedagogical, English-Only pedagogy.\(^{89}\)

English-Only pedagogy from the 1910s to the 1960s depended upon pedagogical justification; in Texas this was especially so if segregation was the aim. Intelligence testing provided English-Only pedagogy with just such a rationalization. Restricted by the intellectual shackles of that particular time, such testing (and consequently English-Only itself) was greatly influenced by eugenics and racism. On the basis of IQ testing, decisions on educational policy and pedagogy were made to significantly reduce educational opportunity for large numbers of people. In Texas it specifically curtailed opportunity for Mexican Americans. So even though the unabashedly eugenic and racist IQ science of the 1920s changed its skin in the 1930s in stressing environmental and cultural reasons like language for poor scores, the shift actually meant little more than exchanging one set of reasons for inferiority and segregation for another supposedly kinder and gentler set. In the end, the Mexican American child was still segregated and still failing school.

Chapter Six:  
World War II and the Pedagogical Shift Away From  
English-Only, 1923-1962

Although English-Only dominated the academic and professional landscape of the education of non-English-speakers from World War I through the late 1960s, it did not achieve such dominance without challenge or change. Since the 1920s there existed strong legal, political, and pedagogical dissent from the practice of English-Only instruction. Also, English-Only pedagogy underwent a subtle transformation as the social context that had created it, early twentieth-century Progressivism and nativism, changed with the arrival of World War II. Specifically, Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy contained educational implications for the schooling of Mexican Americans (then called Latin Americans). In Texas such policy reflected an important opportunity to change the general attitude toward educating Mexican Americans. Finally, the national literature on both language acquisition and how language reflected (or did not) innate intelligence underwent a substantial shift in the 1950s and 1960s, modifying the thinking about and implementation of English-Only. All told, these unspectacular alterations in English-Only thought and action set the stage for the eventual revolution in pedagogy and politics that ushered in the modern bilingual education movement of the 1960s.

1920s and 1930s
The earliest and most important obstacle to the full implementation of English-Only was the United States Supreme Court. The state of Nebraska, like Texas and many other states, passed English-Only statutes during World War I in an effort to promote the English language among the many immigrant children in its public and private schools (Nebraska's immigrants were mostly German American). On May 25, 1920, between 1:00 and 1:30 PM, teacher Robert T. Meyer at the Lutheran Zion Parochial School in Hamilton County, Nebraska, instructed one German-speaking student, Raymond Parpart, in the subject of religion, normally a completely legal action. Meyer taught, however, by means of several German language bible stories. Word of this reached the local authorities Meyer was charged, tried, and convicted of violating Nebraska's English-Only law of 1919, which carried with it a fine of $25 to $100 or thirty days jail time. Meyer appealed to the Nebraska state courts and lost until his appeal reached the United States Supreme Court in 1923.¹

Robert Meyer's appeals to the Nebraska Supreme Court and to the United States Supreme Court held important ramifications for the right to teach foreign languages both as a course of study and as a means of instructing other content areas. The distinction needed legal clarification. Meyer and his attorneys chose argue that the state's regulation of his parochial school's ability to instruct either a foreign language or other content lessons in a foreign language interfered with the right of parents to determine the substance of their own children's education and was therefore a violation of the fourteenth amendment. The Nebraska Supreme Court quashed Meyer's appeal in 1919, the same year that the law took effect. It noted mostly nonlegal arguments in support of the statute. Such nonlegal arguments consisted of citing statistics from the federal wartime draft that pointed to large numbers of illiterates and non-English-speakers in the population. The connection between this pressing social problem and its solution through English-Only proscriptions was deemed self-evident by the court. As partial justification the court found that in the year 1919 alone, nine other states had passed similar statutes.²

The judges also dabbled in a bit of unsubstantiated pedagogical discussion about the merits of English-Only

policy. In theory the court allowed for some very limited amount of translation in selected cases but ultimately defended the alleged success of English-Only instruction as obvious, a simple matter of common sense. The majority opinion written by Justice Charles Letton asserted such claims: "The assertion that it is necessary to teach Polish in order to teach English does not seem well founded...We think we are not bound to draw the conclusion that because children, when they first attend school, cannot understand or speak English, they must be taught the language of their parents, whether Polish or Bohemian, in order that they may learn English, otherwise no children of foreign-speaking parents attending the public schools, wherein no other language than English is spoken, could ever learn the language. It is common knowledge that the easiest way to learn a foreign language is to associate only with those who speak and use it. Of course, the occasional use of a few words of the language of the home would not, if good faith is used, violate the act, as seems to be feared." \(^3\) Only a short number of years before such "common knowledge" was commonly exercised to protect bilingual schooling.

The United States Supreme Court in 1923 overturned the Nebraska Supreme Court's earlier denial of Meyer's appeal by ruling that Nebraska's English-Only law did indeed violate the fourteenth amendment. In reversing the state's ruling and its 1919 English-Only law, the Supreme Court argued that

\(^3\) *Ibid.*, 1693.
barring the existence of some sudden state emergency (World War I had ended), the infringement upon the rights of parents to choose in which language their children should be educated was not justified. They also claimed in regard to Nebraska's use of state emergency powers that "Mere knowledge of the German language cannot reasonably be regarded as harmful." However, the Supreme Court appeared to sympathize greatly with Nebraska's predicament. The majority opinion editorialized that "The desire of the legislature to foster a homogeneous people with American ideals, prepared readily to understand current discussions of civic matters, is easy to appreciate. Unfortunate experiences during the late war, and aversion toward every characteristic of truculent adversaries, were certainly enough to quicken that aspiration. But the means adopted, we think, exceed the limitations upon the power of the state, and conflict with rights assured to plaintiff in error." While the state of Nebraska had every right to pursue such social aims in the public schools that it financed, the United States Supreme Court ruled that in the area of private schools, language was only liable to regulation from the state in times of dire emergency, non-existent by 1923.

The Meyer v. Nebraska challenge to the primacy of English-Only was limited. To this day it has yet to be

---

5 Ibid., 1451.
overturned and was regarded at the time as a most significant case in the area of school law and regulation. While it meant that states would be less able to fully police the languages of private schools, it nevertheless left unscathed English-Only in the public schools. In fact, the courts even sympathized with the desire of states to create English-Only laws, just not for the private schools. The judges, while they certainly did not advance very pedagogically sophisticated arguments, still based their decisions in part on what they perceived as the obvious success of English-Only in molding American citizens out of what had been foreign-speaking children. English-Only was no longer one language pedagogy out of several competing ones; it had reached the status of paradigm. English-Only by World War I had become a systematic outlook on language and learning that set the stage for all debate on the subject, instantly making certain ideas like native language instruction in the early grades taboo. By the time English-Only achieved dominance after World War I it was embedded in the law as illustrated in Meyer v. Nebraska, in pedagogy as shown by the scientific justifications, and in the minds of most Americans as common sense.

In the 1930s the United States witnessed the continued dominance of English-Only pedagogy. But also in this decade

---

there began to emerge some pedagogical dissent within the academic community, usually by those educators closest to large populations of non-English-speaking children. This shift was especially notable in Texas and other parts of the Southwest with their large Mexican American populations. In these places English-Only was already coming to be regarded as a failure. The local educational authorities may have enforced English-Only ruthlessly, but they simultaneously hinted at grave doubts as to the pedagogy's success rate. Due to the racism of the time as manifested in the Americanization component within English-Only pedagogy, most educators doubted the total effectiveness of English-Only but viewed it as the only practical solution to an insolvable problem: the education of innately ignorant Mexican Americans. But as indicated in Chapter Five, by the late 1920s and 1930s there appeared a shift in the academic community on the educability of Mexican Americans; scholars came to regard Mexican American potential less as non-existent and more as simply unfulfilled due to the shadows of poverty, racist schools, and impoverished culture. It is in this intellectual context of the late 1920s and 1930s that the first significant pedagogical attacks upon the foundation of English-Only came from educators in the Southwest.

The shift against the direct method in language pedagogy and toward new types of bilingual instruction was something of an international development. Linguists from the United States were in contact with colleagues in Mexico who were in
contact with other linguists around the world, including those in the Soviet Union. In Mexico where there were roughly 130 separate language groups (mostly indigenous), bilingual instruction had met with pedagogical acceptance in the 1930s along with some semi-official acceptance from Mexico's President Lázaro Cárdenas himself. By this time in the United States the language difficulties in the schools of the territory of Puerto Rico had long been considered a problem. In one pedagogical manual from 1935 a doctrinaire English-Only theorist wrote of her exclusive use of the direct method (only English) in the schools of Puerto Rico. But the administrative head of education on the island who wrote the foreword to her monograph neglected to defend English-Only: "Several methods of teaching English have been tried; but nobody as yet has arrived at any final conclusions on the matter of method." He went on to hedge his own professor's conclusions before the reader was even able to get to them: "In fact, we state nothing dogmatically."

By the 1930s English-Only as it was practiced in Puerto Rico since the United States occupation was widely regarded a massive failure. However, that it failed was interpreted by many U.S. educators and public leaders not as evidence of the

---


pedagogy's failure but rather as evidence of the Puerto Rican people's inability or lack of interest in learning English. The victim was blamed. Repeated attempts at enforcing English-Only for four decades only to slide back into Spanish as the dominant instructional language due to intense local pressure in Puerto Rico led the United States government in 1937 under the direct order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to again mandate English-Only. Of course it failed again. In 1947 Puerto Ricans were finally allowed to choose their own commissioner of education, and he solidified Spanish as the medium of instruction in the early grades with English taught as a second or foreign language. Franklin Roosevelt remains perhaps the only United States chief executive to come so close to officially declaring English as the nation's official language.

In the continental United States the great pedagogical innovations working counter to English-Only were found in Texas and New Mexico among the universities and teachers colleges that trained the educators of Mexican American.

---


10 Melvin C. Resnick, "ESL and Language Planning in Puerto Rican Education," TESOL Quarterly, 27 (Summer 1993), 263-64.
children. One of the American pioneers in the early scientific experimentation with bilingual instruction as an alternative to English-Only was Lloyd S. Tireman of New Mexico. Tireman's work was oft cited by Texas educators in the 1930s and 1940s who explored options within and even outside the realm of English-Only. Tireman was an Iowan who migrated to New Mexico in the late 1920s and began a series of laboratory schools that worked with New Mexico's language minorities. He pioneered the use of a pre-first grade class (a form of kindergarten) for Mexican Americans who did not speak English. In the process of such work, Tireman found that if young Spanish-speakers simultaneously studied Spanish, then their scores and performance level in all other school subjects, such as English, for example, improved. Then after a sabbatical in which Tireman toured Europe to study language techniques, he discovered bilingual education and toyed with the idea in his own laboratory schools in New Mexico, notably the San José school. Tireman felt that a European-style bilingual program would not function in the American Southwest where Mexican Americans, he felt, had not the same level of culture and literacy.\textsuperscript{11}

Tireman had a very unique outlook on bilingualism. He regarded bilingualism itself as a cognitive, intellectual plus. Bilingual instruction was different, however. He regarded that as a novel approach with some potential merit.

but not yet a scientifically justified or proven approach. Tireman saw no immediate payoff for bilingual instruction. As much emphasis as he placed on the teaching of Spanish to Spanish-speakers (Spanish as an academic course apart from English or other subjects) to improve overall intellectual ability, it was for the sole purpose of the rapid acquisition of English. Theoretically, bilingual instruction (which Tireman was not doing) offered possibly similar end results according to his own experiments, but not immediately. So while Tireman represents one of the first direct assaults upon the theoretical edifice of English-Only pedagogy through his flirtations with bilingual education, he would never have conceived of his actions as such. Tireman felt that he was broadening and stretching the direct method of English-Only pedagogy when, in fact, he had progressed so far from it that he was unknowingly beginning to work counter to it.  

Tireman’s intentional efforts to push the boundaries of English-Only to its logical limit and then unintentionally to its illogical conclusion were widely publicized. Tireman’s work was cited prominently in a federal education report on the Southwest in 1933. The report gave considerable attention and discussion to Tireman’s groundbreaking experiments regarding language in the classroom. Annie

---

Reynolds, the author of the federal report, reported of Tireman and his work that "So far as information is available, the proposed experiment at the San Jose Training School is the first instance of an expression of interest in an experiment with a foreign language in teaching pupils of foreign speech in the United States."

English-Only had become so dominant in the pedagogical discourse of language instruction that Reynolds viewed Tireman's semi-serious flirtations with bilingual instruction in 1933 as a completely new thing owing derivation from pedagogical practices in Europe and in Africa; the earlier bilingual tradition had been effectively wiped from historical and institutional memory in the United States. After advancing several arguments as to the inadvisability of introducing the native tongue to teach English which cited New Mexico's Tireman and Texas's Herschel T. Manuel, one national guidebook on teaching Spanish-speakers ultimately hedged on such indirect methods of instruction. The author felt compelled to conclude that "it seems at present that no positive conclusions can be formulated regarding the merits of either a modified or a complete bilingual program until more experimental evidence is available."

---


The impact of Tireman's work in Texas was great in the 1930s. In an educational world divided by those teachers who cared little for their Mexican American charges and those who cared deeply for them, Tireman's work was allied with those teachers who were most sympathetic and even activist in the cause of Mexican American education. Tireman's work represented the most and the best that scientific pedagogy had to offer to the situation and many teachers who appropriated Tireman's ideas spoke of them as they would their own. Most of the sympathetic teachers in the 1930s and 1940s, still operating from the pedagogical paradigm of English-Only, assimilated Tireman's experiments into their own curriculum. But they did so without Tireman's potentially radical tinge of bilingualism for English acquisition. Usually their appropriation of Tireman's work centered upon the use of Spanish for incidental reasons, "she will need it in conversing with the parents of the children; in sympathizing with some small child that gets hurt." This teacher (who also cited H. T. Manuel) went on to write that "Often by means of a few Spanish words one can gain the love and confidence of a child." However, she stopped at that boundary of English-Only that Tireman had only briefly crossed: "Never give the Spanish word first for we do not wish the children to translate from Spanish to English, but to think in English."  

edge of pedagogy in the 1930s, the dominance of English-Only was such that certain things like bilingual education existed only as exotic European or international techniques in the realm of theory and not of the real world of the actual classroom.

The growth of interest in Mexican American education during the 1930s was a small educational shift which took its place among much larger watershed changes in society, notably the Great Depression and the New Deal response. The attitudes of strict Americanization and clearly defined racial separateness, while still strong in most areas of Texas, were beginning to break down slightly, giving way to more liberal and sympathetic (if not slightly paternalistic) attitudes. Just as the researchers in the IQ community were abandoning eugenic arguments of Nordic, white superiority over minorities like Mexican Americans, African Americans, and Native Americans, the broader shift in attitude of the 1930s also affected language policy. In addition, the age-old practice of segregation was now being seriously questioned in some official quarters.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\) This general softening of racial boundaries and racial antipathy should not be overstated. I do not mean to imply that racism toward Mexican Americans generally was that much less intense or effective. But there existed a noticeable softening of attitudes among some in the educational community. By the educational community I mean teachers, administrators, bureaucrats, and university professors. It is in this selective and influential community where there developed the slight growth in tolerance, a noticeable desire to treat Mexican Americans more fairly and to promote intercultural exchange. The explosion of Chicanismo and confrontation in the 1960s is a result of the ultimate failure of this shift of the 1930s and 1940s to achieve its
Taking advantage of this new social milieu, Mexican American leader J. Luz Saenz, a founding father of the League of Latin American Citizens (LULAC), wrote a number of articles in the state education journal, The Texas Outlook, regarding language policy. In 1939 Saenz argued that as the United States girded itself to meet the dangers of fascism and dictatorship, it needed all of the Latin American allies it could get in its own hemisphere. Saenz then explained that the central corollary to such a foreign policy was the better treatment of those "Latin Americans" then living in the United States as American citizens, meaning Mexican Americans. Saenz argued against the widespread racial prejudice directed against Mexican Americans, especially in the schools and in the school curriculum. He claimed: "It is un-American to foster historical prejudice, especially in our American public schools. Mastery and use of English and Spanish languages will bring true understanding in the new world."\(^{17}\) Saenz, a Texan and decorated World War I hero, articulated one of the most important influences in the state's language policy during the 1940s: Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.

1940s

First, some background as to the national Good Neighbor Policy should be given. Next to war materials production

potential in removing the barriers to educational opportunity.

\(^{17}\) J. Luz Saenz, "Spanish From Another Angle," *The Texas Outlook*, 23 (August 1939), 11.
educating on the home front was thought of as one of the most important of domestic weapons in the American arsenal.\textsuperscript{18} The hysteria directed against Mexican Americans that characterized the state during World War I was noticeably absent in World War II. For one, by 1940 there were more American-born Mexican Americans of clear American citizenship than there were recently arrived Mexicans who were not citizens. The tremendous number of Mexican Americans (300,000) who served in the armed forces during World War II were more than any other American ethnic group.\textsuperscript{19}

Now appearing more than ever in The Texas Outlook were compassionate laments regarding the plight of Mexican Americans. One teacher, citing statements by Mussolini on the bitterness between the United States and Mexico, pronounced of the "150,000 Mexicans in Texas" that "The invasion of Germany by way of the fifth column has shown clearly that we should have acted more wisely long ago in educating and protecting and strengthening the bonds of friendship. Good neighbor tours may impress national leaders, but the real need is to impress every individual. The people should be welcomed in community activities as far as they are capable and helped to become more capable."

Although this teacher from San Antonio seemed to mix Italian

\textsuperscript{18} C. R. Van Nice, "Adapting the School Public Relations Program to the War Emergency," The Texas Outlook, 27 (March 1943), 24.

and German threats, she was crystal clear as to the real purpose of American institutions, "The duty of Texas and the United States toward Mexicans should be one of mercy and intelligence."

The figurative tearing of clothes by sympathetic teachers who felt that the educational system in Texas mistreated the Mexican American became a commonly expressed theme. Recounting the squalid and overcrowded conditions in which she was forced to teach, one teacher stated, "I strive to find the best way to do my job with sixty squirming little Mexicans." The fault was not with fellow educators, she insisted, but with the broader attitudes of society that allowed such conditions to be acceptable in the first place. She claimed, "Our progressive superintendent is earnestly trying to do all he can to help solve this problem." This cotton-county teacher then followed with the observation: "The board has a deeper interest in the school for the white children. If they would only realize that in the Mexican school lies a fertile field for richer and united community living!" As with the writings of Mexican American leader J. Luz Saenz, this teacher brought her argument to conclusion with the wartime emergency, "I say give these Mexican people an equal educational advantage and in ten years this

---

20 Anna Woodfin, "Our Mexican Obligation," The Texas Outlook, 25 (August 1941), 19.
community's Good Neighbor Policy would be a fact and not something that the government has crammed into our minds."\(^{21}\)

Even moldy and arcane academic treatises were not immune to open reflection upon the impact of the spirit of Good Neighborism on their own studies. One early study operating within the intellectual confines of English-Only still managed to rigorously question the pedagogy. This study also cogently attacked institutional segregation. In her MA thesis at St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Henrietta A. Castillo, a Mexican American scholar, began with a substantial discussion of the recent "good neighborliness" as war seemed imminent. Castillo viewed the alleged educational handicaps of Mexican Americans (she too had trouble with what name to use) as ultimately fixable, but only if a massive shift in priorities, resources, and attention were given by state and local officials to the glaring inadequacies of Mexican American education.\(^{22}\) Other scholarship published in wider venues experimented with new ways to make English-Only live up to its promise of linguistically assimilating Mexican Americans in rapid time, something it admitted was


\(^{22}\) Henrietta A. Castillo, "Educational Handicaps of the Latin-American Children in the American Schools" (MA thesis, St. Mary's University, 1941), 4-6 and 10-12. Castillo found the terms Latin American, Mexican, Spanish, or even American inadequate and potentially misleading compared to the simple non-ethnic designation of Spanish-speaking and English-speaking. She ultimately settled on the trendy phrase of the 1940s, Latin Americans. Although most misleading, the term Latin American for Mexican American did offer a nice resonance with Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy and its Pan-American rhetoric.
difficult.\textsuperscript{23} One oddly situated master's thesis in 1943 directed by University of Texas Professor George Sánchez, infamous for his scathing reviews of racist intelligence testing, even went so far as to argue that not using vernacular instruction was pedagogically staid. Like its maverick thesis director, the important questions raised by this work would not be undertaken seriously by scholars until the 1960s.\textsuperscript{24}

There was no getting away from the mantra of tolerance, diversity, brotherhood, and sympathy between the United States and its siblings south of the Rio Grande. The Good Neighbor sentiment, whether it was referred to as such, or as Pan-Americanism or Inter-Americanism, was all-pervasive; it infiltrated most institutions in the crisis spirit bred by war. This was before the spirit became embedded in the statewide educational bureaucracy which it was to accomplish very soon after the start of World War II.

One national outgrowth of the new mood in education that had unique and powerful implications in Texas was the Foreign Language in the Elementary Schools (or FLES) movement. While the FLES movement during World War II was perhaps stronger in Texas than it was in any other state, it had national origins apart from Texas that deserve recognition. There is scant

attention paid to the FLES movement by scholars, none by historians. One of its founding fathers, linguist Theodore Andersson, is actually its principal recorder. FLES initially began among selected language departments in American urban school systems such as Cleveland's in the 1920s and 1930s that sought to reintroduce foreign languages in the primary grades which had been absent since urban school systems abandoned the bilingual tradition decades before.

Defining when FLES became a movement or for that matter when it obtained a significant influence in school language policy is difficult, given the scant historical record. The reason for its growth was that public leaders and educators worried at the inability of American combatants to understand or master foreign languages during World War II. That worry fed the FLES movement across the nation and in Texas during the war. In fact, FLES owed a great deal to Franklin

---


26 Theodore Andersson, The Teaching of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School. Preliminary Edition (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1953), 4-5. Other pioneering cities were New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, and El Paso. This was the first work published that actually conceived of itself as part of a larger, national movement of foreign language teaching in the elementary schools. Andersson followed up this small monograph—still very much a work in progress—with a more complete history in 1969.
Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy, first enunciated in 1938, as a driving force in the reorientation of many school districts from a sharp intolerance of foreign languages in the early grades (in some states enforced by statutory law) to encouragement of such curricular goals. This was a significant shift in fundamental attitudes toward other languages, and Texas led the way.\footnote{Theodore Andersson, \textit{Foreign Languages in the Elementary School: A Struggle Against Mediocrity} (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1969), 86-87.}

Texas schools during World War II fed the still-nascent FLES movement with one of the most rigorous efforts across the country in Spanish language instruction. The desire of public leaders and educators in Texas regarding this sudden new shift in attitude, owing largely to the crisis of war, was to not just encourage biculturalism but to also encourage a certain degree of bilingualism as well. Even scholars in the universities who were unconnected with the FLES movement published prominently about the need to teach foreign languages for more than just two years in the high school. This was, claimed one Baylor linguist, tantamount to not really teaching language with any effectiveness at all. This expert claimed that high schools should instruct foreign languages for four years at the very least.\footnote{J. C. McElhannon, "Case for a Foreign Language," \textit{The Texas Outlook}, 27 (March 1943), 60-61.}

Much of the mania for language instruction in Texas during World War II dealt with the Spanish language. The most obvious policy implication of Spanish in the elementary
grades would be with white, English-speaking children. Two university educators wrote of the new appreciation, which was to be found "not only in this state but throughout the nation," that "knowledge of Spanish on our part is basic in our Good Neighbor Policy." They argued that "Spanish has been recognized as an essential feature of our defense program." In an ironic twist related to English-Only, these educators sought to reform teaching Spanish as a foreign language in Texas schools by introducing "The so-called natural method...to develop these skills." The use of all Spanish textbooks to be read and listened to by the non-Spanish-speaking class without the use of English, truly the direct method version, was being experimented with in the elementary grades. What they were talking about was Spanish-Only pedagogy to white, English-speaking elementary school children! This would require more than usual from the primary grade teacher: "An elementary school teacher of Spanish should have a good accent; she should speak the language fluently; she should be acquainted with, and sympathetic toward, the Spanish Americans; [and] she should have had special training in the problems of elementary

29 T. Earle Hamilton and Charles B. Qualia, "Spanish in the Grades," Ibid., 25 (June 1941), 50. By "natural method" these educators meant the use of Spanish-Only, for example, in teaching Spanish as a foreign language to non-Spanish-speakers. This is something that made pedagogical sense even to educators in the 1920s but was denigrated as too harsh while pure English-Only for non-English-Speakers was the rule of the day.
30 Yetta Mae Slayton, "Why Not Spanish Readers?" Ibid., 26 (July 1942), 40.
teaching and in methods of teaching Spanish." Statewide experts considered implementing in Texas the pioneering curriculum of the elementary Spanish program initiated by the Corpus Christi school district under teacher and administrator E. E. Mireles.\footnote{Hamilton and Qualia, "Spanish in the Grades," 51. E. E. Mireles and his language program in Corpus Christi represents an important theme in the story of the Mexican American response to English-Only pedagogy and is a subject of Chapter Seven.}

But teaching white, English-speaking children Spanish in Spanish-Only classrooms was not the end of it. One of the most novel spinoffs of the new emphasis on language instruction in Texas was the teaching of Spanish to Spanish-speakers! One Austin observer noted that "For over a century Texas tried to forget her Spanish and Mexican past. She looked upon with contempt, fought against and tried to stamp out every thing Spanish or Mexican." That "Stop-Speaking-Spanish clubs" were at that very moment being replaced by elementary-level instruction in Spanish mandated by the state's public leaders and education officials was quite an irony for the commentator. That Texans were expressing a desire to make Texas "a bi-lingual state" was a tremendous opportunity to build bridges between the two communities. After noting that instruction in Spanish at a tender age would not hurt the capacity of Mexican Americans to speak English, the observer hinted through first-hand experience that those instructed in two languages from an early age
mastered each tongue with greater ability than monolinguals trying to learn a second language later in life.\textsuperscript{32}

In addition to the language-oriented policy aims for Texas schools, many correctly pointed out that the ultimate aim of all this language instruction was the teaching of cultural tolerance through the broadly defined theme of "Pan-Americanism." This was 1940s-style multicultural curriculum, the bicultural corollary to bilingualism. One teacher referred to the primary emphasis on language instruction when she said that "More emphasis is being placed upon the spoken language." However, she noted that "In connection with the learning of the language, information about the people and their country is given in belief that a true understanding may make way for better appreciation of one another."\textsuperscript{33} In addition to teaching language, the classes should be used to impart some experience of other cultures and attitudes. The organization of Pan-American clubs, banquets, socials, field trips to Mexico, and shows were advised to stimulate more interest in Latin America.\textsuperscript{34} One school in West Texas under their "Attitudes to be developed" criteria of Pan-Americanism listed: "1. Understanding of our Mexican neighbor. 2. Friendliness toward Mexican people. 3. More tolerant attitude toward Mexico and Mexican people."\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32} K. Rocque Wellborne, "Spanish for Children of Hispano Descent," The Texas Outlook, 25 (December 1941), 33.
\textsuperscript{33} Rosalie Montgomery, "Pan-Americanism in Texas Schools," Ibid., 17.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 17-18.
\textsuperscript{35} Autalee Notgrass, "Down Mexico Way: Middle Grade Unit," Ibid., (August 1941), 53.
Texans supported Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy in a variety of individually inspired ways. Some even worked on Good Neighbor issues outside of federal direction before the war began. A Latin-American institute took place in the summer of 1941 on the campus of East Texas State Teachers College with a diverse group of panelists and speakers "To provide an opportunity for students, teachers, school administrators, business and professional people, members of clubs and others to broaden their knowledge of Latin America."\(^{36}\) Some universities like the Texas State College for Women attempted in 1941 to broaden their future teachers by taking part in a summer language institute in Saltillo, Mexico. Participants hailed from Texas, Iowa, Massachusetts, California, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The course work was to prepare the aspiring educators to teach Spanish and to pass on first-hand cultural knowledge. The institute was repeated in 1942.\(^{37}\) Even booming wartime tourism to Mexico was linked to Good Neighborism.\(^{38}\)

The administrative connections between the Good Neighbor Policy's domestic ramifications and other local efforts were organized through the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, which was situated in the State Department and reported directly to the president. Thirty-two-year-old Nelson Aldrich "Rocky" Rockefeller accepted leadership of this

\(^{36}\) "Latin-American Institute," \textit{Ibid.}, (June 1941), 39.  
\(^{38}\) Lawrence Martin, "Mexico Unrolls the Red Carpet of Welcome," \textit{Ibid.}, 21.
agency in 1940. One of the directives of the agency was the oversight and support of Good Neighborism in the public schools. During the war domestic Good Neighbor educational policy became important enough to distinguish it from other international educational efforts. Accordingly, a separate Department of Inter-American Affairs within Rockefeller's administration was created in 1943, and it had within it a Division of Education and Teacher's Aid. The new division had three mandated goals: teacher training, the distribution of educational material, and assistance in the implementation of Spanish programs. Regarding the first goal, a number of "Inter-American Workshops" were established. The division assisted in the creation of new teaching materials but spent much more time in the distribution of existing educational materials through a clearing house in the Office of Education. Finally, this educational arm of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy also aided state educational agencies in the creation of Good Neighbor curricula. Texas was singled out as the state with the most cooperation with the Inter-American Education Division. The division, in conjunction with the statewide Good Neighbor Commission of

---

40 Ibid., 109-10.
Texas, helped produce a number of documents relating to the status and experience of Spanish-speakers.\textsuperscript{41}

An ignored aspect of World War II diplomacy was the inter-cultural domestic diplomacy directed by the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs and directed toward Mexican Americans. This was brought home forcefully by Mexican American leader J. Luz Saenz in another Texas Outlook article in which he made the distinction between foreign policy to Latin Americans abroad and domestic policy to Latin Americans at home. Domestically, Good Neighborism meant treating Mexican Americans better. Luz claimed, "The urgent need of more closely knit understanding and solidarity between the Latin-American and Anglo-American nations touches both Americas, but we must not neglect the same need toward Latin Americans born and raised within the confines of the United States."\textsuperscript{42}

In the State Department of Education in Texas, the official federal Good Neighbor Policy found a willing partner and friend. There is, however, little scholarship on the Good Neighbor policy's effect on the curriculum of Texas schools.\textsuperscript{43} The federal Inter-American Education division was

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{41} H. Stephen Helton, Preliminary inventory of the records of the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Record Group 229 (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Record Service, 1952), 89.
\textsuperscript{42} J. Luz Saenz, "Has Time Come?" The Texas Outlook, 26 (April 1942), 44.
\textsuperscript{43} Chief among contemporary accounts of the educational implications of the Good Neighbor Policy is Pauline R. Kibbe, Latin Americans in Texas (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1946), chapter eight. A recent study of Good Neighbor Policy at work in the Texas
the agency responsible for working with the State Department of Education in Texas, but so was the Texas Good Neighbor Commission; they overlapped. Texas had a Good Neighbor Commission that acted on complaints as to racism in the state or abuses in the recently enacted Bracero Act that allowed documented workers from Mexico to work and live in the United States. The Texas Good Neighbor Commission also worked with other agencies, including the State Department of Education, to alleviate the burden that discrimination exacted from Mexican Americans. The Texas Good Neighbor Commission's membership included prominent Mexican American educators such as Carlos E. Castañeda, a University of Texas Professor of Latin American history who aided the State Department of Education in its curriculum revision and also served on President Roosevelt's Fair Employment Practices Commission.

But it is important to note that the Good Neighbor mood was substantial enough within the general populace to warrant attention on its own before the Department of Education

decided to institutionalize Good Neighbor thinking and personnel into its educational policy machinery. The educational influences of the Good Neighbor Policy actually began before the inception of the statewide Good Neighbor Commission in 1943; it did not have to be ordered from on high. One State Department of Education official in Texas commented on the obvious connection, "To activate the 'Good Neighbor Policy' through our schools is surely a worthwhile project, but one which requires leadership, constant interest, and steadfast determination." She claimed that this determination was why "Since November of 1942, the State Department of Education in Texas has, with the very active cooperation of the Office of Inter-American Affairs and of the Inter-American Relations Division of the Office of Education, been making some effort to bring about a greater interest in our neighbor republics."  

For many Texans it then made sense to form Pan-American organizations and to reevaluate the curriculum to better fit the needs of the newly discovered "Latin Americans" in their own backyards. As in many of the examples given in the previous pages, there were locally inspired efforts at Good Neighborism undirected by any agency. However, the most important aspects of this policy shift in the statewide educational system occurred because of an official connection.

---

between the federal and state agencies. The previously mentioned federal Inter-American Education division of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs office became over time intimately connected with the State Department of Education in Texas. It was more heavily involved with the Texas agency than any other in the country.\footnote{Kibbe, Latin Americans in Texas, 108 and 112-13.}

The State Department of Education in Texas cooperated closely with the Inter-American Education office in Washington on a number of policy committees designed to revamp the curriculum in the public schools for all children, including Mexican Americans. After receiving a grant from the Office of Inter-American Affairs in Washington, the Texas State Department of Education created a new sub-layer of bureaucracy within itself called the Inter-American Relations Education division, which became the administrative apparatus for the assimilation of Good Neighbor ideals into the everyday practice of education in the state.\footnote{L. A. Woods, Thirty Third Biennial Report. State Department of Education, 1942-1943, 1943-1944, No. 447 (Austin, Texas: State Department of Education, 1944), 9-10.} It was an ambitious undertaking. Contemporary participant Pauline Kibbe (the Texas Good Neighbor Commission's secretary as well as having served on the State Department of Education's own Good Neighbor policy committee) labeled this educational policy shift which took its cue from Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy as the "movement" of Inter-American Education
in Texas, a description that even if overstated, nevertheless captures the monumental possibilities ushered by war.\(^{50}\)

The results of the Good Neighbor spirit on state educational policy were significant. There were three central accomplishments by the movement: one, the undertaking of a massive study of the educational conditions of Mexican Americans; two, the instigation of numerous meetings and workshops to promote better instructional techniques and information regarding Mexican Americans; three, the revision of statewide curriculum in such a way as to promote more tolerance, acceptance, and understanding of Mexican Americans which would blunt the sharp edges of Jim Crow discrimination. All of the above efforts dealt directly with new approaches to the language dilemma, demonstrating the lack of full confidence in English-Only pedagogy as it had been practiced for decades.

Perhaps the most important educator in Texas involved in this effort was George I. Sánchez of the University of Texas. Sánchez served as the chair of the Committee on Inter-American Relations in Texas at the University of Texas, a position that put him forward as the spokesperson for the university committee. He left the statewide committee assignments temporarily to serve as an educational consultant to the federal Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. In this capacity Sánchez also published a bibliography of material on the education of Mexican

\(^{50}\) Kibbe, *Latin Americans in Texas*, 104.
Americans.\textsuperscript{51} Austin schoolteacher Connie Garza Brockett, initially a member of the several statewide committees for the State Department of Education, was moved to the federal level in 1943 to head the Division of Education and Teacher Aids in the Office of Inter-American Affairs in Washington. Herschel T. Manuel was also involved in the university's efforts with Sánchez on the university committee as was Myrtle Tanner, the head of Inter-American Relations Education committee of the State Department of Education of Texas. So Sánchez was a member of the federal, state, and university committees. Manuel was a member of the university and state committees. Tanner headed the state effort and was involved in the university's efforts. Brockett was involved with the state and later headed the federal initiative. Texans were not only well represented in the domestic arm of the Good Neighbor Policy, but Texas was the most active of all states in actually implementing it into the statewide education system.\textsuperscript{52}

One important aspect of Good Neighborism in Texas was a groundbreaking study on the Mexican American child by the State Department of Education. The author was William Little, the project director for the University of Texas


committee. The report was called The Spanish-Speaking Child in Texas. Rather than focus on instructional technique, Little instead turned his attention to examining all that took place in the name of English-Only "special" instruction, notably segregation. Little noted that all of the "special" instruction took place in vastly inferior buildings staffed by teachers who were often untrained in the very "special" instruction they were supposed to be giving. While claiming not to condemn or condone such practices, Little's closing questions indicate his true opinion as well as the opinion of his university supervisors Sánchez and Manuel: "Is it not obvious that present practices in the education of these children need honest appraisal in terms of generally accepted purposes of education in American democracy? Do not present practices suggest tremendous waste, both of human resources and of money?" 53

Little's ambivalence about the real effect of Texas's English-Only laws was clearly a break from the previous official attitude of the state's pedagogues. Many of these experts now distrusted the practice of English-Only but could not recommend anything in its place. Within the State Department of Education the war appeared to have unleashed a certain institutionalized skepticism which bordered on cynicism regarding English-Only; finally, there existed the possibility for real change in the education of Mexican Americans. The educators of the previous two decades planned

53 Little, Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas, 62.
on a certain amount of failure from English-Only, but under
the then-prevailing racist attitudes of the supposed cultural,
intellectual, and physical inferiority of Mexican Americans,
pinned blame of failure upon the Mexican American children
themselves. Educators at the top decision-making level of
Texas were now freer of such nonsensical rationalizations.
They faced the failures of English-Only as it was stripped of
much of the racial and ideological baggage of its origins.
These educators, even the most advocacy-oriented of them such
as Sánchez, did not go the extra step in recommending the
dismantling of English-Only in favor of some sort of
bilingual instruction. But they now viewed the failures of
English-Only in a new, less-biased light, which was indeed
significant.

The second major component of all of this coordinated
effort by state, university, and federal committees and
agencies was the formation of several conferences, workshops,
and public lectures to promote the Good Neighbor movement,
especially in seeking ways in which the education of the
Mexican American child, particularly regarding language,
could be improved. After Texas College of Arts and
Industries at Kingsville, Southwest Texas State Teachers
College in San Marcos, and Sul Ross State Teachers College at
Alpine contacted the State Department of Education about
furthering Pan Americanism (also called Inter-Americanism),
the federal Office of Inter American Affairs suggested more
statewide direction. This resulted in the creation of a
statewide conference in Austin in January 1944 on Inter-American education, which was attended by ten of the state's higher education institutions. Numerous regional conferences ensued over the next two years.\textsuperscript{54}

Another conference in Austin in April 1944 illustrated the number of prominent educators and officials involved in what Pauline Kibbe, the secretary to the Texas's Good Neighbor Commission, referred to as the Inter-American Education movement. In addition to the attendance of university professors in language and education and State Department of Education staff, the program also included nationally prominent pedagogue Lloyd Tireman from New Mexico and college presidents such as E. N. Jones of Texas College of Arts and Industries (a member of the State Department of Education's Inter-American Relations Education in Texas committee) and John McMahon of Our Lady of the Lake College in San Antonio. The workshop's recommendations were to eliminate racial prejudice, to upgrade the teaching of Spanish in the elementary grades to all children, to increase the number of Pan-American clubs and organizations, and to pare down the amount of pedagogical segregation justified by language.\textsuperscript{55} Not willing to question English-Only as cynically

\textsuperscript{54} Kibbe, Latin Americans in Texas, 107-08.
\textsuperscript{55} Myrtle L. Tanner, Teacher Training Workshop, Inter-American Relations Education: Program, Personnel, Reports, Recommendations, Summaries. University of Texas, Austin, Texas, April 17-22, 1944 (Austin, Texas: State Department of Education, 1944), pages are not numbered. This appears to be a report by Myrtle Tanner for her agency. It was printed and circulated to the University of Texas Library, Bensen Collection.
as did William Little in his report, the participants in this Inter-American Relations Education workshop still implicitly and more cautiously did so by indicating the ineffectiveness of pedagogical segregation.

In another workshop sponsored by the state agency, Tireman was again the featured speaker. He discussed the affinity that the new educational currents had with John Dewey's earlier ideas about cultural pluralism:

'Sociologists have a term which will help our thinking, 'cultural pluralism.' This refers to the fact that in every culture something of special merit or value can be found.'

In 1945 an Inter-American Relations Education workshop at Texas State College for Women in Denton, Texas, placed their participants, mostly Spanish teachers or English teachers of Mexican American children, in a number of seminars on how to breach the language barrier. The second half of the workshop—for those who could afford to participate—took place in Saltillo, Mexico, to immerse the future teachers in a totally Spanish-Only environment. Yet another summer workshop at the Texas College of Mines at El Paso in 1945 highlighted the language problem, eventually coming up with new pedagogical manuals published by the State Department of Education on teaching methods in the El Paso region. They


57 "Inter-American Workshop," The Texas Outlook, 29 (March 1945), 48.
stressed constant experimentation and concluded that the use of new language exercises and vocabulary lists would be more effective than previous techniques. It was still English-Only, just in a nicer container.\textsuperscript{56}

The final and most significant aspect to the combined inter-agency efforts at promoting the Good Neighbor ethic within Texas schools was the actual revision of curriculum away from the harsher Americanizing sentiments of decades past and toward what Tireman correctly acknowledged as a position of "cultural pluralism." In fact, changes in the curriculum transpired before the State Department of Education could even organize its own Inter-American Relations Education division. Already the curriculum experienced revolutionary changes in foreign language instruction. The agency developed in the first months of 1943 a comprehensive course of study for the teaching of Spanish from the third grade to the eighth grade, six whole years of foreign language instruction for white and Mexican American children alike. A mere decade before the teaching of foreign languages in the elementary schools was against the law! Pedagogically, the State Department of Education backed off its earlier double standard of teaching English to non-English-speaking Mexican Americans in English-Only while allowing for liberal translation for English-speaking, white children learning Spanish as a foreign language. Now in 1943

\textsuperscript{56} Byron England, "El Paso Develops Aids for Teachers of Bilinguals," \textit{Ibid.}, (October 1945), 42 and 44.
the manual stated with regard to Spanish in the classroom, "Conversation should be the basis of all classroom activity."\textsuperscript{59} Ironically, just as the direct method approach inherent in English-Only pedagogy was beginning to erode in the eyes of some pedagogues, it was finally coming to be uniformly applied to non-Mexican Americans in the form of Spanish-Only.

On the question of teaching Spanish-speaking elementary school children in the language that they had only a few short years before been physically punished or even expelled for using, the state added special instructions. The head of the Inter-American Relations Education division in the state, Myrtle Tanner, observed that many Spanish-speakers, due to the inadequacies of state curriculum prior to the 1940s, were hardly literate in their own native tongue. Therefore, to make up for the deficiency of not having had Spanish in the earlier grades as was now being done, she urged that high school Mexican Americans sign up for Spanish there. Even those older Mexican Americans with English problems were encouraged to sign up for Spanish, which would have been absolutely inconceivable just a few years before.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{59} E. C. Dodd and L. A. Woods, Tentative Course of Study for the Teaching of Spanish in Grades 3 to 8 Inclusive, Bulletin No 426 (Austin, Texas: State Department of Education, 1943), xi and xii (quotation).

However, the more things changed, the more they stayed the same. The new Inter-American Relations Education branch within the State Department of Education stuck to several of the old pedagogical assumptions and instructional dead-ends of English-Only despite all of the possibilities for change that existed. Professor Little was willing to label English-Only a failure. But hardly anyone else dared question it that severely. Even Professor Sánchez expressed renewed hope in English-Only now that the institutional culture against Mexican Americans was presumably changing. After stating the evils of educational segregation, Sánchez and Henry Otto, a colleague at the University of Texas, praised the "native deference" of Spanish-speaking peoples and extolled the virtues of English-Only taught by a caring teacher in good facilities. In such an ideal environment, Sánchez and Otto reasoned, a Mexican American child could easily pick up the necessary English in only a year.  

The potential was great for doing away with English-Only through a re-orientation of attitudes of race and nationality during the war. However, it was not fully taken advantage of either by the pedagogical theorists themselves or by local educators. One El Paso educator wrote several tips for the teaching of Spanish to white, English-speaking children in the early grades. He assumed that Mexican American children

---

in the early grades would not be in the same class and so did not bother to discuss them. He recommended the direct method of Spanish-Only, but only for a few minutes a day. The pedagogy was not trusted by this educator, who assured his readers that many would not learn Spanish because they wished not to and that there was little for the teacher to do in such cases. This was nothing new in comparison with similar two-faced instructional practices in the 1920s and 1930s, but now it was much more hypocritical than before when the rhetoric of Pan Americanism was non-existent.⁶²

Even more depressing than the lack of willingness to put much emphasis on the Good Neighbor opportunity during the war from too many educators was the failure of other more sympathetic educators such as Sánchez who chose to ignore the problems in pedagogy and language. Sanchez went so far in his stress on socio-economic and race prejudice as factors in explaining away Mexican American school failure that he let English-Only pedagogy off the hook. Sanchez felt that segregation was the true evil and wanted no pedagogical excuses. But in doing so he and others put their heads in the sand by ignoring the fact that racist schools were not the only reason Mexican American children failed; it also had to do with racist pedagogy: Texas-style English-Only pedagogy.⁶³

---

⁶³ More on Sánchez will be examined in the following chapter on Mexican American accommodation and resistance to English-Only.
In addition to language, the Good Neighbor education sought to impart cultural awareness. The pedagogical manuals on the subject of Inter-American education imparted as much cultural knowledge as they did advice on how to teach Spanish. In addition to providing sample vocabulary lists intended to maximize learning in a Spanish-Only classroom, the manuals also offered such trivia as that the streets in Taxco, Mexico, were paved with silver ore that glittered in the sunlight or that the city of San Antonio was founded in 1731 by Spanish-speaking Canary Islanders.\footnote{Wilson and Tanner, \textit{Meet Latin America}, 11. Actually, Canary Islanders settled in the villa of San Fernando de Béxar in 1731 which was next to the original mission and presidio of San Antonio de Béxar that had been in existence since 1718. See Jesus F. De La Teja, \textit{San Antonio de Béxar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier} (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1995), 8-10.} Other pedagogical manuals served primarily as cultural enrichment guides with topics such as Pan-American heroes, their legends, and the spirit of Pan-Americanism. They included a number of ways in which Pan-American clubs could be started and other suggestions on how to stimulate further interest in Spanish courses to those high school students who missed Spanish in the elementary grades.\footnote{Myrtle L. Tanner, "Los Caminos de Amistad": \textit{Curriculum Enrichment Materials For High Schools, 1946. Bulletin No. 466} (Austin, Texas: State Department of Education, 1946), 6-7.}

At the war's end Herschel T. Manuel, a University of Texas professor and member of the school's Inter-American Education committee, wrote an article stressing the need to carry forth with heightened Good Neighborism after the war.
The momentum, he pleaded, must not be lost. He applauded the stress that the movement had placed upon learning more about Central and South American nations. The real importance for him was that "Finally, we are coming to grips to a greater extent than ever before with the problem of molding the Spanish-speaking and English-speaking people of our own country into an effective democracy." Of the goals of "inter-American education in the Southwest," he recommended "that we make the improvement of the education of Spanish-speaking children a matter of immediate urgency." But Manuel offered more than just rhetoric and platitudes to his fellow educators in The Texas Outlook. The pedagogical innovation he recommended for incorporating the Mexican American child into American life was the use of kindergarten education (not then mandated in Texas) especially designed for Spanish-speaking children that would focus intensely on imparting enough English vocabulary to allow them to be put into a regular first grade class with white, English-speaking children. This idea was borrowed from Sánchez's recommendations of the 1930s and was aimed at removing the excuse for pedagogical segregation by alleviating the absolute need for English-Only "special" (segregated) education for all Mexican Americans. The idea had merit; Texas' State Department of Education and

---

67 Ibid., 14.
influential Mexican American leaders in the remaining years of the 1940s and the 1950s implemented such recommendations. But as time would show, it did not become the solution that sympathetic educators had hoped for.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{1950s}

After World War II the scholarly consensus on the subject of language and Mexican Americans continued to evolve in sympathetic but ultimately limited avenues. Such attitudes were first demonstrated by the socio-economic and behaviorist perspective emanating from the New Deal intellectual milieu of the 1930s which rejected the racial science and nativism of the 1920s. The more liberal attitude was cultivated by both federal and state governments through their educational bureaucracies during the war. However, the impetus to end or at least soften the effects of segregation lost official governmental support in Texas. The late 1940s and 1950s are also important for the gradual evolution of the field of testing away from theories that held Mexican Americans to be inherently handicapped due to language and toward a new appreciation for the cognitive benefits of bilingualism.

In the decade and a half after World War II a radical shift took place in the linguistics and psychology disciplines in regard to the relationship of bilingualism and intelligence. From 1945 to the 1965 the decades old correlation between bilingualism and low intelligence saw a

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid.
complete 180 degree turn. By the early 1960s bilingualism came to be associated with higher than average intelligence rather than being labeled a handicap as it had been since the work of such early IQ scientists as Lewis Terman, Robert Yerkes, and Thomas Garth. History has ignored this development. 69

The shift took place in roughly three phases. First, there was the old guard or traditionalists represented in the literature from the 1940s to the middle of the 1950s. They held that bilingual children were intellectually handicapped and inevitably became failures in school. Next came the transitional in-betweener, best represented in the literature during the middle and late 1950s. They believed that the earlier research linking cognitive defect and retardation to bilingualism either greatly overstated its conclusions or was deeply flawed in methodology. Last came the new guard or bilingualists who in the late 1950s through the 1960s conducted more sophisticated studies accounting for many more socio-economic and behavioral factors than their academic predecessors. They concluded that in structured and monitored classroom situations, bilingual children actually scored higher in intelligence tests and other types of cognitive measurements than monolingual children. Truly, a conceptual revolution had occurred!

69 Elliot L. Judd, "Factors Affecting the Passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1967" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1977), 26-32. This represents one of the few systematic studies of the evolution of language research in the United States from the early 1950s to the middle 1960s.
The traditionalists of the 1940s and 1950s had taken Professor Manuel's criticism of the IQ race scientists to heart. They still concluded that bilingualism meant high levels of educational retardation; they just arrived at such conclusions in a more rigorous scholarly manner. For example, the exclusive use of verbal tests to determine the amount of language handicap in children, long a staple of Manuel's criticism, was dispelled by the 1940s.\textsuperscript{70} Also, this old guard, still holding to the inferiority of bilingualism, functioned in an academic environment much less permissive of race-based explanations than the previous generation, and so they arrived at their conclusions of bilingual inferiority by methodological techniques that took into account environmental factors. Two such researchers noted of the field, "Renewed effort is being directed toward the analysis of socio-economic factors in relation to intelligence and achievement."\textsuperscript{71}

These traditionalists were much less sure of such potentially racist assessments than previous researchers had been and attached to their conclusions numerous qualifications. In her advice to use non-verbal tests, researcher Natalie Darcy indicated that neither verbal nor non-verbal tests were accurate enough to be used on their

\textsuperscript{70} Natalie T. Darcy, "The Effect of Bilingualism Upon the Measurement of the Intelligence of Children of Preschool Age," \textit{The Journal of Educational Psychology}, 37 (February 1946), 23-25.

\textsuperscript{71} Dorothy H. Eichorn and Harold E. Jones, "Development of Mental Functions," \textit{Review of Educational Research}, 22 (December 1952), 421.
own. In fact, the tests were so unreliable on their own that she urged they be used only in conjunction with one another.\textsuperscript{72} Scholar Selma Herr studied the effectiveness of the mandatory kindergarten classes (pre-school instruction) offered to Mexican Americans in order to alleviate the language handicap. This scholar found that the control group, Mexican American children who received no such special instruction, all failed the first grade. Slightly less than half, only 47 percent, of the group that underwent such kindergarten training failed the first grade. So the pre-first grade instruction, while measurably effective, was not a complete success.\textsuperscript{73} In Darcy's review of the literature of bilingualism and intelligence in 1953, most studies cited held that bilingualism equated mental handicap.\textsuperscript{74}

In the middle 1950s there emerged a transitional group of scholars on the subject of bilingualism and intelligence. They bridged the coming 180 degree shift that would soon take place. In the same article in which Darcy reviewed the recent literature on the subject, she noted that by 1953 there were already ten studies concluding that bilingualism


\textsuperscript{73} Selma E. Herr, "The Effect of Pre-First-Grade Training Upon Reading Readiness and Reading Achievement Among Spanish-American Children," \textit{The Journal of Educational Psychology}, 37 (February 1946), 87 and 100.

had neither a positive or negative statistically significant correlation to intelligence.\textsuperscript{75} These studies owed their origins to the early work of Texas researchers Manuel and Sánchez in the 1930s. One such early study by Seth Arsenian, a psychologist, best stated this growing middle position. Arsenian supported "the conclusion that bilingualism neither retards nor accelerates mental development." He believed that language problems on the test were the true discrepancies in IQ scores.\textsuperscript{76} One researcher for the Texas State Department of Education, just having fought the war on the domestic front through Good Neighborliness, argued that the social attendants of segregation such as "Poor housing, inadequate teaching materials, poorly trained teachers, and improper attention to the needs and interests of the children involved" were the factors causing educational failure, not inferior intellectual capacity wrought by bilingualism or an insurmountable language handicap.\textsuperscript{77} Finally, Manuel and Sánchez's positions of the 1920s and 1930s were becoming the dominant interpretations of the field by the 1950s.

In the late 1950s the transitional studies pointed to gaps in the traditional literature's methodological handling of all kinds of environmental factors. One researcher at Our Lady of the Lake College in San Antonio, Sister Mary Arthur

\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., 39-50.
\textsuperscript{76} Seth Arsenian, "Bilingualism in the Post-War World," \textit{Psychological Bulletin}, 42 (February 1945), 74.
Carrow, conducted an impressive study of the relationship between bilingualism and intelligence. When picking the bilingual group Carrow, unlike her academic predecessors such as Darcy, chose only those who were truly bilingual (fluent and literate in both languages), not those who were classified as bilingual simply because they were Mexican American. She discounted those children who tested at exceedingly low IQ scores in both bilingual and monolingual groups. She then examined the children for any hearing, learning, or other psychological disabilities. She also grouped the children according to socio-economic background. Studies previous to this one generally paid lip service to socio-economic factors, but rarely dealt with it in such a comprehensive and systematic manner. She found there to be no real connection between true bilingualism and intelligence. Even studies that did not go as far as Carrow to remove the IQ handicap from bilingualism still found that IQ alone was not a reliable factor in explaining school achievement.

---

78 Sister Mary Arthur Carrow, "Linguistic Functioning of Bilingual and Monolingual Children," The Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 22 (September 1957), 371-72.
From the late 1950s and continuing on through the 1960s, the dominant position on language and cognitive ability held by leading psychologists, linguists, and educators was fast becoming the belief that bilingualism, if done correctly, actually benefited one's intelligence. Much progress had been made since the 1930s when scholars urged that testing be done with more attention to isolating socio-economic and cultural factors, but few actually attempted to do in any meaningful way. Even today, however, scholars in the field of intelligence measurement view their own methods at isolating and studying such factors and their impact educational achievement as open to improvement.\textsuperscript{80}

There were a few studies in existence in the early 1950s arguing that bilingualism was a positive factor in intelligence, but too few to be significant. One such early study on Puerto Ricans in New York City's Spanish Harlem published in 1953 argued that bilingualism in certain contexts could result in increased intellectual capacity. The authors noted that in their own testing, the Puerto Rican children reacted negatively on the non-verbal tests: "Verbal refusals, crying, and other significant emotional disturbance were likewise observed. No such general resistance was encountered among the Negro or white children." They found

\textsuperscript{80} Anne Anastasi, "Introductory Remarks," in \textit{Psychological Testing of Hispanics}, Kurt F. Geisinger, ed. (Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1992), 3-4. In the 1950s Anastasi was one of the earliest researchers to conclude that bilingualism could benefit intelligence in a controlled setting.
that verbal tests translated into Spanish with simple vocabulary and instructions administered by a Puerto Rican adult resulted in better scores.\textsuperscript{81}

Other researchers noted similar findings. This was especially so when class and socio-economic factors were more tightly controlled. One article in the middle 1960s vaguely hinted at such by mentioning that "it is likely that bilingual students may have somewhat higher potentialities than monolingual students from a similar environment."\textsuperscript{82}

Some of these studies in the 1960s dovetailed nicely with the goals of the FLES movement (Foreign Languages in the Elementary Schools) which picked up steam after World War II. Language minority students learned better in all subjects when they were trained early in their native tongue. In one focused study on written language performance, it was found that bilingual Chinese American students were not adversely affected by their dual language ability. In fact, this particular study suggested that "less confusion results when Chinese is known well."\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{81} Anne Anastasi and Cruz deJesus, "Language Development and Nonverbal IQ of Puerto Rican Preschool Children in New York City," \textit{The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology}, 48 (July 1953), 361 (quotation) and 365.


\textsuperscript{83} Hilda P. Lewis and Edward R. Lewis, "Written Language Performance of Sixth-Grade Children of Low Socio-Economic Status From Bilingual and Monolingual Backgrounds," \textit{The Journal of Experimental Education}, 33 (Spring 1965), 239.
The newer studies of the 1960s not only challenged traditional assumptions of inferiority regarding bilingualism, but they went as far as to question English-Only pedagogy. One study in 1961 concluded that if "bilinguals possess a latent aptitude for verbal learning, perhaps greater effort to elevate them to their capacity in English through an intensive language program is advisable. In this type of program, it would seem reasonable that a teacher or clinician conversant with a student's verbal or gestural language would facilitate the learning process. By utilizing the repertoire of associations available to the student, the instructor may be able to elevate the student's functional language more efficiently." This researcher was implicitly favoring a type of individualized bilingual instruction.⁸⁴ Another researcher disagreed with such implications and argued for only native language instruction because he believed that, counter to the FLES mantra, second languages should not be introduced early in the curriculum. This was because it was believed that the structural differences between Chinese and English were too great for young minds to comprehend.⁸⁵

All of this scholarly reconceptualization simmered and bubbled until 1962 when the big blockbuster study that

---

revolutionized the study of language instruction for non-
English-speakers was published by Canadian researchers
Elizabeth Peal and Wallace E. Lambert. The Peal-Lambert
study sought to experiment with bilingual instruction in
English and French for French-speaking children in Montreal
who were ten years of age. After a devastating review of the
literature that pointed out numerous methodological and
interpretational inaccuracies in older studies, Peal and
Lambert then consciously chose those bilingual students who
had full mastery of both languages. They found that the
fully bilingual students of the same socio-economic station
invariably scored higher than the monolingual ones in IQ
tests. In explaining the divergence of their work from the
earlier studies, Peal and Lambert argued that "the structure
of intellect of the bilinguals appears to be more diversified
than that of the monolinguals," in part, they hypothesized,
because "People who learn to use two languages have two
symbols for every object." 86

The two Canadian researchers were not shy about their
interpretations of the data. Peal and Lambert explained the
superior intelligence scores for bilinguals with the notion
that "From an early age, bilinguals may be forced to
conceptualize environmental events in terms of their general
properties without reliance on their linguistic symbols," and

86 Elizabeth Peal and Wallace E. Lambert, The Relation of
Bilingualism to Intelligence. Psychological Monographs:
General and Applied, Vol. 76, No. 27 (Washington, D.C.:
American Psychological Association, 1962), 16 (first
quotation) and 14 (second).
that "The monolinguals may never have been forced to form concepts or abstract ideas of things and may be more likely to think mainly in terms of concretes." 87 Peal and Lambert reiterated the revolutionary implications of their study even though they themselves were not sure "whether the more intelligent child became bilingual or whether bilingualism aided his intellectual development." 88

Peal and Lambert's groundbreaking study, as we have seen, did not occur in a vacuum. It was the product of years of gradual evolution of the academic community's understanding of the meaning of the mental symbols manipulated through language, how such language is acquired, and the meaning of bilingualism. Peal and Lambert's work served to completely capsize English-Only's pedagogical base, which had been for some time taking on water. Their research, along with other trends in the 1960s, paved the way for linguists and educators to reformulate language pedagogy and dispel English-Only pedagogy as it was justified for years. The scientific understanding of primary and secondary language acquisition and its relationship to cognitive ability was being altered dramatically from the previous English-Only paradigm that had been legally mandated across the country for some five decades or longer. But English-Only was still the dominant method of instruction for non-English-speakers throughout the post-war period until the

87 Ibid., 14.
88 Ibid., 20.
middle and late 1960s. This change occurred in the conceptual justification of English-Only, but the practice of language instruction and the way in which English-Only was applied also became altered after the experience of World War II.

World War II brought renewed attention to the teaching of language and that renewed attention wrought important changes in the very way scholars practiced English-Only. The old direct method was partially displaced by a newer version of the direct method called the audio-lingual approach, or the oral method. The armed forces experimented with the audio-lingual approach during World War II with some success. Afterwards it became popularized as an easy way in which adults could assimilate a new language in a short period of time. Maximilian Berlitz advertised a similar audio-lingual method shortly after the war.\(^{89}\)

Theoretical rationale for the audio-lingual method came from the behaviorist theories of B. F. Skinner. It was felt that by orally repeating the sounds of a foreign language many times, fluency would soon come out of habit. It was very similar to the old style direct method in English-Only advanced by linguists in the late nineteenth century, but only with a more modern theory behind it. In the late 1940s and 1950s the new global position of the United States as a

Cold War superpower put renewed emphasis on the study of language, especially after 1957 when the Soviets launched the Sputnik satellite. Language study became an integral part of the federal government's response to Sputnik with the National Defense Education Act.\(^90\)

The audio-lingual method was for teaching older students in high school, college, and in the armed services how to speak languages such as French, German, or Russian. The new behaviorist, audio-lingual approaches stemming from World War II were a type of direct method but also a step away from the direct method. It was only half direct method as it utilized the native tongue (in this case English) for instruction. But unlike the old methods of infusing reading and grammatical translation, it was almost totally oral in approach. It made sense for adults; it saved time to dispense with reading and writing the foreign language by utilizing pure repetition and rote in proper behaviorist fashion to drill the symbols and meanings of language. This conversational method soon came to be implemented in the instruction for non-English-speaking children with some hope of alleviating the failures of English-Only pedagogy.\(^91\)

Some scholars began to question the absence of the native language in the educational experience of non-English-speaking children. Young social psychologist Joshua Fishman

\(^{90}\) Ibid.
began his research on language and schooling in 1950 on the bilingual patterns of education in a Yiddish school. Fishman, later to become one of the leading spokespersons of bilingual education, argued in the 1950s that not utilizing the native tongue in the teaching of the smallest of students was a monumental waste of time, of energy, and of real human potential. Later work by Fishman in the 1950s would elaborate such a thesis.\footnote{Ofelia Garcia, "A Gathering of Voices, a 'Legion of Scholarly Decency' and Bilingual Education: Fishman's Biographemes as Introduction," in Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, Volume I, ed. Ofelia Garcia (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1991), 8.} One of the leading voices in the FLES movement of World War II was Theodore Andersson who kept up the drumbeat for foreign language instruction for young children in the 1950s. In doing so, Andersson, who was himself traumatized as a six year old when he arrived to the United States schools speaking no English after being raised in Sweden, inched closer and closer to the realization of how wastefully the nation squandered its foreign language capital in non-English-speakers, especially Mexican Americans who were educated by non-Spanish-speakers in a language they did not understand.\footnote{Theodore Andersson, "Spanish, Language of the Americas," Hispania, 47 (September 1959), 347-51; "The Role of Foreign Languages in International Understanding," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 41 (December 1957), 56-62.}

While the brief era of audio-lingual language techniques altered the ways in which educators thought of the direct
method and ultimately English-Only, it was the contributions to the field of theoretical linguistics and cognitive formation by the young Noam Chomsky in the late 1950s and early 1960s that delivered the final blow to the behaviorist rationale for the direct method. The direct method of English-Only rested upon the theoretical argument by the behaviorists that language represented a finite set of symbols mastered though constant drill. Chomsky postulated that language was not a closed and limited process but rather an open-ended and limitless activity formed not through repetition but by adherence to basic principles of language and cognition, the way the brain processes the symbols of language into meaning.\textsuperscript{94} The Chomskian revolution in how language was conceived had great import to educational researchers. Now younger pedagogues such as Andersson and Fishman, unlike the older generation of Manuel, Tireman, and Sánchez who were wedded to the direct method of English-Only, could break free from the contradiction they saw in the enterprise and explore new methods of bilingual education.

In the 1950s the Mexican American continued to be a source of concern for education officials of Texas. In the school year of 1955-1956 Mexican Americans were almost twice as likely to drop out of school as were other students in the

\textsuperscript{94} Crawford, Bilingual Education, 120-22. For examples of Choamsky's early work critical of Skinner and behaviorist theory as well as his new linguistic ideas see Noam Chomsky, "Review of Verbal Behavior," Language, 35 (January 1959), 26-58; and "Logical Syntax and Semantics: Their Linguistic Relevance," Language, 31 (January 1959), 36-45.
state. The dropout rate among Mexican Americans was 11.33 percent of its entire scholastic population. Among Mexican American dropouts, the grade at which the greatest loss occurred was the seventh grade, while for the rest of the state it was the tenth grade.\textsuperscript{95} In the 1950s the FLES movement spearheaded by Theodore Andersson, then at the University of Texas, made only limited impact. Many school districts (29 out of 216 polled by the state) in 1957 chose not to take advantage of the permissive language laws regarding Spanish in the elementary grades. The majority of the schools that did practice FLES principles did so through administrative action, not local school board policy.\textsuperscript{96}

Texas struggled to adapt the direct method of English-Only to the new audio-lingual theory. A 1962 state document on the most recent methods of language instruction for non-English-speakers cited World War II and the Cold War as reasons for the increased emphasis on language instruction. This state pedagogical manual incorporated the audio-lingual technique's specific oral approach over the direct method of English-Only. The lessons resembled more of the same

\textsuperscript{95} Division of Research, \textit{Report of Pupils in Texas Public Schools Having Spanish Surnames, 1955-56} (unpublished report, Texas Education Agency, August, 1957), 6. This document was obtained at the Texas Education Agency Library, Austin, Texas.

\textsuperscript{96} Texas Committee of Ten, \textit{School Program Practices in Texas Public Schools. Report Number Three of the Texas Committee of Ten} (Austin, Texas: Texas Committee of Ten, 1957), 14. The Committee of Ten was commissioned by the Texas Association of School Administrators and the Texas Association of School Boards to study education in the state.
English-Only although the theoretical basis had been slightly altered.  

Texas experimented more creatively in other ways that would attempt to reach out to the Mexican American community while still working within the increasingly strained confines of English-Only pedagogy. Such was the charge of the Hale-Aiken Committee of Twenty-Four, a body of public leaders, educational leaders, and concerned citizens who in the late 1950s were authorized to make recommendations for the improvement of the state's schools. One of the members of the Committee of Twenty-Four was Felix Tijerina, a Mexican American leader and national president of LULAC. Tijerina was involved in Houston with the creation of a successful pilot program of teaching English to pre-school aged Mexican Americans through a radio program.

The Hale-Aiken Committee decided to recommend a program similar to Tijerina's pre-school radio program. The pre-school program was authorized by the national LULAC organization and had originally been called the "Little Schools of the 400" because it sought to impart a base vocabulary of 400 English words. But the committee still

---

99 San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed," 140-47. San Miguel's work on these efforts, known as the "Little Schools of the 400," remains the only historical scholarship of note on the subject.
supported the English-Only laws (article 288 of the Penal Code of Texas) and saw the original pre-school program's limited use of Spanish instruction with the youngsters as a necessary trade-off.\textsuperscript{100} The program was to be a three month summer program for five-year-old children entering the first grade the following fall term. The burden of financially supporting the program was shared by the state and the local school district. The hope was to alleviate the still large number of Mexican American students failing the first grade because they had not mastered enough English to keep up.\textsuperscript{101}

There had been similar programs begun shortly before the state legislation came in 1959. A pre-school program for Mexican American children in the Odessa public schools in West Texas began in 1957 and had two years of experience that other interested schools could draw from in beginning their new pre-school programs in the summer of 1960 when the law took effect. The Odessa schools used the newer audio-lingual techniques of "oral bombardment" of English vocabulary through a rigorous and systematic drill of "high frequency words" by specially trained teachers. This was simply a more intense application of English-Only except that the children were not yet expected to have the same cognitive understanding of English as their white, English-speaking

\textsuperscript{100} Hale-Aiken Committee of Twenty-Four, Tentative Draft of the Final Report, 2.
\textsuperscript{101} Division of Administrative Services, Laws and Resolutions Affecting Public Education Enacted by the 56th Legislature, Regular Session, 1959 (Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1959), 47.
counterparts. Emphasizing how the theoretical change supposedly ushered in by the audio-lingual school hardly changed the everyday lessons, an Odessa principal listed goals of his pre-school program that were not dissimilar to old English-Only pedagogical practices.  

This program in Odessa was successful, but it nevertheless required special remedial education for a group of children that, in their own language, had come by the 1950s to be regarded by intelligence scientists as no more or less retarded than any English-speaking group. This was as far as English-Only pedagogy would stretch to accommodate the Mexican American child. Cultural, linguistic, and curricular concessions were made to English-Only pedagogy by the state. These were the lessons embedded in the statewide curriculum via the Good Neighbor agencies as well as foreign language instruction in the elementary grades for white and Mexican American children. This was also exemplified by the support of the state for a pre-school program that could theoretically bring Spanish instruction into the classroom without punishment. The pre-school program was the fulfillment of Manuel's and Sánchez's recommendations from the 1930s and 1940s, but as the decade of the 1960s would illustrate, it was much too little, too late. The sincere and significant efforts to give the English-Only educational experience of Mexican American children a kinder and gentler

---

face in the 1940s and 1950s simply failed because it was too limited. The sudden display of assertiveness and activism with which Mexican Americans in Texas demanded bilingual education in the 1960s and 1970s was the price of the dashed promise of the 1940s and 1950s.
Chapter Seven:  
Mexican American Cultural Accommodation and Resistance to English-Only, 1910-1965

The sincere efforts by statewide educators to gradually reform the dismal educational conditions endured by Mexican American children during World War II quickly faded. By the late 1940s and the 1950s the window of opportunity to fundamentally alter educational discrimination and English-Only pedagogy through existing educational institutions had passed. The war offered a brief interlude from the immediate past and the immediate future, a breath of opportunity that ultimately failed. One theme of continuity, however, was the Mexican American community's cultural response to language issues in the schools. This chapter will examine that continuity: the alternation between English and Spanish, the indecisiveness between cultural assimilation and cultural isolation, the medium between Americanization and ethnic pride. From the 1910s to the 1960s the Mexican American community in Texas simultaneously exhibited both accommodation to Anglo culture and English language as well as resistance to it.

Some in the Mexican American community responded to the English-Only educational paradigm with a culturally accommodationalist tack, insisting upon their patriotism, Americanism, and love of the English language. Others responded confrontationaly in a spirit of cultural resistance that, in addition to stressing the need to maintain and teach
the Spanish language and Hispanic culture, loudly denounced English-Only instruction as well as the segregation, stereotypes, and lowered expectations accompanying it. What both responses had in common was the ultimate desire for the same rights and opportunities as any other citizen. There is no one period of "accommodation" or another period of "resistance." Both of these responses are to be found throughout the period from the rise of English-Only in the 1910s to its demise in the 1960s.¹

Exactly how and when to characterize the Mexican American educational experience as either accommodation or resistance is a matter of historical dispute that has a generational dimension. Not just on educational issues, but on most of the larger questions of historical inquiry, interpretations are fraught with inherent generational politicization. For example, the older academic studies written from the 1940s to the 1960s by scholars on Mexican American education stress the themes of accommodation: Mexican American patriotism, loyalty, its internal diversity, and the need to deal with poverty and segregation within the

¹ Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Inside the Public Schools: A History of the Chicano Educational Experience," Atisbos: Journal of Chicano Research, (Summer-Fall 1978), 86-100. This is one of the few early attempts to offer some periodization scheme to the history of Mexican American education. San Miguel, author of the standard historiographical essays on Chicano education, has backed off this periodization scheme in later works. For a more recent work see San Miguel, "Status of the Historiography of Chicano Education: A Preliminary Analysis," History of Education Journal, 26 (Winter 1986), 523-36.
existing political and educational framework. A younger group of scholars in the late 1960s and 1970s, fired by the activism and radical politics of the age, took a decidedly more confrontational approach in their academic work. It is commonly alleged by critics that this younger generation of intellectuals disparaged the politics and cultural positions of their predecessors and sought to recover a tradition of protest and daily resistance to discrimination—and even to English-Only pedagogy—in the past that was forgotten by the older scholarship which downplayed such matters. These are the historiographical boundaries regarding the issues of Mexican American cultural accommodation and resistance that

---

2 For just a few examples see Jovita González, "Social Life in Cameron, Starr, and Zapata Counties" (MA thesis, University of Texas, 1930); Carey McWilliams, North From Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States (New York: Greenwood Press, 1948); Pauline Kibbe, Latin Americans in Texas (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1946); Herschel T. Manuel, The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1930). Of George I. Sánchez, perhaps the most pivotal participant in this vein of scholarship, more detail will be given later in the chapter. It should be noted that none of these authors were historians, and two of them were not academic scholars.

3 For examples of this generation of scholarship see Rudolfo Acuña, Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation (San Francisco: Canefield Press, 1972); Juan Gomez-Quinones, "Toward a Perspective on Chicano History," Aztlan, 2 (Fall 1972), 1-49; and Tomás Almaguer, "Toward the Study of Chicano Colonialism," Aztlan, 2 (Spring 1971), 7-21. The literature on Mexican Americans and education in Texas has been relatively immune to such much historiographical conflict. While all of these scholars are historians, they do not focus exclusively on educational issues but use the same generational schematics.
sharpen interpretative differences in historical interpretation.⁴

My own interpretation of the Mexican American response to English-Only incorporates parts of both accommodation and resistance without wholly subscribing to either. Rather than arguing that there was any one period of "accommodation" or "resistance," I would like to stress the continuity of response to English-Only from the 1910s until the late 1960s: it had always been a mixed response alternating between pro-English language preferences and pro-Spanish language preferences. In no generation has one or the other position on language achieved dominance within the Mexican American community.

1900-1930, The Mexicanist Generation

From the moment English-Only appeared in those parts of the state mostly inhabited by Mexican Americans, it met with only limited acceptance. The Mexican American community responded to it in a variety of fashions that have in common the lack of ideological consistency. There was English-Only sentiment among dominant Anglo political leaders as early as

⁴ David G. Gutierrez, "Significant to Whom? Mexican Americans and the History of the American West," Western Historical Quarterly, 24 (November 1993), 519-39. Gutierrez argues that the broader generational differences in which Mexican American scholarship originated has significant explanatory power in assessing its content. I disagree with Gutierrez based upon the case study of the writings and actions of Mexican Americans on behalf of education in Texas, especially on the language issue. There was a great deal of thought and activity in each generation on language that belies the notion of much generational difference in the Mexican American past. I argue instead for generational continuity on this matter.
the mid-nineteenth century in Texas as well as in the rest of the Southwest. One Mexican American response to such desires was to attempt to assimilate as much as possible into the politically dominant Anglo culture that, in the border regions of the nineteenth century, was still the minority culture in the daily life of all inhabitants.\(^5\) One historian writes of a sort of "peace structure" that existed in South Texas between the few Anglo merchants and landholders and the neighboring Mexican American elite. This assured minimal conflict in return for political cooperation. This attitude is exemplified in the advice given by old Mexican landholding dons to their heirs, "There will be many coming. Chose from these newcomers men and women who are of your class. Make them your friends, and they will respond and be your friends."\(^6\) Although a little English-speaking ability would be necessary, the dominant language in South Texas, even among Anglos, remained Spanish. The majority of Mexican Americans ignored the few existing public schools, some of which operated in all-English instruction. The prominence of Mexican American private schools throughout the Southwest in the nineteenth century would certainly suggest as much.\(^7\)


The 1910s were momentous years for Tejanos. In South Texas the arrival of corporate agriculture and more strictly enforced segregation coincided with one of the largest immigration surges from Mexico to the United States. As the Mexican Revolution raged, radicals, revolutionaries, elites, and peons streamed into Texas looking for refuge, temporary work, or a totally new beginning. Elsewhere in the American Southwest, Socialists organized in agricultural regions. Labor radicals in the mining industry had already formed the inter-racial Industrial Workers of the World, an anarcho-syndicalist union that would soon meet with governmental repression.8 Pre-existing Mexican Americans and more recent Mexican immigrants in Texas exhibited great frustration at their racial subordination in all areas of daily life, most glaringly in the public schools. This sense of isolation and racial animosity increased as conditions worsened to the point that armed insurrection and the death of hundreds occurred along the border in 1915 after the surfacing of the Plan de San Diego, a revolutionary tract written and signed in San Diego, Texas. This document urged the rebellion of all Mexican Americans in a bloody race war in which all adult

---

Anglo males would be executed in the course of eventual separation from the United States. ⁹

Educational services for Mexican Americans in this period were completely inadequate. Pedagogical manuals to teachers contained little in the way of sympathy for the plight of Mexican American students. Instead, schools served as retardants to social and occupational mobility. ¹⁰ One administrator of a public school in the Southwest run by an agricultural company (in effect a company school) suggested of the content of instruction that "These lessons start with the operations of planting seed and take the student through the various phases of growing, cultivation, pruning, etc., of the trees, the picking, handling and packing of the fruit up to the marketing and the consumption of the same in the far off markets of the world, and then back again finally to the

---


wages paid to the Mexicans." English-Only pedagogy was a massive failure as indicated in Chapter Four. In the public schools for Mexican Americans of Laredo during the 1920s the percentage of the total student population that was overage (possibly by late entry to school but most likely due to academic failure) rose to 81 percent. In Eagle Pass, Brownsville, and El Paso (all border towns) corresponding rates of over-age-ness were 78, 70, and 52 percent for the same year.12

In this tense social climate, Mexican Americans vocally and visibly protested English-Only pedagogy. In the judgement of most historians, the culture of Mexican American community organization then was of a very Mexicanist bent. Many who organized into mutualistas (mutual aid societies catering to immigrant and non-immigrant) in the first three decades of the century put great emphasis on the teaching of Mexican culture and history as well as the Spanish language. They thoroughly distrusted Americanization or assimilation, attempting to effect change outside the political system by establishing their own schools or by boycotting English-Only schools. They took pains to concern themselves with the issues of recent immigrants and created a world apart from the one of Anglo discrimination, especially by means of

Spanish language newspapers.\textsuperscript{13} For the purposes of classification, the historical interpretation of this generation of Mexican Americans from the 1900s through the 1920s could be classified as the "Mexicanist Generation" due to their Mexicanist cultural preferences.

However, just because Mexican Americans took a Mexicanist cultural approach did not preclude their understanding the advantages that learning English held for their children, who they hoped would overcome the racial and class hurdles that they themselves would never be able to surmount. In short, the overall response from this Mexicanist Generation regarding language was mixed. It was not strictly Mexicanist. One Spanish language newspaper established in Laredo, La Cronica, proposed in 1910 that all people in Texas of Mexican descent pull their children out of the public schools and create their own schools run by imported teachers from Mexico. The newspaper argued that although the public schools given to Mexican Americans were vastly inferior, they nevertheless were effective in transmitting Anglo culture and unfair stereotypes. The paper

\textsuperscript{13} Emilio Zamora, \textit{The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas} (College Station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, 1993), chapter four. The work of San Miguel on the history of Mexican American education devotes little attention to the community's responses prior to the formation of LULAC and the 1930s. In one early article aimed at periodizing Chicano education history, this period is completely ignored and in a more recent and longer book-length treatment it is little discussed. See San Miguel, "Inside the Public Schools," 88; and "Let All of Them Take Heed": Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910-1981 (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1987), 65-68.
argued for bilingual schools that would teach an appreciation of Mexican history, culture, and language as well as the very necessary English language. This was bilingual and bicultural education, a tolerant respect of both languages and cultures. This idea sparked a debate in which many agreed with the suggestions. The provoking news stories and ideas spurred by La Cronica galvanized enough interest for a meeting of mutualist and fraternal lodge delegates from twenty-seven Texas towns and cities in 1911.\textsuperscript{14}

One of the central issues for all organizations of Mexican Americans was discrimination in the schools. The public schools were accused of demeaning Mexican American students through the harboring of racist attitudes or through the stubborn application of English-Only, which was seen by most older Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants as offensive and insulting. Throughout Texas in the 1910s Mexican American Masonic lodges, workers' associations, church groups, and other social organizations sought to preserve Mexican culture and language through small, free private schools.\textsuperscript{15} This attitude continued on well through the 1920s and 1930s. A woman in San Antonio recently wrote of her own school experience during the 1930s in a private, non-sectarian institution called "Colegio Altemirano" in Hebbronville, Texas. Her teacher was "La Señorita Emilia

\textsuperscript{14} José E. Limón, "El Primer Congreso Mexicanista de 1911: A Precursor to Contemporary Chicanismo," Aztlan, 5 (Spring and Fall), 90-94.

\textsuperscript{15} Zamora, The World of the Mexican Worker, 78.
Davila" of Saltillo, Mexico, who taught all subject matter in Spanish. Although English was not taught at all, even as a second language, the school appears not to have had disastrous effects according to this one university-educated former student, "Knowing no English when entering the public school in September 1939, I was placed in the second grade, and at the end of the first semester was promoted to the advanced fifth grade."16 This tradition of small neighborhood schools, whatever the language combination taught, existed in the Mexican American community well past World War II.17

There was not much dogmatic ideology exhibited by most Mexicanist political organizations in the 1910s and 1920s regarding the language of instruction. They let it be known that simple Spanish language offered as one course among many could make up for much of the difficulty their children had with English-Only. In a meeting of the Order of the Sons of America, a patriotic middle-class group that was one of the parent organizations in the eventual creation of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), debated such issues. On March 13, 1927, in Alice, Texas, thirteen members of the Sons of America argued over the language of the schools. Manuel Saenz Escobar, the organization's second vice president, proposed a motion recommending that the group

---


17 Frank Trejo, "'Little School' Ma'am Retires," San Antonio Light, May 28, 1972, Mexican File-Education, ITC.
attempt to better utilize the coming school vacation for English instruction for their children: "what made Brother Saenz Escobar to write this artical is that he knows better what little benefit of education our children gets in the 9 months of school, in the three months of vacation they forget everything they learn and with 2 months of Summer School will be a great thing for our boys and girls and we believe everyone of the members of the order Sons of America will help this course to get to the top." ¹⁸

This resolution from the floor of the Order of the Sons of America, although a bit vague on specifics, stimulated great debate among the other members. President Frank Perez responded affirmatively to Saenz Escobar's proposal. But he also gave a short speech in Spanish to demonstrate the point that all-English instruction at the schools would eliminate the children's knowledge of Spanish and that perhaps the proposed summer schools should be run in Spanish. The president also noted that such summertime schools were not unheard of and that he had undergone such summer training as a boy. The secretary summarized President Perez's remarks: "when he was a boy his father and other good citizens from

¹⁸ "Sons of America of Alice, TX, Minutes," page 5, Sons of America File, The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Records, Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas, Austin, Texas (hereafter this file cited as SAF and this repository as NLB), page 5. These are hastily scribbled minutes to what appears to have been a lively meeting, explaining perhaps a bit of the vagueness and grammatical errors in the text. Given the nature of the record here, I will refrain from making any corrections unless they prove necessary for clarity.
San Diego made the same identical thing, they had a Professor paid by them and they gave us a better education and had use of the sunny days. 19 The first vice president sensed a possible conflict and moved to combine the original proposal, which was to teach English in the summer, with the President's counter proposal, which was to teach Spanish in the summer: "First Vice President had a little trouble he didn't understand, he say this that in the motion made by the Second Vice President, wants a English School and the President wants a Spanish School, and wish that children would learn the Spanish correctly and the use of English was easy for them. I would be glad if they learn the two languages." The issue was thus settled, and they congratulated one another on overcoming cultural differences to reach the same goal, bettering the education of their children in both Spanish and in English. 20

The Order of the Sons of America in Alice illustrates the mixed attitudes these community leaders had regarding language in the schools. As much as members of the Alice chapter may have desired Spanish language instruction as an end in itself, they nevertheless conducted their meetings for the most part in English. 21 The Order of the Sons of America

---

19 Ibid., 5, SAF, NLB.
20 Ibid., 5-6, SAF, NLB.
21 These minutes are from February of 1927 to September of 1927. They are mostly monthly meetings. Only the last month (September) was written in Spanish and with a different handwriting. The other two handwritings in the rest of the minutes are consistently in English. Perhaps the last person available to take the notes for the minutes did not feel
was a loyal, patriotic organization of younger men whose organization was founded in Texas during the early 1920s and was one of the original parent groups for LULAC. In 1921 a group of eight Mexican American friends in their 20s and early 30s, three of them World War I veterans, spent time at a small ranch outside of San Antonio camping, barbecuing, and discussing the discrimination facing their community. Out of these purely social origins arose a new mutualist group. Only this mutualista did not cater to incoming Mexican immigrants or have a Mexicanist cultural predisposition; rather, the Order of the Sons of America was exclusively composed of United States citizens who either were born citizens or had undergone naturalization. Mostly a middle-class organization of the more hybridized Tejano culture, it rejected the foreign nationalism of the working-class Mexicanist mutualistas. 22

However, as the minutes from the Order of the Sons of America illustrate, Spanish language and culture was still an important part of this Tejano middle-class, which was beginning to take great pains to differentiate itself from its immigrant and Mexicanist cousins. In some of the current academic literature of the Mexicanist mutualistas and the

\[\text{comfortable with English. The September minutes (two meetings) were brief.}\

Tejano middle-class organizations such as the Order of the Sons of America, the cultural differences are emphasized without mention of what these groups had in common, a belief that Spanish language instruction in some form was important.\(^{23}\) Just because the Order of the Sons of America emphasized English (LULAC would do so to a much greater extent), did not mean that the Spanish language and Mexican culture was something they sought to totally erase. They did not simply represent blind, subservient assimilation or middle class warfare against the lower classes within their own community, although there existed elements of this. The early Tejano middle-class groups were not so terribly dissimilar to the Mexicanist mutualistas prominent in the heavy periods of immigration in the 1910s and 1920s as generational interpretations might assume.\(^{24}\)

1930-1965, The Latin American Generation

Whatever these young, middle-class, patriotic Mexican Americans involved in groups like the Order of the Sons of America and LULAC thought of Spanish, it was relegated to secondary importance when compared with knowledge of the


\(^{24}\) Current research on the formation of LULAC and Sons of America would support this interpretation more than the either/or proposition of earlier scholarship that either lionized or heavily criticized the cultural goals of the emerging Tejano, middle-class organizations in the 1920s and 1930s. See also Orozco, "The Origins of the League of United Latin American Citizens," chapter three; and Zamora, *World of the Mexican Worker*, chapters four and seven, especially on Clemente Idar.
English language and some limited conformity to American ideals of Americanization. Some of these types of community leaders who were emerging in the late 1920s and 1930s did buy into Americanization in wholesale fashion, while others viewed the idea of Americanization as merely having a working and acceptable knowledge of English. One sharp break with the Mexicanist Generation that distinguishes both the official positions taken by LULAC and the Order of the Sons of America was the exclusion of non-citizens from participation. LULAC also mandated in its constitution (it was founded in Corpus Christi in 1929) that only English be used in all meetings and official correspondence. Comically, the original discussions of the English-Only provision had been conducted in Spanish, and the measure itself was even originally written in Spanish.25

The organization of LULAC is often thought to encapsulate the cultural, ideological, and intellectual foundations of an entire generation of Mexican American leaders from the 1930s to the 1960s. The general historical interpretation of this group is that they fought in American wars, exhibited great outward patriotism, championed middle-class goals and policies, preferred less-confrontational approaches to combating discrimination, stressed education as the true agent of uplift for their community (to the extent

that it was felt uplift was needed), and separated themselves from Mexicans and all things Mexican by demonstrating the degree to which they were as American as any other group. This new generation included other groups that organized after World War II, such as the American G. I. Forum and the Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations.\textsuperscript{26} I will refer to this body of leaders as the "Latin American Generation."

The generational interpretation holds that this Latin American Generation differed from its preceding Mexicanist Generation on cultural terms, for example, by emphasizing the acquisition of English over the instruction of Spanish. They stressed linguistic assimilation over what was for many of them their native tongue. As such, this generation of leadership consciously sought to cater to the growing number of well-placed, sympathetic Anglos who agreed that Mexican Americans were as American as any other immigrant group and did not deserve Jim Crow-style segregation. They chose to accommodate to some extent to Anglo society's cultural norms. Ultimately, this policy was designed to effect some sort of

---

\textsuperscript{26} The work of these organizations are much more chronicled than the generation of activity preceding them. A standard interpretation on the formation and meaning of these social, political, and advocacy organizations in the context of a rapidly industrializing and urbanizing state comes from Montejano, Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 278-84. For greater general attention to this generation's influence on education see San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed"; for specifically the G. I. Forum see Carl Allsup, The American G. I. Forum: Origins and Evolution. Monograph No. 6 (Austin, Texas: Center for Mexican American Studies, 1982); for LULAC see Orozco, "The Origins of the League of United Latin American Citizens."
reciprocity from the Anglo power structure. By showing what
good Americans they could be, this Latin American Generation,
best exemplified by LULAC, could combat racial discrimination
by eliciting white sympathy while still working within the
existing political system. But at times white sympathy, it
seemed, was not much different from white animosity. In 1930
University of Texas political scientist O. Douglas Weeks
concluded of LULAC's formation, "In order, therefore, that
these people may be able to stand their ground, they must
correct their own deficiencies, resulting from ignorance,
docility, and prejudice against the Anglo-Saxon and his ways.
And doing such, they must show him that they can meet his
standards and hence can demand his rights." 27

The LULAC desire to eliminate Spanish for English in the
schools was not too uncommon for some Mexican American
leaders of the time, especially those with some influence in
the existing political culture. Early founding members of
LULAC such as State Representative and Senator José T.
Canales stressed the primacy of English over Spanish long
before LULAC was founded. While serving as the
superintendent of the Brownsville public schools in 1915

---

27 O. Douglas Weeks, "The League of United Latin-American
Citizens: A Texas-Mexican Civic Organization," The
Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly, 10
(December 1929), 278. Weeks, like his student Jovita
Gonzalez, also included a copy of the new organization's
constitution. This is an early examination of LULAC and
demonstrates the chords of sympathy a middle-class, non-
radical, patriotic, and seemingly Americanized Mexican
American organization could elicit from whites, although
sympathy in this case was couched in extremely patronizing
terms.
Canales championed the Progressive issue of English-Only in the schools which was unpopular with much of the Mexican immigrant and Mexican American community. Canales even earned the enmity of Anglo political boss of Cameron County James B. Wells for advancing causes like Prohibition that Wells, dependent upon the reciprocity of Mexican American voters who would elect his Democratic ticket, thought contrary to the interests and desires of his constituency. Long before LULAC and other prominent Mexican Americans would do so, Canales instituted an English-Only policy for the public schools.²⁸

The writings of J. Luz Saenz, a World War I veteran and one of the founding members of LULAC, highlight the rhetorical themes of the organization. But Saenz's writings also illustrate the potential threat that the articulation of seemingly "safe" demands could pose to the dominant racial and social order. In a 1946 article Saenz followed the LULAC strategy of disassociating himself and resident Mexican American citizens from migratory and immigrant workers: "They are victims to inevitable circumstances prevailing at their homes or in their country. Let us thank our God for our advantages." Saenz expressed a paternalistic sympathy for Mexican immigrant workers that hardly came close to any sort of brotherhood. After partly blaming the aforementioned "victims" for the stereotype of ignorant and lazy Mexican

American students, Saenz warmed to the subject of his article: Discrimination. Saenz claimed that "Poor attendance on the part of these children and selfishness and narrow-mindedness on the part of other children and parents have created the well known and much disgusting racial problem known in Texas as the 'Mexican Child Problem in Texas Schools.'" 29

Saenz did not shift all the blame for the problems of Mexican American citizens upon Anglo Texans. He believed, however, that Anglos in the state shared partial responsibility for the plight of Mexican American education along with the immigrant Mexicans who sullied the reputations of United States citizens of Mexican American descent like Saenz. Then Saenz warned indignantly that, "very little credit has been rendered us for fighting for flag and country. We have done this. We are doing it. We shall keep doing it. Till when?...Do not take our loyalty for servilism." 30 Saenz concluded his 1946 article with a patriotic appeal for fairness in the schools: "We have destroyed or are trying to destroy Hitler's racial theory. Why not do the same thing with Bilbo and his imitators here in Texas, or in any other part of our union? This is the right thing to do if Christian civilization and democratic principles mean anything to us." 31

29 J. Luz Saenz, "Racial Discrimination: A Number One Problem of Texas Schools," The Texas Outlook, 30 (December 1946), 12.
50 Ibid.
31 Ibid., 40.
Although the primary strategy of LULAC and Mexican American leaders of this Latin American Generation was not to radically challenge the entire educational or political system, their actions at times ran counter to this strategy. One of the first legal cases challenging the segregation of Mexican American children in Texas, the Salvatierra case, was litigated by LULAC attorneys. In 1930 a lawsuit was brought against the Del Rio Independent School District by a group of Mexican American parents who alleged that their children were illegally segregated. The defending school district won the lawsuit by claiming that the segregation was not racially motivated, which would have been a problem since Mexican Americans were legally classified as whites; rather, they claimed that the segregation was for pedagogical purposes. As the superintendent of the Del Rio schools testified, "I find it advisable to devote twice as much time to teaching English to the Spanish speaking child in the first three grades in order to develop in him the necessary facilities and use of the language so that he can cope on equal terms with American language."\(^{32}\) The San Antonio state appellate judge hearing the case dismissed the charge of race-based segregation and stated that the court had no business meddling in the administrative and pedagogical decisions of school professionals. In effect, the judge claimed that the pedagogical experts and teachers knew best and that, provided

\(^{32}\) Inhabitants of Del Rio Independent School District v. Jesus Salvatierra, 33 S.W. 2d 790 (Texas Civil Appeals, 1930), 793.
the existing pedagogical segregation was limited to the first three grades, it was not discriminatory.\textsuperscript{33} It was a victory for Mexican Americans on paper since overt racial discrimination was declared illegal. But it was a hollow victory in that English-Only pedagogy, a common subterfuge for racial segregation, was ordained by the court as a legal loophole to continue the practice of de facto racial segregation by English-Only pedagogy in the schools.

This 1930 case was the only significant legal challenge to the educational status quo by LULAC before World War II. In 1930 LULAC was less than a year old and still attempting to broaden its appeal; large numbers of older and more traditional Mexicanist orders, mutualistas, and other societies protested LULAC's English language provisions and the exclusion of Mexican citizens as well as working immigrants without citizenship. The principal historian of the formation of LULAC estimates that at the 1927 preliminary convention in Harlingen (it finally organized two years later in Corpus Christi), possibly 75 to 90 percent of the delegates, both of Mexican and Mexican American citizenship, walked out in protest.\textsuperscript{34} So LULAC members in 1930 still had some of the old Mexicanist fire in their veins, which explains their participation in and financing of the Salvatierra case. For the most part, however, LULAC stressed consultation and mediation with local school districts,

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 795-96.
\textsuperscript{34} Orozco, "The Origins of the League of United Latin American Citizens" 229 and 256 (footnote 36).
urging them to gradually end their offending policies and form parent-teacher organizations. However, when this failed LULAC did aid with parent protests and boycotts of schools through the establishment of alternative temporary schools that were sometimes bilingual. So even though it billed itself as accommodationalist, LULAC's actions sometimes belied such professed patience and non-confrontation.

The strategy of accommodation by the gradualist Latin American Generation did elicit some sympathy and support from parts of the Anglo community, as illustrated by the state's response to the Good Neighborism of the 1940s. Nevertheless, even with such concerted federal and state action, the effort still did not pay off. After almost two decades of filing occasional lawsuits against flagrantly discriminatory school systems and supporting local efforts at improving education, some LULAC leaders felt less patience than that which they had previously counseled. After almost two decades of working from within the system, the education of Mexican American children remained as poor as ever. In the South Texas town of Three Rivers, for example, the elementary-level "Mexican Ward School" was housed in three wooden frame buildings with leaky roofs, no indoor plumbing or water fountains, hardly any windows, and no insulation while the white schools had such amenities. Sixteen teachers were

charged with educating the 800 attending children out of the 1,400 Mexican American school age children in that district, averaging fifty students per class.\(^{36}\) Statewide educational conditions were similarly dismal, contributing to an incredible failure rate for Mexican American children in the elementary years, as documented by educational researcher Wilson Little in the 1940s.\(^{37}\)

The post-World War II era to the 1960s was one of increasing frustration for the Latin American Generation. After two decades of work, very little of substance aside from the pyrrhic victory of Salvatierra had been accomplished to fundamentally alter school segregation or conditions. Representatives of the Latin American Generation did not take such lack of progress sitting down. During the late 1940s and 1950s LULAC and similar organizations alleged to be patriotic and middle-class oriented such as the American G. I. Forum fought ever more strenuously and vociferously in court and in the public sphere. They became more activist and confrontational with legal challenges against educational segregation and its tool of English-Only pedagogy. The creation of the American G. I. Forum in 1948 by Dr. Hector Garcia represented this more spirited and activist attitude within the traditional middle class and patriotic style of leadership. As the 1950s proceeded, the Latin American

---


\(^{37}\) Wilson Little, Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1944), 43-44.
Generation of leadership inched closer and closer to the militancy, confrontation, and immediacy yet to come.  

Representing this new, more defiant and impassioned mood, Alonso S. Perales, a World War I veteran, U. S. diplomat in Central America, attorney, and founding LULAC member from San Antonio, expressed the growing frustration of Mexican Americans of his generation immediately after World War II. Perales compiled a book of documents illustrating the discrimination faced by Mexican Americans. The documents included congressional testimony on discrimination, speeches from legislators, clergy, and professors, and letters submitted to Perales from ordinary citizens who had a story to tell regarding their own experiences with discrimination. The ironic and mocking title, Are We Good Neighbors? (published in English by a Spanish language press in San Antonio), intended to shame well-meaning Texans into exploring the enormous discrepancy between Good Neighbor rhetoric and reality. One commentator, a Catholic bishop, argued that educational discrimination faced by Mexican Americans was a tragedy since "the Spanish-speaking children, because they must speak Spanish at home and English at school, need more help and better facilities than the other

---

38 Allsup, The American G.I. Forum, 158-59. What Allsup fails to realize is that LULAC followed this same shift in attitude during the immediate post-war period. The groups shared membership, community concerns, and goals of the betterment of education as the key to achieving equality and social advancement.
children." A new mood was afoot among Mexican Americans and Mexican American leaders that would no longer tolerate the type of discrimination faced in the past.

No one exhibited more strongly than George I. Sánchez, a professor of education at the University of Texas, this attitude of futile, impotent disgust at how little had changed since the late 1930s when statewide educators finally started sympathizing with the plight of Mexican Americans. Sánchez also stressed the rhetorical strategy of shame by asking what would have happened had Poles or Italians meet with the same level of educational segregation on the basis of language deficiency. He even called the offending locals names: "Communities practicing the segregation of Spanish-speaking children are, in my conception, educationally backward and misguided." Sánchez concluded, "The practice of segregation does not square up to good pedagogy, to the best learning of English, or to good Americanism." 40

39 Rev. John J. Birch, "The Spanish Speaking People of the United States," in Are We Good Neighbors?, Alonso S. Perales, ed. (San Antonio, Texas: Artes Graficas, 1948; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1974), 55. Perales included a fiery article by LULAC comrade J. Luz Saenz in which Perales cautions the reader in advance that while the position "might look Red-Hot due to the spirit that moves us to express it," it was not an example of "Red-Communism." The article could not have been taken as overly deferential, non-confrontational, or even accommodational. It was combustible, if anything, with Luz Saenz describing Anglo Saxons as "a very limited and undesirable designation, of European descent, who flocked to west America in search of a peaceful place to make their homes and who now despise and ruthlessly antagonize Texans." See J. Luz Saenz, "Racial Discrimination," ibid., 29.

40 George I. Sánchez, Concerning Segregation of Spanish-Speaking Children in the Public Schools. Inter-American Education Occasional Papers, IX (Austin, Texas: University
Activists like Professor Sánchez in the 1950s hoped to maintain the momentum gained by the wartime Good Neighbor efforts. However, Texas' State Department of Education was overhauled in 1949 by the Gilmer-Aiken laws, becoming the Texas Educational Agency (TEA). This eliminated the Good Neighbor bureaucratic niche from which Mexican Americans like Sánchez had influence in the machinery of the state educational system. Governor Allen Shivers in 1950 created the Texas Council for the Study of Human Relations, whose purpose it was to make formal recommendations to the state legislature on matters regarding the issues and problems of Mexican Americans. This policy group was viewed as a possible improvement to the Good Neighbor Commission, which could only promote understanding and not make formal recommendations that public leaders would feel obliged to act upon. Serving on the new council were Professor Sánchez and Gus Garcia, a stellar attorney for LULAC and G.I. Forum. However, the council was disbanded in 1952 for lack of funds.\(^4^1\)

As the 1950s progressed, Mexican Americans shifted in tone away from the gradualist and overly patriotic attitudes that characterized LULAC in the 1930s. An anthropologist in the late 1950s and early 1960s conducted a series of

interviews with Mexican Americans in South Texas and interviewed one young representative who claimed, "We also want the right to be different from the Anglos. We want to maintain the Mexican family, the dignity of the individual, and the beauty of the Spanish language. I would never trade Latin dignity for Anglo boisterousness. I don't want to be like my Anglo neighbors."42 This sentiment grew in the 1950s as cultural discrimination and racial segregation continued unchanged. This growing frustration may be further illustrated by examining the more active legal challenges to the school segregation that was justified by English-Only instruction.

The course of legal challenges to pedagogical segregation in Texas received a push by decisions elsewhere in the Southwest. In 1947 a California court ruled in Westminster School District v. Mendez that the schools could segregate among different races, but that whites and Mexican Americans were not legally classified as separate races. The judge then ruled that the California school did in fact illegally segregate by race; he found unjustified the school's use of pedagogical reasons for segregation as a defense. This was the first time Mexican Americans were found to be "racially" segregated in public schools. The judge emphatically declared of the standard legal defense of limited segregation on the basis of pedagogical necessity

that "Omnibus segregation of children of Mexican ancestry from the rest of the student body in the elementary grades in the schools involved in this action because of language handicaps is not warranted by the record before us." This was a stunning decision! In response, LULAC attorney Gus Garcia asked Texas Attorney General Price Daniel for his ruling on Mendez. Daniel's ruling would spur Mexican American organizations and leaders to spring immediately into action, challenging the legality of pedagogical segregation in the courts almost a decade before the universally recognized Brown v. Board case outlawed racial discrimination in the schools.44

In Opinion Number V-128 Daniel agreed that the federal ruling established precedent for challenging the practice of pedagogical segregation in Texas. Daniel claimed that "It is our opinion, therefore, that based solely on language deficiencies and other individual needs and aptitudes, the school district may maintain separate classes, in separate buildings, if necessary, for any pupils with such deficiencies, needs, or aptitudes through the first three grades." But although Daniel allowed some possible pedagogical segregation, he made two important and significant changes to the legal status quo. First, he

43 Westminster School District of Orange County et al. v. Mendez et al., 161 F. 2nd 774 (California Federal District Court, 1947), 784-85.
limited the allowable segregation to three years. Second, he mandated that the designation of those children in need of "special instruction" had be established by scientific and objective testing: "But as emphasized in the Salvatierra and Mendez cases above, the classification under consideration must be based on the language deficiency, or individual need or aptitude, after examinations, and other properly conducted tests, equally applied to all pupils who come within the classification." In other words, all Mexican American students as a group could not automatically be segregated into special classes and those who were separated for instructional reasons could not be done so without the use of scientific and objective criteria by the schools.

The subterfuge of pedagogical segregation was up in the air, and LULAC and the American G. I. Forum decided to directly challenge the decades old legal justification for racial segregation by English-Only pedagogy. The test case

---

45 Letter from Joe R. Greenhill, assistant to the Attorney General, to Price Daniel, Attorney General, April 8, 1947, "Segregation in Schools, 1943, 1947-48," Folder 7, Box 38, George I. Sánchez Papers, NLB (hereafter this collection cited as GIS). This was a copy of an internal memo within the Office of Attorney General that was sent to the original solicitor of the opinion, Wayne L. Hartman, the Dewitt County Attorney representing the Cuero Independent School District. Sánchez sent an official response on the opinion to the Attorney General and others even though he was not an immediate party to the initial correspondence. He was forwarded a copy from Pauline Kibbe, the Executive Secretary of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission. See Letter from Sánchez to State Board of Education, et al., August 19, 1947, "Segregation in Schools, 1943, 1947-48," Folder 7, Box 38, GIS, NLB; and Letter from Pauline Kibbe to George I. Sánchez, April 14, 1947, "Good Neighbor Commission in Texas, 1946-1950," Folder 7, Box 28, GIS, NLB.
was based upon the pedagogical segregation practiced by the public schools in the towns of Bastrop, Elgin, and Martindale, and of Travis County. Twenty-one Mexican Americans in these towns, including one Minerva Delgado after whom the case would be named, obtained as their legal representation Gus Garcia, the attorney who solicited the potentially useful legal opinion from the state attorney general's office. Garcia, a member of G. I. Forum and LULAC, was assisted financially by a legal fund chaired by Professor Sánchez and representatives of LULAC and the American G. I. Forum. Armed with the support of the still fresh Mendez precedent, the attorney general's recent opinion, as well as most of the statewide Mexican American leadership, Garcia proceeded with his case in 1948 in federal district court.  

The Delgado case in many ways represented the new post-war activism of Mexican Americans in Texas even though, as in Salvatierra, their victory was somewhat hollow. The federal court ruled as it had in the Mendez case of California that segregating Mexican Americans on completely different campuses and entirely separate buildings was on its face illegal discrimination, and the Texas schools in question were indeed guilty of this. But while these offending districts were judged to have violated the plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment rights, the court nevertheless upheld the legality of some segregation of Mexican Americans due to limited English capacity so long as the decisions were made

46 Allsup, "Education is Our Freedom," 32-33.
scientifically through objective testing and not some arbitrary process.\textsuperscript{47}

The *Delgado* case was of national importance because on the heels of the *Mendez* decision, it delineated the possible legal and pedagogical loopholes upon which the growing awareness of Mexican American civil rights might be blunted. The foundational decision concerning the legality of pedagogical segregation, the 1930 *Salvatierra* ruling, did not go so far as to stipulate any conditions upon which the supposed pedagogical segregation might exist. That was for the 1948 *Delgado* decision. *Delgado* preserved the existence of English-Only and Americanizing pedagogical segregation, but did so at a price: the use of tests and objective criteria for establishing whether the individual child, not just any Mexican, may be scientifically classified to be in need of special pedagogical instruction which would entail a temporary separation from other students, but not on a separate campus or for very long. Even more important symbolically was that the school districts were found guilty of rampant, long-term, de facto racial segregation. Even though pedagogical segregation was preserved, *Delgado* was very much a moral victory that served to encourage further challenges to educational discrimination.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed," 124-25.
The state felt the impact of the decision and scurried to comply with the federal ruling's stipulation that some sort of standardized testing be provided for the classification of children needing "special" language instruction. Dr. L. A. Woods, the head of the State Department of Education during the Good Neighbor days of the 1940s, was anxious to comply. In an instructional communication to teachers, administrators, and school boards he repeated the gist of Delgado by stating that segregation based on race or national origin was illegal; that separate classes were permissible in the first grade; and that his agency did have the authority to enforce these new regulations.  

But Woods did more than just tell schools what they could not do. He made available to the local school districts and administrations a state-approved test, the "Inter-American Test in Oral English," which was developed by Professor Herschel T. Manuel of the University of Texas. This test was intended to fulfill the requirements of the Delgado decision by giving schools a standard objective criteria upon which to base their pedagogical separation. Included were instructions and regulations on when to administer the exam and under what conditions (giving the same test to white, English-speaking children) it should be used. Woods did issue the disclaimer that at that present

---

time "no certain score or grade will be fixed to be used as
the dividing line between the pupils who show ability to take
instruction in English, and those who are found to have a
decided language handicap. Each district or school will be
allowed to fix its own standards for such dividing line.
After one year of experimentation and adjustment, then we may
be ready to fix a state-wide standard, based on the data
which we secure during the year 1948-49." Woods also
conscientiously reminded the educators reading his bulletin
that "There must be no discrimination at any time in the
testing program."50

Unfortunately for Mexican Americans, the test hailed by
Superintendent Woods was neither widely used nor taken very
seriously. For one thing, Woods's authority was lessened by
the non-compliance of local school districts. In early 1949
the Del Rio Independent School District was investigated for
non-compliance with the Delgado regulations upon the
complaints of a Mexican American student group at the
University of Texas. The district was found by the state
investigator to be guilty of illegally segregating Mexican
American children. Superintendent Woods canceled the
school's state certification upon the recommendation of his
investigator. However, shortly after Del Rio's de-
certification process, the state legislature passed the

50 Ibid., With Texas Public Schools, Bulletin, State
Department of Education, September 1948 (Austin, Texas:
State Department of Education, 1948), 2. Original
underlining included.
series of sweeping educational reforms called the Gilmer-Aiken laws that completely reorganized the public school system and its bureaucracy. In the process of the overhaul, Woods's position in the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction was eliminated and replaced by the office of Commissioner of Education. The new head of the revamped agency was J. W. Edgar, who promptly re-certified Del Rio school district.⁵¹

Another reason why the tests approved by Woods were not particularly successful is because in addition to the new inability or lack of will to de-certify individual schools, not all such schools with Mexican American youngsters bothered to use the tests. These tests were not free and the costs of administering them may have acted as a deterrent to their ultimate acceptance.⁵² While not every school district provided "special" or segregated education for Mexican Americans, those that did mostly did so without the use of standardized tests.⁵³


---

⁵² Woods, With Texas Public Schools, 2.
the public school of Driscoll, a small farming community near Corpus Christi where almost three-quarters of the student population were the children of Mexican American migrant farm-workers. Upon entering school these children had little command of English. Legal action was threatened after 1949 because the school made it a policy of retaining all Mexican American children in the first two grades for four years.\textsuperscript{54}

The \textit{Hernandez} case was filed in federal district court in 1955, with the decision finally coming in January 1957. The school officials claimed that their actions were fully justified on the pedagogical grounds of language deficiency. However accurate those claims may have been, wrote Federal Judge James V. Allred, a former governor of Texas in the 1930s, they were made immaterial because "This is not a line drawn in good faith, based upon individual ability to speak and understand English." Allred went on: "It is the very opposite. It is unreasonable race discrimination against all Mexican children as a group throughout the first two grades. That it has this \textit{effect} cannot be disputed. If scientific or good faith tests were given the \textit{result} might not weigh so heavily. But where, as here, no such tests have been given, it is unreasonable on its face; and, when considered along with the other facts and circumstances enumerated, it compels the conclusion that the grouping is purposeful, intentional, and unreasonably discriminatory."\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54} San Miguel, "Let Them All Take Heed," 133-34.
\textsuperscript{55} Hermino Hernandez \textit{v.} Driscoll Consolidated Independent School District, Federal Civil Action 1384 (Texas Federal
Allred did not invent law in Hernandez. He simply applied the existing law of the land enunciated in the 1948 Delgado precedent; the Driscoll schools were using the pedagogical argument in such an unsophisticated manner that the obvious conclusion was that they did so because it achieved the ends of segregating Mexican Americans by race regardless of individual ability. Allred concluded that "Judgment will be entered declaring the District's separate grouping of students of Mexican extraction is arbitrary and unreasonable because it is directed at them as a class and is not based upon individual capacities; (2) that any grouping, whether in the beginning or subsequent years, must not be based upon racial extraction but upon individual ability to speak, understand and to be instructed in the English language; (3) that individual capacities and abilities in this respect must be determined in good faith by scientific tests recognized in the field of education." The decision was a remarkably easy one to make. Allred, though a liberal politician by Texas standards, was certainly never accused of being an activist judge. And even among other Texas liberals Allred's political views were never too liberal. He simply

---

District Court, 1957), 12. Original underlining used. These are Allred's remarks and final judgment given on January 14, 1957. This copy of the court docket, judgment, and supporting materials may be found in Folder "1384 Hermino Hernandez v Driscoll Consolidated I.S.D., et al.," Box 232, National Archives and Records Administration-Southwest Regional Archives, Fort Worth, Texas. For more on Allred's political and judicial career see Patricia A. Tidwell, "James V. Allred of Texas: A Judicial Biography" (M.A. thesis, Rice University, 1991), 16-22.
applied the Delgado test honestly in Driscoll and found the segregation arbitrary.\textsuperscript{56}

However, not all judges saw things as clearly as did Allred and not all school districts that improperly segregated did so as flagrantly as Driscoll. The newfound activism of the Latin American Generation changed the legalities while not really altering the fundamental patterns of discrimination and pedagogical segregation in the way it was hoped. Educational conditions for most Mexican American schoolchildren were still poor. After all the so-called pedagogical progress in the previous two decades one study of the 1950s said that over 80 percent of one border city's total student population were found to be enrolled in segregated schools.\textsuperscript{57} Punishment for speaking Spanish on school grounds, an element of English-Only policy dating from the 1920s, continued on in the everyday practice of Texas school districts. One blank detention form labeled "VIOLATION SLIP - SPANISH DETENTION," from the El Paso public schools read "_______ was speaking Spanish during school hours. This pupil must report to Spanish Detention in the Cafeteria...on the assigned day." The slip was dated September 1966!\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{56} Hernandez v Driscoll, 13-A (there were two page thirteens, page 13 and page 13-A).
\textsuperscript{57} Ozzie G. Simmons, "Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans in South Texas: A Study in Dominant-Subordinate Group Relations" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1952), 134.
\textsuperscript{58} "Exhibit No. 12: Copy of Spanish Detention Slip, El Paso, Texas," in Hearing Before the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Hearing Held in San Antonio, Texas, December
George I Sánchez and E. E. Mireles

Two teachers representing the complexities of the Mexican American cultural response to English-Only were George I. Sánchez and E. E. Mireles. Professor Sánchez researched and taught about the educational experience of Mexican Americans, and Mireles shaped that very experience on the frontlines of the public schools of Corpus Christi. Both men were active in LULAC. However, they represented contrasting currents of cultural thought within the Latin American Generation. Sánchez, as we have seen, was classroom segregation's biggest enemy. Since educational Jim Crow depended largely upon alleged language handicap and the special instruction needed to correct it, Sánchez viewed the Mexican American child's knowledge of Spanish as useful only if it did not get in the way of learning the English language, the gateway to integrated schools. Mireles's approach to language was different. Mireles too was an integrationalist who felt that Spanish-speaking children learned best when in classes with English-speaking children. But for Mireles the opposite was more interesting; he was most concerned with the teaching of Spanish as a foreign language in the elementary grades to both English- and Spanish-speaking children together.

Dr. George I. Sánchez was born in rural New Mexico to a long-standing family of prominence in 1906. He was educated in the public schools of New Mexico and Arizona and then taught elementary school in a rural impoverished area, acting as its principal at the young age of 17. He did this for several years while working on his bachelor's degree from the University of New Mexico during the summers. He obtained his degree at age 24 and with his diploma in hand became the superintendent of the school district. Shortly after, Sánchez took his masters degree from the University of Texas in educational psychology and Spanish. Immediately thereafter he went to the University of California at Los Angeles to work on his doctorate in educational administration. During the period in which he was finishing his doctorate he also served as the Director of the Division of Information and Statistics in the New Mexico State Department of Education. In the early 1930s Sánchez earned a reputation as a young, crusading bureaucrat by his impolitic attacks (he received some death threats while serving in the New Mexico agency) upon the segregation and poor facilities that the Mexican Americans of New Mexico had to endure. Sánchez would last in New Mexico for only a short time. An academic position beckoned in 1940 and Sánchez found himself back at the University of Texas for the rest of his career except for brief stints as a visiting professor to universities and educational consultant to governments.  

---

Américo Paredes, "Jorge Isidoro Sánchez y Sánchez
Had George Sánchez done nothing more than simply publish his scholarly work, he would still be remembered as one of the leading Mexican American intellectuals of his age. Sánchez's scholarship remains an underexamined aspect of his life.⁶⁰ He cut his academic teeth by writing several articles in the 1930s that dealt with the influence of bilingualism on IQ testing. A brief overview of Sánchez's early works illustrates his frontal attack upon the practice of labeling Mexican American children as innately retarded or mentally challenged. First, he made the distinction between loyal, progressive, and patriotic Mexican American citizens on the one hand, and on the other hand, immigrant workers with no tie either to the United States or to the English-speaking public school system. Second, Sánchez made the point that the IQ tests of the 1920s measured socio-economic factors more than they did actual intelligence. Third, Sánchez argued that almost all such tests were poorly constructed due to the lack of knowledge of bilingualism and the lack of accounting for environmental factors. Fourth, Sánchez argued


that one unmeasured factor of daily life intruding upon the results of such tests was the daily prejudice experienced by Mexican Americans.⁶¹

Praise from his academic peers in the national testing community eluded Sánchez. In one of the standard reviews of the literature published in the 1950s, some two decades after Sánchez published his pioneering work in the discipline, one of the major figures of the field of intelligence testing on bilingualism cited only one article from him of significance.⁶² Sánchez was one of the lowest paid faculty members at the University of Texas at the time of his death. It was recalled by a colleague at the university that this snubbing by academic comrades was not unintentional and that in addition to Sánchez's outspoken and blunt nature, "His tendency to range far and wide in interdisciplinary fields was one of the reasons why he was something of a thorn in the side of those who favored the academic status quo."⁶³

---


⁶³ Paredes, "Jorge Isidoro Sánchez y Sánchez," 123.
Sánchez was a prolific scholar and published scores of articles in academic journals, state education journals, newspapers, and pamphlets for governmental agencies. In addition, he gave expert testimony for court cases and wrote articles for political journals. When his administrative duties increased in the 1940s and 1950s, his publishing did not end; rather, it widened from tightly focused and limited studies in academic journals to topics of broader popular appeal. His 1940 book, Forgotten People, deals with language as a part of the issue of social and educational discrimination against Mexican Americans. In the early 1960s Sánchez, after having difficulty in eliciting interest from publishers, privately published a book on Mayan arithmetic. From the 1940s to the 1950s Sánchez was especially active in the authorship of numerous governmental reports and studies. In the 1960s Sánchez no longer published much in academic forums but rather in newspapers and political journals.  

Sánchez was directly involved with the experimentation of new variations of English-Only pedagogy in the heyday of the Inter-American Education movement at the University of Texas during World War II. Much of Sánchez's experience in the actual pedagogy of English-Only was not with small children, however. The efforts of several university educators at the University of Texas during the summer of 1943 involved the teaching of adult foreign university

---

students in Austin how to speak enough English to get by in their introductory freshmen courses or for teachers from Latin American countries to better their English through an English-Only immersion course. The goals of the professors, Sánchez among them, was to use this experience and apply it to "Anglo-Americans interested in the teaching of English to Latin Americans, or in the allied field of teaching English to children of Spanish-speaking communities in the United States." The desire to use these results and apply them to children illustrates how Sánchez and others did not fundamentally question the theoretical understanding of English-Only.⁶⁵

Sánchez's concern for language lay mostly toward its use by local school officials seeking to justify segregation. As such, Sánchez was not overly interested in Spanish as a subject, especially if it were to hinder the learning of English, which his early articles imply. However, by the 1940s the professor moved along with the times. As English-Only underwent some easing during the Good Neighbor years of the war, Sánchez and others celebrated the teaching of Spanish as a means of helping Spanish-speaking students gain greater self-confidence. However, his support of Spanish was always qualified. In an article from the 1950s Sánchez suggested, "That teacher's concern would be less with

⁶⁵ "A Report on The Program of Teaching English as a Second Language at the University of Texas, Austin, Texas, From July 5 to August 28, 1943," "Inter-American Relations," Folder 11, Box 61, GIS, NLB.
'teaching English' than with helping children learn how to think—helping them to acquire the tools for thought and to utilize those tools in the construction of ideas, in the solution of problems, in communication. In brief, she would be concerned with the education of the child rather than with English—and the two are not synonomous!" The obvious answer Sánchez was leading up to was Spanish instruction for Spanish-speakers in teaching them English. How else would higher level "concepts" be taught when the child's cognitive framework was already in Spanish? This is the theoretical wall that Sánchez hit as early as the 1930s and continued to butt against well into the 1950s. His theoretical understanding of language was still very much colored by English-Only concepts and would be so until the 1960s.

In this period he remained wedded to English-Only as the proper pedagogical tool but disagreed with the daily practice of English-Only in local school districts where it meant segregation. His activities after World War II and well into the 1950s reflected this concern. In a letter to Joe R. Greenhill, the legal assistant who shaped Opinion V-128 for Attorney General Price Daniel, Sánchez argued that there was no reason for any type of pedagogical segregation that made educational sense. He asked if Mexican American children (or any other children) could be segregated on this basis, then "why can't they be segregated on the basis of deficiencies in

---

arithmetic, or ability to draw, or muscular reaction speed, or any other arbitrarily selected subject matter, accomplishment, etc.?" He then argued that as an educator there was no justification for arbitrarily defining the segregation cut off-point at grade three. Sánchez ended by correctly prophesying that the state's current position "will boomerang on the very first instance that the matter is brought to the attention of the federal courts."  

George Sánchez perhaps never achieved the admiration of his academic peers because of his passion for politics. Indeed, his work, especially after the late 1940s, had been less academic and more political in nature. This political involvement is illustrated by Dr. Sánchez's long-running relationship with Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough. Sánchez wrote several letters to the senator regarding the potential misuse of National Defense Education Act funds (Yarborough had been the principal author of the legislation in the late 1950s) by the TEA. According to Sánchez, the TEA used the grants to fund a program for migrant children in which these children were in pedagogically segregated classrooms that Sánchez, perhaps a little too dramatically, referred to as

---

68 Ibid., 2 and 3 (quotation). A week later Sánchez sent a similar letter to Governor Beauford Jester. See Letter From Sánchez to Governor Beauford Jester, May 15, 1947, "Segregation in Schools, 1943, 1947-48," Folder 8, Box 38, GIS, NLB.
"pedagogical concentration camps." In other instances Sánchez complained to Yarborough about the overrepresentation of African Americans in various Great Society programs in comparison to Mexican Americans.

Not only did George Sánchez have access to Senator Ralph Yarborough, but he appears to have had some significant degree of influence as well. In 1961 Yarborough thought enough of Sánchez to include in the Congressional Record an article Sánchez wrote entitled "A New Frontier for the Americas," in which he argued for greater inter-American efforts in the way of scholarships, studies, and educational opportunities. In 1967 Sánchez wrote a strategy memo with his recommendations regarding Yarborough's Bilingual Education Act that was still in the process of being formulated. Sánchez illustrated in the memo, addressed to Yarborough's legislative aid, Joe Alaniz, that he had begun to deeply alter his own theoretical understanding of language away from the English-Only framework. Sánchez noted, "In Canada, a few years ago, psychologists discovered that students who were bilingual made higher scores on intelligence tests than those who only knew one language." This was a reference to the Peal and Lambert study. Sánchez

---

69 Letter From Sánchez to Senators John Tower, Ralph Yarborough, and Congressman Jake Pickle, May 24, 1968, "Correspondence 1966-68," Folder 12, Box 46, GIS, NLB.

70 Letters from Sánchez to Yarborough, May 16, 1966; October 11, 1966; and February 1, 1967, Folder 12, Box 46, GIS, NLB.

71 Ralph Yarborough, Congressional Record, 107 (March 8, 1961), 1, "Judge Ralph W. Yarborough, 1956-63," Folder 10, Box 46, GIS, NLB.
refused to accept all its implications, but went on to argue for the dismantling of English-Only in order to preserve the Spanish language as a cultural resource.  

Sánchez paid a price for his political activism on behalf of Mexican American educational rights. Sánchez was the national president of LULAC in 1940 and 1941. Like other civil rights activists and leaders across the country, the Federal Bureau of Investigations began a file on him. He was characterized as basically loyal but an agitator on civil rights. In his correspondence to Yarborough, Sánchez alleged that he had been routinely harassed by the Internal Revenue Service along with several other outspoken University of Texas professors. Sánchez also alleged that he was in possession of a letter written by a member of the State Board of Education informing him that Commissioner of Education J. W. Edgar was forbidden to communicate with him.

Sánchez represents the side of the Latin American generation that attempted to work within the English-Only paradigm as part of the rules of admission, the price of the ticket to becoming a citizen of the United States. The Latin American Generation's support of English-Only education was a

---

72 Letter from Sánchez to Joe Alaniz, May 26, 1967, p 1 (quotation) and 2, "Yarborough," Folder 12, Box 46, GIS, NLB.  
74 Letter From Sánchez to Yarborough, April 17, 1963; and Letter from Yarborough to Sánchez, April 26, 1963, "Judge Ralph W. Yarborough, 1956-63," Folder 10, Box 46, GIS, NLB.  
75 Letter From Sánchez to Yarborough, September 18, 1967, Folder 12, Box 46, GIS, NLB.
central part of its core identity. If they ever thought English-Only was unfair or that it made little sense, they did not make much of it as they had, in their minds, much larger problems to deal with such as poverty, violence, and discrimination. Only at the end of his life did Sánchez come out strongly for bilingual education, and by then his position of leadership in Mexican American education had faded as a new leadership emerged.

Another side of this Latin American generation of leadership is represented by Corpus Christi educator E. E. Mireles. Unlike Sánchez, Mireles was never in a position where spoken Spanish did not play a substantial role in his daily life. In Mireles's case, it involved his career as a Spanish teacher, local community leader and activist, and editor of bilingual newspapers. Sánchez, on the other hand, taught teachers how to best teach Spanish-speakers English, was most active in the state arena, and was also affiliated with LULAC but as its national president and representative to the English-speaking world, not like Mireles—the local leader of a predominantly Spanish-speaking community.

Little is known or written about E. E. Mireles. Edmundo Eduardo Mireles was born in 1905 in Parral, Mexico, in the state of Chihuahua, and died in Corpus Christi in 1987. Mireles spent his youth in Mexico and in San Antonio and graduated from the University of Texas in 1931. He taught in Del Rio and San Antonio in the 1930s and was married to the former Jovita González, an author of several children's books.
designed to teach Spanish. She also wrote a legendary master's thesis at the University of Texas in 1930 on the social history of the lower Rio Grande Valley. In 1940 Mireles moved to Corpus Christi to become director of Spanish in the city's elementary schools.  

The Corpus Christi grade school Spanish program was quite unique. It came into existence while teaching Spanish in the grade schools was still prohibited by state law. Mireles's program received a special dispensation from the state before the start of the 1940 school year to proceed on an experimental basis. By the end of the first year in March 1941 (to take effect in the school year of 1941-1942), a bill was passed by the Texas legislature which allowed other elementary schools in the state to follow the example of Corpus Christi. Even before the practice was legalized by the state it had the support of conservative Congressman Richard "Dick" Kleberg of Kingsville who said of Mireles's still-nascent program "Present world crisis accentuates importance of neighborly and friendly relationships between North and South America. For these and many other reasons I am for your fine program." Mireles's program had the
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76 Biographical sketch of Edmundo Eduardo Mireles for E. E. Mireles Papers, Index, 1981, E. E. Mireles Papers (hereafter cited as EEM), NLB.
77 "S. B. No. 67, March 31, 1941," Folder 1, Item 17, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
78 "Comments from Educators," Folder 1, Item 8, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
support of the Good Neighbor policy organizations throughout the state.\textsuperscript{79}

There were nine elementary schools in Corpus Christi when the program began in September of 1940. The courses were made mandatory by the school district. Each school had a head Spanish teacher who submitted reports and lesson plans to Mireles, the district-wide administrator in charge of all Spanish language instruction. The courses, while billed as grade school Spanish instruction, actually extended into what would today be called the Junior High, from grades three to eight. Not all elementary grade teachers felt comfortable or capable of teaching Spanish, even though Mireles swore to observers that "it is unnecessary to know much Spanish to teach a little." Some elementary grade teachers who spoke Spanish well and felt comfortable with such an arrangement could take several other colleagues' classes. But even these teachers did not spring from Mireles's head fully formed. Spanish instruction was not a skill that Texas, either in the high schools or in the universities, took the care to develop. Therefore, many of the district's elementary grade school Spanish teachers attended a weekly seminar Mireles ran in order to practice on their Spanish. Mireles and his staff also offered adult courses at night which, over the course of

\textsuperscript{79} Letter from Thurmond Krueger to Marvin P. Baker, February 24, 1942, Folder 1, Item 11, Box 1, EEM, NLB. Krueger was the coordinator of Inter-American Cooperation for the Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce and Superintendent Baker was Mireles's superior.
a couple of years, enrolled more than 600 adult learners from around the city.\textsuperscript{80}

Mireles required that the grade school classes use the direct method of Spanish-Only. There was to be absolutely no spoken English in the Spanish lessons, which usually lasted anywhere between 20 to 55 minutes a day. In an outline of suggestions for his teachers, Mireles articulated several tips on conducting a Spanish-Only class: "(1) Answer roll in Spanish; (2) Use common expressions repeatedly; (3) Let children answer questions normally rather than in complete sentences."\textsuperscript{81}

He was soon seconded by the state in his preference for Spanish-Only in the classroom. The State Department of Education in 1945 decided on a series of recommendations in which the first and foremost was that "All Spanish in the elementary grades should be of an oral and conversational type." But the state was also aware of the limited language capabilities of many Texas schools. The state went on to suggest that if a school did not have anyone qualified or able to teach Spanish in such a manner, that "a period of at least ten minutes per day be set aside and called the Spanish Period. The teachers should be instructed to use this period

\textsuperscript{80} "Habla Ud. Inglés?", Time, February 14, 1944, 72 (quotation), Folder 10, Item 121, Box 1, EEM, NLB; Letter from E. E. Mireles to Maurice R. Ahrens, May 30, 1952, Folder 1, Item 10, Box 1, EEM, NLB; and "Notes Made on Spanish Program During the First Week of its Existence, September 16, 1940," Folder 1, Item 2, Box 1, EEM, NLB.

\textsuperscript{81} "Conversational Spanish Group, E. E. Mireles, Leader, Outline," 1944, Folder 1, Item 9, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
to present materials in Social Science in the Latin American Field intended to implement the Good Neighbor Policy."\(^{82}\)

Mireles sought no less than the rehabilitation of Spanish as a civilized and cultured tongue. He also set out to rehabilitate the perception of Spanish-speaking children as uneducable by instilling pride in their heritage and a sense of accomplishment, not handicap, at being bilingual. For Mireles, his language program was only nominally about bilingualism; it was more about biculturalism. As Mireles claimed, "Bilingual competence is an integral part of developing a knowledge of the cultural aspects of the Spanish and the English languages and the fostering of an appreciation of the reflection of these peoples and their contributions to our American heritage."\(^{83}\) In many ways, Mireles's desire for bilingual-bicultural education in the 1940s mirrored the bilingual education movement's goals of cultural pride in the 1970s.

During World War II Mireles was as busy outside the school as he was inside. In the spring of 1943 he helped form the Pan American Council of Texas, becoming its first president. This was one of the Good Neighbor clubs that sprang up around the state during the war. As such, Mireles put together public celebrations in Corpus Christi commemorating Pan American Day in April 1944 and Columbus Day

\(^{82}\) L. A. Woods, "Recommendations and Suggestions on Improving the Teaching of Spanish at the High School Level," 1945, Folder 1, Item 25, Box 1, EEM, NLB.

\(^{83}\) "Philosophy," 1944, Folder 1, Item 12, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
later that October. But such organizations went beyond simply repeating wartime propaganda about Good Neighborism. The program for the Pan American Day festivities contained two somber articles on the challenges facing the participants in those days of rhetorical optimism. One article was entitled "Good Neighbor Policy and Discrimination in the Southwest," and another was entitled "Ignorance is No Excuse for Discrimination in the Southwest."  

In addition to serving as president of the Pan American Council of Texas, Mireles also took part in community affairs as a newspaper editor and the head of the local LULAC club. Mireles even edited the national \textit{LULAC News} out of Corpus Christi for a brief time when he was the local president. It was a bilingual paper with articles in English and in Spanish. Shortly after the war Mireles edited another local bilingual newspaper in Corpus Christi called the \textit{Texas Mexican Gazette/La Gaceta Mexico Texana}. There was nothing anti-Hispanic or self-loathing about Mireles's newspapers. They utilized both languages side by side. Most interestingly, Mireles included a regular column entitled "Short Course in Spanish" in which he gave his English-speaking audience (one would assume of Mexican Americans) a

\footnote{\textit{The Pan American Council of Texas Presents a United Front}, April, 14, 1944, Folder 5, Item 107, Box 1, EEM, NLB; \textit{Pan American Council of Texas Organization, Constitution, By Laws, Committees Motion to Incorporate, Charter}, April 12, 1943, Folder 5, Item 104, Box 1, EEM, NLB; and \textit{Program of Pan American Fiesta}, October 12, 13, and 14, 1944, Folder 5, Item 105, Box 1, EEM, NLB. \textit{LULAC News}, January 1945, Folder 11, Item 124, Box 1, EEM, NLB.}
crash-course in the Spanish language through several lessons. For E. E. Mireles his work as a Spanish teacher never ended.\textsuperscript{86}

In the late 1940s and early 1950s Mireles continued to work with Spanish teachers in the elementary grades of Corpus Christi. Mireles still attracted national notoriety from scholars and other language teachers attempting to apply his method and techniques in their own schools. At the end of his first year in 1941 he had 71 teachers in the city's schools who could teach Spanish along with 5,183 pupils. By 1947 Mireles had 127 teachers and 8,016 students enrolled in Spanish; the totals in 1950 were 180 teachers and 9,903 children. At the end of 1952 it was 256 teachers and 10,386 students. Mexican American students were slightly less than one half of the total participation in Mireles's program during this period. Whereas other Spanish programs in the state and in the nation may have fizzled after the war, Corpus Christi's Spanish program which was led by E. E. Mireles flourished.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{86} For one example see Mireles, "Short Course in Spanish, Lesson No. 14," The Texas Mexican Gazette/La Gaceta Mexico Texana, January 1947, Folder 11, Item 125e, Box 1, EEM, NLB.

\textsuperscript{87} Letter from Mireles to Mrs. Anne Harrison, January 30, 1956, Folder 1, Box 1, EEM, NLB; E. E. Mireles, "The Teaching of Spanish in Our Public Schools," The American School Board Journal, 127 (November 1953), 33-34 and 92, Folder 10, Item 123, Box 1, EEM, NLB; Good Neighbor Commission of Texas, Minutes of the Quarterly Meeting, September 30, 1948, 13, Folder 7, Box 28, GIS, NLB; "Buenos Días, Maestra," Christian Science Monitor, January 24, 1953, Folder 10, Item 122, Box 1, EEM, NLB; Memo From Mireles to Dr. Maurice Ahrens, Curriculum Director, May 30, 1952, Folder 1, Item 10, Box 1, EEM, NLB; and "Statistical Report on Latin Americans and Anglo Americans in Corpus Christi Schools, 1947-1951," undated, Folder 1, Item 44, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
In the late 1950s when the state created the pre-school educational program for Mexican American children, Mireles quietly labored to make it a success. In fact, the Corpus Christi schools under Mireles's direction had already begun a pilot program for pre-school English instruction for non-English-speaking children in 1956. It was 1957 before the state became involved in making "official" through House Bill 51 such pre-school language instruction. Similar to the bilingual "Little Schools of the 400" begun by Houston LULAC leader Felix Tijerina in the 1950s, these schools run by Mireles hoped to teach a vocabulary of approximately 500 English words and 50 or 60 common expressions to aid in their eventual transition to an English-Only classroom. Mireles actively defended and talked up the pre-school program well into the 1960s and advised ranking education officials of his suggestions to better it.  

The Mexican American response to English-Only is impossible to separate from the Mexican American response to discrimination, segregated schools, and hurtful cultural stereotypes amplified by the schools. It is impossible to untangle from those responses because it is apiece with them. English-Only was discrimination, it became segregation, and it reflected a lack of confidence in the ability of Mexican
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88 E. E. Mireles, "Summer English Program for Pre-School Non-English Speaking Children," 1962, Folder 3, Item 68, Box 1, EEM, NLB; E. E. Mireles, "Summer English Program, Common Expressions," 1956-1957, Folder 3, Item 73, Box 1, EEM, NLB; Letter from Mireles to Paul Haas, March 1, 1963, Folder 3, Item 83, Box 1, EEM, NLB.
Americans to perform well in schools. The response by the Mexicanist Generation of the turn of the century through the 1920s was to protest English-Only and ignore the schools if possible. Their successors, the Latin American Generation, were World War I and World War II veterans who pushed for education in the public schools as the prime mechanism for social advancement; they attempted to work within the system. This meant that they, for the most part, accepted the primacy of English-Only pedagogy. But like the preceding Mexicanist Generation who mixed accommodation and resistance in their response, the Latin American Generation also was a mixed bag language preferences.

Some like George I. Sánchez went decades before finally getting over the English-Only frame of thinking about language instruction. On the other hand, others like E. E. Mireles only accepted English-Only to the extent that they had to and did all that they could to undermine (un-self-consciously) its theoretical foundations. Mireles never seems to have indicated the implications of his dogged pursuit of Spanish instruction for Spanish-speakers in mixed classes with their English-speaking brethren, but it was only one step removed from the bilingual education that would occur in the late 1960s and 1970s in Texas. By examining language it can be illustrated that neither the Mexicanist generation nor the Latin American generation was as culturally monolithic and different from one another as some historians have made
them out to be. This is an ironic chapter of continuity in a dissertation of discontinuity.
Chapter Eight:

The decade of the 1960s witnessed the discrediting of English-Only's reign as the federally championed method of teaching English to non-English-speaking children. In its place came bilingualism in the classroom as provided for by the Bilingual Education Act of 1967. By 1974 bilingual education no longer was an experimental idea; it had become a judicially mandated tool for the empowerment and integration of language minorities, mostly Hispanic, into the mainstream of American public education. Not merely a passive bystander to these national developments, the state of Texas developed some of the first bilingual education experimental programs in the country and passed its own bilingual education statutes in 1969 and 1973.

Since World War I there had existed among the nation's linguists, teachers, scientists, attorneys, judges, and public leaders a consensus of opinion on how to educate non-English-speaking children: English-Only. As the previous chapters have indicated, the concept of English-Only was so powerful that it had almost completely shut off debate and research on bilingual instruction for decades. It was an all-encompassing system of pedagogy interlaced with racist assumptions as to the concepts of citizenship and assimilation, intelligence and achievement testing, daily curriculum, teacher training, language research, official
legal opinion, and the prospective educability of Mexican Americans. As Chapter Six has indicated, slight fissures in that consensus emerged after World War II. But by and large this whole English-Only paradigm survived intact into the 1960s and only was it finally discredited.

One of the central ironies in the history of the Bilingual Education Act and the modern bilingual education movement is that they were officially legitimized by then President Lyndon Baines Johnson. In true Dickens-like coincidence, Johnson is the only United States president to have actually had any significant experience with non-English-speaking children in a classroom setting. In fact, the very man who signed into law the Bilingual Education Act of 1967 had been a practitioner of English-Only pedagogy at his poverty-stricken Mexican American school in Cotulla, Texas (Welhausen Elementary School). He was a teacher and principal there in 1928, his first job out of Southwest Texas State Teachers College. The young Lyndon Johnson would wake in the morning to "the hum of motors before daylight hauling the kids off in a truck to work on the neighboring farms."¹ It was not Johnson's first experience with poverty, as one childhood friend put it, for he had seen plenty of that in the Hill Country region where he grew up, but it was an altogether different type of poverty.² The blatant

exploitation of and prejudice against Mexican Americans witnessed by Johnson affected him; he wanted to "spark something inside them, to fill their souls with ambition and interest and belief in the future."³

As was his way, Johnson energetically, perhaps even frenetically threw himself into his work. He sacrificed himself and worked tirelessly for his young Mexican American charges. In one instance, the future chief executive asked his mother to procure a crate of toothpaste for his students since many of them were so poor that they did without. In October 17, 1928, Lyndon Johnson wrote to his mother: "I want 200 pkg. Of toothpaste. We soon will have over 250 in school. They are all rather small and I think that they would appreciate it very much." In the same letter Johnson asked his mother for 20 to 25 short selections (two or three paragraphs long) for public speeches for his students.⁴ Dan Garcia, a former Johnson student who became a furniture store owner and the first Mexican American city alderman of Cotulla, said that the gangly teacher pushed for extracurricular activities and was willing to purchase the

³ Dallek, Lone Star Rising, 79.
⁴ Letter from Lyndon Johnson to Rebekah Johnson, October, 17, 1928, Family Correspondence, "Rebekah Johnson Correspondence," Box 1, LBJ.
first athletic equipment the school ever had for its Mexican American students out of his own salary.  

Kind and beloved a teacher as Johnson was to these Mexican American children, he also applied the most Progressive pedagogical techniques of the day to get his students to master the English language: English-Only. The accounts of his former students several decades later attest to his sometimes hard application of the rule of English-Only. He applied the rules of English-Only (corporal punishment for Spanish spoken anywhere on the school grounds) sternly, but not dogmatically or harshly. One former student, Ed Gonzalez, a teletype operator for the Durham Morning Herald in North Carolina, remarked of Johnson "He was a pretty good teacher...We had him for a foreign language, English. It was foreign to us since the whole school was Spanish or Mexican kids." And if those English lessons were incomplete or lacking in effort, claimed Gonzalez, the punishment would have been spankings for the older children and ear-pinchings for the younger ones. Remembered Gonzalez, "I'll say this for him, he could pinch ears harder than anybody I ever knew."  

Juan Rodriguez, an ironworker in

---

Chicago, recalled a spanking from Johnson that was such that he "could hardly sit the rest of the day."  

But Lyndon Johnson's application of English-Only pedagogy was done with a sincere desire to help. All of the students who remembered some form of corporal punishment from the future president (and there were several), almost to an individual followed those statements with recollections of how they had never had a teacher who cared so much for them or made them feel such a powerful sense of self-worth. Even their parents were proud of the effort that the young Johnson made on their behalf. And the young teacher was not completely unbending or insensitive to the young children's language difficulties, claimed Gonzalez, "People don't understand how hard it is to learn English, and Mr. Johnson was very patient with us. He was a good teacher and he had the advantage of knowing Spanish so when we came to an English word we couldn't understand, he would tell us what it was in our language."

Also complimentary were the comments of former student Dan Garcia, who recalled "This may sound strange but a lot of us felt he was too good for us...We wanted to take advantage of his being here. It was like a blessing from the clear sky." Juanita Ortiz remembered that "He also made us compete with other schools in the area in
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7 "One Man and a Boy!" Vulcan Mold's Pit and Pour, 5 (April 1964), PP 13-5, "PP 13-5, Education," WHCF, Box 108, LBJ. This was an unnumbered employee publication for Vulcan Mold & Iron Company in Lansing, Illinois, forwarded to the White House by the plant manager, M. Earl Saxman.

8 Srodes, "Ear Pincher!" "PP 13-5, Education," WHCF, Box 108, LBJ.
debate and declamation...This helped our self-respect a lot."
Johnson was the best teacher these disadvantaged students would most likely ever have; in order to be so he had to bend and contort the rules of English-Only pedagogy.

By the time Lyndon Johnson was president, that very English-Only pedagogy was fast becoming antiquated. Studies and experimental programs carried out by the federal government borrowed from the changing conceptions of language in the scientific community and ushered new ways of teaching non-English-speaking children English through greater use of their native languages. Johnson himself had inadvertently—or perhaps commonsensically—employed some Spanish in his own English language instruction in the 1920s. The federal government through the Office of Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) started experimenting with bilingual instruction in the early 1960s before it was officially legalized.

National Shifts on Language and Culture

In the 1950s language study and the learning of foreign cultures abroad was stressed because of the country's new international position in the Cold War. By the 1960s the interest in foreign cultures shifted to those already in the United States. The nation's demographic makeup was changing rapidly and so were intellectual conceptualizations of

---


In fact, much of this new increase in immigration was spurred on by the federal government's revision of the restrictionist quotas of the old National Origins Act of the 1920s.\footnote{David M. Reimers, Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 81-86.} The idea of immigrant assimilation was in a similar process of revision. Intellectuals like Milton Gordon in Assimilation in American Life (1964) began reevaluating and writing about differing patterns of assimilation in the American past beyond the "Melting Pot" construct.\footnote{Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).}

1960s and the subsequent legalization of bilingual education from these larger social, cultural, and intellectual shifts.

The federal government's Office of Education busied itself throughout the early 1960s with experiments and studies on language. According to the Commissioner of Education, from 1959 to 1963 the number of National Defense Education Act (NDEA) learning centers increased from 19 to 55, the number of modern language fellowships awarded increased from 171 to 902, and the number of federally funded language research projects increased from 20 to 29. The total expenditure for this emphasis on foreign languages rose from $3,415,847 in 1959 to $7,999,999 in 1963. And this flurry of activity by the Office of Education was just from NDEA funding.15

Part of this increasing largesse went to support language experiments that fleshed out the new research on bilingualism and native language instruction. In 1963 an amendment to the NDEA allowed the Office of Education "to support institutes for advanced training of public school teachers in teaching English as a second language to non-English-speaking students." A government linguist, James E. Alatis, indicated that the science of language acquisition was changing. Other factors were now considered in the acquisition of language, such as cultural clash and cultural

15 Testimony of Commissioner of Education Before Special Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Feb. 3, 1964, "LE/EA 2, 7/1/64-10/13/64," WHCF, Box 37, LBJ.
reinforcement. Alatis still favored the audio-lingual approach (described in Chapter Six) that grew out of World War II. This approach was essentially a modified and less intense form of English-Only pedagogy whereby the direct method (using only English to teach English) would be only partially utilized because all stress was on oral and not written language, as it partially was with the direct method of English-Only pedagogy. In addition, claimed Alatis, the language minority child's culture was to be deemed important. He remarked that a certain nod to the student's home culture (language) was granted in the new versions of the audio-lingual approach: "the modern linguist does not reject outright the native tongue or dialect of the various students. He believes, rather, that we should leave the student's language alone (and teach him a second idiom as if it were a foreign tongue). His native language or dialect [in the case of African Americans] is vitally important to him in maintaining social acceptability in his own immediate environment. Certain of our young men, to put it in down-to-earth terms, need to be able to communicate properly in the employment office without losing their status in the poolroom."16 Hip talk from a linguist!

One specific research project sponsored by the Office Of Education and the University of Texas in San Antonio during 1964 and 1965 concerned the failures of traditional English-

Only approaches (even those modified by the audio-lingual methods) and the potential success of native language instruction, or bilingual education. Annie Stemmler, one of the project's main researchers, published a preliminary report on the research goals and methodologies in which she scathingly noted of the curricular status in Texas that 80 percent of beginning non-English-speaking children in Texas schools failed the first grade due to their inability to read properly. Stemmler sampled a number of elementary schools in San Antonio with almost exclusively non-English-speaking children. She found that after intensive instruction in Spanish, the children's abilities and (more importantly) their attitudes toward school and themselves unexpectedly improved. Stemmler was initially interested in a form of all-English instruction and only used the Spanish instruction (with the direct method of Spanish-Only) as a type of control in order to isolate the native language's expected hindrance of English acquisition. Instead, she wrote "we became aware of the tremendous positive impact of according Spanish an accepted role in the traditionally English-speaking classroom. Spanish all too often is considered a second-rate language in Texas and other border states, and to speak Spanish is a mark of low social status. The benefits of true bilingualism have generally been overlooked. In fact, a tacit and nearly general policy has
been to punish children for using Spanish at any time in school."\(^{17}\)

The fact that researchers interested originally in English as a second language (ESL) techniques through various types of the audio-lingual methods were stumbling onto bilingualism such as Alatis and Stemmler is not surprising. The federal government in the early 1960s still favored the post-World War II modification of the old direct method of English-Only, the audio-lingual approach. ESL came about in the 1960s due to the increased demand from the growth of immigrants and non-English-speakers in the United States. The Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages organization (TESOL) formed in 1966, a year before the Bilingual Education Act was passed by the Congress and well before the popularization of bilingual education by 1974.\(^{18}\) The Office of Education reflected this shift away from the old English-Only for ESL, which was newer and less dismissive of native languages.\(^{19}\)

Even old Foreign Languages in the Elementary School movement (FLES) warhorses like Theodore Andersson, a University of Texas professor and director of the foreign


language program of the Modern Language Association, expressed approval of native language instruction. Instead of focusing simply on foreign language teaching in the early grades, Andersson shifted his emphasis. He now claimed that foreign language instruction to the grade school foreign-speaking child (really native language instruction) would benefit their eventual assimilation into mainstream society and acquisition of the English language. Initially, Andersson's focus tended to be with English-speaking children learning a foreign language. Andersson noted that the number of elementary foreign language programs across the country in the mid 1950s increased by 300 percent. But by the late 1950s Andersson stressed more the potential for such courses to the native speakers of such languages and how such instruction would help them learn English. Citing a groundbreaking UNESCO study on language instruction in the Philippines, Andersson was convinced that a two-year bilingual instructional program (two-way bilingualism with both language groups, English-speakers and non-English-speakers) could mainstream the language minority students to an all-English classroom.  

Andersson was not alone. Local areas in several other states such as Florida and New York conducted impressive pilot programs and studies on native language instruction during the 1960s, several years before the Bilingual
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20 Theodore Andersson, "Foreign Languages and Intercultural Understanding," The National Elementary Principal, 5 (February 1957), 32-33 and 35.
Education Act. The study and observation of the inadequacy of English-Only instruction provided for Spanish-speaking (mostly Puerto Rican) children in New York City schools had begun as early as the 1940s.\textsuperscript{21} In New York City the influx of Puerto Rican students to the public schools in the 1950s caused problems for school officials. One federal document argued that English-Only in New York during the 1950s was woefully inadequate and that "Many classroom teachers were forbidden by their supervisors to use Spanish and have stated how they had to close the door so the principal could not hear them and see that this rule was being broken." In the early 1960s the school system caught on to the dissatisfaction with English-Only. In 1963 the superintendent of the citywide school system, Dr. Calvin Gross, advocated that "Puerto Rican children and other new arrivals to the city be able to develop biculturally and bilingually" and announced that "bilingualism and biculturalism will be encouraged for all pupils, particularly Spanish-speaking ones, as an aspect of excellence which will benefit our community and nation in their relationship to a multi-cultural world."\textsuperscript{22}

New York was following the lead established by federal officials and the Dade County schools of Miami, Florida. The


\textsuperscript{22} Mary Jenkins, Bilingual Education in New York City (New York: New York City Board of Education, 1971), 14.
flood of Cuban refugees in the early 1960s concentrated in South Florida, and the federal government sought to establish special educational opportunities for these political refugees from a neighboring Soviet-block nation. As one scholar characterized the federal government's unprecedented efforts to aid in the immigration, settlement, and assimilation of Cuban refugees, "Special visa waivers and resettlement programs for the post-revolutionary immigration were part of the strategy to use Cuban immigrants to discredit the Cuban revolution. In 1961, the United States brought more than 15,000 Cuban children to this country through the State Department-sponsored 'Peter Pan Operation.'"23 The federal authorities provided in the Dade County public schools special bilingual instruction combined with a diet of English language instruction. This was to demonstrate the creativity and flexibility of American schools to this officially welcomed Spanish-speaking population. Memos between the directors of the Dade County Cuban Refugee Program and federal education officials indicated that the money for special pre-school programs for Cuban children were to be financed through the Office of Economic Opportunity and would be offered to all low-income

children of Miami (including African Americans and whites), but with special regard to Spanish-speaking Cuban children to aid in the adjustment to the English language and the public schools.  

While the federal government became more active in the plight of other language minorities on the East Coast, educational conditions in Texas for Mexican Americans remained abysmal. Dr. Joseph Cardenas, the director of the education of migrants for Theodore Andersson's research agency at the University of Texas, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, estimated in 1970 that the dropout rate for migrant Mexican American children was 90 percent. This was not particularly surprising, shocking as it may seem today; rather, the real surprise was the ages of the dropouts. Dr. Cardenas calculated that "one-fifth of migrants are school dropouts at the preschool age. That is, one-fifth of all migrant children never enroll in any school in spite of the State's compulsory attendance laws. So by the time they start the first grade, or they are 6 years old, you have already lost 20 percent of your population." It was estimated by University of Texas professor George I. Sánchez that of all children in the state at seventeen years of age, the total average (whites, African Americans, and Mexican Americans) amount of school attended was over 10 grades; but
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24 Memo, Alden Lillywhite, Acting Director of the Division of School Assistance, to John F. Thomas, Director, Cuban Refugee Program, October, 12, 1964, "BESF-Financial Assistance and Education of Cuban Refugees," HEW Records, Box 162, LBJ.
for the African American group that average dipped to 8.1 years attended, and for Mexican Americans it bottomed out at 4.7 years of school attended.\textsuperscript{25}

There still existed throughout the 1960s public punishments for the speaking of Spanish on school grounds or in the classroom. These disciplinary measures were intended to demean the language and its speaker. A civil rights report published in 1972 contained the school exercises of one group of seventh grade Mexican American students who were assigned to relate their own experiences in the elementary grades with the rules of English-Only. One wrote "In the first through the fourth grade, if the teacher caught us talking Spanish we would have to stand on the 'black square' for an hour or so." Other students repeated similar punishments such as paying fines of a penny to a nickel, staying after school for detention, or getting extra homework assignments.\textsuperscript{26}

In the process of the Civil Rights Commission's activity on the behalf of Mexican Americans in Texas, a cultural shift began to take place. Mexican Americans, including those of the older generation, were becoming more adamant about the role that the Spanish language should play in the public schools. Even an older member of the Mexican American


leadership establishment like Professor George Sánchez (the national president of LULAC in the 1940s) testified that, in regard to Mexican American education, "I would also teach part of the curriculum in the home language of the students, in Spanish, so that they would attain language development in the language that is easiest for them."27 Homero Sigala, the superintendent of the "Mexican" school district of San Felipe (it was 97 percent Mexican American, 2 percent African American, and 1 percent Anglo) in the border town of Del Rio, Texas, testified to the same body in 1968 of his school reforms: "Now, one more thing, one more thing that we have in San Felipe that as soon as I got there I put a stop to it—we have always spoken our language very softly because of the fact that people have said: 'Don't speak Spanish in the classroom. Don't speak Spanish.' So, consequently, the Chicano residing in Texas, whenever you hear him speak Spanish he will whisper Spanish to his comrade in there. And I am asking that Spanish be spoken correct, loud and clear. Y que no se dejen. Don't be intimidated."28

Chicanismo

As Sigala's defiant words suggested, a cultural and political shift was taking place in the late 1960s with a

---

28 "Testimony of Mr. Homero Sigala and Fermín Calderon, M.D., Del Rio, Texas," in ibid., 295 and 308 (quotation). Original italics used.
greater sense of ethnic pride, racial distinctiveness, and cultural recognition being espoused by many young Mexican Americans. The leaders of this generational and cultural shift used the name Chicano to identify themselves, not Latin Americans, Mexican Americans, or Spanish-speakers. They rejected the liberal rhetoric, accommodationist style, and professed patience of the preceding generation for the radicalism, confrontation, and immediacy that grew out of the 1960s civil rights and anti-war movements. More than their predecessors, they strove to include Spanish not only in their daily lives, but they also wanted Spanish to be officially recognized by the schools as a language of instruction. In the late 1960s the "Chicano Generation" of cultural and political leadership largely displaced the older and increasingly frustrated "Latin American Generation."

But the Chicanismo of the late 1960s and 1970s was not simply a cultural, intellectual, and political shift by the young. The older generation's hopes of working within the system to affect gradual but meaningful change was dashed by the mid 1960s. What were the roots of this frustration? The mounting frustration of the leaders of middle-class Mexican American organizations such as LULAC and G.I. Forum came from having witnessed a civil rights movement and a war on poverty, little of which seemed geared to them. In Texas there existed a heightened sense of hope and electoral prominence on the part of Mexican Americans raised by the "Viva Kennedy" political organization that resulted in the
formation of the Political Association of Spanish-speaking Organizations (PASSO), consisting of a cross-section of G.I. Forum and LULAC members. It has been argued that it was the failure of the Kennedy Administration to follow through on that promise of greater influence and participation, particularly by Kennedy's appointment (through Johnson's influence, of course) of Reynaldo Garza, a very conservative attorney from Brownsville, to be the first Mexican American federal judge in 1961.

Scholars date the Chicano Generation's political origins from the series of botched conferences between 1966 and 1967 in which the federal government demonstrated a lack of political tact regarding the Mexican American community. Not only did the established Mexican American leadership loudly and publicly break with President Johnson on substantive policy issues in a declaration of political independence of sorts during these conferences, but the younger, more radical wing of the Chicano Generation first organized itself politically during this period and officially made a complete

break not only with Johnson, but also with the Democratic Party and traditional party politics.\footnote{For the best analysis on this formative period in the development of the Chicano Generation see Juan Gómez Quiñones, 
*Chicano Politics: Reality & Promise, 1940-1990* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1990), chapter three.}

The first sign of trouble occurred at a March 1966 conference of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Mexican American leaders of LULAC, G.I. Forum, and PASSO had been promised by the EEOC an opportunity at this conference to air their grievances over the lack of action taken on the issue of discrimination against Mexican Americans. All but one of the commission members, including the head of the EEOC Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., failed to attend the conference, prompting some fifty representatives of the Mexican American leadership to walk out of the meeting in protest of what they termed a fundamental lack of respect by the Johnson administration. In response, another meeting was promised the remaining Mexican American leaders by the EEOC in which their demands and issues would be listened to seriously and professionally. The rump body of delegates who walked out organized a committee to petition Johnson directly for assistance and support in intervening with the EEOC to meet the Mexican American community's needs. Johnson's response legitimized the walkout. The president created an agency at the federal level solely for Mexican American issues, the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs. Never before had
leaders of the Latin American Generation been so confrontational in pressuring the power structure.\footnote{32}

President Johnson named Vicente Ximenes to head the new cabinet-level agency. Ximenes was a G.I. Forum member from New Mexico and director of the 1964 "Viva Johnson" campaign. Ximenes was indisputably loyal to Johnson and became, next to G.I. Forum founder Dr. Hector P. Garcia of Corpus Christi, the president's line of communication to a Mexican American community that was rapidly changing in the makeup and tone of its leadership. Johnson wanted Ximenes to help him moderate the confrontation emanating from the younger members of the community, the Chicanos. After some delay and suspicion of a political ambush, Ximenes eventually did coordinate another conference the next year in El Paso specifically to address the Mexican American community.\footnote{33}

The El Paso conference is the point from which many scholars date the beginning of the Chicano Movement and the coming-out of the Chicano Generation of leadership. Many of the conference participants presented papers and speeches to the effect that the Hispanic culture and language be elevated to an equal status in the schools and curriculum with the Anglo culture, and such proponents were met with hostility on the part of mainstream social scientists who argued that it was just such lingering patterns of ethnic culture that

\footnote{32} Ibid., 108.  
prevented Mexican Americans from more fully participating in American life and left them open to discrimination. Many of the younger and more radical conference delegates suspected the conference as nothing more than a ploy by Johnson to co-opt the growing unrest in the Chicano community with meaningless words, not action. In addition, many young and more radical leaders had been omitted from the list of those invited to the conference, while other prominent young leaders chose not to participate. The response to the El Paso conference by dissatisfied Chicano outsiders was the creation of a "rump" conference held in the El Paso barrio; while Ximenes's conference was going on, the Chicano protest conference was organized chiefly by Sociologist and labor organizer Ernesto Galaraza from California, an early mentor to César Chávez. These efforts eventually coalesced into La Raza Unida party. La Raza Unida existed for several years in Texas and in the 1970s was large enough to field credible candidates for statewide office.

Several student organizations took part in the walkout at El Paso and the resultant formation of La Raza Unida party. One of those student organizations in Texas was the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO). The MAYO-lead student protests at several public high schools of South

---


Texas in the late 1960s all had in common the demand that bilingual and bicultural education be instituted at once. These school boycotts (also referred to as "blowouts") by high school students, replete with banners, placards, and prayer, occurred at the public schools of Edcouch Elsa in 1968 (in the Rio Grande Valley), and in Kingsville and Crystal City in 1969.\(^{36}\)

Many Chicano students at the university level in the late 1960s wanted to see a more institutionalized and activist student organization that would unite various Mexican American youth groups in the common cause of furthering the goals of Chicanismo. They articulated their ideas for higher education in the document "El Plan de Santa Barbara" and formed a university student group named Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA).\(^{37}\) The Plan de Santa Barbara discussed the ways in which institutionalized Chicano studies programs could connect the university and university-educated Chicano student body to the larger Chicano community and its issues. The synergy of research, knowledge, and activism, it was believed, could benefit both the university and the Chicano community. Chicano higher education would support the necessary research


\(^{37}\) Quiñones, *Chicano Politics*, 118-23.
for teachers and education professionals who would be implementing bilingual education in the community. Even the older generation of leaders like George Sánchez, who previously championed English-Only pedagogy, came to support bilingual education. But Sánchez's support of bilingual education was mostly due to its "lingual" part, not necessarily for culture. For Sánchez bilingual education was to assimilate Mexican American youngsters, not to reinforce elements of their identity that he thought were unbecoming. For example, Sánchez defended bilingual education by lamenting, "How many times have I seen a child cringe and crouch, physically and emotionally, because the language of the home was taboo at school and the language of the school was nonfunctional at home. Here is the genesis of the pachuco, the delinquent." What Sánchez failed to recognize in the generation of young Chicano leaders then taking part in the formation of bilingual education programs was that this very same pachuquismo was celebrated, not something to be ashamed of.

But for the younger generation of Chicano leaders, bilingual education was as much bicultural as anything else. Unlike Sánchez, they were not as interested in the use of bilingual education for ultimate assimilation. Chicano

---

activists in the early days of bilingual education viewed its purpose as one of strengthening pride and ethnic distinctiveness. Many viewed bilingual education's contribution to English acquisition as fine but ultimately secondary to the cultural power of Spanish instruction in the early grades and the empowerment it could bring. As was explained in El Plan de Santa Barbara "Culturally, the word Chicano, in the past a pejorative and class-bound adjective, has now become the root idea of a new cultural identity for our people. It also reveals a growing solidarity and the development of a common social praxis. The widespread use of the term Chicano today signals a rebirth of pride and confidence."40 Bilingual education was primarily bicultural to such Chicano activists.

In the realm of Chicanismo, the speaking of Spanish at school meant cultural authenticity and solidarity, especially since schools had traditionally been considered the historical tools of Anglo domination and cultural genocide. Those without Spanish-speaking ability, whether Chicano or not, had no cultural authenticity. Those who could speak Spanish most colloquially had greater influence. For Chicano activists of the late 1960s and early 1970s (and perhaps even today), the use of the Spanish language, for example in a Chicano student group setting, indicated cultural authenticity. Cultural critic José Limón noted these symbols

40 Chicano Coordinating Council, El Plan de Santa Barbara, 9.
of linguistic authenticity at the meetings of Chicano student organizations at the University of Texas. Candidates for positions in the Chicano Studies program were judged by students participating in the searches partly on their ability to converse in Spanish. Speakers who used colloquial or "folk" Spanish (a very working-class form of speech) were more influential than those who used textbook or halting Spanish, or no Spanish at all. It was this very sense of pachuquismo that Sánchez saw as regrettable and that Chicano activists viewed as genuine.41 Given their view of Spanish in such private settings, it is no wonder that Chicano activists saw bilingual education in the lower grades of the public schools as important to their organizational efforts to empower their Chicano community.

The Bilingual Education Act

The history of the actual legislative passage of the Bilingual Education Act in late 1967 and Lyndon Johnson's signing of it in early 1968 is one of the more well studied subjects by other scholars covered in this dissertation. Consequently, I will only note such secondary work when there are interpretative conflicts with my own. Unlike the contested interpretations of the indistinct and distant bilingual past, the historical record of the arrival of the Bilingual Education Act is clear on many points.

The federal government supported the concept of bilingual education as an experimental program worthy of support, as a useful tool in the education of what they labeled "culturally handicapped" students, and as a political bone to throw to Mexican Americans, who clamored for such legislation. However, not all such support was as cynical as some observers have alleged. The administration's approval was conditional and qualified. Legislators' support of bilingual education came from a variety of motivations. What bilingual education proponents had in common was that they regarded the idea of bilingual education as good but only in a vague and unsettled manner; the program was impressive enough to be enacted, but mysterious enough still to be open to all sorts of future changes and adaptations as it grew and obtained institutional support. The political establishment was stepping into a darkened room with bilingual education and was initially content to feel its way around.

The Bilingual Education Act did not occur in a vacuum. That it was approved so overwhelmingly indicates something of the opportunistic climate for innovation in education; the iron was hot and President Lyndon Baines Johnson struck hard and often. Johnson initiated and signed the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964 (ESEA), the Higher Education Act of 1965, and numerous other education laws. In early 1967 Johnson announced to Congress several legislative goals on education including special aid
to the poor, the policy area into which education officials in the administration would eventually designate bilingual education. Johnson pledged to help the nation’s poor children in one way or another. There was little precedent for such actions, however. As Johnson claimed, "This has been an ambitious venture, for no textbook offers precise methods for dealing with the disadvantaged." Johnson was flexible, and the proponents of bilingual education knew this important fact.

In a short speech and visit to Cotulla late in 1966, only a few months before Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas would propose a bilingual education bill in the Senate, Johnson remembered his teaching days there. It is said that Johnson was best in these small, informal gatherings of "his" Texas people, and the text of his speech in November 1966 would affirm this. This was no mere set of perfunctory remarks intended to delay a trip to the hospital; rather, Johnson eloquently spoke of the hurt of the past and the possibility of the future. The speech was vague on specific policy, but the passionate intonation of the distinctively Mexican American educational experience hinted at some

---

future, as of yet undescribed, action. The president started: "Thirty-eight years have passed, but I still see the faces of the children who sat in my class. I still hear their eager voices speaking Spanish as I came in." After warming to the subject, Johnson cited some abysmal educational statistics on Mexican Americans and then offered a promise of sorts: "the conscience of America has slept long enough while the children of Mexican Americans have been taught that the end of life is a beet row, a spinach field, or a cotton patch...I intend to have all of our educational experts explore practical programs that will encourage these children to stay in school and improve their chances of learning, to prepare themselves, and to equip themselves, to become lifelong taxpayers instead of tax eaters." Johnson wanted Mexican Americans in the middle-class tax bracket and was open to suggestions on how to make it happen. It was in this atmosphere of urgency that bilingual education came into existence.

One of the central fallacies of historical scholarship regarding the passage of the Bilingual Education Act is the notion that it squeaked through an unknowing, uninformed, and uninterested legislative and executive branch and grew as a federal policy due to pressure from radical ethnics.43

43 Speech, "Remarks of the President at Cotulla, Texas," "EX-SP 3-165," WHCF, Box 185, LBJ.
44 For the interpretation that bilingual education was a program that was initiated by and later became infiltrated with militant ethnics see Hugh Davis Graham, The Uncertain Triumph: Federal Education Policy in the Kennedy and Johnson Years (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North
Nothing could be farther from the truth. Most everyone in Congress was apparently not only aware of bilingual education but active in its support. Paradoxically, that support differed from individual to individual public official. Bilingual education was all things to all people, one of those rare instances where a bill achieves wide popularity even though everyone had a different reason for supporting it or a different conception of what it was. This condition is indicative not of a dearth of interest from lawmakers or for that matter was it the result of a political campaign of purposeful misinformation; rather, it was based upon an exuberance of the wide possibilities that the legislation might enable. What many lawmakers liked about the bilingual education concept was that its possibilities were indeed limitless, not limited or narrow.

Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough started the interest in the subject by introducing a bilingual education bill in the upper chamber in January 1967. Yarborough's proposed legislation was intended to better the quality of education solely for Spanish-speakers of the United States. This was an idea that Yarborough had been contemplating for some time; he had consulted with Mexican American leaders and educators like Professor George Sánchez in formulating his bilingual

initiative.\textsuperscript{45} Senator Yarborough originally called this bill the "Bilingual American Education Act" and limited its application to Spanish-speakers: "Sec. 702. In recognition of the special educational needs of the large number of students in the United States whose mother tongue is Spanish and to whom English is a foreign language, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs to meet those special educational needs."\textsuperscript{46}

Yarborough appears to have started a sizable avalanche of interest. Several of Yarborough's Senate colleagues (Democrat and Republican)—including Senators Jacob Javits and Robert Kennedy of New York, Joseph Montoya of New Mexico, Thomas Kuchel of California, John Tower of Texas, and others who would do so at a later date—attached themselves to his legislation as co-authors during the time of its initial reading.\textsuperscript{47} The House began deliberation on the subject of bilingual education that February, and individual representatives issued their own versions of bilingual education. No less than thirty-three separate bills were introduced by May from thirty different Congressmen to promote bilingual education. The importance of this interest

\textsuperscript{45} Letter from Sánchez to Joe Alaniz, May 26, 1967, Folder 12, "Yarborough," Box 46, George I. Sánchez Papers, Netti Lee Bensen Papers (hereafter cited as NLB), Austin, Texas.

\textsuperscript{46} "S. 428. A Bill To Amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965...," 2, "LE/FA 2, 5/24/67-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 1.
by the House of Representatives was in broadening Yarborough's original focus on Spanish-speakers.\textsuperscript{48} The House initiatives eventually coalesced into a bill by Congressmen Edward Roybal and James Scheuer, Democrats from California and New York, respectively. Scheuer's original idea, accepted by most bilingual education proponents of the House of Representatives in their own bilingual bills, was that the pedagogical thought and research behind bilingual education was ultimately too promising to limit to just Spanish-speaking children.\textsuperscript{49}

One commentator of the history and politics of bilingual education is historian Hugh Davis Graham, who alleges of the program's eventual popularization that "the militant Hispanic lobby won" and that bilingual education was nothing more than a "Hispanic job corps."\textsuperscript{50} Graham cited no documentation (other than an oral interview) to explain this charge; he fails to point out who these militants were or what the lobby's name was. Could he be referring to LULAC, the G.I. Forum, or PASSO? Does Graham seriously allege that these supposedly influential "militants" were members of the Chicano Movement, a movement that by all intents and purposes would only catalyze after the El Paso Conference in October

\textsuperscript{49} Memo from Howe to Cater, "Senator Yarborough's Bilingual Education Bill (S.428)," "May-June 1967," Cater Name Files, Box 21, LBJ; and Francesco Cordasco, "The Bilingual Education Act," \textit{Phi Delta Kappan}, 51 (October 1969), 75.
\textsuperscript{50} Graham, \textit{The Uncertain Triumph}, 159.
of 1967 after two separate bilingual education bills had already been passed in August? Did these "militants" force over thirty separate Congressmen (some in states with no significant Spanish-speaking population like West Virginia) to try to broaden the scope of bilingual education? Was Professor George Sánchez one of these Brown Power "militants"? Did the testimony of Joshua Fishman of Yeshiva University and Theodore Andersson of the University of Texas constitute the leadership of "militant" Chicano activists or for that matter the prospective heads of a conspiratorial "Hispanic job corps" searching for federal plums? The claims of Graham are difficult to entertain seriously. The bulk of this unfortunate interpretation appears to have come from an interview with the former head of the Office of Education, Harold Howe II.\footnote{The testimony of Theodore Andersson at the subcommittee hearings on bilingual education illustrates that many in the academic community did regard the concept to be worthy of consideration. The implied assertions of Graham that the notion of bilingual education is not scientifically or pedagogically justified, or that it was an unknown quantity in 1967, are simply not tenable. Its proponents may not have been correct on all of their contentions with the benefit of hindsight, but Graham could hardly claim to dismiss their testimony and support so completely as to imply that the educational justification was non-existent, unless, of course, they were all ethnic militants. Andersson was Swedish, after all! See Theodore Andersson, "Testimony Presented on HR 9840 and HR 10224 To Authorize Bilingual Programs in Elementary and Secondary Schools Before the House General Subcommittee on Education and Labor, 29 June 1967," Folder 14, "Testimony: National Bilingual Education Act," Box 1, Theodore Andersson Papers (hereafter cited as TAP), NLB.} 

The education experts in the Johnson Administration seemed not to know what to do with bilingual education. It
was, after all, not their initiative. But it had nevertheless proven incredibly popular in the Congress. Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) John Gardner articulated his agency's mixed feelings to the House Committee on Education by commenting of the plethora of bilingual education legislation that the administration supported the concept in general. But he added: "We already have a number of programs which support bilingual education. With the assistance of Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a number of schools are carrying out bilingual education programs at this time." Titles I and III of the 1965 ESEA went respectively to support urban land grant colleges and to aid historically black colleges and universities. Gardner went on to note that a number of other laws could just as easily be used to provide for experimental bilingual education programs, such as the NDEA, the Cooperative Research Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Education Professions Development Act.\(^2\)

Commissioner Harold Howe II of the Office of Education (a division under Gardner's direct supervision) exhibited a very mixed relationship to bilingual education. His basic concern about the Senate and House bills that passed and awaited a conference resolution in August of 1967 was one of bureaucratic turf. In an internal memorandum to Johnson domestic policy aide Douglass Cater, Commissioner Howe

\(^2\) Memo from John Gardner to Lister Hill, undated, 2 (quotation) and 3, "LE/FA 2, 5/24/67-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.
remarked that he might be able to support the idea of legislating an entirely new bilingual education law, specifically Yarborough's proposal, "only if it is viewed as a short-term demonstration program designed to spotlight an area which urgently needs attention. I would base my support on the assumption that, after a few years, other education programs (particularly Title I of ESEA) would have picked up most the most effective bilingual education techniques."  

HEW Secretary Gardner reflected the opinion of Commissioner Howe that Yarborough's original emphasis upon only Spanish-speakers should be done away with so as not to entitle any one group of non-English-speakers above another. Gardner's memorandum to the House committee responsible for the legislation indicates this concern. In a memo to Cater Commissioner Howe frankly stated that "Entitlements should not be determined by the number of persons of Mexican and Puerto Rican descent or who have Spanish surnames. The program should instead be directed to persons who come from non-English-speaking backgrounds...it is offensive to use ethnic or national origin (or surname) as a basis for an educational program." Howe had no intensely personal interest in bilingual education or Mexican Americans, as did Johnson and Yarborough. Howe supported bilingual education

---

53 Memo from Harold Howe II to Douglass Cater, June 26, 1967, "May-June 1967," Cater Name Files, Box 21, LBJ.  
54 Memo from John Gardner to Lister Hill, undated, 5-6, "LE/FA 2, 5/24/67-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.  
55 Memo from Harold Howe II to Douglass Cater, June 26, 1967, "May-June 1967," Cater Name Files, Box 21, LBJ.
in limited form as an experiment and did not support its future growth as a federally institutionalized, mandated, and protected pedagogical technique, as indicated in his comments to historian Hugh Graham years later.

Howe apparently feared that Yarborough's bill, which had specifically targeted Spanish-speakers, was an ethnic giveaway. This judgment makes sense in light of the Office of Education's desire to limit the Bilingual Education Act to little more than legislation enabling a broader range and number of experimental bilingual programs than existed. But Howe and Johnson's aides on education policy dared not openly oppose the legislation since it would probably pass over their objections anyway. Jim Gaither, one such aide, wrote to Joe Califano, Johnson's chief of domestic policy, that "Because of these political and legal reasons, plus the likelihood that the committee will pass the bill regardless of what position we take, Budget and HEW now agree that the Administration should support Senator Yarborough's bill." Gaithers went on to indicate of the desired modifications of Yarborough's bill that "These changes will give the bill more of a pilot project, demonstration and teacher training orientation." 56

Neither Howe nor his staff appeared to give the pedagogical science behind the concept of bilingual education much thought. Hardly a memo appeared between those in the

56 Memo from Jim Gaither to Joe Califano, August 15, 1967, "LE/FA 2, 5/2/24-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.
Office of Education and in Johnson's domestic policy staff that actually debated the merits of bilingual education on what it could do. They all dealt with how to couch their objections in such a way as not to oppose the idea of bilingual education, a popular subject for Congress in 1967, so that it would appear as if they had problems with its bureaucratic fit or the way it was funded. What is clear from the correspondence in the Office of Education on the bill was how little debate was actually expended on bilingual education's merits. It concerned bureaucratic turf and political considerations. Howe's previously aggressive enforcement of Titles I and III of the 1965 ESEA regarding African Americans had created a firestorm of difficulty for him. So another reason for supporting the Bilingual Education Act was to take such pressure off Howe, because if bilingual education was defeated, he would be forced to continue funding bilingual programs under Titles I and III at a time, remarked one aide, "when we are fighting to preserve the Commissioner's approval authority in the Congress."\(^{57}\)

The steamroller of bilingual education bills in the House and the number of co-authors for Yarborough's legislation in the Senate convinced Howe and the White House that going along with only a partially objectionable bill was preferable to being stuck with a bill that was entirely

objectionable. For example, Ralph Huit, a legislative aide for the White House, wrote to aides Douglass Cater and Barefoot Sanders that "There is considerable unhappiness on the Committee that the Administration is not supporting the Bilingual Education bill; it is likened to our earlier opposition to Senator Yarborough's 'cold war G.I. bill.'" 58 The next day Sanders quickly reported to Califano, "Joe: Are we on solid ground in opposing this bill? I understand the Latinos are upset with our position." Califano forwarded the memo with a scribbled reply the next day to aide Jim Gaithers, "Let's get in this—shouldn't we support it?" 59 By this time the administration was scrambling to get on board the bilingual bandwagon.

The Bilingual Education Act was signed into law by President Lyndon Baines Johnson on January 2, 1968. In his public statement about signing the 1967 ESEA amendments, of which the Bilingual Education Act had become a part, Johnson did mention bilingual education specifically. He claimed that the amendments contained "a special provision establishing bilingual education programs for children whose first language is not English. Thousands of children of Latin descent, young Indians, and others will get a better

58 Memo from Ralph Huit to Douglass Cater and Barefoot Sanders, August 8, 1967, "LE/FA 2, 5/24/67-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.
59 Memo from Barefoot Sanders to Joe Califano and from Califano to Jim Gaithers, August 9, 10, 1967, "LE/FA 2, 5/24/67-1/2/68," WHCF, Box 39, LBJ.
start—a better chance—in school."^60 The Bilingual Education Act became Title VII of the ESEA and went farther than the original limits intended by the Office of Education. Local entities were to apply for grants to conduct experiments and pilot programs in bilingual education. In the first year of its existence in 1968, the expenditure limit authorized by law was $15 million. For 1969 it rose to $30 million and by 1970 it was to be appropriated up to $40 million.^61 However, even though such amounts were authorized, nothing could force the administration to actually spend that much on bilingual education. The bilingual education provision of the ESEA would remain underfunded for some time to come while it developed a grassroots constituency among teachers, public leaders, and linguists.^62

In the Great Society rhetoric concerning educational matters, bilingual education was not simply for Spanish-speakers. Nor was there a full-fledged effort to bring bilingual education to every school where there existed non-English-speaking children. It was intended to fall under the rubric of "compensatory education." Aid to the handicapped, rural school aid, direct federal grants for minority institutions, and bilingual education were to allow local

^60 Statement by Lyndon Johnson, "Signing H.R. 7819—The Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments," "P.L. 90-247, HR 7819, 1/2/68," Enrolled Legislation, Box 60, LBJ.
school districts to improve the overall level of education to poor people and minorities in addition to aiding in erasing the effects of Jim Crow segregation. The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children reiterated this theme to the White House: "The Council, therefore, continued to place its hope in efforts that combine desegregation and compensatory improvement of the schools—not one without the other."

For one who was initially suspicious of the Bilingual Education Act, Commissioner Harold Howe was quick to embrace its potential. In his enunciations of what he believed bilingual education to be, the actual language aspect of it had no more importance than the cultural reasons for its existence. In a 1968 speech Howe boasted of fifteen projects being funded by his agency at that time that "have shown promise of redeeming Mexican American children from the near-certainty of educational failure"; these programs, he stated, "emphasize a bicultural, bilingual approach which says, in essence, that Mexican American children must learn the English language and Anglo ways—but that they can do so without having to reject their knowledge of the Spanish language and of Mexican American ways." It was Howe's hope to lessen notions of cultural superiority by championing the idea of "cultural diversity" through bilingual education.

---

64 National Advisory Committee on Mexican American Education of the U.S. Office of Education, "Cowboys, Indians
In 1968 as his presidency came to a close and the Vietnam War became his own personal albatross, Lyndon Johnson probably paid little attention to the small, inexpensive law that officially sanctioned bilingual education after decades of governmental repression of such instructional methods. It was only one law among sixty other laws dealing with education enacted during his tenure.\textsuperscript{65} Two recent studies of Johnson's relationship to Mexican Americans and his use of English-Only rules as a young teacher subtly illustrate the high irony of Johnson's signing of the Bilingual Education Act.\textsuperscript{66} Lyndon Baines Johnson may remain the only American president ever to have educated non-English-speaking children in the public schools. That he did so with the best of intentions under a strict English-Only policy (then considered progressive) and that he later played a role in ushering modern bilingual education, a pedagogy that castigated English-Only as nativist and pedagogically backward, is ironic indeed.

The Development of Bilingual Education in Texas

Several states in addition to Texas experimented with bilingual education on their own language minority students before the federal government ever decriminalized the practice in early 1968. In Texas there was no real administrative push for bilingual instruction; there was no effort to immediately match the federal government's passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1967 or in 1968. The experiments in Texas concerning bilingualism in the classroom for Mexican Americans came first during the middle 1960s at the insistence of concerned and sympathetic teachers, school administrators, and professors at the local level. Bilingual education became a charged political issue for Chicano student activists with the school walkouts or "blowouts" of the late 1960s.

Before bilingual education was ever experimented with, the major state initiative for the education of Mexican Americans was the Pre-School Non-English-Speaking Children Program, a legislatively approved outgrowth of the "Little Schools of the 400" and the brainchild of the Mexican American community. In 1959 this pre-school language program was approved by the state legislature and Governor Price Daniel. There were 22,135 pre-schoolers across the

---

67 For the most extensive analysis of the "Little Schools of the 400" see Guadalupe San Miguel, Jr., "Let All of Them Take Heed," chapter six.
state who qualified for the program in 1959, the first year of the program. However, there existed only 720 actual classes and 101 certified teachers. This came out to roughly 31 pre-schoolers per classroom, an unacceptable size for classes of four- and five-year-old children.\textsuperscript{69} These were the pre-school programs that Professor George Sánchez criticized to elected public officials as having a segregatory effect on Mexican American children, even though this program had originally been the idea of fellow LULAC president Felix Tijerina of Houston.\textsuperscript{70}

The number of students participating in such pre-school programs was always lower than the number who were qualified to enroll. In 1960 and 1961 the pre-school program actually enrolled 15,805 and 17,301 Mexican American students, well short of the estimated 22,000 students who qualified for the program in 1959. It should be remembered that these schools were not bilingual. There was undoubtedly some degree of translation between the English and Spanish words for objects in the original LULAC program, but the systematic use of Spanish was discouraged once the state took over. These classes were organized in as much of an English-Only method as possible. The ultimate goal of these pre-school programs was "to prepare non-English speaking children for entry into

\textsuperscript{69} Donald Denum, "Official Agenda State Board of Education, September 12, 1959," Minutes of the State Board of Education, Texas Education Agency Archives, Austin, Texas.

\textsuperscript{70} Letter from Sánchez to Senators John Tower, Ralph Yarborough, and Congressman Jake Pickle, May 24, 1968, Box 46, Folder 12, "Correspondence 1966-68," GIS, NLB.
the first grade with a command of the essential English words needed for communicating and receiving instruction from the teacher." 71 In 1963 the number of participating students was 18,791. 72 In 1964 the number of pre-school Mexican Americans being served by the program numbered 20,342. 73

As the 1960s continued and the federal government under Lyndon Johnson's education laws became more involved in the education of minorities and the poor, the state began to classify its own pre-school program as part of a statewide effort at such "compensatory education." However, by the middle 1960s and continuing on through the late 1960s the program declined in enrollment and importance. One state report claimed that "The oldest of Texas' compensatory programs is the Preschool Program for Non-English Speaking Children." However, the report noted that federal initiatives were beginning to take students away from the state's program: "Although there has been a slight downward trend in enrollments in the summer Preschool Non-English Speaking Program, more children are being reached in year-long non-English programs funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act." Between 1966 and 1968, Title I of the 1965 ESEA alone funneled $145,259,063 to Texas, part of which went to the development of special

compensatory language programs for migrant children.\textsuperscript{74} By the late 1960s and early 1970s the state was getting out of the business of paying for the pre-school program as federally sanctioned bilingual education became an option. In 1970 the state-financed pre-school program only had 8,122 students enrolled and only 3,682 students in 1971.\textsuperscript{75}

Another compensatory program from the Texas Education Agency was organized in 1963 for migrant children. The special migrant education program would essentially be a six month school (the regular school term was nine months) intended to conform as neatly as possible to seasonal labor conditions. It lasted five days a week, eight hours a day, whereas the normal school day was only a six hours.\textsuperscript{76} The content and structure of the migrant education lessons, much like that of the pre-school program for non-English-speaking children, was conducted in an English-Only setting: "Teaching English means practicing phrases and sentences until English word, sound, word form, and word order become automatic."\textsuperscript{77} This constant repetition of oral language remained similar to the decades-old direct method and was largely derivative of the audio-lingual techniques arising

from World War II, stressing behavioral notions of language acquisition.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s bilingual education took up the slack where the pre-bilingual statewide compensatory programs left off. The federal legislation would not take effect until 1968. But Texas interest in bilingual education dated back much earlier. In prepared testimony to the congressional committee assessing the funding of the new bilingual education law during the Spring of 1969, Professor Theodore Andersson of the FLES movement and since the 1950s with the University of Texas claimed that in 1957 he "received from the University of Texas a small amount of money to experiment with bilingual education in selected Austin schools. This experiment met with complete failure, for the public attitude was still such as to be unaware of the educational advantages of bilingual schooling."\(^{78}\) The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory at the University of Texas, headed by Andersson, was named by the TEA as one of the research centers to which funds could be channeled from Title IV of the ESEA.\(^{79}\)

When bilingual education did finally arrive in Texas by the middle of the decade, the funding came from federal and local sources, not the state. The TEA immediately recognized

---


\(^{79}\) Edgar, 45th Biennial Report, 79.
the significance of bilingual instruction after it was accepted on the national level, and not wishing to limit the concept's growth, TEA defined it as broadly as possible: "In bilingual education two languages are used in the instructional program, the language of the child's home and English. Both are used for a portion of, or all of the curriculum, except in the teaching of foreign languages." The state believed that the end pedagogical result of bilingual education was proficiency in both languages for Mexican American and Anglo American schoolchildren. By 1969-1970 there existed twenty-seven bilingual projects in Texas that were federally funded. In the academic year 1970-1971 the number of Spanish-speaking pupils served by bilingual education in Texas' public schools numbered 12,686, while the number of English-speaking children enrolled was 2,744. Teaching these children were 461 bilingual teachers and 141 monolingual teachers. In 1971-1972 the numbers of children involved grew to 18,605 Spanish-speakers and 3,582 English-speakers spread out over 41 school districts. All of these initial projects were funded by the federal government through Title VII of the ESEA, the Bilingual Education Act.

The earliest official bilingual education program in the state began in 1964 at the Laredo United Independent School District, a rural district outside the city of Laredo with a significant Mexican American population. In 1962 Harold C.

---

Brantley, a veteran South Texas superintendent, was hired for the district. Fluently bilingual and a longtime educator in South Texas schools, Brantley came to Laredo with a thorough conviction of the instructional failures of English-Only. By 1963 he had persuaded the school board to repeal the no-Spanish rule on school premises on the basis that it hindered the development of the natural bilingual capacities that he felt should be encouraged.\textsuperscript{82}

In casting about feelers from the TEA regarding his long-held dream of implementing a bilingual education program Brantley met Professor Theodore Andersson. It was Andersson who encouraged Brantley to start such a program in the Laredo schools. It was also Andersson who alerted Brantley to the presence of the Dade County bilingual program offered by the federal government to Cuban refugees in the early 1960s. Brantley felt that the half Anglo, half Mexican American population of Laredo United schools offered an excellent chance to implement truly bilingual education in which English-speakers would be educated in Spanish and English and Spanish-speakers would be educated in English and Spanish together in the same classrooms, or two-way bilingual education.\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{82} Robert L. Hardgrave, Jr., and Santiago Hinojosa, The Politics of Bilingual Education: A Study of Four Southwest Texas Communities (Manchaca, Texas: Sterling Swift Publishing Company, 1975), 16-17. This is the only attempt by scholars to examine the pioneering work of Harold Brantley in the Laredo United schools during the middle 1960s.

\textsuperscript{83} Harold C. Brantley, interview by author, November 2, 1998, tape recording, residence, San Marcos, Texas (hereafter cited as Brantley interview). Brantley was a classmate of
Brantley traveled to Miami, Florida, in 1964 to observe the Dade County bilingual program. After this Brantley then raided the private schools of his region for bilingual talent in getting his program off the ground. He hired Victor Cruz-Aedo, the superintendent of The Holding Institute, a Methodist institution in Laredo that had existed as a partially bilingual school since the 1910s. Cruz-Aedo soon left Brantley to join the TEA in developing the statewide bilingual curriculum. The next step for Brantley was to smooth over potential public disruptions over his controversial plan. He expected opposition from two quarters: "the parent of the English-speaking child who might feel her child would be shortchanged in the amount of first grade work he would be able to cover, and secondly, from the Hispano parent who was striving to identify with the middle class Anglo culture."

Superintendent Harold C. Brantley's pilot bilingual instructional program was one of the first in the state and probably the one of the most successful. Brantley attributed his success with the attitude of making bilingual education a total approach for all children and not a compensatory measure for one group designated as handicapped or disadvantaged. His main criticism of bilingual education is

Lyndon Baines Johnson at Southwest Texas State Teachers College in the late 1920s. Brantley claimed that he and others referred to Johnson by the nickname "Mr. Slip-Shoes." Hardgrave and Hinojosa, *The Politics of Bilingual Education*, 18-19.

today is that it is much too transitional and only geared to language minorities, not the two-way bilingual instruction that was his program.\textsuperscript{86} A year later Texas witnessed the birth of other programs funded by the ESEA.\textsuperscript{87}

One of the most ignored elements of the coming of bilingual education to Texas in the 1960s and 1970s was the enormous amount of support from Chicano student activists and Chicano communities for the implementation of bilingual education programs. Such grassroots support of bilingual education was considered an integral part of the Chicano Movement. One Chicano activist wrote that the relationship between the bilingual education program and the community was absolutely fundamental for success.\textsuperscript{88} One of the ways in which bilingual education came to areas of South Texas that were very Anglo-dominated was through student activism. These protests were called school walkouts, or "blowouts." The growth of the Chicano Movement and the coming of age of its leaders took place shortly after the implementation of bilingual education, not before as historian Hugh Graham has

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Brantley interview.
\item \textsuperscript{87} For an example of San Antonio see Doris Wright, "S.A. Was Forerunner in Dual Language Study," \textit{San Antonio Light}, May 20, 1974, Mexican File-Language, Institute of Texas Cultures, San Antonio, Texas. For bilingual education in the towns of Del Rio, Crystal City, and Sonora see Hardgrave and Hinojosa, \textit{The Politics of Bilingual Education}, chapters three, four, and five.
\end{itemize}
written. Bilingual education had been practiced for several years before there existed so-called Chicano militants. 89

It took a concerted effort from local pressure groups and the Mexican American community to successfully demand bilingual education even when it was funded entirely by the federal government. This is because the TEA, while it offered some technical assistance to districts trying to begin a bilingual program, was not interested in defining the issue of bilingual education as a statewide initiative. Dr. Severio Gomez, the coordinator of bilingual education in Texas, testified to a congressional hearing in 1968 that most of the state's bilingual programs garnering federal support and state approval were more along the lines of loosely structured ESL programs and not truly bilingual as envisioned by most experts. 90

Local initiative from Mexican American communities was also needed in that when the state educators did become involved with bilingual education, they demonstrated a tin

---


90 "Testimony of Dr. James Winfred Edgar, Texas State Commissioner of Education; Dr. Severio Gomez, Assistant Commissioner for Bilingual and International Education; and Mr. Leon Grimm, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Austin, Texas," in *Hearing Before the United States Commission on Civil Rights*, 390.
ear to the biculturalism it was intended to promote. In a TEA pedagogical guidebook for implementing bilingual programs in Texas, a historical background section was given that explained how "The patrón system rested upon values that for the most part still exist and to a large measure still determine the attitudes of the Mexican American." These alleged values of the Mexican American were "(1) a blind loyalty toward traditional ethnic leaders, (2) a tendency to desire to enter into dependent but secure positions of dependency upon an employer or a political leader, (3) a reluctance to make decisions and a tendency to postpone decisions as long as possible, (4) a dislike of competition and of personal initiative, (5) a preference for a stable hierarchical social system with well-defined statuses and roles, (6) a preference for friendly person-to-person primary relationship rather than the formal impersonal relationships of the Anglo American world, (7) a strong dislike for and resistance toward social and cultural change." These were the very attitudes bilingual education was to help transform and here they were embedded in the state's start-up manual.  

Texas did not wait long before it overhauled state law to more neatly conform to the Bilingual Education Act of 1967. Texas still had its 1918 and 1923 English-Only laws on the books and very much in force throughout most school

---

districts. For the first several years, as with the Laredo program under Harold C. Brantley, the TEA granted waivers to the English-Only provisions of the education and criminal codes for those school districts receiving ESEA money to conduct experimental programs with bilingual education. However, bilingual instruction in the public schools of the state was still technically illegal. In order to finesse the discrepancy between law and practice as well as to continue qualifying for federal funds, several state legislators, most notably Senator Joe Bernal of San Antonio and Representative Carlos Truan of Kingsville, sought to make bilingual education legal by statute in 1969. Bernal was active in the study and formation of the science of bilingual education and therefore had a personal stake in the issue. In the Senate Bernal's initial bilingual education bill, Senate Bill 46, passed overwhelmingly without a dissenting vote. However, Truan's House Bill 103, also with little opposition, moved more quickly through the House than Bernal's through the Senate and, according to legislative custom in such cases where identical bills are passed through both chambers of the state legislature, Bernal substituted Truan's House Bill 103 for his own. Bilingual education in Texas was finally de-criminalized in May 1969, over half a century after English-Only's reign began as the chief operating language policy of the state's schools. Finally, the age-old bilingual
tradition was restored and allowed to come out of the shadows of law.  

The Texas bilingual statute of 1969 was neither complicated nor controversial, but it was significant. It was simply enabling legislation. The law passed both chambers of the legislature with almost no opposition because of its limited nature. Truan and Bernal obtained crucial support from Lt. Governor Ben Barnes, a protégé of Texas Governor John B. Connolly and Lyndon Johnson, and Speaker of the House Gus Mutscher. The reason why such support was forthcoming was that both Barnes and Mutscher had higher ambitions and courted the Chicano vote with the passage of the enabling legislation which, in spite of using federal dollars to fund the program, still gave ultimate control over bilingual programs to the TEA and local school districts. It increased educational services without spending any additional money. Truan and Bernal had hopes for grander bilingual education bills that would earmark state appropriations. But for the moment they were content simply to repeal the old English-Only laws and legalize the idea of bilingual education.  

---


93 Vega, Education, Politics, and Bilingualism in Texas, 77-78.
Truan's desire to expand bilingual education into a genuine statewide program to be legally mandated where there existed qualified students did not have to wait long. In 1973 Truan and several of his liberal allies helped pass another bilingual education law; only this time it was more than just simply enabling legislation. This bill made bilingual education mandatory through the first six grades in potentially all subjects for any school district with 20 or more students whose test scores indicated that they were of limited English-speaking ability. And this time the state allocated money for it out of the education budget. Although bilingual education had more vocal and powerful opponents in the legislature by the middle 1970s than it had in the late 1960s—and it was underfunded throughout the 1970s—it was on the books and growing in respectability in the educational community.footnote{94}

Bilingual education in Texas would become involved in the tangled legal efforts by Mexican Americans to challenge educational discrimination in the state's schools. In the Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District decision of 1970 a federal court ruled that Mexican Americans were an identifiable minority group instead of the "other

white" group they had been legally classified as since the Salvatierra decision in 1930. In addition to the Brown v Board legal mechanisms for achieving school desegregation now at the Mexican American community's disposal in the coming legal wars, the notion of bilingual education came to be regarded during the Cisneros decision as a central component for achieving school integration for discriminated against Mexican Americans.95

The Cisneros decision opened the door for legal scholars to push the boundaries of civil rights law dealing with Mexican Americans. Since the history of educational discrimination against Mexican Americans had involved curricular innovations and pedagogical justifications that resulted in what the courts were coming to believe was a racist intent to discriminate, it only followed that the concept of integration in the education of Mexican Americans involved not just the shifting of bodies but also the complete overturn of the standard curriculum that had enabled such discrimination in the first place. For Mexican American civil rights, school integration (or de-segregation) came to include bilingual-bicultural education as a possible remedy in addition to other remedies such as busing and the redrawing of school districts. This reasoning came from federal judges and Mexican American legal strategists.

Influenced by the Cisneros decision, federal judge William Wayne Justice decided in December 6, 1971, in the

95 San Miguel, "Let All of Them Take Heed," 177-81.
United States of America v. State of Texas, that the San Felipe Del Rio Consolidated Independent School District "had made no sincere or good faith effort to obtain federal funding" for the comprehensive educational plan ordered by the court. Such a plan was to include "sufficient educational safeguards to insure that all students in the San Felipe Del Rio Consolidated Independent School District will be offered equal educational opportunities," which included "bilingual and bicultural programs" among other curricular innovations. 96 The educational plan, approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, called for a curricular overhaul as part of the desegregation plan that "presents to all children a bilingual-bicultural instructional program which utilizes the child's language system (English, Spanish, or a blend of both) as the medium of instruction as proficiency in one or more additional language systems is developed." 97

Ironically, it was not historian Hugh Davis Graham's "militant Chicanos" who captured a novel Great Society program in bilingual education and transformed it into a much larger entity; rather, it was the federal government's search for alternative remedies to busing in trying to implement the Brown decision of the 1950s. Despite the massive evidence to the contrary, the myth that bilingual education was

propogated by militant ethnics like Chicano activists and that it was somehow captured by linguistic nationalists intent upon furthering racial and ethnic separateness still exists and plays a considerable role in shaping and influencing public opinion. This chapter illustrates that the Chicano Movement grew out of the social context provided for by the reaction against English-Only pedagogy by linguistic minorities as well as by the federal government and scientific community.

The federal government increased the role of bilingual education in other ways. The growth in awareness of bilingual education's potential usefulness also took place in the Justice Department. On May 25, 1970, the Office of Civil Rights circulated a memo stating that it considered the categorical grouping of language minority children into special education classes for slow or retarded children to be a violation of civil rights. The memo also suggested that the schools had the legal duty to notify the parents of language minority children of all native-language instructional possibilities and that all school districts had to take affirmative steps in opening up the curriculum to non-English-speakers. Within months Chinese Americans would file a lawsuit in federal court that would ultimately be decided in 1974 as Lau v. Nichols, which ruled that a school
must provide equal access to educational opportunity to all language minority students through bilingual education.\textsuperscript{98}

Lyndon Baines Johnson's signing of the Bilingual Education Act stood the progressive pedagogical techniques of his own teaching days on their head. In the 1960s the federal government through the Office of Education supported the experimentation with language-teaching techniques. The scientific shift in the pedagogy of language instruction and the growing political presence of Spanish-speakers throughout the country demanded some sort of federal enabling legislation by the late 1960s. In turn, the courts would come to see bilingual education as a useful mechanism of curricular reform by which to desegregate public schools. In addition to the local pressure from Chicano activists and leaders in the community, the Justice Department's legal opinion and the courts' demonstrated predisposition to utilize bilingual programs for desegregation created the political and administrative context for bilingual education's growth in the next decade. The desire to utilize bilingual education in the tangled and increasingly thorny issue of desegregation was as much responsible for the growth of bilingual education as was the wish by Chicano activists to further it. The reemergence of bilingual education in the 1960s represented the opening of an educational door long

closed to Mexican Americans and other immigrant peoples of the United States.
Conclusion

The history of bilingual instruction in the United States is an ironic story. Part of its irony lies in the fact that so little attention has been given this phenomenon by historians, and yet so much of our historical literature in some small or indirect way deals with the topic. It is ironic that so much has been written about the daily life of past peoples, and yet one of the most fundamental of human experiences—language and language policy—has been relatively unexplored. It is also an irony that academic historians have spent so little time studying education, perhaps the most universal social activity in the world.

This study chronicles the many twists and turns of school language policy in Texas and in the nation from the early nineteenth century until recent times. The historiography of the national nineteenth-century bilingual tradition is contested, but whether or not the practice of bilingual instruction in local areas is sufficient to constitute a significant rethinking of American education history does not lessen the inherent significance of what such practices say about nineteenth-century immigrant and ethnic groups and the larger society in which they lived, worked, and went to school. America's bilingual past was not always initiated as a result of especially grand attitudes of tolerance for immigrant cultures or, for that matter, was it always sophisticated. It does illustrate, however, that
conceptions of assimilation (or Americanization) then were considerably more lax and more democratic than these attitudes would be anytime in the next century, including today. More importantly, the nineteenth-century bilingual tradition illustrates the commitment to learning in general and more specifically to learning the English language among immigrant and ethnic communities.

In Texas the history of bilingual instruction begins with Spanish missionaries in the eighteenth century and continues on throughout the rest of the nineteenth century. The Mexican authorities maintained a Spanish-Only policy in theory but granted exceptions to the Anglo minority on the Texas frontier regarding the languages used in their schools. Bilingual schooling was taken seriously by leading Anglo colonists such as Stephen F. Austin. The Anglo minority soon became the majority and rulers of an independent nation called the Republic of Texas. In this period precious little was said or mandated of school languages beyond the vague teaching of English as an academic subject. The state most clearly articulated and codified the region's tradition of bilingual instruction during Reconstruction when an official bilingual policy did exist. After Democrats took back the reins of government from Republicans and passed legislation reinforcing the total local control of education, they proclaimed English-Only preferences that they were powerless to administer. The bilingual tradition continued through the state's "community schools" among Mexican Americans in South
Texas, German immigrants in Central and Coastal Texas, and
Czech immigrants in Coastal Texas, among other groups.
Bilingual education meant for these citizens—in addition to
preserving something of their home culture—the best way to
teach their children English.

Texas bilingual instructional practices met with many
enemies at the turn of the century. The ideology of
Americanization and its proponents opposed the bilingual
tradition. The rise of English-Only pedagogy at the turn of
the century came to be the established method of educating
non-English-speaking immigrant children; English-Only also
opposed the bilingual cultural tradition. However, these
concepts and practices did not occur in a vacuum. They both
arose from a broader intellectual paradigm that spawned them:
Progressive Education. The Progressive Education Movement in
Texas spelled the end of the bilingual tradition.
Progressive educators in Texas sought to impose more
centralized power in the statewide regulatory agency in order
to better manage education in Texas. Such reforms had the
effect of decreasing local control of educational matters by
ethnic communities. Once the organizational structures
permitting the covert bilingual tradition collapsed,
Progressives sought curricular and administrative changes
that emphasized the dominant Anglo culture over the
multicultural tolerance (or benign neglect) that had existed
throughout the nineteenth century.
The Americanization Movement in Texas was bifurcated. In its initial stages it focused upon wartime Allied propaganda and the concern for German loyalty that occurred throughout the nation. By the 1920s the Americanization Movement across the country died out as the immigration restrictionism of that decade made nativist fears of immigrant culture less important. In Texas, however, the movement switched into a higher gear in the 1920s. In this time Americanization in Texas began to focus exclusively on Mexican Americans and their alleged inability or unwillingness to conform to white, Anglo, Protestant outlooks and lifestyles. This drive to Americanize the Mexican immigrant took place most intensely in the school and in the English-Only language policies and curriculum dealing with health and sanitation for Mexican American children. This Americanization Movement grew partly out of racial antipathy and partly out of class exploitation. The ideas of alleged Mexican American filth and stupidity brought forth and popularized by the Americanization Movement in Texas, even by relatively well-meaning and sympathetic Americanizers, became completely embedded in the school curriculum for Mexican American children. This curriculum became a whole system of educational thought and practice, a totalistic paradigm of educational outlook: English-Only pedagogy.

English-Only pedagogy has a unique history. Originally the product of a nineteenth-century French doctoral student who failed to master German, English-Only was born under the
overriding notion that since children learn languages quickly through complete oral immersion, why not allow adults to utilize the same method in attempting to learn a foreign language? In the United States this pedagogical technique underwent refinement by linguists and teachers from the heavily immigrant Northeastern urban areas who were searching for ways quickly and efficiently to educate with mostly English-speaking teachers the massive influx of non-English-speaking students that resulted from compulsory attendance reforms. Thus was English-Only pedagogy born. It was essentially all-English instruction and drills to the smallest of schoolchildren who did not know English. Students were expected to fail the first grade at least once and sometimes two or three times before they possessed sufficient English ability to master the most elementary of school subjects. In Texas, English-Only laws mandating such a pedagogical technique were enacted in 1905, 1918, and 1923. The first two applied to all ethnic groups. However, the 1923 legislation applied almost exclusively to Mexican Americans. The following four decades witnessed curricular reform after reform by education officials in Texas in repeated efforts to make English-Only pedagogy work. It never did, and most Mexican American children, even those with prior education in Spanish, were expected to fail the first grade one or more times. The special instruction of Mexican Americans through English-Only also became a key
legal rationalization or subterfuge for racially segregated schools.

A fundamental aspect of English-Only pedagogy as it was employed in Texas lay in the assumption that Mexican Americans were hardly educable. At the root of this fundamental axiom was the American science of intelligence testing. These testers of IQ in the 1910s and the 1920s were eugenicists who argued that educational resources were for the most part wasted on handicapped or retarded students, in which Mexican American children were presumed to belong by virtue of a supposed faulty genetic inheritance of IQ. This academic line of reasoning was widely disseminated among local teachers and administrators in the Texas schools serving Mexican American students, and it influenced the curriculum of English-Only pedagogy. Such beliefs conveniently served to lower the expectations of educators for their Mexican American students. These beliefs furthered the notion that Mexican American students were hardly educable as well as the rationale for putting such children in separate and obviously inferior school facilities. Even when the IQ science shed its eugenic and overtly racist outlook by the 1930s, its effect remained the same. The newer science emphasized environmental explanations of the low test scores of Mexican American schoolchildren such as language or poverty. But in doing so, they merely substituted cultural inferiority for racial inferiority.
The 1940s offered a brief possibility of escape from the damning educational effects of the English-Only system. Franklin Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy" extended a symbolic hand of friendship to those Latin Americans at home as well as those abroad. The Texas State Department of Education enacted potentially significant curricular reform in the teaching of Spanish in the elementary grades for English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children. More importantly, the agency was staffed by officials who expressed a new level of commitment against the segregated and inferior schools of Mexican Americans. However, such possibilities for change fell apart after the war when the State Department of Education became the Texas Education Agency (TEA) as a result of organizational reform enacted by the state legislature in the late 1940s. By the 1950s and early 1960s the system of English-Only instruction remained relatively unchanged from its 1920s incarnation, but the sciences of testing and language acquisition were beginning to change conceptualizations of language instruction in new directions that would signal the end of English-Only pedagogy by the 1960s.

The Mexican American community in Texas responded to the schools and their English-Only segregation in a number of ways that ranged from "accommodation" to the English language and "resistance" to its imposition. The cultural value of Spanish in the Mexican American community was a constant; Mexican Americans wanted their children to know Spanish for
the most part, but they also wanted their children to know English. This cultural continuity lasted from the first years of the century, when Mexican Americans initially confronted English-Only in large numbers, until the 1960s, when Mexican Americans championed the bilingual education movement. There was never any one generation of total accommodation or resistance. Both attitudes were exhibited by the Mexican American community and both were expressed simultaneously. Mexican Americans desired to educate their children to learn English but not to disparage, trivialize, or forget Spanish. This accommodation and resistance to Anglo cultural dominance through the English-Only policy of the public schools is an unexamined but important part of the history of Mexican American cultural identity.

The 1960s brought the demise of the entire English-Only system of thought as well as its practice. In its place arose the official acceptance of some measure of bilingual instruction. Although President Lyndon Baines Johnson probably did not reflect much upon his landmark signing of the Bilingual Education Act in early 1968, his administration's support of bilingual education marked an epochal shift in American education regarding basic assumptions of Americanism, citizenship, and the educability of the nation's poorest, most vulnerable, and most vital group of schoolchildren: non-English-speakers. To be sure, not all officials in Johnson's Administration, like Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II, for example, were
completely convinced of the merits of bilingual education as it was enacted by the Congress. But despite such uneasiness bilingual education across the country and in Texas grew in the 1970s at a rapid pace. Texas boasted some of the first and most successful of bilingual education programs and passed its own bilingual education statutes in 1963 and 1973. By 1974 recent federal civil rights decisions as well as the activism of the federal Office of Civil Rights had given bilingual education a pronounced role as a tool in the desegregation of schools for Mexican Americans.

Unlike bilingual education's critics who allege that it is a fluke in the American tradition of English dominance, bilingual education is in fact a return to the multicultural and pluralistic roots of American education. In the bilingual past and throughout the reign of the English-Only system of mis-education, Mexican Americans, like other earlier language groups, sought to assimilate into middle-class America by taking advantage of the public schools. They sought to accomplish this ambition by learning English but with the recognition that the native language of children was important and something to be utilized, not thrown away as meaningless garbage.

However, the public perception of bilingual education is that it is an ethnic maintenance program taken advantage of by militant minorities with no desire to ever truly become American. Nativist elements in American society currently propose such interpretive notions. Nativists disparage
bilingual education in a number of ways. One standard argument is the conspiracy: "The educational results of this segregation by language have been disappointing, especially in learning English. Politically, however, the existence of a body of young people uncomfortable in English and alienated from the mainstream serves the purposes of ethnic politicians very well." The authors of this particular view, one of whom was involved in a scandal in which his racist letters led to the resignation of officials (including himself) from an immigration "reform" organization, argue that bilingual instruction is segregation, which is difficult to fathom given that bilingual education was mandated by the courts in order to remedy (along with other remedies) the lasting effects of segregation.\footnote{Wayne Lutton and John Tanton, The Immigration Invasion (Petoskey, Michigan: The Social Contract Press, 1994), 57.} Other nativist writings defined bilingual education as a type of instruction that "rejects the idea of priority and emphasis on American style, heritage, language, or background."\footnote{Robert Rienow and Leona Rienow, The Great Unwanteds Want Us. Illegal Aliens: Too Late to Close the Gates? (Monterey, California: Viewpoint Books), 30.}

Unfortunately such views, even without scholarly documentation, hold great influence in academic and public policy circles. In one particularly scary illustration of unfortunate ignorance of how children learn language, former Democratic Governor of Colorado Richard D. Lamm summarized several different techniques for teaching non-English-speaking children and favorably noted that English immersion
was the method utilized by businesspersons and State Department diplomats learning a foreign language. Lamm simply ignored the decades of research on child psychology and language acquisition which illustrate that a five-year-old child's level of difficulty in learning a second language on top of a first language that is not yet fully formed is considerably different from that of an adult with a Ph.D. learning a second language at age 50. Lamm then introduced another conspiratorial myth of bilingual education:
"Bilingual Programs have held sway for political, not educational, reasons. Bilingual education gives jobs and local power to members of the non-English-speaking community who work in the schools."  

Unfortunately, the tone and rhetoric of the nativist writings changes little in the hands of well-respected academic opponents of bilingual education. The work of historian Hugh Davis Graham refers to bilingual education as nothing more than a "Hispanic job corps" that was railroaded into existence by "Hispanic militants." Pulitizer Prize-winning historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., recently attacked bilingual education in an uninformed and quite undocumented manner: "Testimony is mixed, but indications are that bilingual education retards rather than expedites the

---

movement of Hispanic children into the English-speaking world and that it promotes segregation more than it does integration. Bilingualism shuts doors. It nourishes self-ghettoization, and ghettoization nourishes racial antagonism." Schlesinger's uncharitable outlook on the ineducability and hopelessness of children with bilingual backgrounds, perhaps the most defenseless of all of those that public education serves, reflects a shameful and willful ignorance of bilingual education and the children it serves that unfortunately persists at all levels of American society.\(^5\)

History has shown that claims of greatness in education by the United States are measured largely on how the poorest and most deprived of its children are educated. The great idea of American education in history is that the children of the poor and the unwanted could use education as a springboard to success in life. Educational opportunity feeds the "American Dream." Those groups who were systematically denied such opportunity in the past such as Mexican Americans and African Americans remain the most economically and socially marginalized of all Americans today. Those in need of bilingual education are often also in need of much more than simply special language instruction. Upon examination of student profiles in the state of Texas for 1992-1993, the TEA found that 51 percent

---

of the total number of the state's first graders were classified as "economically disadvantaged." Of all those first grade students who were classified as "limited English proficiency" (who qualify for bilingual education if it is offered by their school), 87 percent of them were also classified as economically disadvantaged. The TEA computed the total percent of all first grade students who were economically classified as "at risk" to be 29 percent; the number of limited English proficiency children in the "at risk" category was 94 percent. There were 275,142 total first graders in Texas in the school year of 1992-1993, and out of that total there were 50,352 children classified as limited English proficient.⁶

Non-English-speaking children are truly the most defenseless and vulnerable of all of public education's charges, and bilingual instruction remains one of the few official commitments to these children and their culture. In its venture into bilingual education during the 1960s, the United States returned to the roots of tolerance, pluralism, and the will to create opportunity that represents the pinnacle of its ideals. Bilingual education now and in history is thoroughly American education.

---
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