



**Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review
July 2002**

Compilation of Textbook Factual Errors

The views and opinions represented in the reviews are those of the reviewers and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Texas Public Policy Foundation. TPPF commissioned a wide variety of teachers and professors from across the political spectrum to review textbooks for academic integrity and completeness. TPPF materials are published for educational purposes only. Nothing written herein is an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any legislation. Permission to reprint any portion of the reviews is granted provided that credit is given and a copy of the reprinted portion is sent to TPPF.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

July 2002

Dear Reader:

The Texas Public Policy Foundation is pleased to present this compendium of social studies textbook reviews. TPPF commissioned the reviews of 26 textbooks covering required courses in Texas public schools.

These reviews were conducted by distinguished public school teachers and university-level professors. We asked the reviewers to look for errors, and judge the books on accuracy and completeness of information.

We choose our reviewers not for their ideologies or political philosophies, but rather for their expertise in the subject area or their experience in the grade-level. As such, the reviewers come from a wide range of political and philosophic backgrounds and share our belief that textbooks should be *free* of political influence but rich in factual historical content.

While TPPF stands behind its core mission of promoting individual liberty, limited government, sound economics and the principles of free enterprise, we also support the academic independence of our reviewers. We might disagree on some of the notes and thoughts expressed at some points in the reviews, but we are unwavering in our shared commitment to ensure that Texas textbooks are accurate and complete.

As a technical document, it is important to recognize that the comments and suggestions made by the reviewers refer to specific textbook passages. Further, at no time does the Texas Public Policy Foundation call for, or support, the removal of accurate content.

One does not have to be a conservative or a liberal to appreciate the importance of balance, accuracy and fairness in textbooks. We owe it to our children to ensure the textbooks they are using reflect the best, broadest and most accurate information possible.

Respectfully,

Jeff Judson
President and CEO
Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

Compilation of Textbook Factual Errors

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	Our World Today: People Places and Issues, Texas Edition	6 TH Grade Social Studies

1. P. 260 Teacher sidebar at p. 260 mentions the Turkish genocide of Armenian--appropriately so--as it was the first major genocide of this century. However, to equate in the next sentence the prejudice in the U.S. with genocide or holocaust is over the top. As bad as prejudice in the U.S. was, it was not a government-sponsored genocide!!
2. However, at p. 269T, the impression is left that European population growth is out-of-control. In many European countries the birth rates have so declined as to produce zero or even negative growth in recent times. In some countries only immigration puts them in a positive growth posture. Indeed, depopulation may become a major economic and social issue in Europe in future years.
3. However. At p. 313 The authors report that hundreds of thousands died in Yugoslavia wars. This is arguable. The jury is still out on the numbers. We do know that Bosnian government officials greatly exaggerated the casualty situation, and that journalists uncritically published inflated numbers. Little doubt exists that tens of thousands perished, but hundreds of thousands is not supportable. Almost always in civil wars such as this one, there is a higher number of refugees than of those killed.
4. P. 91 Error. It was Emperor Theodosius who made Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire in 381 AD. Constantine issued the edict of toleration at Milan in 313, thus ending the persecution (as the authors correctly note), but this didn't make Christianity the religion of the state, only one among many tolerated faiths. The authors do later (at p. 239) partially correct this mistake.
5. p. 412, While there is ongoing instability in Southern Somalia, there is a stable if internationally unrecognized government functioning perfectly well in Somaliland, to the Northwest.
6. Only one small observation needs to be made concerning the reference to Aristotle at p. 237. He did write, as the authors note, on natural science. However, his most important and influential works dealt with social science, politics, literature, ethics and philosophy. These deserve mention in a social studies text.
7. P. 519S, Why does the statement, "Around A. D. 1500 Europeans began to explore the Americas" need to be stated so inexact? Can't we just say that Christopher Columbus came in 1492 and then exploration soon followed?
8. P. 10S, "Comparing World Languages" graph could be misleading. Is the number of English speakers calculated according to number of English speakers whose native tongue is English or according to number of English speakers worldwide? English has become the international language of commerce and in some cases the Internet. What exactly does 322 mil represent?
9. p. 105S, p. RA19, Sea of Marmara is not labeled on RA19 map of Turkey as indicated in text on p. 105S.
10. P. 93T, 93S, To state that Ramadan has a month, as Westerners know time, is misleading. It cannot be equated with the Christian celebration of Christmas that is always on December 25

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Harcourt School Publishers	Harcourt Horizons	6 TH Grade Social Studies

1. p. 117. The authors imply that immigration has resulted in the growth in the number of religious groups in the United States. This is misleading. The addition of Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism as well as other religious traditions does add religious diversity but in fact the growth in the number of denominations is in small Protestant denominations, over 30,000 and counting with much of this growth coming in the past two decades. The author's grasp of religion and its impact on culture is weak.
2. pp. 290-91. Errors exist in the time-line. Invaders threatened the Roman Empire not in the AD 100s, but in the AD 400s. The Empire was strong and expanding in the 100s under the influence of the "Good Emperors." See any good history of Ancient Rome. Also the process of nation-building in Europe substantially pre-dates the 1500s. Spain, Portugal, England, France, Poland, etc. had national identities going back centuries before this.
3. P. 304. The authors imply that ethnic tension caused WWII. However, the main issues had more to do with economic grievances, nationalism generally and the growth of fascist and Nazi ideology which exploited nationalist grievances. The idea that Joseph Stalin feared military invasion from the West is highly dubious.
4. P. 269-271. The history of Western Europe is badly short-changed, starting with the Ancient Greeks who get a scant few sentences, despite the rich contribution to political science, philosophy, history, natural science, rhetoric, poetry, art, theater, architecture, mathematics, and etc. There is no mention of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, etc. There is no discussion of the differences between Republican and Imperial Rome. No great Roman Emperors are mentioned.
5. p. 283. The language implies that the ECSC became the EC, which isn't quite accurate. The EC was established by the Rome Treaty of 1956. This expanded the common market from the ECSC, which continued to exist, into energy, agriculture and other manufacturing sectors.
6. Error at p. 32. Authors say that lines of latitude are farthest apart at the equator. They mean, one supposes, lines of longitude.
7. P. 502. Most governments and UN agencies involved in food aid avoid giving aid in ways that reduce local incentive to production. The problem cited by the authors is not imaginary, but it is overstated.
8. P. 502. The reference to the ill effects of food aid is welcome, but most governments and UN agencies avoid dumping excess food into emergency areas. Food aid, they authors say, doesn't help much. But it most certainly has saved many lives. It also shows humanity, concern, and generosity of the US and other aid donors. Famine today is closely associated with civil wars. The authors fail to note this.

9. P. 285-86. The discussion of monarchy in connection with Europe ignores the fact that kings for much of the Middle Ages claimed no right to absolute rule.
10. p. 287. The diagram of the German government leaves the mistaken impression that Germany has a separation of powers system like the United States. But Germany is a parliamentary democracy. The Chancellor is not only head of government but leader of the majority part in parliament. There is a fusion, not a separation of executive and legislative powers.
11. p. 69. The background section lumps women and slaves together as having no political rights in Athens. However, Athenian born women were considered citizens of Athens and they ran the households.
12. p. 70. The implication that English kings before 1215 had absolute authority is not true. Custom and canon law restrained monarchial authority in England as elsewhere during the Middle Ages.
13. p. 487. The totalitarian regime established by Haile Mengistu Miriam was a personal communist state, not an Islamic one.
14. P. 116. The authors seem to imply by their treatment of and emphasis on discrimination, especially toward women in the United States and by their emphasis on discrimination against Roma in Europe, that Western democracies have a special problem with discrimination. But these countries in fact were among the first to extend voting rights to women and to look upon discrimination as a matter worthy of governmental regulation and policy-making. The openness and responsiveness of Western democracies is the real story, in contrast to the slowness of other forms of government to extend even minimal rights to anybody.
15. p. 422. The authors claim that North African Muslims suffered under European colonialism, while Europe collected all the profits. But this ignores the new jobs, education, investment and modern medicine and the like that European rule brought.
16. p. 505. The treatment on the Hutu/Tutsi problem in Rwanda is misleading. Germany and later Belgium didn't simply give power to the Tutsis. They found Tutsis mainly in control. The colonial powers recognized a certain existing Tutsi supremacy in political life, and then cemented it in place. They also exacerbated the divisions through colonial policy, so there is some responsibility. The main Tutsi refugee flow from Rwanda occurred at independence in 1962. These Tutsi refugees, having fled mainly to Uganda, formed the backbone of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) that invaded Rwanda in the early 1990s to topple the Hutu regime. The Hutus began the genocide against Tutsi after the death of the Hutu President Habyarimana, who was seeking reconciliation with the RPF. The RPF responded by expelling the extremist Hutu government which, using scare tactics, in turn encouraged all Hutus to flee or be killed by the RPF. Around a million Hutus fled into neighboring countries, although most returned safely to Rwanda by 1997 as stability was restored by the Tutsi-dominated RPF. For details on all of this see Gerard Prunier. *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide* (NY: Columbia, 1995).
17. p. 537. On what empirical basis do the authors judge that Indians at the bottom of the caste system have tried to escape injustice by becoming Christians? How can such a motive be ascribed? Isn't it possible that Hindus become Christians for reasons other than economic self-interest? Can a Hindu escape the caste system by becoming a Christian? The authors need to be more careful in making assertions of this sort.

18. At p. 319 All Saints Day is presented in the Heritage sidebar as a kind of ancestor worship. Nowhere in the text have the authors even defined what a saint is, namely a holy person, specifically those canonized by the Catholic Church. All Saints Day is a Holy Day not just a secular holiday in Catholic countries. Its purpose is not to “honor people from the past,” but specifically to remember models of Christian charity and holiness. All Souls Day is on November 2. It remembers all those who have died, not just saints. This sidebar, then, is badly misleading and poorly written. It converts a Catholic holy day into some kind of animist or Buddhist ancestor worship, a notion alien to Christianity.

19. P. 469 The railroad tracks in colonial Africa always ran north/south, the authors claim. This is inaccurate. What can be accurately said about colonial tendencies, was that roads and railroads were built from coastal areas to the interior, and sometimes this meant that they ran east/west. This is an example of sloppy language and presentation.

20. Events of September 11, 2001 are not addressed. This is a must for a textbook that is going to be in use for at least 7-8 years.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt Rinehart & Winston	Holt, People Places and Change: An Introduction to World Studies, Texas Edition	6 TH Grade Social Studies

1. p. 329. Error. The Austro-Hungarians did not impose Roman Catholicism in Croatia and Slovenia as the authors declare. Catholicism is deeply rooted in these two countries, both of which, though proselytized by Byzantium, inclined to unity with Rome when the Great Schism occurred. For a brief history on this question see Newman C. Eberhardt, *A Summary of Catholic History: Ancient and Medieval History*, Vol. I (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1961, pp. 501-02.
2. p. 427. US and UK led the alliance action against Iraq as the authors point out. However, it is important to say that they did so with the full approval of the UN. This wasn't an 'imperialist' action as might be implied or as one might conclude from the way the text is worded.
3. P. 495. The treatment of the slave trade fails to mention that British policy and enforcement brought it to a close. The authors do not mention the fact that a slave trade existed in East Africa with the Arab and Islamic world, even before the West African slave trade began. Slavery was largely eliminated in Europe during the Middle Ages.
4. p. 519. Famine in Ethiopia is caused not just by drought. Major factors are civil war and bad government, especially during the Communist regime of the 1970s-1990s.
5. p. 273. The Communist Worker's Republic in Spain aggressively persecuted Catholics and murdered priests. So the rather anodyne phrase adopted by the authors, suggesting that the communists just wanted to "reduce Church influence," does not convey adequately the communist animus toward Catholicism in Spain.
6. P. 421. The common prejudice concerning the "Dark Ages" is uncritically repeated here in the sidebar on Math. In fact the dark ages weren't so dark. Learning continued in Europe through the monasteries. The Muslims borrowed from ancient Greek knowledge, including math. It was Euclid who developed the science of geometry. Muslims used it, but cannot take credit for discovering it as might be implied from the sidebar.
7. Pp. 115. Kwanzaa, the authors imply, originated in Africa. But Kwanzaa is not celebrated in Africa. It is an African-American invention of recent decades. Other real holidays with significant histories and backgrounds are not explained in this text, as the TEK requires. They are merely listed.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
McDougal Littell	World Cultures and Geography	6 TH Grade Social Studies

1. p. 89. The authors say: "Europeans often took land from Native Americans without paying for it." This begs for further clarification and explanation, since as a general rule Native American populations didn't have a European notion of land as property with a price, or as being capable of ownership with rights of sale. Moreover, Native American peoples fought one another for the occupancy of land and exploitation of its resources. Further, the comment that "Europeans had been buying people from slave trades in Africa for years," implies, in the context it is written, that the practice was part of Europe's history, but the slave trade didn't begin until the 16th century. Slavery as an institution was largely eliminated in Europe during the Middle Ages.
2. p. 338. The Marshall Plan was also offered to the USSR and to Eastern Europe, not just Western Europe. Stalin refused to participate and forbade Eastern European countries from doing so.
3. p. 511. The authors claim that "Europeans also created conflicts among ethnic groups that had not existed before." Then they cite the example of Belgium in Rwanda and Burundi. This overstates the case. Political, social, and economic rivalry and tension already existed among the Tutsi and the Hutu.
4. p. 515. Transition to democracy for not just some, but indeed for most African countries was smooth. The rocky road began after independence for most countries. The authors make the following highly dubious claim: "The slave trade and colonial rule had created hostility between ethnic groups in Nigeria." The divisions, conflicts and warfare between and among the many ethnic groups in Nigeria pre-dates any contact with the Europeans. It was part of the traditional life. We can say that slavery and colonial administration may have exacerbated various conflicts, but did not cause them.
5. p. 96 The notion that the Iroquois Confederacy "may also have influenced political ideas at the time the Constitution was drafted," is curious. The conditional language employed is appropriate since the founders were steeped in European political philosophy and it is most unlikely that the practices of the Iroquois were seriously entertained at the Constitutional Convention. Respectable scholars of the Constitution do not give much credence to notions of this sort, and there is no reason to include such highly conjectural material in a sixth grade text.
6. p. 370. The authors appear to confuse the EU's Court of Justice with the Council of Europe's European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). The EU Court of Justice resolves disputes between and among EU member states and institutions. The ECHR is the court established to protect human rights of Europeans whose countries are party to the ECHR Treaty.
7. p. 280. Athenian women should not be lumped together with slaves and foreign residents as the authors do here. While it is true that none of these could take part in the government, the women of Athens were considered citizens if born of Athenian parents. Although they didn't participate in politics they functioned as citizens in the oikos or

household. They lacked the franchise and participation rights, but that was true of most societies until only recently.

8. p. 507. The authors say in regard to Africa before the Europeans that, “some states had democratic rule.” This needs some further explanation. Almost by any definition if a state existed in Africa it was centralized and not democratic, by any measure we would use today, such as free elections of competing parties.

9. p. 441. The discussion about Muslim translations of Ancient Greek texts into Arabic from which Latin translations were made inaccurately suggests that the Christian West was entirely beholden to Muslim/Arabic scholars for access to works of Ancient Greeks. There were indeed some Latin translations of Arabic translations of Syriac and Greek texts of ancient classical writing. However, this ignores the fact that many Latin translations done by Western Christian scholars or Eastern Orthodox Christian scholars were translated directly from the Greek into Latin. The authors greatly oversimplify a very complex reality and thus overemphasize Western dependence on Arabic classical scholarship. See Frederick Copleston, *A History of Medieval Philosophy* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1972), pp. 153-54.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	World Explorer: People Places & Culture	6 TH Grade Social Studies

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
6. p# 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.
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.
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.

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.
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 to massacre of Tutsis. Moreover, Rwanda today is more stable than Burundi.
11. 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.
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.
13. P. 387S, p. 387T, “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.
14. P. 387S, p. 387T, “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.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	Texas & Texans	7 th Grade Texas History

1. 340S presents the Union victory as putting federal laws above states' rights. I would argue that laws made by the federal government overrode state laws by virtue of the Constitution (Article VI) and Supreme Court decisions (see *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 1819) long before the Confederacy was defeated. It is more accurate to say that victory for the Union established that states cannot secede (that the compact theory of the Constitution was finally put down once and for all). The Union would supersede states' rights.
2. 379S, Shows the results of the 1873 election as Coke-100,415 to Davis-52,141. Both *The Texas Almanac* and *The New Handbook of Texas* show the figures to be 85,549 to 42,633. I don't think the exact numbers are essential. Instead, the point should be made to students that Coke (Democrat) won by roughly a 2 to 1 margin over Davis (Republican).
3. 377T-I'm not sure it is accurate to say lawlessness during Reconstruction was because people had no say in government, so they decided to disobey the law. I would agree that many Texans were frustrated that their party or faction had lost control of state government, that their pride was considerably wounded, and that they felt they were being forced to do things they didn't want to do. But the Davis administration was elected by Texas voters. The argument that they had no say in government was an excuse for disobeying the law. I would argue that it is more accurate to say that lawlessness during Reconstruction was because there were people who had no respect for the law.
4. 51S states that Houston, in Harris County, is home to more than 3 million people. The most recent *Texas Almanac* puts the population of Houston at slightly less than 2 million. If the authors of the text intend Houston to mean the Houston area, they do not say so.
5. The Karankawas and the Coahuilitecans are listed as part of the Southeastern Indian culture instead of the Western Gulf culture which is the correct one (pp. 86-87 T,S)

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt, Rinehart, Winston	Holt Texas	7 th Grade Texas History

1. 90S says Ferdinand and Isabella gave Columbus three ships. Actually, Columbus chartered the Santa Maria himself, and the town of Palos, a shipbuilding center, provided the Niña and Pinta in lieu of a debt owed the monarchs.
2. 211S states that Santa Anna was popularly elected in 1833 after overthrowing Bustamante in 1832. 212T says he was popularly elected in 1831. The 1833 date is correct.
3. The biography of Zavala mentions that he received a land grant to settle 500 families. It does not say he never developed his settlement. It leaves the impression that he might have settled part of the East Texas among his other accomplishments, 242S.
4. It is incorrect to call William Kennedy a Texan (284S). He did like Texas and served Texas' interests in England (replacing Arthur Ikin as consul) before annexation. He also served a couple of years as British consul to Texas. He received a grant to settle 600 families in Texas, but he never did and he never resided here permanently.
5. On page 271(T,S) the text lists Edward Burleson as the vice president during Sam Houston's 2nd presidential term. Anson Jones was Sam Houston's vice president before becoming the last president of the Republic of Texas. This is a major error.
6. On page 449 (T,S) they mistakenly identify Richard King's partner in the King Ranch as Gideon Lewis when it should be Mifflin Kennedy.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
McDougal Littell	Celebrating Texas	7 th Grade Texas History

1. 98S, States Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand paid for Columbus' expedition. It would be more accurate to say they sponsored him. Columbus invested a sizeable amount of his own money in the expedition as well.
2. 274S, 275S, Mexico surrendered under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo all land between Texas and the Pacific Ocean. The next sentence qualifies this by saying it includes all or part of New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada . . . Nevertheless, the first statement is an over generalization. It wouldn't hurt to excerpt the Gadsden Purchase or change "surrendered all" to "surrendered most," and it would be more accurate.
3. 324S states that after the war Texans had "to make huge changes to their way of life to be allowed to rejoin the Union." While it's true that changes were required, most were intended for the betterment of society (such as abolishing slavery and extending civil rights and education to freedmen), and I question whether the "way of life" in Texas really changed that drastically otherwise. Recent research into Reconstruction in Texas counties has shown that, while there were differences in the severity of the situation from county to county, in general, life didn't change all that much (See Campbell, "Conclusion," *Grassroots Reconstruction in Texas*, 1997). "Huge" seems to me a prejudicial exaggeration.
4. 333S, 334S, Nowhere is the negative presentation of Davis' administration balanced with information about some of the beneficial programs begun during that time. The text refers to the "Obnoxious Acts" without saying specifically what they were. It says Texans feared Davis would use force but didn't say if he actually did. In all mentions of E. J. Davis this text gives the impression that Davis was not a Texan, if only by never noting that he had been a Texas Unionist before the Civil War.
5. This text presents Reconstruction in Texas in the popularly accepted tradition that it was a time of cruel, miserable oppression by outsiders. Recent scholarship (see Randolph B. Campbell, *Grassroots Reconstruction in Texas*) has established that the quality of life in Texas was really not that miserable, that the state grew in a number of positive directions during this period, that office-holders like E. J. Davis were Texans, not outsiders, and that the thing that caused Texans the most suffering during that time was injured pride.
6. 50S, The text lists Texas rivers that flow into the Gulf of Mexico to include the Neches, Trinity, San Jacinto, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and "now the Red." The meaning of the last item is unclear since the Red River flows into the Mississippi in south Louisiana. The term "now"

is not explained. Since “now” would presumably explain how the Red River flows into the Gulf of Mexico, the text is either incomplete or incorrect without such clarification.

7. 56S, Text states that Guadalupe Peak stands 8,751 feet tall. According to *The Texas Almanac*, *The New Handbook of Texas*, and all the other sources I could find, Guadalupe Peak is 5,749 feet above sea level. (Not a fatal error by any means.)
8. 584S states that county attorneys represent the county in misdemeanor cases. “More serious felony cases are sent to district attorneys.” This may be true in metropolitan areas. However, the unqualified statement is misleading in that in some counties the county attorney represents the county in all cases, including criminal cases in district court
9. 439S give the impression that the poll tax was created by the Constitution of 1876 and prior to 1883. The poll tax was added to the Constitution by amendment in 1902
10. Page 267T “Houston served in the Senate until 1859” is incorrect. He was recalled by the legislature after he voted against the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. He ran for governor in 1857 and again in 1859.
11. Page 251T Caption. Perote Prison is not in Mexico City according to the map on Page 246T.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	Lone Star	7 th Grade Texas History

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

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
11. Page 107T "With this purchase of the Louisiana Territory in 1804." (Authors notes) Louisiana Purchase was made in 1803 not 1804.
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.
13. Page 149T "Cos had many leading Texans arrested, including Travis." He wanted them arrested, but they were never captured.

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
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.
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.
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 the University of Texas.
18. Page 269T Sorbs should be Serbs.
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.
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.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	The American Republic, Volume 1	8 th Grade American History

1. Under the section “Numbers”, it lists 65% of colonists able to read in 1602. As the first English colony to survive was not established until 1607, is the book referring to all New World colonists?
2. Chapter 6, p. 175, “Treatment of Loyalists.” 2nd paragraph: “Others took off for Spanish-owned Florida.” Spain did not regain control of Florida until after the war, in the Treaty of Paris, 1783.
3. Chapter 11, p. 350. “The Panic of 1837.” The implication given in the third paragraph is that the North was hard hit by the depression. The South and West were hit much harder, spurring many who went into debt to move westward, to Oregon and Texas, hence an economic root of Manifest Destiny. Neither is any mention made of the corresponding collapse of cotton prices that deepened the depression’s effects in the South.
4. Chapter 12, p. 364. “...colonists agreed to learn Spanish, convert to Catholicism, and *obey Mexican law.*” True enough; but what is not clear is that they had to obey the law because they were obliged to become citizens of Mexico as a condition of settlement.
5. p. 372. “The United States insisted that the Rio Grande formed the border.” True, but what is not explained is that the treaty Santa Anna signed giving Texas its independence had so stated. Claiming the Rio Grande was not, as is implied, an arbitrary decision on Polk’s part.
6. Chapter 15, p. 448. “The Raid on Harper’s Ferry.” 2nd paragraph: “His target was an arsenal.” Why? The whole point to Brown’s attack was what he wanted to do *after* he captured the arsenal, which was to arm slaves to kill plantation owners and free more slaves. That was why the South was so upset. This is vital to an accurate portrayal of the raid and by leaving it out the importance is completely missed. The conviction was for “treason against the state of Virginia” for promoting a slave rebellion.
7. Chapter 15, p. 451. “The South Secedes.” “Many people in the South did not trust the party, fearing the *Republican government* would not protect Southern rights.” Partially true. The presidency was Republican with Lincoln’s election, but congress was still under Democratic Party control until the Southern states began seceding.
8. Chapter 2, p. 40. “Better Maps.”--“The compass allowed sailors to determine their location when they were far from land.” A compass will indicate direction, but if it can determine location as well (especially at sea) that’s been hidden from most of us.

9. Citizenship handbook, p. 225. “Commander in Chief.” The second half of this paragraph describes the War Powers Act, passed after the Vietnam War, not the constitution

10. 1st paragraph: “In 1832 Congress passed a new, lower tariff, hoping that the protest in the South would die down.” In reality, the tariff of 1832 was not significantly lower than the tariff of 1828 (Abominations). That is why South Carolina continued its resistance.

11. 3rd paragraph: “Jackson supported a compromise bill proposed by Henry Clay that would greatly lower the tariff.” True, but gradually over the course of several years, not immediately as is implied.

12. Chapter 3, p. 80, “Conflict with Native Americans”—3rd paragraph: “On May 26, 1637, English soldiers and their Narraganset allies burned the main Pequot village, killing hundreds.” What is not mentioned is that Pequots attacked a colonial settlement the previous month, slaughtering the town’s cattle, killing some of the villagers and kidnapping two young women. Those attacking the Pequot village were colonists, not English soldiers.

13. Chapter 10, p. 318, “Building the Erie Canal.” “Clinton boarded a barge in Buffalo and journeyed on the canal to New York City.” The canal went from Buffalo to Albany; the rest of the trip (Albany-New York City) would have been made on the Hudson River, not the canal.

14. Chapter 11, p. 337. “The Visual Record.” Sidebar says John Marshall was first Supreme Court Chief Justice. It was actually John Jay, as stated on p. 303.

15. Chapter 17, p. 521. “War Breaks Out.”—“...the Texas and US claim that the Rio Grande marked the southern border of Texas...” This claim comes from the Treaty of Velasco, signed by Santa Anna after the battle of San Jacinto in 1836, giving Texas her independence (p. 496).

16. Chapter 11. As mentioned in Section 5A, there is no mention of the election of 1804 or the Essex Junto. It’s plan to get Aaron Burr into the NY governor’s office and then have New England secede from the union shows that the concept of states’ rights and secession was not particular to the South.

17. The “service-learning” project [p. 13(T)]of adopting a local park and picking up garbage there as a way to understand the land-use practices of American Indians is misleading. Students are inaccurately being taught that American Indians looked at developed and undeveloped land in the same way as modern Americans look at parkland. For a balanced and accurate discussion, see Shepard Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (2000).

18. On p. 16(S), the text says: “Some [Europeans] believed the Native Americans had come from Atlantis, an island that was supposed to have sunk beneath the waves of the Atlantic Ocean.” This passage is wrong. The idea that American Indians were refugees or survivors from Atlantis was not

an idea of the Age of Discovery, but rather a 19th-century idea. In the Age of Discovery, some Europeans thought that the Americas were Atlantis and Atlantis had not sunk or only part of it had sunk. This is clearly different from the refuge theory, which is an anachronism in any account of the Age of Discovery. [See L. Sprague de Camp, *Lost Continents: The Atlantis Theme in History, Science, and Literature* (1954), chap. 2.]

19. "The [mammoth] hunters and their families used every part of the animal." [p. 18(S)] This sentence is misleading in its implication that hunters always used every part of every mammoth and that the hunters were practicing a form of ecologically-minded conservation. For a balanced and accurate discussion, see Shepard Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (2000).
20. The map labeled "Prehistoric Migrations Through the Americas" [p. 18(S)] indicates that there were prehistoric migrations from Europe that were comparable to those from Asia that continued along the Pacific Coast of North America. This is highly doubtful. It is certainly too speculative to belong in a textbook. The treatment on p. 21(S) is better, but only slightly. The acknowledgement that "few scientists" [p. 21(S)] agree with this European-migration speculation indicates that it is premature to put such speculation in a textbook. The Alternative Assessment [p. 21(T)] encourages students to believe in the European migration hypothesis. [See Kenneth L. Feder, *Frauds, Myths, and Mysteries: Science and Pseudoscience in Archaeology*, 3rd ed. (1999), chaps. 5-6.]
21. The "You Don't Say" section on "potlatches" [p. 31(T)] says that the institution of potlatches ensured "the distribution of wealth among the peoples." 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).
22. The text says: "Iroquois women occupied positions of power in their communities." [p. 33(S)] 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. The pioneering anthropologist Henry Lewis Morgan writes: "The [Iroquois] Indian regarded women as the inferior, the dependent, and the servant of man, and from nurturance and habit, she actually considered herself to be so." [Morgan, *League of The Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois* (1901), p. 315]. This misleading account of the Iroquois women is also reflected in the social pyramid found in the Bellringer skillbuilder activity's Daily Focus Skills Transparency 4-3 on p. 116(T).
23. The text speaks of "an enslaved African named Estavanico" [p. 54(S)]. Calling him "African" is misleading. Readers will think Estavanico was from sub-Saharan Africa. In fact, he was a Moroccan (a North African). [See Kitty Morse, "Estaban of Azemmour and His New World Adventures," *Saudi Aramco World*, March-April 2002; "Estavanico." *The Handbook of Texas Online*.

<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/EE/fes8.html>
(Accessed Tue May 21 12:36:28 US/Central 2002).]

24. On p. 64(S), the text says that the Dutch paid “about 24 dollars in beads, knives and trading goods” for Manhattan. This dollar valuation has been around since 1846. If it was ever right, because of inflation it is surely wrong now. Sixty Dutch guilders in 1626 (known to be the approximate value of what the Dutch gave the Indians) needs to be translated into current dollars. There is no evidence at all that beads were part of the payment. [For a full account, see Peter Francis Jr., “The Beads That Did *Not* Buy Manhattan Island,” *New York History* (Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association), vol. 67, no. 1 (January 1986).]
25. On p. 82(S), the text says that during the Civil War, Cavalier refugees went to colonies that had been “royal colonies” because they had had that form of governmental organization: “During the English Civil War, English men and women loyal to the king went to royal colonies like Virginia.” In fact, after the English Civil War (1642-47) was over, in January 1649, Virginia declared that it was still loyal to the Stuarts (and became a place of refuge for Cavaliers), until March 1652, when it recognized the authority of the English Commonwealth. The existing wording in the text is misleading.
26. On p. 134(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.” [See William P. Cumming and Hugh Rankin, *The Fate of a Nation: The American Revolution Through Contemporary Eyes*; John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1761-1765*.]
27. On p. 166(S), the text speaks of Nathan Hale’s “last words” as “I only regret that I have but one life to live for my country.” 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.” [See George Dudley Seymour, *The Documentary Life of Nathan Hale; The Diary of Frederick Mackenzie*; Becky Akers, “One Life for Liberty,” *The Freeman*, Vol. 47, No. 8 (August 1997).]
28. The answer to the TAKS practice question given in the teacher’s wraparound section on p. 189(T) is wrong and seems to have dropped in out of the blue. The answer pertains to the Civil War while the question asks about the Revolutionary War.
29. The Bellringer Activity transparency on p. 267(T) quotes Jefferson on those who labor on the earth as chosen people and keeping America’s workbenches in Europe. On p. 280(S), the text says TJ thought the United States should remain a nation of small farmers. 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.

30. On p. 279(S), the text says the Federalist called TJ, “who believed in freedom of religion,” “godless.” TJ was not godless, but his views went beyond freedom of religion. He was a deist, who believed Jesus was an admirable, exemplary man, not the incarnation of God. The wording in the text is misleading.
31. On p. 290(S), defines “impressment” as the practice of stopping American ships at sea and searching them for British deserters. This is wrong and confuses search and seizure with impressment. Impressment is naval conscription, forcing people involuntarily into the Navy.
32. The text on p. 284(S) describes Sacagawea as a guide for Lewis and Clark. This is incorrect. She and her trapper husband helped the expedition in a variety of ways. She and her baby indicated that the expedition was not a hostile war party. She served as a translator and aided in making friendly contact with the Shoshone when the expedition entered Shoshone territory. But she was not a guide.
33. The map on p. 367(S) indicates incorrectly that the Texan victory in San Antonio in Dec. 1835 was a Mexican victory.
34. On p. 439(S), the text gives central prominence (with regard to the congressional approval of the Compromise of 1850) to Millard Fillmore’s persuading Whig representatives to abstain on certain measures. The importance of Fillmore’s action is a matter of dispute among historians. Some would stress instead what they think is the greater importance of modifications that were made in the legislation itself. The discussion in the text should have included the modifications. [See Mark J. Stegmaier, *Texas, New Mexico, and the Compromise of 1850: Boundary Dispute & Sectional Crisis*; William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion*.]
35. On p. 483(S), the text says: “Overall...the Northern economy boomed.” This is wrong. Overall, the Northern economy did not do well during the Civil War, although war industries prospered. Real wages fell by one-third.
36. P. 87(S) reads: “English criminals and Scottish and Irish prisoners of war were also shipped to the colonies....Africans were seized and brought to the colonies as slaves.” The passive voice in these sentences conceals history rather than revealing it. These sentences should read: “British authorities shipped English criminals and Scottish and Irish prisoners of war to the colonies....African chieftains seized neighboring Africans in wars and raids. The chieftains sold the captives to slave-traders who brought them to the colonies as slaves.”
37. The “Critical Thinking Activity” on p. 104(T) incorrectly implies that Europeans introduced aggression and violence into African life (which they did not), rather than increasing the levels of aggression and violence (which the Europeans did, during the era of the slave trade).
38. On page 212(S), the text wrongly attributes the quotation “That government is best which governs least” to Thomas Paine. This quotation is often attributed to Thomas Jefferson, and sometimes to Benjamin Franklin. All

these attributions are wrong. The quotation is not from Paine, Jefferson, or Franklin, it was rather the motto of a Jacksonian Democratic publication, the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. A picture of this publication, by the way, appears in the Holt textbook on p. 516(S). [On this quotation, see Henry David Thoreau, *The Variorum Civil Disobedience*, ed. Walter Harding.] This material in the text would also be used by a student to learn the content listed in TEKS #4.

39. On p. 217(S), the text says that the Framers intended the phrase “general welfare” in the Preamble of the Constitution to authorize the national government to ensure “as much as possible...that citizens will be free from poverty, hunger, and disease.” This is an anachronism. The Framers were not New Deal welfare-statists and had no such view of the phrase “general welfare.”

40. On p. 208(S), the text wrongly equates John Locke-style “natural rights” with the rights of Englishmen as found in the Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights. This misses the point of “natural rights,” which are universal rights founded in human nature not dependent on English charters, statutes, or customs. [See John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*.] This aspect of the text would be used by a student to learn the content listed in TEKS #16 as well.

41. On p. 412(S), the text says: “Henry David Thoreau sat...in the jail cell...As he looked through the cell bars, he heard a voice, ‘Why are you here?’ asked his friend Ralph Waldo Emerson. Thoreau replied, ‘Why are you *not* here?’” This tale is myth and legend, not history. There does exist an 1894 letter written by Eben Loomis, claiming that the story was told to him by Maria Thoreau. But this is third hand, and 1894 is too long after the supposed fact. [Eben J. Loomis, Letter to Alfred W. Hosmer, May 21, 1894] Compare the somewhat better treatment of this supposed incident in the Holt textbook, which uses “reportedly” in describing the conversation.

42. On p. 308(S), Eli Whitney is said to be from Massachusetts; on p. 309(S), he is said to be from Connecticut. He was born in Massachusetts, taught school there, went to college in Connecticut (Yale), and manufactured cotton gins there. The existing wording in the text, however, is confusing.

43. On p. 529(S), the text says “railroad construction was made possible by large government subsidies.” This is misleading in the sense that it implies that a transcontinental railroad would have been impossible to build in this era without government subsidies. This is called into question by both the actual experience of the Great Northern Railway, which was built without subsidies, and by economic historian Robert Fogel’s economic analysis of the Union Pacific line, which he found to be a “premature enterprise.” [See Robert W. Fogel, *Union Pacific Railroad: A Case in Premature Enterprise*.]

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt Rinehart & Winston	Holt Call to Freedom	8 th Grade American History

1. Chapter 11, p. 337. "The Visual Record." Sidebar says John Marshall was first Supreme Court Chief Justice. It was actually John Jay, as stated on p. 303.
2. Chapter 17, p. 521. "War Breaks Out."—"...the Texas and US claim that the Rio Grande marked the southern border of Texas..." This claim comes from the Treaty of Velasco, signed by Santa Anna after the battle of San Jacinto in 1836, giving Texas her independence (p. 496)
3. Chapter 11. As mentioned in Section 5A, there is no mention of the election of 1804 or the Essex Junto. It's plan to get Aaron Burr into the NY governor's office and then have New England secede from the union shows that the concept of states' rights and secession was not particular to the South.
4. On p. 12(S), the text discusses "potlatches." The text's benign wording about social standing and respect 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).
5. On p. 16 (S) the text implies that Iroquois women had proportionally more power than they had in fact. 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. The pioneering anthropologist Henry Lewis Morgan writes: "The [Iroquois] Indian regarded women as the inferior, the dependent, and the servant of man, and from nurturance and habit, she actually considered herself to be so." [Morgan, *League of The Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois* (1901), p. 315].
6. On p. 75(T), the text asserts that all California missions are standing today. This is misleading. In fact, the truth is that many reconstructions of missions exist today. On 110(S), "Carolina" is not a Latin form of Charles, though it is related to Carlus, which is the Latin form of Charles.
7. There is a conflict between pages 7(S) and 68(S). Did the Inca Empire extend from present-day Ecuador or from present-day Colombia to present-day Chile?

8. On pp. 155(T) and 179(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.” [See William P. Cumming and Hugh Rankin, *The Fate of a Nation: The American Revolution Through Contemporary Eyes*; John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1761-1765*.]
9. On p. 166(S), the biography of George III says that his son ruled “as king” during George III’s madness. During this time, George III’s son ruled “as regent,” not “as king.”
10. On p. 175(S), the legend under a picture describes Mercy Otis Warren as the daughter of James Otis. In fact, she was his sister. This material also relates to TEKS #24.
11. On p. 275(S), the text reads: “One of the conditions set by several states for ratifying the Constitution was the inclusion of a bill of rights.” 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. For an example of better treatment of this topic, see the McDougal Littell textbook.
12. On p. 327(S) in the Skills Workshop #1, the correct answer should be c, not a,
13. On p. 515(T), the model answer to the “Critical Thinking Question” is wrong, since Britain did not obtain territory in China (other than Hong Kong).
14. On p. 554(T), it says “House” where the “Senate” is meant, as where the South had more power.
15. On p. 260(S), the text says: “in an emergency, the president can send in U.S. troops....” A better wording would be: “in an emergency, the president can defend the country....” All constitutional scholars who specialize on war powers agree that the president has the authority to repel attacks (this was discussed at the Philadelphia Convention). But scholars disagree over whether a president who sees what he considers to be an emergency in a foreign country has the authority to send in U.S. troops without authorization by Congress.
16. On p. 276(T), the model answer for “Exploring the Document,” says: “[The Ninth and Tenth Amendments] expended rights to the people and to the states.” This is wrong. These amendments don’t extend rights, they recognize pre-existing rights and powers. That is their whole point. This misleading model answer says that it is the federal government which grants all rights and delegates all powers, which is precisely the opposite of what the Ninth and Tenth Amendments say.
17. On p. 286(S), the text says:

"The Second Amendment deals with state militias. Colonial militias were vital to America's defense. The first battle of the Revolutionary War started when British troops tried to seize the Massachusetts militia's weapons. The framers believed that the states needed to keep their weapons for emergencies. Today the National Guard has replaced state militias. National Guard members also serve in wars and help to restore order during crises, such as natural disasters.

"Some people believe that gun control laws violate the Second Amendment. This part of the Constitution states that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed [violated]." In 1939 the Supreme Court passed rules for nonmilitary firearms. Years later, a U.S. court of appeals ruled that gun control laws do not violate the Second Amendment. The Supreme Court let that ruling stand in 1983."

These passages on the Second Amendment are almost entirely factually wrong:

--As historical background to the Second Amendment, certainly as important as the British raids on the militia's arms stores was General Gage's confiscation of the arms of Boston's citizens. [See Continental Congress, "Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms" (July 6, 1775), Journal of Congress, edited 1800, I, pp 134-139. <http://www.civicwebs.com/cwvlib/constitutions/usa/e_declaration_of_causes.htm>]

--During time period when the states were considering ratifying the Constitution and adopting the Bill of Rights, every reference to the right to keep and bear arms was to an individual right. No one wrote or is recorded as having made in a speech a single "collective rights" statement.

--The Second Amendment is part of the Bill of Rights and deals with a right: the individual right of self-defense possessed by the people. This is the view of the Amendment taken by the U.S. Department of Justice. (The alternative view of the Amendment, apparently adopted in the Holt textbook, is that the Amendment recognizes a power possessed by the states to bear arms against the U.S. military. This would certainly be a vindication of Southern secession and the Confederacy.) [See Glenn Harlan Reynolds & Don B. Kates, *The Second Amendment and States' Rights: A Thought Experiment*, 36 *William & Mary L. Rev.* 1737 (1995)].

--The militia is understood in American law to refer to the whole body of the people capable of bearing arms. (See the Virginia Declaration of Rights (June 12, 1776) <http://www.civicwebs.com/cwvlib/constitutions/usa/e_virginia_decl_rights.htm> .)

All states define the unorganized militia as all able-bodied male citizens within specified age groups.

--The National Guard is not a replacement of the state militia and a continuation of that institution. The National Guard (when federalized) is part of the U.S. armed forces and loses its state militia character. [See *Perpich v. Department of Defense*, 496 U.S. 334, 351 (1989).]

--The text refers to *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174 (1939). The Miller ruling held that the Second Amendment protects firearms that would have militia uses. Specifically, the Miller ruling held only that when there was no evidence presented in a trial court that a sawed-off shotgun "at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is any part of the ordinary military equipment or that its use could contribute to the common defense." *Id.* at 178.

The court's test was not whether the individual who had the firearm was a member of a governmental military unit, but whether the firearm "at this time" is "ordinary military equipment" or its use "could" possibly aid in the common defense.

Referring to the militia clause of the Constitution, the court opinion said that "to assure the continuation and render possible the effectiveness of such forces the declaration and guarantee of the Second Amendment were made." *Id.* at 178. In America's history, "the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense," and "these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time." *Id.* at 179. Thus, the Miller opinion concludes that the Second Amendment's two clauses reinforce each other. Protecting the right of the people to keep and bear arms helps make it likely that a well-regulated militia can be found amongst the populace. The Holt textbook completely misconstrues the meaning of the Miller case for the Second Amendment.

--There is a split among the federal courts of appeals as to whether the Second Amendment refers to individual rights or state powers. See, for example, the opinion rendered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *United States v. Emerson*:
<<http://www.ca5.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/99/99-10331-cr0.htm>>

Yet by writing about only one appeals court decision, the Holt textbook misleadingly fails ("Years later, a U.S. court of appeals ruled that gun control laws do not violate the Second Amendment.") to convey to the student the existence of this split.

--The Holt textbook indicates that the 1983 U.S. Supreme Court's refusal to review a lower court ruling (and thus letting that ruling stand) indicates that the U.S. Supreme Court in doing so has made a constitutional holding on the proper interpretation of the Second Amendment. Not so. The fact that the U.S. Supreme Court declines to review a case (that is, technically speaking, denies a petition for a writ of certiorari) carries with it no implication whatsoever regarding the court's views on the merits of the case. As U.S. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter once wrote about a case in which review was denied: "The one thing that can be said with certainty about the Court's denial of [the] petition in this case is that it does not remotely imply approval or disapproval of what was said by the Court of Appeals."

--No federal court at any level has ever upheld a general prohibition on the ownership of firearms by law-abiding citizens. Most constitutional scholars who specialize in the Second Amendment would say that there can be

regulations of firearms that are constitutional, just as the courts have found certain regulations of speech and press constitutional.

--The individual right to bear arms exists so that the people can defend themselves personally from criminals and tyrants and be available when called upon by the civil authorities to enforce the laws or defend the community from invasion.

In summary, the only matters that are factually correct in the text's two paragraphs on the Second Amendment are the statements that the British sought out the arms of the colonial militia and the description of the current functions of the National Guard.

All the rest is seriously wrong or misleading. To be accurate, this section must be rewritten virtually in its entirety. [In general, see Stephen P. Halbrook, *That Every Man Be Armed: The Evolution of a Constitutional Right* (2000).]

18. On p. 289(S), the text suggests that education is a basic right, indeed a Ninth Amendment right. The federal courts have in fact held that there is no federal constitutional right to an education at public expense. Public education is an exercise of a power of the states. Education is, however, usually a right (often vaguely worded) under state constitutions. [See Robert F. Worth and Anemona Hartocollis, "Johnny Can Read, But Does He Know How to Vote?" *New York Times*, June 30, 2002.]

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
McDougal Littell	Celebrating America: Beginning through Reconstruction	8 th Grade American History

1. Chapter 1, p. 36. Crusades—"They ultimately failed to take the Holy Land." Not true. They held it from 1099-1187. A better phrasing would be "they ultimately failed to keep the Holy Land."
2. Chapter 13, p. 326. "Texas Revolt against Mexico." No mention is made that in 1834 Santa Anna threw out the Mexican Constitution of 1824 (which migrating Americans swore to uphold as Mexican citizens) and began ruling as a dictator.
3. Chapter 13, p. 387T. The "Line in the sand" story is rejected by historians because it did not surface until fifty years after the Texas Revolution.
4. Chapter 13, p. 391. "Troubles with Mexico." "Texas claimed the Rio Grande, a river south of San Antonio, as its southern boundary. Mexico insisted on the Nueces River." The Nueces is also south of San Antonio. No explanation is given that the Rio Grande was decreed as the southern border in the Treaty of Velasco, which Santa Anna signed, giving Texas its independence after the Battle of San Jacinto.
5. Chapter 13, p. 395. "Promises were made to protect the 80,000 Mexicans living in Texas and the Mexican Cession." I question this number. If the sidebar mentioned below is counted (12,000) and the total Tejano population of Texas, is counted (ca. 5,000), I don't know where the remaining 63,000 Mexicans are located. Certainly El Paso and Santa Fe don't have that many people, and there were precious few other settlements. Total population 80,000 perhaps, but 80,000 people of Mexican descent I think is unrealistic.
6. Chapter 13, p. 393T. "Bear Flag Revolt." Sidebar says that there were 8,000-12,000 Californios. Here and on p. 396, the text says there were only 6,000.
7. Chapter 1, p. 30. Map of North American in 1500 shows Comanche tribe in Texas. They did not arrive in the area until the 1740s. The region, in the 1500s, was dominated by the Apache tribe
8. Chapter 13, p. 385. The region shaded on the map is the Mexican state of Coahuila y Texas, not just Texas. Texans/Tejanos wanting an independent from this region was one of the reasons Austin went to Mexico City to talk to Santa Anna in 1833. Had Texas claimed all this region, the geographic demands of the US in the Mexican War of 1846 would have been much different.
9. Chapter 13, p. 400T. "Miners and Discrimination." Sidebar says Foreigner Miner Tax was \$3 a month; the text says it was \$20 a month.

10. On p. 31(S), the text says: “Women played important roles in Iroquois society.” This and the accompanying examples imply that Iroquois women had proportionally more power than they had in fact. 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. The pioneering anthropologist Henry Lewis Morgan writes: “The [Iroquois] Indian regarded women as the inferior, the dependent, and the servant of man, and from nurturance and habit, she actually considered herself to be so.” [Morgan, *League of The Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois* (1901), p. 315].
11. On p. 145(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.” [See William P. Cumming and Hugh Rankin, *The Fate of a Nation: The American Revolution Through Contemporary Eyes*; John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1761-1765*.]
12. On pp. 299(S) and 303(S), the text says TJ thought the United States should remain a nation of small farmers. 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.
13. On p. 442(S), the text has a reasonable description of trade as an economic concept. But there is an important mistake. Instead of saying “after the trade, you should both be better off than before,” the text should say: “you and the other person making the trade each expects to be better off than before.” The existing wording does not correctly embody the economic concept of trade.
14. The text says on p. 571(S), “[President Herbert Hoover] warned that government programs could only make things worse.” On the same page it asks students (“Reading History”): “What was Hoover’s attitude toward government action?” The model answer given in the teaching material [p. 571(T)] is: “Hoover distrusted government attempts to help people.” This incorrectly characterizes the views of Hoover, who in fact favored a strenuous federal anti-depression program (including public works, 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*.]
15. On p. 232(S), the text says that the interstate highway system is an example of forming “a more perfect union.” Actually, these highways were passed by Congress as a military measure and belong more accurately under providing for “the common defense.”

16. On p. 232(S), the text says that the Framers intended the phrase “general welfare” in the Preamble of the Constitution to authorize the national government to ensure “safety in the workplace” and “aid to the poor.” This idea of the Framers’ “purpose” [p. 232(S)] is an anachronism. The Framers were not New Deal welfare-statists and had no such view of the phrase “general welfare.”

17. On p. 232(S), the text says that the Federal Elections Commission is an example of securing “the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.” The FEC is commission concerned with procedural rules on federal election campaigns--in particular, with campaign finance. It is odd and indeed misleading to use this example here. Why not use the example of the jury system here, where it is more appropriate than under “establish justice”?

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	The American Nation: Beginnings Through 1877 (Texas Edition)	8 th Grade American History

1. Chapter 5, 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.
2. Chapter 5, 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."
3. Chapter 7, 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.
4. Chapter 10, p. 322. -top of page: "Hull retreated from Canada." Actually, he surrendered his force without a fight and the British occupied Detroit.
5. Chapter 12, 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.
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.
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.
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).

9. On p. 45(S), the text says that among Eastern Woodlands Indians, “women shared social and political power. On p. 48(S), the 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. The pioneering anthropologist Henry Lewis Morgan writes: “The [Iroquois] Indian regarded women as the inferior, the dependent, and the servant of man, and from nurturance and habit, she actually considered herself to be so.” [Morgan, *League of The Ho-De-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois* (1901), p. 315].
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, making his full title *Imperator Caesar Divi Filius Augustus*.” < <http://salve5.salve.edu/~romanemp/auggiex.htm>>
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). [See Kitty Morse, “Estaban of Azemmour and His New World Adventures,” *Saudi Aramco World*, March-April 2002; “Estavanico.” *The Handbook of Texas Online*. <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/EE/fes8.html> (Accessed Tue May 21 12:36:28 US/Central 2002).]
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.” [See William P. Cumming and Hugh Rankin, *The Fate of a Nation: The American Revolution Through Contemporary Eyes*; John Pendleton Kennedy, ed., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1761-1765*.]
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’s 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." [See George Dudley Seymour, *The Documentary Life of Nathan Hale*; *The Diary of Frederick Mackenzie*; Becky Akers, "One Life for Liberty," *The Freeman*, Vol. 47, No. 8 (August 1997).]

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. For an example of better treatment of this topic, see the McDougal Littell textbook.
15. 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.
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.
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.
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*.]
19. 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.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	United States Government: Democracy in Action	High School American Government

1. p. 10 – What is the basis for the statement that “An effective government allows citizens to plan for the future, get an education, raise a family, and live orderly lives?” These items are not found in the Constitution but are assumed by this statement to be a function of government. Some qualification is needed or the statement should be revised.
2. p. 789–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 one sentence devoted to it here. In addition, 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.
3. p. 281 – “Government and You” box on Social Security notes that 6.2% of an employees paycheck is collected for Social Security. The text should also explain that employers have to match this 6.2%, which is money that the employer most likely garners from wages withheld from the employee in determining his or her salary or wage.
4. p. 555 – The discussion of taxation points out that the revenue collected by the federal government, if divided evenly for every citizen in the US, comes to approximately \$6000 per person. The problem with this figure is that it is terribly misleading. It creates the impression that the average tax obligation is roughly \$6000, and the same for every taxpayer. The text should point out that under our progressive tax system, wealthy taxpayers pay both more in terms of total dollars and as a percentage of all revenue collected. That is, the tax burden is not really equally distributed, as the text implies. In addition, the text should point out that tax deductions (page 556) and loopholes (page 559), while reducing the burden on high-income taxpayers,

do not negate the fact that the wealthy pay a disproportionate share of the total amount of taxes collected.

5. 555 – The discussion of taxation cites A1S8 of the Constitution and Congress’s power to lay and collect taxes, with the implication being that the Founder’s intended income to be taxed (there is even a quote from Franklin regarding the certainty of taxation). The text should point out that the income tax is a product of the 16th amendment and not part of the original design of the Constitution.
6. . 162 – Students are asked to evaluate the consequences of privatizing areas like Yellow Stone national park. The answer in the teacher’s edition notes that public control preserves the park for all to enjoy and that privatization would lead to admission fees. The implication here is that the national government runs these parks for free for the enjoyment of all citizens, which is not true. Yellowstone charges an admission fee, and a fairly high one at that (\$20 per car).
7. p. 125T – The teacher’s notes in the margin suggest that each of our 435 members of the House represents about 588,000 people, which I think is too low. The figure I calculate and usually see in other textbooks is on representative for approximately 650,000 people. The textbook uses this 650,000 figure on page 126.
8. p. 313 –The discussion of circuit courts does not make it clear that the each circuit contains more than three judges, although they usually sit in groups of three to hear an appeal. In addition, the explanation of “sitting en banc” needs some clarification.
9. p. 628 – The text notes that relations between NATO and Russia are uncertain. This statement is now dated and should be revised to reflect recent events. The same is true for page 711.
10. p. 778 –The salary listed more members of Congress is for 1998. The figure has changed since then.
11. p. 173 – The political cartoon suggests that Gridlock plagues our government, and the teacher’s Caption Answer suggest “Gridlock is a persistent problem, which slows the passage of new legislation.” Why is gridlock a problem? Given our Constitution, it seems Gridlock is the built-in means of slowing the legislative process by design so as to prevent the hasty passage of laws. I suggest that students debate whether Gridlock is a good or bad thing, and whether they prefer that laws be made quickly or slowly.
12. p. 539 – The book should provide more discussion as to why “the need for large donations compromises candidates and parties.” Couldn’t one argue that part of the democratic process is to seek the support of groups or people with similar interest? As long as the contribution is not illegal, a large contribution might be considered a measure of the level of intensity which a particular group or individual feels about a cause.
13. p. TX25 – In the Texas section of the book, the text notes that 5000 people were killed in the World Trade Center collapse. This figure should be revised. The official figure is closer to 2500, but I cant recall it exactly.

14. p. 9 – The *Government in Daily Life* box notes that the “roads on which you drive are constructed and maintained by the government.” The problem with this statement is that it implies the national government is responsible for this task rather than state or local governments. Some clarification is need to convey that different levels of government are responsible for and provide different services
15. p. 119T While the “Chapter Bonus Test Question” contends that Texas is the only state that may divide itself into smaller states, the Constitution says otherwise. The constitution states that any state, with the permission of Congress and the respective state legislature, may divide itself. Texas is not special.
16. p. 467T – The teacher’s note refers to the Iowa Primary when in fact Iowa uses the caucus method.
17. p. 793 – The text should clarify that that 15th amendment only applied to males.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt Rinehart & Winston	Holt American Government	High School American Government

1. p. 6 – The last sentence of the section on “Providing Services” notes that “Because most government services do address issues of widespread concern, the benefits are shared by everyone.” This may be true in some areas such as defense but many of our social programs are largely redistributive. That is, they provide benefits to the needy by redistributing tax dollars from those who pay taxes. In addition, there is ample evidence to indicate that the wealthy and middle class pay a disproportionate share in taxes to fund these programs. Such discussion of the nature of redistributive politics should be included here less students get the impression that social programs come at now expense or that the expense is equally distributed among all users.
2. p. 6T – The “Themes in Government” box offers the argument that the American colonists were not particularly concerned about taxation as they were about lack of representation. This is partially true as the lack of representation was a critical issue in strained relations between England and the colonies. However, to dismiss the fact that taxation was unimportant is not entirely accurate, as taxation and representation were seen as two sides of the same coin.
3. p. 40 – While it is true that supporters of the Constitution were called Federalists and opponents were called Anti-Federalists, the explanation behind these names should be clarified. The Federalist preferred a stronger *national* government, not a stronger federal form of government as the book notes. Remember, a federal form of government is a government based on the states, which is what the Anti-Federalists were for. The decision by proponents of the constitution to call themselves the “Federalists” was a clever ploy to make them seem in favor of state-based government when what they really advocated was a more powerful centralized government.
4. p. 56 - The argument that the Constitution is a “living document” that has lasted a long time because it is easily adapted to modern times is debatable. 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 revision. 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? More discussion is needed.
5. p. 251 –The “Linking Government and Philosophy” segment notes that the framers of the Constitution were particularly influenced by Locke and Montesquieu. This is true, but in this same paragraph the text discusses Thomas Jefferson as one of the framers. Jefferson was absent during the Convention of 1787, serving as representative from the United States to France.

6. p. 29T – The description of Thomas Paine as a “leader” of the American Revolution in the “Themes in Government” box in the teacher’s edition is misleading. Paine was neither an American nor a revolutionary leader. He really didn’t become famous until after his essay *Common Sense* was published. His work on this project was at the bequest of Ben Franklin who was trying to find work for his underemployed friend.
7. p. 178T – The discussion of Civil Service reform notes that when Arthur became president in 1881 he was a strong supporter of Civil Service reform. In fact, it was Garfield (the previous president) who was the advocate of reform. Arthur was more in line with the Stalwart Republican faction that tended to favor the old spoils system. It was only after Garfield’s assassination by a disgruntled civil service applicant that Arthur championed his predecessor’s cause
8. p. 211 – I am not sure why the book needs to point out that in 1993 President Clinton’s economic package was adopted “despite some Republican opposition.” Was there no Democratic opposition at all? Is Republican opposition unique in this case? Was Republican opposition justified on philosophical differences? More importantly, the contention that the reduction in deficit spending can be attributed to the President’s economic package is highly debatable and should not be presented as fact
9. . p. 511 – The section on socialism notes that one of the criticisms of capitalism is that “some people are quite wealthy, while others are very poor.” Socialism, the text continues, “attempts to reduce these inequalities by redistributing wealth throughout society.” The concern here is that it implies a better standard of living in general in socialist societies than in capitalist systems. That is, the argument could be made that the relative standard of living in capitalist systems is better because it produces a large middle-class that is affluent compared to the average system in a socialist system. This possibility should be discussed.
10. p. 513 – The statement that “When government operates ... businesses [in socialist systems], all citizens own and collectively benefit from any of their profits” should be qualified. First, the “sharing” of profits is not really a cash benefit but instead translates into social programs. Second, some discussion of the extent to which socialist run enterprise succeed should be included.
11. p. 58 – The statement that the Constitution does not provide for a “formal body of leaders” to assist the president is only partially true. While the book specifically mentions the President’s cabinet, and it is true that Washington formulated the idea for a presidential cabinet, the prerogative for the president to consult the heads of the “departments” is provided for in Article 2, Section 2.
12. p. 58 – The text states that the president’s power to make executive agreements has “grown in ways not specifically mentioned in the Constitution.” This seems to imply that the executive agreement is mentioned in some manner but has evolved over time when in fact the executive agreement is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution. The wording is misleading.
13. p. 146 – The succession of the president is not clearly spelled out in the Constitution, contrary to the text. When Harrison died in office there was some discussion as to whether Tyler would become the president or merely become “acting” president until a new one was chosen. Tyler did set the precedent for

succession but it remained more tradition than law until the 25th amendment clarified the issue.

14. p. 278 – The “Careers in Government” section discusses the job of state trial court judge. The segment concludes by noting that “Critics charge that in a Republican controlled Senate (in California), its harder for women and minorities to be confirmed.” The implication here is that Republicans oppose the candidacy of women and minorities when in fact its more likely that many of these women and minority candidates are of the opposite political party. To this end, it should be clarified that the opposition is one of philosophical difference and not racists or sexist.
15. p. 461 – The section of state constitutions begins “The US Constitution divides powers between the federal government and state governments.” This statement might easily be misconstrued to mean that the state governments are a product of the national constitution. It should be made clear that the state governments existed before the national constitution, and that the national constitution is largely a product of state delegation of power and authority. A better way to phrase this sentence might be to write “The US Constitution defines the relationship between the federal government and the states.”
16. p. 472 – The section on Appeals Courts is not entirely correct. The section notes that in Texas the Supreme Court does not hear criminal cases but that they are handled in the Court of Criminal Appeals. While this is true, the implication is that the Court of Criminal Appeals is an appellate court in the traditional sense that it is subordinate to the Supreme Court. In fact, Texas has a bifurcated court system meaning that the Texas Supreme Court and Texas Court of Criminal Appeals are dual “high” courts with different jurisdictions. Oklahoma has a similar arrangement.
17. p. R29T - The teacher’s edition contains some background on the Clinton impeachment in 1999. Given the division of the Senate’s vote, students are asked to analyze why it was so divided. The suggested answer provided in the teacher’s edition is that “neither charge [of impeachment] garnered even a simple majority against Clinton, suggesting a weak initial case.” This is one possible answer. Another might be that the vote occurred heavily down party lines, suggesting that Democrats and Republicans disagreed on the seriousness of the charges.
18. T/S p.164 The chart “Electoral Vote per State 1992-2000” is incorrect. The electoral votes for each state on the chart are the new totals as determined after the 2000 census. Either the writers put the wrong title on the chart or they used the wrong electoral vote numbers.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	Magruder's American Government	High School American Government

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.
2. 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.
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.
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.
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.
6. 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.
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.

8. 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.
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.
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?
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.
12. . 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.
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.

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?
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.
16. p. 415 – As a contrast to exploring the “benefits” of bureaucracy, some discussion should be added regarding potential disadvantages or costs of bureaucracy.
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.
18. . 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.
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.
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.

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.
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?
23. . 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.
24. . 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.
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?
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.
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.

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	Economics: Principles and Practice	High School Economics

1. Economics At A Glance, Figure 7.1, S165, is an extremely helpful side bar; hopefully teachers will use as a starting point to motivate development of a competitive firm's supply curve. One problem: marginal revenue is neither explained nor defined. Since this TEKS objective requires discrimination among market structures and industrial organization, we must clearly explain the implications of marginal revenue for production decisions and profit max.
2. Regarding TEKS #10: It's unfair to criticize capitalism for market failures without providing the same criticism of other types of economic systems. Furthermore, which system has most efficiently recognized and addressed market failures? Compare the records on pollution cleanups and environmental integrity; the U.S. free enterprise system shames the socialist economies, contrary to the casual empiricism of critics of capitalism. Good descriptive narratives provided for traditional, command and market economies; well written with nicely integrated sidebars.
3. Fix-up the definition of absolute advantage, T469..."a country has an absolute advantage when it is able to produce more of a given product than another country can"... That's correct for the special case of identical resource base and different technologies, but certainly not true in general; the general case of absolute advantage is what must be defined here. Otherwise, a good coverage of the basic principles of international trade and finance.
4. p. 38T Comparing Economic systems- I would disagree that a market system does not provide for old, young and sick.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	Economics: Today and Tomorrow	High School Economics

1. The justification for the law of supply, T188, needs some work. It's the rising marginal cost of producing an additional unit that explains the upward sloping supply curve; not that every unit costs more to produce when production expand and therefore you require a higher price to cover costs. That's simply incorrect – marginal analysis underlies that supply curve, not as presented here.
2. A disadvantage of the market economic system, T37-38, involves the “concern about those too young, too old or too sick to work.” Since this criticism is clearly leveled against the U.S. economy, one must simply reflect upon the multitude of government's social programs that address such needs. Meeting this TEKS learning objective can be done with well-written descriptive economics, as done here. A point to make regarding the importance of property rights: look at U.S. record regarding pollution and environmental clean-up versus the socialist economies. Would students and their teachers be surprised at U.S. achievements here? In particular, where do you find cleaner rivers, U.S. or Russia, and why?
3. The definition of absolute advantage, T475, is incorrect; lower absolute cost? No! Why not explain the comparative advantage illustration with PP curves or at least identify the respective opportunity costs explicitly, T475-476? That is, in Alpha the opportunity cost of a bu of soybeans is the foregone production of 5 bu of corn, whereas in Beta, it's 3.125 bu of corn. Hence Beta is the low opportunity cost producer of soybeans and enjoys a comparative advantage in soybeans, her exportable. What are the gains from trade? Can consume beyond your production possibilities frontier; no mention of that fundamentally important consequences of trade.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt Rinehart & Winston	Economics, Texas Edition	High School Economics

1. The explanation of opportunity costs accompanying the production possibility curve, Figure 1.3, see T13, is extremely confused. Opportunity costs involve marginal analysis which is simply not explained here. Although the curve illustrates increasing opportunity costs, the concept is never discussed. Furthermore, the discussion appears to explain opportunity costs wrongly with the PP curve as an all-or-nothing decision. Consider the misleading statement, T13: "The opportunity cost of producing a certain number of one class of cars would be the number of cars of the other class that could not be produced." That is not marginal analysis. How could students master the concept from that statement? What does it actually mean? Granted a well-qualified teacher could say "what the author meant to say here"; however, why place the burden on the teacher? What about the student reading this and trying to make sense out of such a flawed statement?
2. T54: "Diminishing marginal utility helps explain why the demand for a product is not limitless." No, that's not correct. Purchasing power of a consumer's income explains why demand not limitless. We don't even require marginal utility to "explain" demand; intuitively, the substitution and real income effects are satisfactory to justify the law of demand for a first pass for students.
3. T100... high prices signal firms to produce more and low prices less of the goods consumers desire...is this right in terms of economic incentives reflected in the efficient signaling of the price system? It's higher prices, lower prices that are the price signals. Not necessarily the magnitude of prices, but the direction of change in prices, that signals firms to reallocate resources in the economy.
4. A monopolist does not have a supply curve, neither does a monopolistic competitive firm or an oligopolist. But Figure 6.2 analyzes monopolistic competition with supply and demand curves! !! This coverage of market structures is entirely descriptive, with virtually no economic analysis. Where is the decision making with $MR=MC$ profit-maximizing output rule? Concerning this content area, economic analysis is necessary to present the principles, not this way where the student can memorize the descriptive economics on their notecards without learning any economics. Granted, the types of business ownership TEKS learning objective is necessarily descriptive and the text delivers here. But the lack of economic analysis in the coverage of market structures is a real weakness.
5. S428..."The factors of production – natural, human, capital, and entrepreneurial resources – are not distributed equally throughout the world." That statement is insufficient to meet the two part TEKS learning objective relating to the geographic significance of economic factors of production and yet that is fundamentally the text's coverage of this learning objective.

6. T351..."State and local governments also rely on property taxes"...implying the federal government generates tax revenues from property taxes? No! The tax discussions generally meet the first learning objective, although treatment of state and local revenue sources is relatively weak. Why even mention Jean-Baptiste Say..."supply creates its own demand"...in exposition of supply-side economics and fiscal policy strategies? That's a stretch for a history of thought course and inappropriate (confused and confusing) for a high school text, T355.

7. In discussion of decline in labor unions in recent decades, we encounter the negative public opinion explanation, T182, where author states, regarding the actions of union leaders, "others are thought to have used violence and other offensive tactics to maintain their power." Are thought?? Labor corruption and violence simply speculation without any evidence? Please, some honesty here. Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters never used "violence and other offensive tactics"?

8. On fiscal policy p. 356 it states the limitations of supply side economics but not the limitations of demand side. There is also not a mention of the Lafer Curve.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	Economics: Principles in Action	High School Economics

No Factual Errors Reported.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	America: Pathways to the Present	High School American History

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

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?
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.
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.
22. p. 354 T,S Second full paragraph has Secretary of State Seward “sen[d] 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.
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.
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.
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.

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.

27. p. 416 T,S 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.

28. p. 418 T,S 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.

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

30. p. 439 T,S “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.

31. p. 248 T,S 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.

32. p. 391 T,S 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.

33. p. 392 T,S 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.
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.
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.
36. p. 402 T,S Book errs when it claims Taft began segregation in federal offices. It was Wilson.
37. p. 457 T,S Lindbergh did not receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for flying across the Atlantic solo.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.”

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.
44. p. 578 T,S 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—.
45. p. 587 T,S 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.
46. p. 587 T “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.
47. p. 604 T “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.
48. p. 605 T,S 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.
49. p. 605 T “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.

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.
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 Germany.” 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.
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.
53. p. 661 T,S Adlai Stevenson is referred to as a senator from Illinois. He was not.
54. p. 681 T,S 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.
55. p. 682 T,S 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.
56. p. 737 T,S 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.
57. p. 741 T,S 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.
58. p. 755 T,S “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.

59. p. 795 T,S 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.
60. p. 796 T,S 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.
61. p. 803 T,S Book's coverage of the Tet Offensive lacks sufficient detail to properly depict the event's effect on American morale.
62. p. 804 T,S 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.
63. p. 804 T,S 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.
64. p. 807 T "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.
65. p. 809 T,S 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.
66. p. 896 T "American Heritage" archive bit has Clinton's term in office beginning in 1992. It began in 1993.

67. p. 900 T,S 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.
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.
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.
70. . 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.
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.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
77. p. 527 T,S 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.
78. p. 542 T,S 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.
79. p. 544 T,S 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.
80. p. 550 T,S “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.
81. p. 554 T,S 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.

82. p. 549 T,S Book actually claims that Huey Long “never used racial attacks” in his political rise in Louisiana. This is wrong.
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.
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.
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.
86. p. 739 T,S Most reliable numbers indicate the poverty rate in 1960 was nearer 33% than 20%.
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.
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.
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.
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.)

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.
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.
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.
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.
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.

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
McDougal Little	The Americans	High School American History

1. p. 203 T, S The second full paragraph overstates the extent of plains Indians’ dependence upon the buffalo. Even those tribes who evolved into semi nomadic activity in the mid-1700s did not abandon agriculture entirely, for example the Osage, Tonkawa, Wichita. The Sioux and Comanche were exceptions to this trend and did largely abandon agriculture.
2. p. 203 T, S The third full paragraph overstates the concept of "counting coup" as a part of intertribal combat. In the plains, the Sioux and Comanche were engaged in expansionism to gain control of buffalo range and horses. Horses emerged in these tribes as status symbols and a measure of a man. Access to the buffalo was critical to survival. Indian combat in these

conditions did become actual combat rather than the relatively non-violent feat of honor recounted in the text.

3. p. 206 T,S The book correctly identifies Helen Hunt Jackson as author of *A Century of Dishonor*, but writes about assimilation as if Jackson's views were distinct from it. They were not.
4. p. 207 T,S First full paragraph tells readers: "Tourists and fur traders shot buffalo for sport." This is true, but it is also true that once equipped with repeating weapons Plains Indians overhunted and engaged in hunting for the sport of it as well.
5. p.218 T, S The first full paragraph asserts that small farmers did better in the market place than the so-called "bonanza farms." This is true, however, the paragraph gives the impression that small farmers remained small. Farm tenancy was on the rise on the Plains as early as the 1880s, reaching 30-40% by the 1890s. Giant firms disappeared, but land consolidation on a smaller scale continued. This is only part of a larger failure of the book to deal properly with land tenancy as an issue generally.
6. p. 220 T,S A number of problems of interpretation and presentation exist on this page. The second full paragraph attempts to deal with the issue of greenbacks without a proper explanation. This is easily one of the hardest concepts for students to get, but it is also essential to their understanding of the Gilded Age. The book describes farmers repaying loans "in dollars worth more than the dollars they had borrowed." Why not introduce or assume students are familiar with the relationship between interest rates and the money supply? Why not explain that in the gold standard there is a finite amount of currency resulting in higher interest and low prices? In the fourth full paragraph, "Problems With the Railroads," the text fails to place in the proper context the rail companies' reasons for "overcharging" farmers. The railroads were in a volume business. They had high fixed costs and needed high volume to meet those costs. Farm products took up more space than heavier cargoes-- say, iron ore. Therefore, railroads charged farmers more to recoup the difference. In the fifth full paragraph, we are finally introduced to the concept of farm tenancy completely out of its proper context. The paragraph concludes-- "It was time for reform"-- as if a majority of Americans, let alone farmers, bought the reform agenda of the Populists. This is senseless dramatics suitable for cable news, not a history text.
7. p. 220 T,S The paragraph on the "Panic of 1893" seriously misstates the origins of the depression. First, investor confidence led to the crash in stocks, and this led to a run on gold. This the book gets right. The book gets it wrong by suggesting that purchases of silver caused government gold reserves to shrink. This was standard Cleveland administration doctrine to justify eliminating silver, but not necessarily the case. Further, the book implies that investors were present in the US. Most of the major investors in the American economy were foreign, particularly British. Their demand on gold reserves placed the government on the verge of a liquidity crisis resolved by financier J.P. Morgan. Morgan's intervention saved the dollar, but ensured continued gold standard practices, confirming the worst suspicions of those supporting inflation that a gold conspiracy existed. Morgan-- who has not been introduced in the book-- does not appear at this critical juncture.

8. p.222 T, S Under the heading "Silver or Gold," the text makes short work of the complexities of both the Populist movement and the forces which brought William McKinley to the presidency in 1896. The parties were "deeply divided," it reads, and then argues that the primary divisions were between Republicans and Democrats. In fact, *both* major parties had wings that supported some sort of inflation, and *leaders who favored the gold standard dominated both in 1896*. The book oversimplifies the picture to the point that it is only broadly congruent with actual events. We are told Republicans represented the "business owners and bankers of the industrialized Northeast." This is true, but the GOP also counted Midwestern farmers and many Northern factory workers as well in 1896. The book names Grover Cleveland correctly as a "gold bug," but fails to highlight which party he belongs to, or why it is important. Indeed, the coverage of political matters in the Gilded Age in this volume makes no effort to describe or define the parties. There are also repeated problems with clarity as the book tries to discuss the money issue without reference either to interest rates or the money supply. It says bimetallism "would make more money (but with less value per dollar.)" How? It doesn't say. Would not a dollar still be a dollar regardless of basis? Its buying power may diminish, but this is never explained in a straightforward manner. Then, from out of nowhere-- "Stepping into the debate, the Populist party. . ." enters the picture. The Populists had been around since 1892. Moreover, the Populists promoted a much broader agenda than simple inflation. None of this is covered anywhere, so the Populists appear to have congealed from some unclear source. President Cleveland, who was mentioned as a gold standard advocate, disappears from the text as the Democrats nominate Bryan. Finally, twice the book says "laborers" supported free silver. If this is to be taken as wage workers generally, it is not true. In the end, most wage voted with the Republicans out of fear of what an inflated currency will do to their fixed incomes.
9. p. 238 T,S "Farmers were especially affected by corruption in the railroads" the book announces as it moves on toward another discussion of the Grange in the context of railroads. It is a bit much to claim the railroads were "corrupt" in their dealings with farmers. As has been explained in reference to p. 220 above, the book completely fails to recognize the problems rail companies faced and how this affected their treatment of customers.
10. p. 239 T,S The same point as above holds true of the segment headed "Railroad Abuses." No effort is made to offer a factual explanation for the phenomenon of discriminatory freight rates. It is just a case of railroads being "corrupt" according to the book.
11. p. 239 T,S The segment headed "Interstate Commerce Act" could do with some greater nuance as well. It claims the ICC "reestablished the right of the federal government" to regulate the railroads. The federal government had not asserted this right in a regulatory manner prior to 1887. The ICC was a federal measure aimed to replace state Granger laws that had been eviscerated by the Supreme Court's decision in the *Wabash* case 1886. There is strong evidence that the railroads themselves craved some sort of regulation from the federal government by 1887. They desired it as relief to the patchwork of state laws and the dangers of cutthroat competition in hard times.

12. p. 243 T,S The book's description of the definition and origin of the holding company is off in three respects. First, it fails to point out that the holding company organization was designed to protect from regulation and lawsuit. Second, it places holding companies *before* the utilization of the trust chronologically. Third, it seems to imply that Morgan's creation of US Steel might have been the first holding company. It was in fact Rockefeller that invented the holding company idea after the Standard Oil trust was compromised by more aggressive regulation.
13. p. 246 T,S Regarding the origins and role of the American Railroad Union, the ARU was not the first "industrial" union. That was arguably the Knights of Labor. The book utterly fails to make the connection between the ARU and the Pullman situation, without which connection the whole story fails to make sense. This a frequent problem with the book in this and other sections, see below, p. 247.
14. p. 248 T,S Finally, the book addresses the interaction between the ARU and the events at Pullman in 1894. But, it also asserts that the economy was improving in 1894, which should have allowed Pullman to better pay his workers. This simply was not the case. The depression, which began in 1893, lingered into the latter years of the decade. Pullman's business is not going to pick up until the economic situation improves for the railroads, which delays any recovery for the sleeping car business.
15. p. 271 T,S "With employees no longer a source of campaign contributions, politicians turned to wealthy business owners. Therefore, the alliance between government and business became stronger than ever," begins the segment called "Business Buys Influence." This is a sweeping overgeneralization which implies two erroneous assumptions-- that enforced donations from placemen had been enough to finance the major parties prior to 1883 *and* that business had not make much of a financial impact on politics before. A loss of income for the parties does happen, but note that the bulk of federal jobs remain under patronage into the 20th Century and it falls apart. Business was involved influence buying from the earliest days of the republic. The book asserts that the Wilson-Gorman Tariff became law without Cleveland's signature. Can a bill become law without the president's assent? Only if a veto is overridden. Is that what happened? Moreover, what did it do? The whole discussion of the tariff is fraught with problems. The Democrats are said to oppose tariffs because "they increased prices." But how? In reality, the Democrats have strong laissez-faire reasons to oppose the tariff that they see as a special privilege. Many farmers supported the Democrats' crusade against the tariff because they saw it as a consumer tax that fell upon them. In addition, farmers produce faced tariff retaliation by the nations' leading trading partners in response to high American tariffs. The effect of such taxation upon the finances of farmers might have also added insight to earlier passages about the Farmers' Alliance and the Populists.
16. p. 283 T,S Describing Gilded Age schools, the book asserts: "Strict rules and physical punishment made many students miserable." Are our more lax schools any better at teaching? Is any child ever fully content with rules in a school environment? Balance, please. The book is pandering to its audience.

17. p. 207 T,S Heading 3 "The Battle of Wounded Knee" is misleading. The "battle" was in fact a massacre, and was called a battle primarily in its day. This gives the erroneous impression that the Sioux at Wounded Knee gave any meaningful resistance prior to the soldiers opening fire.
18. p. 348 T, S Regarding the sinking of the *Maine*, the book presents a mysterious tone-- "To this day, no one really knows why the ship exploded." Well, we do. The teacher's edition's "Connection's Across Time" blurb tells of research that has proven the *Maine* sank after an *internal* explosion.
19. p. 360-361 T,S Describing events leading to the independence of Panama, there are serious omissions. The book simply asserts that "negotiations broke down" between the US and Colombia over a possible canal zone. Then, according to the book, the Panamanians rebelled at the behest of Philippe Bunau-Varilla for no apparent reason. Then as they declared their independence, "nearly a dozen" American warships popped by for no apparent reason. In a broad way all this is true, but it seems this passage is too exculpatory to be *really* true. First, Colombia decided to up its price on acquisition of canal building rights. Then, the US broke off negotiations and instigated the Panamanian revolt, and it sent the naval vessels specifically to prevent Colombia's landing troops to hold onto Panama. Theodore Roosevelt did not boast later-- "I took Panama"-- for nothing. Lastly, the trxt needs to emphasize that the US had an extended lease on the canal zone. This country never "owned" it.
20. p. 363 T,S The book whitewashes Wilson's diplomacy in Latin America and the Caribbean as "missionary." In fact, Wilson's policies were motivated by his own racial prejudices as much as high ideals. "Wilson's policy pressured nations in the Western Hemisphere to establish governments," the book asserts. This certainly did not happen anywhere American forces intervened while Wilson was president.
21. p. 363 T,S Concerning the fate Mexican President Francisco Madero in 1913, the book omits American embassy involvement in Madero's overthrow.
22. p. 365 T,S Alvaro Obregon's rule in Mexico did not really "mark the beginning of reform." There was still considerable political violence in the nation, and Mexico came to be essentially a one-party state under the PRI.
23. p. 378 T,S The page has a copy of the Imperial German Government's notorious advertisement warning would be American passengers from Allied vessels. This is a good visual, but in the text immediately adjacent, the book asserts that Germany warned "any ship found in the waters around Britain would be sunk." This is not true. The warning on the same page plainly states that it applies only to British and allied shipping. Germany made an early effort to avoid attacking neutral vessels. As a part of its anti-submarine strategy, the UK responded by flying neutral flags on her merchant vessels. Frequently, the flag of choice was American, despite US government protests.
24. p. 383 T,S The book asserts in the first paragraph that the US utilized prefabricated shipbuilding in World War I. This did not happen until World War II.

25. p. 390 T,S The book describes the graduated income tax as being one "which taxed high incomes at a higher rate than low ones." This might mislead students into thinking that most Americans paid income taxes, which they did not until World War II. The point at which Americans had to pay income tax was \$3,000 for individuals, \$4,000 for married couples. \$3,000 was a princely sum in 1917.
26. p. 403 T,S As a legacy of the World War I, the book claims that it strengthened American military power. Well, for the time being, but not for the long run. It would be an error to argue that modern American power is rooted in anything other than World War II.
27. p. 356 T,S Map called "U.S. Imperialism, 1867-1906" has an error. On the caption for Samoa, the text describes a "hurricane" which damaged warships there. Hurricanes are the Atlantic and Gulf names for a type of storm called "typhoon" in the Pacific.
28. p. 404-405 T,S "Tracing Themes" spread on "America in World Affairs": In the segment, 1823-1898, "the United States extended its influence in territories such as Puerto Rico, Panama and Mexico." Panama and Mexico are nations, though Panama was not in the period.
29. p. 407 T,S "Standardized Test Practice": Map boundaries are incorrectly drawn for both Germany and Austria-Hungary. Question Number 2 has no correct answers. Answer J is selected as correct in the teacher's addition because the edition claims that Austria-Hungary and Russia "border[ed] on one of the war's two fronts" and this explains their high casualty rates. The casualties are high for both, but Austria-Hungary fought on three fronts-- in the East v. Russia; in the Balkans v. Serbia, Greece, and Romania; in Italy v. Italy.
30. p. 307 T,S The book argues that Progressives "struggled to make government more responsive to the people." Well, that depends upon how you define responsive or people. The Progressive reformers mistrusted too much democracy, seeing it as destructive of their goal-- properly identified in the book-- of "fostering efficiency." According to the text, the Progressives "aimed to return government to control of the people." Not only is this repetitive (it had just been asserted in the previous sentence), but it is misleading. But, this is the case with the book's coverage of Progressivism generally. Progressives were middle and upper middle class reformers generally who saw government as a vehicle to mediate the clashes between business and labor. They also saw government as a referee in economic and societal disputes with a mandate to keep order. Activist government is a hallmark of Progressivism, but it is not necessarily true they wanted government under "control of the people."
31. p. 310 T,S The "Historical Spotlight" segment on James S. Hogg utterly misinterprets Hogg's career and impact. It is a serious mistake to suggest that Hogg was a "Progressive." Texas Progressivism is very much rooted in the 20th Century rather than the late 19th. The 1880s-1890s, when Hogg rose in Texas politics, were still dominated by conservative Bourbon Democrats (which, had the book discussed them would have helped make the Populists make a lot more sense). Hogg's reform efforts were a response to Populism

and served to insulate the Texas Democratic party from a strong Populist challenge prior to 1894. By the early 20th Century, Hogg was a partner in the Texas Company and made millions in the oil business. This segment makes Hogg into something he was not, and it takes his accomplishments, advanced for his time, completely out of context.

32. p. 312 T,S The section "Reforming Elections" describes the adoption of the Australian, or secret, ballot as a Progressive reform. That it was, but the Progressives were not necessarily interested in power to the people here. The colored-ballot system that existed prior to the 1890s was eliminated in the South especially as a part of an overall effort of disfranchisement, aimed at culling black and poor white voters from the electorate and thereby destroying the GOP and Populists. A secret ballot was often intended to help remove illiterate people from the voting pool, and the secret ballot was often worded in such a difficult way as to eliminate the votes of the marginally literate who somehow failed to follow instructions. The section goes on to assert that by 1915 most states had established some sort of direct primary system for choosing candidates. There need to be two clarifications here so students don't think modern democratic practices emerged suddenly under the Progressives. First, some states-- Texas and the South, for instance-- created all-white Democratic primaries in this period. This made sure that what black voters remained after disfranchisement could not vote in the only election that mattered-- the Democratic primary. Second, the primary system that arose in the Progressive Era *did not* generally include a direct preferential primary for president. That is a development largely after 1968.
33. p. 319 T,S The text argues that the Sherman Act's "vague language" made the law difficult to enforce. This is not the case. The Supreme Court's deliberately narrow interpretation of "commerce" and Attorney General Richard Olney's half-hearted arguments led them to eviscerate the act in *U.S. v. E.C. Knight* (1895). The court's interpretation of the law, rather than the law's own words led to its being nearly useless in prosecuting trusts.
34. p. 324 T,S "In almost two terms as president, Roosevelt-- like most progressives-- failed to support civil rights for African Americans. He did, however, support a few individual African Americans." This failure was not a *mere lapse* on the part of TR and other Progressives. Roosevelt, and especially Wilson, actively opposed anything like black equality. For both men, and many other Progressives, African Americans were inferior human beings who must be managed and cared for by paternalistic whites. The failure of the book to own up to Progressivism's dark side is one of its most glaring errors.
35. p. 329 T,S In "Disputing Public Lands," some important facts are missing. To read it as is, Interior Secretary Ballinger was just a pro-business administrator interested in opening federal lands to business use. The controversy known as the Ballinger-Pinchot Affair involved Ballinger's deliberate leasing of choice federal timber, coal and iron lands to the Guggenheim interests, a former client from law practice in Seattle. This was a plain conflict of interest, which, while not illegal at the time, was pretty controversial. Ballinger could not have acted on the lands as he did without Taft's consent. Taft did not agree with Roosevelt's aggressive conservation efforts and thought them an abuse of presidential power.

36. p. 330 T,S Describing TR and Taft's efforts to gain the GOP nomination in 1912, the book overstates a point and in so doing makes a serious error. "The primary elections showed that Republicans wanted Roosevelt, but Taft had the advantage of being the incumbent. . . ." Yes, the primaries, where they were held and where they actually counted in selecting delegates, were for Roosevelt. But, considering there were so *few* primaries it is simply not possible to claim that "Republicans wanted Roosevelt" no matter how likable the text has made him. Moreover, the book makes it appear that incumbents win by default. Well, there are advantages, but they didn't get Hayes, Arthur, or Cleveland very far. *Why?* That's what matters in Taft's ability to hold on. The incumbency was important because Taft *had* patronage powers while Roosevelt *did not*. Taft could reward loyalty; TR could not. But, we've already dispatched the patronage system several chapters back, so the book does not explain the incident properly.
37. p. 333 T,S The biographical bit about Wilson is correct in saying he "spent time as a lawyer"-- a brief time, but is wrong that he magically became president of Princeton without an academic career. Most of Wilson's pre-political career was not in the law, but as a history professor.
38. p.334 T "History from Visuals" claims to interpret the graph shown in the student edition "Revenue from Individual Federal Income Tax, 1915-1995." Its interpretation is dead wrong. By relying purely on the little line across the graph and not upon factual information, the book misinterprets the data. That gives teachers the wrong answer, and they then pass it on to students. "(Students may infer that during the period 1915-1955 low tax revenues resulted in relatively low federal spending. In contrast, during the period 1955-1995, tax revenues increased dramatically as did federal spending.) Students may ask why taxes did not rise rapidly during World War II. Tell students that the war was largely financed by bonds, rather than tax revenues." There are a number of ways to explain the "low tax revenues" described prior to 1935. For one thing, relatively few people paid income tax; as late as 1939, only about 4 million were required to file. Second, deflation and economic hard times necessarily held back tax revenues. Relative to earlier periods federal spending ballooned dramatically, 1915-1919 and again 1932-1945. Why would the tax revenues be higher after 1955? First, during World War II, the income tax was expanded to include practically everyone. The modern withholding system was introduced in 1942 to improve compliance rates. After World War II, improved personal incomes and growing affluence contributed to growing revenues. From 1965 or so on, the book neglects the coming of working age for most Baby Boomers and the great inflation of the late 1960s-early 1970s. Tax revenues may not have risen quickly in World War II in absolute terms, but they did in relative terms. The tax rate also increased to a top bracket of 90% and an average of roughly 50%. Income taxation accounted for 76% of federal revenues during World War II and paid 45% of the war's costs. The text makes this sound almost negligible. The assertion that "bonds" financed the war needs to be tempered by making clear that ordinary people's purchase of War Bonds did little to finance the war. The bonds that financed the war were out of the ordinary person's price range and were snapped up by banks and corporations. This segment is misleading on so many counts that it does more harm than good.
39. p. 335 T,S The book simply does not "get" the relationship between Progressivism and segregation. Also, since it has never dealt with the

constituency and interest group dimensions of the two major parties, it leaves itself open to errors. Wilson "disappointed his Northern white and black supporters" on civil rights. This is absurd. The Democratic party had been advertised as the "white man's party" across the country since the 1850s. While sympathetic to immigrants, the Democratic party had no interest in civil rights, and because of the power of its Southern wing, was downright hostile to blacks, particularly under Wilson. Northern white Democrats, for the most part, probably could have cared less about whether or not rights of black people were safeguarded. The notion that Wilson had large or even significant numbers of black supporters is also plain wrong. African Americans when and where they could vote, overwhelmingly voted Republican until 1932!

40. p. 335 T,S Given the above correction, the assertion that ". . .Wilson retreated on civil rights once in office" is silly. Wilson may have promised to "treat blacks equally" and oppose lynching, but this was standard paternalistic talk used by many whites of the period. They deplored lynching because they deplored violence generally. He may have spoken of treating people fairly, but full equality-- the end of segregation and disfranchisement-- nowhere inhabited Wilson's own understanding of such a "promise."
41. p. 415 T, S The immigration restriction laws of 1924 reduced the annual number of immigrants admitted to 164,000, not 150,000.
42. p. 423 T,S Describing Coolidge's policies of tax reduction: "Reducing income taxes meant that people had more money in their pockets." This is not true in the 1920s for three reasons: 1.) only a small percentage of people even paid income tax; 2.) reduction of the income tax was off-set by increased tariffs which resulted in higher prices that consumers paid; 3.) the book is internally inconsistent when it claims later that declining consumer demand helped cause the Great Depression (which is true). If incomes increased due to lower taxation and higher wages, what happened to purchasing?
43. T,S The segment on the "Scopes Trial" has several errors/omissions. First, Tennessee was not the first state to pass an anti-evolution statute. The move had been successful elsewhere earlier in the 1920s. Second, the decision of John Scopes to teach evolution in Dayton was a project by town leaders to gain publicity for the town. They decided to answer an ACLU solicitation for a client for a test case. Third, the case degenerated into a media circus fueled by public debate between Bryan and Darrow over the existence of God, and Scopes was soon forgotten.
44. 446-447 T,S "Schools and the Mass Media Shape Culture" makes a series of errors in interpretation of the history of public education. High school enrollments did rise dramatically, but a high school education was not that common into the 1940s. Only 20% of Americans attended, let alone graduated from, high school in the period. High schools "began offering a broad range of courses" to supplement the more rigorous college prep high school curriculum. This is true, but this trend was fueled by many elitist assumptions of education schools and administrators that roughly 20% of Americans qualified as college material, and under no circumstances would American society ever need that many college graduates. High schools increasingly tracked students based upon IQ testing methods now deemed flawed. Families of the working class or immigrants were typically tracked

away from a good liberal education by such methods. This is the dark side of Progressive efficiency at work again.

45. p. 449 T,S "More About. . ." segment on Charles Lindbergh is a good example of determined heroification. It says as a part of efforts for neutrality, Lindbergh "delivered a speech in 1941 that many considered anti-Semitic." Claiming that Jews controlled affairs in Britain and that only they could possibly want the US in the war *is* anti-Semitic. The book also claims that he supported the war after Pearl Harbor, and that he "flew combat missions in the Pacific." I am pretty sure he asked for and was refused a commission by Franklin Roosevelt.
46. p. 424 T "History from Visuals" interprets the photo of airline flight attendants in a strange way. Telling the teacher to ask students why the flight attendants might have been all white and female, the book offers the suggestion that this reflected the idea that "only whites could afford to fly." In truth, scarcely *anyone* in the 1920s could afford to fly. The better question might be why is it that the flight attendants were all *women*.
47. p. 442 T,S Margaret Sanger is depicted as a lonely warrior for women's reproductive rights, but the book neglects to point out that to gain more favorable attention for her cause, she adopted eugenics and control of undesirable genetic traits as a justification for birth control.
48. p. 531 T "Differentiating Instruction" segment at bottom incorrectly identifies Theodore Roosevelt as being Hitler's contemporary for a comparison exercise.
49. p. 532 T,S "Japan Invades Manchuria" map repeats an earlier mistake by dating Japan's take over of Korea in 1910. It was a result of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905.
50. p. 546 T,S Photo in lower left corner does not match caption.
51. p. 551 T,S The Tripartite Pact is not the origin of the term Axis. It instead dates from Hitler and Mussolini's alliance of 1936.
52. p. 553 T,S The book claims that in June, 1941 FDR gave a shoot on sight order to American ships in the Atlantic, allowing them to attack German submarines. This is not correct; neither is the same assertion in the "More About. . ." inset in the teacher's edition. This order was a product of the German "attack" on the *USS Greer* in September.
53. p. 564 T,S "After much protest, African Americans did finally see combat in the last year of the war." No, there were African American units engaged in combat at least as early as July, 1943 by the book's own telling, see Tuskegee Airmen, p. 573 T,S.
54. p. 572 T,S American forces encountered Vichy French forces at the North Africa landings, not Germans, as is implied by the text.
55. p. 573 T "More About. . ." segment on Mussolini is in error. Mussolini was freed from prison in 1944 by German paratroopers and taken back to Germany. Hitler later used Mussolini as a puppet ruler of northern Italy

which had been under German occupation since Italy joined the Allies in 1943.

56. p. 573 T,S Book describes the 141st Regiment, 36th Division as an "all Chicano" unit. It may have been all-Hispanic, but the term "Chicano" has *never* been the commonly accepted designation for this ethnic group in Texas. This is true in Texas today, but was certainly the case in the 1940s. Those in the regiment probably considered themselves "Mexican-American."
57. p. 584 T,S The book is incorrect when it says Hiroshima and Nagasaki were military targets. Neither had any strategic value; they were chosen since they had not yet been bombed and the effects of the atomic bomb could be tested. The book should also balance its coverage by pointing out that US incendiary raids on Tokyo in March, 1945 killed nearly 900,000. This is significantly more than the two atomic attacks put together.
58. p. 602 T,S The American public was not "furious" over the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1945. Only in retrospect, once the Cold War was underway, did this matter as much to Americans as it might have in 1939-1940. The book also states that Stalin was angry with the US for keeping the atomic bomb's development a "secret." The bomb was no secret to Stalin, though the US tried to keep it so.
59. p. 607 T,S As a prelude to the Berlin Crisis of 1948, the book asserts that the British, American and French occupiers had a "legal right" to unify their zones and divide Germany. This is not the case. Germany was not to be divided, but disputes arose about the functioning of the zones of occupation with each other. The US, UK, and France's decision to unify their zones was seen as provocative by Stalin, for whatever reason it was done, and this helped precipitate the crisis and airlift.
60. p. 611 T,S Book again incorrectly claims Japan annexed Korea in 1910 instead of 1905.
61. p. 611 T,S "World Stage" inset reads: "During the 1970s, a number of nations, including the United States" recognized the communist government of China as the legitimate government. This text makes it sound as though the US was part of a trend in this regard. This is hardly the case. The US was among the *last* of the world's major players to recognize the PRC.
62. p. 615 T,S The term "stalemate" is a bit exaggerated. The purpose of UN intervention was to assure South Korea's sovereignty, which was assured. The "war" technically is not over, but the purposes were achieved. That Truman and MacArthur failed when they overreached those purposes is true enough, but it hardly qualifies as a stalemate when the original goal of the operation was achieved.
63. p. 729 T,S "Interact With History" poses situation in 1965, then tells students "the president imposes a draft." The draft was ongoing from 1940-1973. Johnson did not impose a draft, he utilized and in 1966 expanded the existing one.
64. p. 743 T,S "More About. . ." segment on the draft says the 1969 lottery "eliminated all student deferments." That is not true.

65. p. 748-749 T,S Mistakes and oversights exist in coverage of the Tet Offensive. First, the North Vietnamese army also participated in the offensive. Second, US casualties alone were roughly 2,500 in the Tet action, so it is highly doubtful that combined US and ARVN casualties were only 3,000. Third, polling data vary, but there is an indication that a plurality of Americans opposed the war by August, 1967 when the surtax was announced. In March, 1968 when LBJ announced his retirement it was a majority.
66. p. 755 T,S Henry Kissinger was a German immigrant, not an "emigrant."
67. p. 616 T,S The book offers figures that are statistically and chronologically incorrect for membership in the Communist Party. At its height, in August, 1939, the CPUSA reported a membership of 100,000. That number collapsed dramatically with the announcement of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The CPUSA was attractive to many who felt that capitalism could not defeat the Depression and was not strong enough in its opposition to fascism. Most of these members dropped away when Stalin made a deal with Hitler and revealed his cynical side. By the end of World War II, there were fewer than 10,000 members of the CPUSA, and the organization was so thoroughly infiltrated by the FBI by the 1960s that its undercover agents represented nearly half the party membership.
68. p. 620 T,S "[Joseph McCarthy] was always careful to do his name-calling only in the Senate." McCarthy's first major accusation, not by name but with spurious numbers, occurred in public at a Republican fundraiser in Wheeling, W. Va., 1950.
69. p. 621 T,S Book asserts that laws forbidding advocacy of the "violent overthrow" of the government "clearly violated the constitutional right of free speech." In the 1940s-1950s, this was by no means "clear," and the US Supreme Court does not rule otherwise until the 1960s. Even then, advocacy is distinguished as protected speech, which actually trying to overthrow the government is not protected. The point is there was no such understanding of the constitution at the time, and the book has judged the past too heavily by present-day conventions of "freedom of speech," which are themselves somewhat divorced from actual legalities.
70. 627 T,S It is likely not true that Eisenhower wanted the U-2 flights stopped. The U-2 program represented an area of pronounced technological superiority for the US over the Soviet Union.
71. p. 638 T,S The segment on the 1948 election has oversights/errors. The book explains fairly well, the Dixiecrats' bolt from the Truman ticket, but does not explain why Henry Wallace is running on the left. Wallace was upset with Truman's confrontational line toward the Soviet Union and stern tactics toward labor in 1946. The book asserts that Truman called the 80th Congress into special session and "challenged it. . .[to pass] elements of the Democratic Party platform. . . ." Yes, but Truman's reason for doing so was because the Republican platform was so similar. He was calling their bluff, and they played right into the trap he'd set for them.
72. p. 637 T,S Fourth full paragraph, sentence beginning "In September, 1946. . . ." This is not the correct story regarding the civil rights commission. It was not a delegation of black leaders, but rather an interracial presidential

commission on civil rights that made these recommendations in a report called *To Secure These Rights* in 1947. This was the basis of Truman's civil rights program.

73. p. 640 T "More About. . ." segment on Eisenhower's civil rights "record" only gets the Little Rock issue half right. Eisenhower's lukewarm support of integration was well known in the South, and in 1956, he had ignored Texas governor Allan Shivers's efforts to prevent integration in Texas. This emboldened Faubus.
74. p. 662 T "Tracing Themes" uses "Chicano" as interchangeable with "Mexican-American." It is not. "Chicano" in its 1960s usage, and even to a point now, connotes militancy. It is *not* widely accepted in the Hispanic community, in Texas anyway.
75. p. 671 T,S Book explains the significance of Kennedy's perceived sympathy to King's family in bringing out the black vote for the Democrats in the "Midwest and "South." Yes, in the Midwest, it was critical. In the South, the vast majority of African Americans *could not vote* in 1960, so it made very little difference to getting out the black vote.
76. p. 687 T,S Fourth paragraph states that the Kennedy-Johnson ticket won Texas in 1960 by "a few thousand votes." This is incorrect. The Democratic slate won by 45,000 votes.
77. p. 529 T,S The book uses the word "totalitarian" repeatedly in discussing fascism, communism and Japanese militarism. Academicians have largely dropped the word since the 1980s. It does not have intellectual credibility because in this context it lumps together divergent philosophies of government together as the same. They simply were not. Unless the differences between Hitler's view of the state and Stalin's are explained, there's now way to understand World War II. Since there has been no meaningful discussion of Karl Marx's political theory in the book, students and teachers are ill-equipped to deal critically with this. Beyond the theoretical problems with the notion of "totalitarian" government there are practical problems. No government has ever had *complete* control over its citizens. Even modern states must wrestle with their citizens' ability to inform themselves, express themselves, and the like through modern media sources. An Orwellian world has not emerged, nor is it likely to given the trends. Modern scholarship about Nazism and Stalinism have emphasized the extent to which the leader presided over an apparatus, from the daily control of which he was largely disconnected. This is particularly true of Hitler. The word "totalitarian" needs to be dropped for it is a Cold War relic with little meaning beyond propaganda value.
78. p. 551 T,S The "Point, Counterpoint" segment needs to be drastically overhauled. Based off the teacher edition thought questions-- i.e., "How did Charles Lindbergh risk his reputation?"-- it appears that Lindbergh's role in the neutrality debate is being used as a morality play about a person speaking their conscience despite risk to themselves. This is a perversion of the whole notion of citizenship permeating the state curriculum. Lindbergh opposed US intervention because of his *sympathy* with the Nazis; he considered efforts to aid the UK as part of a plot of international Jewry. To portray Lindbergh as a lonely voice calling for peace is an obscene cover-up. If Lindbergh must be used in this segment, *tell the truth*.

79. p. 602 T,S The book continues the absurd use of the term "totalitarian." Whatever their obvious evils, communism and fascism cannot properly be conflated together *and* the logical impossibility of a regime which totally controls its citizens is primarily the stuff of propaganda. If anything, the word is an artifact itself, suitable for analysis as a concept from the period.
80. p. 734 T,S It is highly unlikely that Kennedy would have withdrawn from Vietnam had he lived. These comments attributed to him were pretty standard for LBJ as well in 1964. They *do not* mean that the US was going to withdraw. Kennedy had the same advice and advisors that Johnson will inherit in 1963. He also had the same political liabilities-- that is a possible strong GOP challenge in 1964 based on his weak record of fighting communism. This would have forced him to make difficult political choices had he wished to leave Vietnam, something Kennedy was loathe to do as evidenced by his civil rights policy. Combined with its treatment of Kennedy's civil rights actions, *Americans* distorts Kennedy into a figure above reproach that he simply was not.
81. p. 751 T,S Book describes Richard Nixon as "nearly forgotten" by 1968. This is utter nonsense. Nixon had reinvented himself as an elder statesman by 1968. He was hardly forgotten.
82. p. 753 T,S When describing George Wallace's appeal to Northern white voters in 1968, the book pulls punches. There were plenty of people who voted for Wallace up North for racial reasons, with the riots a mere pretext.
83. p. 639 T,S Fifth full paragraph some balance needed. In fairness to Richard Nixon, the "secret slush fund" was neither secret, nor a slush fund. The fund was a pool of money to underwrite Nixon's political travels outside California. Both Eisenhower and the Democratic nominee, Stevenson, had similar funds. While controversial, the fund violated no laws.
84. p. 682 T,S Book fails to recognize the Kennedy Administration's basic policy toward civil rights-- avoid any confrontation with the South, keep demonstrations to a minimum, and avoid clashes with Congress over civil rights policy. The result is that the Kennedy Administration did *very little* to help the cause, and indeed actually inhibited it. Robert Kennedy's Justice Department (third full paragraph) may have "investigat[ed] racial injustices," but it also ordered the FBI to spy upon movement leaders and attempt to disrupt movement functions. Again, this book places hero-making over the truth.
85. p. 683 T,S "Now and Then" segment makes history "interesting" for students, I guess. There is no credible evidence that John Kennedy's death was the result of a conspiracy. Many, if not most, academic historians accept the broad conclusions of the Warren Commission-- Oswald the sole gunman, no conspiracy. School textbooks should not propagate conspiracy theories.
86. p. 702 T,S "A Developing Civil Rights Movement" needs to cite the increasing power of African Americans within the Democratic party under the New Deal coalition as one of the forces contributing to the birth of the civil

rights movement. The section also again misrepresents the FEPC by claiming FDR "issued a presidential directive prohibiting racial discrimination by all federal agencies and all companies that were engaged in war work." This simply was not true, not of the FEPC or *any other action* taken by Roosevelt.

87. p. 703 T,S Describing the reaction of Southern governors to *Brown* the book says: "In Texas, the governor promised to comply. . . ." That *is not true*. Allan Shivers used the decision to fire enthusiasm in his race for reelection, taking a hostile stand toward integration.
88. p. 704 T,S The Montgomery Bus Boycott is out of chronological order. I am not a stickler for chronology, but in a situation, like civil rights, where events clearly influence events, it might be worth sticking to so that students see context. Coverage makes a familiar mistake in that it fails to point out that Parks's defiance, her arrest, and the subsequent boycott were planned in advance by Montgomery black leaders lead by E.D. Nixon.
89. p. 708 T,S *Brown* case "Historic Decisions" layout has some problems. In the introduction ,the book reads: ". . .Topeka, Kansas, like all Southern elementary school systems. . ." was segregated. Three issues here: 1.) Kansas is not in the South; 2.) *Brown* was one of four cases decided together from disparate parts of the country to make a point about segregation being a national problem. While multiple cases are mentioned on p. 709, there is no explanation; 3.) a student might imply that middle and high schools were not segregated by this sentence.
90. p. 710 T,S The book asserts that the fate of the freedom riders "shock[ed] the Kennedy administration into action." The passage properly implies indifference by president and attorney general to the demonstrations, but fails to convey the hostility that was there also. As for "action," well, wait until p. 711.
91. p. 711 T,S Photo of bus burning in Anniston, AL has incorrect date. The date is 1961, not 1967.
92. p. 712 T,S Narrative of the Birmingham demonstrations reads: "On April 20, King posted bail and began planning. . . ." King *was not* the primary planner at Birmingham. Ralph Abernathy and 16th Street Baptist Church were the organizational energy behind the protests. The SCLC and King were invited to participate.
93. p. 713 T,S Wallace's confrontation with federal officials in the "schoolhouse door" is another example of the textbook's whitewash of the Kennedy administration's civil rights record. A deal was made with Wallace in which he promised to allow peaceful integration if he could personally block the entering black students, make a calm, dignified speech and then be superseded by federal authority. The Kennedy administration granted these requests for a choreographed television spectacle that built Wallace's strength in Alabama, but also made him a national figure and offered him a chance to appear a more sympathetic personage in the rest of the nation. As a result, in 1964 Wallace will garner unexpectedly high support in Northern primaries against LBJ, and in 1968, do the same in a three-way presidential race.

94. p. 716 T "Historical Spotlight" regarding voting restrictions incorrectly argues that Southern states based disfranchisement upon the Tenth Amendment. Article I Section 4 of the US Constitutions gives states the power necessary to determine voting qualifications. This was the basis. The Tenth Amendment has not been seriously litigated.
95. p. 716 T,S The depiction of "Bloody Sunday," March 7, 1965 in Selma is wrong on some points. At LBJ's request, King unilaterally cancelled a march scheduled for that date to avoid violence. King was not present at "Bloody Sunday." However, many of the SNCC volunteers refused to abide by King's decision, seeing him as an interloper in the situation. They were the ones who marched. The shocking spectacle on TV gave Johnson the political leverage he needed to ask for a voting rights act.
96. p. 721T,S Sirhan Sirhan is incorrectly identified as Jordanian. He was a Palestinian.
97. p. 722 T,S Assertion that the Johnson Administration "ignored" the Kerner Report is not true. Fair Housing Act (1968) and the improvements to the Civil Rights Act that same year (given in the *very next* paragraph) undercut the book's telling of the story.
98. p. 712 T,S Last sentence implies that Kennedy finally recognized the need for the civil rights act after Birmingham. This is nonsense. Kennedy did not commit any serious effort towards passage until the last months of his life, if ever.
99. p. 720 T,S It would be more accurate to say that SNCC under Carmichael expelled whites rather than refrained from "recruiting whites."
100. p. 466 T "More About. . ." segment on Alfred E. Smith incorrectly asserts that the Ku Klux Klan led opposition to his presidential bid in 1928. The Klan of the 1920s was moribund by 1928, however, the things they stood for were not. It is also important to point out that Smith's opposition to, and personal flouting of, Prohibition.
101. p. 469 T,S One hopes never to see it, but it always pops back up. "The stock market crash signaled the beginning of the Great Depression. . . ." After a fairly good bit of background, the text makes the same mistake everyone else does about the causes of the Depression. Arguably the Depression began in 1919 with the collapse of agriculture. Arguably it was present in weak real estate markets and lowered consumer spending by 1926-1927. The stock market crash *is not* a cause of the Depression, and is really more a symptom of economic ills than a cause.
102. p. 469 T "History from Visuals" inset describes a British poster and claims it is from the "National Government Party." There's no such thing. In British political parlance, "the Government" means the leadership of the party in power. This would have been either the Conservative or Labor party. I don't know which when it was made, but it was not the National Government Party.
103. p. 492 T,S NRA was not intended "to ensure fair competition." Indeed, it was intended to rationalize away competition in order to promote recovery. The book does not explain *how* such a scheme was to be enforced. It was

primarily a public relations campaign designed to convince consumers to put pressure on businesses to comply with codes.

104. p. 518 T,S The "Now and Then" insert about Social Security, as well as the book's meager coverage (utterly disconnected from related legislation of the Second New Deal) of the reform fail to mention the key element of the program that make its future such an issue today. The generation that began to receive benefits in 1935 had never paid *in* to Social Security. Therefore, the working generation *pays* for the retired generation, *and* the retired generation generally gets back far more than they ever paid in. Most people don't get this about Social Security and they aren't going to get it any better after reading this book, either.
105. p. 466 T,S The text asserts that Hoover had "one major advantage"-- the Republican record of prosperity. There's a lot more to Hoover than this indicates. Hoover had a decided advantage in 1928-- he was universally admired and respected in the US and the world. The text implies that Hoover's only credentials were his connections to Harding and Coolidge. It probably is the other way around.
106. p. 475 T,S Despite their problems in the Depression, Americans "emphasized the importance of family unity." On *The Waltons*, perhaps, but most people faced stark choices. Divorces increased and desertions of families by parents increased. The birthrate plummeted. Many adult and teen males left their families and traveled long distances to find work. Sure family was important-- perhaps more so than now, but the facts just stated remain. Modern students have unfortunately had to grapple with these sorts of family issues, keeping their presence in the Depression era a secret makes the period even more remote from them than it needs to be.
107. p. 481 T "Tracing Themes" asserts that Hoover was a devout believer in *laissez faire*. This is ridiculous. Hoover had read Keynes at the end of World War I. He was as aware as any of Keynes' theories. He had also proposed stimulus spending in the event of an economic downturn while he served as secretary of commerce under Harding and Coolidge. Conservative Republicans viewed Hoover with profound suspicion for these unorthodox viewpoints.
108. p. 591 T,S Under economic gains section, the book mentions the 35% increase in wages, but needs to make clear that 25% of that was after inflation.
109. p. 635 T,S The book characterizes situation found by employed women with end of the war-- "Many were reluctant to give up their newfound independence when their husbands returned." This may well have been true, but the majority of those who found work in the war years *did* return home. This needs to be added to make a dual point. Many women wanted to continue working, but societal pressures were strong that they should not.
110. p. 660 T,S Describing the extent of poverty despite the poverty of the 1950s, the book asserts that "nearly one out of every four" Americans lived in poverty in 1960. The correct figure is nearer 33%.
111. p. 689 T,S The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act is described as "the first major federal aid package for education in American

- history." This is simply not true. The National Defense Education Act (1958), which was ignored by the book, was the first such measure.
112. p. 693 T,S The percentage of those living in poverty is incorrect. It was 33%. The Great Society was also *not* the chief contributor to the emerging budget deficit; it was the war in Vietnam that led to the deficit, q.v. comments on p.692 above. The US government ran a balanced budget in 1965 even as the War on Poverty and Great Society programs emerged.
113. p. 864 T,S Discussing NAFTA's passage, the book correctly identifies President Clinton as a critical figure, but the originator of the treaty was George Bush. Also, the book fails to explain what NAFTA was and how it would work. It, like the health care plan discussed on p. 861, is just some controversial thing Clinton wanted to do. The teacher edition's "More About" segment claims that "Democrats and labor advocates" opposed the treaty, as did "some Republicans." There was *bipartisan* support and opposition. Later description of the WTO is vague to the point of meaninglessness. What does the WTO do? Why would people oppose/support it? In truth, the book has never done well with the concept of world trade and its effects on the US economy, so a foundation is not laid for students to deal with these issues in the 1990s.
114. p. 813 T,S The book has so far rarely made assertions that were flat wrong. Mostly, mistakes are the result of a lack of nuance or errors in presentation. The "Economic Background" insets speak of a "1980s Texas Oil Boom." There was not one. Oil prices plunged in the 1980s, plunging Texas into a deep recession. The prosperity these insets discuss belonged to the 1960s-1970s. The 1990s increase in oil prices did not do much for the Texas economy, which was in recovery largely because of its new diversification since the disaster of the 1980s.
115. p. 691 T,S Text reports that the Warren Court "banned prayer in public school." This overstates the court's rulings. The court banned state-sanctioned school prayer, the use of designated times in the school day for all to pray, and teachers and principals leading students in prayer. Individual students, so long as they are not disruptive, may pray whenever they feel like it. Religious student groups cannot be denied access, etc. The suggestion that the Court banned prayer in school under Warren is a canard of unscrupulous politicians and preachers.
116. p. 325 T,S W.E.B. DuBois is permitted hero status here, but the book omits the reasons why much of his work remained ignored until after 1963. He became a communist and left the US. That is not shared, apparently because it would make him less heroic. The point is that DuBois commitment to civil rights was so strong that when it appeared the US might never progress, he changed ideologies. Even heroes have flaws and are complicated beings. Most history textbooks, this one included, do not let students see that.
117. p. 603 T,S "Key Player" bit on Harry Truman incorrectly has him going broke after World War II. It was in the depression immediately following World War I.

118. p. 241-243 T,S Discussion of Andrew Carnegie is so bent on turning him into a hero that it overlooks key elements of his business strategy, social thought, and later completely avoids any possibility of his involvement in the Homestead Strike.
119. p. 243 T,S "Key Player" segment presents John Rockefeller more as a mistreated child turned philanthropist and good father than the hard-bitten businessman he was. No mention is made of the ruthless competitive techniques and his iron hand against labor, such as the Ludlow Massacre.
120. p. 583 T,S "Key Player" inset on Douglas MacArthur exaggerates considerably when it states that he "was arguably the most brilliant Allied strategist of World War II." This point is *very arguable*; so much so, it should not be made. MacArthur's own poor decisions helped insure the loss of the Philippines to a smaller Japanese force. Indeed, had MacArthur been anyone else in this situation, there's a pretty decent body of evidence out there that Franklin Roosevelt would have found some other use for a man of his talents. The only reason he was not moved out was that he presented a possible Republican challenger for the president in 1944. George Marshall and Omar Bradley each could be arguably a better strategist and certainly a better representative of the uniformed services of a democracy. As far as Allied strategists go, it would be a tough argument to claim that MacArthur could shade Georgi Zhukov.
121. p. 750 T "More About. . ." on Robert Kennedy does not make mention of the turnabout RFK took from 1966-1968. As his brother's attorney general he had authorized FBI spying on the civil rights movement and had also done little to advance the movement's goals. He was also instrumental in advising his brother and LBJ to take a firm stand in Vietnam.

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	The American Republic	High School American History

No errors reported. However, one reviewer only evaluated this textbook.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt, Rinehart, Winston	The American Nation	High School American History

No errors reported. However, one reviewer only evaluated this textbook.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
McDougal Littell	Patterns of Interaction	High School World History

1. p. 489 – In “Different Perspectives: The Legacy of Columbus,” it says that “Others claim they [Columbus’ voyages] were the beginnings of an era of widespread cruelty and bloodshed.” While this claim is debatable, the near-exclusion of the cruelty and bloodshed that occurred before the arrival of the voyages is misleading. For example on page 486, the widespread human sacrifice practiced by the Aztecs, which alienated surrounding tribes to say the least, receives only this: “They [other tribes] hated their harsh practices, including human sacrifice.” *Harsh* practices? Forced labor is harsh; cutting someone’s heart out while they are still alive demands more (Mayan and Toltec human sacrifice and the role it played in their demise is absent as well). Further, “Cortes convinced these natives to fight on his side”, as if they needed much persuading by Cortes. Lastly, “the invisible warrior that marched alongside the Spaniards – disease,” and the diseases Europeans had brought with them to the Americas.” This could leave students with the impression that Cortes rounded up infected soldiers along with casks of diseased material, to be spread throughout the New World. In other words, *intentionally*.
2. p. 489 – same section. Suzan Shown Harjo is listed as a “Native American” a term as historically inaccurate as was “Indian.” In her introduction, she “disputes the so-called benefits that resulted from Columbus’s voyages.” The problem here is that the introduction is written by the publisher, not the person espousing the viewpoint. The publisher did not view the pros or cons of any other viewpoint as “so-called.” If that viewpoint is to be presented, let it be by the partisans, not the publisher.
3. p. 489 – same section. Harjo proclaims that the Europeans committed “genocide and ecocide.” Genocide is defined (by Merriam Webster’s) as: “the deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political or cultural group.” With generally accepted definitions of genocide, such as Auschwitz and Rwanda, the people were overwhelmed with superior force in a limited amount of time, and no change in their behavior could have prevented it from happening. To say the same with indigenous Americans, who had 500 years, and to ignore the role indigenous behavior played (human sacrifice), is to use the term “genocide” loosely. George Orwell warned a long time ago what happens when we loosely use words -- like the trend of labeling any injustice where people die genocide – those strong words will not be there when we really need them. Again, intentionality is a point, and 500 years does not compare to ten, five, or one. Also, human sacrifice is not listed as genocide; wouldn’t it qualify? “Ecocide” goes undefined and uncontested. Implied by Harjo is that plowing the ground is raping the Earth, but the slash and burn clearing of Rainforest by the indigenous goes unmentioned. And yes, it is her opinion, but it goes uncontested, undefined, and set in bold, twice-high type.

4. p. 495 – “Spotlight on Slavery.” “Slavery has existed in numerous societies around the world.” While “numerous” means “consisting of great numbers of units,” it could be inferred by a student that only dozens of societies practiced slavery, instead of the more accurate “universal” or “near-universal.” Further, “Race was not always a factor in slavery” leaves students with the impression that it usually was, but not always, i.e. there were exceptions. The problem here is that race as a factor usually was the exception, not the rule. Availability, ease of obtainment and profitability were much more significant factors. Slavery in the U.S., where race was a factor, is a drop in the bucket when the entire 10,000 years of slavery is considered. Thus, there is an implication that what was a modern development in slavery was the typical experience (Also, D’inesh D’Souza in *The End of Racism* makes a strong argument that race was not a significant factor, at least as most think of it, in the U.S. until *after* the Civil War).
5. p. 501 – The Columbian Exchange picture, listed under “Global Impact: Food Exchange” lists diseases as well as food. Diseases are not food, and while the written explanation on p. 500 explains it better, it seems eliminating “food exchange” and letting it stand as “Columbian Exchange” would be more accurate. Yellow Fever and Hookworm are two typical diseases that were exchanged and are not included. No diseases are listed, such as syphilis and yaws, as coming to Europe from the New World; while they weren’t as deadly as the diseases coming the other way, students may be left to think that the New World was disease free.
6. p. 647 – Malthus and Ricardo were capitalists, the ideas for which they are mentioned were their central contributions to economics, and their ideas made sense at the time, (as the book alludes), “The predictions of Malthus seemed to be coming true in the 1840’s, their ideas have largely been disproved.” There is not mention, in particular, that the Malthusian predictions of mass famine have simply been wrong. To not mention this allows the student to think that they are true.
7. p. 648 – “Socialism grew out of an optimistic view of human nature, a belief in progress, and a concern for social justice.” How does one consider ‘optimistic’ the metaphysical view that man is so calloused toward his neighbor, that unless the government – by vote or by gun – forces him to help, that society will collapse, the poor will starve, etc.? On p. 647 it mentions that capitalist philosophers believed that “the flow of commerce in the world market without regulations – the economy would prosper.” And the people? Left out of this equation, apparently. In reality, these philosophers knew, as Bernard Mandeville put it, that “Private vices lead to public benefits.” For balance, the plan for “the people” should be mentioned for capitalism, as well as socialism, particularly since history has proved that it has worked so much better at uplifting the poor.
8. p. 636 – Robert Fulton is listed immediately after the definition of “entrepreneur – a person who organizes, manages and takes the risk of business.” It then explains that he “ferried passengers up and down New York’s Hudson River.” I’m not sure what risk he took, as he had a 30-year government enforced monopoly, ensuring that no one else could ferry passengers – not much of a risk. Not mentioned is Cornelius Vanderbilt, who, through innovations and ingenuity both in technology and marketing,

out competed Fulton, who refused to innovate (why innovate when the government guarantees you no competition?.) Through his partner, Vanderbilt sued and won in the Supreme Court (Gibbons v. Ogden), breaking Fulton's monopoly. Vanderbilt went on to have the same success in trans-Atlantic voyages, out competing with both a British and American firm that were subsidized by the government. After this success, he accomplished the same in railways. Seems like if there is space to mention Matthew Boulton, there is space to mention Vanderbilt.

9. p. 638-640 – There are 13 paragraphs on the perils of industrialization and four on its benefits. The benefits are only listed, not explained in any comparable depth to the perils. Student conclusion? Industrialization had a negative impact on a society that was probably better off farming. And while factory work could certainly be dangerous, farm work, from which these workers were often coming, could be incredibly dangerous as well.

10. p. 642 – “Connect to Today: Child Labor.” No one denies that child labor was not where children should have been and that the hours were quite excessive. In the connection with today, it is pointed out that many corporations have moved their manufacturing operations overseas to poor countries (no mention is made that this is largely due to unions artificially inflating wages of tasks – is it really worth \$18.00 an hour to sew a shirt together? It should be a clue when a corporation can ship materials half way around the world, pay for it to be assembled, ship it back, and still do it for less than it takes to pay someone here in America to assemble it). “They [children] are unprotected by child labor laws” (no mention is made of whether their parents are “protecting” them from such labor). “For mere pennies an per hour, children...stitch soccer balls...” Channel One ran a story last year in which they interviewed a 12-year old boy in India who stitched together soccer balls. While they mentioned he should be in school instead, they noted that he made enough money to support the whole family. No mention was made if the parents worked, too. If they did, between the three, they certainly could significantly raise their standard of living. The story, along with the “Connect to Today,” fail to mention what the child would be doing if he weren't stitching together soccer balls. Farm labor is a good guess. Farmers tend to work hours similar to what factory workers did, yet this is not mentioned. The student is left with the assumption (both western and modern) that all children everywhere should/would be in school if they weren't being exploited in these factories. Corporations such as Nike have been criticized for such endeavors, yet as Newsweek reported last year, Nike pays 2-5x the going rate in Southeast Asia, provides barrack-style housing, transportation on a company bus if you live in a neighboring village, meals, etc.

11. p. 645 – “While workers earned small wages for long hours at hard labor, stockholders earned high profits ...” This is listed under Big Business – defined as “the giants that controlled the industries -- yet no mention is made of giants such as Ford, who paid over twice the going rate per day, Rockefeller, who was known to give generous vacations to top workers, Carnegie, who was known to give bonuses (equivalent in today's money of one million dollars) to workers who came up with labor/money saving ideas.

12. p. 658 – Inventions of electricity, cars, phones, etc. covered. Question is asked about student inventing something, “But wait – if people could move

five times faster, would they *really* be happier?" Then in question #2 "What might have been better about life before the 'progress' of the 19th century and for whom?" Here we are back at the noble savage fallacy, that we were all better in the halcyon days before corrupting technology, etc. Yes, we were all better off moving five times faster, since it freed up more time for things more important than the drudgery of 18th century travel. A better way to ask the question that is attempted here (not to mention economically more sound) is to ask, "What is the 'opportunity cost' of technological developments?" Thus a student weighs the trade-off between moving faster and the chance for more dangerous crashes, etc. The same goal is accomplished without the Rousseauian "are they *really* more happy?" Of course they are, by any measure, life span, quality of life, time spent with family instead of traveling, etc. And they still have the *freedom* to travel slowly should they choose. Nowhere does social progress receive quotes around "progress." Why not ask if people *really* were better off under the reforms made by the progressives? The underlying assumption that students will pick up subconsciously, if not consciously, is that free market progress is questionable, but government progress is guaranteed. Unbalanced, not to mention untrue.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Prentice Hall	Connections to Today	High School World History

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

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 Carenegie, John D. Rockefeller, etc.
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.
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).
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?
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.

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Glencoe/McGraw Hill	Glencoe World History	High School World History

1. There is one point upon which historians do disagree. The text deals with the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire on S358. There it states: “As we will see, throughout the Americas, Europeans, using gunpowder first developed in Asia, were able to destroy powerful civilizations weakened by European diseases.” Not so simple: different historians have rather different views on this topic. Many do not accept the thesis that military superiority founded on the technological developments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can entirely explain the Spanish conquest. (See William R. Thompson, “The Military Superiority Thesis and the Ascendancy of Western Eurasia in the World System” in *Journal of World History* spring 1999 143-178). At any rate, steel weapons (based on Arab technology) were as important as gunpowder in the Spanish conquest.
2. Chapter 3 “India and China 3000-B.C.-A.D. 500 has a lovely photograph of the Great Wall on the first page (S69/T69). This is, of course, a Ming dynasty wall—not the wall constructed by the First Emperor of Qin. The myth that Qin built a wall in a certain place and that it has stood there, repaired and added to from time to time, ever since, is just that—a myth. See Arthur Waldron, *The Great Wall of China: From History to Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). The author makes this clear on S100. The little “More About the Art” box on T69 ought to be rewritten in order to agree with the text on S100.
3. The text incorrectly states that “From the start, however, the Song experienced problems, especially from the Uighurs in Northern China. Because of the Uighur threat, the imperial court was forced to move its capital from Changan further south to Hangzhou. The Song also lost control over Tibet.” (S250/T250). There are several problems here. First, the Song were not threatened by the Uighurs, but by the Khitan. Second, the capital city of the Northern Song dynasty was Bianjing (modern Kaifeng), not Changan (modern Xi’an). Third, the Song could not have lost control over Tibet, since they never controlled it in the first place. On this count, the authors may believe that the Tang empire controlled Tibet (S248/T248). The text may be trying to simplify the complex relationship between Tibet and the Tang empire for the sake of clarity in a textbook. I think, however, that the text has slipped from simplification into error. The Tang relation to Tibet could never be accurately described as one of “control.” “Influence” would be more accurate. The Tang empire did not exercise direct administrative or military control over the area known as Tibet. It was not the Song that lost this

influence: it was the Tang, whose influence there and elsewhere declined significantly when the An Lushan Rebellion nearly tore the empire apart. (For reference, see J.A. G. Roberts, *A History of China vol. 1 Prehistory to c. 1800*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1996, 113-116). See also Bulliet et al *The Earth and its Peoples: A Global History* (second edition, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 201, 284). According to the latter: "By the late 600s, the Tang emperor and the Tibetan king were rivals for religious leadership and dominance in Central Asia, and Tibet was extending its sway not only into Central Asia but also through what are now Qinghai, Sichuan and Xinjiang provinces in China." Clearly, the textbook that I am reviewing here has not communicated to students the true nature of the relationship between Tibet and the Tang empire. Why does this matter? Because the People's Republic of China justifies its present control over Tibet on the basis of claims that Tibet was a part of the Tang empire. I am not naïve enough to think that rectification of the historical record will free Tibet: but it will at least stand as a demonstration of the ways in which governments and nationalists interpret (and change) the record of the past for their own present and future interests.

4. On S255-256 the authors discuss Neo-Confucianism. Here too, their pro-Tang, anti-Song bias comes into play. The renaissance of Confucian thought that we refer to as Neo-Confucianism certainly had its roots in the Tang, but the important developments took place in the Song. Notwithstanding, the text states: "during the last half of the Tang dynasty . . . Confucian ideas reemerged in a new form." (S255). Why this antipathy toward the Song dynasty? I know that many contemporary Chinese despise the Song dynasty because it controlled substantially less territory than did the Tang. Is this textbook influenced by such subtle considerations? Or does it seem "easier" for the students to ascribe everything to the glorious Tang? Either way, if they take a course in world history or Chinese history in college, they'll have a few things to unlearn. . . . In general, the way in which the text combines Sui, Tang and Song into one period seems misleading. I recommend that the author of this text take a look at Bulliet et al. (referred to above, pp. 276-292) for an example of how to do it right.
5. The map insert on S269 indicates parts of the Indian subcontinent controlled by the Muslim Delhi Sultanate and by Hindu rulers. The Delhi Sultanate's territory is in light red, the Hindu-ruled areas are in green. But the map legend simply labels the green areas as "Hindu areas" in contrast to "Sultanate of Delhi." The "Geography Skills" box under the map suggests the following activity: "Create a political map of the subcontinent of India today. Use a legend with icons to show Hindu and Muslim populations. How does your map compare with the map above?" This combination of map and exercise will probably lead students to conclude that most of the Indian population in 1335 was Muslim, with only a few small areas populated by Hindus. That, of course, is wrong: the territory controlled by the Delhi Sultanate, although under Muslim rule, was overwhelmingly Hindu as far as the religious identity of the population goes.
6. There is no analysis of the causes of the Japanese participation in WWII-no discussion of the effects of the Depression in Japan, of population pressure or social tensions. Nor is there discussion of the influence of the military in Japanese politics. There is no way, reading this, that students could gain an understanding of Japan's reasons for going to war, nor would they be prepared to make any meaningful comparisons between Japanese militarism and European totalitarianism. (See S812-813).

7. S942 states “In 1960 the government abandoned the communes and returned to collective farms.” This is not correct. Maurice Meisner states: “the abandonment of the Great Leap Forward did not result in the abolition of the rural people’s communes, although it did result in a drastic reduction in their size. The 24,000 communes were broken up into approximately 74,000 units, each with about 1,600 households . . .the communes remained the basic administrative structures in the countryside . . .” (Maurice Meisner, *Mao’s China and After: A History of the People’s Republic*, third edition, New York: The Free Press, 1999, 262.) It would be more accurate to say : “In 1960 the government scaled back the communes and allowed the return of private plots and free rural markets on a limited scale.”
8. Chapter 31 Section 1 (S941) is entitled ‘Communist China.’ This Cold War appellation is correct in the sense that the People’s Republic of China is and always has been under one-party Communist rule. Nevertheless, to use the term “Communist China” rather than “People’s Republic” seems overly politicized. The appellation “Communist China” is one used on the U.S. side of the Cold War. The textbook should use the correct name: People’s Republic of China.
9. Although it is a quibble, I will point out that in the essay on “The Japanese Discover Firearms” on S501, the author states that “The Portuguese brought handguns to Japan in the sixteenth century.” Now, the general definition of “handgun” is a gun held and fired with one hand. The guns that the Portuguese brought to Japan and which the Japanese subsequently learned to produce themselves were arquebus. The arquebus was a heavy gun (6.5 kg) that required two hands and, often, a light stand to support the weapon.
10. p. 586 – The closest definition of capitalism is “an economic system based on industrial trade.” This is a weak definition. In the Index, capitalism receives only four page entries. Socialism receives 18 page entries, Communism/Communist receives 47. I didn’t count Comintern, etc. Four page entries to 65. Students are left to believe that Socialism/Communism are much more important than Capitalism, despite the abject failure of the former.
11. p. 586 – Capitalism is given two paragraphs. The remaining treatment of capitalism is its abuses and “creation” of harsh living conditions. Socialism is segued as an attempted solution. It is not mentioned that socialism would largely fail to solve these problems and that capitalism would.
12. p. 909 – Rigoberta Menchu is listed in “People in History.” There is no mention that she fabricated half of the information in her autobiography, *I, Rigoberta Menchu*. Independent journalists have confirmed this at least twice. University professors will now admit as much, but teach it anyway, because “it represents the typical experience” of what Guatemalan Indians went through. If it is so typical, why must a half-fabricated book be used to teach it? Aren’t there accurate stories to portray, as this was the typical experience? (Source: David Horowitz, *Hating Whitey and other progressive causes, “I, Rigoberta Menchu, Liar”*). Further, the Nobel committee let it be known that the 500th anniversary of Columbus’ journey to the new world would be celebrated by awarding the prize to an indigenous American. This was not a great secret. It all seems a bit contrived to receive no mention in the text of the controversy.

13. p. 763 – “Stalin himself is supposed to have said that 10 million peasants died in the famines of 1932 and 1933” appears in the main text, yet the total count, “... as many as 25 million people” is relegated to a sidebar. Hitler, who killed six million, receives 40 pages in the index; Stalin who killed 25 million, receives 28 pages.

Texas Public Policy Foundation

Texas Public Policy Foundation
Social Studies Textbook Review 2002

List of Factual Errors by Book

PUBLISHER	TEXTBOOK TITLE	SUBJECT
Holt Rinehart Winston	Holt World History: The Human Journey	High School World History

1. Discussion of the Declaration of the Rights of Man (S513) fails to mention that one of the rights with which this phase of the revolution was concerned was the right to property—this allows the authors to miss the fundamentally bourgeois nature of this phase of the revolution and deprives the students of the chance to compare it to the American Revolution, whose wealthy conservative leaders shared the same concern about the sanctity of property (particularly theirs) and about protecting their property from taxation by their government.
2. The section on post-war China is entitled “Communist China and its Influence” (S852). “Communist China” is a Cold War appellation. It is generally not used in the Chinese language. Chinese refer to “mainland China” (Zhongguo dalu) or to “The People’s Republic of China” (Zhonghua renmin gongheguo). I suggest that in future editions, the textbook use the latter.
3. p. 395 – Claims that Magellan’s circumnavigation of the globe “was also the first proof that the world was round.” The earth was known to be round as early as Aristotle, who observed the Earth’s curved shape on the moon during a lunar eclipse. “Eratosthenes calculated the distance around the earth with amazing accuracy” (p. 145).
4. p. 400 – Credits horses, guns, and smallpox as reasons for Spanish overtaking Aztecs, all of which are true; however, left out are the surrounding tribes that were all too eager to overthrow the oppressive Aztecs. The role of human sacrifice among the Mayans (p. 209) and the Aztecs (p. 210), barely receives mention. Cutting out the hearts of your neighbors plays a large role in why they want to overthrow you.
5. p. 548 – “American engineer Robert Fulton was the first to build a profitable steamboat. In 1808 his boat, the Clermont, began regular trips on the Hudson River between New York City and Albany.” And, “Soon Samuel Cunard of Great Britain was providing regular steamboat service across the Atlantic.” To call either of these men “profitable” is stretching the definition. Fulton secured a 30-year government enforced monopoly on the Hudson. It took Cornelius Vanderbilt illegally operating on the Hudson and suing to break it. With his partner, Vanderbilt won in *Gibbons v. Ogden*. The Supreme Court ruled that Fulton’s monopoly was unconstitutional. His “protection” by the government allowed him *to not innovate and still profit*. Once this lack of innovation and ingenuity faced the free market, he quickly went out of business. The same held true for Cunard, who was subsidized by the British government. Vanderbilt should receive mention for his work in steamboats and/or railroads.

