

Whether Republicans Hate Latinos: Takaki, Schlesinger, and the  
Arizona Ethnic Studies Ban (HB 2281)



by

Kees Oost

S4246861

Instructor: Dr. M. Valenta

Course: BA Thesis

Date: 28 September 2016

ENGELSE TAAL EN CULTUUR

Teacher who will receive this document: Dr. M. Valenta

Title of document: Whether Republicans Hate Latinos: Takaki, Schlesinger, and the Arizona Ethnic Studies Ban (HB 2281)

Name of course: Bachelorwerkstuk Amerikanistiek

Date of submission: 28 September 2016

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

Name of student: Kees Oost

Student number: 4246861

## Abstract

This work focuses on the arguments that legitimize or contest Arizona House Bill 2281, using as a basis ideas presented in *The Disuniting of America* (1991) by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. and Ronald Takaki's *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (1993). The consequences of the bill to the Arizona Latino/a population become clear, and the political motives behind it, also. That which constitutes as history to both scholars is evaluated and criticized, if necessary. Multiculturalism in the Arizona public school system is assessed, and critical arguments surrounding belonging and inclusion are provided. Also, developments in US education are evaluated in relation to HB 2281 and United States history, and in the end an answer to the question whether Republicans hate Latinos/as, as claimed by Mexican-American labor activist Dolores Huerta, is provided.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Schlesinger, Takaki, Horne, public schools, Arizona, Republican Party, HB 2281, SB 1070, conservatism, Tucson Unified School District, anti-immigration, belonging, cultural diversity

## Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Essay Coversheet	ii
Abstract and Keywords	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
Schlesinger v. Takaki	5
Arizona House Bill 2281	13
Conclusion	24
Notes	27
Works Cited	28

## Introduction

In my childhood village ethnic diversity consisted of one actual immigrant family and a few other “immigrants” that originated from elsewhere in the country. I was regarded as one of those other immigrants, because my father grew up in Amsterdam, and my mother in another province. Although I was born in the village itself, making me one of the most local people around, my “immigrant” family that talked and acted “different” somehow always kept me from being considered a full-fledged local resident. My situation was incomparable to that of the members of the actual immigrant family, who were political refugees from Angola, yet despite my best efforts to blend in with other locals, I too never felt fully accepted within the small-town community. Hence my interest in cultural diversity. After a semester of studying at Siena College in New York State this interest prompted me to investigate the situation in the United States concerning diversity and the teaching of it at schools, which led me to the Arizona Ethnic Studies ban (2010). This law aims at eliminating the Mexican-American Studies program throughout Tucson’s Unified School District (TUSD).

According to this Arizona House Bill 2281 (HB 2281), which effectively banned Mexican-American Studies programs from Tucson schools by threatening to cut funding if schools continued to teach them, “public school pupils should be taught to treat and value each other as individuals and not based on ethnic background” (“HB 2281” 1). Aimed at a course that was sometimes called Raza Studies (Horne 7), which is translated as “the race” in Spanish, the bill prohibited public schools in Arizona to include in their curriculum courses that are primarily designed for pupils of a certain ethnicity (“HB 2281” 1; Soto and Joseph 50), and courses that promote ethnic solidarity instead of pupils’ individuality (“HB 2281” 1; Soto and Joseph 50). Arguing that these programs promote to overthrow the US government and foster resentment of other ethnic groups (“HB 2281” 1; Soto and Joseph 50), the elected Republican Superintendent of public instruction, Tom Horne (2003-2011), was given the authority to enforce the ruling, which was of his design, by withholding up to ten percent of a disobedient public school’s monthly apportionment, and decide on his own which programs fell under HB 2281 (“HB 2281” 1). Also, after students and teachers challenged HB 2281 in court, the TUSD banned seven textbooks from classrooms<sup>1</sup> (Planas).

Extra cause to examine the motives behind, and effects of, HB 2281 is the enactment of another law that targets predominantly the Latino community in Arizona, namely SB 1070. Enacted also in 2010, Senate Bill 1070 increased legislation regarding the registration (documents) of aliens in Arizona, required state or local officials to attempt to determine

someone's immigration status, barred these officials to restrict enforcement of federal immigration laws, and imposed penalties on those who aided aliens in their anonymity ("Senate Bill 1070 1-3). The Republican Party in Arizona has, with these measures, sanctioned the strictest immigration laws of the country in an area that has been historically diversely populated. It even prompted a United States Supreme Court case, *Arizona v. United States*, because the federal government argued that the law seized the government's authority to regulate immigration. Similar to HB 2881, SB 1070 primarily targets one ethnic group, namely the Latino/a community, who, because of increased immigration, have become a large ethnic minority in Arizona.

Overall the development of public education in the US after World War II seems to be in line with the development of society in general, yet with HB 2281 it seems as though Arizona halts this progressive tendency. With the help of court cases and amendments the public school system has greatly progressed in its mission to accommodate education for all those who require it. Since the 1954 United States Supreme Court case of *Brown v. Board of Education* racial issues concerning public schools have focused on desegregation on *de jure* basis (Ryan 1370). Before this ruling racial segregation at schools had been legally endorsed by the court since 1896 with *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which held that "separate but equal" treatment for whites and African-Americans is permissible under the Fourteenth Amendment ("Plessy v. Ferguson" par. 1). In other words, racial segregation at public schools was constitutional as long as the different racially comprised schools had equal facilities. *Brown v. Board of Education* overturned the racist divide in the public school system, stating that separate school systems were unconstitutional because they were "inherently unequal" ("History" par. 3) and therefore violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The idea that schools were equal, provided they acquired equal government funding, was overcome when the Coleman Report, titled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, was released in 1966, which focused more on the development of the student instead of the institution and introduced discussion about the effectiveness of K-12 (primary and secondary) schools (Hanushek 18-20). James Samuel Coleman et al. investigated segregation in public schools, equal educational opportunities, curriculums, teacher and student characteristics, socioeconomic backgrounds, and student self-reflection and aspirations (iii-iv). Afterwards they researched how different students learn, "measured by their performance on standardized achievement tests" (iv), and if it matters to performances which student attends which school

(iv). As a result of the Coleman Report the manner in which education was done became an academic subject of itself, and developed pedagogical and educational discussion about how and what to educate.

Concerning HB 2281, at first sight the act aims to eliminate racial distinction in the public school system, and therefore discrimination in society based on race. Few people would disagree with the elimination of racism in US society, yet the manner in which this can be achieved through public schools is contested. Most notably two scholars, Ronald Takaki and Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., have in the 1990s introduced ideas concerning the teaching of US racial and ethnic history in (public) schools. Especially Schlesinger's *The Disuniting of America* (1992) and Takaki's *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (1993) present radically different ideologies concerning education in the diverse and equal United States of today, but also Takaki's essay "Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground" can be effectively used to address these issues. Schlesinger focuses on the traditional idea of the US as a melting pot of all cultures into one, with individualism at its basis, while Takaki introduces an approach to multiculturalism that promotes identity through emphasis on ethnicity, stressing the importance of group culture.

To Arizona the importance of HB 2281 and its effects is more evident than it would be to an ethnically less diverse state. Namely, the significance of Ethnic Studies programs to Arizonian public schools is unmistakable, since they have proven to help increase much-needed graduation rates of Latino/a children. For example, the PBS documentary about the studies ban, *Precious Knowledge*, emphasizes that currently 48 percent of Mexican American students, overall, do not finish high school, while according to the documentary the TUSD recorded in 2011 that, on average, 93 percent of enrolled students eventually graduated, of which 85 percent continued to attend college. Also, with regard to the TUSD, student demographics reveal that sixty percent of all enrolled students are Hispanics (Cappellucci et al. 5). Because of the importance to graduation rates and the (political) desire, in general, to increase these rates, the necessity to investigate the motivations behind HB 2281 and the consequences of it, is apparent.

My research shall examine, compare and contrast Takaki and Schlesinger's books in chapter one, and look for arguments in each of the works that will explain and offer valid academic claim to the studies ban explained before. Next I will examine the motivations behind the Republican obvious aim at eliminating the Mexican-American Studies program, and decide whether these motivations are rightful and true, or whether Dolores Huerta's

proclamation that “Republicans hate Latinos” (Diaz par. 1) more accurately describes the reasons behind enacting HB 2281. Ultimately I will conclude that in general United States social history legitimizes Mexican-American Studies programs, and the US contemporary public school situation even requires ethnic studies within school curriculums. Therefore, HB 2281 is based on illegitimate motivations in relation to equality and citizenship, and unmasks Republican Party reasoning in Arizona as being flawed.

## Schlesinger v. Takaki

Although Schlesinger's book was written at the onset of a particularly frigid time in US history with regard to the emancipation of African-Americans (I am referring to the 1992 L.A. race riots) and focuses mostly on Black and White America, it nevertheless also provides an accurate framework to apply to the Ethnic Studies ban. The idea of the Melting Pot that Schlesinger supports encompasses the melting of all former identities into one American identity. He argues that this is, or should be, America's strength: "E Pluribus Unum," out of many one. Although other cultures should be respected and taught about, American and world history should be taught what he calls "honestly" and "fact based." In Schlesinger's mind this means that because European settlers have produced the most extensive contribution to the creation of the United States, historical focus in public schools' books should lie on their history. He furthermore stresses not only US historical background as predominantly European, but he also recognizes the value of European intellectual schools of thought and their impact on American history and present-day United States society. Similarly, although sympathizing with minorities he stresses what he calls "facts of history" (122), that the US was established by predominantly "dead white European males" (122), and to deny this by focusing public school programs on, for example, the accomplishments of Confucius, the ideas of the *Quran*, or Marxist theories, would be to "erase history" (122).

E Pluribus Unum, throughout the book Schlesinger's main argument concerning diversity, is meant to overcome thinking in ethnicities and to promote individualism among people from different backgrounds. According to the US Constitution all men (and women) are created equal, and the Melting Pot should allow for equal chances and representation in society, since people should be treated based on their individuality, not their ethnicity. Preference for the usage of "Black" instead of African-American, for example, is pointed at by Schlesinger and apparently supported by multiple polls under the Black population (87-88). Since not all slaves originated from similar tribes or kingdoms, the term African-American is also an oversimplifying notion, thinks Schlesinger, which misleadingly places all Black people under one unified African banner (81). For that reason Schlesinger explains his preference for the term Black as an expression of respect towards a diverse community, which he regards also as an "all-American" community, since it derived homogeneity from the American plantation, not the some 850 diverse ethnic and linguistic groups that lived in the areas from where the slaves came in West Africa (81). Clearly Schlesinger disapproves of

ethnic homogeneity, despite writing a book called *The Disuniting of America*, in which he primarily promotes national and cultural (Western) homogeneity.

Concerning the public school debate the Greco-Romano tradition and the overall Greek idea of democracy are the most contributing factors for Schlesinger as to why Classicism is an essential foundation around which the public education program should be build. The integration in the public school system of an all-Latino/a based educational program such as the Mexican-American Studies program, would, as argued by Schlesinger, disregard the essential national US motto of E Pluribus Unum, since he does not regard Mexican values as “Western” or “American,” attributes Europe as the birthplace of the US (122), and views the United States as “an extension of European civilization” (122). He recognizes “the crimes of Europe” (122, 126-127), and states that recognizing those crimes is the result of the “analytical weapons forged in the West” (124), and that the origins of these weapons are the reasons as to why the history of Western civilization should be cherished and taught about (124).

Schlesinger furthermore states that many of the critics who argue against Western society simultaneously argue along Eurocentric ideas, and by doing so experience and acknowledge Western ideals (124). He points to black intellectuals such as Léopold Senghor, who originated from Senegal and wrote in French, and emphasizes on Europeans such as Nietzsche, Marx, Derrida, Gramsci, Foucault, and Sartre (124). They are at the basis for international critique on Western civilization, yet argue from European ideas. Nevertheless it seems obvious that intellectuals who were born in Europe and attended European universities because these were the major intellectual bulwarks at the time, also argued according to a European frame of mind, and that intellectuals from outside the Western sphere of influence tried to gain acknowledgement by communicating in the language of the West. Schlesinger continues to stress that every culture has had its shortcomings and wrongdoings, yet in his mind the West has created its own antidote against society’s atrocities through its individuals and the development of civilization, and should therefore be relished (126-129). However, as American history professor Ellen Schrecker points out, Schlesinger conveniently does not mention the technological and intellectual dominance that these Western countries enjoyed, which enabled their citizens to develop this critical mind and their governments the opportunity to act upon their citizens’ ideals, without being dominated by more close-minded powers (1565). Schlesinger even admits this by stating that Antonio Gramsci “had a point” (125) when he argued that ruling values permeate and dominate any society (125).

Schlesinger continues to focus on the canon as an adequate example of the changing cultural values that the United States endorses, since the canon's reliable pattern of change allows for fair representation (125). This comes to light when looking at the American literary canon of today, which includes the likes of Emerson, Melville, Hawthorne, and Thoreau; hardly men that could be perceived as "apologists for the privileged and the powerful" (126). To the contrary, these men are the champions of the Enlightened American culture of today, play a major part in overcoming Western-based forms of slavery and misogyny, and they should therefore not be accused of being men who enforced "the hegemony of the white race, the male sex, and the capitalist class" (125). "White guilt can be pushed too far," (129) implying that Schlesinger and his critics both acknowledge faults in American society and Western civilization, but that these faults are overemphasized by his opponents since focusing mainly on US culture's contemporary shortcomings does not reflect and involve the correct image of the achievements these errors have indirectly produced as a remedy to society's inadequacies.

Too easily are these achievements overlooked and disrespected, states Schlesinger, partly because there is less room for pride in society when a nation's history is frequently accused of having committed crimes against its own population (128). Yet for all Schlesinger's optimism about American society, today, which should indeed not be disregarded, his historical mind does not offer insight in contemporary problems, but instead focuses too much on achievements of the past. Yes, American society has stopped lynching African-Americans and is not about to annex more of Mexico's territory and its inhabitants, but that does not mean that descendants of victims have forgotten about their families' history, nor does it erase these happenings from American history; the consequences of what happened previously are still apparent in society, today. Apparently, Schlesinger wants society to "get on with it."

This historical focus on Classical thinking and Eurocentrism is not meant to be the only framework around which curriculums should be developed, argues Schlesinger, but it should be the predominant one (122-123). Besides promoting Classicism Schlesinger also argues against Afrocentrism, and other forms of what he describes as the "cult of ethnicity" (qtd. in Schrecker 1565) in the public school system, quoting William Raspberry's argument that this will make students "less competent in the culture in which they have to compete" (qtd. in Schlesinger 93). To Schlesinger also the question remains to what extent the Black population in the US can still relate to their African ancestors, and, more importantly, whether

it is sensible for them to glorify national African successes in international society, since that would mean “the corruption of history as history” (93). He furthermore questions to what extent it is only possible for people of a certain ethnicity to identify with people of the same ethnic background (90), which would infer that Black Americans can only relate to significant other Blacks such as W.E.B. du Bois or Frederick Douglass, Scotch-Irish only to Andrew Jackson, and so forth. While Schlesinger merely hypothesizes, contemporary opponents such as Henry Louis Gates Jr. were two steps ahead, and already agreed upon the notion that Afrocentrism promotes intellectual weakness and self-defeating strategies (Schrecker 1565), which unmask Schlesinger’s argument as feeble.

In fact, Gates is one of the fiercest critics of Schlesinger’s cultural homogeneity in school curriculums. In the introduction of his book *Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars* he quotes a New York Times article that announced in 1991 that “the greatest threat to civil liberties was no longer communism, but violent nationalistic passions unleashed by its collapse” (xi), which would establish in the 21<sup>st</sup> century as the major societal problem that of ethnic differences (xii). He describes conservative efforts to minimize change as viewing the debate in terms of “the West versus the Rest” (xvi), with the West viewed, through conservative eyes, as a homogenous and monolithic concept (xvi). While this raises many questions about the concept of “the West,” one glance at historical developments on what constitutes as “the West” will show that the lands connected to “the Western ideal” are inhabited by many diverse peoples, who not necessarily have to all agree with whatever “the West” is supposed to stand for. Similar to the debate about what defines being “American” is therefore the idea of a homogenous West, both of which simply do not have clear answers and therefore should not be used as though they are easily answerable. This reveals the academic shortcomings of Schlesinger’s reasoning and establishes that “the world we live in is multicultural already” (xvi).

Actually, in 2015 Arizona’s demographic composition was comprised of four major racial groups. These consisted of 55.8 percent Whites, 30.7 percent Hispanics (people that have a historical link to Spanish culture) and/or Latino/as, 4.8 percent Blacks and/or African Americans, and 3.4 percent Asians (“QuickFacts Arizona”). Also, between 2010 and 2014 of all Arizonians 13.5 percent was foreign born (“QuickFacts Arizona”). Diversity of cultural backgrounds is extensive because of Arizona’s migrant past and present, including predominantly Native Americans, Hispanics, Southerners, Mormons, Midwesterners, and Californians (Berman xii). Arizona is also religious; 89 percent of adult Arizonians who

participated with Pew Research Center's Religious Landscape Study (RLS) acknowledged belief in god ("Adults in Arizona"). In Arizona four substantial groups dominate the landscape: 26 percent of Arizonians is Evangelically Protestant, 21 percent Catholic, 27 percent unaffiliated, and nineteen percent believes in "nothing in particular" ("Adults in Arizona"). These figures establish once more the diversity in ethnicities and cultures in Arizona, and limit generalization about matters that concern these groups.

Overall, critics' responses on *The Disuniting of America* are extensive, and rarely positive. Schrecker rightly states that Schlesinger's starting point is the fragility he perceives that resides in American society, and that, according to Schlesinger, the cult of ethnicity will destroy the American identity. The question remains, however, what the American identity is, if ever there was one, and whether it is even possible to create a definition of something that will have to be supported by millions of diverse people. One of the main other issues concerning this question, which political scientist Deborah Schildkraut introduces, is the lack of focus on how nonwhites define the American identity (597). Without including everyone in the discussion, there cannot be a discussion. Schildkraut supports this, and writes that "a broad range of constitutive norms define being American" (597). She concludes that whether or not a person identifies strongly enough with the American people more potently determines his or her idea of being American than ethnicity does (598). Ironically, she turns around Schlesinger's arguments concerning individuality by recognizing the position of different people in the US, and diagnosing that many people can only become individuals and Americans once they have the possibility to compete for these labels and participate fully, which constitutes for her idea of "getting on with it."

In *A Different Mirror* Takaki incorporates a more inclusive account of history in an effort to convey his idea of American society as a Salad Bowl, in which all cultures blend as one but retain their own "taste." In his first chapter he explains how he was mistaken for a foreigner or immigrant in the United States, merely because his Asian looks did not connote the regular appearance of a US citizen (3). While he was not mocked for being Asian, he still felt a stranger in his own country because he was not regarded as American although his family had already lived in the US for three generations. He provides many similar examples of peoples that were not included in the most important American historians' work over the past two centuries, stating that Frederick Jackson Turner's speech entitled "The Significance of the Frontier in American History" and Harvard historian Oscar Handlin's prizewinning study *The Uprooted* only communicate the story of the European immigrant and his

transformation to become the distinctively different person that we now call “American” (4-5). In contrast to Schlesinger’s arguments surrounding E Pluribus Unum, Takaki stresses the importance of diversity in the US, describing it as America’s emerging “manifest destiny” (5). Because of changing demographics, he argues, all US ethnic groups will become minorities, therefore the importance of an inclusive view on history is important in order to make everyone “feel” American and be considered American (5).

According to Takaki one has only to consider American history to recognize the exclusion of many ordinary Americans from society, but also the opportunities that did enable some groups to become “American.” For example, legislation such as the Naturalization Act of 1790, which allowed citizenship for Whites only, enabled Irish-Americans who lived in a fiercely Protestant state such as Massachusetts to pursue what Takaki calls an “‘ethnic’ strategy” (8). Excluded for being Catholic, by electing Irish to mayor ships and city councils, who ensured that their Irish constituency was given lucrative construction contracts or positions within the police forces and the firefighting departments, the Irish could overcome discrimination and enter the middle class. This privilege, which at that time was based on skin color, was denied to for example African-Americans and Chinese and Japanese immigrants, who endured legislative discrimination such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, imprisonment during World War II, and Jim Crow laws in the South, respectively. With these exclusions present in the nation’s history it is ironically sensible but morally wrong, according to Takaki, to have a Eurocentric curriculum, since it have been the non-European peoples that were left out of the equation for generations through legislation and other forms of discrimination and disregard (19). Whatever Schlesinger might argue about denial of historical facts, Takaki is certainly correct in reminding him of the historically decided position of non-White minorities in United States society.

Takaki explains the position of minorities in the US on the basis of Frederick Jackson Turner’s “Master Narrative of American History” (4), which looks at American history through a filter and` assumes that the United States was settled by Europeans. The narrative assumes that because these settlers were White, Americans are White. This relates to Schlesinger’s statement about the United States being establishment by “dead White European males,” as indicated before. Takaki argues that the assumption that Americans are White is largely caused by the “complete lack of information” (6) concerning multiculturalism, which is derived from the absence of a multicultural curriculum that incorporates non-European, or non-White, histories. In contrast to Schlesinger, Takaki does

emphasize ethnic difference and multiculturalism in the US. He stresses the need for ethnic groups to find their place in society through establishing and recognizing their own identity, not through individualism, but rather by communality and belonging. Hence Takaki argues for individualism (identity) through communality, while Schlesinger reasons for unity through individualism.

Takaki recognizes but does not share Schlesinger's optimism concerning United States society and the position of Mexican-Americans, especially not since Latino/as are often people who are torn between identities. They do not regard themselves as fully American or Mexican, but rather have created an identity that is special in its own right. Congregating mostly in the Southwest, Mexican-Americans lived on lands previously owned by Mexico, and which often looked similar to their former habitats in their homeland. Since Mexican immigrants came from different parts of Mexico over different periods of time it was not self-evident that they would form the "*colonia mexicana*" (307) that they did. Also called "the barrio" (307), the Mexican-American society and identity became one of "border people," since they were neither Mexican nor American. Clinging to their former identities while cherishing the opportunities of American life, Mexican immigrants did not assimilate immediately according to Schlesinger's standards, but rather formed a natural community of people who spoke the Spanish language, belonged to the same low social and economic class, and who were all discriminated against (308-10).

In this case, for Mexican immigrants to form a community of mainly Mexicans within the borders of an alien nation state is a normal social tendency, as explained by professor of information Yan Chen and economics professor Sherry Xin Li in "Group Identity and Social Pressures." They explain that according to social identity theories people define others by labelling them as belonging to a particular group (431). Also, bias and envy is proven to be more often present between people of different groups, and we tend not to identify with "outgroups," (431) but cling together with our "ingroups" (431). Socially lower-placed people in society therefore cannot simply become the individuals that Schlesinger wants them to be, first there must be mutual understanding and acceptance between groups. Including their stories in American society and enabling them to learn about themselves, and others to learn about different groups, as well, therefore increases the alien's chances to become established in the middle class as similar to their Irish-American predecessors. After all, "a more inclusive curriculum is also a more accurate one" (Takaki 6), and is important to a multicultural society. Professor James A. Banks, specialist in multicultural education,

provides an explanation to Takaki's meaning of multiculturalism in public schools. In "Multicultural Education and Curriculum Transformation" he ascribes the concept of multiculturalism as being too often ascribed to situations that should not have been characterized as such. His idea of well-functioning multiculturalism incorporates more than just curriculum reform. It states that "the entire system has to be restructured" (393); this includes altering the process of staff development, the assessment program, and the choice of textbooks, which is what materialized in the TUSD, was supported by Takaki, and attacked by HB 2281.

Takaki's opinion on group identity is therefore more inclusive and considerate concerning minority groups, yet *A Different Mirror* only conveys the histories of US minorities, without offering any deeper insight in the manner in which US institutions maintain social hierarchies. United States history professor Karen Sawislak writes that "Takaki's effort to tell a multicultural story to some degree ends up effacing the distinctiveness of the historical experience of each of the groups he describes" (49). His book therefore merely provides a framework from which to commence the recognition of minority contributions in American history books, in order to create more understanding of all Americans and overcome historical exclusions. In this way the book is similar to *The Disuniting of America*, since both offer a historical introduction from which to initiate discussion about contemporary issues. Schlesinger's assertions, however, contrast with Takaki's perceptive anecdotes of an inclusive American history. Concerning E Pluribus Unum, Takaki responds to Schlesinger with a quote from Herman Melville, who wrote that "you can not spill a drop of American blood, without spilling the blood of the whole world," (20), Americans are "not a narrow tribe" (qtd. in Takaki 20). Trumping Schlesinger's arguments concerning "factual history," "Western society," and "being American," Takaki presents accurate histories based on people's experiences; in contrast to Schlesinger Takaki does not merely assert.

## Arizona House Bill 2281

HB 2281 shows that education is influenced by politics; factions have discovered that what and how matters are taught can influence children's behavior and manner of learnedness extensively. The rise of the New Left in the 1960s, for example, introduced the idea that schools in the US themselves were responsible for many wrongdoings in society concerning racism, academic freedom, and authoritarianism (Gitlin 16-20). In 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education released a report titled *A Nation at Risk*, in which the authors called for educational reform in order to uphold the quality standards of American education, primarily in the field of math, science, and language ("A Nation at Risk"). Twenty years later President Bush prioritized education during his first administration through the national law "No Child Left Behind," which added to its predecessor Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 strict requirements for the acquirement of math and reading (English) skills (Brill 84; Rhodes 179-81; "Archived"). Contrasting these major additions to public school requirements on the national level that are in line with US school developments after WWII, is HB 2281 in Arizona. This law aims to remove a class from curriculums, revealing the postwar irregularity in the actions of Superintendent Horne and his proponents and the political involvement that the Republicans introduce in Arizona by focusing their legislation on one particular fast-growing ethnic group.

According to Horne Ethnic Studies programs in Tucson's high schools presented the United States with a relic of Southern segregation laws, but this time segregation was represented by the political left instead of the right (Three Sonorans News). In Horne's opinion it is the left that is promoting group identities in order to rise up against the rightwing elite (Three Sonorans News). The discussion, according to Horne, is heading in the direction of Schlesinger's problem with stretching white guilt too far. Horne stresses the importance of desegregation as a consequence of the *Brown v. Board of Education* case and his own march on Washington D.C. alongside Martin Luther King, depicting his opponents as proponents of radical forms of action, and as people who will be dissatisfied with whatever the white elite decides to make into law (Three Sonorans News). Horne explains that he has had to grapple with the complexity of US history, while creating laws that were truthful according to their interpretation of the Constitution (Three Sonorans News). Yet the harsh manner in which the Arizona Ethnic Studies program was dealt with by the legislative powers gives rise to questions about whether other options concerning implementing Ethnic Studies in the

curriculum, ones that would also have been in line with the Constitution, would have been a possibility for Arizona public schools.

Before 2013 the Arizona Department of Education had set the public high school graduation requirements for a standard diploma at twenty credits. Four credits were required for English units, two for Math, 2.5 for Social Studies, two for Science, one unit for “arts or vocational education,” (“Standard High School”) and the remaining 8.5 credits would be earned through elective programs prescribed by the school governors themselves, but were “subject to state board approval” (“Standard High School”). The TUSD, in particular, required their students to complete a minimum of 21 credits, adding one credit to physical education, one to Math, .5 to health, and .5 to Social Studies, while canceling two from the elective program (“Governing Board Policies”). Its Social Studies program incorporated classes in American Government, American History, and World History, but did not include Ethnic Studies, which fell under the elective programs that required state board approval.

Problematic about incorporating more diverse courses in the curriculum in Arizona, therefore, is the limited position that Social Studies have within the school system, relative to the large role of elective classes. To Arizona, the use of elective classes has proven to be inadequate because schools are limited in their choice of classes by the local governing body, yet Social Studies programs are of importance in a state that is as diverse as Arizona, not merely because of contemporary diversity issues, but also because schools are “spaces in which students’ cultural identities are shaped” (Borja par. 3). Besides shaping identities and learning about other cultures and peoples, the Mexican-American courses in Arizona help students to pass English and Math tests and graduate, according to the Cambium Audit and the Cabrera Report on education in Arizona (Diaz par. 9).

Horne does not acknowledge these achievements of the program, but primarily voices concerns because of the grouping of Latino/a children with other Latino/a children, African-Americans with African-Americans, etcetera. To CNN he mentioned that “the standards that [the Arizona Department of Education] promulgate[s], require[s] that all social studies classes teach different cultures. We want all kids to be exposed to a lot of different cultures” (Peterson). Yet the contradiction in his reasoning is apparent, since he does not offer a reason as to why elements of the ethnic studies programs, for example, have not been incorporated in the compulsory curriculum. Horne, Schlesinger, and other proponents of individualism in the public school system have argued for inclusion of the contributions and heritages of all Americans, but these do not return in the courses presented above. Their reasoning is

inadequate since they did put effort in having a studies program banned, but they could not spare the time to add important aspects of these diverse classes to the standard curriculum.

Concerning the manner in which education should be supportive of multiple cultures, the public school debate about Ethnic Studies has generally developed in two directions: the one that emphasizes education of national and state history (Schlesinger) and the one that endorses the history of humanity in general (Takaki). National and state history focus their attention on the creation and development of Arizona as a US State, which limits focus on previous histories and inhabitants of the area now called Arizona, but emphasizes unity according to the historical happenings that relate best and are most significant to the creation of the state. History professor Kenneth T. Jackson states that because the study of all people's lives is impossible, public schools should convey common ideals of people within the country (Lawrence 326), not ideals promoted by (Marxist) authors such as Paulo Freire, as was the case in Arizona. Jackson argues alongside Schlesinger's fears for a disunited America through the public education system and the cult of ethnicity, instead of national cohesiveness by means of adopting Western culture and individual thinking.

Schlesinger's reasons for arguing against what he regards the cult of ethnicity become apparent especially in the public educational system, where "belonging" to a certain identity is prone to create resentment of people of other complexions. From an early age on students already show a natural tendency to segregate themselves, which is exacerbated when distinct ethnic groups exist and do not mix (Nealy par. 4). Renowned *New York Times* journalist Frank Bruni writes that in college "students spend the bulk of their time on one of many homogeneous islands" (par. 8). Ronald Shaiko of Dartmouth College professed incomprehension at the effort that colleges take to create diverse campuses, while releasing their students to default to sameness by not nudging them into interactions with their diverse peers (pars. 12-14). Universities have not been able to build connectivity amongst their students, instead they have indulged in the students' desires for "self-affirming enclaves" (par. 16), such as fraternity houses or other safe, rather homogeneous, spaces. Thus far, Schlesinger's concerns about disunity are confirmed, but whether they should be contributed to minorities, only, remains questionable.

Namely, Dr. James Sidanius of Harvard University agrees upon the notion that groups which do not interact reduce the chance of bonding. He presents data in his book *The Diversity Challenge: Social Identity and Intergroup Relations on the College Campus*, which showed that contact between groups reduced tension and increased friendship (Nealy par. 4).

Although Bruni's article and Dr. Sidanius' research aimed at students on the college level, it is not misplaced to apply their ideas to high schools, since it is less difficult to modify children's racial attitudes and beliefs while they are young (Banks 392), and enclaves created at high school are likely to be revived through college. The perfect example of increased interaction and comprehension of others is through study abroad programs, but the Institute of International Education records that only about ten percent of college students in the US participate in such programs, of which most are in Western Europe and usually last less than the length of a full semester (Bruni par. 29). Horne and Schlesinger's observations surrounding group behavior are clearly already occurring, not just with minorities, but also alongside class or gender lines, or for example within programs of internationalization. This reveals that the tendency to group with like-minded or otherwise similar people is natural and occurs at all levels. To argue and create legislation against only one ethnic group while others are allowed to group comfortably together, therefore constitutes as hypocritical reasoning.

Takaki and other proponents of multiculturalism overcome the rather limited view on merely the state or country, and consequently the need to be protected from a growing (Latino/a) population, stating that "there is no common American culture" (qtd. in Lawrence 328). According to Temple University chairman of the Department of African-American Studies, Molefi Kete Asante,

Multiculturalism in education is a nonhierarchical approach that respects and celebrates a variety of cultural perspectives on world phenomena. The multicultural approach holds that although European culture is the majority culture in the United States, that is not sufficient reason for it to be imposed on diverse student populations as "universal." Multiculturalists assert that education, to have integrity, must begin with the proposition that all humans have contributed to world development and the flow of knowledge and information, and that most human achievements are the result of mutually interactive, international effort. Without a multicultural education, students remain essentially ignorant of the contributions of a major portion of the world's people. (qtd. in Asante 172)

Asante's statement that the United States does not have a universal culture adds to Takaki's chapter in *A Different Mirror* named "We Will All Be Minorities," in which the relation between Anglo-Saxon culture and what are today called minority cultures is criticized for its short term idea of the US having a majority culture. The argument, therefore, that national desires should be promoted is less applicable in the United States because of the diverse standpoints among its people. The composition of US society has been diverse from the nation's inception, and it is changing rapidly to become a nation of minorities. To not acknowledge this in society by refusing to allow the influence of other cultures in it constitutes as "falsifying" the present.

Concerning Arizona's HB 2281, Schlesinger's individualist ideal is materialized by Superintendent Horne. If restated, HB 2281 forbids classes to do the following:

1. Promote the overthrow of the United States government
2. Promote resentment towards a race or class of people
3. Are designed [primarily] for pupils of a particular ethnic group
4. Advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of pupils as individuals.

(qtd. in Soto and Joseph 50)

Points three and four constitute as section 15-112 (A), and will be referred to as such. Number two and 15-112 (A), respectively, Schlesinger explicitly states in chapters "The Battle of the Schools" (73-99) and "E Pluribus Unum?" (119-38), while these points together could accommodate for the overthrow of the US government, or at least strong resentment of it, which is portrayed in chapters "History the Weapon" (45-72) and "The Decomposition of America" (101-18). Also the two exceptions to the law, the indication that HB 2281 should not restrict or prohibit any discussion of controversies with regard to historical events or historical oppression of any group of people (Lundholm 1043), indicate that Schlesinger's arguments can be connected to this legislation, since he openly acknowledged the wrongdoings of the US and promoted the teaching of other cultures (Schlesinger 122-27).

When examined closely HB 2281 does not beforehand ban all teaching of ethnic studies; points one and two merely target courses that promote resentment of people or the government. Thus, if taught without elements that promote resentment, these classes should be legal according to HB 2281. Yet Horne explains that in section 15-112 (A) (3) his emphasis on the word "primarily," which Soto and Joseph left out of their quotation but

Horne did not (Horne 2; “HB 2281” 1), together with 15-112 (A) (4) constitute for the major reasons that HB 2281 was created (Horne 2). Consequently, because of section 15-112 (A) HB 2281 becomes mostly focused on the (endangered) position of the individual than the promotion of resentment of the United States government or a race or class of people. The aspects within HB 2281 concerning the individual directly follow Schlesinger’s arguments, and can therefore be related to the critique attributed to Schlesinger in the previous chapter, though he does add nuance concerning the first two points of the law.

Besides copying Schlesinger’s arguments Horne also based his findings exclusively on classroom descriptions by five teachers within the Mexican-American Studies programs, and the textbooks used in-class (Horne 2-10; Lundholm 1044), without having observed how curriculum materials were presented to students in these classes (1044). To determine whether a course creates resentment of anyone or anything without experiencing an actual classroom situation, seems hard. Therefore Horne’s successor, John Huppenthal, “at the cost of \$110,000 ... commissioned a private consulting company to audit all La Raza Studies curricula” (qtd. in Lundholm 1044), who issued a 120 page report. In all these audits none of the elementary, middle, or high schools within the TUSD were accused of violating section 15-112 (A) (Cappellucci et al. 74, 78, 84, 89, 92, 95), yet Huppenthal, via his own research, concluded that the studies programs did violate three subsections of the law (Lundholm 1044). This shows yet again the determination of the Superintendents to ban Mexican-American Studies programs; Huppenthal ignored both the consulting company that he himself commissioned, and Horne’s emphasis on section 15-112 (A), by continuing his attack on the TUSD Mexican-American Studies programs.

From Takaki’s point of view, his essay “Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground” accurately describes the issues public schools in the TUSD are faced with in regard to multicultural curriculums after the enactment of HB 2281, and the determination to terminate Ethnic Studies as described previously. The essay was written in response to Schlesinger’s *The Disuniting of America*, and Takaki consequently starts off by ridiculing Schlesinger’s argument about factual history. He quotes Jose Fernandez of California’s saying in 1874, that “it is very natural that the history written by the victim does not altogether chime with the story of the victor” (qtd. in Takaki 110). Ironically, White Protestant conservative Winston Churchill is also attributed for having said that, which shows that there at least is consensus over who attributes what to his or her history books. Takaki continues to acknowledge Schlesinger’s recognition of the dominant position of White Anglo-Saxon Protestant males in US history (books), and the exclusion of others (114).

Discussing the manner in which school books present the history of the nation and the world brings to light bigger issues that are at stake concerning HB 2281, which both Schlesinger and Takaki try to highlight. These involve the ways in which children are taught about the US and its (racist) past, the manner in which the US wants its next generation to cope with this past, and the emphasis that is placed on the atrocities that accompanied that racism. Emphasis on particular subjects can raise more awareness, or less awareness, depending on which topic is covered and how it is covered. For example, only recently Texas high schools were accused of using grammar in order to lessen the significance and atrocities surrounding slavery (Rockmore pars. 1-2), while a Colorado high school decided to use their history lessons primarily to promote US victories and achievements (Galo par. 2). Takaki's confession that even after attaining a Ph.D. in American history he had learned nothing about his family's history in the United States, and the reasons for them coming from Japan to the United States as immigrant laborers (113), is another example of how some portrayals of history can be incomplete and exclusive.

Exclusive also would be to overlook political motivations behind HB 2281, because the influence of politics has become more apparent as the debate surrounding cultural diversity (in public schools) and immigration intensified. Horne and Huppenthal's determination to eliminate Mexican-American Studies programs in the TUSD, even after an extensive audit had taken place, demonstrates the political incentive that is involved. While Takaki and especially Schlesinger recognize the political motivations behind curriculum change, concerning the Arizona case their literature merely provides a framework from which to start the investigation. It is therefore necessary to look further into Arizona politics, especially with regard to HB 2281 and SB 1070.

Namely, with regard to politics HB 2281 is unmistakably linked to SB 1070, which was also passed in 2010. As mentioned in the introduction, Senate Bill 1070 increased legislation regarding the registration (documents) of aliens in Arizona, required state or local officials to attempt to determine someone's immigration status, barred these officials to restrict enforcement of federal immigration laws, and imposed penalties on those who aided aliens in their anonymity ("Senate Bill 1070 1-3) The law also allowed the following:

Where reasonable suspicion exists that the person is an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States, a reasonable attempt shall be made . . . to determine the immigration status of the person. . . . A law enforcement officer,

without a warrant, may arrest a person if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed any public offense that makes the person removable from the United States. (qtd. in Orozco 45)

Although the act officially concerned the immigration status of all Arizonians, in a Border State such as Arizona SB 1070 became in effect a law “that focused on Mexican ethnics” (45). Certainly since both HB 2281 and SB 1070 were enacted almost simultaneously and target a specific (Latino/a) group, political motives become extra visible and arouse extra suspicion with regard to who does and who does not “belong” in Arizona.

Exclusion forms one of the most stressing arguments concerning HB 2281 that comes from Takaki’s reasoning, because of the societal consequences to the excluded faction, in this case the Latino/as. Assistant professor of secondary teacher education, Richard A. Orozco, describes the description that the TUSD attributed to its Mexican-American/Raza Studies program (MARS) as “transcend[ing] the depth of any previous knowledge” (qtd. in Orozco 46), “a learning partnership” (qtd. in Orozco 46), and an acknowledgment of the students in their “full humanity” (qtd. in Orozco 46). Ultimately, the intentions of the program were to teach “both a Latino academic identity and an enhanced level of academic proficiency” (qtd. in Orozco 47). Besides humanitarian grounds for the Ethnic Studies program Orozco thus also describes the practical academic benefits that accompanied the program. Namely, the graduation rate for participants of MARS exceeded 97 percent, while White students that were not enrolled in MARS graduated only at a rate of 82.5 percent (47). Although Schlesinger argued in *The Disuniting of America* that teaching the grandeur of Roman history has not necessarily increased the academic record of Italian-American children (89), evidently it does increase academic achievement amongst Mexican-Americans in Tucson.

Because of all the positive additions of Ethnic Studies in Arizona to the progress of students, HB 2281 increasingly relates to whether political involvement in public school curriculums (in Arizona) should be pursued or not. Because of political involvement in curriculums the teaching of history consequently becomes a subjective and politicized class in schools; history is often used to promote local or national pride and cohesiveness, therefore any argument about teaching “correct” or “factual” history raises more questions by the minute. For example, in 2010 the Texas Board of Education passed legislation that, according to New York Times reporter James C. McKinley Jr., stressed “the superiority of American capitalism, question[ed] the Founding Fathers’ commitment to a purely secular government

and present[ed] Republican political philosophies in a more positive light” (par. 1). Similar to Horne’s decision as elected Republican superintendent of public instruction, the members of the Texas Board of Education are elected, and all Republicans on the board voted in favor of the act (pars. 2-3).

Anti-immigrant legislation in US Border States have thus become manifested in mainstream politics, which seems to be motivated along ethnic or racial lines. Namely, the Republican Party’s political position in Arizona is threatened because of rapidly changing demographics. Non-White immigrants such as Mexicans tend to vote Democratic, which is generally known to have been one of the major contributing factors to President Obama’s presidential elections in 2008 and 2012. For example, Pew Research Center estimated the total percentage of Latino/as voting for Obama in 2012 at 71 percent, versus 27 percent for Mitt Romney (Lopez and Taylor par. 1). Additionally, according to a study by University of California scholars Zoltan Hajnal and Michael U. Rivera, White Americans who endorse anti-immigration views are less likely to identify with, and show support for, the Democratic Party (773). This information further establishes the population’s division in Arizona. Especially in its capital city region of Tucson, the center of Republican legislative control, demographics reveal that the White majority is estimated to have been surpassed by Hispanic Americans in 2015 (“City of Tucson”).

With their focus on individualism Schlesinger and Horne in effect argue to remove any ethnic or racial motivations for grouping and voting, yet overlook actual and possible developments that stem from Ethnic Studies programs and increased education for Latino/as in Arizona. Pew Research Center established that Hispanic college graduates voted 62 percent for President Obama and 35 percent for Mitt Romney in 2012, while Hispanics without a college degree voted more overwhelmingly for Obama, 75 percent versus Romney’s 24 percent (Lopez and Taylor par. 14). For the Arizona GOP to enable the Hispanic minority to attain a college degree is therefore in the party’s advantage, since the 2012 elections proved that a degree more readily entices a person of Hispanic origin to vote Republican. It shows that, with regard to HB 2281, the Republican Party in Arizona too readily concludes that every minority will cling to his or her own group, politically, and that education seems to enlarge the possibility to think differently, also within the Latino/a community. By targeting one ethnic group it is the likes of Horne that increase tension between ethnicities and encourage group thinking.

In addition, according to scholars Julian J. Mendez and Nolan L. Cabrera Arizona Latino/as did not regard themselves as victims of HB 2281, but rather as targets (388). Their research was conducted at the University of Arizona (UA), and observed experiences of eighteen Latino/a students in the wake of HB 2281 and SB 1070 (377). Ironically, they found that besides increased tension between its diverse residents, the campus became a breeding ground for political awareness, which lead to engagement and activism (381) Political conversations increased in dorm rooms:

We would talk about [the legislation] . . . me and my roommates . . . we would do little debates . . . we would talk about how much we hated it, but we would also talk about why others wanted to implement it. (qtd. in Mendez and Cabrera 383)

These conversations occurred especially between UA students who had previously considered themselves “apolitical” (qtd. in Mendez and Cabrera 383). Ultimately, political engagement increased group identity amongst these Latino/as, but also among other sympathizers. Thus, besides increasing that which Horne was trying to prevent, he also prompted political organization amongst multiethnic students. Although arguably this might constitute for Horne’s desire for individualism within Arizona’s communities, because people from different backgrounds united, this unity was still formed surrounding an argument that focused on one ethnic group, which constitutes as his own argument of ethnic solidarity.

The enactment of HB 2281 can therefore be seen as similar to the change in school curriculums in Texas, only in Arizona it worked the other way around. Instead of adding school books aimed at promoting certain philosophies and American capitalism, HB 2281 aimed at banning certain (Latino/a) thoughts and values. These developments in regard to school curriculums in these Border States reveal that political involvement is hampering independent academicism and the development and acceptance of diversity. Ironically, that political involvement, and the generalizing of people that it brings along, in some cases proves to hamper their own interests. Takaki’s view on multicultural education encompasses the idea that people who regard themselves as a group will naturally cluster, but not necessarily always identify or agree with each other. In other words, they are not always similar to each other, despite belonging to a (Latino/a) group. Instead of being excluded by the political majority this group is in need of recognition and a place in United States society.

Political motivations such as those addressed by Horne and implemented with HB 2281 therefore have the opposite effect on what Arizona public schools actually need, which is diversity based on equality in order to ensure graduation and the development of students.

## Conclusion

Concerning HB 2281 and “belonging” the questions that this work raises are related to whether teaching history according to Horne and Schlesinger’s individualist ideal of unity is an unwanted addition to school curriculums. Regarding purely the academic aspect of learning Takaki and Schlesinger’s books have clarified that biased teaching does not add to an independent development of students’ critical thinking. This thesis has critically assessed their arguments concerning the multicultural curriculum in the TUSD, and found that the differing arguments in the HB 2281 discussion match the disagreements that Schlesinger and Takaki convey in their books. Also, banning Ethnic Studies programs has proven to seriously hamper the development of already disadvantaged minorities such as Latino/as. Yet increasing regional or national pride and knowledge of the nation’s history, in order to unite people, is another aspect that must be taken into consideration, which Schlesinger in *The Disuniting of America* conveniently reminds us of. Despite Schlesinger’s choice and use of concepts that are not appropriate for him to use in an academic debate, his usage of them does remind us of important questions about identity and belonging, and specifically the Arizonian understanding regarding these concepts.

HB 2281, however, does not convey the individualist message that Schlesinger endorses and Horne has tried to install. This study shows that Schlesinger’s reasoning against Ethnic Studies programs, and Horne’s motivations in favor of HB 2281, are often based on flawed arguments, yet do carry support of the political majority in Arizona. Multiculturalism in Arizona has thus become politicized also in the public school system, which is not a positive development with regard to HB 2281. Targeting only one ethnic group reveals the hypocrisy in Horne’s plans, while Schlesinger overlooks many aspects of the social history of the US, and too easily attributes the concept of “the West” to United States culture and history. Consequently the need for legislation such as HB 2281 becomes questionable; a more inclusive curriculum could have solved both Horne and Schlesinger’s issues with Ethnic Studies programs, and would have pleased Takaki, also. HB 2281 subsequently exemplifies both how and which history is taught in Arizona, and which students are supposed to learn what in order to participate fully in society and be “American.” Schlesinger and Horne argue alongside similar lines in light of this exemplification, both wanting to retain the United States for Western culture as they know it, while not recognizing any Latino/a claim to what for these people constitutes as El Norte. Although Schlesinger’s recognition of the grouping of

cultures is correct, grouping behavior occurs at every level of society and is not specifically applicable to the Latino/a community in Arizona.

Instead of including all its residents in Arizonian society, political fear for Latino/a culture and change has taken control of the Republican Party that by tradition rules in Arizona. Anti-immigration attitudes through legislation have become the norm with SB 1070, and public schools face penalties for conveying differing, Latin-American, ideologies through HB 2281. Politically, the Arizona GOP's hypocrisy is evident, since it rules out people for their beliefs and their cry for compassion and justice. Instead of resisting ethnic change in the population the GOP could also embrace its own ideals concerning individualism as expressed by Horne and HB 2281, and regard Latino/as as individuals, too. This way changing demographics will not matter as much to the Republicans as they do now, since attaining extra confidence and learnedness through individuality will increase the chances of graduating from college, and decrease the chances of voting Democratic. First though, people need to have the opportunity to become more learned, through attaining high school degrees, for example. Overall, Republicans stand to benefit from tolerant and inclusive standpoints towards the Latino/a population, but as of yet their fear and dislike of them seems to be more important.

Possibilities for further research include an investigation into the concept of belonging in Arizona and the US, since it is that subject that is at the root of the position of minorities in the US, and the enactment of HB 2281. Also, a developed comprehension of Latino/a culture, together with that of the United States as a Western/European-cultured country, which Schlesinger argues it is, would further add to understanding the issues at stake and the animosity that exists between the GOP in Arizona and many of the Latino/a residents there. If we have to believe Horne and his proponents than the seven books that had to be banned from TUSD schools should provide for this comprehension of Latino/a history, while contemporary school books in Arizona evidently should increase knowledge with regard to what is behind viewing the US as a country that is founded on Western ideals. Moreover, increased knowledge of court cases between the TUSD and Horne, or those between individuals and Horne, Huppenthal, or newest Superintendent of public instruction, Diane Douglas, would provide more insight concerning the ways in which HB 2281 has held out against indictments, and what kinds of accusations have come along. Finally, extra research in the contemporary situation in Arizona would shed light on the consequences of HB 2281 to present-day Arizona and the standards of its schools.

Where this work leaves us is in the middle of an ongoing struggle between proponents of multiculturalism in public schools, and proponents of Western-based curriculums. In the case of Arizona it is clear who has eventually prevailed, yet the changing demographic situation, especially in Border States, will show whether the conservative situation there will triumph eventually. In the end, HB 2281, Schlesinger, and Takaki touch on fundamental issues of belonging, ethnicity, individualism, and the United States and its culture. The divide that exists among Americans concerning these issues, which the Arizona study case demonstrates, is intense, and has recently developed up to the level of the Presidential election. Because of the politicization of these issues it is up to the US people to decide in what kind of United States they believe and want to be part of. To me it is apparent that the Republican Party in Arizona does not hate the Latino/a individual, yet they do mistrust the ideals which they believe a Latino/a brings along and will endorse, even if this person behaves as “American” as any other. The group thinking that Schlesinger and Horne believe that Ethnic Studies promotes is therefore most apparent in their own reasoning, and limits their arguments to a conservative boundary.

Notes

1. The books include Rodolfo F. Acuña's *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, Elizabeth Martinez's *500 Years of Chicano History in Pictures*, Paolo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Bill Bigelow's *Rethinking Columbus: The Next 500 Years*, Richard Delgado's *Critical Race Theory*, Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzalez's *Message to Aztlán: Selected Writings*, and *Chicano! The History of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*, by Arturo Rosales ("Latino Books Once Banned in Arizona")

## Works Cited

- “A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.” *U.S. Department of Education*, n.d. Web. 22 Sept. 2016.
- “Adults in Arizona: Religious Composition of Adults in Arizona.” *Pew Research Center*, n.d. Web. 2 Sept. 2016.
- “Archived: Fact Sheet on the Major Provisions of the Conference Report to H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act.” *U.S. Department of Education*, 23 Aug. 2003. Web. 1 Sept. 2016.
- Asante, Molefi K. “The Afrocentric Idea in Education.” *Journal of Negro Education*, 60.2 (1991): 170-180. Print.
- Banks, James A. “Multicultural Education and Curriculum Transformation.” *The Journal of Negro Education*, 64.4 (1995): 390-400. Print.
- Borja, Yvette. “The Importance of Culture in Curriculum.” *Huffingtonpost.com*. The Huffington Post, 10 July 2012. Web. 8 July 2016.
- Brill, Steven. *Class Warfare: Inside the Fight to Fix America’s Schools*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011. Print.
- Bruni, Frank. “The Lie about College Diversity.” *Nytimes.com*. New York Times, 12 Dec. 2015. Web. 12 June 2016.
- Cappellucci et al. “Curriculum Audit of the Mexican American Studies Department Tucson Unified School District.” *Cambium Learning*, 2 May 2011. PDF File
- Chen, Yan, and Sherry Xin Li. “Group Identity and Social Preferences.” *The American Economic Review* 99.1 (2009): 431-457. Print.
- “City of Tucson: Racial Proportions – 1860-2015.” *Tucsonaz.gov*. Government of Tucson, Arizona, n.d. Web. 13 July 2016.
- Coleman, James S. et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966. Print.
- Diaz, Tony. “Do Republicans Hate Latinos?” *Huffingtonpost.com*. The Huffington Post, 9 July 2014. Web. 8 May 2016.

- Galo, Sarah. "Tell Us: Did Your School Curriculum Distort American History?" *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 2 Oct. 2014. Web. 2 Sept. 2016.
- Gates, Henry Louis. *Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Print.
- Gitlin, Todd. "The Left's Lost Universalism." *Harper's Magazine*, Sept. 1993, pp. 16-20.
- "Governing Board Policies." *Tusd1.org*. Tucson Unified School District, 6 Nov. 2015. Web. 8 July 2016.
- Hajnal, Zoltan and Michael U. Rivera. Abstract. "Immigration, Latinos, and White Partisan Politics: The New Democratic Defection." *American Journal of Political Science* 58.4 (2014): 773-789. Print.
- Hanushek, Eric A. Conclusions and Controversies about the Effectiveness of School Resources." *Economic Policy Review* 4.1 (1998): 11-27. PDF File.
- "History – Brown v. Board of Education Re-enactment." *Uscourts.gov*. United States Courts. Web. 10 June 2016.
- Horne, Tom. "Finding by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Violation by Tucson Unified School District Pursuant to A.R.S. § 15-112(B)." *Arizona Central Archive*, 30 Dec. 2010. PDF File.
- "House Bill 2281." *Azleg.gov*. Legislature of the State of Arizona, 2010. PDF File.
- "Latino Books Once Banned in Arizona." *Huffington Post*. The Huffington Post, 24 Oct. 2012. Web. 23 Sept. 2016.
- Lawrence, Vanessa J. "Multiculturalism, Diversity, Cultural Pluralism... 'Tell the Truth, the Whole Truth, and Nothing but the Truth.'" *Journal of Black Studies* 27.3 (1997): 318-333. JSTOR.
- Lopez, Mark H., and Paul Taylor. "Latino Voters in the 2012 Election." *Pewhispanic.org*. Pew Research Center, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 8 July 2016.
- Lundholm, Nicholas B. "Cutting Class: Why Arizona's Ethnic Studies Ban Won't Ban Ethnic Studies." *Arizona Law Review* 53.3 (2011): 1041-1088. PDF File.
- McKinley, James C. "Texas Conservatives Win Curriculum Change." *New York Times*. The New York Times, 12 Mar. 2010. Web. 31 Aug. 2016.

- Mendez, Julian J. and Nolan L. Cabrera. "Targets but not Victims: Latina/o College Students and Arizona's Racial Politics." *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 14.4 (2015): 377-391. PDF File.
- Nealy, Michelle J. "Do Affinity Groups create more Racial Tension on Campus?" *Diverseeducation.com*. Diverse, 10 Mar. 2009. Web. 6 June 2016.
- Orozco, Richard A. "Racism and Power: Arizona Politicians' Use of the Discourse of Anti Americanism Against Mexican American Studies." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 34.1 (2012): 43-60. PDF File.
- Peterson, John. "Tom Horne Ariz Sup. Public Instruction & Michael Dyson Prof. of Sociology at Georgetown.wmv." *YouTube*. YouTube, 13 May 2010. Web. 8 July 2016.
- Planas, Roque. "7 Mexican American Studies Books Banned From Tucson, Arizona Classrooms (SLIDESHOW)." *Huffington Post*. The Huffington Post, 24 Oct. 2012. Web. 23 Sept. 2016.
- "Plessy v. Ferguson 163 U.S. 537 (1896)." *Supreme.justia*. Justia US Supreme Court, n.d. Web. 12 July 2016.
- Precious Knowledge*. Dir. Ari Palos. Dos Vatos Productions, 2011. Film.
- QuickFacts Arizona. *United States Census Bureau*, n.d. Web. 30 Aug. 2016.
- Rhodes, Jesse H. *An Education in Politics: the Origins and Evolution of No Child Left Behind*. New York: Cornell University, 2012. Print.
- Rockmore, Ellen B. "How Texas Teaches History." *New York Times*. The New York Times, 21 Oct. 2015. Web. 31 Aug. 2016.
- Ryan, James E. "The Supreme Court and Public Schools." *Virginia Law Review* 86.7 (2000): 1335-1433. JSTOR.
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. "Defining American Identity in the Twenty-First Century: How Much 'There' is There?" *The Journal of Politics* 69.3 (2007): 597-615. JSTOR.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The Disuniting of America*. New York: Norton, 1992. Print.
- Schrecker, Ellen. Review of *The Disuniting of America*, by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. *The Journal of American History* 79.4, Mar. 1993, p. 1565.

“Senate Bill 1070.” *Azleg.gov*. Legislature of the State of Arizona, 2010. PDF File.

Soto, Sandra K. and Miranda Joseph. “Neoliberalism and the Battle over Ethnic Studies in Arizona.” *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal* (2010): 45-56. PDF File.

“Standard High School Graduation Requirements (50-state).” Education Commission of the States. *Ecs.force.com*, 2016. Web. 8 June 2016.

Takaki, Ronald. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America, Revised Edition*. New York: Hachette Book Group, 2008. Print.

Takaki, Ronald. “Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530 (1993): 109-121. JSTOR.

Three Sonorans News. “Tom Horne – Richard Martinez – Ethnic Studies debate Part 1/5.” *YouTube*. YouTube, 22 Mar. 2011. Web. 9 June 2016.