The “Other” in Modern Secondary History Textbook Narratives from Mexico & the United States: Connection, Conflict, or Indifference?

Chapter List:

I. Public Sentiment Toward the “Other”
II. The Far-Reaching Impact of Textbooks
III. The Politics of Textbooks
IV. Evolving Narratives
V. Reopening and Reshaping the Question: Methodology and Analysis
VI. Quantitative Analysis
    i.Inclusion: The basic metric
    ii. Spacing and Clustering
VII. Theme Analysis
    i. Migration
    Ii. Cooperation
    Iii. Conflict
    Iv. Agency
VIII. Language, Tone and Textbook “Traps”
IX. Implicit Messaging and the Null Curriculum
    I. The “And Also” Effect
    Ii. Worth a Thousand Words
    Iii. Questions Posed
    iv. Luck of the Draw
X. Toward Transnational or Multifocal History?: Continuity and Change Over Time
    i. ideology
    ii. Methods and Expertise
    iii. Collaboration Amongst Scholars
XI. Further Research
XII. Conclusions

Textbooks Reviewed

Works Cited

Appendices

Chapter I: Public Sentiments Toward the "Other"

The United States is home to over 50 million Hispanics, more than 60% of them of Mexican origin[1]. South of the border, the reputable American-based Pew Research Center found that throughout the Obama administration (2009-2017), surveyed citizens in Mexico reported a favorable image of the United States - with a high of nearly 70% by 2009. However, by the spring of 2017 these opinions had taken a sharp course change, with nearly two-thirds expressing a negative opinion. The same holds true for economic ties between the countries, with just over half maintaining that a trade relationship was positive, down 20% from 2013[2]. For their part, larger numbers of Americans in recent years return the negative sentiment. By late-summer of 2018, only 39% of Americans surveyed said that they felt at least "somewhat warm" feelings toward Mexico, while 34% felt coldly and 26% remained neutral. (For comparison, a full 67% replied feeling somewhat to very warm feelings toward America's own northern neighbor, Canada)[3]. These polls reveal two key understandings. First, opinion is malleable and can shift over time in response to transnational politics. Secondly, even when posed with a similar situation (e.g. attitudes toward immigrants), a conception of the "other" is important in shaping these attitudes.

If we can begin to understand a source of information that informs malleable attitudes, perhaps we can also begin to recognize shared historical experiences and continuing mutual benefits.

Chapter II: The Far-Reaching Impact of Textbooks

Understandings of nationhood and individual identity are a complex *melange* of economic, political and demographic realities (or at least perceptions of realities). But they are undoubtedly influenced and reinforced by the stories we tell ourselves: about ourselves, about each other, about "the other". From dinner table conversations to the news to social media, this narrative is actively shaped and frequently has the utility of molding and mobilizing public attitudes and actions for economic or political purposes. In this sea of competing messengers, the great equalizer of constructing an informed public has long been thought to be a nation's public schools, its secondary school classrooms, and the teachers and textbooks within them where these core stories, analyses and conclusions are disseminated to a broad audience.

---

[1] Krogstad
[2] Vice
[3] Laloggia

Textbooks have long been seen as a cornerstone of streamlining curricular objectives and instruction. Citing earlier research, Cruz (2002) emphasizes the claim that "according to virtually all studies of the matter, textbooks have become the *de facto* curriculum of the public schools, as well as the *de facto* mechanism for controlling teachers"[4]. In the same year, a study conducted by the US Department of Education observed that history textbooks were used in the classroom at least once a week, and 44% of teachers reported daily use[5]. This was nothing new. According to Foster (1999), American studies from the 1970s-1990s concluded that 80% of teachers, especially teachers of primary grades, relied on a textbook as the sole source of knowledge in a social studies lesson[6]. Blumberg (2008) found that textbook use also occupied up to 80% of classroom time in some cases[7]. In the United States, due to government-mandated curriculum standards coupled with ever-increasing professional accountability measures designed by legislators, many teachers have felt compelled or obligated to connect instruction to the textbook as a guideline for completing state-established curriculum expectations[8]. The ubiquity and use of online sources provides a multitude of other material outside of the textbook, but is compounded by a variance of knowledge and awareness, objectivity or political biases, experience and desire of individual teachers to incorporate such external supplements. Any common measurement of the frequency or degree of utilization of the same textbook sources remains scattershot and imprecise. One thing that we can be sure of is that in both the US and Mexico, state-mandated curriculum has not gone away, and neither have textbooks. Therefore, even with an array of supplemental resources, textbooks remain a staple vehicle for educators delivering history content.

Journalists and even individual historians have the luxury of expressing arguments and opinions in their writing and defending them through criticisms, recognizing that they cannot satisfy every reader. Textbooks are another animal altogether. How, for example, can a textbook strive to develop a concise, comprehensible, politically palatable and engagingly memorable story that accounts for a multiplicity of actors, while not diminishing a strong sense of cohesion that is the basis for a nation-state's history? This initiative is further hamstrung by a general consensus to offer a broad swath of students a story that recognizes a flawed past but engenders pride in the nation's accomplishments and optimism for the future[9].

---

[4] Cruz, 324
[5] Lapp, Grigg and Tay-Lim, 2002 in Schrader and Wotipka, 73
[6] Jerdee, 15
[7] Blumberg, 2008 in Schrader and Wotipka, 69
[8] VanSledright, 2008 in Schrader and Wotipka, 73
[9] As difficult as writing a fair narrative A roundtable conference of textbook historians discussed that in the highly multicultural Habsburg Empire, this still resulted in a mono-narrative: "we" built the state together and it is acceptable to have others living with you as long as they don't threaten national

Hispanic communities often feel marginalized in society at large, especially those with illegal immigrant status in the United States, and as a result often turn to "ethnically insular communities with little sense of connection to the country's institutions or its civic life"[10]. Inclusion in the "national story" can serve to inform, celebrate and integrate, and exclusion may have deleterious effects on both opinions of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, and even their opinions or assessments of their own place. Tenorio calls textbooks part of a "paradigm of assumed binary as part of answering the question 'who are we'?[11] We are not them. So who are they? VanSledright (2008) has demonstrated that attention to minority subcultures within national history matters a great deal to students' perceptions - especially for minority students. Researchers found that when students sorted lists of historical events and figures in order of importance, the students comprising the white majority made choices that coincided with the "freedom quest narrative" of pioneers (e.g. Washington, Kennedy, the Declaration of Independence), while African-American students chose countercultural outsiders and movements (e.g. Malcolm X & Harriet Tubman -neither chosen by white students!, and the Civil Rights movements)[12]. White students reported that their choices were influenced by textbooks and teachers, while black students named parents as influential, and researchers noted suspicion among the students of the simplified textbooks and school curriculum. This demonstrates the importance of a broader inclusion of figures with whom students are able to identify as contributors to society, as a reflection of themselves as valuable contributors and citizens.

But there has been a long history of omission for minorities, especially for Mexicans. Cruz's (1994) research centered on three eighth grade texts found less than 1% of illustrations or photographs were Latinos and *Our Nation's History* included none at all. For eleventh grade texts, while African-Americans average 10% of pictorials, Latinos figure 2%. She says that:

> *"For Latino students, their US history text serves as a painful reminder that they and their ancestors are either not considered a part of US history, or that they exist in stereotypical fashion taking siestas, in violent combat, or as lustful Don Juans.[13]"*

---

identity and dominance. The historians conclude that this often creates a national narrative that divides people who lived a common history, and question whether it is actually possible to write a "disentangled history" or whether we have to settle for "damage control". ("History Textbooks and the Profession"). Wineburg describes the national collective memory, including school textbooks, as a filter of past events, constantly reshaped by the present; an "amorphous set of social needs that draw on some elements from the past while leaving others dormant." (*Historical Thinking*, 249)

[10] See Chua. "Most Mexican-Americans today live in deep social isolation. I'm talking about the overwhelming majority: those with poor education, poor housing, poor wages. There's a clear distrust of US politics, a perception that only a few control the country, with the rest of Americans being used as labor." (152)

[11] Tenorio in "History Textbooks and the Profession"

[12] VanSledright, 128

[13] Cruz (1994) in Cruz, 326

Many scholars point out the pitfalls of textbooks and their lack of inclusion. A vanguard of modern scholarship in history education, Stanford University's Sam Wineburg has conducted much inquiry into the use and usefulness of textbooks and his condemnation goes furthest in concluding:

> *"History's complexity requires us to encounter multiple voices.The textbook achieves its synthetic harmony only by squelching discordant notes. That's Muzak, not history. Even lively textbooks pose a threat. The main problem of history textbooks is not how they're written. The main problem is their very existence.[14]"*

Nevertheless, a good deal of consensus exists in the literature that textbooks are indeed ubiquitous in schools globally, that their authoritative narratives have the power to shape young perspectives, and that the endorsement of the state and its curriculum provides a sense of certainty and stability to teachers and students alike. Gilbert concludes that,

> *"Whether or not school texts possess the power over young hearts and minds attributed to them, faith in their power is widespread among elites. It is this faith that makes textbooks such revealing cultural artifacts.[15]"*

They have power because we believe in their authority and legitimacy, and therefore we include them as a staple of instruction.

Chapter III: The Politics of Textbooks

That textbooks are both ubiquitous and impactful on impressionable young minds -and that public ideas and discourse may change by changing school curriculum - has been long accepted. Through inclusion or exclusion, emphasis or triviality, the heroic vs. the victimized or even the destructive, implicit and explicit messages are given to students. Thus it remains a writing and selection process surrounded with debate and controversy, globally[16]. How words are chosen and perspectives are shaped still involves an active process with the government playing a large role in any country.[17]

---

[14] Wineburg, Sam. "Opening Up the Textbook And Offering Students a 'Second Voice'", 2007
[15] Gilbert, "Rewriting History", 273
[16] In a previous work, I analyzed the role of school history textbooks in the early era of the Soviet Union. Lenin set out to establish a "usable past", transforming a national and international narrative to fit revolutionary politics; a goal carried into school readers for decades after.
[17] A variety of literature is enlightening on these relevant and varied subtopics. For eliminating narratives crediting foreign (Russian) influence on national development in Ukraine see Korostoelina. Recently, China's education minister directed universities in 2015 to discontinue use of textbooks promoting Western values (Neuman). For analysis of how Japanese textbooks confront controversial transnational issues such as Korean "comfort women", see Hein & Selden's *Censoring History.*

Mexico has a much more centralized process for textbook selection than does the United States. Since early in the twentieth century the Secretaria de Educacion Publica (SEP) advanced the goal of providing *Libros Gratuitos* to the nation's students, and so the government was bound to play a significant role of gatekeeper for approved narratives, not without controversy. In 1992, *Libros Gratuitos* in history were particularly fraught. President Salinas and Minister Zedillo had personally chosen the authors and approved the narratives, rather than the earlier editions which were selected by juried competitions[18]. The resulting texts were roundly criticized as serving narrow political interests and were later revised. This incident, the media exposure and the public backlash demonstrates the subjectivity that political interests can introduce into history as a school subject. As a result, the SEP has attempted to avoid these controversies, aware of media scrutiny, and the secondary texts include a variety of titles. In the US, the decisions to adopt one history text over another are no less political and ultimately left to local board members. Widely conceded though is that decisions made by particular states such as Texas and California tend to drive the textbook market for the whole of the country. The state selection panels, appointed by the respective state boards of education differ greatly, and like in Mexico reflect political leanings or interests. Whereas today California's is composed entirely of educators, the Texas panel represents a cross- section of educators, parents, businesspersons, politicians and a Christian pastor[19]. One must conclude from this both that the influence of the selection board matters in the narratives presented to students, and that despite changes over time, this issue of bias persists.

If contemporary politics help to dictate both American and Mexican adoption processes, so does free market capitalism. A University of California study thirty-five years ago revealed that even though many US history texts were published each year, at that point only six or seven titles were widely used[20]. In his study of world history textbooks in use within the United States, Marino (2011) found that only five titles accounted for eighty percent of texts used by public high schools[21]. And over the years the number of publishers has decreased as well, from nine in 1988 to only four by 1998[22]. While even the *New York Times* was unable to obtain specific distribution data from each company, what we do know is that limitations of choice have only become more acute as publishing companies have folded altogether or consolidated into megalithic conglomerates with three publishers now dominating the US textbook market: Pearson, McGraw Hill, and Houghton Mifflin. In fact, these

[18] Citing a 1992 *La Jornada* article, Dennis Gilbert concluded that "For Mexicans, as for Russians in the last days of the Soviet Union, history -- dependable, official, textbook history -- had become problematic." and thus required change. ("Rewriting History", 272)
[19] Goldstein
[20] Cherry
[21] Marino,425
[22] Sewall, 78

publishers also contribute several titles to the SEP approved free textbooks as well. While it is important to note for methodological purposes that the same publisher on different sides of the border indicate little about the authors' process, ultimately these publishing houses act as filters between the narratives crafter by historians and the approval of boards of education.

Though specific adoption processes differ, in both Mexico and the United States, it leaves a handful of historians writing national histories palatable enough for a handful of publishers to market to a handful of politicians - to then teach to the masses of students nationwide. It can be a fraught and filtered process, to say the least, as are the narratives that emerge.

Chapter IV: Evolving Narratives

The topic of history textbooks and multicultural inclusion remains a subject of interest not just for esoteric academics but for the layperson, evidenced by books like James Loewen's bestseller *Lies My Teacher Told Me* or *History Lessons: How Textbooks from Around the World Portray US History*[23], or in opinion pieces published by mainstream news media[24]. Most recently, *The New York Times* ran a public interest piece this year comparing titles from the same large publishers prepared for two of the largest public school markets in America: Texas and California, whose demands are broadly thought to influence the texts produced and used for thousands of students in smaller and less influential states and school districts. The *Times* evidences the stark contrasts between texts used in California and Texas school districts; two states whose selection committees are widely thought to drive textbook content and demands nationwide. While staff writer Jill Cowen concedes that there were many similarities between editions produced by the same publisher for both states, and that the books seem more inclusive than they were twenty years ago[25], the notable differences when juxtaposing these editions reveals different guiding principles that result in different narratives arriving in students' hands. The main piece written by Dana Goldstein examines those contrasts in detail using eight texts designed for eighth and eleventh grades where US history is typically taught. She found that in the most recent editions (2016 or later) while the general narrative remains the same in both editions, the points for emphasis, inclusion of particular primary sources, and footnotes reveal these subtle nuances that can leave a much different impression and one that could not be more stereotypical of their liberal and conservative state cultural climates. As it pertains to

[23] Lindaman & Ward, 2004

[24] *The Chicago Tribune* in 1986 published an optimistic assessment from six historians and educators who reviewed more than thirty US history texts used in middle high schools. The panel found that the books portrayed America positively, while also presenting multiple views, including those of minorities, and encouraged critical thinking without dodging controversial topics.

[25] Cowen

this particular question - US/Mexico cross-border narratives - the contrasts are compelling. The California editions were found far more likely to explicitly note when an historical figure was an immigrant, and the California Board of Education has specifically asked textbook publishers to emphasize the contributions of immigrants, including Mexican-Americans. While the California edition of a McGraw-Hill eleventh grade text includes a primary source account of growing up as an immigrant, the contemporary Texas edition instead chooses the account of a white Border Patrol agent who expresses concerns about immigration and drug trafficking, stating "if you open the border wide up, you're going to invite political and social upheaval.[26]"

One recent study has found that in a 1997 student edition of a US text in print for the prior thirty-four years, only 0.03% of its more than 700 pages were dedicated to the entire Latin American region[27], while another sampled eleven US texts and discovered that none tallied more than two pages to Latinos in general, and those that did were not always positive in nature[28].

But of course a narrative goes beyond basic inclusion to overall tone and the arc of the story presented. For Mexican texts, this has often been an "evolution from barbarism to civilization"[29] driven by a few great men, and emerging into a story of shared language, religion and cultural identity. Scholars like Mattias Vom Hau conclude that in Mexico's textbooks, the twentieth century was also a struggle to recognize the many contributions of the darker skinned populations, that is, those of native or *mestizo* races, to the building of the Mexican nation[30]. Change is also clearly reflected in how Mexico relates to the United States[31]. When the overarching

[26] Texas editions more often emphasize the strengths of the free enterprise system, California ones emphasized the impacts of capitalism on the growing wealth gap and environmental impacts. Texas also notes regarding Reconstruction efforts from 1865-1877 that the movement ceased because they were costly and meant higher taxes, while California's observes that southern whites opposed black equality. In the pages devoted to the Constitution, California notes in a sidebar the various Supreme Court challenges to Second Amendment gun rights; Texas includes a blank space on the edition's same pages - a void that is replicated in national editions of the book. California's make explicit efforts to highlight struggles of the LGBTQ community, even in reference to society under slavery and amongst Native American communities. (Goldstein)

[27] Besse, 411

[28] Steeler and Grant, Davis in Cruz, 325

[29] vom Hau, 128

[30] This change began after the Mexican Revolution and the formation of the Secretaría de Educación Publíca in 1920, and increased during the Cardenas presidency in the 1930s. (vom Hau, 134) According to Gilbert, the first run 1992 texts reversed earlier trends of presenting the *Porfiriato* in the context of foreign influence and social class division; difficult topics to attack in a political atmosphere that encouraged growing trends of neoliberal capitalism. Avoiding terms related to social class, the texts claim that in the years preceding the Mexican Revolution, peasants and workers wanted to improve their working conditions, but in the abstract without attribution to the forces that produced their dissatisfaction (Gilbert, "Rewriting History", 277).

[31] Vasquez concluded that in pre-World War II texts, two threads of nationalist narratives converged on anti-American suspicion, and texts around this period pointed to Ambassador Henry Lane Wilson as trying to dismantle the Revolution. The 1992 texts still acknowledge friction points in the twentieth century, including the role of the Wilson, but their general tone to American business changed. They

narrative tones change for whatever purpose, descriptions of historical figures and their actions often do too, with new emphasis on biographical traits that better exemplify the story, or omissions occur to avoid contradictions[32].

The traditional American narrative in general high school texts tends to be one of settling an ever expanding frontier through deeds of great individuals with superior character[33], and an imperfect quest for expanding liberty to greater numbers[34]. Van Sledright has called this the "freedom quest" narrative[35]. Addressed in various points throughout the research, American textbooks are now broadly more inclusive of minority groups within the US and Latin American neighbors like Mexico are more in this narrative than in decades past, however, as Besse's 2004 research indicates, the sample did not promote new thinking about the region, but instead furthered a longstanding narrative of neglect, vulnerability and victimhood of native populations, marginalization in the world and general inconsequence[36].

Still, as textbooks have changed over time common patterns persist. An examination of twenty-seven world history textbooks from 1921-2001 arrived at the conclusion that, despite these changes, "The values promoted by the historical narrative are essentially the same in 2001 as they were in 1921…[which] goes to

---

position American investment as necessary to modernity from the *Porfiriato* to NAFTA (Gilbert, 287). In the final chapter, it asserts that economic growth, justice and democracy will accelerate with foreign investment and global openness (Gilbert, "Rewriting History", 294).

[32] Examining elementary texts, vom Hau found that early twentieth century texts focused on singular elites and their unique role in delivering the nation from indigenous barbarism to Spanish higher civilization. This includes the "boldness of Cortés" without whom "the country would have never been conquered and submitted to the Spanish government" and Hidalgo's leadership beginning the Revolution with the indigenous populations who, "adored him and would follow him to the ends of the earth". (vom Hau, 133) By the 1930s, in the growing reflection of a multicultural nation and the role of peasant masses, SEP issued texts portrayed Cortés as the poster child for Spanish corruption, cruelty and ignorance, and Hidalgo as responding to the overwhelming will of the masses (vom Hau, 135). Gilbert focused his 2003 analysis on the role of Emiliano Zapata in textbooks from 1920-2002. A 1926 elementary reader dedicated more page space to Porfirio Diaz's funeral than to Zapata's career. By 1935 he became a "clean and tenacious defender of exploited peasants", and although the uncontroversial and unalloyed heroism narrative faltered throughout the century, by the early 1990s his blemishes were again erased, portrayed, as Gilbert describes, as, "destabilizing but purposeless#. Zapata helps to develop a familiar archetype to all school narratives: "Like a character in a novel, Zapata must fit the requirements of the textbook narrative. He cannot, for example, be a hero unless Diaz is a villain." (Gilbert, "Zapata: Textbook Hero", 134-155)

[33] Elson notes that nineteenth-century American schoolbooks contrasted American 'manliness' with effeminate European scholarship, and until the twentieth century contrasted American freedom and mobility with European intolerance and class conflict (Alm, 238)

[34] The tropes of expanding liberty and American exceptionalism have been reflected over and over in the titles given to these school sanctioned texts: *America: Land of Freedom* (1952); *History of a Free People* (1954); *The American Pageant* (1971); *America: The People and the Dream* (1992); *The Enduring Vision* (1996); *Nation of Nations* (1998). Our modern sampe utilizes less stilted titles: *United States History; United States History and Geography,* and *The Americans.* All Mexican books are titled *Historia de Mexico.*

[35] VanSledright, 122

[36] Besse

show how important valorization can be to historical culture.[37]" Alm concludes that, while less explicit, judgments regarding superiority remain: "the present is better than the past, and the recent past is better than the distant past.[38]" Textbooks can also tend to lean on longstanding tropes, even if trying to avoid overly moralistic or value laden stereotypes. Mexican textbooks have long positioned the relationship to the United States as being dominated by the geopolitical interests of the northern hegemon even when recognizing resulting benefits of cooperation, and American ones including a "birds of passage" trope, on one hand stripping migrant workers of active agency[39] while on the other ascribing morally superior qualities to those of the dominant group[40]. The persistence of these tropes then, serve to undermine more nuanced discussions. In telling their national evolution story, another pattern that is regularly observed is that texts also often avoid the nuanced language of historians, such as "suggests" or "considers[41]", instead opting for language that reinforces certainty. All of these aspects highlight what researchers have dubbed the implicit or null curriculum that send powerful messages even when not explicitly considered; understandings that don't appear on an exam, but are learned nonetheless.

On the northern side of the border, the research is more robust in terms of examining the role of Latinos, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans within US textbooks. As a result, we know that my great-grandfather in late-nineteenth century Columbus, Ohio would have read about Latin Americans as "naturally weak" and "guilty of loitering and inactive pleasures".[42] From these few lines about people he was unlikely to meet, he would become familiar with only negative stereotypes posing as fact and how different they were from him and his people. The rest of his text, or any text from the era, would make this abundantly clear with nationalistic tales of white American ingenuity and exceptionalism. By the time my grandfather had passed through a history classroom in Columbus, according to Marcus (1961) his textbook largely ignored Latinos that could have moved to the city in the

[37] Alm, 249
[38] Alm, 234
[39] Cremer found this effect even in his sample of Advanced Placement US history texts. The 'birds of passage' trope means that migrant workers return on a seasonal cycle out of the American southwest's fields, did not settle there or in northern cities, or were not actively involved in agitation to change their situations; all contradictory to facts on the ground.
[40] Upon review of six popular titles published in the 1970s, Glazer and Ueda (1983) also found a new trend for those who were included. Although minorities in total accounted for between 5-10% of the entire narrative for each book in their sample,
"The old myths of racism, which were prominent in American texts of the twenties and thirties, are now replaced by new myths proclaiming the superior moral qualities of minorities, and we find a Manichaean inversion of which whites are malevolent and blacks, Indians, Asians, and Hispanics are tragic victims." (Gold, 60)

[41] Marino, 422
[42] Foster (1999) in Jerdee, 257

preceding decades[43]. My father's generation did not dramatically remedy the stereotypes, despite the growing popularity of revisionism in academic history. During this period, only two of the twelve even mentioned Mexican-Americans or Chicanos at all[44]. On the sheer omission of their contributions, Gaines concluded that it is "not inaccurate to speak of a 'forgotten' people. Neither their history nor their existence are given due consideration." In his 1972 study of ten titles from the 1950s-1970s that, "Mexicans are characterized as lazy, undemocratic, and cowardly, though sometimes romantic.[45]"

One might postulate that by the time I entered a high school history classroom in the late-1990s, the inclusion would have increased and depictions became more nuanced. However, the earlier patterns persisted, either ignoring Latin America or token recognition given[46].Salvucci (1991) analyzed ten US texts between 1986-1992 (with only one author or title overlapping Fleming's ten book study) and found the portrayals of Mexico and Mexicans "inconsistent, idiosyncratic, incorrect and empty" [47] and that while Mexicans are *mentioned* more often, it is often outside of integration in the wider historical context. They are faceless statistics fighting between tradition and modernity[48]. In the massive, 1343 page tome *America: A Narrative History* (intended for more advanced students), only three paragraphs in total covered Mexicans or Mexican-Americans[49].

The underpinning suggestions here are that textbook narratives, like public opinions, are malleable; that they can at times reflect new historical scholarship or ways of thinking, but can be holistically better through simultaneously reflecting more diverse voices of experience and all the while asking students to engage critically. How significantly have the stories that we tell ourselves through these books changed as we press further into a new millennium of globalized reality, and are those recognized and explained or avoided and ignored in the textbooks in widest use in our public schools? If avoided altogether, is this the result of nationalist arrogance or historical ignorance?

---

[43] Examining eight broadly used titles from the 1950s, Marcus concluded that for Mexican immigrants and Puerto Ricans, "No book contains more than a paragraph about either of these peoples," and for Puerto Riquenños specifically, one book informs students that, "they create problems for cities where they settle." (Gold, 55)

[44] Hoffman (1972) in Gold, 354

[45] Gaines (1972) in Gold, 354

[46] Fleming (1982) found in studying ten books of the 1970s-1980s, "The perspective of the Latin American countries is given little attention in most books and the cultures of the region are virtually ignored. The tone of most of the textbooks concerning U.S.-Latin American relations is generally bland and avoids controversy.

[47] Salvucci, "Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans…" 204

[48] Rodriguez & Ruiz examined eight books from the mid to late 1990s. (1690)

[49] Jerdee, 17

Chapter V: Reopening and Reshaping the Question: Methodology and Analysis

This raises an interesting and central question. While the range of studies discussed above attempted to quantify and qualify the inclusion of minorities in US history textbooks, the literature dedicated to examining the presentation of Mexican-American relations and how this may impact a student's understanding of *el otro lado* are rare[50]. Many of the past studies that have been conducted dedicate their focus to primary school books and readers, or conversely, texts for higher-level high school elective (i.e. Advanced Placement or *bachillerato*), or university courses in national history within one country or another. Comparatively few, however, explore the texts used by the vast majority of secondary students (destined to be citizens, but not historians) in their upper secondary years when their critical thinking skills are more robust than in their earlier schooling. Additionally, the majority of studies that have been carried out on the general topic are now twenty to forty years out of date, in which time many new titles and editions have been produced and a potential rethinking of topics has occurred amongst historians. For these reasons, the question is worthy of (re)visiting in a new way: How do modern Mexican and United States history textbooks relate interactions with 'the other' within their own national narratives?

With regard to the central focus of history texts, choices were made in selecting a sample, as a survey of all titles currently in publication would prove an insurmountable task, even if they are somewhat centralized. In the U.S., as described above, preferences of Texas and California tend to drive the market for titles produced, but it is still left to individual states and/or district school boards to decide when and how a course in American history is presented to its secondary students. Many offer national history courses somewhere between 8th-11th grade (14-16 years old). Because such variation exists down to the local level, this study will examine secondary U.S. history texts generated from the nation's dominant publishing houses – McGraw Hill, Pearson, and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt - as offered by their headline catalogue. This attempts to attain a degree of representativeness not achievable by solely examining one state[51]. In addition, many states run curriculum review cycles every eight to ten years, and lesser resourced school districts may continue utilizing older texts out of necessity, even after curricular standards have been updated. On the other hand, with state and world

[50] In my own queries to University of Chicago historian Mauricio Tenorio Trillo, he concluded that there is not much research available specifically on analyzing the role of the twentieth century United States-Mexican relations in history texts, responding literally, "*I do not know, and I have worked on the subject for a long time.*" What little there is has been examined by him, and the articles have been cited here.

[51] As noted earlier, even a well-resourced publication like the *New York Times* was unable to receive precise distribution data or national sales figures from any of the three publishers.

history themes presented in early secondary years, in a public-private hybrid the SEP prescribes Mexican national history curriculum to be presented in *tercer grado de secundaria,* and provides an official list of approved materials from which schools may select a history text from the twenty-five titles provided. These can be accessed online in full, as part of the *Libros Gratuitos* program[52]. Because precise usage data is not publicly available for these either, a random sampling was taken using the same publishers as the U.S. texts where possible. Although imperfect, the selection method for both the United States and Mexico attempts to analyze titles that are likely seen by millions of mainstream secondary school students[53].

In approaching the research question, this study aimed to achieve both a quantitative and qualitative analysis. In line with previous works, the former of these objectives was accomplished in the US sample through an accounting of the index references and proportion of writing per volume dedicated to presentation, evaluation or even pedagogical questions (e.g. end of section summaries or chapter assessments; the assumption being that if the textbooks are used, these comprehension tools would also be employed by the teacher, at least occasionally)[54] . It was also noted if a relevant person, event or concept was included in bold print as a key term for students, if a biography or source material was included in the margins, or whether an individual or event was depicted pictorially, as these are all ways that an author might provide additional emphasis - saying that the information is "worth" paying attention to. The Mexican sample provided an additional obstacle of not including an alphabetized index, so special care was taken to read each text selection multiple times.

The analysis used a bi-directional approach, first aiming to examine the attention given to specific individuals, groups, events and contexts that are discussed in the text. This consisted not only of an accounting of space dedicated to the topics, but also by creating a positive/negative coding of the language used in the descriptive passages[55].

[52] Titles come from the most recent list See: Gobierno de México, Secretaria de Educacion Publica - https://conaliteg.sep.gob.mx/secundaria.html

[53] NB: All texts are developed by multiple authors, but for ease of reference, the author whose last name came first alphabetically is used here as a synecdoche. The full list of authorship is provided at the end.

[54] For example, if Germany appeared on pages 332, 451, and 518, three total entries would be counted for Germany. Even though discussion or review questions do not directly 'deliver' content, they do ask the reader to engage intellectually with the narrative that has been assembled in the preceding chapter, arriving at comparisons and contrasts and ultimately broader conclusions about the issues.

[55] As discussed later, neutral language included statements of general fact or statistic, not interpretation or explanations of significance.

Specific focus was given to four chronological eras of the twentieth century[56]:

1) the American intervention during the context of the Mexican Revolution and First World War ;
2) government responses to the Great Depression & WWII;
3) the civil rights movements of the 1960s; and finally
4) the NAFTA era and the issue of modern migration and labor.

These periods were chosen specifically for their cross-border elements. In some periods (say, the civil rights movements of the 1960s), it was expected that, given demographic realities, more focus would be given by American texts to the role of Mexican communities than for a Mexican text to include in its 1960s narrative much about the US or a small American expatriate community's role during the same period. One area in which extensive research has already been conducted and as such is intentionally absent in this research is the independence of Texas and the Mexican-American War. This is not to neglect its obvious importance; only to recognize that the field is already occupied and more productive research should be dedicated to recent history.

Limitations of this approach do exist, however, as a single index entry may account for a simple passing reference to a particular country, rather than an in-depth analysis of conflict or cooperation. For instance, an entry on Israel may explain that "the U.S. provided support to Israelis during the war of independence", but this explanation may be one part of a larger discussion of U.S. foreign policy efforts during a given period, and does not analyze much beyond the stated fact. An entire two-column page may be dedicated to a more nuanced view, yet both scenarios account for only a single index entry. This was dealt with through a line-by-line qualitative analysis.

Another design limitation is the author's linguistic standing as a native English speaker. Although working in Mexico City for three years and able to speak and read in Spanish, translation tools were used at various times, and while it should not threaten the integrity of the overall research, it should be noted as a limitation.

Finally, when conducting an investigation of this type a researcher must recognize the multitude of variables that serve to enhance or impede one's socialization. School texts (and perhaps 'schooling' in general) constitute but a small element in formulating a person's ideas about his or her place in their own nation and that nation's relationship with others. The influence of family values, discussions amongst friends, observance of national holidays and cultural rituals, and sources

[56] Another issue to account for here is in the curriculum design. Most American textbooks take the reader through thematic units, but ultimately grounded in chronological progression. Mexican history curriculum for *tercer grado* is entirely thematic, and so while texts do present narratives chronologically, they do so within thematic *bloques.* For example, the theme of "foreign relations" is traced from 1982 to the present, before moving to the next theme.

such as news, pop culture and social media are all undoubtedly involved in the learning process to greater or lesser degrees – leaving those in search of attributive and causal precision as to the role of any one particular influence dissatisfied. Daunting as these limitations are, school history materials do provide some common medium for the construction of national narrative endorsed by policymakers and used by teachers. After all, it is also the hope that public education might also provide necessary depth and balance to these issues so as to temper an unproductive perpetuation of cultural stereotypes that may be inherent in these other informational sources. To what extent have they succeeded in our era?

Chapter VI: Quantitative Analysis

After conducting a meticulous, line-by-line analysis[57] for all instances of transnational inclusion, several observations follow; some surprising, others perhaps less so but verified with evidence from the modern books. From the analysis we can induce four recurrent themes which are central to the student-targeted narratives on both sides of the border in terms of explicit content, implicit messaging and national biases inherent in writing such a broadly consumed history. Foremost amongst these is the long history of Mexican migration to and residence in the United States, both legally and illegally. Secondly and often linked to migration, are examples of international or intercultural cooperation for mutual political and economic benefit. As might be expected, there are also emphasis points dealing with tension, conflict and sovereignty. A final theme and contrast to account for is that of individuals, leaders and independent agency. Through examining modes of overall inclusion, these themes and a process of language coding we arrive at an evaluative conclusion.

i. Inclusion: The basic metric

At its core, this is one of the main questions repeatedly raised by American scholars such as Abraham Hoffman when he, in a 1972 article, inquired “Where are the Mexican-Americans?”. The research here broadened the question -perhaps for the first time in this way- to also ask, “Where are the Mexicans” (and likewise, “Where are the Americans” in Mexican textbooks)[58]?

From solely a quantitative accounting, we arrive at a sweeping and general conclusion: Especially as it pertains to modern history, the United States figures a great deal more into the Mexican national history narrative than the other way around, including discussion of contributions of US residents or citizens of Mexican origin. Of the sample used, the Mexican texts reference the United States’ actions or policies, cultural influence or individual leaders on an average of 29% of text pages about the twentieth century[59]. In other words, approximately every third page a

[57] This was painstakingly true for the Mexican sample, in which no text includes an alphabetical index.
[58] For the table detailing occurrence and mode of inclusion by topic, see Appendix 1.
[59] This ranges from 23 entries on 25% of pages (Perez), 29 entries on 29% of pages (Martinez) to 34 entries on 32% of pages (Montoya).

Mexican student will be reminded of US influence in one way or another. For American readers, references to Mexicans or Mexican-Americans[60] are found on anywhere from 3.5-6% of total text pages in the sample, including chapter assessment questions or document excerpts. US Hispanics (of which the largest single group by far is ethnically Mexican) demographically outnumbered the total African-American population at the time of this study, yet on average African-Americans appear on an average of 8% of total pages regarding the same periods in history. While these estimates appear to be relatively close, the Mexican figure accounts for *all* entries (images and questions, as well as text, for any reference to the group or individuals), the African-American references are indexed for text-only, which means that the true number, including references to specific individuals, photos, primary sources or questions, is bound to create even greater difference[61].

Another interesting metric is the inclusion of the neighboring state in comparison to the inclusion of other global actors. For Mexican textbooks, again lacking an alphabetical index, it is still plain to see that throughout the relevant chapters the United States is a reference point far more than other countries, including others in the Latin American region. In the case of the US sample, it may be unsurprising that, given the dominant cultural heritage, most connections are made to Western and Eastern Europe (accounting for between 40-50% of the total), while Latin America as a whole region ranges between 10-18%. This is another indication that the Mexican historians are often looking northward for comparisons, while American ones are looking across the Atlantic. Interesting for this case, all three American texts include more nominal references to Cuba than to their larger southern neighbor despite demographic and geographic realities.

ii. Spacing and Clustering

The greater inclusion of Cuba than Mexico can lead to another worthwhile quantitative observation, as most discussion of Cuba relates either to the period of the Spanish-American War or to the Cuban Missile Crisis. We can surmise that a fanning out over a period of roughly sixty years and hundreds of pages would not lead an average student to understand much depth about Cuba, except for her relation to the United States when deemed important. To analyze the potential impact of textbook history narratives upon students, not only does explicit inclusion contribute to an impression that the "other" is worth considering, it is also relevant to examine the spacing or clustering of these references (that is, whether there are

[60] NB: While not interchangeable, Mexican-Americans are consistently categorized in American texts as a cultural "other", participating in a similar overarching economic life but socially and culturally different from the national mainstream.

[61] This is partly attributable to the unique nature of African-American history within the broader national story from slavery to civil rights. The question can be legitimately raised though, in the sense that Mexican communities existed in the continental US from before the arrival of the first African slave and never really went away.

many references in a small range of pages or a large range of pages between references). Either scenario could impact a reader's understanding, by not observing an author's intended long narrative thread about the other group[62], or by implying, with several mentions only on one topic, that the group should only be considered in relation to that topic.

The Mexican authors cluster most page space dedicated to the United States into "*Bloque V: 1982 - Actualidad*[63]", which includes discussion of NAFTA and the "soft power" cultural role of the US during the modern stages of globalization[64]. Issues of (illegal) migration aside, one of the largest US reference-clusters comes not at the end of the twentieth century as is the case with Mexican texts, but at the beginning, in the period of the Mexican Revolution and World War I. While the Mexican textbooks are by nature shorter tomes than the American ones[65], in between some of the inclusions of Mexicans in the US sample are more than 100 "busy" pages of narratives, graphs, photos and assessments.

From quantitative accounting we gain holistic insights that may be less apparent when reading individual text excerpts. Now we can turn attention to a more inductive qualitative analysis to account for four themes that emerged for comparison and contrast, and conclude with a discussion of the explicit language and implicit messaging of these textbooks.

Chapter VII: Theme Analysis

i. Migration

The most consistent theme emergent from both text samples involves Mexican migration to the United States, mainly in search of low-wage economic opportunities related to harvesting. Readers discover that immigration continued throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first century[66], typically in response to how well the Mexican economy was doing or what the US needed at the time. All texts demonstrate in some form or another that these migrants tended to form segregated cultural communities apart from the English speaking majority and, partly attributable to this fact, they were persistently the target of racism, discrimination and (at least threat of) deportation, even if they became US citizens[67].

Mexican authors consistently connect economic fortunes, either Mexican underdevelopment or American downturns, to the comings and goings of its workers

[62] A high likelihood in the busy lives and cognitive development of adolescent students. It relies on talented and attentive teachers to draw students attention to these issues, and even well-intentioned teachers could neglect making explicit connections to topics from 100 pages earlier in the text.
[63] NB: Mexican national curriculum dictates these curricular "blocks" which all *Libros Gratuitos* follow.
[64] For Martinez, Montoya and Perez respectively, 45%, 62% and 64% of total references to USA.
[65] US texts averaged 894 pages, while Mexican ones 265 - more than three times as long.
[66] Context is typically provided for readers that Mexicans historically lived in the now-US western states of California, Texas and others for centuries, but since this is outside of the twentieth century these specific sections or references are not dissected here.
[67] For images used in textbooks, see appendix 3.1 - 3.11

[68]. In this sense, Mexican writers tend to focus more on structural influences whereas Americans focus more on function (i.e. Mexicans are hired because they are 'cheap') [69]. These statements at times simply lack the broader economic context offered by their Mexican counterparts, other than use of the all-encompassing word, "poverty". Regardless of circumstance or motivation, the experience of Mexican migrants in any time period is described as an unpleasant one. Economically, they lacked both pay and power. From contracts that, "bound laborers into slavery in order to work off a debt to the employer[70]" in the early part of the century to "Legalized slavery[71]" in the *Bracero* program, migrant workers are presented as vulnerable and in virtual bondage. Their welfare is described as living "in dilapidated housing and [suffering] high rates of infant mortality and disease".[72] and working conditions combined with racism added to the misery.[73] (See Appendix 2) Further specific examples of interracial tension, including mass deportations, are provided below in the chapter regarding "conflict".

Inescapable too is the narrative of illegal immigration that so dominates modern political discussions on both sides of the border. Montoya explains that prior to the Revolution, migrants would easily come and go, or repatriate, but ever since the Revolution it has been "*un constante problema"* between the two countries[74]. In reality, illegal immigration would seem to pose greater problems for the United States in terms of providing government services, but Mexican texts across the board raise the issue of illegal migrant flows as often as US texts do, and even visually depict migrants at the border fence crossing illegally, whereas none of the US texts do this (See appendix 3.13-3.14). As with legal migration, Mexican authors more often connect illegal migrants to economic circumstances in Mexico and facing the same challenges as legal ones, while Americans often relate to whichever broad political theme is at hand: WWII and *Bracero* labor contributions, civil rights,

---

[68] "A Crisis of poverty and hunger led many to migrate to the United States." (Montoya, 220); "The flow has decreased because of policies but also because of 2008 [recession]." (Martinez, 239, 250). Perez summarizes: "The migratory politics of Mexico have been determined by its proximity to the United States."

[69] "They labor in low paying jobs, such as migrant farmwork, and receive no benefits." (Lapansky, 1028); "They took jobs many Americans turned down." (Danzer, 886); "Employers still needed immigrants, a source of cheap labor." and "could only find work in low paying jobs." (Appleby, 272, 530). In discussing their deportation in the 1930s, Appleby also offers reasoning that they were targeted for deportation too because of low cost.

[70] Danzer, 289

[71] Lapansky, 907

[72] Appleby, 530

[73] Both countries' authors concur in their characterizations. "..exploited and cheated by their employers." and "frequently subjected to brutality and violence." (Lapansky, 907, 675); ""Regardless of their citizenship status, people of Mexican heritage were often treated as outsiders by the English-speaking majority." (Appleby, 531); "..abuses and aggressions from employers, authorities and racist groups." (Perez, 207); "...lead insecure lives and the government of the US wants to deport them, some with children who don't speak Spanish or know the other country." (Martinez, 250)

[74] Montoya, 192

changing demographics. Interestingly, when it comes to illegal immigration, the American narrative tones are more circuitous in their word choices than those written by Mexican colleagues[75].

Nearly all texts describe in some measure the joint-labor recruitment venture known as the *Bracero* program that existed from the time of the Second World War until the 1960s[76]. *Bracero* was specifically designed by the United States government in coordination with Mexico to fill (mainly agricultural) gaps in the American labor market. With estimates varying wildly depending on the source[77], Mexican and American texts generally again concur on what are two dominant themes: discriminatory treatment of migrant workers in the US, and some migrants maintaining illegal status to escape poverty in Mexico[78]. Two of the American texts also link this permanent settlement of *Braceros* or resultant illegal immigration with widespread and controversial deportations of Mexicans in the 1950s. Still, from texts on both sides of the border, despite the abuses exposed and associated with it, the *Bracero* program is put forward as an example of mutually beneficial cooperation, with each country providing a comparative advantage to the other[79].

There is, on occasion, a recognition that the work done by these migrants had positive impacts on someone other than themselves or their discriminatory employers. Unlike the concurrence as to the treatment of immigrants, more positive aspects tend to align with national biases, such as Mexican texts explaining how important remittances are to Mexican improvement; “a very important quantity of money [$22.4 billion USD] to support the development of the economy of our country”[80] and “Their work is very important for both countries...the entrance of money is greater than the income from oil exports”[81]. Less detailed in their descriptions, the US texts make scant and general but still explicit references. “Migrant workers thus became important to the Southwest’s economic system[82]”, “vital to the development of mining and agriculture”[83], “made major contributions to

[75] “During the 1920s, half a million Mexicans immigrated to the US through official channels. An unknown number entered the country through other means.” and Other immigrants arrived without official permission. The largest number of unauthorized immigrants came from Mexico.” (Appleby, 529, 607); “When their employment ended, the braceros were expected to return to Mexico. However, many remained in the United States illegally.” (Danzer, 662); In a caption, Lapansky couches “52% are illegal” between the positive function “77% of foreign born migrant workers are Mexican” and their struggles “half live below the poverty level.” (Lapansky, 1031)

[76] Although the US texts dedicate more space to describing the program, generally.

[77] “Hundreds of thousands between 1942-1947” (Danzer, 662); “By 1964, 3 million..” (Lapansky, 907); “Nearly 5 million…” (Appleby, 442)

[78] Lapansky dubs this “legalized slavery” and is the only text of the six to include a dedicated space to Ernesto Galarza, one Mexican-American author who exposed mistreatment of *Braceros.* Perez describes that they suffered “abuses and aggression from employers, authorities and racist groups” (207), but ends the section with a seemingly bizarre question for students to consider whether this treatment of migrant workers was “fair”.

[79] Cremer

[80] Martinez, 204

[81] Perez, 207

[82] Appleby, 364

[83] Danzer, 289

the local economy[84]"or "This luxury [cheap grapes] was made possible by a group of hardworking and largely silent migrant farmworkers."[85] Though generic and sparse, these types of positive inclusions mark a contrast with texts of the past that may have included markedly negative stereotypes or excluded positive benefits altogether. It should be noted that while the Mexican authors offer these benefits in present tense, for the American authors it is in the past; Mexicans *were* a cornerstone of the economy back then, but as it pertains to the present, Mexicans still come (some illegally) but it is unclear what they do now or whether they are "vital"[86].

Relatedly, there is some nominal recognition that Mexicans did other work besides in farm fields, such as in railroads or mining. On the surface, one might wonder about other service related jobs, especially if indeed Mexicans formed separate *barrios.* Did they own stores, restaurants, small businesses that serviced other immigrants? Did anyone emerge from poverty through their own hard work and initiative and overcome obstacles to succeed; a staple trope of American narratives, writ large? Once again, Mexicans are absent from this immigrant success story in a way that other [European] immigrant groups may not be, and readers could end with the conclusion that *all* Mexicans are poor farmworkers[87].

For those Mexican immigrants who settled in the US permanently, their political affiliations and impacts are mostly neglected until the modern era. Of the three American texts, only one sets Mexican-Americans in the context of the Great Depression even though discussion is generally thorough regarding the economic impact on farms and farmers[88]. The explanations of the resulting Democratic coalition that formed the New Deal programs and the impact of these programs is consistently inclusive of African-Americans and even Native Americans, but Mexicans are broadly absent[89]. In fact, apart from this reference, in the American text explanations of modern politics, Mexicans are later blended with Latinos as a voting bloc to discuss any political influence[90]. We might hold Mexican authors less responsible to discuss direct impacts on American politics, but in a concluding section, Montoya states that, "his [Barack Obama's] triumph was obtained in large part due to the vote of Mexican-Americans."[91], whereas American texts recognize

---

[84] Lapansky, 675
[85] Lapansky, 1030
[86] Jerdee concurs here, stating that "Immigration in U.S. texts is in the past and contributed to cultural diversity, while in Mexico it remains a fluid phenomenon. (71)
[87] Cremer
[88] "Mexican-Americans tended to support the New Deal, even though they received even fewer benefits than African-Americans did." (Danzer, 506).
[89] Lapansky does include a Depression-era mural at the end of the chapter (see appendix 3) which reinforces the image of the Mexican farm laborer, but with no discussion of New Deal farm program impacts on the group.
[90] Lapansky includes another generic statement for the modern era, "However, Latino immigrants have had a profound social, cultural and political impact.", but no other explanation accompanies *how* they impacted anything, specifically. (1128)
[91] Montoya, 242

coalitions of diverse groups but do not note Mexican *or* Latino support as being instrumental to any of them.

Without question, the story of migration from Mexico to the United States in the twentieth century is the most consistent and concurrent theme across all of the texts, and the reason why it has a dedicated chapter here. It is clear, no matter which textbook a student holds, that migration is described as most often economically motivated, sometimes illegal, and persistently unfair. While all of these statements are historically verifiable, no single text captures fully the context, perspectives and nuance that might be formed from meshing the narratives together. From this issue stems both a narrative of international cooperation and conflict, and nationalistic agency in the chapters that follow.

ii. Cooperation

The cessation of hostilities in 1848 with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo closed the last declared conflict between the US and Mexico[92], and since then there have historically been a litany of shared issues and concerns, especially around the border itself. Although some are directly linked to the prominent issue of migration, several other segments from the sample demonstrate a narrative of ongoing cooperation between the neighboring states[93].

Along with the beginnings of *Bracero* and during this same chronological period, a split-phenomenon exists when examining cooperation from either country regarding the Second World War. The two nations were allies in the fight against European fascism and Mexican-Americans volunteered in large numbers to serve with distinction in the US military. Both are points thoroughly explained, but only in the two isolated national samples.

Mexican books explicitly address the allied relationship, and Mexico's role in providing "indispensable" oil, manufactures and workforce to the American-led efforts [94], and *Escuadron 201,* which flew its dangerous missions alongside American fighter pilots. Perez goes furthest by selecting a mural demonstrating friendship and historical parallels between the two countries (See Appendix 3.25), explains the ongoing positive impact that the war created for US-Mexico relations, and asks students review questions about the immediate historical context and to seek current news articles about the US-Mexican economic relationship[95]. For their part, the American sample says absolutely nothing about Mexico's role, with focus settled solely on European allies[96].

---

[92] The US invasion of Veracruz, while resisted by Mexican authorities, was not declared an official war
[93] See Appendix 2 for language of cooperation
[94] Montoya describes this supply relationship, but does not explicitly note the nations' alliance, but this should be understood in the context that this title actually does not note *any* alliance during the war.
[95] Perez, 204-205
[96] One chapter opening map does display Mexico and all of Latin America shaded as "Other Allied Countries" (as opposed to "Main" ones) and makes note of Brazil's contributions and "Allied freighters and tankers" being attacked in the Atlantic [though not specifically Mexican ones, as all of the Mexican sample highlights] (Appleby, 356)

However, unlike samples of past textbook studies, contributions of Mexican-Americans to the war effort are not ignored here. They note that several hundred thousands Mexican Americans (or Hispanics) joined the military and two of the three texts explain that 17 individuals were awarded the Medal of Honor for their heroics. Danzer goes furthest in noting that from Los Angeles, Mexcian-Americans served in greater numbers proportionally than their population in the city and that an all-Chicano unit was one of the most decorated of the war[97]. This obviously represents a progressive departure from the omissions of these contributions in earlier samples. Even though Mexican texts extensively describe the lives of migrants to the US, including citizens of Mexican origin, they make no reference to patriotic military service in this allied cause, but still focus on the alliance itself.

Without question the largest-scale historical example of direct governmental cooperation between Mexico and the United States is the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), also including Canada in the tariff-free zone. Given the resulting billions of dollars worth of goods and capital flow for the three economies it is little wonder that all historians found it crucial to include NAFTA in the form of text, political cartoons, images and questions[98]. Universally the authors recognize the debate surrounding the treaty's passage, but this is where the similarities break down into national perspectives[99]. All US texts relate that American workers worried because Mexican labor costs were lower, two also note lax anti-pollution laws there, and one offers specifics on these fears, summarizing that 100,000 American manufacturing jobs were indeed lost[100]. According to current estimates, the US tends to be the greatest economic beneficiary of the treaty, but only Appleby explains any general positive tradeoffs as a result of participation, even for Americans[101]. Additionally, the scant coverage that NAFTA does receive in all US texts is consistently embedded within a section dedicated to describing the 1990s more broadly, and is set alongside the creation of the EU, aiding peace in Israel, the growth of the internet and even details of the Clinton impeachment. From this we may conclude that NAFTA is important to the growth of US power in the post-Cold War world, but to American analysts it is only one of many contributory factors. On the contrary, for the Mexican texts driven again by national curricular demands, issues surrounding NAFTA are far more than a sidebar; often given two to three full pages. Describing earlier periods they often connect how the World War II era helped grow the Mexican economy by supplying the US with needed goods, but NAFTA's permanence and interdependence lends it to a lengthy coverage.

---

[97] Danzer, 573

[98] Neither the American nor Mexican sample gives anything besides nominal reference to NAFTA's third triumvir: Canada.

[99] See Appendix 3.17 - 3.20

[100] Danzer, 873

[101] "Many Americans feared that NAFTA would cause industrial jobs to move to Mexico, where labor costs were lower. Although some jobs were lost, the US unemployment rate fell as wages rose." (Appleby, 614)

Opening with either lofty pronouncements such as, “entering globalization hand in hand with the United States and Canada[102]”, “a radical experiment without precedent in the history of the world[103]”, or explaining the overall benefits of importing higher-quality, lower cost goods, Mexican histories quickly turn to the problems associated with the accord, each citing its own variation on three issues.

For example, each text makes a point to describe that despite NAFTA’s provisions for free flow of goods, American authorities and union protesters have blocked the entry of produce trucks on “the pretext that they were contaminated with bacteria[104]”. Secondly, each notes the negative impact of foreign agricultural competition on Mexican farmers, forcing many of them to abandon their traditional crops and influencing them to relocate - sometimes illegally - to the United States[105], or how the rise of *maquiladora* plants offering low wage work devastated the countryside and local competition[106]. Only Martinez, whose overall assessment is the most positive of the set, takes efforts to remind students that rural poverty is longstanding and structural, and cannot solely be blamed on NAFTA[107]. Finally, regardless of any positive benefits these histories describe as part of the relationship, as with the issue of migration, all of the Mexican books emphasize an interpretation of increased dependency on the United States and its economy that resulted from the deal, and Mexico’s understanding that they are part of an unequal and unstable partnership, but one which has ultimately helped to push their economy to be a player on the global stage after the financial crises of the 1980s, and which has delivered better consumer goods to middle and upper class Mexicans. In sum, with regard to the longstanding trade agreement and explaining its costs and benefits and debates to readers, Mexican historians award it significantly elevated prominence in comparison to American writers, furthering the broad conclusion that the US plays a more significant causal role in the writing of Mexican history.

Taken together, these narratives of ongoing cooperation between the two counties, though not without debate or shortcomings, can perhaps serve to further support the conclusion that the producers of these histories sought to emphasize a contributory role played by Mexico to the United States, albeit via different avenues. Mexican historians choose to articulate the economic needs that Mexico’s laborers, supplies and markets provide to the United States, in spite of lopsided benefits (e.g. discrimination and deportation of *Braceros,* disruptions caused by NAFTA). For their part, American historians recognize this too, though as with migration, through a lens of how Mexico or Mexican-Americans “fill gaps”, rather than provide any kind of essential backbone or partnership that could not be found elsewhere, and fit within a broader narrative of the United States as an aspirational, if imperfect world power.

---

[102] Montoya, 232
[103] Perez, 251
[104] Montoya, 246
[105] Perez, 252
[106] Perez, 229
[107] Martinez, 249

iii. Conflict

When it comes to direct conflict between the United States and Mexico, a large body of existing literature analyzes narratives of the Mexican-American War (1846-1848) in history readers at all levels. With that in mind, this research sought to focus on only the international relationship in the twentieth century, exemplified early in the period with tensions, border clashes and American invasion of Veracruz surrounding the Mexican Revolution. It also included sporadic episodes of racially-tinged violence from both white citizens and government officials against cultural enclaves, migrant workers and illegal immigrants to the US[108] .

For the Mexican Revolution writ large, in 1972, Abraham Hoffman discovered that while only two of the twelve texts' indices he examined included direct entries for either "Mexican-Americans" or "Chicanos", *all* of the textbooks incorporated the Mexican Revolution. While his former finding has changed greatly over fifty years, the period surrounding the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) still provides a key window into the cross-border narrative. According to the Mexican historians, foreign interests[109], either provided support or found advantage in the government of Porfirio Diaz, helping to cement the inequalities and corruption that ultimately fueled desire for revolution. The Mexican desire for transparent democracy fits comfortably with American narratives of expansion of their ideals during the period, but even though the American texts do explain that American investors were involved in Mexico's economy, they stop short of attributing this as a direct factor for upheaval.

Instead, US President Woodrow Wilson so-called "Moral Diplomacy" plays a central role in US-Mexican relations of the period and Wilson, like his predecessors, is portrayed as catalyzing positive changes across the Latin American region: eschewing corruption and encouraging democracy through "a plan of 'watchful waiting'[110]. Mexico's Francisco Madero, a reform minded democrat staring down a military dictator should complement the moral diplomacy story of Wilson presented by the American texts quite well, but it is only the Mexican texts that take note of any role -though peripheral- for the United States in the early stages of the Revolution.[111] That said, along with inclusion of Madero, what is generally notable in the comparison between the modern sets of texts is the sheer number of Mexicans who are explicitly named in US texts (e.g. Huerta, Carranza, Villa) for their respective roles in the few pages dedicated to the Revolution; a stark contrast with the Mexican

[108] See Appendix two for examples of language related to conflict.
[109] Identified or implied to be American
[110] Danzer, 363
[111] The role is geographical, as Montoya and Martinez explain Madero's critically important escape from a Mexican jail to the United States – specifically to San Antonio, Texas– where he was able to regroup, plan the insurrection and form the basis of the *Plan de San Luis.* Perez offers a map of Madero's 1910 campaign, which clearly crosses into the US in Texas cities like Loredo and El Paso on the border, and San Antonio deeper into the state, but with no explanation as to what actually occurred in this foreign territory.

texts that do not name the US Presidents (whom the American texts regard as crucial leading figures in relations across the region).

Two other stark contrast points arise between the samples in describing these chaotic years. The first regards the coup of Huerta which resulted in Madero's assassination. The American texts stress Wilson's disapproval, saying that he would not support a "government of butchers", and while no Mexican texts directly refute this, they nuance this complex narrative by introducing another Wilson: American ambassador to Mexico, Henry Lane Wilson[112]. This Wilson inside the country did not moralize and wait for democracy, but actually encouraged Huerta's assassination of Madero[113], and according to one book, signed the document pledging US support inside the American embassy[114]. A striking instance of underhanded foreign maneuvering, Lane Wilson is entirely absent from the American sample, presumably because his dealings are out of step with the "moral diplomacy" narrative emphasized in the section[115].

The 1915 US incursion into the port of Veracruz also provides an excellent window into variation amongst the sources and haphazard historical scholarship. Montoya attributes the action to German cargo ships arming the Huerta government which attracted American attention[116], while Perez states that it was motivated by gaining access to Mexican resources[117]. US sources explain that the inciting provocation was the kidnapping of American sailors by the Huerta dictatorship, but reactions of Mexicans at the time vary depending on the source. One describes Wilson's surprise at anti-American riots after the invasion, but with the US still acting as a mediator and ensuring Carranza the presidency[118]. Another establishes a directly causal relationship linking the American action to the immediate collapse of Huerta's government, and that "Huerta's fall from power cheered many Mexicans and appeared to validate Wilson's 'moral diplomacy'.[119]". Danzer reassures students with an unattributed claim that "most US citizens supported American intervention in

[112] Henry Lane Wilson has been a constant in Mexican texts over the years, despite changes made.
[113] Montoya, 165
[114] Martinez, 170. Perez goes even further in drawing attention to this, including a secondary source document and questions on the ensuing *"Decena Tragíca"* in the unit evaluation for the whole *bloque,* asking "which foreign person intervened?" (219). (*these are the *only* source-based questions provided).
[115] American authors are not uncritical of Presidential foreign relations and usually characterize the period as empire-building, but Lane Wilson's actions may be a "bridge too far". Similarly, they do not include American abuses in the Philippines that happened in the same context.
[116] Montoya, 165
[117] Perez, 202. However, Perez places the invasion in the wrong year (1914). Martinez does not write about the invasion at all.
[118] Appleby, 195. This source does offer an exercise in empathy, asking students to write a radio news broadcast of the invasion from the perspectives and feelings of a Mexican citizen.
[119] Lapinsky, 61. This source is the only of the three *not* to include an excerpt from Edith O'Shaughnessy, an American diplomat's wife in Mexico City who describes the invasion as a "great wrong done to these people" (Danzer, 363). Neither source notes, however, that Mrs. O'Shaughnessy and her husband allied with the Huerta dictatorship and fled Mexico after his fall.

Mexico[120]". These sources present a morally justified and generally popular invasion of the sovereign southern neighbor, but one that is unmoored from other necessary context.[121]

Another comparable discussion of state-to-state tension between US and Mexican writing also centers in this period around the so-called Zimmerman Telegram, which texts ask students to engage with in various ways[122]. The significant differences in the texts here rest on two elements - the immediate and critical context of the Mexican Revolution, and the agency of Mexican leaders (discussed in the following chapter) - which are only provided by Mexican texts and absent from US ones. Each of the Mexican books recounts Germany's assistance of Huerta and Pancho Villa in acts of sabotage. The American texts consistently describe German acts of naval provocation against other European vessels, while the Mexican ones keep the focus on Germany's interference only in Mexican maritime affairs. Aside from the immediate context, the American texts note the promise to Mexico of recovering territory in the southwest[123], including Texas, though only one of three reminds students why this would be culturally or historically significant for Mexico

---

[120] Danzer, 363

[121]On the Veracruz intervention, Greenfield & Cortes cited a 1986 text in which the decisive and democratically-minded Wilson "favored the interests of 85% of the Mexican people struggling toward liberty over the interests of foreign investors…who had invested almost $1 billion..[and] favored Huerta because they believed he would keep order." (296) Oddly precise in its accounting of Mexican sentiments during a time of upheaval, the text describes that despite Wilson's best intentions in promoting the triumph of democracy over dictatorship, "Latin Americans looked upon what they regarded as Wilson's 'moral imperialism' with no more favor than Roosevelt's Big Stick diplomacy (201)"; leading the researchers to speculate that likely student responses are either confusion or "a conclusion that Latin Americans behave irrationally." (Greenfield and Cortes, 296). In their International textbook study examining how the US is portrayed in history texts around the world, Lindaman and Ward (2004) observe an interesting addition to both the US and Mexican accounts of the Mexican Revolution. *Estudios Sociales 10,* a 1999 Costa Rican high school textbook, describes Pershing's punitive expedition in response to the Columbus attack, and like most American texts, attributes the withdrawal attention to European events around the First World War, and Mexican resistance, but the Costa Rican text also claims that another factor was "the solidarity of the US laborers who rose up against the action." If an implicit goal in the American texts is to promote a unified story of championing democracy Veracruz and subsequent events as broadly popular (though *Americans* and McGraw did note the US Ambassador's wife in opposition), then omitting American labor dissent seems coherent. In Mexican texts, however, with a growing focus on labor inequality especially during this early twentieth century period, this is a detail which could have been used to express nuance in the American approach or to promote empathic connections amongst the working class on either side of the border.

[122] Nearly all texts ask students to engage with the Zimmerman Telegram either through a bolded term, specific question and/or through including the source pictorially. Only two, one Mexican and one American, require students to process the document itself in a meaningful way - Martinez asking students to consider context and potential consequences of Mexican acceptance of the telegram, and Lapansky requires historical thinking through analyzing the credibility of the document itself. Although Danzer does draw readers' attention to the telegram a total of five times, it is in simple ways and, for the American texts, it is essentially a sidebar to the broader narrative of German naval aggression as a contributory factor for ending American reluctance to enter the First World War.

[123] Lapansky offers the closest to accounting for perspectives in that US leaders did not think Mexico would actually follow through on Germany's offer (256). In the teacher's edition, one text instructs the teacher to tell students that Americans might have been worried by Mexico's proximity, and Germans could physically invade from there - a dubious historical claim.

anyway, as the Mexican-American War is discussed hundreds of pages earlier in each text[124]. These contextual differences, however small, provide alternate motivations and causes behind international tensions.

Apart from outright or potential aggression between the two countries, treatment of individual people becomes the focus point for conflict for the rest of the histories. As discussed in the migration chapter above, racial discrimination against Mexicans in the United States is a universal theme across the twentieth century. One incident in 1943 Los Angeles exemplifies the cultural tensions when mobs, some of them US military on vacation (and implied caucasian), attacked Mexicans and Chicanos wearing "zoot suits" in the eponymous Zoot Suit Riots. US texts emphasize that most Mexicans were victims rather than perpetrators, but the subtle presentations within the narrative foster ambiguity about deeper cultural causes. "Fear of juvenile crime[125] ", "migration", lacking mastery of English, and unemployed youth "languishing in slums[126]" are all attributed as context leading to the violent outburst, along with rumors that zoot suiters were attacking sailors. Other implied negative messages include a photo of zoot suiters in handcuffs waiting to go to court[127], (See Appendix 3.12) as well as a statement after defining the popular, baggy zoot suit style of Mexican-American youth that, "Most men, to conserve fabric for the war, wore a victory suit.[128]"; effectively setting these youth apart from most other Americans by not acting responsibly or patriotically in a time of crisis. This represents a direct contrast with Montoya's Mexican version, explaining that the suits were instead "a form of "protest against racial discrimination because, like African-Americans or Indians, they were not able to sit together with the whites or be close to them.[129]", a point raised by no American text. While the American texts explicitly say that Mexican-Americans weren't at fault, the authoritative justifications for racially-motivated violence implies at least partial responsibility for aggravating the tensions.

Aggression towards the Mexican and Mexican-American cultural community was not always expressed through overt violence. Surprisingly, it is only the American texts that describe in any detail the two major waves of deportations in the 1930s and 1950s in which potentially millions of Mexicans, including Mexican-Americans who had either birthright or naturalized citizenship were

[124] Perez also neglects to add this context, although Perez stands alone in asking students to contextualize or compare in a different way- with an assessment task of locating modern news about Mexican-American relations.
[125] Appleby, 364
[126] Lapansky, 811
[127] Even though the text indicates they were wrongfully accused, the caption on the photo says "These Mexican-Americans, involved in the 1943 LA riots, are seen here leaving jail to make court appearances." (Danzer, 593)
[128] Appleby, 364
[129] Montoya, 241

deported thanks to economic nationalism and resulting xenophobia[130]. More than a passing reference, the texts include statistical estimates[131] and even primary source materials from those affected. “Deported[132]”, “Pushed out[133]”, “Rounded up..(often without regard to citizenship status) and forcibly returned to Mexico”[134], the black mark on American officials is laid bare. Appleby notes that the 1950s raids were criticized in both countries, and the texts make efforts to recognize the injustice of the repatriations solely due to their cultural “otherness”, especially for American citizens of Mexican origin[135]. It is striking that although Mexican texts frequently include abuses that migrants to the US faced, the forcible re-entry of millions of people in two cases of government-led racism is not noteworthy enough to include in the standard section called “The Politics of Migrants”.

“At times, the differences between Mexicans and Mexican-Americans are subtle.[136]”, says Martinez; but this is not the impression that US texts provide - they are a group apart. This “otherness” of Mexican communities in the US has one other interesting sidebar: the development of a Chicano culture. (Mexican books make specific efforts to explain that the term Chicano has actually fallen out of fashion and is now considered derogatory). Often noted by American authors that Mexicans and their descendents have historically settled in *barrios* in the Southwest, books on both sides describe their unique heritage, including a mural movement, inspired in part by Rivera and Orozco (See appendix 3.21-3.24). While Appleby begins by framing these mural as significant in helping Hispanics celebrate their culture and contributions to the United States, the segment curiously concludes:

“As with all cultural movements that emphasize an ethnic identity, however, a potential negative effect of the movement was that it might also have contributed to division among communities, rather than emphasizing common ground among all Americans...Some people found some images disturbing.”[137]

And it is this culture that Mexican authors consistently describe as being homogenized by American-led globalization and cultural hegemony[138]. Statements about zoot suits vs. victory suits, segregated barrios, indiscriminate deportations of Spanish-speakers, divisive expressions of heritage, changing *corridos* to reflect

---

[130] The peak of deportations was in 1933, prior to the election of Franklin Roosevelt, who was known for his Good Neighbor Policy with Latin America. The deportations actually continued throughout the Great Depression, albeit at a slower rate, until 1940. This overlaps with the period of the legal *Bracero* program which could create confusion for readers trying to anchor the Mexican-American experience.
[131] In the texts, these vary between 300,000 and 2 million, depending on the text!
[132] Danzer, 506
[133] Lapansky, 717
[134] Appleby, 296
[135] Lapansky includes personal stories of those deported, included a family who had to leave their US citizen-child’s birth certificate behind, but these human stories appear only in the teacher’s edition and thus unavailable to all student readers.
[136] Martinez, 245
[137] Appleby, 533
[138] “...many Mexicans aspire to live like, eat like and have American values.” (Perez, 244) Also see Appendix 3.18

intercultural abuses, and destruction of other traditional culture send clear messages to student readers that despite periods of peaceful coexistence, the "other" is still too different to be "like us", and these cultural differences often bring us into tension and conflict.

iv. Agency

"This war...is doing what we in our Mexican-American movement had planned to do in one generation...it has shown those 'across the tracks' that we all share the same problems….After this struggle, the status of the Mexican Americans will be different." - Manuel de la Raza, quoted in A Different Mirror: A history of Multicultural America[139]

A final and vital theme for comparison and contrast raises an important question about efficacy, power and choices in this international and multicultural relationship. Even if we recognize an economic imbalance, or that the United States maintains greater influence on the global stage than does Mexico in both hard and soft power terms, what space exists in the stories that we tell about "others" whose deliberate actions support or challenge that global order? The previous three sections have been dedicated to migration opportunities seized by individuals, and cooperation and conflict at both top and bottom levels. This chapter concludes the thematic analysis by examining how each sample set addresses agentic actions and motivations that perhaps the other set of texts excludes (or at least relays with different perspectives), and leads into the holistic analysis of national biases[140].

One of the clearest contrasts is in the sovereign power ascribed to the Mexican government. From the American perspective, it is typically characterized as chaotic, weak and unstable during the Revolutionary period (in spite of American support for its democratic ideals), a non-entity for most of the century, and a mixed partnership in the modern era; both a beneficial trade partner thanks to cheap labor and lax environmental regulation, and implicitly ineffectual in preventing illegal immigration to the United States. Naturally in a national history book, the Mexican authors devote more favorable, though not uncritical, coverage to their own system, but they afford it far greater influence in this relationship than the American texts portray; an influence characterized in three main ways: neutrality in the face of American pressure, as a conflict mediator for the United States and human rights advocate. In asserting its sovereignty, the Mexican government is described as refusing the US commander's demands for an apology for the kidnapping of sailors in 1914[141] and later agreed with Venezuela to "sell oil to Latin America at preferential prices and the United States had to accept that decision."[142] Leveraging its own economic position and independence, increased trade with the US was seen as a

[139] Danzer, 593
[140] See Appendix 2 for language related to agency
[141] Appleby, 194
[142] Montoya, 245

strategic way to open new doors in international relations[143] and during the earthquake in the 1980s, Martinez notes that the "Secretary of Foreign Relations announced that there would be no petitions for help, even less from the United States.[144]" According to the sources, during the First World War Carranza's government maintained its neutrality despite American diplomatic pressure[145], during WWII the government opted for a military and trade alliance with the US, in the midst of aggressive Cold War policies Mexico maintained friendly relations with Cuba, not adopting the US-led embargo[146] and, despite more US pressure, voted against the 2003 invasion of Iraq as a member of the UN Security Council[147]. Another notable point here is the role afforded to Mexican diplomacy by its national authors in serving as a mediator between the US and Cuba[148], and between the US and Nicaragua after US intervention - ultimately choosing to help the new Nicaraguan government over its neighbor's interests[149]. Despite discussion in the US texts of these events broadly, the Mexican government does not appear at all in any resolution[150]. Finally, as it pertains to Mexican citizens migrating to the US and facing discriminatory policies, the Mexican government is positioned as a growing defender of migrants' rights by "demanding that even illegal workers are protected[151]", or failing but still trying[152]. Even when immigration laws that pertain to Mexicans are mentioned in US texts, the coordination of a response or efforts of the Mexican government are not considered. All three of these cases soundly illustrate that while the Mexican authors establish a role for the US government's influence and Mexican autonomy in the face of it, the US rarely is presented as considering the opinion or action of Mexican authorities.

For years of history education in schools, most, if not all national histories relate the heroic deeds of individual national leaders. As described in the previous chapter, US President Woodrow Wilson is presented as a catalyst or arbiter of events in Mexico in the American version of events[153], yet generally given a peripheral role at best in Mexican ones. American historians set Madero simply as a weak administrator, while Mexican ones recognize the context of complicated circumstances and diverse factions that he was trying to hold together before his

[143] Martinez, 247
[144] Martinez, 241
[145] Perez, 202
[146] Martinez, 164; Montoya, 191
[147] Perez, 205
[148] Montoya, 192
[149] Montoya, 245
[150] It may be noteworthy that while US texts do not often ascribe a mediating role to any other countries, in skirmishes between the US and Mexico, one of them does credit Argentina, Brazil and Chile for mediation. (Danzer, 363)
[151] Martinez, 230; also Martinez 204, Montoya 236 & 246
[152] "For these reasons, deported fathers and mothers have had to leave their children born in the United States with the inability of our government to negotiate reform." (Perez, 207)
[153] Appleby does note that "Wilson''s Mexican policy damaged US foreign relations. The British ridiculed the president's attempts to 'shoot' the Mexicans into self-government." (195)

assassination (and again, US texts neglect Lane Wilson's role). Though briefly discussed as a democratic leader in the US books, in the Mexican versions Carranza is universally hailed, ranging from his pragmatism and balance of recently having his government recognized by the US and wishing to avoid further complications[154], to avoiding foreign "conspiracies", driving out the American Marines' punitive expedition and maintaining a government "without compromise"[155]. In one version he even does so despite the "demands" of the US diplomats to actually join the US in declaring war on Germany[156], and even took the bold step to raise taxes on US and British oil companies at the moment when they needed it for their militaries[157]. A stark contrast between texts, it is Americans who remain committed to Mexican democracy amidst chaos, or Carranza who boldly takes a stand against both significant American military and diplomatic pressures and German support of internal enemies. All of these examples serve to illustrate a vastly different degree of agency characterized in national leaders, depending mostly on the nationality of the author[158].

Madero, Carranza and Huerta appear in each text, Wilson appears in most, and all three are characterized differently. But no individual figure looms larger in popular culture than Francisco "Pancho" Villa[159]. If not by name, Villa's caricature and archetype is ubiquitous in American representations of Mexicans: the horse-mounted, sombrero clad, bullet belt-sporting bandit[160], and he has long appeared in American texts, often with blatantly loaded or hyperbolic language[161]. In our modern sample, one text explains Villa's initial expression of friendship and seeking US aid in the revolution, even incorporating a primary source where Villa called Wilson "the greatest American".[162], or in another that Wilson "courted" Villa[163]. But then, for reasons unclear, all texts include Villa's raid on Columbus, New Mexico

[154] Montoya, 188
[155] Perez, 202
[156] Martinez, 200
[157] Martinez, 199
[158] Another way that a handful of leaders are shown to demonstrate agency and choice is by acting as cultural brokers. Emphasizing the transition to modern economics and globalization, Mexican texts devote entire paragraphs to Mexican leaders studying at prestigious US universities Harvard or Yale -where they adopted neoliberal ideas - rather than in their native land. (Montoya 229-230; Martinez 231). In the artistic realm, this might be Diego Rivera's influence on Chicano muralists or Carlos Santana and Selena blending the two cultures in music. (Motoya, 241)
[159] According to internet data research company Wolfram Alpha, Villa's name was searched on Wikipedia (English) with an average of nearly 2000 hits per day at the beginning of 2019 (down from a high of nearly 6000 per day in early 2012!)
[160] See Appendix 3.26 - 3.31
[161] Long running texts like Bailey's *American Pageant: A History of the People* described him as "swarthy", a "sinister figure" and a "bloodthirsty combination of bandit and Robin Hood." (Hoffman, 146) Morris contributed to the caricature, branding him "wild and wooly". Even Hofstadter, another colossal figure amongst American historians, has the facts and sequence plain wrong: placing Carranza as the president in 1914 and allying Villa with Victoriano Huerta, rather than contributing to his downfall! Hoffman in 1972 called the texts "superficial and embarrassing" given the available scholarly research at the time. 75% of Hoffman's 12-book sample included Villa, as opposed to only 17% for Zapata. (146)
[162] Danzer, 364
[163] Lapansky, 611

resulting in the death of Americans. Mexican books describe acts of "sabotage", but without concrete details, and they generally avoid inclusion of the so-called "punitive expedition" in which Wilson deployed General John J. Pershing and either 5800, more than 10,000 or 15,000 soldiers into Mexico (depending on whose US text is read) where they even clashed with the Mexican army.[164] This leaves a reader with the impression that a fair and benevolent Wilson, faced an impulsive and vengeful Villa, and Wilson was left with no choice[165]. In the Mexican texts, surprisingly Villa seems an influential yet marginal player in the overall narrative. One declares that he was "an able commander[166]", another that the *caudillo* "had no determined plan and that his fight was regional".[167], while the third credits the *División del Norte* as the "most effective of the revolutionary armies"[168]. In the whole context of the Revolution, though, Villa is presented as rather unremarkable and the conflict sparked with the US is entirely omitted. In fact, while his pursuer Pershing is featured as a key player despite the mission's ultimate failure, American texts turn the agency back over to Wilson who wished instead to devote more attention to the growing European conflict[169]. Therefore, one of the few individuals included in 100% of the text sample is not portrayed as a significant agent, but a violent betrayer chased on American initiative or a mildly consequential military leader in the broader story[170].

Another way that certain individuals within a history textbook are awarded elevated status and agency is through inclusion of a biography, and this may also imply that this person is more worthy of our attention than many others[171]. Following the period of the Mexican Revolution, Mexico herself reemerges at various points, especially when related to labor and migration concerns for the United States. Explicitly named Mexicans, as plentiful as they were in the pages devoted to the

---

[164] Respectively: Appleby, 195; Lapansky, 611; Danzer, 364.

[165] Lapansky sets the tone in stark contrast with a full page excerpt entitled "Intervention in Mexico: The Hunt for Pancho Villa." Spatially, this box is placed at the top of the page where the Mexican Revolution is only briefly introduced (i.e. a student knows the results of the US invasion and search for Villa before reading about the motivations for the Revolution as a whole or Villa's role in it). In this cutaway, the "rebel" and his "gang of outlaws" drew a response from an "enraged" Wilson who wished to "hunt Villa down". (610)

[166] Martinez, 167, 170-171

[167] Montoya, 166

[168] Perez, 178

[169] After reading most of these texts, American students understand that there was an *attempt* at Mexican reform and democracy, followed by US military intervention to promote it and chase a bandit, but *not* the knowledge that Mexico actually became a constitutional democracy (albeit at times a harsh, single-party one) until the present day; ; a critical omission if seeking to promote cross-cultural comparisons.

[170] An interesting sidebar here: As the textbooks can differ, so does the Wikipedia entry for Pancho Villa. The English and Spanish versions differ on the size of the punitive expedition by 100%, and while the English source names Villa's commanders who were killed and cites no reason for American departure, the Spanish version states clearly that "Villa disappeared and mocked his persecutors."

[171] Across the board, the Mexican textbooks studied do not dedicate such biographical "history maker" spaces in their text pages, even for Mexicans, so the same analysis is not possible for that sample. However, a common method of drawing extra attention to subtopics is through captioned images in the margins of the narrative, discussed below.

Revolutionary period, disappear entirely[172]. That said, the little focus turns to the contributory role played by Mexican-Americans, some native-born, other naturalized citizens. None is more prominent than Cesar Chavez, with a dedicated "Key Player", or "History Maker" margin biography in all US editions (See Appendix 3.34-3.37). Always noting his humble origins and tenacious spirit, Chavez's is a story of triumph over adversity and tireless commitment to problem solving - a longstanding trope of American national history textbooks aiming to transmit a sense of the ethos of gritty American exceptionalism. Although not exclusionary to foreigners, these marginal text boxes are unsurprisingly dominated by Anlgo-American citizens[173] with only two other Mexican-American "History Makers" besides Chavez appearing in the sample, with each of them in a separate text: Dolores Huerta on the page opposite Chavez, and Ernesto Galarza (See Appendix 3.38-3.39)[174]. Huerta, like Chavez, is described as organizing farm workers and leading respectable, non-violent and democratic protests. A story of "becoming", Galarza is noted as being born in Mexico, working as a farm laborer in California, and, "more fortunate than most Mexican American children, he succeeded in school[175]", before going on to expose abuses of the *Bracero* program. Because Chavez is the only Mexican or Mexican-American afforded such universal and elite status across US texts, it may lead Americans to believe that he is considered the "need to know" Mexican of the twentieth century, aside from Pancho Villa. Other names are mentioned[176], but he is the standout, and others, like Huerta or Galarza are important, but not universally so, as they appear in separate and not all texts.

Offset biographies give added importance to these individuals and their cultural heritage, and another method that the US texts use consistently are including primary sources that share unique experiences from an historical period. These include voices such as Mexican-American disc jockey and US citizen Pedro Gonzalez, unjustly deported to Mexico during the Great Depression, Jessie Lopez de la Cruz who was an average person inspired by Cesar Chavez to strike, or Edith O'Shaughnessy, wife of the US ambassador during the invasion of Veracruz. The common pattern amongst these is that while they add a human dimension to the Mexican-American experience, they are often still "segregated" to a section of chapter or segment of a section pertaining to Mexican-Americans as a group apart from the whole rather than alongside it, and although they humanize the otherwise

[172] Not a single US textbook references a Mexican national from after 1920, save a marginal caption identifying Diego Rivera as an inspiration for Chicano muralists.
[173] Exceptions include figures like Winston Churchill, Hideki Tojo, Anwar Sadat or Mikhail Gorbachev.
[174] One other figure is mentioned in the US sample in reference to dealings with Mexico, specifically to chasing after Pancho Villa before his own command in WWI. However, since John J. Pershing was a white American, further analysis is not necessary here.
[175] Lapansky, 907
[176] Jose Angel Gutiérrez, founder of La Raza Unida is also included in each of the texts, though never pictured or given such special focus as Chavez.

abstracted racial categorization, they still only account for an average of roughly 2% of the total such sources[177].

All told, these special focus areas, either primary sources or biographies of Mexicans or Mexican-Americans, average 3% of the total across sources in the sample. For comparison sake, the same types of sources for African-American men average nearly 10% of the total and white women account for 12%. Without question, writing of textbooks has changed over time to become more inclusive, but white males still accounted for an average of 62% of these highlighted excerpts, reinforcing an assessment that minorities like Mexican-Americans may have *felt* something about historical events that happened to them, but they rarely shaped or significantly influenced these societal events.

Lastly, while language like "Mexican Americans who faced almost daily discrimination benefited immeasurably from the legislation"[178] or "The wartime economy also benefited Mexicans"[179] can reinforce impressions that things happen to or for them and not because of their initiative, there are some examples of groups of nameless Mexicans or Mexican-Americans asserting influence in relation to broader American society. As Gilbert observed in the 1992 texts, the Cananea miners' strike in 1906 showed initiative of Mexican workers to protest unequal pay schemes that benefited Americans, with violent consequences[180]. Mexicans volunteered for the military of their own accord and served heroically.[181] They asserted their "identity and contributions to the United States" through constructing murals[182], protested injustices after discrimination like the Longoria Incident[183] and sometimes risked arrest to draw public officials' attention to their persistent problems [184]. As rich as these examples could potentially be, they are scattered across different texts without uniformity, and without individuals ascribed to them, the references may appear fleeting and inconsequential, and coincide with Cremer's noting of the "birds of passage" trope.

Chapter VIII: Language, Tone and Textbook "Traps"

Especially given the fact that in both cases inclusions of the other are peppered throughout a given text (even more so in the lengthy American books) , the descriptive and explanatory language choices made by the authors matter greatly.

---

[177] The US texts include an average of 167 such primary voices across the periods examined. Mexicans and M-A's account for only 2%, African-American males 9%, white women 7.4% and white men 66%. For Appleby, white men number 72% of the total first-hand accounts.
[178] Appleby, 968
[179] Lapansky, 907
[180] All Mexican texts include this incident (Martinez, 151; Montoya, 142; Perez, 154). No American texts do, even though it involved an American company and contemporary issues for American workers. Large scale mining strikes were occurring in the US at the same time.
[181] "Thousands of Mexican Americans also served in the [First World] war, volunteering for service more than any other immigrant group in the United States." (Appleby, 241)
[182] Appleby, 533
[183] Danzer, 662
[184] Danzer, 771

Frances Fitzgerald argued that it is not specific factual information but an overall tone or impression that is significant in what students will retain from their history texts[185]. Roland Barthes' observations on the "referential illusion" (that is, that the way history texts present the narrative is simply the way they were) were useful in examining author tone. Barthes posited that text authors achieve this authoritative discourse in three ways: 1) by eliminating meta-discourse that is common in historical scholarship; 2) eliminating traces of how the text came into being by excluding sources material or relegating it to margin space, and; 3) writing in an omniscient, third-person narrative[186]. Crismore and others claim that to do this history textbooks also avoid hedges common to historical complexity (e.g. "may", "appears", "perhaps")[187], and instead speak only with authoritative certainty[188].

In our case, what Barthes and Crismore observed as true of history textbooks in the 1970s-1980s remains broadly true for this sample too. No specific instance of metadiscourse was found where the author interjected with his or her particular stance or dialogue[189]. Most American texts do incorporate plenty of source material in the form of photographs or primary sources regarding the other[190], but they often remain as sidebars that emphasize the themes that the text narrative seeks to establish and not as organically contributing to formation of the narrative in an apparent way for readers. In other words, the conclusion has been reached and now a photo or personal experience highlights the conclusion rather than authors as historians utilizing the documents to explain how the conclusion came to be in the manner of an historian. Finally, authors may attempt to nuance by disaggregating the population or demonstrating that realities were not *always* true with word choices like "some", "although", "tended to", "often", and "critics argued", scant evidence of actual historical debate is included anywhere[191]. These history narratives continue to be presented from an "omniscient third person"; a corporate author, certain of the facts.

Framing also matters greatly in this discussion of overall tone. As the texts were qualitatively analyzed, a positive/negative coding scheme was developed as

---

[185] Fitzgerald (1980) in Gilbert, "Zapata: Textbook Hero"
[186] Wineburg, *Historical Thinking,* 12
[187] Ibid. 77
[188] Marino examined five popular world history texts and also found them to avoid the nuanced language of historians, such as "suggests" or "considers", instead opting for language that reinforces certainty. (422)
[189] Very few examples were found that approached a metadiscourse, but some display a step beyond factual certainty or explicit public debates. **"**Mexicans were probably targeted more than others, in part because of racism, and in part because of cost.." (Appleby, 296) or "Although most leaders knew [that the Mexican military would not invade the US] Americans were shocked." (Lapansky, 627). Still, these do not provide author justification or discussion of how the conclusions were reached.
[190] Mexican texts include almost no examples of the other. These source materials are discussed in the next section.
[191] An example to highlight this case would be a statement like Danzer's: ""Despite such unhappy experiences with racism, many Mexican Americans believed their sacrifices during wartime would lead to a better future." (593) It is not stated what led them to this optimistic conclusion, especially given decades of disrimination and hostility. Were they naive or justified in this belief?

well for deeper comparisons[192]. Most of the texts are filled with neutral statements of fact, but the explanation of significance or the argument that follows constructs an impression and tone from the omniscient expert, essentially instructing readers how to feel about this fact. From this angle of analysis it was clear that in every case, negatively coded statements about the other exceeded positive ones, typically by around a 2:1 margin[193]. Expressed in terms of percentages, the cumulative sample sets of texts for the US and Mexico include between 30-35% positive references and between 65-70% negative ones. It cannot be concluded definitively that one national sample is somehow more negatively biased that the other, but what is apparent is that more negative inclusions in both samples are found in period I (1900-1930), and for the Mexican sample specifically period IV (1980-Present) includes more negative statements than the American ones, usually regarding impacts on the modern economy.

Chapter IX: Implicit Messaging and the Null Curriculum

Harder to qualify but also potentially quite significant is implied messaging in student materials, or what some call null curriculum. What is the impact if when a Mexican is included in the discussion it is as an abused victim, or each time America is referenced it is as an exploiter or powerful abuser? These excerpts demonstrate potential for these types of inadvertent misunderstandings or misperceptions:

"In some cases, this repatriation was voluntary as jobs became scarce. In other cases, repatriation was forced…[The US government] also stepped up efforts to deport immigrants who had violated the law. In the Southwest, federal officials rounded up Mexicans (often without regard to their citizenship status) and forcibly returned them to Mexico.[194]"

"Few had mastered the English language, and many languished in slums while struggling to find work. A violent incident highlighted the problems.[195]"

It may not be the author's intention to directly imply that millions of innocent Mexicans actually *did* violate the laws or that linguistic barriers automatically contribute to violence, but we can be left with muddled conclusions.

i.The "And Also" Effect

An unanticipated finding in the analysis of the US sample and another implied message was a status of Mexican-Americans as a sort of "second" minority, or "another other", like Native Americans. When Mexican-Americans are a part of the

[192] "Positive" statements were ones that emphasized cooperation or mutual benefit. "Negative" ones were statements that emphasized conflict, inequity produced by the other, discrimination or overt negative stereotypes. See Appendix 2 for examples of language coding.
[193] All ratios are stated here as negative : positive. Martinez 1.7:1 - Montoya 2.6:1 - Perez 1.3 : 1 - Appleby 2.5:1 - Danzer 2.8:1 - Lapansky 1.7:1.
[194] Appleby, 296
[195] Lapansky, 811

broader story, without exception the unique impacts of events on them (e.g. the Great Depression, the civil rights movement) are addressed only after those events have been examined for the African-American community. These sections are often led with headings such as “Other Minorities in the Military[196]” and “Other Americans Face Injustice[197]”, or include comparative statements such as “Like African-Americans, most Mexican-Americans served in segregated units[198]”, “Johnson was also popular with Mexican American voters and in the Southwest”[199], “The wartime economy also benefited Mexicans.”[200], “Like other minorities, Latinos had long faced injustice”[201]. These remind readers that the experiences of Mexican-Americans and Latinos are comparable to other immigrant groups or African-Americans, but very rarely are Mexican-Americans the starting reference point for others’ experiences[202]. Even though civil rights movements were actually occurring simultaneously, in most cases American textbooks include one or more whole sections to the African-American initiatives, then follow with Mexican-Americans clustered in a section with Native-Americans, other minorities or even those with disabilities. Mexican-Americans are also implicitly included numerous times in catch-all questions that ask about the experiences of events by minorities, but only about half of the time does the question ask about their group specifically.

ii. Worth a Thousand Words

It is also worth considering when and how the “other” is depicted pictorially as part of the broader narrative. Authors and publishers engage in an active process of selecting images and writing captions that they hope will be of interest to the reader and to enhance the understanding of the overarching concepts. Modern textbooks are packed with such images in full color, be it photographs, paintings, political cartoons, or even maps. (See Appendix 3: Images)

In almost 800 pages of Mexican texts, and also considering a *Bloque* specifically dedicated to the present where the US relationship is described most extensively, there are only two individual Americans pictured in any of the texts: a smug Ambassador Dwight Morrow and a painted mural including President Franklin Roosevelt. Both are in the same textbook[203], and interestingly the historical significance of neither of them is actually discussed in the text itself[204]. The other

[196] Appleby, 359
[197] Lapansky, 906
[198] Danzer, 573
[199] Lapansky, 968
[200] Appleby, 442
[201] Lapansky, 1029
[202] One exception is noted in the section below
[203] Perez, 181 and 204, respectively. See Appendix 3.25 & 3.32
[204] Although the caption describes how Morrow helped stabilize troubled US-Mexican relations, these relations are not explained in the narrative, and Roosevelt is only considered a political figure of the time, next to the Second World War section. Morrow never appears in any American text.

relevant images are not actually photographs of Americans *per se*, but a mural created by Chicanos to celebrate their unique heritage, a map to show where Mexican migrants often settle in the USA, a Mexican corn farmer negatively impacted by NAFTA, and an SUV to demonstrate how American culture has permeated middle-class lifestyles in Mexico[205].

A consistent criticism in past literature has been that even when minorities like Hispanics were included in American texts, it was often in demeaning ways that reinforce negative stereotypes. On this matter we can make two observations for the current sample: 1) the ways in which Mexican laborers are depicted in US texts is not dissimilar to their depictions in Mexican texts; however, 2) this is often the *only* way that they are depicted.

In photographs and murals that represent Mexico or Mexican-Americans in the American texts we can understand a few simple messages. They are impoverished, often hunched-over, agriculturalists. In the sample of Mexican texts, though, it was not uncommon to see migrant workers or rural, low-wage farmers to be depicted in much the same way. Some of the same criticisms of NAFTA abstractly depicted in Mexican texts were concretely shown through political cartoons and photos about job loss in the American ones, in a nationally specific way. The few examples of murals used to highlight Chicano culture could easily have appeared in a text in either country. Similarly, the stereotype of Pancho Villa as bullet-clad cowboy that some may assess as a negative one was not isolated to American texts; he is depicted the same way in most Mexican books, even though several more formal images of him do exist that might have been chosen[206]. Lastly, depictions of illegality are mixed. Two of the three American texts include the same image of “zoot-suiters” waiting to board a police bus. While authors state plainly that they were victims of violence rather than perpetrators, if the image “sticks” in someone’s mind rather than the words, the messaging would be murky. Surprisingly, even though all texts explain the persistence of illegal immigration, it is the Mexican texts rather than the American ones, that show migrants aside or physically climbing over the border fence into the United States[207]. Because so few, if any, cross border analyses of textbooks have been made, these comparisons and contrasts, and therefore weight of the criticisms of stereotyping, may have been missed or interpreted incompletely in earlier works.

That said, this is by and large the way that Mexicans are depicted in US textbooks: as poor workers, often victims of or vulnerable to circumstance[208]. Even

[205] See Appendix 3.18
[206] See Appendix 3.26 - 3.30
[207] See Appendix 3.13-3.14. This is normally mentioned in the context of Mexican poverty forcing people to seek other opportunities and/or abuses and dangers faced by these migrants. These images might serve to emphasize the rhetorical message, and one that US narratives gloss over.
[208] See Appendix 3.3-3.8. An additional image is significant here. Although it does not label Mexican or Hispanic, facial features of the subjects might lead one to this conclusion, and it is an image regarding low income healthcare. See Appendix 3.16.

though textually it is at times stated that they were taking advantage of opportunities, photographs of frowning families down on their knees or tops of hats without faces shown sends a mixed message about empowered agency and initiative.

In a world full of easily accessed and shared images, these must carry a significance similar to what is actually written in the text, as viewers draw their own conclusions and often fill-in contextual blanks. When there are rare images of “the other” in these hundreds of text pages, two things are true: Often they are faceless, and when not faceless, they are often nameless.

iii. Questions Posed

Far more so than in decades past, secondary textbooks have evolved to not only provide a story to the reader, but to include key terms and questions that run the taxonomic spectrum: comprehension, comparison, evaluation, synthesis.

Although not a central focus for evaluation here, it was obvious when studying the texts that even when the “other” was included in the narrative portions, this did not always translate to end of section or end of chapter questions that specifically related to Mexicans, for instance. Often times, there are questions that require discussion of impacts on “minorities”, a catch-all term that implies but does not require a focus on the Mexican experience. Other times, there is narrative coverage but then the questions are solely focused on the experience of white Americans or white historical figures. Rarely, a primary source document is used as stimulus for questions relevant to our topic, but the inconsistencies on both sides mean that readers do not need to apply their understanding; a topic worthy of investigation in its own right.

iv. Luck of the draw?

As in all history writing, the author selects evidence to most coherently match their desired tone, themes or conclusions, and these diverse perspectives make history reading entertaining and enjoyable. But the broad public, government officials or even teachers do not necessarily view textbooks as an historical argument, but as an authoritative canon like a physics or geometry book. That is, if it is not in the book, or especially not in bold print or with a question asked about it, then it must not be significant.

Naturally, this makes complex understanding from such a history texts a dicey enterprise. A reader of Perez would follow that relations between the US and Mexico during WWII cemented mostly positive relations for the rest of the century while those reading Martinez would come away far more positive about the impacts of NAFTA than those reading Montoya. Especially as it pertains to the 1960s era, any American reader would celebrate the United Farm Workers’ heroism, but a cafeteria conversation between a student who read Appleby and one who read Lapansky, one person would raise the either the Brown Berets or Senator Joseph Montoya, to have

the other party respond, “who?!”. Readers of any Mexican text would learn about harsh US immigration laws such as the *Ley Carter* (1978), the Immigration Reform and Control Act (1986), or the *Ley Arizona* (2010), though all three are the specific chosen example in three different texts. To be sure, the skeletal framework of the narratives is generally the same. But these inclusions or omissions are another factor that leaves readers with piecemeal knowledge in a way that is especially hard to avoid when writing concise national histories and leaves students’ knowledge dependent on the title that their teacher or school district chose.

Chapter X: Toward Transnational or Multifocal History?: Continuity and Change Over Time

Considering all of the aspects discussed here - quantitative inclusions, modes of depiction, author language - and in reference to an array of secondary literature written over a period of decades, a simple conclusion is that Mexicans and Americans do not categorically ignore or hyperbolically stereotype the other, especially not in the same ways or to the extent that some earlier research demonstrated[209]. Still, more often than not, the language with which the other is included and the modes of inclusion promote a narrative of ethnic nationalism, rather than a fully integrated, pluralistic or global one. In crafting their own respective national histories, when the other is included, evidence is selected and interpreted in a way that advances the narrative already established in the text.

Even in the 1930s, Herbert E. Bolton, president of the American Historical Association was calling for a greater integration of thematic narratives applicable to many countries, saying:

> *“It is my purpose, by a few bold strokes, to suggest that they are but phases common to most portions of the entire Western Hemisphere; that each local story will have clearer meaning when studied in light of the others.”*[210]

Bolton’s thematic approach was not borne out in most historical narratives that followed, and certainly not in the majority of textbooks of the remaining twentieth century. Even if American textbooks sometimes attempted to place the US in greater transnational contexts, Eurocentrism was an is still far more prevalent than establishing any links or discussing shared experiences with its own hemispheric neighbors, as has also been shown above[211]. Gilbert (1997) observes that the 1992 editions moved from placing blame on America and foreigners for enhancing inequalities to a “sanguine attitude toward U.S. and other foreign investment”, demonstrating Mexico connecting with other economies and producing progress,

[209] While the framework and scope for this study are not necessarily the same as the earlier studies, appropriate and productive parallels can still be found.
[210] Tenorio “On the Limits of Historical Imagination” 579
[211] Columbia University’s James Harvey Robinson laid out this same position in 1929, that there should be a greater recognition of national histories linked to general histories. (Glaser, 1047)

albeit alongside inequality[212]. The updated texts in this sample carry on this tone in general, yet still in a way that is largely centered on Mexican nationalism, either through explicitly noting essential contributions or resisting unfair changes brought on by foreigners. The seemingly unique challenges faced by the single nation-state is still the lens through which history is viewed.

In his study of Japanese and American textbooks intended for the same level, Billington uncovered five forms of nationalistic bias: bias by inertia (authors failing to account for current scholarship), omission (distortion in selection of facts), cumulative implication (accounting for one, rather than multiple facets or perspectives), use of language (in terms of overt derogation or implied nuance), and finally, unconscious falsification (inability to divorce from national cultural perspectives)[213]. While it does not appear that our authors are overtly or extensively biased in terms of unconscious falsification or inertia[214], we have seen several instances of how particular language used by the US and Mexican books can be starkly contrasted when discussing the same issue. Less malign or intentional perhaps, there are also numerous cases of omission of facts entirely. This may be done for efficiency of page space, fittingness to a particular narrative thread or simply what an author thinks readers may find interesting as an example or case study. It is not consistently the case that facts or perspectives that challenge the nation-positive narrative are excluded, and several times in our case it is the national authors themselves who lay bare the illegal and immoral (e.g. harsh treatment of migrant workers; inability to create jobs which contributes to illegal immigration or drug trafficking). Still, we are able to see from the index accounting on both sides that what is consistently referenced in one national sample is as often omitted from the other (e.g. Ambassador Wilson; Cesar Chavez or La Raza Unida; stopping trucks at the border). Lastly, cumulative implication is seen on several occasions where one set or the other will account for motivations of actors, though not other perspectives or possibilities (e.g. Zoot Suit riots, NAFTA's impacts, the agency of individuals). With these many examples we can conclude that nationalistic biases still exist in large part in today's texts. Yet, it is not categorically true, in that texts on both sides do include the "other" in positive ways, highlight the benefits of cooperation between them, or take responsibility for some of their own shortcomings that might have frustrated their historic relationship. In these nationalistic approaches, the other typically plays a contributory role. Tetreault (1986) examined the role of women in textbooks and developed a five-part framework for understanding, and the same framework can be brought to bear here[215]. Although

[212] Alvaro (1999) in Lindaman & Ward (2004)
[213] Billington in Hein and Selden, 265
[214] That said, there may be changes in recent scholarship in one of the four periods selected of which I am simply ignorant and cannot fully account for enough to cite this as a bias issue.
[215] The phases are contributory (how women helped men generally), compensatory (how great women did more, just like men), bi-focal (complementary but equal), independent (examining

Schrader and Wotipka found that American women in World War II textbook narratives had achieved a bifocal (complementary but equal) status to men, the same conclusion cannot be reached for our sample on either side of the border; the experiences of and interaction with the "other" can be described as contributory: the first phase, especially so because specific individuals are rarely mentioned. The "other" is abstract and peripheral, and only included in a contributory way when convenient rather than really emphasizing common experiences in an equal way. (That is, most experienced the Great Depression, but "other Americans" are awarded far less attention or agency in the story).

So what might account for the persistence of nationalistic bias and contributory roles in Mexican and American high school history texts? As described in the introductory pages, successful history textbook production involves a multiplicity of actors before reaching student readers: historians and researchers, government officials, corporate producers and even the media and public opinion. In the democratic societies that are the United States and Mexico it would be difficult to claim that any one of these groups has the power to fully dictate what is produced. It is rather a circle in which authors must write histories palatable enough for state boards to write a check to publishers (who then pay the authors). Even though the large textbook publishing companies compete with one another to gain favor and income from these government adoption boards and schools, there was little evidence uncovered here that one particular title was so far out of step with contemporaries for having vastly more nationalistic overtones or more multicultrually integrated. Part of the answer must be political; that is, serving a cohesive national interest is seen as a high priority, reflected in maintaining a dominant and familiar narrative that generates national pride in citizens. We have seen cases where titles are rejected, either because the state boards felt that the story was in fact not patriotic and traditional enough for their tastes (e.g. Texas) or when political leaders attempted to push too far in their own interests and there was public backlash (e.g. Zedillo texts of the 1990s). Some attribute the persistence of an artificial nationalism in a seemingly more integrated-era to contradictory policies or perspectives in the political reality (e.g. the flaws of NAFTA)[216], and that multinational integration is simply not possible because of current or ongoing political fears: Mexicanization of the United States and Americanization of Mexico[217]. Sergio Aguayo takes it a step further to say that the Mexican government has actually found advantage in pressing

---

women's unique experience alongside) and multifocal (interactional and holistic). Schrader and Wotipka concluded in their examination of women as part of WWII narratives in US textbooks that although there had been change over time, modern textbooks had achieved a bifocal narrative, still out of step with modern feminist thinking, writing and institutions. (73-74) See also Wineburg: "Contributory history sends us to forage through the documentary record in search of a woman rum trader but never thinks to challenge why we narrate the story of rum."(*Historical Thinking,* 129-130)

[216] Ibid.

[217] Tenorio, "On the Limits of Historical Imagination", 578

the textbook and general narrative of a malevolent US in order to generate a sense of unity and obedience[218].

A significant answer to questions about continuity and change in narratives must also lie with historians themselves. After all, they generate the texts for approval and publication in the first place. Under these pressures we see that when compared to past works, historians today are writing textbooks with a more culturally inclusive approach than before, even if the overarching tone still stokes a biased pride in a singular version of the nation. This can arise from three main sources: ideological reluctance, lack of specific expertise or a greater need for transnational collaboration.

I. Ideology

Perhaps a new generation of textbook authors has grown in a different historiographical and cultural context with different sensibilities than before, and they respond to multicultural realities. They exist in a post-NAFTA and globalized era where economic connection between the two countries is hard to deny, and where demographic realities are starkly different, as until recently Mexico was the largest single origin for both legal and illegal immigrants, and Mexicans now comprise a larger total population share than African-Americans. This is even more true in those US states whose demands are thought to be the cradle of the history textbook industry: Texas and California. On Mexico's part, this human and economic integration with *el otro lado* must generate an undeniable recognition of this force that historians are bound to discuss and least somewhat.

Certainly not everyone in the historical community argues for a greater push towards multicultural or transnational histories in school textbooks on a variety of grounds. On the more conservative side, some are critical of a politically correct reluctance to make harsh judgements, lest they risk offending cultures and these critics say the results are nebulous stories[219]. Others claim that national pride and cohesion are actually desirable in a rapidly changing globalized reality, and narratives that are overly complex undermine this[220]. Other dissenting historians may not disagree with the moral sentiment of inclusion, but argue that consistently forcing lower status groups into the narrative creates inaccuracies "incongruent with their real experiences"[221]. On the more liberal end and pulling in different directions, some also wonder about the impacts of extensive focus on cultural uniqueness, as it creates a new dilemma of stereotyping and a "postcolonial pedagogy of the

[218] Aguayo, 38
[219] Sewall in Marino, 424
[220] Soledad Loeza puts forward this argument that while simplistic, national hero stories provide a sense of belonging, and that this over simplicity is actually acceptable to a degree as later and gradually coming face to face with darker nuances is a natural part of identity formation, in general. She also notes that even in multicultural regions such as the European Union, national characteristics and distinctions are still recognized and valued, rather than fully blended and subsumed. (Loeza, 111-112)
[221] Ravitch (2002) in Schrader and Wotipka, 72

oppressed, and in the process diminishes historical complexity[222], that even pluralistic identities such as “Chicano” have developed into stereotypes in history writing,[223] or that, ”In this process [of integrating multiculturalism or internationalism], we risk “creating national narratives that divide people who lived a common history[224] .” In other words, by emphasizing the experience of groups, you ignore intersectionality or transnational issues, and highlight differences when not intending to.

The possibility also exists, however, that if changes occur, they will not always be linear towards a more progressive or integrated approach. A 1991 edition of *The Americans* explains that for Mexicans in the US:

“Many obtained farms of their own. Others found good jobs. Some became successful professionals. Their examples caused thousands of other Mexicans to want to come to the United States.” [225]

Despite the persistence of the progress and freedom quest narratives in our modern US sample, individual successes and inspirations, vaguely attributed as they may be, have all but disappeared. This is but to say that even though greater inclusion may occur in one edition over another, it is not guaranteed that the new narrative persists in future editions; especially true if political winds shift in a more nationalistic and globally sceptical fashion that create new pressures or ideological priorities. As Jerdee put it with issues such as illegal immigration, textbooks “place struggles in the past, which assumes they do not continue.[226]”

iI. Methods and Expertise

To be sure, in the face of these debates and political winds, the authors face a daunting task of summarizing a national history into a concise and manageable reader, and obviously cannot be expected to be specialists in each subject. Still, very few of them in this sample *are* actually specialists in modern history writ large, let alone intercultural or international relationships (and on the Mexican side, not all of the authors are historians or professors)[227]. This provides another explanatory angle,

---

[222] LaSpina, 679. LaSpina also suggests a reframing of dichotomous conceptions by using simple integrative language, such as replacing “The West *and* the world” with “The West *in* the world”.
[223] Thelen, “Rethinking History and the Nation State”, 442
[224] See Charles Ingrao’s discussion of multiculturalism in the Habsburg Empire in “History Textbooks and the Profession”.
[225] *The Americans: A History* in Cruz, 336
[226] Jerdee, 19
[227] The US sample is authored solely by groups of historians or university professors, with outside readers and consultants credited. Specialties run the gamut from 17th century England, sports, the US Senate and Quakerism, but only one of fourteen total authors (Jorge Klor de Alva in *The Americans*) is a specialist in ethnic studies and intercultural images. *The Americans* lists a “Multicultural Advisory Panel” who assisted in the effort and Pearson credits John Chavez, an historian of Chicano culture, as an outside consultant but not a primary author. Only the McGraw publication for Mexico includes two historians as the primary authors and one, Guadalupe Ramirez

as their expertise as creators of the narrative is either reliant on consultants or secondary literature, may not have taken much time to consider the issue firsthand, or leaving them adopting earlier patterns.

Different than Billington's bias by inertia which neglects emergent scholarship, perhaps the issue amongst these national historians is also more fundamental and structural, and scholars who examine the issue of developing transnational narratives between the United States and Mexico remain pessimistic that a large change is just around the corner for a variety of reasons[228]. Even many active historians still broadly think in terms of comparative *differences* between the cultures rather than similarities and cooperation[229]; distinct and contrasting nation-states, rather than overlapping experience and culture[230]. They have therefore developed isolated and "self-enclosing historiographical traditions"[231]. Adding to this, programs that might pave the way are not always well-attended. The *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México* (UNAM) shuttered its US history center altogether in the 1970s and 1980s, and still by the mid-1990s, only .001% of the total UNAM student population was enrolled in any US history course[232].

Lastly, there is a possibility that the persistence of nationalistic biases is a result of a conscious or unconscious commitment to transmitting the same core values or national self-perceptions that historian-authors have done for generations. Moskowitz noted this in a comparison of US text sets from the 1950s and the 1970s; that while the narratives of individuals and groups were often in stark contrast, broad values and themes remained unchanged[233]. For Mexican authors this could mean staying the course in a historical narrative of the underdog asserting its own

---

Ornelas, completed her Master's degree analyzing symbols and myths between the United States and Mexico. The authorship of the other Mexican titles do not inspire great confidence, as the Trillas edition was created by a specialist in viceregal ethnohistory (XVI-XVIII centuries) and an editor who worked as a systems information specialist until 2005 (!), and two of the Pearson authors are entirely absent from internet searches, except for their authorship of this textbook (meaning they do not seem to be active academics, historians or current authors of other works). Unlike the American editions, the Mexican texts do not credit outside consultants, even though they likely rely on them. They do, however, include extensive bibliographies for works consulted in developing the textbooks. While these may be written by professional historians, the structure leaves the impression that some of the Mexian texts are essentially compiled reports by those lacking direct expertise in history writing or practice.

[228] VanSledright (2004) offers a different perspective in raising the question of whether economic influences will begin to trump identity ones, and what this impact will be on the future of nation-state loyalty and history narratives.

[229] Salvucci adds that in Mexico, some students and historians think that by understanding the past actions of US imperialism, it might help predict future dealings. ("Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican-Americans")

[230] See Ochoa (1998) As an example, Ochoa points to the image of Mexican poverty and American affluence as a perpetuation of this contrast-based thinking.

[231] Thelen, "Rethinking History and the Nation State", 443

[232] Salvucci, "Mexico, Mexicans, and Mexican-Americans")

[233] "America's growth, strength, and endurance remained virtues, and America's unique place in the history of the world continued to be a dominant theme." (Moskowitz, 271)

autonomy in a relationship with the northern hegemon[234]. Tenorio adds to the chorus critical of an historical imagination and the resulting narratives hamstrung by current political climates and values:

> *"While the US seems to have found an eternal favorable flow of freedom from past, present to future in history, today's second nature also dictates that there are places, such as Mexico, endlessly caught in tradition, resignedly searching to overcome their atavistic circumstances."* [235]

Tenorio claims that even when Mexican history is incorporated into US history and vice versa, it has been "hindered by the unchallenged conviction that Mexico belongs to another - non-western - civilization."[236] Thus in his assessment, it pushes the historical imagination too far to not categorize Mexico as a victim or aggrandize a US march toward progress. This is not to say that authors don't embrace multiculturalism and internationalism generally, but modern political circumstances combined with the framework narratives that have guided national stories for generations and only a short history of transnational collaboration leave the texts in a similar state as those published decades ago. This seems less an overt act of moralistic nationalism than a combination of forces bearing down on authors.

III. Collaboration Amongst Scholars

Following a transnational conference of historians discussing perspectives on US history, David Thelen and his colleagues drew the conclusion that it would be "hard to set American history in transnational perspectives" but that "part of the answer lies in strengthening a tradition of collaborative scholarship"[237]. In sum, one apparent explanation for why there is not a ubiquitous and coherent thread of connectivity between the US and Mexico in the textbooks is that the historians writing the books are either unaware of some diverse perspectives of their colleagues or are lacking in a methodology to even look for them. For those well-intentioned historians[238] who have crossed borders to address this issue, these are conclusions to which they themselves have come.

There are several suggestions made in this field for more transnational history approaches that might be applied to textbook writing. Instead of a broadly national phenomenon, some suggest that a transnational processes like migration should be addressed through other lenses such as networks, transnational institutions, "products, ideas, and families" which exemplify intercultural exchange better than a

---

[234] Leidenberger describes this longstanding pattern amongst Mexican historians regarding differentiation of culture and weaving of victim vs. expansionist giant as a "contrapuntal fugue". (321)
[235] Ibid. 582
[236] Tenorio, "The Riddle of a Common History", 103
[237] Thelen, "The Nation and Beyond", 974
[238] In 1988, H. Tyson-Bersntein described problems with America's textbooks as a "conspiracy of good intentions".

discussion of national government policies.[239] Enrique Ochoa critiques that historians have actually helped perpetuate myths about American wealth and Mexican poverty as products of their internal histories and suggests a multitude of opportunities to discuss historical issues that created connectivity across the border.[240] Addressing criticisms of a tradeoff that would diminish pride in the national story[241], Morris contends that enhanced globalization does not equate to a linear tradeoff, placing nationalism and identity into folkloric status, but that a postmodern approach can actually allow a complex narrative of both "resistance and assimilation" to exist in the narrative between the United States and Mexico[242]. In a similar vein, some modern voices also posit that it is possible that history writing can develop a sense of national self and global self simultaneously[243]. The Mexican texts step in this direction in their coverage of NAFTA and how Mexican life is shaped by globalization, but this is really the only example. Finally, some scholars call for awareness in writing history of the paradox of the US as a global nation leading to the conclusion that "The United States *in* global history might all to easily morph into the United States *as* global history.[244]"

In all of the pages of text studied, there were perhaps two examples that highlight the potential of a deeper transnational narrative or changing the trends of the recent past. One has been discussed earlier in Perez's incorporation of the mural depicting side by side national heroes and describing cooperative efforts during World War II. The other sole example that moves more towards a bifocal approach of equality of experience is Lapansky's use of a primary source from Cesar Chavez. Unlike the "and also" effect seen in every other case, the Chavez's experience as poor farmers during the Dust Bowl is related, and is followed by, "Like the Chavez family, other farmers moved on after their losses.[245]". The is the only instance where the experience of a Mexican-American comes first as the exemplar, rather than events "also" happening to them. Similar missed opportunities in the texts include a discussion of the US Progressive movement alongside a desire for reform in Mexico during the same period, the similar large-state efforts to fight poverty by Lazaro Cardneas and Franklin Roosevelt, or the shared agitation for greater civil rights during the 1960s on both sides of the border. All of these serve as examples of ways in which connections and similarities, rather than differences might be reinforced, but as we have seen, each country dominantly treats its experience as rather unique.

Although the intention of this research is not meant to act as a precise policy prescription, we can see ways here in which a group of historians are clamoring for

[239] McKeown, Beckert in Gräser, 1042
[240] Ochoa suggests emphasis on connections such as the role of the borderlands in the Mexican Revolution, US Prohibition and the growth of border cities like Ciudad Juarez and Tijuana, and changes in US tariffs in the 1960s that eventually gave rise to modern *maquiladoras.* (120-123).
[241] See Loeza
[242] Morris, 110-112
[243] See also Stephan Berger and Hanna Schissler for writing national histories during globalization
[244] Gräser, 1044
[245] Lapansky, 713

greater transnational collaboration that they believe will result in inclusion of narratives that are closer to lived realities, and which better recognize multiculturalism in the world today. Gräser boldly opened a 2009 piece with "The internationalization of historical writing is here to stay."[246] But, if it is occurring in a meaningful way, this internationalization has not really trickled down into the writing of national historical textbooks, and perhaps it will not for some time to come without a large and concerted effort that seems in the relatively distant future.

Chapter XI: Further Research

Using various methods and theoretical frameworks, this research attempted to account for and dissect textbook narratives in several ways. Still, aside from earlier recognition of methodological questions or limitations here, it leaves some aspects unexplored, and potential further research could complement the broad objectives in two obvious ways. The first would adopt a method that some earlier studies indeed have, moving beyond a synchronic approach and selecting a sample that covers a span of years, but the sampling would also need to represent *both* countries; a task that is, by nature, a larger undertaking and would require several more texts than were included here. Another possibility would be analyzing whether the effects seen here persist in higher level texts, either designed for a *Bachillerato* or Advanced Placement program for the university-bound secondary level[247], or beyond into university-level texts.[248]

Another potentially fruitful area is in the field of educational action research. This study has looked through a lens of narrative construction and comparison of texts, and referenced earlier studies about the extensive reported use of textbooks in the history classroom. It does not, however, ask students themselves what impressions *they* come away with after reading selected narratives. For example, are there significant implications for developing a coherent sense of the "other" if the narrative is too fragmented across the school year, or, even more drastically, a yawning void if a student misses a particular class or skips the homework reading that day when Cesar Chavez's section is assigned? It might also suggest that if a history teacher relies heavily on the text and attempts in one year to cover history to the present, only a very short period can be dedicated to *any* topic, let alone supplementing materials that deal with foreign countries or peoples. Do pictorial representations matter in forming these opinions? Do the questions posed in the section or chapter assessments cause students to consider perspectives and issues relating to the "other" in a deep and meaningful way? The body of educational

[246] Graser, 1038

[247] A less rigorous preliminary examination of these texts indicates that they are not radically different from the texts used in this sample.

[248] One difficulty encountered here that would be exacerbated if studying university texts would be the sheer variety and unpredictability of a history course syllabus. At least for secondary schools, while there is variety too, the process is more streamlined with the *Libros Gratuitos* or through the known relationships between government education boards and the few large publishers of these texts.

research that uses such interview or “think-aloud protocols” already demonstrates that the intended purposes of history education - a rich understanding of causal, consequential and complex relationships - are not always understood by the mass of students, specific factual knowledge is not retained over the long term, nor do students clearly recognize these history education goals or their significance.Thus, to provide a conclusion with greater depth it is worth further exploration from this perspective.

Chapter XII: Conclusions

Twenty years ago, Rodriguez & Ruiz concluded that:

> *“Latinos are still too frequently reduced to numbers, faceless statistics who wander in and out of the text -- nameless lost souls, seemingly at loose ends. Individual stories remain untold in these baseline narratives.”*[249]

Conducting a multifaceted analysis of recently published textbooks from Mexico and the United States with regard to stories they tell about the “other” to new generations of students, this study sought to explore that question again and in new ways. On the surface, the sample collected here is not as exclusionary of the “other” in comparison to past textbooks, when omission was the status quo. In fact, while US texts include Mexicans or Mexican-Americans on roughly 5% of total pages regarding twentieth century history, their Mexican counterparts dedicate large sections to the modern relationship with entries appearing on an average of nearly 30% of pages. These references are typically clustered around particular topics (e.g. Mexican-American civil rights, the impacts of NAFTA). In terms of international relations, the United States authors continue to look across the Atlantic for any comparisons on an equal basis, while Mexican authors, instead of forging narrative links with culturally similar Latin American nations, look most often to the connection with events in the USA both as a help and hindrance to their own progress. The portrayal of the relationship between the countries and individuals is also less hostile or negatively stereotyped than it was in the past, though strains still outnumber gains in terms of explaining the context and results of the relations. American texts highlight the efforts of Mexicans in national events such as the World Wars, and Mexican texts highlight the benefits of its citizens migrating to the US, though this role in both sets of texts can still broadly be described as “contributory”, rather than moving towards a “bifocal” or “multifocal” approach. Both sets of texts award their people and governments with a good deal of agency which the other national set primarily ignores. Although at times the authors explain negative aspects of their nation in relation to the other such as the US invasion of Veracruz, illegal deportations of Mexicans or the Mexican government’s inability to alleviate poverty,

[249] Rodriguez & Ruiz, 1690

the texts still consistently demonstrate nationalistic biases such as with language, omission and cumulative implications. Authors continue to highlight perspectives that advance the traditional tone of nationalism, and have been found on several occasions to neglect motivations of the "other". Examples do exist that push beyond this framework, though they are rare. Where they are used, many of the pictorial representations can serve to promote existing stereotypes or isolate the other to particular roles, and roles that lack agency. Not explicitly labeling with negative stereotypes such as "lazy" anymore, some historians continue to worry though that this position is instead traded for victimhood, and the cases in this sample give support to their concerns. As Cruz put it, and which applies here too, "much of the textual bias is often subtle – employing adverbs, adjectives and subordinate clauses that insinuate and that suggest rather than declare[250]". And finally, while especially the American texts do integrate primary sources, it is not in a way that reveals an historical writing process, nor is there evidence of metadiscourse or hedging words common to the profession; maintaining past criticisms of textbooks in general. Still, in a final judgment, even though American texts use a variety of primary source materials from Mexicans, the Mexican texts are in several ways more nuanced and integrative of "the other" than American ones. In American books, Mexican-Americans truly are the "other" ethnic minority, consistently after African-Americans.

Several historians have proposed methods for compiling a more integrated history for these two countries that have so many shared historical experiences, such as a focus on reimagining the borderland narratives or emphasizing transnational processes such as with migration, but national tropes persist and anyone seeking a transnational narrative in current textbooks would find them lacking. It has been demonstrated that this is a complex result of political and economic demands outside of the writing process, and ideologies and preferences, expertise and methodological traditions and a general lack of transnational collaboration amongst historians. The result is that textbooks have indeed changed over the years in terms of quantitative inclusions and the tone of these inclusions, though Mexicans and Mexican-Americans remain marginalized in American texts, and the US remains a source of benefit, but more so unwelcome pressure in Mexico.

Perhaps the question could be raised as to whether national histories *should* spend a significant portion of text on other countries. After all, world history courses exist to explore foreign cultures. But it is precisely in national histories that identity is a core issue and in that assumed binary between us and them is played out, either with a nod to shared issues or an ethnocentric tale of exceptionalism; either helping us conceptualize ourselves. Research into this question will continue to be germane in history subfields regarding political culture and national identities, precisely because of its nature. If we wish to know ways in which states or nations have

[250] Cruz, 337

oriented perceptions and alignments towards action, the public schools historically have and continue to occupy a central role. As Wineburg and others have claimed, even the most mature and critical students rarely question the origins or validity of knowledge in their history textbooks, relying on them as authoritative voices, and as these titles have become increasingly centralized over the years, masses of students are left with and examined on impressions, narratives and biases delivered explicitly and implicitly by these books. This has a potentially profound impact on how students perceive their nations, others and themselves, and can ultimately translate to action or inaction and discimination or cooperation in their political polities, and why research into history textbook narratives and how they change over time remains relevant and worthwhile.

Textbooks Reviewed

Mexican textbooks

Martínez Baracs, Andrea & Javier Lara Bayón. *Historia de México. Tercer grado.* Mexico: Trillas, 2014.

Montoya, Patricia & Guadelupe Ramírez. *Historia de México.* 3, Segunda edición. Mexico: McGraw-Hill, 2014.

Pérez Tagle Mercado, Gabriela E., Benjamín de Jesús Pérez Tagle Mercado & Sergio Manuel Jiménez Quiróz. *Historia de México: Alternativas.* Tercer Grado. Mexico: Pearson, 2014.

United States Textbooks

Appleby, Joyce, Alan Brinkley, Albert S. Broussard, James M. McPherson, Donald A. Ritchie. *United States History & Geography: Modern Times.* USA: McGraw-Hill, 2016.

Danzer, Gerald A., J. Jorge Klor de Alva, Larry S. Krieger, Louis E. Wilson, Nancy Woloch. *The Americans: Reconstruction to the 21st Century.* USA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2012.

Lapansky-Werner, Emma J., Peter B. Levy, Randy Roberts, Alan Taylor. *United States History.* New Jersey, USA: Pearson, 2013.

Works Cited

Aguayo, Sergio. *Myths and Misperceptions: Changing US Elite Visions of Mexico.* Colegio de Mexico, 1998.

Alm, Martin. "Europe in American World History Textbooks." *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 12, no. 3 (2014): 237-257.

Besse, Susan K. "Placing Latin America in Modern World History Textbooks." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 84, no. 3 (Aug. 2004): 411-422

Cherry, Susan Spaeth. "U.S. History Texts Rated As Truthfully Positive." *Chicago Tribune* (Nov. 30, 1986). http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1986-11-30/news/8603300414_1_history-texts-social-studies-association-of-american-publishers

Chua, Amy. *Political Tribes: Group Instinct and the Fate of Nations.* Penguin Press, New York, 2018.

Cowen, Jill. "What California's History Textbooks Tell Us." *New York Times Online* (Feb. 6, 2020). https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/14/us/textbooks-history-california-texas.html

Cremer, Gregory, "A Critical Investigation of Advanced Placement US History Textbooks." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (2012).

Cruz, Bárbara C. "Don Juan and Rebels under Palm Trees: Depictions of Latin Americans in US History Textbooks." *Critique of Anthropology* 22, no. 3 (2002): 323-342.

Fleming, Dan B. "Latin America and the United States: What Do United States History Textbooks Tell Us?" *Social Studies* 73, no. 4 (July, 1982): 168-171.

Gilbert, Dennis. "Rewriting History: Salinas, Zedillo and the 1992 Textbook Controversy." *Estudios Mexicanos* 13, no. 2 (Summer, 1997): 271-297.

Gilbert, Dennis. "Zapata: Textbook Hero." *Estudios Mexicanos* 19, no. 1 (Winter, 2003): 127-159.

Gold, Erika Sloan. "United States History Textbooks in High Schools: Research on Racial Bias 1950-2000." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh (2004)

Goldstein, Dana. “Two States, Eight Textbooks, Two American Stories: American history textbooks can differ across the country, in ways that are shaded by partisan politics.” *New York Times* (Jan. 12, 2020). https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/01/12/us/texas-vs-california-history-textbooks.html?action=click&module=Top%20Stories&pgtype=Homepage

Gräser, Marcus. “World History in a Nation-State: The Transnational Disposition in Historical Writing in the United States.” *The Journal of American History* 95, no. 4, (March, 2009): 1038-1052.

Greenfield, Gerald Michael & Carlos E. Cortés. “Harmony and Conflict of Intercultural Images: The Treatment of Mexico in U.S. Feature Films and K-12 Textbooks.” *Estudios Mexicanos* 7, no. 2 (Summer, 1991): 283-301.

Hein, Laura & Mark Selden (eds.). *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, German and the United States.* M.E. Sharpe publishers, London, 2000.

“History Textbooks and the Profession: Comparing National Controversies in a Globalizing Age.” Conference held at the University of Chicago (May 4, 2007). Published on Youtube (July 20, 2015). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zdcTscmqMDw

Hoffman, Abraham. “Where Are the Mexican Americans? A Textbook Omission Overdue for Revision.” *The History Teacher,* 6, no. 1, (Nov. 1972): 143-150.

Jerdee, Danielle. “Messages of Nationalism in Mexican and U.S. Textbooks: Implications for the Identity of Transnational Students.” Graduate Thesis, Loyola University of Chicago (2010)

Krogstad, Jens Manuel. “Mexicans, Dominicans More Catholic than Most Other Hispanics.” *Pew Research Center* (May 27, 2014) https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/05/27/mexicans-and-dominicans-more-catholic-than-most-hispanics/

Laloggia, John. “Americans have mixed views of Mexico, ‘warmer’ feelings toward Canada.” *Pew Research Center* (Aug. 28, 2018). https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/28/americans-have-mixed-views-of-mexico-warmer-feelings-toward-canada/

LaSpina, James Andrew. “Designing Diversity: Globalization, Textbooks, and the Story of Nations.” *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 35, no. 6 (2003): 667-696.

Leidenberger, Georg. “Exploring the Past of the ‘Other’: The Practice of U.S. History in Mexico.” *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 1, no. 4 (Oct., 2002): 308-329.

Lindaman, Dana & Kyle Ward. *History Lessons: How Textbooks from Around the World Portray U.S. History.* New York: The New Press, 2004.

Loeza, Soledad. “La Historia Patria y Los Libros de Texto Gratuitos.” *Transatlántica de Educación* 7 (December, 2009): 110-115.

Marino, Michael P. “High School World History Textbooks: An Analysis of Content Focus and Chronological Approaches.” *The History Teacher* 44, no. 3 (May 2011): 421-446.

Morris, Stephen D. “Exploring Mexican Images of the United States”. *Estudios Mexicanos* 16, no. 1, (Winter, 2000): 105-139

Moskowitz, Eva. “Lessons in Achievement in American History High School Textbooks of the 1950s and 1970s.” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 112, no. 2 (Apr. 1988): 249-271.

Neuman, Scott. “China Cracks Down on University Textbooks Promoting ‘Western Values’.” *National Public Radio* (Jan. 30, 2015) http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/01/30/382610842/china-cracks-down-on-university-textbooks-promoting-western-values

Ochoa, Enrique C. “Constructing Fronteras: Teaching the History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands in the Age of Proposition 187 and Free Trade.” *Radical History Review* 70 (1998): 119-130.

Rodriguez, Joseph A. & Vicki L. Ruiz, “At Loose Ends: Twentieth Century Latinos in Current United States History Textbooks.” *The Journal of American History* 86, no. 4 (Mar., 2000): 1689-1699.

Salvucci, Linda K. “Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican Americans in Secondary-School United States History Textbooks.” *The History Teacher* 24, no. 2 (Feb., 1991): 203-222.

Sewall, Gilbert & Stapley W. Emberling. “A New Generation of History Textbooks.” *Society* (Nov./Dec., 1998): 78-82.

Schrader, Corbin & Christine Wotipka. “History Transformed? Gender in World War II Narratives in U.S. History Textbooks, 1956-2007.” *Feminist Formations* 23, no. 3 (Fall, 2011): 68-88.

Tenorio Trillo, Mauricio. “On the Limits of Historical Imagination: North America as a Historical Essay.” *International Journal* 61, no. 3 (Summer, 2006): 567-587.

Tenorio Trillo, Mauricio. “The Riddle of a Common History: The United States in Mexican Textbook Controversies.” *Journal of Educational Media, Memory & Society* 1, no.1 (Spring, 2009): 93-116.

Thelen, David. “Rethinking History and the Nation-State: Mexico and the United States.” *The Journal of American History* 86, no. 2 (September, 1999): 438-452

Thelen, David. “The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History” *The Journal of American History* 86, no. 3 (December, 1999) 965-975

VanSledright, Bruce. “Narratives of Nation-State, Historical Knowledge, and School History Education. *Review of Research in Education* 32 (2008): 109-146.

Vice, Margaret & Hanyu Chwe. “Mexican Views of the US Turn Sharply Negative: Widespread dissatisfaction with economy and political leaders.” *Pew Research Center* (Sept. 14, 2017). https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2017/09/14/mexican-views-of-the-u-s-turn-sharply-negative/

vom Hau, Matthias. “Unpacking the School: Textbooks, Teachers, and the Construction of Nationhood in Mexico, Argentina and Peru.” *Latin American Research Review* 44, no. 3 (2009): 127-154.

Wineburg, Sam. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Wineburg, Sam. “Opening Up the Textbook And Offering Students a 'Second Voice’.” *Education Week* (June 5, 2007). https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/06/06/39wineburg.h26.html

Wineburg, Sam. *Why Learn History (When It’s Already on Your Phone).* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Other Works Consulted

Beuchot González de la Vega, Alberto. “A Los Ojos del Vecino: Un Estudio Comparativo de Sociocentrismo a Través de Libros de Texto de Historia de Educación Media Superior en Estados Unidos y México.” *Revista de Humanidades* 10 (2001): 175-200.

Salvucci, Linda K. “Did NAFTA Rewrite History? Recent Mexican Views of the United States Past.” *The Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (Sept., 1995): 643-647.

Salvucci, Linda K. “Getting the Facts Straight: New Views of Mexico and its Peoples in Recently Adopted U.S. History Textbooks in Texas.” *The Public Historian* 14, no. 4 (Autumn, 1992): 57-69.