

Formal Response to the Texas Public Policy Foundation Report

Submitted by Prentice Hall

August 7, 2002

World Explorer: People, Places, and Cultures
Prentice Hall

1. p. 116. The author states that the U.S. establishes immigration quotas for various ethnic groups. This isn't the case. The quotas are established by country or region, not on the basis of ethnicity as such.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 116, paragraph 1, Revise last two sentences to read as follows:

“Americans began to worry about the large number of immigrants from certain European countries, too. After World War I, the United States established **quotas**, certain numbers allowed, for various countries.”

2. p. 220. The Sandinistas lost power in Nicaragua in 1989, not 1999. Further explanation of who the Sandinistas and Contras were would be helpful.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 220, Revise 2 paragraphs under “Economic and Social Changes” as follows:

“From the 1970s to the late 1980s, violent political warfare plunged Nicaragua into deep economic and social trouble. One group, the Sandinistas, seized power in 1979 and established a communist-leaning government. Another group, known as the Contras, fought to overthrow the Sandinistas. Both groups sometimes used guerilla tactics to get what they wanted. A **guerilla** is a person who takes part in undeclared warfare as a member of an independent group. In 1990 the Sandinistas were defeated in elections. Today, Nicaragua is one of poorest nations in Latin America. The country's main hope is its wealth of unused natural resources.”

3. pp. 332-33. The discussion of the cultural divisions in Yugoslavia is not well written. The claim of hundreds of thousands of dead is a common claim but not well-supported in documentary evidence. Casualties were most probably under 200,000, making tens of thousands a better way to express the numbers of dead. The peace accords (in Dayton) were mediated and later enforced by the US and NATO. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) remained recognized as a member of the UN, until the Kosovo War period, after which it had to reapply for UN membership, according to a UN General Assembly Resolution of November 1, 2000.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 332, Revise paragraph 4 as follows:

“Adding to these challenges were cultural differences. Serbs maintained control of what remained of Yugoslavia, the country later renamed Serbia and Montenegro, as shown on the map above. Serbs living in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina worried about living under non-Serb governments. Likewise, Croats living outside of Croatia worried about living under non-Croatian governments.”

SE p. 332 (-333), final paragraph, Revise as follows:

“Eventually, these cultural conflicts resulted in bitter warfare. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, fighting broke out among three main ethnic groups—Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Muslims. Tens of thousands of lives were lost, and the capital city of Sarajevo was destroyed.”

SE p. 333, paragraph 2, revise 2nd sentence as follows:

“NATO forces (see page 298) responded quickly by bombing Serbia and sending in peacekeeping troops.”

SE p. 333, Revise first sentence of caption as follows:

“The war in Bosnia claimed thousands of lives and reduced cities to rubble.”

4. pp. 376-77. West African slave trade with Europe is mentioned, but the East African slave trade with Arabia is ignored. Why? The slave trade in the Atlantic was largely reduced by British policy and enforcement in the early 19th century.

Publisher’s response:

SE p. 378, Revise first paragraph as follows:

“The Slave Trade

Even before the arrival of the Europeans, slavery was common in Africa. Beginning around 1450 Europeans began transporting Africans across the Atlantic to work on the plantations and mines in North and South America. At the same time, Swahili traders in East Africa relied heavily on slaves for labor and exported African slaves to Arabia, the Mediterranean, and to lands bordering the Indian Ocean. While the British put an end to the Atlantic slave trade by about 1850, the slave trade in East Africa continued until about 1900. The effects of slavery for Africans were disastrous.”

5. p. 378. The impression left is that the Europeans encountered massive or ‘fierce’ resistance in colonizing Africa. The picture was more complicated. The Somali in the North, for example, made treaties with the British to protect themselves from Ethiopian incursions. The Berlin Conference should be explicitly mentioned.

Publisher’s response:

SE p. 378, Revise paragraph 2 as follows:

“The Effects of Colonization

Many Europeans wanted to **colonize** Africa, or settle it and take over its governments. When the slave trade ended, some Europeans saw Africa’s natural resources as a new way to build wealth and empires. In 1884 fourteen countries, including Germany, France, Great Britain, and Belgium, met at the Berlin Conference to divide up Africa among themselves. By 1900, most parts of Africa were colonized. Though not all were ruled in the same way, in most cases Africans had little power in the governments that ruled them.”

6. p. 362 Farming in Somalia, the author asserts, is done around oases. This is a misstatement. Farming in Somalia is limited largely to the interriverine area along and between the Webi Shebelle and Juba rivers where better soils and water are available, thus supporting wider cultivation. Wells and water holes in the hinterland are used for the herds, which graze on pastureland that greens with seasonal rains. So Somalia is not principally an oasis-driven agricultural zone.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 362, Revise paragraph 3 as follows:

“Somalia, at a lower elevation than Ethiopia, is hot and dry. Farming is possible only near rivers. Far from the rivers, farmers rely on oases to water their herds. An **oasis** is a place where springs and fresh underground water make it possible to support life in a dry region.”

7. p. 55. The treatment on direct democracy and monarchy is too simplistic. Egalitarian traditional societies could still be patriarchal and not quite “direct” democracy. At Athens not all men could vote, only free Athenian adult male citizens could participate. Many monarchies, throughout European history were limited and constrained by custom, canon law, oath obligations, and the like.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 55, Revise paragraphs 1-4 as follows:

“Direct Democracy A democracy is a type of government in which supreme political authority rests with the people. The people hold power and government is carried out only with the consent of the people. A democracy can either be direct or indirect. In a direct democracy, citizens participate directly in decision-making. One example of a direct democracy is a New England town meeting. In town meetings, every adult citizen can vote on laws, budget items, and town officers.

Monarchy Until about 100 years ago, one of the most common forms of government was a **monarchy**. In this system, a king or queen rules the government. The ruler inherits the throne by birth. At one time, many monarchies were forms of unlimited, or nearly unlimited government. The only limits that were placed on the monarch were custom, church law, or oaths of obligation. Citizens had little say in the affairs of their country.

Monarchies still exist today. Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, Spain, and Switzerland are examples. However, these monarchies do not have unlimited power. The power of the rulers and the government is limited. These countries have **constitutions**, or sets of laws that define and often limit the government's power.”

8. pp. 307-08. Coverage of British government is very weak. There is no mention of the House of Commons or House of Lords. There is no discussion about the importance of the British parliamentary model for so many countries of the British Commonwealth in various corners of the globe.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 308, Add the following side-column note:

“Government

Britain's Parliament

Britain's Parliament is divided into two houses, the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Members of the House of Commons are elected by the country's citizens and they pass Britain's laws. Members of the House of Lords can delay, but not block, a House of Commons bill. The House of Lords also serves as the final court of appeal in the British legal system. Britain's Parliament has served as a model for legislative bodies throughout the world.”

Make the following cuts to the main text to make room for the above side-column note:

SE p. 308, Paragraph 2, revise second sentence as follows: “The royal family may participate in national ceremonies and may represent Britain on trips to other countries.”

SE p. 308, Paragraph 3, delete the following sentences: “The laws state what they can and cannot do. This is very different from the absolute monarchies of the past.”

9. p. 438. Error. The caption to the bust of Plato says that his book, *The Republic*, “set out ideas for how to organize a democracy, which means ‘government by the people.’” Obviously the author has not read *The Republic*. Plato disliked democracy and in his *Republic* he lays out a scheme for establishing benign rule by a philosopher king, definitely not a democratic system.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 438, Revise second sentence of Plato caption as follows:

“His book, *The Republic*, set out a plan for an ideal government ruled by a philosopher king who always seeks to achieve good.”

10. p. 422. Peace talks to end the violence in Rwanda by Mandela and Clinton are mentioned. That's news to me. I've followed the area pretty closely. The Clinton administration remained largely inert during the height of the genocide, not acting until it was well over, and then mainly to provide aid to escaping Hutu refugees who fled into Zaire with the leaders who perpetrated the massacre of Tutsis. Moreover, Rwanda today is more stable than Burundi.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 422, Revise first paragraph (under “World Leaders Intervene”) as follows:

“Both Rwanda and Burundi have experienced continual military coups, assassinations, and outbreaks of ethnic violence. In 1994, the rest of the world began to recognize the desperate situation in these countries. In April of that year, the presidents of both Rwanda and Burundi died when their airplane was shot down. In Rwanda, extreme Hutu soldiers soon killed hundreds of thousands of civilians, most of them Tutsi. Since 1999, world leaders, including South African President Nelson Mandela and United States President Bill Clinton, have organized peace talks in hopes of ending the violence in neighboring Burundi.”

SE p. 422, Revise last two lines of caption as follows:
Change “conflicts in Rwanda and Burundi?” to “conflict in Burundi?”.

11. /12. Information regarding the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) needs to be included in discussion of the economies of the United States, Mexico, and Canada. This is highly significant to all three economies and may be a driving force for years to come. The omission of NAFTA is a glaring one, particularly to Texans who are already dealing squarely with its ramifications. A lot of details regarding NAFTA may not be necessary, but it does deserve “the time of day”, at least an introduction.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 128, Add new side column feature as follows:

“Economics

Promoting Trade

Since it went into effect in 1994, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has had a big impact on the economy of the South and the United States as a whole. This agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico has phased out tariffs, or taxes on trade, and other trade barriers between these countries. The agreement has sharply increased trade, since each country can now sell goods to its neighbors more cheaply. NAFTA has had an especially strong impact on Texas and on other states that border Mexico or Canada. Critical Thinking How has NAFTA affected the economies of these countries?”

SE p. 128, Replace existing basal text with the following (for fit):

“New industries are growing all across the South. One is the high-technology industry, which makes computers and other electronic products. Some centers of high technology are Raleigh, North Carolina, and Austin, Texas. In Florida, Texas, and Alabama, people work for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) running the nation’s space exploration program.

Transportation and Tourism Some of the South’s largest cities play big roles in the transportation industry. Miami, Florida, is a gateway to Central and South America. New Orleans, Louisiana, connects the Gulf of Mexico to the Mississippi River system.

The South is part of the **Sun Belt**, a broad area of the United States stretching from the southern Atlantic Coast to the coast of California. It is known for its warm weather. Some arrivals are older adults who want to retire to places without cold winters. Others come for both the weather and the jobs that the Sun Belt offers. Still others come to the South as tourists.

Our Nation’s Capital The city of Washington is not in any state. Instead, it is in the District of Columbia, which lies between the states of Maryland and Virginia. This area was chosen as the site for the nation’s capital in 1790. **Washington, D.C.**, is home to the nation’s leaders and to hundreds of foreign diplomats.”

TE p. 128, Add the following in an “Answers to…” box:

“CRITICAL THINKING

NAFTA has increased trade between the United States and its neighbors. Imports are now cheaper in NAFTA countries, and NAFTA countries are now exporting more. Students might note that increased trade will bring increased job opportunities or that some jobs might move to a neighboring country if a product can be produced more cheaply there.”

SE p. 147, Replace existing basal text with the following:

“**Ottawa** is the national capital of Canada. It lies on the south bank of the Ottawa River, which forms the border between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Canada’s three Parliament buildings sit on Parliament Hill overlooking the Ottawa River. Ottawa’s most important employer is the Canadian government, which employs more than 100,000 of the Ottawa area’s residents.

Toronto is Ontario’s capital, as well as Canada’s largest urban area. It is the commercial, cultural, and financial center of Canada. Headquarters for Canada’s largest banks and insurance companies are located in Toronto. Three of the world’s 50 tallest buildings are located in downtown Toronto.

The Golden Horseshoe The sprawling metropolitan area that includes Toronto is the center of Ontario’s richest manufacturing region. The area, known as the **Golden Horseshoe**, follows the curve of the western shore of Lake Ontario. Most of Ontario’s automobile plants are located here in the cities that cluster around the lakeshores. Manufacturing automobiles is Ontario’s major industry, but other important industries include electrical equipment, meatpacking, chemicals, textiles, industrial machinery, and furniture.

Resources and Trade

Ontario is rich in natural resources such as timber, minerals, and fertile soils. It is also close to large population centers in North America. This is a great advantage for Ontario’s economy because big cities provide markets for goods and services. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has greatly expanded trade between Canadian provinces such as Ontario and their neighbor to the south, the United States.”

SE p. 216, Revise paragraph 2 as follows:

“Mexico City is not the only city that is growing. All of Mexico’s major cities are becoming more crowded. This is especially true near Mexico’s northern border, where the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has greatly expanded trade between Mexico and the United States. People have moved to these cities for jobs in industries that export products across the border.”

13./14. SE p. 387 “How Culture Spreads”, Statement: “One of the more recent influences on North Africa is Western culture.” Due to modern day transportation, communication, television, and movies, it can be stated that Western culture universally influences the world. There really is no point in singling out North Africa as being influenced by Western culture any more than some other country. Some Middle Easterners, terrorists in particular, object to the influence of

Western cultures on Eastern cultures, and this may be an idea that needs to be explored. The sentence needs to be revised.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 387, Revise first sentence under C-head "Contemporary North African Culture" as follows:

"Like other parts of the world, North Africa has felt the influence of Western culture in recent decades."

Lone Star: The Story of Texas
Prentice Hall

1. 56S says the Spanish king and queen paid for [Columbus'] voyage. Actually, Columbus chartered the Santa Maria and supplied more than a third of the sum contributed by the king and queen. He did so in order to receive a greater percentage of profits from the voyage. He indebted himself to do this and thus stood to lose his entire personal fortune such as it was. Ferdinand and Isabella had everything to gain if he succeeded and almost nothing to lose.

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 56, paragraph 2, lines 3-4 to:

"Columbus sought a new western route to Asia. The Spanish rulers paid for most of his voyage. He paid for some of it himself. A new, faster route to Asia would make Spain's trade with India and China even more profitable."

2. 124S states that Lorenzo de Zavala received an empresario contract but never colonized his grant. 249S says Lorenzo de Zavala built a colony in early Texas. The two statements are inconsistent. As 124S goes on to explain, Zavala never settled any families on his contract. He sold it to the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company.

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 249, paragraph 5, line 1 to:

"Lorenzo de Zavala served in the Consultation and the Convention of 1836. He was the first vice president of the Republic of Texas."

3. The presentation of DeZavala, Vehlein and Burnet's empresarios (124S) seems negatively biased for no constructive purpose I can think of. It holds the three out as crooks, who set out to betray the trust of the Mexican government and defraud colonists, when the unethical business was conducted by the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company. The implication that Zavala, Vehlien and Burnet were somehow responsible for the company's conduct because they sold their contracts to it is unmistakable. The Law of 1830 suspended all uncompleted contracts, which the text never mentions. Burnet and Zavala are never mentioned in much greater detail elsewhere in the text. Considering the involvement of these two in the era of the Texas Revolution and Republic, and the many positive contributions of Zavala and his family in particular, a more balanced presentation seems warranted. I am not even sure why the text chose to make so much of this particular transaction since it is not, in my opinion, particularly important to an understanding of the history of this era at the 7th grade level.

Publisher's response:

Change SE pages 124-125, paragraphs 7, 8, and 9 to:

"**De Zavala, Vehlein, and Burnet** The Mexican government wanted empresarios to personally find good settlers and help their colonies grow. However, not all land agents could do this.

“Three examples were Lorenzo de Zavala, Joseph Vehlein, and David Burnet. Each of these men received contracts, but none of them had enough money or support to attract settlers by themselves. Instead, in 1830 they sold their contracts to the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company.

“The Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company did not actually buy land from De Zavala, Vehlein, and Burnet. It bought only the right to bring settlers to Texas. Yet the company told would-be settlers that it had land in Texas. The company sold these settlers something called scrip. Scrip supposedly gave the owner the right to claim a piece of Texas land, but it was worthless. People who bought scrip thought they owned the land, but in fact, they owned nothing.

“The actions of the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company caused great confusion. Many scrip holders arrived in Texas and found they owned nothing. Some never got any land. Despite these problems, the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company did bring about 1,000 families to Texas.”

4. 124S relates the story of Robertson’s Colony with such bias as to cast Robertson in a negative light unreflective of the facts.

Publisher’s response:

Change SE page 124, paragraphs 5 and 6 to:

“Leftwich sold his contract to a group headed by Sterling C. Robertson. Robertson brought families to Texas in 1830. However, a Mexican law that temporarily banned American immigration prevented them from settling. Stephen Austin and a partner convinced Mexican leaders to give them Robertson’s land. However, Austin did not issue any titles to settlers either.

“Robertson and Austin argued over the land for many years. Robertson started bringing families to Texas in 1835. He settled 600 of the 800 families called for in his contract.”

5. More detail and background needs to be provided about the Constitution of 1824 and the subsequent changes need to be emphasized. What, specifically, were the differences between the Mexican Constitution of 1824 and the Law of April 6, 1830, and why, specifically, was that law so repugnant to Texans? This text presents the Anglo-American colonists as having been denied their rights without really explaining the issues. And what of the Tejanos who joined Anglos in seeking independence? What were their motivations? Not the American Revolution or religion or cultural differences. The text does not deal with them.

Publisher’s Response:

Add the following text to TE page 142:

“Activity

Connecting Civics and Government

Understanding the Constitution of 1824 Ask students to research the provisions of the Mexican Constitution of 1824. Then have them compare the Mexican Constitution to the U.S. Constitution. Tell students that both constitutions split power between executive, legislative, and judicial branches. However, the Mexican Constitution specified a state religion—Catholicism. Ask students to discuss further similarities and differences between the two documents. Then,

lead a class discussion on the question: “Given that the Texans supported the Constitution of 1824, why would they be upset by the Law of April 6, 1830?” (*Possible answers include: they had no say in the decision; it was supported by military force; it revoked contracts that already existed.*) (**Verbal/Linguistic Learners**)”

Also, add the following to SE page 157, end of last paragraph:

“Although Tejanos shared Mexico’s culture, some Tejanos, such as Juan Seguín, opposed Centralists. Others realized that the Anglos outnumbered them, but did not want to leave their homes. Instead, they joined the fight.”

For fit, change p. 157, paragraph 2, lines 3-5, to:

“Were Texans fighting for a separate state within Mexico, or independence?”

p. 157, paragraph 5, lines 1-2, to:

“For example, the American Revolution lasted six years.”

p. 157, paragraph 5, lines 3-5, to:

“In contrast, the fighting in Texas lasted just seven months and fewer battles took place.

p. 157, paragraph 6, lines 3-5, to:

“In the American Revolution, both sides had the same basic British culture.” and delete “Most of the colonists were British, just like the people they were fighting.”

p. 158, paragraph 2, lines 2-4, to:

“Four years earlier, Mexican leaders had loaned a small cannon to the Texans at nearby Gonzales to fight Comanches.”

6.124S-125S, More emphasis is placed on Zavala as an empresario (failed) than on his contributions to Texas. Since both Zavala and Burnet are portrayed in a negative light as empresarios (124S), I am confused as to what point the text is trying to make on 125S, “Drawing Inferences,” when it asks students, “How might DeZavala and Burnet have profited from their brief experiences as empresarios? Mention of Zavala otherwise as a leader in Texas is so slight as to go easily unnoticed. The only other reference to him is a sentence on 184S saying that he became vice-president of the ad interim government in 1836, and on 249S saying that he built a colony (addressed previously). It might be expected, from the information presented about Zavala, that students would assume his “significant” role in Texas history to be that of a crooked empresario, who, by implication, became a crooked government official.

Publisher’s response:

Change SE p. 125, caption question to:

Drawing Conclusions *Why were De Zavala and Burnet unable to bring settlers to Texas?*

Change TE p. 125, caption answer to:

“De Zavala and Burnet lacked the funds and support to raise settlers, so they signed their grants over to the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company.”

To give a more thorough view of De Zavala, add the following to TE page 125:

“Background

Connecting With Civics and Government

Lorenzo de Zavala Lorenzo de Zavala was an important political figure in Mexico before and after his brief stint as an empresario. A strong federalist, he played an active role in the Mexican government during the 1820s and 1830s. When a centralist government took control in 1833, De Zavala resigned his post and traveled to Texas. There, he became involved in the Texas Revolution and served as the first vice president of the Republic of Texas.”

7. Use of the word “tyrant” to describe Santa Anna (150S, 157S) is, I think, distracting. It is a prejudicial term, whereas a balanced and unemotional presentation of Santa Anna’s actions would allow students to come to their own conclusions about him. Enough factual information is provided in the text that they would, I think, get the picture and practice objective analysis at the same time.

Publisher’s response:

SE p. 150, paragraph 5, line 2, change “Centralist tyrant” to “Centralist ruler.”

SE p. 157, paragraph 3, line 1, change “tyrants” to “unjust rulers.”

8. 295S says many white Texans disliked that men from the North won public office in Texas. It does not say, specifically, who any of these “Northerners” were. I would argue that this is a misleading, if not inaccurate, generalization. The men who won public office during Reconstruction were not from the North but were Texans who had remained loyal to the Union. A. J. Hamilton had served Texas in Congress 1859-1861; Elisha M. Pease (appointed during Congressional Reconstruction) had been a popular governor of Texas 1853-1857; E. J. Davis had served as a state district judge in Brownsville before the war. In the election of Nov. 30-Dec. 3, 1869, the only carpetbagger to win one of Texas’ four Congressional seats was a Democrat. The three Republicans elected were Texans.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 295, paragraph 5, change to:

“Many white Texans resented the actions taken by Congress. They disliked the fact that Texans who had been Unionists won public office. They resented Southerners who supported Reconstruction. They called these people “scalawags,” another word for rascal. Another aggravation was the presence of Northern outsiders who moved to Texas after the war. They called these outsiders “carpetbaggers.” The name came from the luggage of the day, bags made of carpet. Many secret societies, such as the Ku Klux Klan, formed. They terrorized African American voters and kept them away from the polls.”

9. 365T, The activity for honors/Pre-AP students has students read about significant individuals of the new economic era, among them James Rayner. Rayner’s first name was John.

Publisher’s Response:

TE page 365, “Customize for”... activity, line 4, change “James Rayner” to “John B. Rayner.”

10. 367S says James Rayner became a key leader of the Populist Party. His name was John B. Rayner, not James. This is the second place in the text that this name has been confused.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 367, last paragraph, line 2, change "James Rayner" to "John B. Rayner."

11. Page 107T "With this purchase of the Louisiana Territory in 1804." (Authors notes) Louisiana Purchase was made in 1803 not 1804.

Publisher's response:

TE p. 107, Author's note, line 1:

Change already on error list submitted to TEA. Change to "With the purchase of the Louisiana Territory in 1803,..."

12. Page 147T "Santa Anna, the new president, had resigned his position because of poor health." He was out of Mexico City, but he never resigned.

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 147, paragraph 5, lines 2-3, to:

"Austin arrived in Mexico City in July 1833. He found a confusing scene. Santa Anna, the new president, had not assumed his position because of poor health. Valentín Gómez Farías, the vice president, acted as president in his place. Santa Anna was not even in the capital."

13. Page 149 T "Cos had many leading Texans arrested, including Travis." He wanted them arrested, but they were never captured.

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 149, paragraphs 10 and 11 to:

"This was not enough to persuade Cós that Texas remained loyal. Cós called for the arrests of many leading Texans, including Travis. If captured, these prisoners would face trial in a military court and possibly execution.

The move towards war Even for settlers who favored peace, Cós' demands went too far. The Texans vowed never to hand over their neighbors to a military court. Most believed that people had a right to a trial by a jury of their peers, not by members of the military. Cós never captured any of these people."

14. Page 64T "Luckily the people who lived on San Luis Island, the Atakapans, were friendly and gave them food and shelter." It was the Karankawas that lived on Galveston Island.

Publisher's response:

The *Handbook of Texas* gives conflicting information about exactly what group of peoples Cabeza de Vaca met. Some historians believe that Cabeza de Vaca may have met the Hans

people of the Atakapan group, while others believe that he met Karankawas. Both groups were active in the coastal area of Texas at that time, although the Karankawas seemed to have had more of a presence on Galveston Island, near where Cabeza de Vaca is believed to have landed. Scholars working on a joint project about Cabeza de Vaca at the Center for the Study of the Southwest at Southwest Texas State University and The Witte Museum in San Antonio also have not reached a definite decision on what ethnic group of Native Americans Cabeza de Vaca met (see <http://www.English.swt.edu/CSS/Vacaindex.HTML>).

Given this uncertainty, change paragraph SE p. 64, paragraph 2, lines 2-3 to:

“The original 400 members of the Narváez expedition had dwindled to about 80 people. The group was in terrible shape. Luckily, they met some people who lived on San Luis Island, possibly Atakapans or Karankawas, who were friendly and gave them food and shelter.”

and change paragraph 5 to:

“Alone among the Native Americans, Cabeza de Vaca began his incredible adventure. For a time, he was forced to work. He also carved out a role for himself as a trader. He traveled widely across coastal Texas, trading shells and beans for skins and other items.”

15. Page 162T “The Mexican army called it Presidio San Antonio de Bexar. The Texans knew it better by another name-The Alamo.” This is wrong. San Antonio de Valero, the mission, is called The Alamo.

Publisher’s response:

Change SE p. 162, paragraphs 2, to:

“Meanwhile, General Cós reached San Antonio on October 9, 1835. Cós had about 800 troops under his command. He placed some in the town and some in a nearby abandoned mission, now used as a fortress. The mission had been known as San Antonio de Valero. Texans knew it better by another name—the Alamo.

SE p. 162, paragraph 3, line 2 **and** paragraph 8, line 2, change “presidio” to “fortress.”

16. Page 18T When Texas joined the United States, government officials agreed that Texas could divide into four states. Wrong. Texas could divide into as many as five states or 4 states in addition to what would remain as Texas.

Publisher’s response:

Change SE p. 18, paragraph 1, lines 3-4, to:

“When Texas joined the United States, government officials agreed that Texas could divide into as many as five states.”

17. Page 216T “Congress also set aside land for a university.” Congress set aside land grants that provided a permanent fund for two Universities, Texas A & M and Texas University. [note: should be University of Texas]

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 216, paragraph 5, lines 3-4 to:

“Congress also set aside land to be sold to fund a university.”

Note: The Permanent University Fund didn't expand to include Texas A&M until 1931, according to the *Handbook of Texas*. The sentence to be changed refers to an action taken by the Congress of the Republic of Texas in 1839. The Permanent University Fund is discussed more fully on SE p. 389.

18. Page 269T Sorbs should be Serbs.

Publisher's response:

According to the *Handbook of Texas Online*, the Wends are “also known as Sorbs or Lusatian Serbs.” Also, *Encyclopedia Britannica* states that “The Wends themselves were enserfed and gradually assimilated by the Germans, with the exception of a minority in the traditional region of Lusatia, in present-day eastern Germany, who are now known as Sorbs.”

Change SE, page 269, paragraph 3, line 2, to:

“These people, also known as Sorbs or Lusatian Serbs, are an ethnic group whose homeland is in Eastern Germany.”

19. Page 313T “Cattle that roamed the plains were called mavericks.” Wrong. Unbranded cattle were called mavericks because Sam Maverick refused to brand his cattle. Therefore any unbranded cow was called a maverick.

Publisher's response:

Change SE p. 313, paragraph 3, lines 8-9, to:

“Samuel Maverick let his cattle roam the plains without branding them. Unbranded cattle that roamed the plains were soon known as “mavericks.””

20. Page 394T “The same storm had previously struck near New Orleans, but the weather bureau had received little information.....” The Great Storm of 1900 did not first hit near New Orleans.

Publisher's response:

Change TE p. 384, Background Note, lines 1-10 to:

“**Hurricane Preparedness** The limitations of communications equipment in 1900 caused the people of Galveston to have little advance warning of the approaching storm. The national Weather Bureau had sent warnings about a storm in the Gulf of Mexico to Galveston weather officials from September 4 through September 8, when the storm struck. However, details on the nature and strength of the storm were not available.”

The American Nation
Prentice Hall

1. pp. 144-45 The French and Indian War is treated as a stand-alone conflict instead of part of an international war. Some mention should be made of the Seven Years War, the continuing conflict between England and France, and the contributions and attitudes of colonists during and after the war.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 142, Revise paragraphs 2 and 3 as follows:

“In 1754, fighting broke out again. English settlers called the conflict the **French and Indian War** because it pitted them against France and its Native American allies. In Europe, the conflict involved many nations and was called the Seven Year's War. The conflict in America again centered on the Ohio River Valley. The opening shots were fired by soldiers led by George Washington.

A Bold Young Leader Washington was only 22 years old in 1754. Gifted at mathematics, he was working as a land surveyor by the age of 15. His job took him to frontier lands in western Virginia.”

2. p. 158 “Quebec Act.” No mention is made that the land in question had been given to the affected colonies in their original royal land grants, making the Act seem like outright theft. Further, the colonists viewed the Act (when viewed alongside the Massachusetts Government Act) as favoring French settlers over ethnic British subjects, hence “Intolerable.”

Publisher's response:

SE p. 158, Revise paragraph under “Quebec Act” as follows:

“**Quebec Act** About the same time, Parliament passed the **Quebec Act**. It set up a government for Canada and gave complete religious freedom to French Catholics. The Quebec Act also extended the borders of Quebec to include the land between the Ohio and Missouri rivers. The act pleased French Canadians, but it angered American colonists. Some of the colonies claimed ownership of these lands, based on their original royal land grants.”

3. pp. 208-209 An important aspect of both the Great Compromise and the 3/5 Compromise is that it is not just representation that was being decided, but taxation also.

Publisher's response:

SE p. 208, Paragraph 3, Delete last sentence to save space, “Under the Articles of Confederation, each state regardless of population, only had one vote in Congress.”

SE p. 208, under The New Jersey Plan, second paragraph, add sentence to the end of the paragraph, as follows:

“The plan also gave the national government the power to tax and regulate trade.”

SE p. 208, under The Great Compromise, last paragraph, delete for space the last sentence, “Each side gave up some demands to achieve unity.”

SE p. 208, under Northern and Southern States Compromise, revise last sentence as follows:

“Would slaves be counted as part of a state’s population for figuring taxes and representation?”

SE p. 209, under The Three-fifths Compromise, revise as follows:

“**The Three-Fifths Compromise** Southerners wanted to include slaves in the population count for figuring representation but not tax assessments. If slaves were counted, southern states would have more representatives in the House of Representatives. Northerners disagreed. They argued that slaves should be counted for tax assessment but not when assigning representatives.

Once again, the delegates compromised. They agreed that three fifths of the slaves in any states would be counted for both taxes and representation. In other words, if a state had 5,000 slaves, 3,000 of them would be included in the state’s population count. This agreement became known as the **Three-Fifths Compromise.**”

4. p. 322, top of page “Hull retreated from Canada.” Actually, he surrendered his force without a fight and the British occupied Detroit.

Publisher’s Response

Hull did invade Canada, and, after the invasion failed, he retreated. It is also true that in Detroit, to which he retreated, he later surrendered to the British without a fight. Our decision not to include this information will not affect student understanding of the key point—that Hull did not help the Americans reach their goal.

5. p. 388 picture at top of page is incorrectly labeled. Santa Anna is standing in the center of the picture wearing white pants and a blue coat.

Publisher’s response: This correction has already been submitted to the TEA on the Prentice Hall Editorial Corrections list; the lead line will be moved to correctly show Santa Anna.

6. Chapter 16 This chapter has virtually no mention of states’ rights as an issue in the upcoming war. Other than a definition of popular sovereignty, it is not mentioned at all. The Activity box on p. 487T states “the question of states’ rights was a key issue in the Civil War era.” This is only discussed in Chapter 17 as it affected the relations of states in the Confederacy, not in the pre-war era.

Publisher's response:

Our presentation of the causes of the Civil War is supported by the great preponderance of historical scholarship. States' rights, of course, is an important part of American history. As a part of the U.S. Constitution, states' rights has provided our political system with a creative tension embodied in the notion of federalism.

While the South had a long tradition of supporting states' rights, as reflected in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and the Nullification controversy (which topics the text covers, of course), most recent scholarship minimizes the role played by the doctrine of states' rights in the breakup of the Union. The waters of this debate have been muddied because Confederate leaders like Jefferson Davis and Alexander Stephens began to stress the importance of states' rights in their writings many years after the conclusion of the war. But if one reads the writings of these same men during the crucial decade of the 1850s, the banner of states' rights is much less prominent. Professor James McPherson of Princeton, a leading historian of the Civil War, has even gone so far as to state that "Many observers in the 1850s would have predicted that if a rebellion in the name of states' rights were to occur, it would be the North that would rebel." He concluded thus because during this decade, Southern leaders were, in fact, often vigorous in championing an *extension* of federal power in the context of defending the rights of slave owners. The Fugitive Slave law is the most striking example of this, for it used federal power to recover escaped slaves in northern states, while the northern states claimed their rights as sovereign states not to be forced to carry out that law.

When it came time to secede, the issue of states' rights was mentioned--by South Carolina, for example, in its declaration of secession. On the other hand, similar documents issued by Mississippi and Georgia make no explicit cases about states' rights; rather they build their arguments around the fact that the North's actions threaten the institution of slavery. Charles B. Dew's recent book, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (2001) further supports this argument.

7. On p. 36(S), the text says: "Another theory claims that people could have reached the Americas from Europe, Africa, or islands in the South Pacific." This theory is treated on a par with migration from Asia. Ideas of migration from Europe, Africa, or the South Pacific should be described as extremely unlikely, based on the evidence.

Publisher's response:

While they are in a minority, some anthropologists and paleontologists do support the theory that the first Americans migrated from such places as Europe, Africa, or the Pacific Islands. See, for example, NOVA's "Mystery of the First Americans," a broadcast of February 15, 2000.

Of course, the predominant evidence supports the Asian migration theory, and this is reflected in our treatment. Much of the text treatment on pages 36-37 describes the creation of the land bridge and the subsequent migrations across the bridge. By contrast, only one sentence is given to alternative theories of migration from Europe, Asia, and the South Pacific. Furthermore, the map on page 37 shows only two routes, both originating from the land bridge, from the easternmost tip of Siberia into Alaska.

8. **On p. 44(S), the text speaks of the institution of potlatches as a way of competing for social standing. This benign wording misleadingly neglects the central importance that potlatches and similar customs give to envy in the society in which they exist. Widespread envy has serious corrosive effects on families, friendships, and trust as well as holding back economic development. For a discussion of potlatches and envy, see Helmut Schoeck, *Envy* (1969)**

Publisher's response:

The discussion of potlatches is presented in a straightforward, factual way, with no intention to plumb the sociological roots of the custom. While envy might conceivably be one reason for potlatches, it was not of "central importance" as the reviewer indicates. None of the well-reputed sources we consulted (listed below) describe envy as a primary motivation for the potlatches.

* Peabody Museum at Harvard (<http://www.peabody.harvard.edu/potlatch/contpot1.html>)

* Canadian Museum of Civilization

(<http://www.civilization.ca/aborig/tsimsian/weafe01e.html>)

* "Alaskan Tlingit and Tsimshian Customs," University of Washington,
<http://content.lib.washington.edu/aipnw/miller1/potlatch.html>

9. **On p. 45(s), the text says that among Eastern Woodlands Indians, "women shared social and political power." On p. 48(S), text says "[Iroquois] women. . . had political power." And on pp. 64-65 (S), text presents a feminist re-telling of the legend of the founding of the Iroquois confederation. This is misleading. It is true that Iroquois women had a minor political role, but Iroquois politics was overwhelmingly male-dominated, to such a degree that the text's bland wording masks the reality of the situation. Women possessed a rarely-wielded veto power and a nominating power that customarily was in tune with male guidance. Actual tribal leadership was always entirely male. . . ."**

Publisher's response:

The role of Iroquois women in tribal affairs was significant. According to W.G. Spittal, the editor of *Iroquois Women: An Anthology*, *Iroquois Social Dance Songs*, and *Warfare Practices Among North American Indians*.

"One of the most striking aspects of traditional culture was the high status of women. Through the women passed family names, clan, and nationality.

"Women selected and deposed Confederacy Chiefs and Sub-Chiefs. They could start and stop wars, adopt or condemn prisoners; they were the custodians of home, garden, and territory. Atonement for causing the death of a woman was twice that of a man. Men were renowned diplomats and warriors but Iroquois women were the center of their society."

The following is testimony from the Whipple Report, published in 1889 and considered by Professor Robert Venables of Cornell to be "the most complete single source of evidence for

(Iroquois) views.... “The counsel for the committee, Judge O.S. Vreeland, interviewed Luther Jack at the Tuscarora reservation north of Buffalo, New York.

Judge Vreeland: How did you get to be a chief?

Luther Jack: Well, they choose by my clan, by the women of my clan.

Judge Vreeland: The women choose the chiefs?

Luther Jack: Yes, the women choose the chiefs; the women of my clan.

The story referred to by the reviewer, “The Mother of Nations,” is by Joseph Bruchac, a scholar and author, who is himself a Native American. It is a respectful recounting that is fully in accord with Iroquois tradition.

10. On p. 57(S), the text says: “After Caesar’s murder [in 44 B.C.], his nephew Octavian, declared himself emperor in 27 B.C. He received the title “Caesar Augustus.” This is in error. *De Imperatoribus Romanis: An Online Encyclopedia of Roman Emperors* says “In 38 [B.C.] Octavian replaced his *praenomen* Gaius with *Imperator*, the title by which troops hailed their leader after military success (ultimately, *Imperator* developed into the title Emperor). From this time Octavian’s full title was *Imperator Caesar Divi Filius*, including the reference to him as the son of his deified father. . . The official title decreed to Octavian by the Senate [in 27 B.C.] was *Augustus*, the name by which he is most widely known, . . . “

Publisher’s response:

SE page 57, paragraph 5, revise the paragraph to read as follows:

“As Rome expanded, the republic faced a series of crises that led military leaders to seize power. Among them was Julius Caesar, who named himself dictator for life. After Caesar’s murder, civil war broke out. Caesar’s nephew, Octavian, seized power. In 27 B.C., the Senate granted him sweeping powers and the title of Augustus.”

11. The text speaks of “an enslaved African named Estevanico.” [p. 76(S)]. Calling him “African” is misleading. Readers will think Estevanico was from sub-Saharan Africa. In fact, he was a Moroccan (a North African). . . .”

Publisher’s response:

SE p. 76; last paragraph

Since Morocco is part of Africa, our wording is accurate. However, to further ensure student understanding, we will revise the last paragraph to read as follows:

“Cabeza de Vaca, an enslaved North African named Estevanico, and two others finally escaped their captors in 1533. The four walked across the plains of Texas, searching for a Spanish settlement. Finally, in 1536, they reached a town in Mexico. They had walked more than 1,000 miles through the Southwest.”

12. On p. 152(S), the text quotes Patrick Henry as saying “If this be treason, make the most of it.” There is a dispute among historians about what precisely was said by Henry on this occasion, since the sources do not agree. It would have been better for the text to have said “Henry reportedly replied: or “According to some reports, Henry replied.” . . .

Publisher’s response:

SE page 152, 4th paragraph from top,
revise the paragraph to read as follows:

“A young lawyer, Patrick Henry, became well known as a vocal critic of British policies. His speeches in the House of Burgesses moved listeners to both tears and anger. Once, Henry attacked Britain with such fury that some listeners cried out, “Treason!” Henry reportedly replied, “If this be treason, make the most of it!” Henry’s words moved a young listener, Thomas Jefferson. At the time, Jefferson was a 22-year-old law student.”

13. On p. 182(T), the teachers’ wraparound materials speak of Nathan Hale’s “famous last words” as I “only regret that I have but one life to live for my country.” (Yet the student edition text on the same page more carefully says that Hale is “said to have declared” these words.) These words were not attributed to Hale until decades after his execution and are in all likelihood a rewriting of what he actually said. British officer Captain Frederick Mackenzie reported in his diaries that Hale’s final words were actually: “It is the duty of every good officer to obey any orders given him by his commander in chief. An account published six years after Hale’s execution has him saying: “I am so satisfied with the cause in which I have engaged, that my only regret is that I have not more lives than one to offer in its service.” . . .

Publisher’s response:

TE page 152, replace existing
Background: Connecting With Cultures
with the following:

“Dying for His Country Nathan Hale was 21 years old when the British discovered his school-teacher disguise and hanged him as a spy. The famous last words that Hale is supposed to have uttered were not reported until many years after his death. In fact, a British officer, Frederick Mackenzie, recorded them differently. He wrote in his diaries that Hale’s final words were: “It is the duty of every good officer to obey any orders given him by his commander in chief.”

14. On p. 217(S), the text reads: “Several states had agreed to ratify the Constitution only on the condition that a bill of rights be added.” This is misleading. It sounds as if several states had said that their ratification would only go into effect when a bill of rights was added. In fact these states ratified unconditionally, but recommended that a bill of rights be added.

Publisher's response:

Revise SE page 217, last paragraph, last sentence, as follows:

“As you have read, several states had ratified the Constitution while recommending that a bill of rights be added.”

15. p. 288 The text on p. 288(S) quotes Thomas Jefferson as believing that farmers were the backbone of the new nation and the "most valuable citizens." The teacher's Background material [p. 288(T)] says that TJ sought to protect the agrarian Southern economy. A chart in the text [p. 289(S)] says that Republicans "emphasized agriculture." This was TJ's view in the 1780s. But following the War of 1812, TJ clearly recognized that agriculture in the United States should be complemented by commerce and manufacturing to the extent that it was appropriate under free-market conditions.

Publisher's response:

All of the citations given by the reviewer are in Chapter 9, Section 3, “Political Parties Emerge.” The dates of the chapter are 1789-1800. As the reviewer acknowledges, our statements accurately reflect Jefferson’s views at this period in history. The fact that Jefferson later moderated his views (long after leaving public office) does not invalidate the facts as presented. To jump ahead chronologically would serve only to confuse students’ understanding of the differences between the Federalist and Democratic Republican parties at the time they were formed.

16. On pp. 26-27(S), the text discusses the economic institutions of societies. The discussion is all in terms of the government deciding what institutions will be permitted instead of free people establishing institutions and engaging in commerce. There is no sense of what Nobel Laureate economist Friedrich Hayek called the “spontaneous order” of markets and prices. The text’s premises are collectivist, and the assumption is that a central planner is designing the economy.

Publisher's response:

When the text says each "society" must make economic decisions, it is talking not necessarily about government decisions. In free market societies which place a high value on individualism, groups of people constantly make economic decisions about how resources are handled. In socialist or communist states, of course, the government makes these decisions. But in free market societies, collective economic decisions are made by individuals, by partnerships of two or three or a half dozen, by small businesses, by larger businesses, or by huge corporations. Thus the assumptions in the text on these pages are not collectivist, in the sense suggested by the comments, merely descriptive of economic activities in the aggregate.

To make this clearer to students, we will make the following revisions:

Revise page 26, under “Three Economic Questions,” first paragraph, as follows:

“The study of how people manage their limited resources to satisfy their wants and needs is called economics. The people of every society must answer three basic economic questions:...”

Revise pages 26-27, under “What Goods and Services Should We Produce?”:as follows:
“The people in every society have to find ways to fulfill their basic needs for food, shelter, and clothing. After that, society must make choices about how to use the rest of its limited resources. Should it focus on producing consumer goods, such as cars and washing machines? Should it use its resources for education? Should it concentrate on heavy industry such as construction or trucking?”

Decisions about what to produce vary according to the time and culture. People in developing nations are less concerned about producing private automobiles. They are more concerned...”

17. On page 554(S), the text says that speculative investment was the cause of the Great Depression. This is a highly contested issue. (See the works of John Maynard Keynes, Milton Friedman, and Murray N. Rothbard.) The text does not reflect the debate.

Publisher’s response:

The reviewer is correct in saying that the text does not present the debate over the causes of the Depression. However, the text describes the speculative fever, and it notes the economic slide that slowed the economy. Standard accounts routinely describe the Crash because it had a galvanizing effect on the mood of large and small investors in the United States.

Please note that this presentation comes in the Epilogue, which summarizes United States history from 1865 to the present. Because the Grade 8 curriculum focuses on American history prior to 1877, it seems appropriate to hold off discussion until high school of the various theories about the causes of the Great Depression.

18. The text says on p. 554(S), “[President Herbert Hoover] did not believe that the government should become directly involved in the economy.” This incorrectly characterizes the views of Hoover, who in fact favored a strenuous federal anti-depression program (including public works, which the text acknowledges; farm subsidies; and the Reconstruction Finance Corp.) Walter Lippmann, for example, acknowledges that Hoover made the changeover in principle on national anti-depression action. The only things Hoover held back from were direct federal relief to the poor and explicitly compulsory industrial cartels, e.g. the National Recovery Administration. [See Walter Lippmann, “The Permanent New Deal,” *Yale Review*, June 1935; Joan Hoff-Wilson, *Herbert Hoover: Forgotten Progressive*.]

Publisher’s response:

p. 554, Revise paragraph 5 as follows:

"President Herbert Hoover tried to restore confidence in the economy. Unlike most earlier Presidents, he believed that the government could take steps to help recharge the economy. Hoover fought the Great Depression with public works programs and a tax cut. But his programs did not cure the enormous economic ills. In the end, people blamed him for the hard times."

19. p. 293 On p. 293(S), the text says that the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were passed "with help from Jefferson and Madison." Jefferson and Madison didn't just help with the passage of these resolutions in the state legislatures, they actually wrote the resolutions and the wording should indicate this. This passage on p. 293(S) also relates to the topics in TEKS #5.

Publisher's response:

Although there is technically no factual error, the reviewer is correct. Since both resolutions were not written by both men, we will revise the paragraph as follows:

“In 1798, Kentucky passed a resolution, written by Jefferson. It claimed that each state “has an equal right to judge for itself” whether a law is constitutional. The following year, Virginia passed a similar resolution, written by James Madison. If a state decides a law is unconstitutional, said the **Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions**, it has the power to nullify that law within its borders.”

World History: Connections to Today

Prentice Hall

1. **Zen is presented as the dominant sect in Japan. Zen has always been very much a minority sect in Japanese Buddhism.**

Publisher's response:

SE p. 322, Revise paragraph 5 as follows:

“During Japan’s feudal age, a Buddhist sect from China won acceptance among samurai, a small, elite group in Japanese society. Known in Japan as Zen, it emphasized meditation and devotion to duty.”

2. **p. 630 – “In OPEC, oil-producing countries of the Middle East and other world regions try to maximize their profits through cooperation. They influence oil prices by controlling how much oil is produced.” Cooperation? If these were American companies there would be charges of conspiracy, cartels and price-fixing. Some discussion as to whether this “cooperation” is ethical is warranted.**

Publisher's response:

This appears to be a question of word choice rather than fact. In the passage cited, we do not make any ethical claims that OPEC practices are good or bad, moral or immoral. We simply state the fact that OPEC nations cooperate to control production.

The statements cited appear in a brief “Connections to Today” sidebar. There is more detailed discussion of OPEC and its worldwide impact later in the book. See SE pp. 813 (negative impact of the oil embargo), SE page 890 (OPEC v. non-OPEC nations), and TE page 549 (discord within OPEC, which is indeed identified as a cartel).

3. **p. 631 – “Exploiting Indian Diversity” also could be titled “Indians can’t unite.” Lack of unity is usually blamed on geography and political differences (e.g. the Greeks). Here though, we see that “India was home to many peoples and cultures.” This diversity is a good thing of which the ruthless British took advantage. While the British may have been ruthless, it should be pointed out that this “diversity” has its disadvantages.**

Publisher's response:

The reviewer is correct in saying that “diversity has its disadvantages.” We point this out. On p. 270, we have a “Comparing Viewpoints” feature titled “Does Diversity Strengthen or Weaken a Society?” This feature appears within the context of a text discussion of the introduction of Islam to India. We make it clear that ethnic and religious clashes were a part of Indian life hundreds of years before the arrival of the British.

On 631, the page cited by the reviewer, we state that “As Mughal power crumbled, India fragmented” and that “Indians with different traditions and dozens of different languages were not able to unite against the newcomers.” We make it clear that the British did not introduce ethnic clashes and rivalries to India, but were able to exploit clashes and rivalries that already existed.

4. p. 632 – “The British flooded India with inexpensive, machine-made textiles, ruining India’s once-prosperous hand-weaving industry.” Yes, the same way Ford’s production of cheap cars “ruined” the buggy-whip industry. You do not have a “right” to a profession, or particularly, to a *method* of production. The Indians had the same choice that all human do in economic situations: “Adapt or die.” They could learn to work on the machines, they could create a niche market for those who value hand-made goods, etc.

Publisher’s response:

In his *New History of India*, historian Stanley Wolpert states that British imports “had all but destroyed the rich varieties of Indian handicrafts and cottage industry.” What seems to be at issue here is not a question of fact but interpretation. The text does not attempt to judge the rights or wrongs of industrialization. We are merely describing positive and negative impacts of British rule on Indians.

In fact, the native textile industry in India did not have complete autonomy to “adapt or die.” To give advantage to British industry, the British government removed duties on cloth imported to India, while at the same time imposing an excise tax upon cloth manufactured in India by Indian mills. (Wolpert; Encyclopedia Britannica).

On p. 633 of the textbook, under the subhead “Benefits of British Rule,” we do state that “Indian landowners and princes, who still ruled their own territories, grew rich from exporting cash crops.” This makes it clear that some Indians were indeed able to adapt to the new economic conditions and prospered as a result.

5. p. 665 – “...modern medicine undermined traditional herbalists and local healers, who sometimes possessed useful knowledge of the medicinal value of plants.” Medicine cannot “undermine” other medicine. If I have a “cure” for cancer that involves waving chicken feathers over your stomach, and you in turn have a pill that makes it disappear, you have not undermined my “cure.” Medicine, perhaps more than any other industry, is about what works. Indians were still free to practice, but were “undermined” because Western medicine produced greater results. Again, there is no “right” to practice a method of weaving or of medicine, expecting advancements in the rest of the world to avoid you, so that you don’t have to compete. Further, the best claim that is offered of this “undermining” is that traditional herbalists and local healers “sometimes” possessed useful knowledge. While this is true, and those accomplishments should be listed, what about the massive increase in quality of life that western medicine brought to India?

Publisher’s response:

SE p. 665 Revise paragraph 5 as follows

“Western medicine brought many benefits. Missionaries introduced medical breakthroughs such as vaccines and modern methods of hygiene that saved lives. At the same time, the success of modern medicine drew people away from traditional herbalists and local healers, who sometimes possessed “useful knowledge of the medicinal value of plants.”

6. p. 512 – The reader is left to believe that Robert Owens was a success, since it is not mentioned that his experiment failed after only three years. Yet industrialists who succeeded and treated people well receive no mention. Ford who paid \$5.00 per day, about twice the going rate, hired the handicapped and all we get is a picture of an assembly line. Why are his efforts not worthy of mention? Who lifted more out of poverty, Owen or Ford? Owen “showed that an employer could offer a decent living and working conditions and still run a profitable business,” except for that it failed! How is that profitable? Further, there is a false dichotomy at work here, that you can either treat workers well or be profitable. Owen bought into this fallacy and therefore, was destined to fail. Ford didn’t buy into it. He knew that it is not “either-or,” but “both-and.” In fact, he said that the “five dollar work day was the best cost-cutting move we ever made.”

Publisher’s response:

SE page 512 Revise paragraph 4 as follows:

“He wanted to show that an employer could offer decent living and working conditions and still earn a profit. By the 1820s, many people were visiting New Lanark to study Owen’s reforms. Like other utopian experiments, in the end, it failed.”

The discussion of Owen is in the context of the origins of socialism, as specified by the TEKS (“historic origins of contemporary economic systems.”) Owen's ideas, and the general feeling that reform was needed, did have a long-term effect both on the historical development of socialism and on later 19th century reform movements.

A comparison between Owen and Ford would not fit into the historical context of Chapter 20. (Ford is not introduced until two chapters later.) When we do discuss Ford, the impact of the assembly line and the transportation revolution is presented in a positive way.

7. p. 549 – It is implied that great power comes only through inheritance, which is apparently unfair. To give example of a big business, the Krupp family of Germany is noted for passing down business advantages through three generations (no mention is made of how the first Krupp succeeded in his steel-making business). No mention is made of entrepreneurs who started with little to nothing, and then built great empires. Examples could be Canadian James Hill, Scottish immigrant Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, etc.

Publisher’s response:

The text does not state or imply that inheritance is wrong or that it was the only path with success. Alfred inherited the steel-making business and then expanded it. We do not say or imply that there was anything wrong in this.

The text does mention John D. Rockefeller in this paragraph. Although there is no factual error, we will add to our description of Rockefeller for clarity, as follows:

SE p. 549 Revise Paragraph 4; p. 550 Revise Paragraph 1 as follows:

“Move Toward Monopolies Powerful business leaders created monopolies and trusts, corporate structures that controlled entire industries or areas of the economy. In Germany, Alfred Krupp inherited a steelmaking business from his father. He bought up coal and iron mines as well as ore-shipping lines that fed the steel business. Later, he and his sons acquired plants that made tools, railroad cars, and weapons. In the United States, John D. Rockefeller began selling produce and created a business empire. He bought an oil refinery and built it into the Standard Oil Company. His ownership of oil wells, refineries, and pipelines gave him a dominant position in the American petroleum industry.

Some ruthless business leaders destroyed competing companies. With the competition gone, there were fewer limits on price increases. Sometimes, a group of large corporations would form a cartel, an association to fix prices, set production quotas, or control markets. One cartel fixed prices for 170 German coal mines. An international cartel of British, German, French, Japanese, and Dutch shippers came close to setting freight rates on the world’s sea.”

8. p. 550 – “Acquired” is often used instead of the word “bought.” “Acquired” leaves room for doubt as to whether shady methods were employed. If shady methods were used, says so. If not, use “bought.” Similarly, Rockefeller “gained control.” How? That’s left to the reader’s imagination, but if it needs help, there is always the picture of the greedy octopus next to the paragraph. There is no mention made of the tremendous improvements and innovations that Rockefeller made, which his competitors often refused to make.

Publisher’s response:

This seems to be a matter of wording. In the sentence prior to the one cited, we say, “He bought up coal and iron mines as well as ore-shipping lines that fed the steel business. Later, he and his son acquired plants that made tools, railroad cars, and weapons.” Rather than intending a negative implication, this wording was an editorial choice to find a synonym to the word “bought” rather than to repeat it. (Large companies themselves use the term “mergers and acquisitions” to describe how they expand.)

Starting on page 544, the text shows the many benefits of the growth of industry. Under the head, New Directions for Business, the first sentence lets students know that these benefits “required the investment of large amounts of money.” In our discussion of the rise of big business, the text mirrors the historic debate that went on at the time. The cartoon of the octopus cited by the reviewer is clearly presented as representing one viewpoint. It is labeled “One View of Big Business” and the question at the end of the caption makes it clear that there is a viewpoint behind the cartoon: “Do you think this cartoonist favored or opposed government regulation of business?”

The text presents both views of big business on page 550. For example, the text states one argument presented in favor of big business: “capitalists invested their wealth in worldwide ventures, such as railroad building, that employed thousands of workers and added to general prosperity.” On page 550, we ask students to draw a cartoon in which they take a stand “for or against” regulation. On page 566, we ask, “What arguments were made for and against the rise

of big business?” If students do not understand both, they cannot understand the debate or the reasons why governments at that time took steps to regulate business. In later chapters, we discuss the how the new industrial society led to the rise of the middle class.

9. p. 550 – “Ruthless business owners destroyed competing companies.” Really? Did they blow them up? If offering lower prices to the consumer “destroys” another company, the fault lies with the company charging higher prices. As for predatory pricing, or selling below cost, there are ways to compete with companies who do so (see Burton Fulsom, Jr.’s *The Myth of the Robber Barons*). As for cartels, they are beatable as well (see Fulsom’s account of Herbert Dow defeating German cartel).

Publisher’s response:

Again, this is a matter of wording and interpretation. The meaning of the word “destroy” includes “to ruin,” “to defeat”, or “to put an end to” and was used accordingly. (See note above regarding presentation of both views of big business.)

10. p. 550 – “Any effort to destroy competition, critics argued, damaged the free-enterprise system.” Again, the word “destroy” is used. Were entrepreneurs dynamiting the competition’s factories? If a business can’t compete, their destruction is usually self-caused. Isn’t part of the free-enterprise system failure? Isn’t that a possible consequence of going into business? How is it damaging to the market if an industry leader is more efficient than his competitors? If competition dries up and he raises prices, doesn’t that encourage others to come in and undercut his price?

Publisher’s response:

This section points out arguments for and against the methods used by industrial capitalists. The meaning of the word “destroy” includes “to ruin,” “to defeat”, or “to put an end to” and was used accordingly. The whole debate is one that we would expect the teacher to take up in more detail.

11. p. 710 – Deaths attributed to Stalin “Collectivization took a horrendous toll...Between five and eight million people died in the Ukraine alone.” And “Secret police files reveal that at least four million people were purged during the Stalin years. Some historians estimate the toll to be much greater.” Students are left to think he killed around 9-12 million. While p. 708 does list in a sidebar, “Many historians think this one man was responsible for the deaths of some 20 million people,” deaths of this magnitude deserve to be treated fully in the main text. We would never relegate Hitler’s six million deaths to a sidebar. Many historians estimate Stalin’s death between 20 and 25 million.

Publisher’s response:

The text presents Stalin as a ruthless dictator whose policies resulted in millions of deaths. We say that 5-8 million died "in Ukraine alone" plus 4 million in the purge; in the sidebar, we give the estimated total as 20 million. (We do not consider the sidebar to be separate from the text. Note that the reviewer’s comments regarding OPEC, above, also referred to a sidebar.)

The reviewer states that “we would never relegate Hitler’s six million deaths to a sidebar.” This is true. However, the treatment of Hitler and Stalin in the text is equivalent. The “six million deaths” were one fraction of the total number who died in Hitler’s concentration camps and his wars. Similarly, the 5-8 million who died in the Ukraine during collectivization and the 4 million people who died in Stalin’s purges were one fraction of the total number who died under Stalin. Neither the 6 million, the 5-8 million, nor the 4 million are covered in sidebars.

America: Pathways to the Present

Prentice Hall

1. p. 269 T,S Describing the Texas cattle boom the book explains: “During the Civil War, many Texans left their ranches to serve in the Confederate army. They returned to find up to 5 million cattle roaming wild. . . .” Most Texans were subsistence *farmers* prior to 1861, not cattlemen. Cotton was always a more powerful element of the state’s agricultural economy than beef. The cattle roaming the landscape were something on the order of pests, and they were plentiful. But they had not miraculously appeared 1861-1865. The Spanish introduced livestock to Texas in a deliberate fashion as early as 1690, and these wild herds had been part of life in Texas ever since.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 269, under the heading “Demand Spurs Growth,” revise the first paragraph as follows: “Several changes launched the West’s legendary cattle industry. Since Spanish colonial times, vast numbers of cattle had roamed wild on the Texas grasslands. After the Civil War, Texans founded ranches and rounded up these herds, which provided ample supplies of beef.”

2. p. 270 T,S “Cow Towns” claims Texas cattle were first driven “all the way to their markets,” then Abilene offered an alternative. Texas cattle were not driven to Chicago prior to 1867, they were instead driven to the nearest railhead—Sedalia, Missouri. The only drives direct to “market” were early ones to New Orleans prior in the Spanish period up to the Civil War.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 270, under the heading “Cow Towns,” revise the first two sentences as follows: “At first, Texas herds were driven north across the open range all the way to the nearest railroad. In 1867, J.G. McCoy established the town of Abilene, Kansas, on the Hannibal & St. Joseph Railroad—the first town built specifically for receiving cattle.”

3. p. 274 T,S Book argues that the “Great Plains remained a region of small family farms well into the 1900s.” This is true, but it covers up the rising trend toward farm tenancy in the Plains, which was reaching into the 30-40% range by the 1890s and contributed to agrarian radicalism. The bonanza farms may have failed, but consolidation of small parcels into larger ones continued nonetheless.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 274, revise the first paragraph after the heading “Farmers Prevail on the Plains” as follows: “Large-scale farms absorbed smaller farms in some places, and many employed landless tenant farmers. Still, the Great Plains remained primarily a region of small family farms well into the 1900s. Despite continual setbacks, the farmer’s way of life prevailed in the West, as mines closed down and the song of the cowboy slowly faded. Farmers triumphed in a showdown with ranchers that shaped the economy of the West. (See Geography and History: Settling the Great Plains, on pages 286–287.)”

4. p. 278 T,S In section on “Farmers and Tariffs” the book makes two serious errors. First, “tariffs helped farmers by protecting them” from competition. This is simply false. Most farm products had no tariff protection, the major exception being sugar. Second, the book claims that tariffs “kept foreigners from earning the US currency they needed to buy American crops.” This is absurd. In fact, it is difficult to understand as well. The tariff’s greatest flaw in foreign trade was that it *invited retaliation* from US trading partners, most notably Britain and Europe. Since the US produced little in the way of manufactures for export, agricultural products represented the chief source of a favorable balance of trade. America’s trading partners responded to US tariffs on manufactured goods with tariffs on American agricultural products. They then turned to other sources—Canada, Argentina, for example—for foodstuffs.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 278, revise the third paragraph under the heading “Farmers and Tariffs” as follows: “However, tariffs hurt most farmers in two ways. First, they raised the prices of manufactured goods, such as farm machinery. Second, U.S. tariffs on manufactured goods spurred manufacturing nations in Europe to retaliate with their own tariffs against American crops. Thus, tariffs indirectly reduced the world market for American farm products.”

5. p. 279 T,S Book repeats Cleveland administration dogma that the government’s silver purchase program drained the gold vaults as truth. The 1893 panic brought about the near bankruptcy of the government, not because of Bland-Allison, but rather because of gold withdrawals by frightened foreign investors. Cleveland used the panic to do away with a program he had never favored.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 279, revise the third paragraph under the heading “Silverites” as follows: “In 1890, Congress passed the **Sherman Silver Purchase Act**. While not authorizing the free and unlimited coinage of silver that silverites wanted, it increased the amount of silver the government was required to purchase every month. During the early 1890s, the government’s gold reserves dwindled, and the government nearly went bankrupt in the financial panic of 1893 when frightened foreign investors withdrew gold from the country. President Grover Cleveland blamed the Silver Purchase Act for the loss of gold and the panic, and he oversaw the repeal of the act in 1893.”

6. p. 281 T,S The book depicts the Populists as drawing away “some black sharecroppers and tenant farmers” from the GOP. This is an incorrect depiction of the interplay between the Populists and Republicans in the South. More often than not, the two parties ran “fusion” tickets whereby they named the same nominees and pooled their strength. This is true in the Midwest as well, where the Democrats and Populists often cooperated rather than competed—i.e., the election of William Jennings Bryan to Congress and later his elevation to the Senate.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 281, revise the 6th (last) sentence of the second full paragraph (not counting the numbered list) under the heading "The Populists" as follows:

"In the South, the party often endorsed a common list of candidates with the Republican Party to pool the support of poor black farmers."

7. p. 282 T,S Several errors exist in the book's depiction of the election year 1896. First, it is described without the context of the ongoing economic depression. The 1894 bailout of the federal treasury by J.P. Morgan solidified the image of a gold conspiracy in many minds. The Populists hoped to capitalize upon this in 1896 by being the only party to come out in favor of inflation of the currency. They expected the sitting president, Grover Cleveland, to win the Democratic nomination on a gold platform; likewise, they expected the GOP to nominate a thoroughgoing gold standard candidate as well, which they got with William McKinley. The book is wrong to portray McKinley as a "moderate." He was for the gold standard and had authored the outrageously high McKinley Tariff in 1890. With the two major parties selecting goldbugs, the Populists hoped to offer the only alternative and carry the election. This hope was dashed with the Democrats' nomination of Bryan. The "Cross of Gold Speech" was certainly celebrated in its time, but it was hardly sufficient to sweep the Populists off their feet for Bryan. When the Democrats adopted a silver plank in their platform, this undercut the Populists, who decided to nominate Bryan as well to avoid diluting the strength of the pro-inflation forces. This represented a serious shift in emphasis from the broad reform agenda the Populists had put forward in 1890 and 1892.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 282, revise the first paragraph (under the heading "Bryan's Cross of Gold") as follows:

"An ongoing economic depression colored the 1896 presidential campaign. In an election focused mainly on currency issues, the Republicans ran Ohio governor William McKinley on a gold-standard platform. William Jennings Bryan, a former silverite congressman from Nebraska and a powerful speaker, captured the Democratic nomination with an emotional plea for free silver."

8. p. 230-231 T,S From time to time the book attempts to interject modern historical perspectives into its discussion of the past. This is a good idea, and certainly innovative for a textbook. However, there are a number of times in which the book makes errors in trying to do so. "Historians disagree" about the propriety of government funding for the railroads. Historians might make judgments about the effectiveness of railroad expansion or even some of the mistakes made by government and industry, but most historians do not dispute the notion that some government intervention was necessary to supplement private investment. The book asserts that the Great Northern was not built with federal aid, and therefore was more profitable and efficient. This is not likely. Even if the Great Northern lacked federal aid, it doubtless had state and local aid. The Great Northern became a powerful monopoly in the Pacific Northwest, which really accounts more for its ability to have higher profits than any efficiencies occasioned by a lack of federal involvement.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 230, revise the third paragraph under heading "The Transcontinental Railroad" (which continues onto p. 231) as follows:

"Scholars disagree as to whether it was a good idea for the government to provide funds for this project. Many believe that the government gave a much needed boost to the railroad industry when the private sector was hesitant to invest. However, others argue that the government should not have gotten involved. One reason is that railroads built with federal aid did not operate as efficiently and profitably as some built with little government assistance. For example, James J. Hill's Great Northern Railroad in the 1880s and 1890s had both lower rates and higher profits than railroads built with federal aid."

9. p. 239 T,S Describing the theory of evolution, the book says natural selection was "a process by which only the fittest survived to reproduce." Darwin never used the term "survival of the fittest." This is a phrase coined by Herbert Spencer, who is responsible for social Darwinism, not Darwin. Darwin was dead by the time Spencer's misuse of his theories had become a powerful social philosophy. The book needs to make a point of emphasizing this distinction and crediting Spencer and American William Graham Sumner with promoting social Darwinism.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 239, replace the second and third paragraphs under the heading "Social Darwinism" with the following:

"After Darwin's death, Herbert Spencer in England and William Graham Sumner in the United States promoted a philosophy called **social Darwinism** that extended Darwin's concept to human society. Social Darwinists argued that society should interfere with competition as little as possible, and they opposed government intervention to protect workers. They believed that if the government would stay out of the affairs of business, those who were most "fit" would succeed and become rich. Social Darwinists believed that society as a whole would benefit from the success of the fit and the weeding out of the unfit. Because many Americans agreed that the government should not interfere with business, the government did not tax businesses' profits."

10. p. 248-249 T,S The Knights of Labor deserves to be credited as the first "industrial union" as opposed to the American Railroad Union (p.251). "By the 1890s, the Knights had largely disappeared," the book explains. This is true. The why is more important and needs to be mentioned. The Knights were mistakenly implicated by the press and public in the Haymarket Affair (p. 250-251). This led to their decline. This link is not made clear either here or in coverage of Haymarket. Therefore, Haymarket is simply presented as an example of labor violence, but has no significance in and of itself by the book's telling.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 252, revise the first full paragraph as follows:

"The press and the public blamed the Knights of Labor for the **Haymarket Riot**, although the union's involvement was never proved. Public disapproval contributed to the decline of the

Knights of Labor after 1886. Much of the American public came to associate unions in general with violence and radical ideas.”

Note: The Knights of Labor is not credited as the first industrial union because the term “industrial union” is defined in this text as a union that organizes all workers within a single industry, whereas the Knights of Labor organized workers across industries and even outside the industrial sector.

11. p. 259 T,S Discussing the West in section called “Pull Factor: Government Incentives,” the book lists a battery of reforms—i.e., the Morrill Land Grant Act—which “opened the way to western migration.” But, the book errs in claiming these reforms were passed “after the war.” All were passed *during* the war in the absence of Southern Democrats who had previously been able to block their passage.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 259, revise the first paragraph after the heading “Pull Factor: Government Incentives” as follows:

“Before the Civil War, disagreements between the North and South over the extension of slavery in the West delayed settlement in the region. During the war, with that issue eliminated, however, the federal government promoted western migration by giving away public lands—or selling them at rock-bottom prices.”

12. p. 260 T,S German immigration to Texas and Missouri originated prior to “the last half of the 1800s.” More specifically, the bulk of German settlement in these areas ended by the Civil War.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 260, revise the second paragraph under the B-head “Settlers From Far and Wide” as follows:

“European immigrants arrived in the middle 1800s, many seeking land to farm. Some German settlers established farms in the Great Plains. Others settled in Midwestern cities. They brought the Lutheran religion, with its strict ethics, and a commitment to hard work and education. Scandinavian Lutherans settled the northern plains from Iowa to Minnesota to the Dakotas, many pursuing dairy farming.”

13. p. 292 T,S Listing the political parties of the Gilded Age and their supporters, the book makes two oversights. First, blacks in the South were reliable Republican voters but are not mentioned. Second, the two parties—especially the GOP—were rent by factional disputes that influence politics.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 292, revise the first two paragraphs under the heading "Opposing Political Parties" as follows:

"During the Gilded Age, the Democratic and Republican parties had roughly the same number of supporters. They differed greatly, however, in who those supporters were and in their positions on major issues.

Republicans appealed to industrialists, bankers, and eastern farmers. The party was strongest in the North and the upper Midwest and was weak to nonexistent in the South, although it did receive support from southern blacks. In general, Republicans favored a tight money supply backed by gold, high tariffs to protect American business, generous pensions for Union soldiers, government aid to the railroads, strict limits on immigration, and enforcement of **blue laws**, regulations that prohibited certain private activities that some people considered immoral."

Note: factional disputes in the Republican Party and their influence on politics are covered on pages 293 and 294.

14. p. 292 T,S The Republicans are depicted as gaining support for "waving the bloody shirt." This was also a tried and true tactic of Democrats in the South, usually combined with race baiting.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 292, paragraph 6, lines 3-4. Change the last sentence in paragraph 6 to read:

"Southern Democrats had their own "bloody shirt," in this case a reference to the abuses of Radical Reconstruction."

15. p. 294 T,S Book does not properly record the naming of the Mugwumps. The term is one of derision because a Mugwump had his "mug on one side of the fence and his wump" on the other. In a time period of strong party identification and male-only politics, such an uncertainty was considered unmasculine. The definition "Great Chief" is one adopted by the Mugwumps for themselves as a flattering term. Whether or not it was really Algonquin is less important.

Publisher's Response: SE page 294, paragraph 3. Change to:

"Cleveland became the first Democratic president since 1856. He owed at least some of his success to Republican independents who decided that Blaine was too corrupt to support. These independents were called "mugwumps," an Algonquin word for "renegade chief." The term stuck when a newspaper editor joked that it really meant "unreliable Republicans," men whose "mugs" were on one side of the fence and "wumps" on the other."

16. p. 295 T,S The spending of the Harrison years is not to blame for the panic of 1893. Signs of a worldwide economic slowdown appeared in Europe even before they did in the US.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 295, paragraph 8, lines 2-3. Change second sentence in paragraph 8 to:

“A worldwide economic slowdown contributed in part to a financial panic that hit the country in 1893.”

17. p. 295 T “Connecting With Government” has Chester Arthur ending the spoils system. The Pendleton Act did not “end” patronage, it merely curtailed it slightly.

Publisher’s Response: TE page 295, Activity, paragraph 2, line 6. Change “Arthur ends the spoils system.” To “Arthur limits the spoils system.”

18. p. 332-336 T,S The book’s coverage of segregation is generally well done. With respect to voting restrictions there are several omissions that detract from the overall picture. The effort to restrict voting by African Americans is taken entirely out of context. First, disfranchisement needs to be understood as a reaction to Populism, but from this it is disconnected. Second, disfranchisement was aimed at destroying any possible coalition of poor whites and blacks, so the book needs to point out that such restrictions were as much aimed at poorer whites as blacks. The chart provided contains an error: Mississippi was the originator of disfranchisement beginning in 1890, and utilized *all* of the impediments listed. The coverage also suffers from a critical oversight—it does not discuss the “white primary” system, which established a one-party Democratic South, all but destroyed the GOP in the region, and insured that African Americans could not vote in the one election that mattered.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 333, regarding the chart: the original sources of this chart, *The American Record: Images of the Nation’s Past*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982, p. 163) and J. Morgan Kousser’s *The Shaping of Southern Politics: Suffrage Restriction and the Establishment of the One-Party South, 1880-1910* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974) does not indicate that Mississippi used the grandfather clause or the property qualification. Mississippi did use the “understanding clause,” which required voters to demonstrate an understanding of any section of the constitution by explaining what the section means, and the secret ballot. The Constitution of Mississippi indicates that a poll tax and a literacy test were once required, but specifies no other measures. Other tactics may have been used locally; but the chart includes only major, state-wide initiatives.

SE page 333, paragraph 2. Change paragraph 2 to read:

“In many southern communities, whites were concerned that African Americans would gain too much political power if they were allowed to vote. Also, they feared that black voters would unite with poor white farmers and elect Populist candidates. As a result, during the 1890s southern states began using several tactics to deny the vote to blacks. Some states required voters to own property or pay a **poll tax**, a special fee that must be paid before a person was permitted to vote. Most African Americans found both requirements difficult to meet. Voters also had to pass literacy tests that showed that they could read, write, and meet minimum standards of

knowledge. But, like the property requirement and poll tax, literacy tests were really designed to keep African Americans from voting.”

Also, SE page 333, paragraph 3, delete the first sentence and replace it with the following: “Both poll taxes and literacy tests could keep poor whites from voting as well. In some states, southern Democrats wanted to keep these voters from supporting Populist candidates. Other states sought to protect white voting rights by passing special laws with **grandfather clauses.**”

To fit these changes, delete the following:

SE page 333, 3rd paragraph, third sentence, delete “and thus were required to take the literacy tests.”

SE page 333, 4th paragraph, delete “and baggy clothes grinned broadly as he” from the 6th sentence.

Also, add the following Background note to TE page 334, shifting the current Background note to page 335:

“Background

White Primaries

As another way to block African Americans from political power, some southern states passed laws that excluded blacks from voting in Democratic primaries. The Democratic Party dominated most southern states from Reconstruction through the mid-twentieth century. Barring African Americans from Democratic primaries effectively kept them from exercising their right to vote in a meaningful way. The so-called white primary was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court decision *Smith v. Allwright* in 1944.”

19. p. 239 T,S “Most Americans agreed that the government should not interfere with private business,” the book avers. How are we to know this of public opinion in the Gilded Age, when mass movements proliferated that proposed—with varying levels of intensity—just that?

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 239, paragraph 4, change to:

“Americans were divided on the issue of government interference in private business. The government, however, neither taxed businesses’ profits nor regulated their relations with workers.”

20. p. 252 T,S Textbooks are determined to have unalloyed heroes. This one is no exception, though it is more judicious than some in applying whitewash. Carnegie’s role in the events at Homestead in 1892 is still very much in dispute. Frick did not act purely on his own initiative, and Carnegie decided to be out of the country and left Frick in charge when he *knew* the contract was coming up. Instead, Carnegie is the Teflon tycoon.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 252, paragraph 3. Change to read:

“In the summer of 1892, while Andrew Carnegie was in Europe, his partner Henry Frick tried to cut workers’ wages at Carnegie Steel. Carnegie knew about the contract negotiation and had left Frick to handle it. The union at the Carnegie plant in Homestead, Pennsylvania, called a strike.”

And paragraph 5, change the last two sentences to:

“Carnegie claimed that he believed in unions. However, Carnegie Steel (and its successor, U.S. Steel) remained nonunionized until the late 1930s.”

To fit the first change, delete the phrase “admitted defeat and” from the first sentence in paragraph 5.

21. p. 321 T,S Book says that more than a “million” students were in American high schools by 1910. The figure might be misleading without offering a percentage representation of American children who attended high school.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 321, paragraph 3, change last sentence to:

“By 1910, nearly 72 percent of American children attended school. The percentage of 17-year-olds graduating from high school rose to 8.6 percent.”

To fit this change, change the third sentence in paragraph 2 on SE page 321 to:

“As industries grew after the Civil War, parents realized that their children needed more skills to advance in life.”

22. p. 354 T,S Second full paragraph has Secretary of State Seward “sen[ding] 50,000 troops to the Mexican border” in reaction to French intervention in that nation. Secretary Seward *did not* have the power to dispatch troops. It was likely Secretary of War Stanton acting on orders of President Johnson that dispatched the soldiers.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 354, paragraph 3, change 2nd sentence to read:

“Secretary of State William H. Seward advised the president to send 50,000 troops to the Mexican border after France placed an emperor on the Mexican throne. Faced with this army, the French abandoned their colonial venture in Mexico.”

23. p. 354 T,S Book says Matthew Perry “convinced Japan to open trade relations with the United States.” This is a bit too pretty. Perry sailed in with a fleet of armed ships, threatened the Japanese, and *then* they consented to trade with the US.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 354, paragraph 4, 2nd sentence to:

“In 1853, an American fleet led by Commodore Matthew C. Perry sailed into Tokyo Bay, forcing Japan to start trading with the United States.”

24. p. 358 T,S Recapping American success in the Venezuela crisis, the book asserts that the US had “forced the world’s most powerful nation [the UK] to bow to its will.” This is a crass exaggeration. The British relented in South America in part because of a desire for good relations with the US, but also because they had become embroiled in the Boer War and could not stretch their resources sufficiently to deal with the US.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 358, paragraph 5, first sentence, change to read:

“By the mid-1890s, not only had the Monroe Doctrine been reaffirmed but the world’s most powerful country had bent to it.”

25. p. 359 T,S Regarding the explosion of the *USS Maine*, it is now pretty clear that the *Maine* suffered a massive internal explosion, perhaps coal dust. The mystery is pretty much solved, and any effort to perpetuate it covers for US overreaction to the accident.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 359, paragraph 7, lines 2-4. Change to:

“The blast had probably been caused by an accidental fire that set off ammunition, but the American public put the blame on Spain.”

Delete line 4: “The exact cause of the explosion has never been determined.”

26. p. 414. T,S Book incorrectly identifies Gavrilo Princip as a “Bosnian nationalist.” He was not. He was a Serbian nationalist who sought unification of Bosnia with Serbia.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 414, final paragraph, revise first sentence as follows:

“Princip, a Serbian nationalist, believed that Bosnia should be part of neighboring Serbia, not Austria-Hungary.”

27. p. 416. Book claims that Serbia “shared a language and common history with Bosnia.” This is too simplistic. Then, and now as we have had to learn recently, Bosnia is multi-ethnic and multi-religious. Catholic Croats, Orthodox Serbs and Bosnian Muslims share the region. It should also be pointed out that Austria issued an ultimatum to Serbia regarding that nation’s support of terrorism in Bosnia and gave the Serbs one month to comply before declaring war, July 28, 1914.”

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 416, “The Conflict Expands,” revise first paragraph as follows:

“Bosnia was the focus of a nationalist dispute between Austria-Hungary, which had recently annexed Bosnia, and Serbia, which shared a common national identity with one of Bosnia’s three major ethnic groups. Austria-Hungary blamed Serbia for the assassination. On July 23, Austria Hungary demanded that Serbia cease its support for terrorism in Bosnia within two days or risk war. Unsatisfied with Serbia's response, Austria-Hungary declared war on July 28.”

28. p. 418. Book claims that Kaiser Wilhelm was “an autocrat—a ruler with unlimited power.” This is simply incorrect. Germany had a parliamentary system of government from 1871. The Kaiser was more powerful than his British cousin, but was decidedly weaker than his other cousin, the autocrat, Nicholas II of Russia.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 414, delete “autocrat” from Key Terms list; SE, p. 421, add below “Zimmermann Note.”

SE, p. 418, “The American Response,” fourth paragraph, revise second sentence as follows: “Although Germany had an elected Parliament, the Kaiser, or Emperor, had strong powers over the government.”

SE, p. 424, “Revolution in Russia,” Revise paragraph 2 as follows:

“Then, in March 1917, Czar Nicholas II of Russia was forced to give up the throne to a republican government. The czar had been an **autocrat**—a ruler with unlimited power. The **Russian Revolution** cheered the pro-war faction in the United States. Concern over being allied with an autocrat had slowed the nation’s move toward entering the war. The fall of the czar removed a last stumbling block to joining the Allies.”

29. p. 435. Book describes a “vigorous revival of natives” in response to US involvement in World War I. Natives is really ongoing from the Civil War on into the 1920s. It is a mistake to portray American natives as an anomaly. It is really a fairly recurrent characteristic of American viewpoints about immigration across time.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 435, first paragraph, revise third sentence as follows:

“Still, the test had set the stage for an increase in natives feelings.”

30. p. 439 “Comparing Primary Sources” has an excerpt from Woodrow Wilson “testifying before the [Senate] Foreign Relations Committee.” While Wilson may have submitted written testimony, it seems highly out of character for him, and unlikely for any president given separation of powers concerns, to have personally testified before a congressional committee. This fact needs to be checked out by someone with a bit more detailed knowledge than me.

Publisher's Response:

While it is extremely unusual for a President to testify before Congress, President Wilson did submit to personal questioning by the Senate to encourage the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles without revisions. His testimony may be found in *Senate Documents*, No. 76, 66 Cong., 1 sess., XIII, pp. 6, 19.

31. p. 248 The book oversimplifies American socialism and links it too heavily with Marxism. Marxism never took off in the US as it did in Europe. American socialism was essentially a transplanted European social democracy. The government controlled key industries—say rail or communications, regulated others, and provided comprehensive social services to its citizens. American socialism never “called for an end to free enterprise” as the book asserts. In the context of the times, the Socialists were on the left of the American political spectrum, but were reacting to the abuses of unregulated capitalism, much as social democrats in Europe were doing.

Publisher's Response:

SE, p. 248, “The Rise of Labor Unions,” revise first paragraph as follows:

“A small percentage of American workers became Socialists and called for greater government intervention in the economy. Far more workers, however, chose to work within the system by forming labor unions.”

32. p. 391 Describing the commission form of government that arose in Galveston, no note is made of the anti-democratic nature and intentions of many of these urban reformers. This was certainly the case in Galveston, where Progressives grappled with traditional urban politics in a fight over the future of the city. The commission system, established in a time of emergency, accomplished greater “efficiency” at the expense of the more democratic and participatory system that had existed previously. The same motivation underlay adoption of other systems such as council-manager.

Publisher's Response:

SE, p. 391, “New Forms of Municipal Government,” first paragraph, revise last three sentences as follows:

“To manage the huge relief and rebuilding effort needed, the city created an emergency commission of five appointed administrators to replace the mayor and aldermen. The commission worked so efficiently that Galveston permanently instituted the commission form of government, with later reforms to make it more democratic. Other cities rapidly adopted the Galveston model, adapting it to their needs.”

33. p. 392 Book discusses state-level Progressive reforms fairly well, but again there are moments of oversimplification. “More Power to Voters” is not the unvarnished good that it appears. Progressives were also actively engaged across the nation in limiting the franchise—this is especially true in the South and areas with large immigrant populations. Progressives did not necessarily advocate ballot access for all, but rather for those better sorts who deserved to

vote. The book oversimplifies the spread of the “direct primary,” which as in the case of the white primary, was often a means of limiting mass influence on politics as much as expanding it. Moreover, it is not true that 45 states had direct primaries by 1916, and it is also overlooked by the book that these direct primaries had little to do with the selection of presidential candidates. Effective direct primaries for president do not become commonplace until after 1972.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 392, second paragraph, Revise first five sentences as follows:

“During the Progressive Era, voters gained somewhat more direct influence in lawmaking and in choosing candidates. Throughout the country, party leaders traditionally had handpicked candidates for public office. In Wisconsin, reform governor Robert M. La Follette instituted a **direct primary**, an election in which citizens vote to select nominees for upcoming elections. Other states later adopted direct primaries for state and local offices. . . .”

See also pages 401-402.

34. p. 394 T,S The chart on “Progressive Era Legislation” has one error and one oversight. First, the Sherman Antitrust Act is not Progressive legislation. While it is arguable that Progressives existed at the state and local levels as early as 1890, Progressivism does not become a national force until Theodore Roosevelt becomes president in 1901. Second, the chart leaves off the Clayton Antitrust Act (1914) which is a major piece of Progressive legislation.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 394, Chart

Delete the entry for the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Add the following entry following the entry for the Federal Reserve Act:

“Clayton Antitrust Act, 1914 Prohibited companies from engaging in certain specific activities, such as offering some types of rebates.”

35. p. 402 T,S First complete sentence on this page claims “some” Progressives favored literacy tests and immigration limits. This is a much more generally held Progressive attitude than the book portrays.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 402, first line

Change “Some” to “Many.”

36. p. 402 T,S Book errs when it claims Taft began segregation in federal offices. It was Wilson.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 402, paragraph 2, line 3. Change sentence to read:

“Wilson allowed his Cabinet officers to extend the Jim Crow practice of separating the races in federal offices.”

37. p. 457 T,S Lindbergh did not receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for flying across the Atlantic solo.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 457, paragraph 4, line 4; revise as follows:

“Lindbergh was brought home on a navy cruiser, given the Distinguished Flying Cross, and celebrated with parades throughout the nation.”

Note: According to the U.S. Army Center of Military History, Lindbergh was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor by act of Congress 14 December 1927 with the following citation: “For displaying heroic courage and skill as a navigator, at the risk of his life, by his nonstop flight in his airplane, the Spirit of St. Louis, from New York City to Paris, France, 20-21 May 1927, by which Capt. Lindbergh not only achieved the greatest individual triumph of any American citizen but demonstrated that travel across the ocean by aircraft was possible.” The medal is sometimes considered controversial because of deviations in the procedure leading to the award.

38. p. 480 T,S Book claims that after World War I there was a “brief postwar boom.” There was none. The economy lapsed into a serious recession 1919-1921, which arguably is the birth of the Great Depression for the agricultural sector.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 480, paragraph 1, line 3, revise sentence to read:

“At the same time, a harsh economic downturn had begun.”

39. p. 482 T,S Describing the Seattle Strike of 1919, book claims it was only “shipyard workers” who walked off the job. The Seattle Strike was a “general strike” in which 60,000 workers went out in all fields of wage labor.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 482, paragraph 2, line 4, revise as follows:

“In February, thousands of workers went on strike in Seattle, and the mayor proclaimed them “revolutionists.”

40. p. 485 T,S Book incorrectly claims the GOP held majorities in both houses of Congress, 1921-1933. This is not true. The GOP did not control the House, 1931-1933; their control over the Senate was slender after the 1930 elections.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 485, paragraph 4, line 6, revise as follows:

“Republicans held the majority in Congress during most of this period.”

41. p. 487 T,S Last full paragraph tries to make Harding into a modern civil rights hero, which he was not. Yes, Harding is the last GOP figure to speak out in favor of civil rights. However, he was also a member of the KKK in Ohio.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 487, revise last paragraph as follows:

"During the 1920s, the positions of the Republican Party mirrored those of its supporters. The party favored restrictions on immigration because its white supporters were uncomfortable with massive immigration. The party also had to placate its black supporters. Thus, in 1921, in front of a segregated audience in Birmingham, Alabama, Harding made a bold speech concerning black equality:"

42. p. 500 T "Geography in History" claims the Hoover Dam was completed in 1936 and then named after Hoover that year. Then, as the book has it, "after Hoover left office" it was renamed the Boulder Dam. Then, in 1947, it was re-renamed the Hoover Dam. This is a muddle. The dam was completed in 1936, three years *after* Hoover left office, and named the Boulder Dam. In 1947, when the GOP took control of Congress, the dam was renamed "Hoover Dam."

Publisher's Response:

TE p. 500, revise "Geography in History" note as follows:

"Hoover Dam, on the Nevada-Arizona border, controls the flow of the Colorado River. The project was begun while Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce in the Harding administration, and he is generally credited with settling many engineering problems and controversies pertaining to the dam while he was President. A Congressional Act on February 14, 1931 officially named the dam the Hoover Dam. However, after Hoover left office the Interior Department used the names "Boulder Canyon Dam" and "Boulder Dam" when referring to the dam. On April 30, 1947 President Truman signed a resolution "officially" restoring the structure's name to Hoover Dam."

Note: Source is U.S. Department of the Interior

(<http://www.hooverdam.usbr.gov/History/naming.htm>)

43. p. 500 T,S Third full paragraph describes 1920s taxation policy as follows: "Mellon's tax plan, however, gave the largest tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans." This is misleading. Only those couples that made more than \$4000 per year paid *any* income tax in the 1920s. \$4000 is nearly twice the standard middle-class income of the period. Therefore, the rich did better under Mellon's tax plan because they were the only ones paying income tax. The untold story, so far as the book goes, is that most Americans who did not pay income taxes saw a tax increase under the GOP in the 1920s in the form of tariffs passed on as consumer taxes on imports or higher prices for domestic goods.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 500, revise paragraph 4 as follows:

"Government tax policy contributed to this imbalance. Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the

Treasury and one of the richest people in the nation, successfully pushed Congress to reduce taxes. Because only the wealthy paid income taxes at the time, they were the main beneficiaries of the tax cuts. Mellon believed that continued high taxation of the wealthy, imposed during the war, would hinder business expansion.”

44. p. 578 Book asserts that Free France “. . .continued the struggle. . .from bases. . . in France’s colonies in Africa.” Vichy French forces controlled the North African colonies—Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia—.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 578, “The Fall of France,” third paragraph, revise first sentence as follows:

“Free France, a government-in-exile in London, continued the struggle against German invaders from bases in Britain and in France’s colonies in central and western Africa. “

45. p. 587 Segment titled “Debating the American Role” explains that “three weeks after the invasion of Poland. . . . The neutrality legislation was effectively dead.” This is incorrect. Whatever amending and loopholes were added, there remained the “cash and carry” provisions along with the Johnson Act (1934) which banned loans to nations in default on previous obligations to the US—essentially everyone with whom the US sided in World War I. The book here makes too short work of neutrality legislation.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 587, first paragraph, delete final sentence and replace with:

“Neutrality legislation still prevented the United States from lending money to the Allies.”

46. p. 587 “Connecting With Government” sets up a potential debate for students over “explanations offered by historians as the reasons for American involvement in World War II.” It then offers “Roosevelt saw the war as a way to end the economic depression. . . .” as one of these “explanations offered by historians.” The book comes dangerously close to giving credence to conspiracy theory here, presumably in hopes of making history “interesting” for students. No academic historian of any reputation seriously believes that Franklin Roosevelt deliberately arranged America’s involvement in WW II for any reason of economics. This exercise should not be suggested as presented here.

Publisher’s Response:

TE, p. 587, delete activity

47. p. 604 “Background Interdisciplinary” is not exactly interdisciplinary to my reading, but it also has an error within the text. It claims US deaths in World War II were “about 40,000.” 405,000 American servicemen died of all causes during the war. This is still sufficiently dwarfed by Soviet casualties to make the book’s point, which is not in error.

Publisher’s Response:

The following correction has already been submitted to the Texas Education Agency.

TE, p. 604:

“Nearly 18 million Soviets died as a result of the war. The comparable figure for Americans is about 400,000 lives lost.”

48. p. 605 Book claims Stalingrad “proved to be the turning point of the war in the east.” It was the turning point of the war *in Europe* and should be presented as such.

Publisher’s Response:

SE, p. 605, second paragraph, revise first sentence as follows:

“The Battle of Stalingrad proved to be the turning point of the war in Eastern Europe.”

49. 605 “Connections to History and Conflict” sings the praises of the Norden Bombsight and its alleged accuracy. While the book claims the Norden was “less accurate” than believed, it was “still fairly effective.” This is nonsense. According to a postwar US military study only 3% of US bombs actually hit intended targets.

Publisher’s Response:

Teacher’s Edition, p. 605, “Connections to History and Conflict.” The text will be deleted.

50. p. 639 T,S “Comparing Historian’s Viewpoints” about the beginning of the Cold War presents Barton Bernstein arguing that “American policy led to the Cold War.” This implies a great deal more deliberate American aggression than the excerpt from Bernstein does. The excerpt claims “. . . American policy-makers contributed to the Cold War.” This is not the same thing as saying US policy “led to the Cold War.” While I don’t generally agree with him myself, in fairness to Bernstein, the book is putting words into his mouth, based upon the excerpt.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 639 “Comparing Historians’ Viewpoints;” revise sub-heading in left column as follows:

“American Policy Contributed to the Cold War”

51. p. 645 T,S Describing events leading to the Berlin Airlift, the book asserts that the US, UK, and France “had become convinced that Stalin was not going to allow the reunification of German.” Again, this is imbalanced. The western Allies had already created a currency union in the west, meaning they moved first toward division. That is what Stalin reacts against in the 1948 Berlin blockade.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 645-(646), revise last paragraph as follows:

“The Allies could not agree on what to do with Germany following World War II. In March 1948, the Western Allies announced plans to make the zones they controlled in Germany into a single unit. The United States, Britain, and France prepared to merge their three occupation

zones to create a new nation, the Federal Republic of Germany, or West Germany.

52. p. 659 T,S Some factual errors with respect to early postwar US policy in Southeast Asia. The US began substantial military aid under Truman and continued it under Eisenhower. The Geneva Conference described at the end of the paragraph was sabotaged by the US when it pressed the South Vietnamese to reject the terms of the peace arrived at in Geneva.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 659, paragraph 3, line 4, revise as follows:

“Meanwhile, the United States continued to provide substantial military aid to France, which was trying to retain control of its colony, Vietnam.”

53. p. 661 T,S Adlai Stevenson is referred to as a senator from Illinois. He was not.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 661, Paragraph 1, line 1; revise as follows:

“Many Americans agreed with the reaction of Democratic leader Adlai Stevenson: “I am shocked. . .”

54. p. 681 Describing Truman's 1946 threat to draft striking railroad workers into the armed forces, the book says the plan came to naught because “the Senate refused to go along.” It never had to act. The mere threat led the railroad unions to reach an agreement. Truman received a note informing him of this in the midst of his address to a joint session of Congress asking for such authority.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 681, paragraph 3, revise the paragraph to read as follows:

“In the spring of 1946, a railroad strike caused a major disruption in the economy. In response, Truman asked Congress for the power to draft the striking workers into the army. He would then be able to order them as soldiers to stay on the job. During his address to Congress, Truman received a note stating that the strike had ended ‘on terms proposed by the President.’”

55. p. 682 Book claims that little came of Truman's civil rights initiatives in 1947-1948 because “a majority of the members of Congress disagreed” with the proposals. This really is an exaggeration. Southern strength in key committee positions, and particularly in the use of the filibuster prevented serious consideration of these proposals. It was never clear how a “majority” felt.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 682, paragraph 5, revise the first sentence to read as follows:

“With southerners in control of key congressional committees and threatening a filibuster, Congress took no action.”

56. p. 737 Book exaggerates the closeness of Kennedy-Johnson victory in Texas claiming Nixon only needed “a few thousand more votes.” Texas was won by the Democrats with a margin of 45,000 votes in 1960. Illinois was much closer as the book does point out.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 737, paragraph 4, revise the last sentence to read as follows:

“In Illinois, Nixon could have inched by Kennedy with just a few thousand more votes, and accusations were made that the Democrats had won the state through fraud.”

57. p. 741 Book asserts regarding the Kennedy assassination that “[t]he whole story will probably never be known.” Most academic historians accept that Kennedy was killed by Oswald with no conspiracy behind the murder. This pandering to conspiracy may make good reading for bored high schoolers, but it is very poor history.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 741, last paragraph, delete the last sentence

58. p. 755 “The Soviets could already inflict serious damage on the United States from . . . within their own country,” the book claims of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. The USSR was significantly behind the US in ICBM technology and deployment. Arguably, their placing of missiles in Cuba was the only technologically feasible method of countering US missiles close to the USSR in Turkey. This is why Khrushchev sought a linkage between the Turkish and Cuban missiles.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 754-755; revise paragraph under "Kennedy's Options" as follows:

"Kennedy's Options The Soviet missiles in Cuba did not radically change the military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. Yet installing missiles so close to the United States seemed to be an effort by the Soviets to intimidate the Americans. In addition, the Soviets intended their missiles in Cuba to counter American missiles close to the USSR in Turkey. Kennedy was convinced that the missiles presented a direct challenge to which he must respond."

59. p. 795 Book does not properly explain LBJ’s initial skepticism about the value of Vietnam and the process of his being convinced by McNamara, Rusk, Robert Kennedy and others that it was necessary to fight there.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 796, revise first paragraph as follows:

Johnson replied to Lodge: “I am not going to be the President who saw Southeast Asia go the way China went.” Johnson did not want the Southeast Asian “dominoes” to be set in motion by the fall of Vietnam. At the same time, conversations between Johnson and his advisors reveal that Johnson was skeptical about the war. While he did not wish to pursue a full-scale war, he

also did not want to risk damaging the authority of the United States by pulling out. In the end, Johnson was convinced of the need to escalate the war.”

60. p. 796 Book details the Gulf of Tonkin incident, but gives the 1964 “official version,” which is now known to be false. The *Mattox* was in North Vietnamese waters deploying saboteurs when it was “attacked.” Subsequent examination by the *Mattox*’s crew showed no evidence of an attack. This was ignored by LBJ who took advantage of the situation to ask for sweeping powers in Southeast Asia.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 796, paragraphs 2 and 3, revise the last sentence of paragraph 2 and the first sentence of paragraph 3 to read as follows:

“This announcement would change the course of the war

Although details were sketchy, it was later shown that the attacks did not occur.”

61. p. 803 Book’s coverage of the Tet Offensive lacks sufficient detail to properly depict the event’s effect on American morale.

Publisher’s Response:

The issue of American morale following the Tet Offensive is addressed on SE page 804 and 808-809, as well as in the Background Global Connections note on TE page 808.

62. p. 804 Book describes Nixon’s commutation of William Calley’s sentence, but does not explain that Nixon took that action because many more senior officers responsible for what happened at My Lai went unpunished. This makes Nixon appear insensitive to basic justice, when a more nuanced view is in order here.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 804, paragraph 1, revise the third and fourth sentences to read as follows:

“Although at first his testimony was covered up, eventually, in 1971, Lieutenant Calley began serving a sentence of life in prison. Many Americans saw him as a scapegoat, however, because many senior officers went unpunished. As a result, President Nixon reduced his sentence to 20 years.”

63. p. 804 Book greatly errs in claiming after Tet, “a majority of Americans supported a policy tougher than the one pursued by the administration.” A majority of Americans opposed the war by March, 1968. A plurality opposed it as early as summer, 1967 when LBJ asked for tax increases to help pay for the war and prevent inflation. There is no treatment of the interplay between the Great Society and the war in Vietnam. They both affected one another as well as issues of taxation and inflation.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 804, paragraph 3, revise the fourth sentence to read as follows:

“In spite of the vocal antiwar protesters, many Americans supported a policy tougher than the one pursued by the administration.”

Note: The last sentence on SE page 749 and the last paragraph on SE page 750 both address the issue that military spending in Vietnam interfered with the funding of Great Society programs.

64. p. 807 “American Heritage” archives contain remarks by Martin Luther King, Jr. that “twice as many Negroes as whites” were fighting in Vietnam. The book then adds parenthetically, “(this view has been challenged in recent years.)” What is not arguable is that blacks were drafted and served in the armed forces in the Vietnam era in proportionally far greater numbers for their percentage of the American population than were whites. The book appears to take issue with King, when the point just made is his basic grievance. This same criticism is applicable to the “Recent Scholarship” segment on, p. 810. The factual nature of overrepresentation of blacks in the armed forces in the period has been established pretty well.

Publisher's Response:

TE page 807, *From the Archives of American Heritage* note, revise the third sentence to read as follows:

“It was Dr. King’s strongest statement yet on the war, in which ‘twice as many Negroes as whites’ were serving.”

TE page 810, Background Recent Scholarship note, Delete the third sentence.

65. p. 809 Eugene McCarthy did not “almost beat” LBJ in the 1968 New Hampshire primary. He won 40% of the vote which was a strong showing against an incumbent and contributed to LBJ’s decision not to run.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 809, second paragraph, revise the last sentence of the paragraph to read as follows:

“On March 12, McCarthy made a strong showing against Johnson in the New Hampshire Democratic primary.”

66. p. 896 “American Heritage” archive bit has Clinton’s term in office beginning in 1992. It began in 1993.

Publisher's Response:

TE page 896, “From the Archives of American Heritage” note, revise the first sentence to read as follows:

“For most of his career Bill Clinton (1993–2001) has been a remarkably successful politician.

67. p. 900 In light of newer figures the casualty figures for the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 need to be revised downward from 5,000 currently in the text.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 900, seventh paragraph, change has already been submitted to TEA as follows:
“The official number of people missing and presumed dead after the assault was estimated to be around 3,000.”

68. p. 625 T,S “Comparing Primary Sources” segment lists W.R. Poage as a “Texas state representative.” Poage was a congressman representing the 11th District in Central Texas.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 625, Comparing Primary Sources, *Opposed to Integration*, attribution line, to
“—W. R. Poage, Texas Congressman, 1941”

69. p. 701 T,S Book says Rosa Parks took a seat “in the middle section of a bus, where both African Americans and whites were allowed to sit.” No, she sat in the black section of the bus. There was no “middle.” When the white section filled up, black people were expected to give up their seats in their section to whites. That’s what the boycott was about initially.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 701, paragraph 2, second sentence and ff., to

“In December, Rosa Parks, a seamstress who had been the secretary of the Montgomery NAACP for 12 years, took a seat at the front of the “colored” section of a bus. The front of the bus was reserved for white passengers. African Americans, however, were expected to give up their seats for white passengers if no seats were available in the “whites only” section.”

70. p. 702 T,S Eisenhower shown as following a policy of avoidance so far as the civil rights movement is concerned. Eisenhower was in fact personally hostile to the movement and acted in Little Rock more because of Faubus’s defiance of the federal government than any concern about integration.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 702, replace the first two sentences of the second paragraph under the heading “Resistance in Little Rock” (beneath the quote) with the following:

“Although President Eisenhower was not an ally of the civil rights movement, Faubus’s actions were a direct challenge to the Constitution and to Eisenhower’s authority as President.”

71. p. 712 T,S The rather sordid role of the Kennedy brothers in the Freedom Ride and Ole Miss controversies is completely whitewashed by the text. The Kennedys were generally hostile to the protests of the movement, permitted FBI spying on its leaders and avoided any real clash with the South over civil rights until forced to act. In the Freedom Rides matter, RFK did

authorize federal marshals to accompany the riders to Jackson, Mississippi as the book tells. However, at Jackson, the Riders were arrested by police and imprisoned in the state prison at Parchman, one of the nation's worst. This was done because the Kennedys made a deal with Mississippi governor Ross Barnett that in exchange for a peaceful arrival in Jackson, the state could prosecute the Riders for violating segregation laws already declared unconstitutional. With respect to the Ole Miss crisis, the book does not tell the story properly. Barnett agreed to assure Meredith's peaceful admission if he could have a photo-op in Jackson personally refusing to admit him to the University of Mississippi. Justice Department officials would then overrule Barnett, Meredith transported for enrollment to the Oxford campus of Ole Miss, and peace would prevail. Barnett betrayed the Kennedys by making an inflammatory radio address calling for resistance soon after Meredith and his Justice Department protectors left for Oxford. After a three hour car ride, Meredith and the others found themselves besieged in the Ole Miss administration building by the mob Barnett called out.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 712, replace the first two sentences of the third paragraph under the heading "Integration at 'Ole Miss'" with the following:

"Barnett's defiance of the Supreme Court decision forced a reluctant President Kennedy to act. Kennedy sent federal marshals to accompany Meredith to the campus."

Note: The text mentions Attorney General Kennedy's reluctance to protect the Freedom Riders and their arrest in Jackson earlier on this page under the C-head "National Reactions." President Kennedy's reluctance to displease southern Democrats by acting on Civil Rights receives further coverage on page 716.

72. p. 716 T,S Caption claims "[b]oth Kennedy brothers played key roles in the civil rights movement." This is excessive, as they spent as much time frustrating it as helping.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 716, Delete second sentence of the caption.

73. p. 726 T,S The book claims that RFK was a "crusader" for civil rights and "opposed the Vietnam war." These are *both* turnabout positions for him in 1968.

Publisher's Response:

SE p. 726, replace the first two paragraphs under the heading "Robert F. Kennedy Is Assassinated" with the following:

"Since the assassination of President Kennedy, his brother, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, had come to support the civil rights movement and to oppose the Vietnam War. In 1968, he decided to enter the race for the Democratic presidential nomination. President Johnson had lost support from many Democrats because of America's involvement in the Vietnam War. After Senator Eugene McCarthy lost to Johnson in the New Hampshire primary by only a few percentage points, Kennedy realized that Johnson was vulnerable. On March 16, Kennedy entered the campaign. His candidacy received a critical boost on March 31, when Johnson stunned the nation by announcing that he would not run for a second term as President.

“In the years since his brother’s death, Robert Kennedy had reached out to many Americans, including Chicanos, Native Americans, African Americans, and poor white families. He condemned the killing of both Americans and Vietnamese in the Vietnam War. He criticized the Johnson administration for financing a war instead of funding the programs needed to help the poor and disadvantaged at home.”

74. p. 509 T,S In the “Focus on Economics,” the book all but attributes the Great Depression to the stock market crash. This is not true for more reasons than can be counted, most of which are in the book itself. The stock market crash is a good touchstone for the times, and it is also a good symptom of problems with the economy. It is not the cause of the Depression. Arguably the business cycle was turning down as early as 1926, it just took the stock market a while to catch up.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 509, Focus on Economics, first sentence of first paragraph under *The Historical Context* to:

“The Crash of 1929 signaled the end of the economic expansion of the 1920s and the beginning of a prolonged period of economic contraction known as the Great Depression.”

75. p. 511 T,S Book continues to imply in the segment titled “Economic Contraction” that the stock market collapse brought on the Depression. The contraction had begun as early as 1926 with the drop-off in consumer demand and collapse in real estate markets, especially Florida. The crash served only to intensify the contraction not to cause it.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 511, paragraph 2 to:

“**Economic Contraction** The results of the Great Crash described above are symptoms of a contracting economy. A contraction is an economic decline marked by a falling output of goods and services. A particularly long and severe contraction is called a depression. The economy had begun to show danger signs in the late 1920s; the Great Crash triggered even more serious consequences. The result was the most severe economic downturn in the nation’s history—the **Great Depression**—which lasted from 1929 until the United States entered World War II in 1941.”

76. p. 516 T,S Book asserts that the Depression lessened the divorce rate because it was too expensive to maintain separate households. Since when has that stopped anyone? Divorce and abandonment increased throughout the Depression. Marriages and births declined.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 516, paragraphs 2 and 3, to:

“**Stresses on Families** Living conditions declined as families moved in together, crowding into small houses or apartments. People gave up even small pleasures like an ice cream cone or a movie ticket.

Men who had lost jobs or investments often felt like failures because they could no longer provide for their families. If their wives or children were working, men thought their own status had fallen. Many were embarrassed to be seen at home during normal work hours. They were ashamed to ask friends for help. Some even abandoned their families.“

77. p. 527 Regarding the Bonus March book claims “MacArthur decided to use force” to disperse the protest. This is true, but it also needs to be made plain that MacArthur exceeded Hoover’s orders in doing so. This is neither the first nor the last time MacArthur will exceed orders.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 527, Revise paragraph 1, sentence 2, as follows:

“Although the President ordered General Douglas MacArthur to clear only Pennsylvania Avenue, MacArthur decided to use force to drive the marchers out of Washington.”

78. p. 542 Sixth full paragraph, book explains that the “AAA had ignored many of the farm workers who did not own land.” This is not true. Under the AAA, tenants and sharecroppers were supposed to receive their share of the subsidies. But, large landowners tended to turn off tenants and mechanize, while pocketing the funds themselves. This should have been addressed earlier, as the AAA is presented in such a vague form on p. 540.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 540, Revise paragraph 5 as follows:

“Many farmers were losing their homes and their land because of the low prices they received for their products. The **Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA)**, set up in May 1933, tried to raise farm prices by paying subsidies, or government financial assistance, to farmers who cut production of certain crops. The AAA hoped that lowering the supply of these farm products would cause their prices to rise. Proceeds from a new tax on the companies that processed agricultural produce were used to pay for the subsidies to farmers.”

SE p. 542, Revise paragraph 6, sentence 2 and 3 as follows:

“The original AAA had caused hardship to many farm workers who did not own land. When large commercial farms cut back their production, these workers often lost their jobs. In the Southwest, Mexican American farm workers struggled to survive.”

79. p. 544 Discussion of *NLRB v. Jones Laughlin Steel* claims the case “established the federal government’s ability to regulate interstate commerce.” This is not true. That power exists in the Constitution. Perhaps the book meant labor relations.

Publisher’s Response:

The following correction has already been submitted to the TEA: SE p. 544, revise paragraph 1, second sentence

“The landmark case established the federal government’s ability to regulate labor disputes linked to interstate commerce.”

80. p. 550 “Long and Coughlin never seriously threatened FDR. . .,” the book is correct so far as Coughlin is concerned, but dead wrong with respect to Long. Even the “Background Biography” blurb in the teacher’s edition, p. 549, contradicts this sweeping statement.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 550. Revise paragraph 2 as follows:

“Long and Coughlin’s popularity warned Roosevelt that if he failed to solve the nation’s problems, he could lose mass support. Coughlin was never a serious threat to FDR, but if Long had lived, he might have influenced the 1936 election.”

81. p. 554. The book’s discussion of the Roosevelt Recession verges on the absurd. It asserts that social security taxes helped cause the recession by taking money “out of worker’s paychecks.” That same money went right back into someone else’s for spending. The real basis of the Roosevelt Recession is Roosevelt’s own fetish for balanced budgets. With certain economic indicators approaching 1929 levels, FDR decided to cut spending and attempt to balance the budget in 1937. The book only hints that FDR’s own conservatism caused the recession, focusing instead upon the taxation red herring.

Publisher’s Response:

SE p. 554, delete paragraph 2; revise paragraph 3 as follows:

“Americans had less money because FDR had cut way back on government spending. Many of the biggest cuts targeted programs such as the WPA, which had provided jobs to many workers. At the same time, FDR had increased taxes. FDR wanted a balanced budget, in which the government’s revenue and expenses are equal. The President had also become distressed at the rising **national debt**, or the total amount of money the federal government borrows and has to pay back. (See Focus on Economics, page 550.) The government borrows when its **revenue**, or income, does not keep up with its expenses. To fund the New Deal, the government had to borrow massive amounts of money. As a result, the national debt rose from \$21 billion in 1933 to \$43 billion by 1940.”

82. p. 549 T,S Book actually claims that Huey Long “never used racial attacks” in his political rise in Louisiana. This is wrong.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 549, paragraph 3, sentences 4-6 to

“Unlike many southern Democrats, Long did not build his base of power on racial attacks.”

83. p. 549 T,S “Comparing Historians’ Viewpoints” on Roosevelt and the New Deal pairs historian William Leuchtenburg with Robert A. Taft. Taft was not a *historian*. He was the leader of the Republican party Old Guard conservative wing. Not only is his book not a history of the New Deal, but it is not even close in time to the post-1960 historical debate over the place of the New Deal. Most debate among academic historians revolves around whether or not the New Deal was conservative and propped up capitalism or offered real reform. This makes all the

more ridiculous the book's assertion that "some historians. . . .say the New Deal programs actually hindered economic progress. . . . (550)" If the book is referring to economists or conservative politicians, it should say so. Historians generally have not argued these points in this manner.

Publisher's Response:

SE page 549 change title of feature to *Comparing Primary Sources*.

Change introductory sentence to "Historians, politicians, and economists disagree on the effectiveness of the New Deal in combating the Depression and improving the lives of Americans."

Change *Analyzing Viewpoints* question to "Compare the viewpoints of these two authors."

Change page 550, paragraph 4, sentence 1 to "Some critics...."

84. p. 672 T,S That is except for this critical oversight. The GI Bill of Rights, which is the fuel of the postwar boom and modern middle class lifestyle enjoyed by most Americans gets exactly *one sentence* of vague summary. The GI Bill's implications for the future—indeed the present—are so staggering they merit considerably more than this pittance.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 672, text under *Moving to the Suburbs* to:

"Seeking more room, growing families retreated from aging cities to the suburbs. World War II veterans expanded their opportunities with the help of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or **GI Bill of Rights**, which gave them low-interest mortgages to purchase new homes and provided them with educational stipends for college or graduate school. This important act provided fuel for the postwar economic boom and the modern middle class lifestyle that developed during the 1950s.

With more people able to afford mortgages, developers like William J. Levitt...."

Add to TE page 672 side-column *Background Note*:

"In addition, on the 50th anniversary of the signing of the G.I. Bill, then Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley spoke of the profound and lasting changes the G.I. Bill had on American education: "The G.I. Bill helped forge an economic renewal and reaffirmed the right of every American to receive an education, to invest in their own futures and the future of America. Eight million veterans took advantage of the law, which assisted them in establishing careers, raising families, and seizing a part of the American dream.""

For fit, delete the following text from *Connecting with Culture* activity: "Then conduct . . . address the problem."

85. p. 676 T,S Not connected to the Depression, but also not right either, the book asserts that "during the Depression many teenagers stayed in school" to avoid the job market. This is nonsense since dropout and truancy rates rose in the Depression.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 676 paragraph 2, sentences 4-5 to

“During the height of the Depression, many teenagers left school. However, by the 1950s, ...”

86. p. 739 T,S Most reliable numbers indicate the poverty rate in 1960 was nearer 33% than 20%.

Publisher's Response:

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Historical Tables, Table 2, *Poverty Status of People by Family Relationship, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1959 to 2000*, the overall poverty rate in 1960 was 22.2%. See <http://www.census.gov/income/histpov/hstpov02.txt>

87. p. 750 T,S Book claims that the Great Society cut poverty rates by half. Yes, assuming 20% poverty rate at the beginning. Better figure might be two-thirds reduction, assuming 33% poverty rate reduced to 11% by 1970.

Publisher's Response:

See response to #86 above.

88. p. 828 T,S Book incorrectly claims that John Maynard Keynes introduced deficit spending as an economic stimulus tool “during the Great Depression.” Keynes had suggested the idea as early as the end of World War I.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 828, paragraph 3, sentence 5 to:

“Proposed by British economist John Maynard Keynes, deficit spending had restored prosperity during World War II.”

89. p. 852 T,S Fifth full paragraph, book claims that the Federal Reserve “increased the money supply” under Carter. This is not true. It raised interest rates sky-high in an attempt to curb inflation. Nonetheless, inflation rose as the book correctly claims.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 852, paragraph 6, sentence 4, to:

“As deficits grew, the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates.”

90. p. 871 T,S “Focus on Economics” claims that tax reform in 1981-1986 resulted in a reduction of the highest income tax rate from “50 percent to 28 percent without a serious loss of revenue.” This is just not true. Combined with Reagan’s borrow-and-spend economics, it actually contributed mightily to an increase in the deficit and national debt. On p. 873, this increased deficit blamed on defense spending. Tax “reform” and spending need to be credited

for the Reagan boom and deficit. The book contradicts itself on this point on p. 871. (This is apparently a point on which the authors and the economist who wrote the “focus” were not sufficiently coordinated by the publisher.)

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 871, under “Focus on Economics,” last sentence to:
“In 1986, however, these loopholes were eliminated.”

91. p. 829 T,S Discussion of electricity shortages in California in the early 2000s claims the problem was simply “low supplies” and “higher prices.” It now seems quite clear that in the deregulated marketplace there was considerable manipulation of supply and thereby price, viz. Enron.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 829, text under *Fast Forward to Today*, paragraph 2, to:
“Interruptions in electricity supply can also cause hardships. When disruption is minor, an area may experience a brownout, a temporary reduction in electrical power. Blackouts, complete cuts to power, are more serious. Recently, “rolling blackouts” in California shut off power to selected areas at hours of peak usage. Homes and businesses without alternate energy sources, such as gas-powered generators, could not operate computers or appliances. Causes of the California energy crisis were threefold: energy deregulation leading to steeply rising prices, increased demand for electricity, and the financial instability of the state’s major utility companies. Demonstrators (above) protested high prices by burning their electricity bills.”

92. p. 873 T,S While the book praises the prosperity of the Reagan years, it neglects to mention that poverty increased as did homelessness in those years.

Publisher’s Response:

SE page 875, paragraph 2, add after last sentence:
“Poverty rates and homelessness, however, remained high.”

93. p. 841 T,S Describing the illegal activities of the White House staff in 1972, the book explains: “Their efforts paid off in the November presidential election.” There is no evidence to imply that Watergate made it any harder for George McGovern to win the presidency than he and his own supporters made it themselves. This sentence implies illegitimacy to the 1972 election that is belied by the sheer weight of the Nixon landslide.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 841, , paragraph 2, sentence 1 to:
“In the election, Nixon trounced Senator George McGovern of South Dakota by 520 to 17 electoral votes. McGovern had been unable to unify Democrats sufficiently to offer an effective campaign and was perceived as too liberal by much of the country. Nixon had the mandate he wanted, though he did not get a Republican majority in Congress.”

94. p. 969 T,S Otherwise helpful segment on “Key Supreme Court Cases” makes it appear that the Court intended to ban all prayer in public schools based on this description. In *Engel v. Vitale*, the key issue was a state prescribed prayer to be said at a time designated by the state. It by no means should be implied that the court meant to move against individual prayer in school.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 969, under *Engel v. Vitale, 1962*, last sentence, to:

“The Court ruled New York’s action unconstitutional, although it made no ruling against individual prayer in school.”

95. The term “automation” – refers to jobs lost because of new technology. In the 1950s machines took the place of workers and workers and unions complained. These workers had to retrain to learn new skills. This is an aspect of capitalism which is never mentioned.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE, page 671, text under heading *Changes in the Work Force* to:

“In earlier years, most Americans made a living as blue-collar workers, producing goods or performing services that depended on manual labor. After the war, however, new machines assumed many of the jobs previously performed by people. This process is called automation. Some blue-collar workers learned new skills and found white-collar jobs. Young people, particularly former servicemen with new college degrees, also chose white-collar jobs as they joined the work force. Corporate expansion meant that more people were needed to keep growing organizations running. By 1956, a majority of American workers held white-collar jobs, managing offices, working in sales, and performing professional and clerical duties with little manual labor.”

Magruder's American Government *Prentice Hall*

1. p. 4 – The discussion of government notes that government in the United States should “provide for education, guard the public’s health, and protect the environment. It must also pave the streets, punish criminals, protect civil rights, care for the elderly, and do much, much, more.” What is the basis for this assertion? With the exception of civil rights and punishment of criminals, none of these other elements are listed in the US Constitution.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 4, paragraph 2, column 1 to:

“Government in this country is now focused on the fight against terrorism at home and abroad. Still, government has many other tasks to perform. It punishes criminals, protects civil rights, and regulates trade. Although Americans disagree on government’s role in providing services, today’s government also provides for education, guards the public’s health, cares for the elderly, and does much, much more.”

2. p. 66T – The *Background Note* detailing Locke’s influence on Jefferson is of sufficient importance to merit placement in the student text rather than as background material only in the Teacher’s edition. Furthermore, while the analysis is generally accurate it is too simplistic to say that Locke encouraged people to “withdraw their support” if governments failed to protect their natural right to life, liberty, and property. In fact, Locke advocates armed revolution if all other means of protest fail.

Publisher’s Response:

Delete *Background Note* from TE page 66. On SE page 38, column 1, paragraph 4, add a new paragraph after paragraph 4:

Jefferson relied heavily on the works of John Locke, who argued that the legitimacy of government sprang from the individual, or, as Jefferson wrote, from “the consent of the governed.” Locke argued that the individual was born free and was entitled to the Natural Rights of “life, liberty, and estate”—a phrase Jefferson refashioned as “certain inalienable rights” among which were “life liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” If governments failed to protect these rights, subjects were entitled to withdraw their support and resort to armed conflict if all other means of protest failed.”

For fit delete page 38, column 1, paragraph 2, and change pages 37-38, beginning on page 37, last paragraph, to the following (run in with page 37, column 2, paragraph 3): “From July 1776 to March 1781, when the Articles of Confederation went into effect, it did everything any government would do in the circumstances.”

3. p. 11T – In the *Focus* exercise regarding Locke’s *Second Treatise*, students are asked to list all the ways in which governments benefit people on the board. This is a good exercise but should be balanced with a list of all the dangers or inconveniences governments impose on people’s

lives as well. After all, Locke's treatise was not an advocacy of government as much as a warning of the dangers of governmental power unchecked.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE p. 11 *Focus* exercise to:

“Before students read the selection, ask them to suggest ways that governments benefit people. Then ask them to suggest ways in which governments impose dangers or inconveniences on people's lives. Write all ideas on the chalkboard. Then ask students how society might be different without a government.”

4. p. 51T – The *Background Note* in the Teacher's Edition presents Rakove's book refuting the idea of original intent/strict construction in interpreting the constitution. To allow students the opportunity to follow the other side of the debate, scholarship supporting original intent should also be discussed.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE, p. 51, *Background Note* to:

“A subject of serious debate in politics today is whether current interpretations of the Constitution should be based on the Framers' original intent. Originalists argue that the best way to interpret the Constitution is to determine how the Framers intended it to be interpreted. In *Original Arguments: Constitutional Interpretation, Textual Meaning, Original Intent and Judicial Review*, Keith E. Whittington buttresses the originalists' argument by making the case that originalism, or original intent, should be the preferred method of constitutional interpretation, as it is the method best suited for a democratic government. On the opposite side of the spectrum, in *Original Meanings: Politics and Ideas in the Making of the Constitution*, Jack Rakove argues that there was no single “original intent” among the Framers. Rakove analyzes the sharply different perspectives of the Framers and points to how those differences led to dynamic debate and compromise.

5. p. 366T – The “Background Note” in the Teacher's Edition begins with the line “If Thomas Jefferson was the hand that wrote the Constitution ...” I think the editor means the Declaration and that this is an oversight given that Jefferson was absent during the Constitutional Convention.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE page 366 “Background Note,” first sentence, to:

“If Thomas Jefferson's was the hand that wrote the Declaration of Independence, ...”

6. p. 497T – The “Make it Relevant” activity provides an example of students banding together to protest multinational corporations that sell apparel on campus. Some discussion of the merits of multinational corporations seems in order before students jump to the conclusion that free-enterprise on a global scale is bad.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE page 497 "Make It Relevant" activity to:

"Multinational corporations benefit consumers and workers by providing jobs and products throughout the world. Some multinational clothing manufacturers, however, have come under scrutiny for allowing clothing to be produced in overseas sweatshops under unsafe conditions. One group, United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS), has been working to protest these conditions. USAS focuses on t-shirts and other apparel sold on their own campuses. This group wants colleges to pressure their suppliers to end these practices, and 160 colleges have agreed to try. What's more, one of the biggest manufacturers in this \$2.5 billion industry has disclosed the identity of its foreign factories, thus allowing better oversight. ASAS has found supporters in Congress, and its members have been invited to the White House."

7. p. 292 – What is the basis for the statement that the "American people have generally agreed with a liberal interpretation of the Constitution?" This seems a fundamental difference between liberals and conservatives as well as the political parties.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 292, second column, fourth paragraph, first sentence to:

"Today, United States politics is marked by a lack of **consensus**, or general agreement, over the proper limits of national power. Liberals favor a liberal construction, while conservatives favor a strict construction. This fundamental split is reflected in the different points of view of the Democratic and Republican parties."

8. p. 67T – The answer provided in the Teacher's Edition to the political cartoon exercise suggests that the two Congressmen in the cartoon have come to the conclusion that the Constitution is flexible and hence meant to "change with the times as necessary." The difficulty here is twofold. First, the answer implies a definitive conclusion that the constitution is an organic document that can be interpreted differently over time. The publishers should be aware that there is much debate between constitutional scholars and theorists as to the manner in which the constitution is to be read. To suggest as is done on page 67 that the organic approach is the correct one stifles debate on an important constitutional issue. Perhaps as part of the discussion of this cartoon students could debate the idea of strict constructionism versus a more organic approach. Second, its hard to tell from this cartoon if the artist is serious or if he is using irony and actually supports the notion of original intent.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE page 67, answer to "Interpreting Political Cartoons," as follows. Delete last sentence of Heterogeneous Groups activity for fit.

"Some students may answer that the speaker means that the Constitution can change with the times as necessary. Others may argue that the speaker is using irony to support the notion that the Constitution should be interpreted strictly, according to the Framers' original intent."

9. p. 72T – The wording of the *Quick Lesson Plan* on page 72 of the Teacher’s Edition implies that the constitution has lasted a long time because it is easily adapted to modern times. This suggests that the document itself it meant to be reinterpreted in different ways across the ages. One could just as easily suggest that the reason it has lasted so long is because it contains timeless principles that are not open to revisionism.

Publisher’s Response:

Change TE page 72 *Quick Lesson Plan Focus* to:

“Tell students that the Constitution has survived for more than 200 years because it contains timeless principles yet can be amended. Ask students to discuss what they know about the formal amendment process.”

10. p. 82 – The Assessment exercise *Take it to the Net* asks students to read about why the constitution is often called the “Living Constitution.” It should be suggested that students also discuss the importance of maintaining the original intent of the constitution less the document become meaningless. Perhaps students could draft up 10 rules for good classroom behavior and then debate the extent to which these rules should remain fixed over time or be flexible. If fixed, will they become too rigid or outdated as time passes? If flexible, are they in danger of becoming meaningless, as students will simply amend them to get away with whatever they want?

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 82, *Take It to the Net* activity to:

“Read about the ways in which the Constitution can be amended. Then write a “constitution” for your classroom that consists of 10 rules for good classroom behavior. Debate whether these rules should remain fixed or be flexible. If fixed, will they become outdated? If flexible will they eventually become meaningless, as students amend them to get away with whatever behavior they want?”

11. p. 321 – Regarding the seating of the political parties in the House, the Republicans sit on the right side of the chamber and the Democrats the left, not the other way around as the book conveys. I think the book presentation on this is confusing because it presents the seating arrangement from the orientation of the Speaker rather than from the perspective of the members. As is the case with most assemblies in the world, conservative sit on the right, liberals on the left. The same is true with the House.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE, page 321, paragraph 2, last sentence, to:

“The Democrats take their seats to the left of the center aisle; the Republicans, to the right.”

12. p. 363 – The discussion regarding whether the president can fire the Vice-President implies that the Vice-President is independent of the president. It should be acknowledged that the President is still the VP’s superior and he can essentially be forced off the ticket or asked to resign.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 363, second column, paragraph 1, last sentence to:

“No matter what the circumstances, the President cannot fire the Vice President, although he can force the Vice President off the ticket or ask him to resign.”

13. p. 380 – The discussion of the presidential election of 2000 notes that the Supreme Court “gave” Bush the electoral votes from Florida. While the book has done a fairly good job of avoiding partisan rhetoric, an alternative word choice is need here. For instance, the book could contend that the US Supreme Court “validated” Bush’s victory in Florida. In short, the outcome of this election was fairly controversial (as the text notes). The analysis of the election seems slanted given the word choice used to describe the outcome. A more neutral descriptor is needed.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 381, paragraph 1, sentence 1 to:

“It also preserved George W. Bush’s 537-vote lead in the Statewide count, resulting in Bush receiving Florida’s 25 electoral votes.”

14. p. 381 – The text does a good job of discussing the weakness of the electoral college as well as proposed reforms. Is no attention paid to arguments in favor of retaining the current system?

Publisher's Response:

See SE page 384, second column, text under heading “Electoral College Supporters.”

15. p. 391 – When explaining why the presidency has grown in power since its conception, the book offers the explanation that as the “United States has become more industrialized and technologically advanced, the people have demanded that the Federal Government play a larger role” The wording of this statement conveys the impression that increased Federal Power is a one-way street; that the people demand something and the government responds. It is just as likely that the Federal Government grew in power by usurping powers traditionally left to the states and by an increase in bureaucratic size that simply expanded the government’s ability to regulate. This section of the text might better be phrased as “The Federal Government has played an increasingly larger role ... “ and omit the “demands of the people” part since that seems rather speculative.

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 391, paragraph 3, sentence 3 to:

“As the United States has become more industrialized and technologically advanced, the Federal Government has played an increasingly larger role in transportation, labor, civil rights, health, welfare, communication, education, the environment, and a host of other fields.”

16. p. 415 – As a contrast to exploring the “benefits” of bureaucracy, some discussion should be added regarding potential disadvantages or costs of bureaucracy.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 415 heading, “The Benefits of a Bureaucracy,” and two paragraphs following to:

“Costs and Benefits of Bureaucracy

These three features—hierarchical authority, job specialization, and formalized rules—can make bureaucracy an effective way to accomplish large and complex tasks. The hierarchy can speed action by reducing conflicts over who has the power to make decisions. Job specialization can promote efficiency because each worker focuses on one particular job and thus gains a set of specialized skills and knowledge. Formalized rules can mean that workers act with some speed and precision because decisions are based on a set of known standards. These rules also enable work to continue even as some workers leave and new workers are hired.

On the other hand, bureaucracy’s reputation for waste and inefficiency is not unfounded. Bureaucracies can be large, unwieldy organizations where hierarchy, specialization, and rules lead to seemingly endless paperwork and delays.”

See also caption on page 414 regarding “red tape.”

17. p. 451 – The statement that social insurance taxes are collected by the IRS and then “credited” to trust accounts maintained by the Treasury is true but incomplete. Students should be made aware that these funds are credited but not held in the Treasury. That is, the collected funds are usually completely spent on an annual basis to help the government meet expenditures in other areas. This practice has created great concern over the future viability of the Social Security program as it may lack necessary funds to meet payments.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 451, column 1, paragraph 3 to:

“The IRS collects social insurance taxes. The money is credited to trust accounts maintained by the Treasury, and Congress appropriates funds for social insurance programs as needed. These funds are usually completely spent on an annual basis to help the government meet expenditures in other areas.”

For fit, change column 1, paragraph 2 to “Notice that social insurance taxes are **regressive taxes**. They are taxes levied at a flat rate, without regard to a taxpayer’s income or ability to pay.”

18. p. 534T – the Background Notes section of the Teacher’s Edition notes that the first slate of amendments proposed for the newly adopted constitution consisted of 12 amendments, of which only 10 were ratified. This is true but it should be noted that one of those remaining two – the one dealing with Congressional salaries – was eventually ratified as the 27th amendment, two centuries later.

Publisher’s Response:

Delete TE page 534, Background Note, “Constitutional Issues.”

19. p. 542T – The Background Note states that “this country was not founded as a Christian nation” and to think so is a misconception. The sidebar needs more explanation. First, the writer seems to have confused differences between denominations and religions. Much of the debate over religion and the decision to protect religious diversity in the First Amendment was due to disagreement between Christian denominations – Catholics from Maryland, Anglicans from Virginia, Puritans from Massachusetts, etc. The Founders feared that a state religion would in fact lead to tyranny against these other religions. However, Christianity was the dominate religion of the day, the intent of the First Amendment was to protect the diversity of Christian denominations at the state level from the National government. Second, the claim that Jefferson was not a Christian is subject to some debate.

Publisher’s Response:

Change TE page 542, *Background Note*, to:

“The Free Exercise Clause

The intent of the First Amendment was to protect the diversity of Christian denominations at the State level from the National government. Since the Framers did not share one denomination, they felt that no single religion should be dominant in the new nation. When delegates to the Virginia Convention met in 1776, they drew on John Locke’s ideas of religious tolerance, which held that though an established church might be retained, other faiths would be tolerated. It was delegate James Madison who drafted the statement that “all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.” This statement became the model for the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment and ensured religious freedom for people of all faiths.”

20. p. 570 – The book should devote more discussion to the 2nd Amendment. There is ample scholarship on both side of the issue to support different interpretations. Discussion of the 2nd Amendment should also make use of Locke’s treatise. Remember Locke, upon which the Americans base their doctrine of revolution, contends that if governments become tyrannical the people should attempt to alter that government first through peaceful means. If all these attempts fail, armed revolution may be the only recourse. The placement of the 2nd Amendment immediately after the 1st (our ability to criticize and protest against the government) implies that the right to bear arms is conceived of by the Founders as part of the means of resisting tyrannical government. To what extent this can be achieved solely through the strength of the state militia is debatable. Given the increase in Federal power over the last 200 years, and increased efforts to regulate gun ownership, this topic merits more discussion than the five small paragraphs devoted to it here. On a related note, page 772 interprets the 2nd amendment without giving any consideration to differing interpretations. The text provides a collectivist interpretation of the 2nd amendment without giving any consideration to differing interpretations. The 2nd amendment has taken on a more individualistic definition, particularly in light of recent circuit court cases and the changes in the presidency, and the strength of the NRA in terms of membership and influence leads credence to at least exploring this alternative interpretation.

Publisher’s Response:

Add to TE p. 570:

“Background Note

Constitutional Issues

In November 2001, Attorney General John Ashcroft informed attorneys working for the National Government of a shift in policy regarding the 2nd Amendment. In the past, U.S. attorneys had argued that the 2nd Amendment referred primarily to a collective right based on state militias. Ashcroft wrote that U.S. attorneys were to argue in weapons-related court cases that the 2nd Amendment was intended to protect an individual’s right to keep and bear arms. The new policy was apparent in a letter that Solicitor General Theodore Olson wrote to the Supreme Court in May 2002 regarding a challenge to a District of Columbia law. Olson wrote, “The current position of the United States is that the 2nd Amendment more broadly protects the rights of individuals . . . to possess and bear their own firearms, subject to reasonable restrictions.”

Change SE page 571, first column, first two paragraphs to:

“Many argue that the 2nd Amendment also sets out an individual right. In this view, the amendment guarantees a right to keep and bear arms just as, for example, the 1st Amendment guarantees freedom of speech. This interpretation rests partly on Locke’s *Second Treatise on Government*, which says that people have the right to overthrow a tyrannical government when peaceful means fail. Armed individuals may be a more effective deterrent to tyranny than a state militia.

The Supreme Court has not accepted this interpretation. In *United States v. Miller*, 1939, the Court upheld part of a federal law that outlawed shipping sawed-off shotguns, machine guns, or silencers between States unless the shipper had registered them with the Treasury Department and paid a \$200 fee. The Court ruled there was no reasonable link between these weapons and “the preservation . . . of a well-regulated militia.”

SE page 772, 2nd Amendment Commentary, has been changed on errors list submitted to TEA to “The right of the people to keep and bear arms was insured by the 2nd Amendment.”

21. p. 170 – The comment that older voters typically prefer the Republican party is subject to debate. For the past 10 years, the Democratic party has seen an increase in support from older voters, mainly on issues of Social Security and prescription drugs. Your own data in the table on page 167 supports this claim.

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 170, paragraph 2, sentence 2 to:

“Traditionally, younger voters have been more likely to be Democrats than Republicans. Older voters were likely to find the GOP and its candidates more attractive.” [Remainder of paragraph explains how these patterns changed from 1984 to 2000.]

22. p. 240 – The argument that better organized and better-financed interest groups have an *unfair* advantage should be further explained. How, in a democratic system, can we make the claim that an organization that is freely funded and more effective is somehow unfair?

Publisher's Response:

Change SE page 240, column 2, paragraph 2 to:

“Some interest groups are more highly organized and better-financed than others. Critics argue that these groups have an unfair advantage. Others point out that such groups are freely funded by people who believe in the group's work. That these groups are highly influential simply means that they have more popular support, or members who believe more intently in their causes, than other groups.”

23. p. 209T – The answer to question A regarding the political spectrum notes that “Liberals tend to support raising taxes to help ensure economic fairness.” The problem with this statement is that the concept of “economic fairness” is unclear. In addition, it implies that those who oppose raising taxes must be against “economic fairness.” Some clarification is needed here. Perhaps the statement could be rephrased to suggest that liberals tend to support tax increases in order to redistribute wealth or fund social programs.

Publisher's Response:

Change TE page 209 answer to “Interpreting Diagrams” (a) to:

“Liberals tend to support raising taxes in order to redistribute wealth or fund social programs.”

24. p. 234T – If the teacher's edition of this text is going to advocate that students investigate SAFE (a gun control organization) and decide whether to start their own campus chapter, perhaps they should also investigate the NRA and compare and contrast the two.

Publisher's Response:

TE page 234, change “You Can Make a Difference” to:

“The SAFE in SAFE Students stands for “Sane Alternatives to the Firearms Epidemic,” an interest group that supports gun control. NRA stands for the National Rifle Association, which promotes the right to gun ownership. Point out that these organizations represent just two of the hundreds of interest groups in this country. Then direct a committee of students to consult each group's Web site (www.safestudents.org and www.nra.org) and evaluate SAFE Students and the NRA. They should compare and contrast each group's purposes and activities and make a presentation to the class.”

25. p. 196T – In the Quick Lesson Plan the publisher advocates that teachers begin the discussion by telling students that the high cost of elections has “created serious problems in the American political system.” On what basis does the publisher make that claim?

Publisher's Response:

Change TE page 196 *Focus* to:

“Tell students that total campaign spending for the 2000 presidential election came to at least \$1.5 billion. Ask them to list some of the ways in which candidates might have spent this money, such as staff salaries, travel, and advertising. Then discuss whether the amount of money

candidates spend should be restricted or whether such high costs are justified in a democratic system where candidates are expected to reach tens of millions of people.”

26. p. 205 – The disposition to see soft-money and the current campaign financing system as problematic also permeates the learning activities of the book.

Publisher’s Response:

See response to #27 below.

27. p. 205 – The disposition to see soft-money and the current campaign financing system as problematic also permeates the learning activities of the book. Question 28 on the Critical Thinking Skill sections asks students to discuss how *Buckley v. Valeo* creates a problem for “closing the loopholes” in current campaign finance laws. My concern here is three-fold: 1) The question implies that the Supreme Court was wrong or presents a barrier to reform, 2) the question implies that there is something wrong with soft-money contributions, even in light of the Supreme Courts ruling that this is a freedom of speech issue, 3) the question ignores any discussion of the merits of soft-money as a means of participating in the democratic process and supporting candidates and causes in which one believes.”

Publisher’s Response:

Change SE page 205 question #28 to:

“28. *Expressing Problems Clearly* Should federal law prohibit candidates from accepting soft money? Write a well-reasoned paragraph explaining your answer.”

Change TE page 205 answer to #28 to:

“28. Yes: Candidates who use soft money for political campaigns are exploiting a loophole in campaign finance laws and have an unfair advantage. No: soft-money is a means of participating in the democratic process and of supporting candidates and causes in which one believes.”