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This historical study examines the career of George I. Sanchez, New Mexican educator, who led many political and educational battles in New Mexico and Texas to improve educational opportunities for Spanish-speaking children. Archival materials from the State Records' Center of New Mexico, the papers of Senator Bronson M. Cutting, the Rockefeller Foundation Archives, the papers of President Lyndon Baines Johnson, Sanchez's private papers, unpublished materials at the University of Texas in Austin, oral history, and published materials were used in this study.

Sanchez was born in Albuquerque, New Mexico, in 1906, and he received his bachelor's degree from the University of New Mexico in 1930. He earned his master's degree from the University of Texas in Austin in 1931, and his doctorate from the University of California in Berkeley in 1934. Both his master's thesis and doctoral dissertation dealt with educational problems of Spanish-speaking children. These studies set the tone for much of his later writings.

The educator began his career as a teacher. He also served as a school principal as well as head of the Division of Information and Statistics in the New Mexican State Department of Education. From this position of leadership he
strived to work actively for improved funding of public education. Sanchez also served as president of the New Mexico Education Association and represented the interests of the state's teachers in appeals to the legislature for more adequate educational funding. The General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation aided Sanchez's career by awarding him fellowships for graduate study, underwriting the funding of the Division of Information and Statistics for a four-year period, and sponsoring research projects in topics of concern to Mexican-Americans.

Sanchez wrote many articles during his career in New Mexico, but *Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans*, published in 1940, is his best-known work. This book deals with rural poverty in northern New Mexico, a region largely inhabited by the Hispanics, or Spanish-Americans.

The educator joined the faculty of the University of Texas in Austin in 1940. He chaired the Department of History and Philosophy of Education from 1951 to 1959. Sanchez took an active role in both university and national issues, and he frequently spoke out publicly concerning the needs of the Mexican-American. He participated in many court cases dealing with the segregation of Spanish-speaking people. The most famous case concerned his development of the "class apart" theory used by the plaintiffs in the 1954 United States' Supreme Court case, *Hernandez vs. Texas*. Sanchez assumed a leadership role in state and national Mexican-American
organizations. He received recognition from Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson who appointed him to national and international commissions dealing with problems of Hispanic people.

Sanchez's determination to equalize opportunities for the Spanish-speaking people brought him into frequent conflict with state political leaders and university administrators. These battles received publicity in the press and in many of Sanchez's published materials. He died in 1972.
INTRODUCTION

This historical study describes the professional career of George I. Sanchez, New Mexican-born educator, who participated in educational and political events for almost half a century. Sanchez's activities transcended the political borders of the United States, but this work is limited to those activities in New Mexico and Texas aimed at improving opportunities for the Spanish-speaking child.

Sanchez's career began in New Mexico, and this dissertation includes the historical and socio-economic conditions that Sanchez found when he became an educator. Additionally, the study contains chapters discussing Sanchez's early writings, an analysis of his doctoral dissertation and a discussion of his political contests in New Mexico.

The Texas portion of the dissertation includes a bird's eye view of Texas history, and an explanation of the role of language as an important determinant in shaping the Spanish-speaking child's self-concept. The work has chapters detailing Sanchez's later writings, the theses and dissertations of his graduate students which reflected his concerns, his political activities in Texas, his contests at the University of Texas and the historical perspective of the total work.
Sanchez's activities generated a great deal of controversy in both political and educational communities of the Southwest. This work attempts to explore the dynamics of that controversy in a balanced fashion to illustrate the many facets of Sanchez's educational and political interests.

The author used oral history and archival materials to gather much of the information for this work. The author extends special thanks and appreciation to Mrs. George I. Sanchez for making Sanchez's private papers available for study. The author also wishes to thank Dr. Hector Garcia, Senator Ralph Yarborough, Judge Carlos Cadena, Tom Sutherland, Arthur Campa, J. W. Edgar, Ed Idar, Jr., John Silber, and Connie Sprague, Sanchez's daughter, for their help.
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CHAPTER I

NEW MEXICO: LAND OF "FORGOTTEN PEOPLE"

The Southwest, the lands of the Texas Republic and the Mexican Cession, is an area possessing a population that reveals examples of both cultural pluralism and cultural isolationism existing side by side. Regional diversities offer a laboratory for students with varied interests. Some students find topographical contrasts, variations in climate and soil conditions to be worthy of study. Others discover that some of the underground natural resources are already being exploited. Yet other students, interested in history, examine the region from the viewpoint of the groups of people who call this area home.

When the student who is interested in human concerns examines the lifestyles of the Southwest, he finds that the interplay of geography and history has brought about development of culturally distinct living patterns. These distinctions sometimes present difficulties for people who cherish those differences. Sociological questions arise, and these complex questions defy easy solutions. These solutions have not been found, but the quest for answers does move forward. George I. Sanchez, New Mexican-born educator, reacted with sensitivity to the regions cultural differences, and he indicated this concern in his speeches and writings. He traced
his own cultural heritage to the arrival of the conquistadors, a group which left its cultural stamp on the region. Sanchez considered himself to be a spokesman for the Hispano, the Spanish-speaking New Mexican. In that role he led many political and educational battles to try to improve opportunities for this ethnic group. He became a student of history and politics in order to effect social change. His political battles remained an all-consuming interest throughout his life. Sanchez challenged repeatedly leaders whom he believed neglected the Hispanics' needs, and he criticized political decisions which he felt ignored the Spanish-speaking New Mexican. His writings, speeches, and political activities illustrate his concerns.

This work examines George I. Sanchez's career in both New Mexico and Texas and his attempts to reach his goal of establishing equal opportunities for the Spanish-speaking people. The primary focus of this study concerns Sanchez's educational and political activities, as well as the inevitable rebuff he encountered when his philosophical positions differed from the goals of the establishment. Sanchez's behavior as an educator and a participant in political action illustrated the old saying, "You can take the man out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the man." Sanchez never forgot his cultural heritage. It was that heritage that served as the propellant for his total life's work.
New Mexico may be viewed as the "land of enchantment" by its civic clubs, but Spanish explorer Antonio de Espejo named the region New Mexico, hoping that it would offer the wealth of already discovered Mexico to its enterprising explorers. Early colonial maps chose the label "New Mexico" to embrace what is now both southwestern United States and northern Mexico. Geographically New Mexico is a land that has large areas of mountains, some flat plains, pine forests, and deserts. Lands adjoining New Mexican rivers provided rich farming soil when free from destructive flooding; but water, rather than minerals, has been the prime-mover in determining New Mexican historical development.1

When Spanish conquistadores reached the region in the sixteenth century, they found several different Indian cultures. Although the first explorers remained ignorant of the background of the early settlements, archaeologists have determined that groups of hunters located themselves in the Sandia mountain region during the Ice Age, and other hunting groups followed this migration wave ten thousand years later. By 3,000 B.C. the natives began to farm, weave fabrics, and make baskets. They expanded their houses from one-room shelters to larger stone houses. When the Spaniards found these people living in villages, they named them pueblo or village Indians.2

Pueblo Indians dwelt in desert areas as well as along such river banks as the Rio Grande and the Pecos. Desert dwellers included Acoma, Hopi, and Zuni pueblos. These
groups had formal religious rituals and relied upon their priesthood to cure illnesses and control evil spirits. Elected tribal leaders made governmental decisions, including warfare, for a closely knit group which excluded outsiders. River pueblo dwellers maintained a more open society and engaged in frequent warfare. They used a governing council for formulating tribal decisions and rotated decision-making roles among tribal leaders. These people used different spokesmen for their political and religious needs. The Spanish admired the life-style of the river pueblo Indians and reported that the inhabitants raised crops, made colorful earthenware pottery, and lived in well-planned multi-storied buildings, placed around gracious plazas.

About 400 years prior to the Spanish exploration of New Mexico, nomadic Indian tribes who came from Canada and spoke an Athapascan dialect moved in around these pueblo settlements. Sedentary Indians labeled them "Apaches," meaning enemies. The Navajos, Jicarilla Apaches, and Mescalero Apaches who remained in the New Mexican region near established pueblo communities survived as descendants of original invaders.

These diverse Indian groups, accustomed as they were to a period of conflict with enemy tribes, received a series of surprises when various waves of Spanish explorers and missionaries penetrated into their homeland. Foreign adventurers came searching for gold and precious stones and offered God and glory in exchange for treasures. Cabeza de Vaca and Friar Marcos de Niza supposedly explored New Mexico. Both
explorers received primary credit for their discoveries from different historians. Both parties romanticized their journeys in such a fashion that the subsequent Coronado expedition searched for the famous cities of Cibola which were supposed to contain vast quantities of gold. Instead, Coronado did not find these famous seven cities, but he discovered six poor villages inhabited by starving Indians.\(^5\)

In 1541 Coronado's subsequent search for the rich city of Quivira yielded only Kansas grasslands, while the Chamuscado Rodríguez's adventure in 1581 gave explorers sufficient additional contact with Indian groups to pave the way for Antonio de Espejo's adventure. Espejo's imaginative report of the region's population and natural resources, coinciding with news of Englishman Sir Francis Drake's successful circumnavigation of the globe, motivated Spanish rulers to sponsor further explorations to New Mexico. Drake's navigational feat made Spanish leaders assume that he had discovered a water passage to Europe. The Spanish ruler wanted the viceroy of Mexico to facilitate a settlement north of Mexico in the belief that this region lay near the bay area which might adjoin the newly-discovered all-water passage.

In 1598 Don Juan de Oñate wanted to undertake this new adventure. Married to a granddaughter of Cortés, he had the necessary family ties to prompt the king to name him governor; he was allowed to raise an army and was granted an hidalgo. With this hidalgo from the king, Oñate could issue land grants
to his followers. Onate's dreams of riches failed to materialize, and his expeditionary party became disenchanted with the materially fruitless venture. The resistance of the Acoma Indians cost the leader some men and debilitated the morale of the remaining members of the expedition. When Oñate decided to divide his group in order to press further in his search for the fabled city of Quivira, remaining members of the party deserted the campsite, which abetted the ultimate failure of the expedition.

Although New Mexico never yielded the gold nor silver riches of Mexico, the Spanish crown continued to maintain its tenuous hold on the region throughout the seventeenth century. Missionary groups came to offer god to the Indians, and soldiers came to protect churchmen from hostile Indian groups. Spain's continued interest in the area remained stimulated by a desire to prevent further expansion of Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands in the New World. A sufficiently populated New Mexican colony loomed as a protective bastion to thwart greedy Europeans' dreams of invading the silver mines of Zacatecas south of New Mexico.

Santa Fe became the territorial capital in 1609 or 1610. Early settlers included both civil and religious leaders who struggled to tame both the territory and native inhabitants. These diverse representatives of the Spanish crown also quarreled among themselves regarding the right of each group to assert primacy over the Indians' destiny. Religious leaders
complained that the governor claimed both land and Indians' labor without first requesting permission from the viceroy to institute these policies. The Indians first drafted into service by secular leaders were sometimes sold as slaves to willing buyers in New Spain. Indians choosing not to convert to Christianity had the opportunity under Spanish law to remain free from such abuses, but governors apparently ignored these legal restrictions. Churchmen also reported that civil leaders deprived Indian chiefs of their authority among their own people; moreover, they even distributed Indian-occupied land to newly arriving Spanish settlers. Additionally, governors disobeyed royal decrees which forbade them to own farms or cattle ranches.8

Civil leaders also objected to qualities of religious leadership displayed by churchmen. They reported that church leaders denied sacraments to congregants, including confession. These civil authorities charged that priests prevented non-Indian residents from maintaining farms and cattle ranches by asserting that these farms damaged Indian cornfields, while churchmen raised cattle openly. Civil leaders also complained that religionists took possession of most of the arms and ammunition in the territory and refused to place weapons under gubernatorial jurisdiction.9

From the conflicting reports of the religious leaders and civil authorities, it appeared that both groups had difficulty carrying out their assigned missions. If governors sometimes used their positions to enrich themselves, they found that
these practices brought them into open conflict with missionary goals of religionists. The Franciscans resented interference from civil authorities in their religious tasks. Although most churchmen worked selflessly to fulfill their missionary role, some missionaries failed to exemplify unselfish religious ideals. Specifically, lay leaders resented Franciscans' practice of using Indian labor to till their fields, but churchmen responded to this criticism by asserting that Indian labor improved God's work.10

Conflict between Spanish and Indian forces erupted violently in 1680 when Pueblo Indians, inspired by Pope, a medicine man, organized a successful campaign against Spanish settlements in the Santa Fe region. This attack resulted in heavy casualties among Spanish settlers, and they withdrew to San Lorenzo near El Paso. Whether the revolt was precipitated by clashes of religious values or antagonism against Spanish rule seemed unimportant. The net result freed Indians from oppressive rule of Spanish overlords. Spanish forces under Don Diego de Vargas recaptured Santa Fe in 1693, and Spanish rule remained undisturbed after 1700.

New Mexican settlements remained semi-isolated during the remaining years of Spanish rule. Americans moving westward, stimulated partly by pursuit of the lucrative fur trade and partially by nationalistic feelings of manifest destiny, soon discovered this sleepy land of enchantment. In 1806, Zebulon Pike, an American adventurer, explored the Arkansas river region and the mountain peak which bears his name. Ultimately,
Pike was captured by the Spanish and taken to Chihuahua where his papers were carefully examined. He was released later and returned to the United States. The official papers that Pike had in his possession and the fact that he had built a block-house which flew the American flag on Spanish-held land, seemed to indicate that Pike had territorial expansion in mind.11

Pike's exploratory efforts led the way for subsequent incursions by American adventurers who roamed the Southwest in search of beaver. Imaginative reports of travelers' frontier experiences motivated more Americans to seek the beaver in Spanish and later Mexican-controlled territory. Americans' disregard for the laws forbidding foreigners to enter this territory resulted in the Mexican government's issuance of a formal protest to the American secretary of state. Because the Mexican government lacked sufficient troops to police the region properly, mountain men continued to ignore protests. American incursions for fur diminished when the beaver supply decreased, but these early expeditions blazed the trails for William Becknell who in the early 1820's organized the Santa Fe trade route and began profitable annual pilgrimages to the Southwest.12

Native New Mexicans battled Indians, foreign invaders, and geographic conditions as they struggled to survive. Both climate and topographical problems increased the severity of the colonizers' difficult task. George I. Sanchez, New Mexican educator, observed that the twentieth century New
Mexican believed that he had been victimized as a result of this historical struggle. The educator stated that the student who viewed the early history of the region and saw only color and glamour of the Spanish conquest tales missed the harsh realities of the Spanish invasion. To Sanchez, the New Mexicans remained a "forgotten people" whose needs had been ignored by all the conquering heroes who claimed the territory.13

Throughout the entire period when Spain and Mexico controlled the New Mexico territory, the natives pursued their subsistence by farming, and by raising cattle, sheep, and hogs. They accepted a dull and isolated way of life. Their life changed little once Mexico declared its independence from Spain in 1821, and the natives didn't view changes in political administration to be indicative of reform. Instead, they observed that their personal fortune deteriorated when leadership changed.14

Although the region had been settled by Europeans for over 200 years, only 35,000 Spanish and mestizos lived in New Mexico by 1821. Twenty-six pueblo communities, numbering fewer than 10,000 inhabitants, lived among Spanish settlements. These Indians, although converted to Christianity by Franciscans, remained culturally separated from the European population. The area, washed by the Rio Grande and Chama rivers, called Rio Arriba country, had residents who grazed sheep and raised blue maize and chili peppers on small, irrigated plots. The Rio Abajo region to the south had better
agricultural conditions. Residents had an easier life; they enjoyed more material comforts and kept the poorer residents in the region employed by a system of debt peonage. The fact that the Pueblo Indians lived among the Spanish settlements brought about a spirit of inter-cultural tolerance. When inter-tribal outbreaks erupted within the Ute, Apache, and Navajo tribes, Indians of defeated tribes became the slaves of the victors. These vassals more closely resembled the vassalage of ancient history than the pattern of black-white slavery in the southern part of the United States. This custom, along with the debt-peonage system, gave a formal stratification to New Mexican communities and allowed a few powerful families to rise as important leaders.15

Regional social patterns also had their parallel in provincial religious practices. A lay group, named Third Order of St. Francis, had begun in Europe during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and practitioners accompanied the conquistadores on their New Mexican adventures. Here they became known for their emphasis on pain and death as part of their religious experiences. By 1850, inhabitants called them Los Hermanos de los Penitentes. Followers of this group rejected church supervision, practiced fasts, imposed beatings upon each other, and re-created the crucifixion for their members with all the accompanying gore. By 1856, the group's focus broadened to include political activities, along with their religious rites.16
Taos and Santa Fe grew to be the two chief settlements of the region. Santa Fe residents, because of the wealthy haciendas south of their community, developed a life style different from that of Taos residents. People in Taos remained exposed to frontier dangers and lived a more isolated existence than those in Santa Fe. Don Jose Manuel Martinez secured a large land grant in the Rio Arriba region at Tierra Amarilla and settled his four sons there. This family through intermarriage built a strong paternalistic society. Their relative, Father Jose Antonio Martinez, opened the first school of Taos and brought the first printing press into the region.¹⁷

Taos became the gateway for the Santa Fe trade route from the United States, and merchants flocked to the region to look for business ventures. As trade flourished, the American government built forts from Missouri to the New Mexico region to protect trading caravans from Indian marauders. These new settlers flocked to the area between 1821 and 1845. Mexico feared the United States' dreams of expansion into this territory and sought to establish settlements to impede the American population encroachment. The government used empresario land grant awards to those settlers who would settle groups of families on the frontier to block foreign encroachment. Almost 200 land grants were issued in the region from 1598 until the American conquest, but 69 of these were issued from 1840 until 1847.¹⁸
Shortly after Mexico declared its independence from Spain, Carlos Beaubien, a French-Canadian and later naturalized Mexican citizen, came to live in Taos. He, along with Ceran St. Vrain, Charles Bent, and Taos prefect Cornelio Vigil asked Manuel Armijo, merchant governor of the territory, for such a land grant. They selected Guadalupe Miranda, former secretary to Governor Perez and customs' collector for Armijo, to make their request. Both Miranda and Armijo received partnerships in the group's land award, limited to 97,000 acres by Mexican law. Father Martinez secured recision of the grant in 1844, but Armijo restored the award the following year.19

The priest opposed the land grant to Beaubien and his associates because he maintained that lands could not be awarded to foreigners. He ignored the fact that Beaubien had become a naturalized citizen. The priest also charged that lands given to grantees included pasture land long used by Taos natives. Grantees did not take possession of their new holdings immediately, because Texans invaded the region and residents became more concerned with repelling advancing Texans in occupying new lands.20

Americans came to New Mexico first to look for furs and stayed to engage in land speculation. Beaubien as a representative of these new enterprising businessmen clashed with the established Martinez family regarding political supremacy in Taos, and he tried to wrest control from the Hispano group.
As fears of approaching American occupation alarmed conservative New Mexicans, 4,000 residents organized and prepared to repel unwelcome invaders. No open warfare erupted because the territorial governor cooperated with the American military leader, Stephen Watts Kearny. The American general had been sent to New Mexico under orders to hold that region securely until peace terms could be arranged. He received instructions to establish a temporary civilian government and retain present officeholders. Instead, Kearny appointed American traders to governmental positions in both Taos and Santa Fe.  

Kearny's temporary government utilized some of the existing governmental structure, but the General created the offices of sheriff, tax assessor, as well as additional judgeships. He changed the role of the legislature from an advisory body to a lawmaking one. The American leader's governmental philosophy also included plans for the separation of church and state, use of paid militia, and the establishment of a secular school system. Kearny's new government excluded old Santa Fe families from the "new establishment" and this action precipitated increased outbursts of hostility in Taos between Hispanics, led by Father Martinez, and the Americans. Singlehandedly, and in defiance of President James K. Polk's specific instructions, Kearny conducted a constitutional revolution.  

Between 1848 and 1950 New Mexico became the pawn in the Congressional battle regarding extension of slavery. When some New Mexicans voiced opposition to slavery extension
they actually expressed more of an anti-Texan attitude than they did an anti-slavery one. Historian Howard Lamar asserted that natives remained fiercely anti-Texas and non-committal regarding slavery. Once the Compromise of 1850 became law, with its skillful sidestepping of the slavery issue, Texas received 33,000 miles of New Mexican territory as part of the compromise. This represented less of a loss for the region than leaders had originally expected because Texans had once claimed 70,000 miles.23

During the years before the Civil War, a few families influenced regional political decisions. The territorial legislature took little action to establish public schools or eliminate Indian peonage and slavery. The lawmakers taxed grog shops and American merchants but refused to establish public education, because they considered secular schools as a threat to religion. Functioning schools in the area remained under religious sponsorship.24 Residents had little need for education. Churchmen taught congregants religious doctrine, but few people learned to read. Some families sent sons to Mexico for seminary training, but most of the residents saw little need for formal schooling.

Controversy concerning the creation of a secular school system continued to generate lively discussion in the region for many years. The greatest effort to offer educational opportunities to local residents occurred during the first half of the nineteenth century with the establishment of parochial schools, such as the one operated by Father Martinez
in Taos. Sanchez reported that this priest displayed a liberal and progressive attitude toward education as well as other secular needs. This attitude perpetuated a continuing controversy between him and members of the religious hierarchy. Sanchez believed the priest deserved credit for choosing to demonstrate concern for humanitarian and public service at the expense of both his personal security and social position.  

Sanchez stated that the American victory in the Mexican War and subsequent ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo brought about major changes for native New Mexicans. Treaty provisions safeguarded political rights but ignored values natives held regarding both land use and ownership. New Mexicans had created a land-centered existence in which they organized the community around land grants, ranging in size from 200 to more than 1,000,000 acres. These grants sometimes became community property with private ownership limited to homesteads and farming lands. Grazing lands and water rights remained under community control. The concept of community ownership did not motivate individuals to strive to amass personal wealth. Sanchez charged that American occupation of New Mexico left natives cast asunder as a by-product of imperialism.

During the early years of the territory's political development, cliques instead of political parties exercised leadership. The territory's Congressional delegate symbolized the important means for New Mexicans to request increased
governmental services for the region. Religious reform, stimulated by the arrival of Bishop Jean Baptiste Lamy, who was sent to reform the region's nonconformist religious structure, generated political controversy. He relieved Father Martinez of his religious duties, established schools under the aegis of the Sisters of Loretto, and forced the residents into "pro" and "anti" Lamy factions. From 1851 until 1861, with increased economic prosperity stimulated by ranching and merchant activities, residents came to accept American rule.\textsuperscript{27}

When the Civil War erupted, some anti-Union feelings surfaced in New Mexico because federal troops had abandoned forts in Arizona and left miners at the mercy of the Apaches. New Mexico remained neutral on the slavery and secession questions. They viewed the approaching conflict with expressed concern of whether they wanted to surrender their trade and political organization to Texas which they knew would join the Confederacy. New Mexicans still harbored anti-Texas feelings. Confederates viewed possession of New Mexico as a gateway to the west which would include both mining interests and Pacific ports.\textsuperscript{28}

The most significant battle for New Mexico occurred at Glorieta Pass on March 28, 1862, when Union forces, supported by Colorado troops, defeated the Confederate army. Confederate leaders needed to place the territory securely within the Confederate camp in order to reach their goal of occupying all lands westward to the Pacific. They desperately
wanted to control the mining areas so that they would have the means to buy military supplies from European nations. Confederate defeat left the region of the Mexican cession out of Confederate control.29

After the Civil War ended, the Indian fighting resumed against the Apaches and Navajos. James H. Carleton, American military leader, believed that Indians should be killed or captured until they expressed willingness to submit to reservation life. Kit Carson helped round up the Mescalero Apaches in 1863, and other groups ultimately surrendered. After 1868 Navajos had lost most of their power, but some Indian raids continued until 1885.30

Once the Indian question had been settled, the region began to receive new settlers. Civil War veterans migrated into Lincoln and Colfax counties during this period. Major Lawrence G. Murphy became a trader at Fort Stanton, as well as the rancher and political boss of Lincoln county. Local policies continued to be influenced by family alliances, cultural ties, church and economic interests, rather than strictly political party affiliations. These local leaders concerned themselves with questions of land grants, statehood, open range cattle ranching, railroads, and mining. Almost all political and economic questions stemmed from questions concerning land usage.31

The question of land grants proved to be the most thorny economic and political question in the region. Under Spanish law, Indians were viewed to be owners of lands they actually
possessed, and Spain tried to deal fairly with aborigines. The Indians failed to show any interest in land grants. When the Spanish began occupying New Mexican territory, the Spanish rulers authorized viceroys to apportion land to those who wished to settle there, pending advice from the local governing councils. Viceroys received instructions that these grants should be made without harm to Indians. Land titles for many years resembled the original forms decreed by the Spanish kings.\textsuperscript{32}

After 1848, the American government learned that three types of land grants existed in the territory: grants made for community settlements, small individual grants, large-sized grants for individuals willing to bring groups of settlers to a designated region in the territory. Under Mexican law, land transfers could be consummated by verbal contract, while under Spanish law grantees had received a royal decree of possession prior to assuming actual possession. All these grants had been characterized by vague boundary lines and poor surveying and by fraudulent claims. The United States Congress confirmed thirty-six Mexican grants from 1858 until 1860, including Carlos Beaubien and Guadalupe Miranda's grant, later called the Maxwell Land Grant.\textsuperscript{33}

New Mexican lawyers found that for over sixty years they had to unravel the origin of these land grants to determine if they had been pueblo or individual grants. In both the United States and Mexico, the written record served as verification of the grant, and this grant also became the land
title. If a land claimant was unable to produce an authentic record the courts developed the rule that claimants could support assertions of ownership, with secondary evidence, provided that this evidence certified that these papers had been properly filed in Mexico.\textsuperscript{34} The problem of adjudication of land grants has made it necessary for the legislature to draft a great deal of statutory law.

Taxation on land, accepted in American law, had been more loosely applied by both the Spanish and Mexican laws. Individual or community grants sometimes had a stipulated number of years of taxation exemption, and sometimes remained permanently exempt. When the American government introduced the principle of land taxation, holders of the grants realized that land holding became a liability instead of an asset. The snarled mess of land grants became so increasingly complicated to administer that it might have been better if the United States in 1848 had declared all land in New Mexico to be in the public domain, and they had paid grantees fair market value for their property.\textsuperscript{35}

When Congress appointed William Pelham as surveyor-general in 1854, they gave him complex instructions that served to deny the existence of lands in the public domain, paving the way instead, for many legal battles. Of all the controversies, the Beaubien-Miranda, later called the Maxwell Land Grant, became the most famous. In 1864, following Miranda's death, Lucien Bonaparte Maxwell, Beaubien's son-in-law, purchased both his in-laws' share of the grant as well as
Miranda's. He believed that he had clear title to the grant; but, when he wanted to dispose of part of the land, his trouble accelerated.36

Maxwell knew gold had been discovered in 1867 on part of the land. In 1869, he asked for a new government survey and learned that the grant, according to Mexican law, remained limited to 97,000 acres or twenty-two leagues. He worked with many influential people in the area who were interested in buying the grant and in 1869 he sold the land for $1,350,000. The land grant was renamed the Maxwell Land Grant and Railroad Company. New owners arranged for another survey and found that the grant grew from 97,000 acres to 2,000,000 acres. Once the surveyor filed his report in Washington, D. C., and before the owners received confirmation of this claim, the new owners sold the land to English purchasers. The new owners involved Dutch bankers as financiers for the $5,000,000 deal.37

In 1871, Secretary of Interior Columbus Delano ruled that the grant was limited to 97,000 acres. This new decision meant that new owners would have to cease selling worthless stock for non-existent land. Company leaders circumvented the governmental leader's decision. The chain of events left the company bankrupt in 1857, but the Dutch investors held on to their claim and had a new survey in 1879 which reaffirmed their claim of 1,764,084 acres. New Mexican leaders also became involved in these legal land battles.38

In order for New Mexican leaders to handle claims successfully, such as the Maxwell Land Grant, they needed an
organization of lawyers, judges, politicians, and businessmen to work cooperatively for mutual gain. Out of this need came the Santa Fe Ring, essentially an organization of men who wanted to make money in the territory. They maintained ties to eastern businessmen and influential men in Congress to aid their group's cause. The fluid membership for the group retained long-standing economic and political motivations, and they shifted their interests from land to cattle, mining, and other business activities. New Mexicans learned to build power bases from the local community level to the territorial level.\textsuperscript{39}

Control of the Maxwell grant had political repercussions in Lincoln and Colfax counties when settlers and Indians learned that they had trespassed on company-owned lands. Gold miners moved into a section of the land, and Texas ranchers chose to graze their cattle in the lush grazing areas of Colfax county. Violence erupted in this region as mining, ranching, land speculation, and railroading all collided to determine which group would maintain control of the region.

Community leaders who represented opposing business interests mobilized their supporters as violence erupted. Lawlessness raged and on October 7, 1878, President Rutherford B. Hayes declared the county to be in a state of insurrection. By 1879, fifty agitators were indicted for their roles in the violent outbreak. The unrest in both Lincoln and Colfax counties strengthened the Santa Fe Ring. No members of this
political group were convicted of participation in the Lincoln county outburst, even though some had been suspected of involvement. Although the Santa Fe Ring remained plagued with internal factional struggles, they remained intact when the Lincoln county war ended.41

Historians Warren H. Beck and Howard R. Lamar reviewed the history of New Mexico's territorial period with a degree of objectivity, but George Sanchez saw this era as one of betrayal for the Hispanics. He reported that when the American government assumed control of the area the native Spanish-speaking resident became a political pawn of the new administrators. He charged that American economic practices, based on competition and unscrupulous business practices, cheated the native population. The Hispanics saw their land become the subject of court battles, resulting in frequent loss of their birthrights because they knew nothing of American laws.42

Sanchez stated that Governor Donaciano Vigil addressed the first legislative Assembly in 1847 and urged that body to adopt reforms that would protect public revenues, safeguard the Indians, give the farmer access to adequate water rights, and provide for the education of the inhabitants. The Governor stated that the people remained unable to exercise their civil rights if they had no formal education. He believed that education would remove provincial prejudices and enable citizens to understand the new values of the American government. Legislators did not heed Vigil's advice. They
established a state university but did not create public schools until 1890.43

Regional multi-cultural influences made it almost impossible to establish even a rudimentary educational system. Inhabitants spoke different Indian dialects as well as Spanish and English. The pervasive poverty system, compounded by a socio-economic system encouraged by the ricos, failed to serve as a stimulus for establishment of public education. Spanish-speaking New Mexicans constitutionally sanctified their right to retain use of this language in public life. The result of different language patterns, plus lack of taxable resources helped perpetuate widespread illiteracy.44

If Spanish rulers failed to establish guidelines for tax-supported education in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries; the United States did little to facilitate development of public schools when it assumed regional control. Local patrones ignored American requirements for compulsory education because they viewed the educational mandate as a threat to their own political security. When a few schools opened during the territorial period, the penchant for political patronage in the region motivated leaders to appoint school personnel on the basis of political loyalties, rather than educational qualifications. An 1889 law requiring teachers to be literate in either Spanish or English, rather than both languages, illustrated that Hispanos failed to see a pressing need to learn English in order to be considered part of the greater American community.45
Sanchez pointed out that by 1903 more than one-half of the eligible scholastics failed to attend school. Rural schools which enrolled most of the school population spent fewer than five dollars per scholastic annually and offered school terms which averaged fewer than five months in length. Teachers received salaries of fewer than 250 dollars per year. By 1900, almost one-quarter of the male population remained illiterate. In 1901 J. Fransisco Chaves, territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated that school funds should be equitably distributed to provide adequate funds for elementary school education. He criticized appropriations made for higher education at the expense of grammar school funding. The Superintendent also pointed out that the federal government should be as generous with this territory as it had been with Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands. Chaves stated that New Mexicans had already taxed themselves to their financial limits to support public education and needed more governmental assistance. By 1905, the region could raise only one-half million dollars for education, equivalent to eleven dollars per child for all education from elementary school through university training.46

Roman Catholic leadership thwarted the development of public schools. Religious leaders used church funds to teach parochial values in their own schools rather than support secular leaders interested in furthering tax-supported education. Protestant groups fought Catholic opposition to public schools and territorial leaders ignored the entire
matter of public education from 1856 until 1891. Even after the first public education bill became law, church groups still continued to operate parochial schools, and Protestant leaders complained that Catholic churchmen donated their services to the public schools. Despite the Protestant protests, these religious leaders were often the best available teachers. Protestant missionaries challenged Catholic control of education by establishing their own missionary schools surrendered their control of education to local authorities when legislative provisions for tax-supported education became a reality.47

In 1891, territorial leaders created a board of education which comprised the governor, superintendent of public instruction, and three presidents of higher learning institutions. Amado Chavez, an able Hispano who believed in education, became the first superintendent. Organization of New Mexican schools on a county unit contributed to the weakness of public education. The 1866 law provided that county probate judges would serve as school superintendents, and justices of the peace would appoint local teachers. By 1884, the office of county superintendent became elective with three directors chosen from each district. These county officers frequently differed with municipal school directors concerning the operation of school districts under their jurisdiction. County boards, anxious to perpetuate their small power basis, often voted against consolidation of small districts into larger more efficient units. Collection of taxes continued
Corporate railroad interests that owned 30 per cent of the taxable property within the territory regarded the New Mexican region as a passageway for their transcontinental routes and opposed any attempts by local taxing agencies to tax their rights of way.48

Congressional concern over New Mexico's lackadaisical attitude toward public schools surfaced when the territory applied for statehood. The 1912 Enabling Act for statehood set aside 12,100,000 acres of land. Congress outlined provisions for disposing of this land, stipulating that proceeds were to go into a permanent fund. Only the interest from this land could be used for education, but the principal had to remain intact. The state constitution provided for a uniform and compulsory education system for all school-age children. Safeguards prevented public funds from being channeled into private school treasuries. The document also prevented use of religious tests for school entrance requirements. Teachers and students, according to constitutional stipulations, could not be required to participate in religious services.49

The State Superintendent of Education, chosen by popular election, served no more than two consecutive two-year terms, but he remained an ex-officio member of the State Board of Education. This governing body included the governor, five members appointed by the governor, a county superintendent, a head of a state institution, and one other individual associated with education.50
By 1923, the State Board of Education which enjoyed little power in early statehood days could now determine teacher qualifications, accreditation of teacher-training institutions, minimum instructions standards, basic curricula, and textbook approval. The legislature, eleven years after statehood, took necessary action to improve the administration of the public schools. Coming to grips with educational funding created many additional problems for school administrators. The legislature decreed that school districts had to submit their annual budget estimates first to the county superintendent, who would then forward this information to county commissioners. Municipal school directors submitted their requests for funding directly to the county commissioners, while rural school directors had to obtain the approval of their county superintendents first. Money for funding educational needs came from land leases, interest from permanent school funds, and state property taxes.51

In 1923, the legislature also authorized county commissioners to collect one-half mill tax annually on all taxable property. This money was earmarked for education. This assessment became an additional tax to the already-imposed fifteen mill local tax. School districts, unable to collect enough local funds for their annual operation of a five-month school term computed at 300 dollars per classroom unit, could request additional funds from the state treasurer.

The state-wide battle for control of public education funding was led by the New Mexico Education Association, the
Parent-Teacher Association, and the New Mexico Taxpayer's Association. The taxpayer's group believed that schools could operate more economically. Ranching, mining, and railroad interests supported enthusiastically these economy-minded groups. Naturally, education groups lobbied for better school funding. Along with organized resistance to supporting public education properly, the state's system of financial control further lowered the amount of money available for educational purposes. Two taxpayers appointed by the county commissioners worked as local educational budget commissioners. They served along with an educational budget auditor, appointed by the governor, to authorize a line-by-line approval of local budgets. The state budget auditor, rather than local boards of education, had the final work on the number of operating classrooms, bus routes, and other expenditures.52

Sanchez, as head of the state educational research and statistics division, knew that areas with large numbers of Spanish speaking residents, had poorer schools. He asserted that these children became the victims of selfish allocation of school funds. Using his office in the Department of Education as the launching pad he began a well-mobilized effort to equalize school fund distribution so that districts would have money available to them in terms of their educational needs, rather than just the availability of taxable resources. This action by the educator generated a great deal of political controversy throughout the state. The Chronicle
of this struggle reveals the educator's role in New Mexican education.

The political history of New Mexico's long-sought attempt to become the forty-seventh state reflects that sectional struggles of the nation from the 1850's until the 1880's and also illustrates the effort exerted by special interest groups who had more to gain if New Mexico remained a territory. Despite the attempt of some politicians to petition Congress to address themselves to the statehood issue, New Mexico failed to achieve statehood until 1912. New Mexico's economic development centered on mining, sheep herding, and cattle grazing. Mining began in the post-Civil War years, but sheep raising commenced with the arrival of the conquistadores. Wealthy Spanish patrons owned most tracts of land and grazed large flocks of sheep tended by pobres on a share cropping basis. When new arrivals who were interested in raising cattle began to fence off the open range, the sheep raising industry moved to the western regions of the territory.53

The political history of the region differs markedly from political development in Anglo-dominated areas. Hispano attraction for political patronage motivated Spanish-speaking New Mexicans to participate vigorously at first in territorial and later state level politics. Patronage determined political support, and the state governor distributed about 5,000 jobs. Stories freely circulated in New Mexico that wealthy patrones
voted their sheep in critical elections. Spanish-speaking residents clustered in the upper Rio Grande valley, and their heavy concentration in this region gave them a disproportionate share of political power. The scope of their influence can be seen in the state constitution which made both Spanish and English official state languages. Legal documents and ballots had to be printed in both languages. Teacher-training institutions for Spanish-speaking teachers also received legal sanction. Bicultural influences and the cohesiveness of the Spanish-speaking population strengthened the viability of the Iberian heritage and prevented eradication of Spanish culture by a more rapidly-expanding Anglo group. To obviate the significance of racial issues at election time, opponents for designated races generally ran against members of their own ethnic group. Additionally, political leaders "saved" certain state offices for ethnic group members, and this resulted in many Spanish-Americans winning political office for lower level positions.54

Both Republican and Democratic party leadership led hard-fought battles for political control. Between 1912 and 1930, each party won the governor's race four times. Spanish-Americans supported the action to become involved in the political mainstream. Public education mirrored general conditions throughout the state. Poor regions had poor schools. Communities having limited taxable resources had restricted funds to allocate for education. Economy-minded business interests
continually strived to run the educational system as economically as possible.

When Sanchez's Forgotten People was reprinted in 1967, the publisher asked the author to write a new preface for this volume. Sanchez noted that when he had first written the book in 1940, he viewed the problem of the Hispano with a modicum of hope. He believed that as the rest of the nation climbed out of the economic difficulties of the 1930's, then the Spanish-speaking American would also prosper. He stated that instead of this minority group being able to pick themselves up by their own bootstraps, they even lost their boots to the whim of the power structure. Sanchez reported that the New Mexican had been exploited by merchants, cattle barons, land speculators, and politicians. The population lacked sufficient schools and the federal government did little to improve the situation. Sanchez criticized the short-range New Deal programs which failed to alleviate New Mexican poverty, and the federal government's preference for foreign aid rather than fund allocation for poor American citizens. The tenor of these remarks illustrates how Sanchez viewed the many problems which beset the Hispano. He insisted that social planning had to be one of the viable tools used to help members of this minority group find their places in the American mainstream. The educator aimed all his efforts in both New Mexico and Texas towards changing conditions which kept Spanish-speaking Americans impoverished and unable to cope with the demands of the modern age.55
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Concerns for the plight of the Spanish-speaking American has prompted scholars interested in socio-economic causes of minority group problems to examine the roots of the widespread poverty. Curious outsiders may tend to think that Spanish-speaking Americans represent a monolithic culture of poverty, migrancy, landlessness, and illiteracy. Casual observers may believe that an over-all umbrella program would cure the ills for all members of this minority group. Nothing could be further from the truth. The native-born New Mexican, or Hispano as he prefers to be called, has a distinct culture. Because roots of the New Mexican problems do not lie in the urban barrio and fail to have the same close ties to the "wet-back" problem as do other Spanish-speaking regions of the Southwest, it is necessary to examine them separately. Then it seems to be clear why Hispanos' educational, economic, and political problems offered specific challenges to George I. Sanchez and other professional educators.

George I. Sanchez traced his New Mexican ancestry back to colonial days. He was born in Albuquerque, New Mexico, on October 4, 1906. From the time that he was seven years
old and until he reached fifteen years of age, he lived in Jerome, Arizona, a booming copper town, where his father was a hardrock miner and ran a poker game in a neighborhood saloon to supplement the family income. Young Sanchez spent his spare time looking in abandoned copper mines and trash dumps for metals which he could convert into spending money. He searched for lost money underneath the town boardwalk and sorted through spoiled vegetables and fruits in neighborhood grocery stores to find family food. Sanchez stated that life had been good for his family until the depression of the 1920's. At that time it became necessary for him to use his talent playing the cornet, and he used his skill as a 112 pound prize fighter to supplement the family income. He returned to Albuquerque during his teenage years and completed high school there. He began to teach school at sixteen years old at Yrrisarri, a rancheria fifty miles east of Albuquerque. He made his weekly roundtrip on horseback much of the time as he went up the Sandia mountains to Tijeras canyon, stopping occasionally to build a fire. A year later he taught at San Ignacio, popularly called, El Ojo Hediondo, or "Stinking Springs." Here he had to fight both sand and the Rio Puerco on his way to the rural school. Sanchez taught school while he matriculated for his baccalaureate degree at the University of New Mexico. Sanchez later lived in both Santa Fe and Albuquerque, but he remained tied emotionally to problems of rural poverty which he experienced early in his career. He
believed problems in rural areas could be eased through modification of the state's public school system, and he focused much of his research on the rural school. His later contests with state political forces, stimulated by his feelings that rural Spanish-speaking communities received less of the educational dollar than more affluent Anglo areas, propelled him to work tirelessly to explore obvious educational deficiencies in rural New Mexico.

Rural New Mexicans lived in isolated subsistence level communities for 300 years until calamitous conditions of the depression of the 1930's forced them out of their communities and onto federal relief roles. During President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administrations, New Deal leaders realized that New Mexico contained two linguistically alien groups that had lived in the area for centuries. The first group, the Indians, received governmental assistance and some supply of land with the establishment of the reservation system, but the Spanish-speaking group had received little federal aid. This latter group, United States' citizens since ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, continued to live in the upper Rio Grande valley where they comprised from 50 to 90 per cent of the population.²

The culture complex of the region, homogeneous because of its longstanding isolation from the outside world, remained highly immobile and resistant to change. Typical settlements appeared to be poor, self-sufficient rural villages, partly communal in terms of economic organization and containing a
population density that averaged 2.9 people per square mile. Little modern transportation existed in the region until well into the twentieth century. By the beginning of the century, some villagers began to leave their homes to work in expanding labor markets in other regions of the state, but most inhabitants, unable to solve their economic problems by themselves, asked the federal government for help during the 1930's. In many communities every family received relief. This pervasive poverty forced state and federal agencies to examine village life more closely to determine generic causes for poverty.\(^3\)

Researchers quickly learned that whereas the region appeared to be sparsely populated on the whole, certain villages had too many people for their limited resources. They saw that village life styles depended upon ownership of land and cultivation of small tracts, but many villagers had already lost their lands and had become stranded with no economic support base. People in other areas persisted in dryland farming in a state which had an average of fourteen inches of rainfall annually. Residents in some regions, such as the Santa Cruz irrigation district, had planned or installed irrigation ditches for local use, but poor planning and inadequate cost accounting procedures left residents with too small and too expensive a facility to serve their needs properly. Villagers, such as those in the upper valley of the Rio Puerco, resigned themselves to live with periodic flood torrents which destroyed their irrigation dams and reduced land productivity.\(^4\)
The Hispano continued to struggle to maintain his village as home base. Older people clung tenaciously to their poor adobes so that younger family members who had left home temporarily would some day be able to return to their native region. Fathers considered it their obligation to bequeath their meager land holdings to their children because elders sensed that their children would remain aliens in an Anglo-dominated world, and they believed that this village home represented an emotional and cultural anchor for their children.5

New Mexican villages tended to look alike with houses close together and corrals and barns located behind the houses. Schools, churches, and stores were located in the center of the community. Villagers, because of these living conditions, as well as ties of kinship, maintained a close personal relationship with their neighbors. People frequently married fellow villagers, although they did not marry first or second cousins. Consequences of this type of life style, strengthened even further by the villagers' use of Spanish as their primary language of communication, gave residents unusually strong feelings not as well known in more mobile parts of the United States.6 Northern New Mexico was not the only poor and isolated section of the nation, but it is one of the few regions where factors of history, geography, and culture have worked to keep the inhabitants living apart and often unaware of the
forces of urbanization and industrialization at work in other parts of the nation.

Villagers cherished their land and worked it diligently to produce essentials for the family. People raised chili peppers, brown speckled beans, squash, root vegetables, melons, peaches, apples, and plums. They grazed their sheep on the mountainsides and their cattle on the open plains. When they slaughtered their animals, they utilized every bit of the carcass. They felt close to the earth and even used local soil to build their houses. These homes, constructed of molding earth and wheat straw, had dirt topped roofs. Because material for home construction came from the locale, houses cost little but labor to build.7

Patriarchal family structure gave the father all decision-making power. He decided how the family felt about current issues. He also planned what crops would be grown and how the harvest would be divided among his adult sons. Sons and fathers worked the land together and usually lived near each other.8 In these villages men led a freer life than women. Men were expected to assume responsibility for the family's welfare, maintain loyalty to a larger family group, and display impeccable external behavior to family and friends. Community cultural mores recognized presence of machismo, and this gave men more license in private affairs. For example, they could have an illicit love affair, but they were not expected to be seen drunk in public. Women readily conceded that men were the jefes de la casa, heads of the household, but they played the role of providing stability and teaching
piety to family members. They were expected to be tolerant of and obedient to their husbands and assume complete charge of raising the children. Scolding served as the major type of discipline, and mothers neither forced weaning nor toilet training.9

The church served as a powerful integration force for the villagers. It led the way in establishing religious authority. By sponsoring games and fiestas the church also formed the core of residents' social lives. Spanish-Americans recognized their church obligations and always tried to find some way to support the local parish. Parents began children's religious education at an early age, and several villages shared the services of one priest. When no priest was available, local residents conducted their own services. Many people participated in worship, and they knew the liturgy and psalms well, even though many were unable to read.10 The Penitentes, a unique brotherhood, helped residents perform religious rites and offered services to enrich their community life. This religious group disavowed and excommunicated by the church hierarchy served, nevertheless, as both spiritual and political leaders. Additionally, the community enjoyed the services of the compradrazgo, or godfather, who sponsored children for baptism, confirmation, and marriage.

These small villages of northern New Mexico came into existence under three different types of land grants established during the era of the conquistadores. One type, the
community land grant, and the most important in northern New Mexico, gave land to a group of settlers for agricultural settlement. The proprietary grant, given to a specific individual, went to a prominent leader who promised to establish a village and provide both churches and military protection for the inhabitants. The proprietor received payment in kind from the settlers and also profited by controlling local commerce. The sitio, the third type of land grant, belonged to an individual for the establishment of a livestock ranch. Although English North American proprietary and charter colonies could be said in some way to resemble Spanish land grants, this resemblance remains superficial. English settlers, valuing highly institutions of private property and being ever-mindful of profit motives, developed totally different community organizations from those that evolved in New Mexico.

In some villages patrones dominated village life. New Mexican villages had several different types of patrones. One was the large landowner who ran the community in a feudalistic fashion. Another was considered the patron by the villagers because he had the most wealth or exhibited the strongest powers of leadership. Land owning patrones dispensed jobs and provided for their workers' welfare through a debt-peonage system which continued to tie the worker to the landlord. Village patrones provided leadership, but they did not inherit their positions, and they did not control villagers' labor in the same sense as the land owners did. Still
another leader, the political patron, served as an important leader in some rural communities. This leader, not synonymous with the jefe de politico, or political leader, emerged as a father figure in the community who guided villagers to make wise political choices on election day. The paternalistic social organization in these villages give the influence of the patron added significance. Villagers respected his leadership, and they realized that through his efforts their community had a stability that they enjoyed. Jefes de politicos merely worked to win votes for political candidates on election day and cared little about the community's core of social values. These leaders failed to have the same kind of community influence that patrones enjoyed.¹³

Hispanos believed that land served as the foundation for total family survival, and they maintained that a family had the right to receive enough land to maintain itself. Land not in use could be utilized by other families needing land. Since land was intended for use rather than as a commodity to be traded for a profit, land titles remained unregistered and unoccupied land became available for those who needed it. The villager considered that his community comprised the village site, the irrigated land adjacent to it, and communal grazing, and timber lands. Water rights belonged to the entire village, and water allocations based upon land needs, allowed equitable distribution of this scarce resource. House lots and farmplots were owned individually, but New Mexicans discouraged selling village property to nonvillagers.¹⁴
New Mexicans believed that their village represented their entire world, and they regarded it as immoral for any political authority to alter their long-accepted patterns of land and water rights. Villagers always remembered those who had been original landowners and continued to regard newer occupants as trespassers. This communal sense of proprietorship differed strikingly from Anglo property values and gave inhabitants such a strong sense of belonging to the land that they never accepted new settlers who violated these land usage values. According to Knowlton, a sociologist, "There is an aching sense of injustice that will never end until the village is totally abandoned or until the land is restored to the village." Anglo values regarding property ownership, taxation, private assignment of water, and grazing rights differed markedly from those of the Spanish settlers. Older inhabitants, accustomed to vague boundary lines and payment of taxes in kind rather than payments in cash as taxation for land ownership, could not adjust easily to new styles of political administration. Consequently, many became aliens in their own country and many ultimately lost their lands.

Department of Agriculture employees in 1935 recognized the severity of the deprivation in rural New Mexico, and they looked to comprehensive measures to be undertaken by several federal agencies simultaneously to tackle different facets of the distress. The Federal Relief Administration dispensed
emergency relief. The Resettlement Administration concerned itself with problems in dry farming areas, defunct lumbering regions, unused mines, and regions with poor land unsuited to farming. The Resettlement Agency believed that they needed a two-pronged program to provide temporary rehabilitation as well as long-term resettlement. This rehabilitation required that families receive additional financing and instruction in improved agricultural techniques to help them make better use of the land; otherwise, families should be removed to an area capable of sustaining them more easily.\textsuperscript{17}

Widespread poverty throughout much of New Mexico made the state a fertile field for government planning, according to Sanchez. He noted that almost one century after the area became part of the United States, native New Mexicans still maintained persistently obsolete beliefs and practices, and many still clung to traditional life styles which hampered their ability to learn the social and economic practices of the larger American community. No organized effort, according to the educator, had been successfully undertaken to resolve these problems. In the 1930's, Spanish-speaking citizens comprised at least 50 per cent of the population in 15 of the 31 counties. In Taos, Rio Arriba, Mora, San Miguel, Valencia, Sandoval, and Socorro counties, they comprised more than 80 per cent of the total population.\textsuperscript{18}

Taos county in northern New Mexico became the focal point of Sanchez's interest concerning the question of rural poverty, and he believed that the poor conditions found in
that area illustrated the widespread poverty found in other parts of the state. Taos is mountainous, and most land is unfit for cultivation so that even dry land farming techniques can't be used. Only narrow valleys that border mountain streams provide the limited soil used to grow crops. Life in the villages remains dependent upon agriculture, and every piece of usable land retains a great deal of value. The region has a growing population resulting in continuous division and redivision of farming lands. Some native Taosenos had to move northward to Colorado to survive, and those who remained overgrazed the pastures and denuded the forests to eke out a living.\textsuperscript{19} Class distinctions found among the local populace indicated that Hispanos stayed poor and received little help to rehabilitate their community, leaving them isolated both socially and economically.\textsuperscript{20}

In the 1930's, 42 per cent of the state land was privately owned and 45,000,000 acres were owned by the government. The federal government held 32,000,000 acres in national forests, Indian reservations, and public lands. The state held 13,000,000 acres. Only 37 per cent of the state's total acreage remained subject to taxation. Sanchez reported that the federal government had failed to take action to benefit Hispanos, although they had implemented measures to help the Indians. Earlier governmental policies balanced Indian needs with needs of New Mexicans. Sanchez noted that Taos illustrated the state-wide problem because 46 per cent
of the county acreage remained under federal government control. Seven per cent was controlled by the state, and 47 per cent was held privately. The area had originally been divided into 9 land grants, and 4 of these were community holdings, while the rest were owned individually. Natives had lost control of these original grants.21

There are 2,200 farms in the county ranging from 6 acres to 200 hundred acres in size. More than half the farms contained fewer than 6 acres. Sanchez stated that a comprehensive regional development plan had to be implemented to make maximum use of land and water facilities. He pointed out that regional planning could increase usable acreage from 35,000 to 45,000 acres, double crop production, and increase the number of cattle and sheep by 50 per cent. Poverty-ridden families from Taos became the migrant workers of Colorado, according to the educator.22

Hugh Calkins, federal regional conservator, realized that the farmer in northern New Mexico had serious problems. He reviewed the work of the Resettlement Administration and concluded that the government should focus its main effort in lending money to impoverished farmers. The administrator reported that in 1935 that agency serviced 3,384 clients and approved loans averaging 405 dollars. The agency expected to receive applications from over 3,700 clients during the next calendar year and anticipated the new loans would average over 500 dollars per family. The administrator anticipated that over 80 per cent of the loan recipients would be able
to repay their debt within a three year period, and 46 per cent would pay within one year. They expected that a total of 80 recipients would have to default. Calkins questioned the advisability of using solely credit resources as the major rehabilitation tool. He asserted that total economic reorientation might be a better road to follow.  

The government conservator asserted that the Santa Cruz river valley which extended from Santa Cruz to Sanctuario and included Rio Chiquita, Cuniyo, Cordova, and Truchas, would be a worthwhile region to consider for a new kind of economic planning. Calkins surmised that this region could serve as a model for future development. The twenty mile region contained a homogeneous population and varied climatic and soil conditions. It has some fertile soil and water available for irrigation, but the native Spanish-American population, which already understood farming techniques, appeared unable to support themselves. Residents had found it necessary for the past fifty years to supplement family income with outside employment. Calkins acknowledged that both the Rural Resettlement Administration and the Works Progress Administration had stimulated economic activity in the area, but the aid served as survival insurance instead of assisting residents to plan for future economic independence.

Calkins' report failed to include the total acreage of the area, but he did state that most of the 800 families in the region owned from 2 to 8 per acres of land. About
100 families remained landless, and 75 families controlled more than 8 acres. He estimated that a family of five needed an annual income of 250 dollars. Families used their land to produce food for immediate use. They grew wheat and chili and alternated alfalfa crops with chili peppers. Families owned 1,400 cattle and horses and 2,500 sheep and goats. These animals grazed in the over-grazed lands of national forests and village grazing lands.25

The government employee asserted that present farm practices of wheat production on small irrigated tracts of land represented wasteful use of a limited resource. He stated that farmers should use more land to cultivate chili peppers as a major cash crop. He also suggested that people who produced Chimayo blankets should use crafts as another source of cash income. Finally, he stated that part of the region should be used for truck farming to serve produce needs of nearby Santa Fe. If truck gardening techniques were to be initiated, farmers would have to learn new fertilizing techniques and vegetable grading regulations. Calkins suggested that using irrigated land for crops that would provide cash could help villagers begin to improve their economic resources. To do otherwise, he warned his governmental coworkers, would perpetuate a nonproductive system of financing individuals for only short-range goals. Regional long-range goals, according to Calkins, should include new resource development, improved techniques for land use, and sufficient alternation of the economy to eliminate burdensome taxes.26
Calkins also reported that the Rio Grande watershed area, including Jimez-Tewa and Puerco settlements contained a rural population which numbered 70,000 Spanish-Americans, 9,000 Indians, and 13,000 recently-arrived Anglos. Most of the Spanish and Indian populations had lived there for centuries. Before 1880, they depended upon irrigated farming and range lands for their total income. Other range lands in the area had once been available for village use, but in later years these lands had been appropriated by newly-arriving large-scale sheep owners. After the railroad reached this remote region, energetic businessmen took over open range lands to increase livestock production. Villagers lost their grazing lands to both the big businessmen and the federal government, after Congress established national forest preserves. Because inhabitants lost a great deal of economic security, many were forced to seek supplementary income from wages earned outside the area. The seasonal nature of wage income served to increase inhabitants' deepening poverty. Their dire economic plight stimulated government employees during the 1930's to look at this region to analyze the cause of their poverty.27

Calkins claimed that village suffering had reached the crisis state. Many depended upon relief for bare survival. The land no longer provided enough food, and remaining grazing lands had been overused for so long that they failed to support enough animals to take care of local population needs.
Calkins stated that starvation and abject poverty could easily be seen, but no studies had been done to determine either consumption levels or living standards for the region. He contended that families lacked sufficient food for survival. They had practically no cash for clothing, medicines, or education; and they had no savings at all. He observed that the upper Rio Grande area housed 15,300 Spanish-American and Indian families that needed a family income of 795 dollars annually to survive. He concluded that a governmental cash supplement of over one million dollars would be needed to provide this size income.28

Descriptive governmental studies helped document the serious deprivation of the region. Although Spanish-American residents had preferred to remain in their villages and continue to support themselves solely by farming and ranching, economic conditions prevented them from doing so. From 1880 until 1930, more of these inhabitants had to seek outside employment. They worked in railroad construction, mining, lumbering, and other nonagricultural jobs which became available. Because Spanish-American traditions of bequeathing land equally to all children served to increase land fragmentation, more people left the villages as years passed. The parents believed that each child needed his security in land ownership, and they continued a custom which exacerbated the poverty. Depletion of the soil, appropriation of large land tracts for commercial ranching, and creation of national forests accelerated the deprivation.
Until 1900 most Rio Grande valley residents sought work in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and other western states. By 1915 many Spanish-Americans worked in out-of-state sugar and smelting industries. When economic conditions permitted, residents migrated seasonally and returned to their homes during the slack periods. When the availability of seasonal work declined, some had to leave the area permanently. Sources of outside income disappeared for remaining residents when the depression began, forcing families to seek federal relief funds.29

Although the government spent a great deal of time and effort in developing descriptive studies for separate destitute areas of northern New Mexico, they did mobilize some group effort in experimental attempts at total economic and social planning. The Department of Agriculture decided to experiment with a plan for social and economic rehabilitation of the Pueblo region of New Mexico. This region, located between Santa Fe and Albuquerque, represented a first attempt by the federal government to undertake rural rehabilitation by concerted action. The Pueblo region consisted of four villages that seemed to have serious health and economic problems. Employees involved in the governmental experiment learned many things from this social planning effort. First, they learned that they had to understand peoples' needs before they began to overhaul their lives. For example, if residents had a high incidence of disease, the disease had to be treated first before any comprehensive
social planning began. Next, they learned that a comprehensive approach to regional problems surpassed the piece-meal attack. The project leaders discovered that villagers identified more readily with personalities than they did with intangible program goals, and it became mandatory for the project director to execute goals as villagers understood them. The over-all government plan coordinated various agencies' functions to present a united front.

Leaders also learned that the village-community approach surpassed the individual family method. These supervisors, working within the social structure as they found it, initiated at first new farming and living practices which required only slight modifications of existing behavior patterns. They allowed their programs to unfold gradually so that people who were recipients of the program would come to believe that project workers served as teammates, rather than intruders. Technicians on the scene needed not only training in agricultural techniques, but they also had to understand the regional cultural values. They worked to have people understand they served neither as patrones or as jefes but as coworkers.

The Pueblo region, one of the poorest in the nation, comprised an early Spanish land grant of over 400,000 acres. The people had lost all but 5,000 acres in the Private Land Claims Court in 1901. Some land in the area, the Anton Chico Grant, was owned communally by heirs of the original grantee, but these heirs had also lost much of the acreage.
through the years through tax default. By 1938, heirs still owned 63,000 of the 278,000 acres originally ceded to the family by the Mexican government in 1822. Federal funding made it possible to buy back some of the land-grant acreage in the El Cerrito region of El Pueblo in order to supplement the region's limited grazing lands.\textsuperscript{33}

In 1938, prior to the start of the rehabilitation project, 53 families with able-bodied family heads, earned 135 dollars in cash annually, and most of this came from W.P.A. project funds. Only 11 per cent of the families earned any money from private employment. These families were unable to produce all the food they needed, and they did not know how to can the food that they did produce. Fifty families owned an average of 5.7 acres of irrigated land. Twenty-two families owned twenty acres of dry crop land, and 26 owned 181 acres of mesa land. The average family had 1.8 horses, 1.8 cows, and 11.4 chickens. These families owned among them a total of 43 sheep and goats and 19 hogs. Although other groups, such as the Pennsylvania Amish, successfully practice intensive agricultural methods; the Spanish-Americans, traditionally more accustomed to ranching than intensive agricultural techniques, managed to produce little from the rocky soil.\textsuperscript{34}

Project workers soon learned that although regional climatic conditions should have helped residents be healthy and vigorous, people were generally weakened by widespread
disease. Tonsillitis, eye diseases, measles, arthritis, dental caries, and rickets prevailed among residents. Children were so weakened by simple activities like walking to school and playing at school recess that they were unable to resume their academic activities without first having a rest period at the end of their recreational hour. These people were so poor and so far removed from normal medical facilities that they suffered and died from maladies treated easily in more urbanized regions of the state.

When the program began, leaders had two main objectives. First, they wanted to make villagers independent of federal relief and outside laboring jobs. Second, the leaders wanted to learn how to develop techniques to help villagers help themselves. In order to meet their overall goals in this pilot project, project supervisors learned that they would have to improve health and sanitation facilities first. This meant that the leaders worked to improve living conditions in order to give people more living space, better ventilation and storage facilities for food and supplies. Then, they worked to help villagers increase their farm and livestock production by giving them additional pasture land, as well as teaching them newer grazing techniques. They wanted people to learn to grow the foods that they consumed. They also needed to teach these people how to preserve harvests and store their crops. Project leaders planned to teach villagers how to develop community and co-operative businesses, including water facility programs,
river control projects, and community livestock production. They also worked to help residents improve community life by assisting them in the development of additional educational and cultural facilities.  

Given the limitations of the region, the project directors believed that this project had been a success. Residents learned to can food and supplement their diets by growing different kinds of fruits and vegetables. The net worth of each family increased from 393 dollars to 929 dollars by the end of the five-year experiment. Project leaders helped villagers to build modern sanitation facilities and to develop a purified water system. Department of Agriculture employees also mobilized regional medical facilities to provide medical care and vaccination services. The leaders hoped that the increased spirit of cooperation which had developed within the village, as well as the leadership roles assumed by the villagers, would remain as permanent benefits of the rehabilitation project.  

This experiment lasted from 1938 until 1943. Some agricultural department employees tried to extend this program to other regions of the state having similar problems. The project leaders must have realized that a project tested in one area might not be replicated successfully in another, but they concluded that this experiment had been worthwhile. They learned that they should have surveyed health and nutritional levels of residents first before they began any social planning. Project leaders also
believed that they should introduce already-tested remedies experimentally in a new community before beginning an all-out campaign for reform. Additionally, total government efforts in the area should be coordinated so that villagers would have all their needs met through a unified multifaceted effort. Leaders also realized that whatever technical changes had to be done must be initiated within the residents' cultural frame of reference. Realizing the importance of working with cultural differences, supervisors learned to work first with community and religious leaders so that they would join them in winning community support.38 The Pueblo project had been planned as a blueprint for future action. It did not provide a panacea for all rural New Mexicans. Unfortunately, it did not have a sweeping effect in changing both economic and cultural values of the region.

The depression turned the national spotlight on rural New Mexican poverty, but many state leaders knew long before the 1930's that they had serious deprivation in their state. During the 1920's, residents began to express concern over financial, engineering, and water usage problems of the Rio Grande river region. The area suffered under the weight of tax delinquency and farm bankruptcy. The Rio Arriba region, comprising Santa Fe, San Miguel, Sandoval, Rio Arriba, Taos, and Mora counties, still accommodated 27 per cent of the state's population, but the ethnic balance was changing as more Anglo residents moved into the region for
commercial livestock raising, thus serving to disrupt traditional life styles. New Deal experts in the National Resources Planning Board undertook an in-depth study of the Upper Rio Grande River basin and formed an interdepartmental governmental board to try to develop a plan as comprehensive as the Tennessee Valley River Authority for the area. The government plan included land reform, conservation, and family agriculture.  

Federal agencies consolidated efforts to purchase more than six million acres of land in that region in order to consolidate land holdings for controlled use of Indian pueblos and Spanish-American villages. The Emergency Relief Administration, the Resettlement Administration, and the Grazing Service cooperated in this effort. The Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service joined ranks to intensify public land regulations and cut back on the practice of overgrazing lands. The Farm Security Administration lent money for erosion control, reforestation projects, and re-vegetation efforts. By 1936 over 4,000 Civilian Conservation Corps workers provided man-power for reforestation efforts. The Inter-departmental Rio Grande Board also stimulated further projects by continuing their field research. They were interested in efforts of community development, health education, vocational training, public works, and cultural resources. The onset of World War II ended the program.  

Cultural pluralism in New Mexico also affect the state's political life. As recently as the 1930's, members
of the state legislature still heard all bills, resolutions, and other business proposals in both Spanish and English. All laws were published in both languages, and the House of Representatives had an interpreter who offered immediate translation of all proposed business. Also, all public election notices, poll books, ballots, and constitutional amendments had to be printed in both languages. This seemed necessary because approximately 42 per cent of the population were Spanish-American. Population figures remained approximations because the census data categorized native Spanish-Americans as white. Immigrants were classified as Mexicans, and all but 10,000 of this newly-arrived minority lived in Chaves, Dona Ana, Eddy, Grant, Hidalgo, Lincoln, Luna, McKinley, Otero, and Socorro counties. This immigrant group failed to have the political impact of the native Spanish-Americans.41

Native Spanish-Americans continued to live in the northern counties during both territorial and early statehood days. Prior to the administrations of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Spanish-Americans usually supported the Republican party, while Anglos generally voted for Democrats. Spanish-American representatives dominated the legislature from 1847 until 1884, when Anglos reached a majority in the upper house. From 1913, when New Mexico achieved statehood, until the 1930's, the Spanish-American voting strength began to decline. By the middle of the 1930's, they began to lose
seats in the legislature. The Spanish-Americans supported the Democratic party during the New Deal era, and by 1937 Republicans held only two seats in the legislature. These representatives were both Spanish-Americans. In the 1934 Senatorial election the Spanish-American voter rejected the Democratic party's candidate and supported, instead, Senator Bronson M. Cutting, Progressive-Republican, in his reélection bid. The Hispanos believed that Cutting more closely understood their needs than the Spanish-American candidate who opposed him.

Despite the importance of bicultural influences in state government, and despite the fact that the Spanish lost political strength as more Anglos migrated into the region, political leaders carefully avoided issues which might precipitate racially-inspired political division. Occasionally, racially charged issues surfaced, but they died quickly. Such an issue was the proposed election code of the 1920's which stated that a voter should receive no help in marking his ballot unless he made a sworn statement first that he was defeated. An attempt to institute a direct primary loomed as a potentially threatening issue in the 1930's. Spanish-Americans managed to defeat this measure because they feared that if the direct primary became law, then Spanish-Americans would align themselves with the Republican party, and Anglos would align with the Democrats. If this occurred, then the likelihood of racially motivated political issues would increase. In the 1930's, illiteracy still remained a major
problem in New Mexico. A coefficient correlation of .91 existed between the percentage of Spanish-Americans in each county and the number of illiterates, making it obvious that legislators represented two different kinds of constituencies.44

If it was true that the Spanish-speaking New Mexican legislator represented a different constituency from the Anglo delegate, no visible characteristics of this fact surfaced in the state's political life. Political analysts observed that Spanish-American representatives had less formal education than their Anglo counterparts. They seemed to focus primarily on local issues and appeared to have less interest and understanding of broader and more complex problems of state government. They supported bossism in local politics and accepted the old Jacksonian adage, "To the victor are reserved the spoils." They expected to distribute jobs to the local faithful. Local voters, interested in political affairs, actively participated in politics in order to profit from promises of patronage. The Penitentes, a religious brotherhood, helped to stimulate local villagers' political interests, and candidates worked to please members of this brotherhood to gain their support at election time. These Spanish-Americans, while actively working for the election of candidates of their choice, jealously guarded their political traditions and resisted any attempts by outsiders to change them. The political use of biculturalism
gave New Mexican politics a unique regionalism for the South-
west.45

Native New Mexicans realized that their cultural values
differed from those of Anglo settlers, but they did not con-
sider themselves a minority until economic and political
pressures made them more aware of their uniqueness. When
Spanish-Americans first realized that they had become a min-
ority group, they could have handled their status in three
different ways. First, they could have attempted to main-
tain their original Iberian heritage with little change.
Second, they could acculturate themselves to the point of
eventually assimilating into the dominant cultural pattern,
even though this meant that they would have to withstand
mounting prejudice along the way to the completion of the
assimilation process. Third, they might develop something
alien to both their inherited cultural values and existing
dominant values. All three routes have been tried by Span-
ish-speaking people in the United States. The old-time
New Mexican villager, called by some authors, the Manito,
tried to hold on to his culture, but this culture inadver-
tently became modified by conditions on the frontier, which
contrasted markedly from those that he had known in Europe.
This group continued to live in isolation and regarded the
Anglos as intruders.46 Ruben E. Reina in a review of Munro
S. Edmonson's *Lost Manitos: A Study of Institutional Values*
noted that Manitos exhibited a high degree of social stabil-
ity, except in the political area. Here they have been
influenced by Anglo values. Edmonson found that the Hispanic value system survival appeared dependent upon persistence of Hispanic culture. This included the language, folk tradition, literature, religion, and music. The rich New Mexican, because he had the advantage of both wealth and social position, managed to maintain his cultural roots more effectively than the peon. He could afford to send his sons to foreign universities, and he could do some traveling himself. He had more acceptance from the Anglos, because he represented a higher degree of social and economic status.

When the typical New Mexican child was young, he had no idea that he differed from Anglo children; in fact, he seldom knew any Anglo children. He usually had Spanish-American teachers in elementary school, and he went to school with his fellow villagers. He did learn at home to distrust Anglos, whom his parents perceived to be exceedingly materialistic. The village child had his first contact with the Anglo if he went to high school. There he experienced culture shock when he realized that Anglo students would not associate with him in the classroom. This Spanish-speaking village child soon realized that he had been ill-prepared for secondary school. He had struggled to complete eight years of elementary school using materials designed for Anglo children. His parents believed that high school represented a useless luxury which the village child could ill afford. If this child persisted, despite family opposition, in joining the alien world, he probably accepted cultural values of his extended family,
stipulating that he had to share all accumulated material goods with the entire family. A Spanish-speaking child had to be highly motivated to seek formal education against overwhelming odds of Anglo prejudice and family traditions. Sometimes he even had to sever his family relationships completely in order to join the outside world. Sanchez identified strongly with the traditional values of his family and reported that he spoke only Spanish at home. His childhood experiences made him realize that the schools had shortchanged the Spanish-speaking child. He noted, "This concern has not left me, and I shudder still at many of the educational programs to which mexicano children are subjected."

The record indicates that few Spanish-speaking children wrenched themselves away from strong family ties of village life. It became easier for them to slip into established living patterns at home. They attended local elementary school in which classes were taught in English in compliance with the state law. Fortunately, some teachers did speak Spanish to make students understand some of the bare educational essentials. These students generally had poor attendance, experienced mediocre teaching, and withdrew from school at an early age. Some efforts, although quite spasmodic, were made to teach the child in Spanish. Often, the child lived in an alien educational world and spoke only English. This method compares with throwing a nonswimmer into the water to teach him to swim.
Educators easily recognized that Spanish-speaking children presented greater educational challenges than English-speaking students, but the educators did not know how to solve the language problem. In 1932 Sanchez addressed the Pan American Institute at the University of New Mexico, and he offered some new insights into the problem. Speaking to his audience in Spanish, he noted that by 1930 70 per cent of the state's school age children attended school, a gain of 5 per cent since 1920. He explained that at least 50 per cent of the state's scholastics were of Spanish descent, and native born Spanish-speaking students had a lower school attendance than foreign born pupils. Before offering any immediate solutions to the problem, the speaker cautioned that school personnel should investigate first the magnitude of the learning problems to ascertain why more Spanish-speaking students withdrew from school. He seemed unwilling to accept the idea that the Hispano child had inferior learning abilities when compared with the Anglo.52

The educator revealed that the state spent $97.91 per capita for public school education. In counties with a large Spanish-speaking enrollment the expenditures ranged from approximately thirty-eight dollars to fifty-two dollars. Because of the disparity of expenditures in predominately Spanish speaking communities, he reasoned that teacher qualifications and school attendance also reflected a poorer quality than in Anglo communities. A later chapter dealing with disparities in school expenditures illustrates this assertion.
Sanchez maintained that one might possibly explain differences in educational funding in terms of geographic location, property values, or political influence, but he firmly stressed that the state had an obligation to educate the child. He argued that the state's wealth should be used for that purpose. Working in a poor state with limited resources at a time when concerned people came to expect that organized social planning would solve social ills, the speaker suggested that other states also had difficult educational problems that they could not solve. Therefore, he proposed that the United States Commissioner of Education establish a bilingual educational division to examine and deal with these problems.53

New Mexican educators obviously recognized that children failed to speak English when they came to school and remained unable to read English when they left school. The severity of the Hispano's lack of acculturation surfaced during World War II when the government processed millions of men into military service. During 1943, the government decided to take new inductees, found to be functionally illiterate, and send them to a special training center for a crash course in literacy. These testing experts noticed a sharp difference between native-born non-English speaking Spanish trainees and recently-arrived Spanish-speaking immigrants who came from Spain or western hemisphere nations. Only a minimum number of native-born Spanish-speaking men survived the crash course. When all groups of non-English speakers were tested at the end
of the program, it was evident that 23.3 per cent of foreign-born non-English speakers could meet or surpass fourth grade literacy levels, while only 10 per cent of the native-born could meet test requirements.54

The army personnel documented the fact that the Spanish-speaking American lived his entire life within this country and still remained unable to speak English. They also noted more evidence of maladjustment among non-English speaking native-born Spanish-Americans than among corresponding immigrant groups. These native-born Spanish-Americans demonstrated that they used language as an intrinsic part of their total cultural heritage, and this helped the language to survive to the exclusion of English. When army psychologists tried to test literacy of the Spanish-speaking inductees by translating test questions into Spanish, they found that 18.4 per cent scored 10 or more points in Spanish, predetermined to be equivalent to a fourth grade reading level, even though most of them had never studied Spanish in school, and had attended solely English-speaking schools.55

Testing experts also found that few of the bilinguals tested had any measurable literacy in English, even the third grade. However, 9 per cent were fully literate in Spanish, and 39 per cent had some Spanish literacy. Cultural ties of language withstood the fact that inductees lived all of their lives in an English-speaking country, had attended school through the primary grades, but had not studied Spanish in school. These people demonstrated no written or oral
knowledge of English, while some showed complete literacy in Spanish. Army personnel judged that the Spanish language persisted with greater hardiness with native-born speakers than it did with any other bilingual groups. Psychologists hypothesized that several reasons contributed to the Spanish-speakers' tenacity to his home language. First, the Mexican-American trainee generally worked in unskilled labor occupations and spent most of his time working along with other Spanish-speaking people. Second, the familial structure of the extended family aided the continued use of Spanish at home. Third, the Spanish-American's self-concept may have contributed to his persistent use of Spanish. Army personnel learned that the Spanish speaking New Mexican called himself a Mexican. He did not mean that he had been born in Mexico, but he used the word to let the outside world know that he came from another culture and spoke another language. Finally, psychologists theorized that Mexican-Americans drew more deeply upon their own cultural heritage as part of a self-defense mechanism to shield them from violent antagonisms of Anglo society. The Mexican-American knew that his heritage predated the arrival of the Anglo to this hemisphere, and he probably wanted the Anglo to know this too.

The army records included those people who were growing up during the depression years in the small villages of northern New Mexico. Their records indicated clearly that the educational system had obviously failed. Sanchez knew this too. His work in New Mexico during the depression in the research
and statistics bureau of the state educational office focused constantly on educational inequities. Although it is impossible to state that more money spent on education always produces more learning for students, the fact does remain that a positive correlation exists between amounts spent on education and educational performances. Sanchez believed that one way of meeting the problems rested with increased educational expenditures. He confronted this issue during the 1930's when he worked in New Mexican education at the state level.

Sanchez also addressed himself to the issue of bilingualism when he spoke as president of the New Mexico Educational Association in December, 1934. He reported that one-half the total population and over one-half the school population spoke Spanish. He stated that the state could progress only as rapidly as the Spanish-speaking people progressed. Schools had obviously failed to do their jobs properly; and, teachers who remained unable to modify their teaching techniques to meet specialized needs of the bilingual child, shared the blame for this failure. Educational problems could be met if teachers gave these children proper learning experiences. Sanchez failed to spell out specifically what he meant by "good educational opportunities" in this address, but he praised the effects of improved methodology in an experimental educational program sponsored by the University of New Mexico. 58

If Sanchez failed to address himself to the specifics regarding the schools' failure to meet specialized needs of
the bilingual child when he addressed the state educational association, he managed to zero in on rural education shortcomings in an article in Progressive Education in 1936. He reported that quality of rural education indicated a wide gap between educational theory and educational practice. He noted that a state of inertia continued to perpetuate poor rural schools. Sanchez blamed leaders who accepted weaknesses of the rural schools solely because of a lack of economic resources. He believed that these educators lacked initiative to do something positive to correct the problem. Financial problems, he conceded, did represent a real issue; but both the inability of the educational administrators and poor preparation given by teacher-training institutions really deserved most of the blame. Sanchez criticized decision-makers for focusing the rural school to pattern its curriculum after the urban school mold, when this format failed to meet rural needs. He also noted that methodology presented in pedagogy courses had little implementation in the rural environment. He felt that if professors of teacher training institutions taught their courses in rural areas, they would recognize immediately how to use rural resources to broaden competencies in methodology. He also charged that these institutions would also modify their certification requirements based on these field experiences. The educator added that content courses for rural teachers differed from courses required for urban teachers. He reasoned that rural teachers needed tools
to help members of their communities help themselves economically and educationally. They needed specialized training to be able to do this well. Sanchez concluded that a community level of education reflected partially the proficiency of teacher-education techniques which community teachers demonstrated. He concluded that existing data indicated that professional schools failed, and their graduates also failed.\(^{59}\)

Sanchez anticipated the serious educational shortcomings which army psychologists documented during World War II by pointing out the serious problems in rural areas, but he failed to accept these problems as insurmountable difficulties. He suggested that rural regions also possessed educational assets that urban-oriented administrators neglected to see. The fact that professional educators failed to recognize that different communities required different kinds of education helped perpetuate inadequate and ineffective schools for rural children.\(^{60}\)
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George I. Sanchez earned his baccalaureate degree at the University of New Mexico in 1930. That institution's President, J. F. Zimmerman, took a personal interest in furthering Sanchez's career. The administrator contacted Leo M. Favrot, regional representative of the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, in order to obtain a fellowship for Sanchez so that he could study for his master's degree at the University of Texas in Austin under Herschel T. Manuel. The Texas professor, a well-known educational psychologist and recipient of grant funds from the Rockefeller Foundation, had been conducting research concerning the education of the Spanish-speaking child. Zimmerman knew that Sanchez had a great deal of interest in this field, and the university administrator wanted to help the young graduate further his professional training. Manuel also contacted Favrot and urged him to award fellowship funds to Sanchez. The professor stated that the kind of research that he had been conducting in Texas would benefit Sanchez in his New Mexican career.

Sanchez received his fellowship, enrolled at the University of Texas, and completed his graduate program in one
academic year. He submitted a thesis entitled, "A Study of Scores of Spanish-Speaking Children on Repeated Tests," and he received his Master of Education degree in 1931. This research study documented the fact that Spanish-speaking children performed at a lower achievement level on standardized tests than their Anglo contemporaries. The research attempted to determine if hereditary limitations, inferior home environment, language disabilities, inappropriateness of tests, or lack of uniformity of test administration contributed significantly to the severity of the educational problem of this minority group.  

Sanchez reflected his own cultural values as he discussed the influences of heredity on intelligence. He cited conflicting theories concerning the impact of racial factors upon intelligence. On the one hand, he credited the research of recognized scholars who hypothesized that children with "white blood" performed better on intelligence tests than non-white children. He also cited opposing research which maintained that standardized tests failed to measure educational and cultural differences; moreover, they could not be used to determine the existence of either racial inferiority or superiority.  

The graduate student tried to span these opposing views of racial influences by offering his own characterization of the New Mexican population. Sanchez explained that only selected Spanish immigrants migrated to the New World and little intermarriage took place between Pueblo Indians and Spanish immigrants. He asserted that Indian blood failed
to constitute a significant hereditary factor among these Spanish-speaking New Mexicans. The New Mexican also maintained that the Spanish people who migrated into the region came from good families. The Spanish royal government screened carefully all people interested in coming to the western hemisphere. Additionally, he noted that the little intermarriage which had occurred took place between the Spanish and the highly civilized Aztec or Pueblo Indian groups. The educator concluded that questions of racial inferiority failed to apply to Spanish-speaking New Mexican children because "such an assumption presupposed a large mixture of Indian and white [Spanish] blood or a section of inferior Spanish stock."\(^4\)

After Sanchez discounted the assumption that New Mexican Spanish-speaking children demonstrated racially inferior abilities, he zeroed in on the inadequacy of the home environment. Sanchez admitted that even though New Mexican Spanish-speaking children represented all socio-economic groups found in society, their home environment appeared to be inferior when compared to Anglos. Inferiority in this sense meant that children grew up in economic poverty and had few pieces of reading material in their homes. He explained that the region's predominantly rural economy, combined with pervasive influences of the church, did little to stimulate literate forms of learning. Most New Mexicans used solely oral skills to learn and transmit their culture.\(^5\)

Sanchez's views regarding ethnicity of the Hispano population reflected the prevailing sentiments in New Mexico
during the 1930's. Later research revealed that beliefs regarding the racial "purity" of the Spanish Americans failed to be borne out by facts. Frances Leon Swadesh, curator of ethnology at the Museum of New Mexico in Santa Fe, stated that in the Chama valley of northern New Mexico, the Indian and Spanish populations intermarried. That region still had many Spanish-speaking residents at the time that Sanchez did his study. The anthropologist noted that cultural values, instead of ancestry determined residents' beliefs concerning ethnicity. Swadesh stated that from 1760 to 1821 the Genizaro Indian population grew from 166 to 246 persons. The Spanish population and the population of mixed ancestry increased from 617 to 3,029 persons for that same period. Isolation of Chama valley inhabitants from major population centers made it feasible for marriages to take place among residents. The author noted that a family who wanted its child to marry someone of pure Spanish lineage would have to import an eligible marriage partner from the Mexican colonial aristocracy. This seldom happened.

When the United States assumed control of the region, government officials exhibited greater interest in the Indians' welfare than they showed the native Hispanic population. Despite the lack of government aid to the native New Mexican, residents made both economic and educational progress during the last thirty years of the nineteenth century. Individual
initiative by inhabitants and the arrival of the railroad in 1879 improved economic opportunities for residents. Efforts by religious groups to establish and maintain schools offered some educational opportunities for the children. As recently as 1930, New Mexico still had a rural economy; and Sanchez noted that most New Mexicans continued to live in poverty. He stated that interpretation of test results had to consider the existing environmental influences.\(^7\)

Sanchez reported that current research appeared to reach little consensus regarding the significance of a foreign language home experience. Along with difficulties in evaluating research on learning abilities of children from foreign language homes, Sanchez cited additional research to support his view that the high illiteracy rate of Mexican children failed to measure their inherent lack of competency, but this research measured differences in their culture. Sanchez also theorized that conditions under which tests were administered could influence test results. These conditions included repeated testing of children with similar test forms; examiners' attitudes toward children; and the physical setup of the testing area.\(^8\)

He elected to examine causation of low test scores for Spanish-speaking children by considering home environment, language limitations, and testing conditions as influencing the interpretation of these children's performances. Sanchez
focused his primary effort on testing conditions, including the effect of giving children the same test or different forms of the same test, to bilingual children during a two-year interval. He administered several tests to a group of forty-five Spanish-speaking children in grades three through eight in Bernalillo county schools at intervals of four, seven, and five months. He found that generally the mean quotients in various abilities increased at successive test applications. Achievement and intelligence quotients began in the below normal range and approached normal as the child progressed through the grades. The greatest gains occurred in intelligence and reading between the first and second test administrations. Sanchez stated that children made the least gain in scores between the second and third test administrations because of the summer vacation interval.

Sanchez also reported the following data: First, on the basis of the first test, students in the upper grades showed greater educational and mental ability than did students in the lower grades. Second, retested students in the lower grades made gains which exceeded upper grades. The marked change affected the relative position of the two groups. Third, children's mental ability gains surpassed changes in any other achievement area. Fourth, means of the two groups remained the same, indicating little correlation between age and ability as measured by the first test. Younger children showed greater gains on retests. Fifth, brightest children
scored highest on the first test, but duller children gained most in mental and educational abilities on retests. Sixth, reading correlated highest with all other abilities. Reading and intelligence exhibited the highest correlation, whereas arithmetic and intelligence showed the lowest correlation. Seventh, changes in reading and intelligence stood in zero order correlations with abilities, changes in abilities, and partial correlations. Changes remained negatively correlated with quotients on first tests.10

Sanchez also questioned which of the four test applications best indicated the actual ability of the subjects. He postulated that if the first test served as a practice experience for all children, then the second test would be one of intelligence but little influenced by other factors. Sanchez noted that tests beyond the first would be influenced by group factors which would be equal for all individuals. He did not verify this opinion. He stated that tests beyond the second test varied for age groups, different school subjects, and differences between brighter and duller children. He concluded that these variations made evaluations based on one test application difficult. He believed that a number of factors included: a lack of parallelism of testing conditions, practice experience in test-taking to make children "test-wise," and increased English fluency. The author noted that the practice effect of repeated testing may have contributed to test gains, but he stated that this effect appeared to be negligible.11
He theorized that the school environment, along with increased abilities in English usage, probably played a part in helping children to improve test scores. Influence of reading indicated that language skills stood out as an important factor in determining test results. The author concluded that the close relationship between reading and all other learning abilities indicated that language had to be considered as an important factor in interpretation of test results. This link between language and learning, as measured by standardized tests, revealed that Spanish-speaking children remained at a disadvantage when they lacked learning experiences such as the subjects upon whom the tests had been standardized. He concluded that investigators had to consider cultural influences, frequency of test administrations, and the relationship of language learning. Sanchez asserted that if educators failed to recognize that tests measured only common cultural experiences, test results became invalid. Sanchez believed that language fluency served as the important process in offering bilingual children common learning experiences.12

Sanchez's questioning of test results of Spanish-speaking children appeared to be a bold position to take in the 1930's.13 The Binet-Simon test of intelligence, published in 1916, was respected by the national academic community. In 1937, when Lewis M. Terman and Maude A. Merrill revised the test scales, they retained the basic outline of the original instrument.
They made provisions for different forms of the test, and they added more items to test both upper and lower ability ranges. The psychometric revisionists found the test to be adequate for children from five to ten years of age, and they considered that this instrument had no serious rival.

Terman and Merrill pointed out that they had attempted to devise more nonverbal items but managed to do this only at the lower ability ranges. For the other age groups, they found that subjects needed language skills to demonstrate their ability to do conceptual thinking. "Language, essentially, is the shorthand of the higher thought processes, and the level at which this shorthand functions is one of the most important determinants of the level of the processes themselves."

The authors criticized the sampling used to standardize the original test and pointed out that they had made a greater effort to secure a more representative population sample for their revision. They tested 3,184 subjects in 17 communities of 11 states. Less than 16 per cent of the sample group included children whose fathers worked as unskilled or semi-skilled laborers. The rest of the sample came from professional, business, and clerical occupational groups. All subjects were American-born Caucasians. In 50 per cent of the cases, their parents were also native-born. The authors' listing of the parents' national origins indicated that none came from the Spanish-speaking countries of the western hemisphere.
Although Sanchez neglected to include in his master's thesis information dealing with the sampling used to determine norms for the test instruments he had used in his experiments, his criticism concerning test validity stood unchallenged. Terman and Merrill's intelligence test revision had wide range acceptance comparable with Binet-Simon. However, these psychologists completely ignored any consideration of ethnic differences either in their preparation of test items or in the development of validation criteria. The authors reported that their parental occupation distribution was skewed in favor of higher income and educational groups. They pointed out that this distribution appeared acceptable because it represented a trend in the "right direction inasmuch as the census figures for employed males over ten years of age include Negroes, who, of course, represent on the whole a lower occupational group." 17

Although Sanchez did not use the Binet-Simon test for his master's thesis experiments, this test served as the prototype for all intelligence and achievement instruments. The population sampling, the methods used to establish validity and reliability, and the emphasis on verbal skills were incorporated in later tests. The cultural biases of the first instruments became accepted models for later tests. Sanchez wisely realized that if children lacked learning experiences like the sample population, then they could not
score as well on the test. Other educators learned many years later that culturally different children remained at a disadvantage when they took standardized tests.

The New Mexican educator's master's thesis offered the essence of much of his later writings. He frequently stressed language fluency as the key to the bilingual child's learning problems, as he maintained that learning differences found among these children had to be considered as group differences rather than racial differences. The educator noted that factors contributing to a child's learning problems could be classified as hereditary, environmental, or linguistic, depending upon which of the three factors appeared to be primarily responsible for the inferior test results. Stating that researchers had not quantified the influences of these factors upon a child's learning abilities, he asserted that one had to consider their significances prior to making any evaluation. Sanchez explained that current research indicated wide ranging views among recognized scholars. Some believed that innate capacity could be differentiated racially, and intelligence tests measured this differentiation. Others asserted that environmental factors contributed to intelligence levels, and tests quantified environmental effects. Still other researchers, who examined bilingualism, found that it presented a handicap to oral expression and influenced other psychological processes involved in learning. These last
scholars admitted that at the very least bilingualism presented additional learning obstacles for foreign language children. Sanchez concluded that the Spanish-speaking child's problem represented a sampling of the larger research problem involving group differences among all children. He believed that one had to study these differences to understand the bilingual child's needs because this child reacted to same kinds of influences which affected all children.¹⁸

Sanchez criticized standardized tests requiring language skills because these instruments ignored both language and environment in the tabulation of tests results. He charged that this insensitivity on the part of psychometrists to include these factors could invalidate test results. Sanchez charged that test items were valid only to the extent that they served as common to the experiences of the children tested as well as to those upon whom the norms were based. He supported this assertion by explaining how he took a group of bilingual second grade children with a median I.Q. of 72, gave them remedial instruction for a two-year period in language arts and reading, and raised their I.Q. score to 100.¹⁹

The author charged that school systems failed to remEDIATE language difficulties prior to testing. He explained that in 1932, in New Mexico, of the 24,810 Spanish-speaking children who enrolled in the first and second grades, only 540 remained in school by the twelfth grade. This indicates
that the bilingual child failed to receive an education which met his needs. He lamented the prostitution of democratic ideals for expediency, politics, vested interest, ignorance, and class and race prejudices. He noted that dual educational systems for Mexican and Anglo children, along with family systems of contract labor, social and economic discrimination, educational neglect by local and state authorities, homogeneous grouping of children in school to obfuscate professional inefficiency, all of these factors indicated a need for greater understanding to cope with problems inherent in a multi-cultural society.  

Sanchez questioned the failure of the child, based merely on objective test results; and he charged that, perhaps, it was the schools that had failed. He concluded that mental tests did not serve as measuring devices comparable to yardsticks. He believed that they stood as professional instruments which had to be used by intelligent people to serve the best interests of the children involved. He concluded that if the test failed to measure what a child knew, the test remained invalid.  

Building further on the thesis that language inadequacy predetermined children's scores on intelligent and achievement tests, Sanchez cited Marie M. Hughes, who had been associated with the San José experimental school in Albuquerque for her experience as a field worker. Hughes reported that
50 per cent of elementary school enrollment was found in primary grades. These children in intermediate grades seemed unable to speak and read English effectively and remained in grades behind their chronological level until they dropped out of school.\textsuperscript{22} Sanchez raised the question concerning how much language the child understood when he first entered school. He also questioned if the aims of the schools in their initial language training programs paralleled language requirements in the standardized tests. He theorized that the child had no English skills when he entered school, and few students attained the understanding of the 500 basic words vocabulary necessary for beginning reading by the end of the preparatory period.\textsuperscript{23}

Sanchez believed that the necessary basal vocabulary of 660 words served as the ideal goal rather than the achievement standard. He observed that the bilingual child generally reached seven years of age before he acquired the minimum vocabulary. The educator commented that beside learning vocabulary words the Spanish-speaking child had to learn word usage differences between the two languages. He concluded that kindergarten experience for these children would have greater value than for the English-speaking ones.\textsuperscript{24}

Sanchez made plans for his future career during the year that he studied at the University of Texas. He corresponded with J. F. Zimmerman and proposed the establishment of
a division of information and statistics in the New Mexican education department. He undoubtedly had his own career in mind when he suggested that the division be created by the state board of education to work cooperatively with both the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the University of New Mexico. He suggested that this new agency be funded for a four-year period so that the philanthropic benefactors would have assurance that it would not degenerate into another political office. He suggested that once the trial period had been completed, "an arrangement more in agreement with modern education thought could be effected." 25

The educator outlined the functions of the proposed agency. He asserted that the office should supervise research dealing with testing programs and effectiveness of teaching methodologies. He believed that the education department needed to evaluate the primary education program, the usage of Spanish versus English for beginners, and the effects of preschool training on elimination or reduction of educational retardation. He also proposed that this agency serve as a clearing-house for dissemination of experimental research. Finally, Sanchez stated that a division of information and statistics could offer additional supervision to former cadet teachers and train students in special summer sessions. He concluded that this office could also work with county supervisors in developing educational research. 26
Sanchez did not neglect the statistical aspects of the agency. He suggested that this office would gather and compile data on educational experiments and disseminate this material in professional conferences and publications. He also suggested that the office gather data dealing with geographic distribution of scholastics by race, age, grade, and sex. He believed that the state needed information concerning the economic and occupational status of scholastics' families, as well as population trends and school attendance figures. The graduate student also noted that the agency would be able to recommend curricular readjustments, as well as establish communication channels with other state education departments. Sanchez believed that the agency would be more concerned with the practical, rather than the theoretical aspects of education.27

Zimmerman sent Sanchez's proposal to Favrot and stated that Georgia Lusk, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, had great interest in this proposal. Favrot responded that he wanted the views of John Milne, President of the State Board of Education, before he submitted a formal request to the General Education Board.28

Lusk wrote to the General Education Board and noted that she knew the organization had already established similar research departments in other southern states. The Administrator stated that the New Mexico education department needed this kind of service too. The Superintendent pointed out
that the director of an information and statistics office could assist local school systems in their reorganization and provide local leaders with needed budgetary assistance. Because the state lacked adequate funds to initiate this program on their own, the Administrator requested assistance from the General Education Board. She proposed that the Foundation provide an initial outlay of 6,000 dollars for a director's salary, travel expenses, and clerical assistance. She also asked that an additional 1,500 dollars be allocated for possible salary increases. The formal request to the Board was cosigned by John Milne and J. F. Zimmerman.29

The General Education Board met on April 16, 1931, and approved the state superintendent's budgetary request. The Foundation noted that Sanchez had been offered the position of director and would begin his new assignment on July 1, 1931. The organization made it clear to the state administrator that they granted these funds for a trial period and expected the state education department to assume the financial responsibility for the agency once the funds had been depleted.30

Sanchez enthusiastically plunged into his new assignment and submitted a news release to the press in which he stated that this new agency would provide invaluable aid to state department education officials. He stated that revision of record-keeping techniques would give state officials uniform data regarding children's grade status, teacher qualifications,
and school finance. He also remarked that specific research projects would inform state officials of problems dealing with testing programs, courses of study, and textbook needs. He promised to aid local school boards and school administrators in their attempts to solve local problems. Finally, he offered the services of the state office to legislators to give them necessary information so that they could pass more effective legislation.31

Sanchez wasted little time publishing data concerning attrition rates in public schools. In 1931, Sanchez reported that during the current school year 42 per cent of the children in first grade failed to be promoted to the second grade, and 90 per cent of the first grade students failed to reach the twelfth grade. Sanchez hypothesized that the 90 per cent might not be completely correct, but he stated that since 46 per cent were not promoted to third grade, and 72 per cent did not reach the eighth grade, obviously, the state had a serious dropout problem.32

The statistics director conscientiously tried to find out the causes of the attrition rate by revising the pupil-gathering data processes then in use in the state department of education. He developed a teacher daily register and class book that would include information concerning children's ages, promotion or retention data, family data, and home language. His instructions to the teachers were to enter the students' grades on a daily basis, compute weekly and monthly
averages, and summarize the grades at the end of the school year. He also suggested a rating scale of 90 to 100 as excellent, 80 to 90 as good, 70 to 80 as satisfactory, 60 to 70 as unsatisfactory, and 50 to 60 as very poor. He asked that they use letters "A" through "E" to correspond to numerical groupings, and that a general average of "C" be used as the promotion criterion.33

Sanchez submitted his biennial report to the state education department for the 1930 to 1932 fiscal years. He explained in the report preface that it was the first report issued since the 1924 to 1926 biennium. He offered no data interpretation with the statistical information. The detailed document contained information dealing with budgets and school accreditation, as well as narrative explanations of special school projects, library facilities, vocational home economics, and other related topics.34

The statistics chief also included a brief report of the San José experimental school in his summary statement. This summary, written by L. S. Tireman, director of the school, stated that the San José school had been established in 1930 through the combined cooperation of the state board of education, the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, New Mexican United States Senator Bronson M. Cutting, the University of New Mexico and Bernalillo county. The multi-faceted school program for 640 children included establishment of an experimental program to gather data about
the Spanish-speaking child. Children, attending the San José school, received both individual and group intelligence tests, as well as achievement tests. Teachers collected statistical data and prepared specialized instructional materials for the Spanish-speaking child. Tireman stated that educators knew little about the effect upon the child of trying to learn two languages simultaneously. He reported that teachers scheduled daily sessions for students to learn to read and write in both languages. Teacher training opportunities at the San José school gave selected participants the opportunity to learn how to teach the bilingual child more effectively.35

Tireman also said that the school would work with twenty-three key schools in seven counties scattered throughout the state. These rural schools would serve as models in which field workers and local faculty would cooperatively organize program materials, incorporating community resources into the total school experience.36

Sanchez's report for the 1933-1934 biennium included additional data about the experimental school. Children in the second, third, and fourth grades who successfully mastered their English lesson received the enrichment of a forty-five minute Spanish lesson. Those children who had trouble learning English spent more time learning the new language. The practice of teaching both languages proved to be successful because sixth and seventh grade children who received
bilingual instruction exceeded ninth grade norms, and eighth grade students surpassed tenth grade levels. The statistics director's report stated that the San Jose school provided an excellent laboratory for both students and teachers to study learning problems of the bilingual child. The school's director believed that this child presented complex problems requiring years of study, and he concluded that the child's problem would be remediated by early school admission in order to cut down the serious overagedness prevalent among the group.

Sanchez maintained a close personal interest in the school and helped gather research data for the program. He believed that this school demonstrated pragmatically that something positive could be accomplished to help bilingual children. He noted that progressive methodology, along with the high level of enthusiasm and interest on the part of the teachers and students, revealed that a problem could be confronted and solutions found. Sanchez disagreed with the practices of beginning English teaching immediately for beginning students. He reported to the school's director that between 10 and 15 per cent of the Spanish-speaking enrollment drops out before they complete the third grade because they failed to reach bilingual fluency. L. S. Tireman, reported that as a result of Sanchez's advice as well as his European research trip, he began teaching first grade children in Spanish. Test results showed marked learning improvement for those children.
From the vantage point of the state office of Information and Statistics, Sanchez investigated conditions in the rural schools in 1931 and 1932, hoping to learn how to remediate overage conditions in elementary schools. He suggested presentation of documented data of the problem to enable the state department to qualify for additional funding to ease the situation. He found that the age-grade status could serve as one criterion to determine aid allocation. Pointing out that 22,779 rural school age children, or 41 per cent of the rural school population, were overage by 1.1 years, and 50 per cent were retarded at the least by 1.4 years; Sanchez suggested that rural funds be distributed on a county by county basis based on need. Furthermore, he suggested that the allocations be determined to give larger sums to lower grades. He felt that the primary grades had the most serious problems, and he believed that use of additional funds could support both rural school supervisors and field workers to remediate the difficulties. He also suggested that the San José Project be used to develop key school centers with well-trained critic teachers who would do field work and disseminate educational information. Sanchez also wanted his division of research and statistics to serve to gather data, evaluate rural programs, and develop additional programs to fight this educational retardation.
Although the educator recognized that the Spanish-speaking child faced an immediate communications' barrier when he entered school, he believed that the child's problem appeared largely to be one of acculturation instead of language. He pointed out that rural life in the United States lacked cultural balance. Economic factors contributed to inadequate living conditions for the rural poor, but Sanchez criticized social institutions for their failure to attack collectively the many facets of rural poverty. Writing during the New Deal era, he observed that efforts of the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps should be coordinated with public health and welfare agencies, schools and libraries to confront these broad-based problems of rural poverty. He felt that the rural school should be the focus of total community effort, and rural teachers should have additional training beyond normal pedagogical courses to enable them to wrestle satisfactorily with multi-faceted problems of rural life. He theorized that a cultural mission, similar to the traveling cultural missions of Mexico, be used to institute rural self-help projects. He explained that these missions resembled traveling normal schools, and mission members visited rural communities for extended periods, conducted field demonstrations, organized classes, and planned recreational activities. The leaders of these missions paved the way for future relationships between public service agencies and local residents.
Mexican cultural missions included general educators, manual arts instructors, nurses, agricultural workers, music and recreation directors, physical education instructors, and social welfare workers. Some of these cultural missions remained in a community permanently, while others traveled to neighboring settlements. Sanchez observed that these groups had an ameliorative effect on rural poverty. He assumed that the Mexican-American could also prosper from this type of organized group effort.⁴⁴

Some of Sanchez's ideas concerning total community planning had been attempted by ten states with coordinated programs of public welfare that included child welfare, mental hygiene, and public assistance programs. The federal government also moved to relieve distress with public policy efforts, but leaders had not developed an integrated effort for complete community assistance. National leaders planned to use the legislation of the Smith-Lever and Smith Hughes Acts to implement grants to counties for educational purposes. Leaders recognized that during the depression years people needed a public agency to cope with emergency conditions, but they had been unable to develop a total master plan.⁴⁵

George I. Sanchez did his best analytical study of the New Mexican people in his study of Taos, Forgotten People: A Study of New Mexicans, that was originally published under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation in 1940 and reissued in 1967. He examined the socio-economic problems of the
region and felt that the inhabitants suffered because of neglect. He pointed out that Taoeseños lacked education and language skills and failed to use their political powers effectively. The result of all these hardships left the native New Mexican a pathetic and helpless stranger in his own home. The author substantiated his charges by citing data to show that in 15 of the state's 31 counties, Spanish-speaking people comprised at least 50 per cent of the population, and in 7 counties they constituted more than 80 per cent of the total population. He showed that the 1930 census figures revealed that 13.3 per cent of the population remained illiterate, ranking the state 45 in literacy. The illiteracy perpetuated itself because of inadequate library facilities, since the state had one library book for every six inhabitants.

Sanchez said that positive correlation between number of Spanish-speaking residents and illiterates existed because of poor school attendance, chronic overagedness, and a high dropout rate. His careful analyses demonstrated that as the bilingual population increased, the educational opportunities decreased. Educators focused little attention on instructional materials needed by this ethnic group to enable them to speak and read English more effectively. He charged that educators' unresponsiveness to children's individualized needs tended to force children out of school. Counties with the highest number of Spanish-speaking people remained
the poorest. The author noted that ineptitude characterized a state policy requiring children to learn English but failed to provide them with opportunities to do so. Illiteracy and poverty joined poor health conditions to give this ethnic group an infant mortality rate almost two and one-half times greater than the rest of the county's residents. Hispanics, ignorant of modern medical knowledge, relied on herb doctors, evil eyes, and homemade remedies to treat their illnesses.49

The poor socio-economic conditions of the native Hispano also surfaced in his ability to manipulate the political system sufficiently to improve his personal status. Rural Spanish-speaking people saw little connection between candidates for public office and their own welfare. They tended to believe that a candidate had fulfilled his campaign promises by simply grading a rural road or giving a friend a political job. The New Mexican, an alien in his own land, continued to live in isolation and remained ignorant of means available to him to improve the quality of his life.50

Sanchez used Taos as a case study to illustrate the abject poverty of the rural New Mexican. He reported sympathetically that Father Antonio Jose'Martinez worked during the first half of the nineteenth century to establish educational opportunities for the Taoseños. The priest brought the first printing press into the region, printed school books, law books, and published a newspaper. He used the newspaper as a vehicle for political reform by encouraging
more equitable division of land holdings to give all inhabitants enough land to support themselves.\textsuperscript{51} Little political leadership surfaced after the priest died; and the natives, unable to improve their own conditions, fell under the influence of politicians, traders, and new settlers who appeared interested in furthering their own economic interests. New arrivals, including artists, created a more stratified society and old patterns of communal usage of water and grazing lands gave way to more clearly defined private property boundaries. Poverty accelerated among \textit{Taoseños} as more Anglos moved into the region.\textsuperscript{52}

Sanchez's chronicle of the poverty of Taos included a detailed report of educational opportunities available for residents. He cited data showing that in 1938 the state spent on the average of seventy-one dollars for each public school student while the school district in Taos allocated thirty-five dollars for each scholastic. The author charged that the northern New Mexico community lagged twenty years behind the rest of the state in their educational expenditures. He also criticized the state school appropriation procedures as contributing to this inequitable distribution of state funds. Sanchez pointed out that the state contributed about 80 per cent of the local community's school budget, but Taos failed to receive an equitable share of state funds. If it had, according to Sanchez, then local
administrators would have twice the amount of money then available to them for educational purposes.53

Ninety-six per cent of the public school children in the region used Spanish as their home language; but teacher education, curricula content, and methodology ignored this fact. Although the state constitution provided for teacher-training programs for the Spanish-speaking, the state educational administrators failed to implement this legal provision. Sanchez noted that because of the decision of local Taos school leaders to try to solve almost insurmountable problems, the community managed to establish a foundation for a good school system. The author also stated that most of the teaching personnel in Taos were New Mexican. These teachers spent time in summer school learning general methodology, rather than studying specific ways to cope with the unique regional problems. This meant that local teachers remained ill prepared to handle problems of bilingualism, health, public school education, adult and vocational education, land use and management, and community organization.54

As a result of inadequate funding and improper teacher-training, Taoseños left school without language facility or subject-matter fundamentals, Sanchez noted that teachers ignored using Spanish, the one language understood by most of the students. Consequently, children dropped out of school and failed to use their limited academic training as a foundation for future intellectual growth. He criticized local
educators for failure to teach essentials in Spanish. He particularly rebuked the custom of disseminating health care information in English. Sanchez believed that Taoseños neglected to learn basic skills needed to improve their lives while they attended school, and this failure affected their adult lives.\(^{55}\)

Sanchez remained a pragmatist and an activist as he searched for solutions to serious educational problems, and he opposed token approaches to serious questions. He felt that poverty, poor health conditions, and illiteracy illustrated problem symptoms. He called for a major coordinated effort of social planning to help the Taoseño master his environment. "The curriculum of the educational agencies becomes then, the magna carta of social and economic rehabilitation, the teacher, the advance agent of the new social order," he stated.\(^{56}\)

Sanchez's own educational research, as well as his emotional and intellectual commitment to the New Mexican Spanish-speaking child, propelled him to work actively to sell his message of necessary social change to remediate conditions of poverty. During the ten years that he had public exposure in New Mexico, he continually voiced the same refrain--social justice can be obtained if total social forces become mobilized to effect this change. Any piece-meal division of the educational opportunities would arouse his ire, and he would use the media to expose those state
forces who continually resisted the changes acutely needed to help the Spanish-speaking child.
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CHAPTER IV

"THE EDUCATION OF BILINGUALS IN A STATE SCHOOL SYSTEM"

Sanchez served as the Director of Information and Statistics in New Mexico's state education department without leave from July 1, 1931 until September, 1933. During the Spring of 1933, he requested a leave of absence in order to matriculate for doctoral study at the University of California in Berkeley. He also requested fellowship aid from the General Education Board for this advanced study. Lusk approved Sanchez's leave request, and the Foundation awarded him fellowship funds. The State Superintendent unsuccessfully tried to secure a firm commitment from the Rockefeller Foundation to extend their grant for an additional year after Sanchez had completed his work in California, but the organization refused to make this commitment. Instead, they allocated funds for clerical help for the state research office for the year of Sanchez's leave and provided for Sanchez's travel funds to return periodically to Santa Fe to supervise research already in progress. They promised to consider extension of the grant once Sanchez completed his doctoral fellowship. The tone of the foundation's correspondence to the State Superintendent indicated that the philanthropic organization had more interest in Sanchez's career than it did in the operation of the state research office.1
Sanchez enrolled at the university and completed his doctoral program during the 1933-1934 academic year. He utilized the research-gathering facilities of the Division of Information and Statistics to gather data for his study entitled, "The Education of Bilinguals in a State School System," and he received his Doctor of Education degree in 1934. Sanchez acknowledged that the purpose of his research concerned appraisal of the status of education throughout the state, but his primary interest centered on learning problems of the bilingual child. Believing that these children exhibited specialized needs that required careful assessment by educational practitioners, the researcher gleaned data from state research files, including several of his own reports, to document his findings.2

The author stated that in 1930 the United States differed from other countries because the nation-wide public education system had a more rapidly increasing percentage of children from foreign-born homes enrolled in schools throughout the nation than children of native-born parents. He conjectured that although schools played an important part in the acculturation process up until the time that he began his research, educators had failed to zero in on an applicable methodology for the 37 per cent nation's scholastics who had foreign born parents. The educator conceded that bilingualism did not present a problem for all these children, but he remarked that diverse socio-cultural backgrounds of these
scholastics challenged school leaders to develop acculturation techniques to accomodate these children's individual and group differences. Sanchez stated that if school leaders paid attention to the differences found among children from immigrant families, then they would also be addressing themselves to bilingual children's needs.

In the early 1930's, 50 per cent of the state of New Mexico's population spoke Spanish. The state's school population of 109,523 school children, included 54,444 categorized as bilingual. When Sanchez began to investigate learning problems in his state, other scholars in other southwestern states also began publishing studies discussing different aspects of the Spanish-speaking child's educational problems. In addition, New Mexican educators had begun to focus their concerns on elementary school materials for bilinguals and had already established a demonstration school and teacher-training programs, along with a research office, to help teachers learn to deal with specialized problems for this group. The state education department provided both statewide rural supervision of schools and county supervision in areas heavily populated by Spanish-speaking residents. The United States' Office of Education had also begun to prepare reports concerning these children's educational problems. Sanchez reported that available economic studies indicated a
close relationship between economic deprivation of the Mexican worker and inferior educational opportunities available to him.\footnote{4}

The educator observed that many writers had presented data showing psychometrists' documentation of the Spanish-speaking child's below average performance on I.Q. tests. These clinicians remained unable to determine the weight that socio-cultural factors had in influencing the intelligence quotient score. Sanchez believed that both environmental change and specialized training affected I.Q. scores. The educator cited a study done by E. Lee Davenport in which the author reported that school experiences had produced a low correlation in the I.Q.'s of Mexican siblings, while this low correlation failed to exist for English-speaking children in the control group. One can assume that Sanchez's citation of Davenport's study implied that Sanchez believed that the school had little impact on the life of the bilingual child.

The New Mexican conjectured that one factor contributing to the below-average performance of Spanish-speaking children on I.Q. tests came from the fact that these tests included many vocabulary words that were unfamiliar to these children. He noted that in grades three through eight, the Binet I.Q. test, the standard instruments used to measure intelligence quotients, had eighty-four words not found on minimum word lists of vocabulary considered essential for children enrolled in those
grades. The educator admitted that teachers needed to obtain a reasonably accurate measurement of children's abilities. He believed that absolute differences in measured intelligence scores between the bilingual child and the English-speaking child remained less important than the overlapping scores between the groups, as well as variations of scores within each group. In other words, Sanchez hypothesized that a representative sampling of scores would reveal measured quartile differences for both groups. He said that educators might benefit by finding similarities in scores between the culturally diverse groups, rather than just differences. The scores of the Spanish-speaking children could not be found within the entire measurement range, and he hypothesized that the greater preponderance of seriously depressed scores might indicate both individual differences and unequal education opportunities.5

The educator also reported that Spanish-speaking children's performance on achievement tests showed that they consistently lagged behind their English-speaking contemporaries. Non-English speaking children remained in assigned grades longer than English-speaking classmates. Although 50 per cent of the school census was bilingual, only 17 per cent of the group had been graduated from high school, and 2 per cent of the first grade enrollment reached the twelfth grade. Twenty-six per cent of the English-speaking children reached the twelfth
grade. Lack of English fluency contributed to students' lower scores on standardized tests, but Sanchez stated that investigators had thus far been unable to agree as to whether a child's inability to understand English when he entered school adversely affected his achievement. He believed that this lack of consensus among professionals stemmed from the fact that investigators were unable to agree on the best way to measure lack of English fluency. Sanchez asserted that it belabored the obvious to state that the child had a handicap if he failed to understand the language of the school. He said that prior to determining the severity of the child's handicap, one had to determine first the amount of language facility needed by a child when he entered school. Because of investigators' inability to develop an instrument to assess accurately a bilingual's intellectual potential, psychometrists limited their observation to measurement of the bilingual child's abilities in relation to standards accepted for the general population.  

Sanchez remarked that the bilingual child challenged the professional educator with his socio-economic differences, his cultural uniqueness, and his language problems. He believed that educators had to consider all these factors before they could assess the impact that presently accepted educational theory had for these children. They also had to include implementation of theory in their evaluation techniques, administrative procedures, and daily educational practices if they
hoped to succeed in educating the bilingual child. He asserted that the aim of education in a democracy required that schools be judged by their effectiveness in attaining already-agreed to educational goals. Sanchez assumed that it became a logical interpretation of the school's effectiveness to rate the school by the academic achievement of its scholastics.7

The educator reminded his readers that public education, a function of the state's responsibility, had to afford equal educational opportunities to all children. Citing the New York State Committee on Elementary Education as an authority, he pointed out that tax-supported education held the responsibility for helping children to develop critical thinking skills while these children simultaneously internalized a common body of knowledge. He concurred with those educators who claimed that conflicts existed in education between ideals and practices. He asserted that schools should either accept worthwhile educational principles and modify practices to become consonant with these goals or accept current practices and adopt principles harmonious with the practice.8

The educator declared that conflicts between educational theory and its practice adversely affected all children, but he believed that it had a more damaging effect on bilingual children than it did on the rest of the scholastics. He noted that current policies which accepted segregation as part of educational practice compounded learning problems for minority children. He reported that Texas' educational policies
already acknowledged legalized segregation of Mexican children while other southwestern states practiced more subtle means of separating these children. Inferior educational opportunities accompanied segregation, and Sanchez claimed that discriminatory legislation perpetuated the problem. "This often happens where class prejudice and 'social' discrimination must clothe itself with the cloak of pedagogical respectability before it can perpetuate its educational atrocities."9

He conceded hesitantly that particular needs of bilinguals may require special classes for some scholastics to help them to develop English fluency during the primary grades, but he criticized school systems for their blanket segregation of bilinguals prior to a scientific determination of their learning difficulties. Sanchez noted that if all children were tested prior to class assignments, educators would find that the over-lapping of scores would cease to legitimate use of test results as an excuse for segregating bilinguals. The author noted that this practice of segregation helped insure continued isolation of Anglo and Hispano children; therefore, community residents came to believe that segregation remained a worthwhile goal. He conceded that current practices regarding the preference for attending the neighborhood school made it easier to continue racial isolation. This practice negated democratic theories which maintained that all children should receive equal educational opportunities.
Sanchez decided to study public schools in New Mexico because the state had a large bilingual population found throughout the state. Bilinguals lived in varied geographic areas and represented an educational problem in all districts. He believed that if he reported indices of bilingual achievement, existing administrative practices and legal policies affecting public education then he would provide insight to the causes of the bilingual child's learning problems. The reader of Sanchez's dissertation rapidly becomes aware that the educator had no degree of objectivity with reference to educational problems of this ethnic group. He presented objective data but the interpretation of the data became a frequently stated refrain. His desire to "sell the cause" contributed to his inclusion of obvious contradictions.

Sanchez explained in detail that educators must first establish objective criteria for measuring all children who first enter school. He chided psychometrists for their failure to do this. Then, he contended that objective data alone would not provide answers to difficult questions with reference to the bilingual child. This child, he reminded readers, had a unique culture which included a native folk culture, cultural values, and historic roots different from English-speaking classmates. It seemed that Sanchez wanted to use statistical material to support some claims and ignore quantitative data when subjective evaluations would result in
providing a disproportionately higher expenditure for bilingual students in order to enrich their educational opportunities.

The author's dissertation lost strength by the fact that he lumped all bilinguals together in an umbrella classification and appeared to ignore the presence of different socio-economic levels among the group. He reported that one-third of all public offices in the state were held by bilinguals, and that Spanish-speaking teachers employed in the school system had competencies similar to rural school teachers in other areas of the country. He included charts in the dissertation which showed that communities which had large numbers of bilingual students also had larger numbers of bilingual teachers than communities with fewer bilingual students. Although bilingual teachers comprised only 20 per cent of the total number of public school teachers during the 1930 to 1932 school years, it would seem that despite state-wide educational problems of bilinguals, statistical data supported evidence of upward mobility among this group.

The educator completely ignored the fact that upward mobility had been a significant factor in the development of the American people from earliest history for those groups able to identify with middle class values accepted by society's dominant groups. The evidence that one-third of the public offices in the state were held by bilinguals, and that a sizeable number of bilinguals taught in the public schools, seems to indicate that the social structure in New Mexico did
not prevent the bilingual resident from ascending the success
ladder. If more bilingual New Mexicans were poorer than other
ethnic groups, it would seem reasonable to assume that fewer
of them would attain middle class status than members of other
groups. Sanchez offered no explanation of differences within
the social structure of the Hispano society as an explanation
of part of the New Mexican's socio-economic and educational
problems.

Sanchez also stated that counties with the greatest
number of bilinguals had the lowest per capita assessed
valuation. He presented a chart to illustrate his findings
and stated that factors of per capita wealth and bilingual
population had a correlation of rho-.68. This correlation
indicated that as the bilingual population increased the per
capita income decreased. However, the reader can also make
some additional observations from the data. If the reader
ranked the thirty-one counties in descending order from high-
est to lowest incomes, he would easily see that as the per-
centage of minority inhabitants increased the per capita income
decreased. De Baca county ranked first and had a per capita
income of $2,095.41. Twenty-nine per cent of its 2,893 in-
habitants belonged to the bilingual group. Mora county had a
population of 10,322 persons, and 95 per cent of its population
spoke Spanish. The per capita income of this county was
$490.25, and it ranked twenty-seven out of thirty-one counties.
The use of per capita income rather than median or modal incomes beclouded rather than clarified the question. It would have been more significant to see the income range in each county rather than just the per capita figures. It would also have been valuable to know how much land in each county remained exempt from the tax rolls because it was owned by the government. Use of per capita income helped Sanchez to build a strong case, but it may not have been the fairest representation of the data.12

Sanchez also stated that illiteracy rates increased in counties along with the increase of bilingual population. He stated that New Mexico ranked forty-seven in illiteracy among the forty-eight states, despite its small population. Citing as examples the same two counties already mentioned, De Baca with the highest per capita income and a 29 per cent bilingual population had an illiteracy rate of 8.1 per cent. This meant that out of a total of 2,893 persons, with 834 bilinguals, 258 people were unable to read. Mora county's 10,322 residents had 9,806 bilinguals and 1,363 illiterates comprising 13.9 per cent of the population. Assuming that more illiterates come from the bilingual group than from any other one, it seemed that De Baca county whose income was five times greater than the income of Mora county still had a significant illiteracy rate. Sanchez did not offer a rationale for this.13

The author also reported that he and L. S. Tireman, director of the San José experimental school, had tested the entire
eighth grade in Santa Fe county with the Stanford Achievement test. He reported that test results indicated that children's achievement failed to coincide with their grade placement. Sanchez stated that measured intelligence of eighth graders improved as their skills in language arts increased. He also reported that test results showed that in 4 categories rated on the achievement test, only 7 per cent exceeded established norms in paragraph meaning tests, 13 per cent in dictation, 12 per cent in language usage, and 7 per cent in literature. The remaining scores fell in the first and second quartiles. Sanchez concluded that the achievement test either did not measure what the children knew, or the school failed to attain fundamental reading objectives. He cited the fact that the state had few libraries and a low circulation of books and newspapers as an explanation of this low reading level. His conclusions might have been strengthened if he had also included an analysis of reading methodologies as one of the explanations for poor reading skills.

Sanchez's presentation of data illustrating pupil dropout rates in the public schools supported his assertion that schools failed to meet goals of teaching reading. He also amplified this contention by citing the fact that students frequently remained unable to purchase readers at the beginning of the school term, and they sometimes waited as long as forty school days without having use of necessary books. He noted that the average expenditure of fifty-two cents in rural
schools for textbooks, instructional supplies, and library books did not attain the goal of offering free textbooks for all children. In the 1930 to 1932 school years, the state spent 75,000 dollars for readers and circulating libraries in rural school regions. The legislature had passed the Free Textbook Act of 1933 to make free readers available for all scholastics in the first three grades and free textbooks for pupils in all elementary grades. At the time that Sanchez did his study, it was not feasible to evaluate the effect of the law, because it had just been implemented in rural communities.15

Sanchez asserted that if he analyzed the age-grade status of bilingual children in the state-wide school system, then he would obtain a rough estimate of pupil adjustment. He did not have data available on a state-wide basis showing grade progress and individual achievement for all bilingual children, but he felt that current educational theories determining grade placement and pupil-progress allowed him to use age-grade data to answer his question concerning group achievement for the bilingual child. The educator reported that some theorists believed that school achievement is divided into standard measurable steps. Each step must be accomplished satisfactorily before a student could progress to the next level. Other popular educational theorists equated learning results with the equalization of educational opportunity. This second group believed that schools in a democratic society should offer opportunities for all students to develop those
skills needed for the individual to increase his ability to understand the world around him. His learning tasks should be consonant with his abilities. Sanchez stated that the concept of equalized educational opportunities implied that schools individualized their standards to fit each student's needs. In this way a child competed with himself rather than with his total peer group. He affirmed that it made little difference which of these two theories New Mexican educators supported, because results revealed that neither theory reduced the serious overage condition found in the schools. He conceded that the initial late school entrance of bilingual children and their poor school attendance exacerbated the problem, but the fact that the overage condition remained so serious indicated that schools had failed to find ways to improve the bilingual child's adjustment.16

Using the pupil-reporting data required under the state education laws, Sanchez examined minutely the condition of overagedness. He summarized his findings by reporting that of the 93,433 children enrolled in public schools during the 1931-1932 school year, 49,751 were bilingual. Rural schools had 59 per cent of the total enrollment and 64 per cent of the state's bilingual scholastic population. Urban schools had 41 per cent of the scholastics and 37 per cent of the bilinguals. He stated that for all the state's elementary schools, 37 per cent of the students were overage in relation to their class
assignment. The percentage of overagedness fluctuated from 29 per cent to 44 per cent. The average overagedness remained two years below chronological grade level.

Although he conceded that overagedness was a problem for all scholastics, he noted that the bilingual child exhibited a higher incidence than all other children combined. Rural schools had a greater total of overage students than urban schools. The seriousness of the problem grew increasingly severe for the bilingual child. He compared figures showing the numbers of children in each type of school system who were bilingual with the number who were overage. He stated that as the bilingual enrollment increased, so did the overaged condition. Sanchez said that the language problem of the bilingual child when he first entered school remained the primary cause of his overaged condition. He did not attempt to analyze other factors which produced this condition, but he presented the data in such a way as to embarrass those professional educators who appeared willing to accept the fact that bilingual children achieved at a lower rate than English-speaking ones. Instead of limiting his accusations to unsupported charges, the author could have illustrated his data by explaining the defects in the current methodology then in use in the elementary schools to teach reading and English language skills.

Because rural New Mexican schools had the most serious overage problem, Sanchez examined conditions in these districts to analyze factors contributing to their severe problems.
He reported that rural schools served a larger geographic area than urban systems and had many one-room school houses. The state had 1,045 rural schools servicing 5.6 pupils each, while urban schools served 266.9 pupils each. Rural areas had 817 one and two room schools, while urban regions had only thirty-two. If one believed that the state education department wanted all schools to be administered efficiently, it became obvious that administration grew increasingly difficult in rural areas.

Sanchez equated a lack of efficiency in rural educational administration with the manner in which school boards were selected. He charged that to insure increased educational efficiency, school boards should be elected by all people in the region, and these boards should recruit the best professionals available to educate the children. He said that if school boards were elected for overlapping terms, this would bring about continuity in the development of educational policies. The educator noted that present education law provided that rural boards of education have five members. Four of these members were appointed every two years by the district judge who ran for election biannually on a partisan ballot. No more than three of the board members could belong to the same political party. One member was elected by an at-large vote, while three others were chosen from each county commissioner's district. The fifth, an ex officio member, served as secretary to the board and
county superintendent. The county superintendent was elected for a two-year term by all voters in the county, including those living in urban regions removed from his jurisdiction. Urban systems elected their board members for overlapping terms giving the board continuity in the policy-making role. The board appointed the superintendent and determined his salary. The chief school officer had to possess a valid teaching certificate to qualify for the position. Urban administrators exhibited better educational qualifications than their rural counterparts. In 1931, none of the rural superintendents had a masters' degree, four had been graduated from college, and three had high school diplomas. Of the sixty-one urban systems, seventeen superintendents had masters' degrees, forty-one had earned bachelor's degrees, and only three had just three years of college.

Sanchez suggested that the amount of educational financing allocated for a school district affected the quality of the schools. He stated that educational funds came from three sources, and two were supposed to be apportioned equally for urban and rural systems alike. Ninety per cent of current school expenditures came from current tax funds. Monies were raised by a county-wide levy and apportioned to school districts based upon previously determined budget requests. These budgets had received prior approval by budgeting authorities before districts received their operating funds. According to a strict interpretation of the law, all school
systems were to receive fund allocations on an equal basis. The state's Common School Current Fund contributed less than 10 per cent to a system's total annual budget. This figure was computed on the basis of enrollment. A school district could construct school building and undertake other needed capital expenditures within the guidelines of legal limits determined by the assessed valuation of the region. Money raised from this taxation could be used only for school buildings and other related capital improvements. Urban systems represented single systems, and rural systems included larger geographic areas with more than one school district. Variations in amounts of assessed valuation available for taxation in different areas gave urban schools an investment in buildings of 101 dollars for each child enrolled, while rural schools had a 54 dollar investment.20

Rural schools received less money and had to make their funds serve more physical plants than did urban schools. The city schools had $3.10 more per capita for school operation than their rural counterparts. Comparison of attendance figures indicated that rural schools had lower attendance than urban schools. School administrators lacked sufficient personnel to police the great distances between schools to enforce the compulsory attendance laws. The rural schools with smaller budgets had shorter school terms than city systems. Sanchez cited Bernalillo county as an example to
show that for a 180-day school year, rural children attended only 68.4 per cent of the term. Urban children in the same county attended 18 days more during the year. Other school districts had shorter terms than Bernalillo county. These shorter terms reduced achievement potential for all children.21

Sanchez also submitted data to show that rural teachers had fewer years of college training than urban instructors. He remarked that educators tended to rate quality of schools by the professional credentials of its instructors, although he admitted that this could not be considered an infallible standard. He admitted that although teacher qualifications did have an effect on the quality of education, factors affecting attendance and amounts of money spent per capita on education had a more significant correlation with achievement than did the quality of teacher-preparation. He stated that level of teacher preparation and attendance varied positively together in rural schools, but appeared to make little difference in urban systems. This meant that schools with better teachers had students with better attendance figures. Teacher qualifications and attendance had a positive relationship but appeared to be less important than the relationship of attendance and per capita expenditures. Sanchez noted that either a practical level of training had already been attained in school systems, or that too little money had been expended to achieve both a high level of training and good attendance. He believed that the latter statement
had more credence. He reminded his readers that New Mexico spent less per capita on education than any other comparable state.22

Sanchez summarized his data by asserting that New Mexican schools provided less educational opportunity as the bilingual population increased. He used various statistical techniques such as coefficients of correlation and regression equations to document his thesis. He believed that all schools could stand improvement, but rural schools needed it most of all. The decentralization of rural schools, along with their poor administrative practices, less per capita expenditures for education and poorly qualified teachers, increased the educational inequities for children in these areas. He noted that attendance figures did not necessarily decrease as the Spanish-speaking enrollment increased, but attendance figures decreased in all systems as per capita expenditures decreased. He had already established the premise that per capita expenditures decreased with increased bilingual population, but he did not statistically determine that bilingual children's attendance was appreciably worse than that of English-speaking children. He merely reminded his readers that figures of attendance for all children varied as per capita expenditures varied. Believing that centralized school systems with efficient educational administration could spend more money on their schools and
have better trained teachers, he maintained that reforms were needed to improve the state-wide system.

The author summarized his research by asserting that his present assessment of education led him to believe that schools had been a function of factors not related to educational need. He noted that relative status of taxable wealth, political manipulation of education, budgetary, and administrative processes all served to accelerate inequality of opportunity. He urged state leaders to recognize their problems and reorganize rural systems for improved efficiency. He also wanted the state to underwrite educational opportunities based on need rather than on the amount of taxable wealth available to each taxing district. He challenged the state political leaders to reorganize their budgetary procedures in order to relinquish budgetary control to educators instead. He felt that educational planning should be an ongoing process not tied to biennial elections in order to improve educational opportunities for all children. He concluded that if schools were reorganized to serve children in the optimum manner, then the bilingual child would also profit from this reorganization.23

The dissertation amplified further the position that Sanchez had already taken in his articles published in the
New Mexican press that will be discussed in a later chapter of this study. The message came through loud and clear that he wanted education removed from political control and placed under educational jurisdiction. He also wanted to implement a redistribution of wealth program to equalize educational opportunities. Admitting that Sanchez's motivations appeared worthwhile, the casual reader can suspect that the author in his position as head of the information and statistics office, would have preferred to have a more direct hand in the implementation of budgetary and curricular practices than the present structure allowed. The position that he took in his study of openly accusing those in power of making unwise educational decisions, certainly indicated that the dissertation would fan rather than abate the political controversy.

Sanchez remained well within his rights to criticize educational policy as he saw it, but he failed to tell the entire story. He omitted the historical explanation for the state's inability to finance education according to pupil need, rather than according to resource availability. If he had summarized his findings in the light of historical problems, he would have stated that monied interests in New Mexico had opposed liberal funding of education from public funds since the state's territorial days. He also would have noted that county organization of education began in 1866, and
the region had a meager commitment to public schools in 1891. State leaders historically preferred decentralization of school administration to a unitary system.24

Sanchez would also have indicated that railroad interests held large tracts of land and used all their power to prevent the legislature from increasing taxes. The federal government insisted that the state provide for public education as a condition for statehood, but the government limited its active participation in education to the establishment of Indian schools.25 Sanchez also should have told his readers that problems in rural areas remained more severe than those in urban districts because more New Mexicans lived in rural regions at that time.

Sanchez became embroiled in controversy regarding educational fund allocation while he served as head of the Office of Information and Statistics in the state education department. The question of fund distribution ranked high among Sanchez's educational priorities. He failed to include an explanation of the causes of the financial problems in his dissertation but merely left his accusations to stand on their own merits. Sanchez's omissions of pertinent information seemed to indicate that he might have been more interested in writing a documented editorial rather than making a viable contribution to educational research.

This dissertation set forth many unsubstantiated statements. Although it is true that human beings fail to lend
themselves to the same kind of microscopic examination as
do other members of the plant and animal kingdom, it seemed
that Sanchez with his penchant for use of statistical data
could have administered some tests to bilingual children to
learn how the currently accepted reading methodology af-
fected their learning skills. Sanchez also failed to cite
evidence already being accumulated by L. S. Tireman's San
Jose Project to illustrate that improved methodology did
produce a positive result in improving learning skills of
the bilingual child. His failure to include positive studies
made it appear that Sanchez cared more about the political
impact of the dissertation than its educational merits.

Sanchez did build upon his study of bilingualism in a
position paper he wrote entitled, "The Elementary School and
the Challenge of Bilingualism," which he prepared a year
after he completed his doctoral study. In that report he as-
serted that the elementary school occupied a key role in
developing an integrated program of democratic human rela-
tions. These schools would be better able to accomplish
this mission if the universities would offer to prospective
teachers courses dealing with meaningful social and economic
concerns shared by inhabitants of communities where new
teachers would teach. This bilingual child did not appear
to be an alien to a teacher able to speak some Spanish and
aware of the characteristics of Spanish culture and customs.26

Sanchez criticized teachers for their insistence on
"Americanizing" the bilingual child by practicing cultural
obliteration, rather than using the Spanish language and culture as a viable instructional tool. He pointed out that instruction in health, citizenship, and primary subject materials should be offered first in the native tongue. The educator said that using Spanish for initial instruction would bridge the gap between home and school and reduce learning barriers created by the language handicap. Sanchez also stated that use of Spanish as the instruction language demonstrated that the teacher regarded this language with respect.

Additionally, monolingual English-speaking students needed exposure to Spanish, according to Sanchez, in order to develop an awareness of cultural differences. Bilingualism offered no more difficulties to a good teacher than the myriad of other individual differences the instructor handled within the classroom organization. Bilingualism as a specialized individual difference could be handled best in a non-segregated setting.

Sanchez also criticized use of history teaching materials which glorified the arrival of the Pilgrims to New England, yet excluded the story of the settlement of the Southwest. He pointed out that regional culture had valuable historic roots that impinged more directly on residents' lives. He suggested that if teachers wanted to offer more historical materials for their students they should include an examination of Mexican history, along with traditional American
history materials. If courses of study reflected the bicul-
turalism of the scholastics, the bilingual child would find more meaning from his classroom activities. Sanchez believed that if Mexican culture became part of the total educational curriculum in New Mexico, the schools would then be meeting the needs of bilingualism.27

Sanchez's dissertation omitted educational concerns related to methodology and stressed primarily flaws in the educational system in the state. The later position paper, on the other hand, while critical of the educational opportunities available for the bilingual child, outlined positive approaches to the bilingual question. The author showed that biculturalism remained a natural resource for New Mexicans and should be regarded as such in courses of study for all elementary school children. This kind of data included in the doctoral study would have illustrated that Sanchez's views regarding the means of dealing with bilingualism and biculturalism indicated his sense of prescience that other educators failed to realize for many, many years.
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CHAPTER V

THE QUEST FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

New Mexicans recognized their multi-cultural problems, but they failed to meet their diverse educational needs. The state constitution provided for establishment of a uniform school system throughout the state and allowed a school district to borrow to finance school building construction if a majority of voters approved these costs. These expenditures had a legal debt ceiling of 6 per cent of the district's assessed valuation. Operational school funds came from fines, forfeitures, taxes, and a permanent school fund. On the whole New Mexicans were poor. With the exceptions of a few districts which had coal and copper mines or areas where the railroads had taxable assets, New Mexico actually lacked sufficient wealth to tax an educational program adequately.

Besides dealing with matters of school financing, the state constitution also prohibited segregation of Spanish-speaking children and sanctioned establishment of teacher-training institutions to prepare instructors to teach non-English speaking children. New Mexicans outlined educational procedures in their 1912 constitution, but by 1923 it became apparent that changing school needs required additional legislation. The legislature enacted the 1923 school code.
which established an educational budget auditor, along with local budget commissioners, to decide collectively proposed school expenditures. This law gave power and responsibility to persons not actively involved in education to determine educational priorities. Local budget commissioners, appointed by county commissioners, represented political party interests. They worked with the state auditor to recommend allocation of local funds. These usually affluent and influential taxpayers tried to keep school expenses as low as possible.3

When Sanchez became head of the Division of Information and Statistics, he rapidly became aware of the power of local budget commissioners. In 1932, he openly opposed allowing these commissioners who knew nothing of technical educational questions to decide problems of school finance. He charged that, "To the end . . . we are now burdened with many illegitimate educational babies fathered by political or economic vested interests." 4 Sanchez believed that local boards, elected by local taxpayers, should replace county budget commissioners.

The 1932 school code gave impetus to creation of a Taxpayer's Association to work to reduce school budgets. The taxpayer's group urged ceilings on tax rates. They also wanted final control of the educational spending to be decided at the state level. This centralization of school tax funds removed from educational agencies the control of expenditures and
placed spending under the governor's authority. As the depression of the 1930's deepened, Sanchez publicly proclaimed his opposition to the efforts of these non-educational economy-minded groups. He chided school districts which already had low tax rates for further lowering their taxes. He insisted that these cuts would fail to promote educational efficiency. These reductions would be balanced on the educational scale with the ignorance of children.

Governor Arthur Seligman supported economy-minded state interests. In a speech entitled, "Sacred Cows in Taxation Pastures," delivered before the state Federation of Taxpayers' Associations on June 3, 1932, the Governor deplored the special regional interests in the state legislature which proposed economy measures that would leave unscathed their own "sacred cows." He facetiously chided the representatives of communities which had excellent school buildings and advised them that in the interest of economy they should willingly sell all but one of their school buildings. The sole remaining building could be used in six four-hour shifts 365 days per year to save money for the taxpayer. He remarked slyly that some members of his audience believed that teachers worked merely 5 hours a day and 200 days per year instructing 20 pupils. The Governor suggested that if members of his audience wanted to cut teachers' salaries, they had to be prepared to face angry newspaper criticism in their home communities where teachers, also fellow taxpayers, would
vehemently protest a 25 per cent proposed salary cut. Seligman added that he believed teachers had received shameful treat-
ment by being denied employment security. 7

The New Mexican Educational Association Newsletter re-
ported that the Santa Fe New Mexican editorially rebuked the Governor for his anti-education remarks. The newspaper writer sarcastically commented that teachers failed to own property and had limited productivity, making it necessary for them to accept a 25 per cent reduction in salary. The article con-
cluded that if the state succeeded in bringing about all the proposed plans to save money, then New Mexico would rank forty-eight in education instead of its present rank of thirty-nine. 8

In July, 1932, Paul L. Fickinger, Executive Secretary of the New Mexico Educational Association, reported to his mem-
ership of a recent series of meetings in Santa Fe of the Federation of County Taxpayers' Association. He stated that education could expect little from this or any other taxpayer group, since special interest factions determined the poli-
cies of the organizations. The secretary explained that average taxpayers failed to be represented in local associa-
tions, and delegates to state-wide meetings prided themselves in their ability to reduce drastically local school budgets. Fickinger asserted that Alex Shipley, President of the Curry County Taxpayers' Association, remarked that no school teacher in the state was worth more than seventy-five dollars per month.
Hugh L. Sawyers, representative of the state taxpayer's association, testified that school budgets had to be cut because educational operations consume about 60 per cent of property tax collections. According to Fickinger, Sawyers proudly reported that teachers in El Paso had received a 25 per cent salary cut, yet still considered themselves lucky to be employed. The taxpayers' association representative revealed that when the budget auditor visited local communities, he deliberately painted a dismal picture of funding availability. By doing this, the state had been able to reduce its anticipated deficit from one million dollars to one hundred thousand dollars.⁹

Although Sanchez had data available to him regarding both educational needs and expenses, his publicly expressed pleas had little impact upon state decision-makers. The educational administrator asserted that unsound budgetary thinking required current school budgets to match the previous year's allocations. The budgetary decision-makers used an obsolete figure to compute school appropriations initially, and then they further reduced this allotment by 10, 15, or 20 per cent. Sanchez explained that this method of computation aided counties with large budget allocations and crippled poorer counties. School needs varied annually because of enrollment changes and fluctuations in assessed valuation figures. The budget auditor resorted to fallacious reasoning when he failed to consider the distinctive needs of
different school districts. Although Sanchez opposed the idea of any budget cuts, he conceded that the auditor should substitute a weighted average for an across-the-board reduction. In this way, school districts may still find the means to provide adequate instruction.10

On July 27, 1932, Sanchez addressed an assembly of the summer session of the University of New Mexico and charged that although the nation-wide depression contributed to the economic ills of the region, poor economic policies governing educational financing served as the chief cause of educational poverty. Schools had a hand-to-mouth existence because people ignorant of school needs determined school budgets. For the 1930 to 1931 fiscal year, state financial experts computed operating budgets for New Mexican non-educational expenses at a projected collection rate of 90 per cent of the outstanding tax bills. Educational budgets, on the other hand were computed at a 95 per cent collection rate. All taxes remained hard to collect because of the wide-spread economic hardship experienced by many taxpayers during this period. Sanchez suggested that school budgets should be based on a lower expectation of total revenue collection to prevent punishing school districts for their inability to amass adequate funds. He believed that the state should use a single standard for all their anticipated property tax revenues. Remarking that if budgeting authorities computed tax rates correctly, then budgets would be increased.
Sanchez explained that districts which had instituted severe economies in order to keep their schools in operation had been forced to continue operation at the same inadequate figure despite their increasing needs. This unsound program of school financing endangered the welfare of the state's children. 11

The educator maintained that a public forum should be used to air issues affecting educational needs. Writing in the New Mexican Tribune, he criticized the state budget practices as well as the total revenue-producing structure of state financing. He pointed out that in 1928 the state received 50 per cent of its income from property taxes, while other states depended upon property taxes for 25 per cent of their revenue. States, which were less dependent upon property taxes than New Mexico, managed to allocate a larger per capita sum for education than did New Mexico. To do this, state governments assessed taxes on retail sales, income, and other intangibles. Sanchez asserted that real property did not constitute a state's total wealth.

He also questioned New Mexico's budgetary priorities. He explained that the other forty-seven states spent 29 per cent of their income for education while New Mexico spent 29 per cent for that purpose. New Mexico, however, spent 48 per cent of its revenue for highways while the other states budgeted 36 per cent of their income for that purpose. 12 Differences in highway and educational expenditures can be
explained by the fact that state leaders failed to give education a high priority, while these same leaders realized that the mountainous terrain of the state required good roads, and these were costly to build.  

Sanchez reasoned that a disproportionate burden placed on property owners contributed to inadequate education funding. He pointed out that a study recently done by the National Education Association indicated that New Mexico ranked thirty-four in school attendance, thirty in retention of children in school, twenty-eight in the value of school property, and forty-one in illiteracy. New Mexico ranked lower than any other western state and narrowly surpassed Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Arkansas. Sanchez's criticisms appeared valid. In 1930, the states of the deep South spent the least amount of money on education. New Mexico spent the least amount of any western state. Arizona with approximately the same school population spent almost 105 dollars for each school age child, while New Mexico spent under 67 dollars. The two states had almost the same number of children attending school, which seemed to indicate that New Mexico spent its more limited school budgets wisely to produce results comparable with those of Arizona.  

The New Mexico Education Association, J. E. Seyfried, and V. G. Sorrel of the University of New Mexico shared Sanchez's concerns regarding existing inequities of school financing. The education association supported Seyfried's and Sorrell's
research which called for an equalization of educational opportunities. The scholars proposed that the state establish a public school equalization fund to take care of current expenses. The equalization fund should provide a minimum foundation's program for all children and should be used to supplement supervision costs, transportation expenses, and teachers' salaries.¹⁶

The university professors also suggested that counties unable to meet minimum standards by using their own local resources could then participate in the equalization fund on a standard basis. The money for the fund would come from additional revenues such as gross sales, corporation, and income taxes. These newer forms of taxation would supplement the overworked property tax. Sanchez commented that these new taxing proposals would allow for more equitable allocation of funds for the individual taxpayer, because education would be supported by those better able to pay taxes.

Sanchez urged his fellow teachers to support this equalization proposal which would help mitigate the state's educational crises. The state American Legion, taking their lead from the liberal United States Senator Bronson M. Cutting, joined Sanchez in his requests by adopting the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the New Mexico Department of the American Legion assembled here in annual convention does deplore the drastic curtailment of educational opportunity to the
children of this state that has been effected for next year and that we pledge ourselves to support such a constructive program as will provide for an adequate education of every school age child in New Mexico. 17

Educators and businessmen continued to disagree over the controversy concerning principles involved in equalization of funds and the use of only property taxes for school financing. Responding to a criticism voiced by W. J. Barker, State Chairman of the Democratic party, Sanchez and Vernon O. Tolle, newly selected Executive Secretary of the New Mexico Education Association, chastised the political leader for calling educators "dictators." The educators, using the newspaper to secure public attention, noted that they had fought all attempts to reduce school appropriations. They refuted Barker's charge that educational budgets had been reduced just 7.24 per cent. Instead, they asserted that budget allocations actually reduced educational funding by 16.56 per cent. 18

Part of the educators' need to use the press to tell their sides of the funding controversy arose when pressure groups, opposed to increased educational spending, provided ample publicity to sell their messages to New Mexicans. Sanchez condemned the fact that paid corporate representatives attended budget hearings and proffered free advice, while professional educators had to stand "in the wings" at these meetings. Sanchez affirmed that activities of these corporate representatives created a climate of misguided
practice and indifference to human needs. The results of the actions of vested interests saved the individual taxpayer two or three dollars for each one thousand dollars of assessed valuation. Big businesses, assessed at one million dollars, saved two thousand dollars with a tax reduction.  

Although Sanchez and leaders of the New Mexico Education Association viewed educational funding problems simply from the viewpoint of school needs, others tried to assess the totality of the state's financial difficulties in their search for remedial measures. Byron O. Beall, conservative New Mexican Chief Tax Commissioner, reported that in 1931 taxpayers experienced losses in the values of their business as they returned to postwar business levels. These citizens demanded a reduction of tax bills. Beall recognized that if the government acceded to their requests, property owners would be expected to should an increased financial burden. The Office of the Tax Commissioner handled 43 per cent of the state's total tax valuations as well as production assessments of the oil and gas industries. The Commissioner suggested that the legislature should find new taxation sources, such as an income tax, to provide necessary funds. He also wanted new laws passed to evaluate real property once in four years as well as revision of delinquent tax laws and abolishment of appraisal boards. Additionally, he suggested that all property, including tax exempt properties of religious and fraternal organizations, be listed by each county
tax office. Beall believed that the legislature would then have to delineate the tax exempt criteria for religious institutions.20

Governor Seligman also recognized the seriousness of the financial crisis as he urged the boards of education throughout the state to introduce further economies in their local schools. The Governor explained that he expected tax delinquencies to increase by the end of 1932. He suggested that new budgets not exceed present budget levels in order to prevent future state administrations from having to reduce embarrassing deficits.21

Even though educators recognized the state's financial problems, they still wanted the Governor to present requests for new sources of revenue to the members of the legislature. Teachers requested that Seligman support proposals for business and income taxes as supplements to the over-used property tax. Once these new sources of funding became available, teachers then asked that funds be distributed on a basis of classroom units which considered average daily attendance figures as part of the funding computation. Educators' requests for reforms stretched beyond their suggestions for new taxing sources. They asked the Governor to alter the terms of members of the State Board of Education so that they would serve for overlapping periods. They also suggested that the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction become an appointive office, instead of an elective one.22
Clarence Iden, President of the New Mexico Federation of Taxpayers' Associations, supplied the Governor with the opinions of the taxpayer groups. The leader stated that property taxes should be limited to a maximum of 2 per cent of the assessed valuation, exclusive of levies for municipal needs and special school district assessments. He also asked for enactment of a 1 percent general sales' tax, along with a salary reduction for state and county employees. Seligman apparently disapproved of Iden's suggestions, because he wrote negative comments in the margins of his letter to the Governor.\(^\text{23}\)

The eleventh Legislature debated several education measures. They passed School Equalization Bill Number 183, but the Governor vetoed the law. Seligman criticized the law for its failures to appropriate necessary funds or to establish procedures for distribution of tax money. He also pointed out that local authorities would become subordinate to the State Board of Education. This would deny the right of counties to participate in the equalization program unless they agreed to place their schools under state jurisdiction. Seligman concluded that the proposed equalization measure would necessitate hiring additional teachers, thus increasing the total cost of education.\(^\text{24}\)

Sanchez worked diligently with the education association to lobby for passage of House Bill 183, which he had helped to write. He organized an effective lobby to educate
legislators to see the need for reform. He and Vernon Tolle freely addressed committee members to urge them to pass the law. When the Governor vetoed the bill, Sanchez replied to the veto message but was unable to persuade enough lawmakers to override the veto. Sanchez believed that he had worked sixty days in a lobbying effort but accomplished little of value for the state's schools.25

The Governor sent the legislature a special message on March 9, 1933, urging them to endorse a substitute equalization bill to enable richer counties to assist poorer ones finance schools.26 He wrote to members of the legislature asserting that his primary responsibility rested with limiting governmental costs. He praised the law-making body for reducing expenditures by 636,000 dollars, but he reminded legislators that schools required additional revenue sources besides the property tax.27

The Governor later responded to the state's serious financial predicament by issuing a proclamation during May of 1933 in which he suspended for the rest of that year enforcement of Senate Bill Number 144. This measure required county tax treasurers to sell tax certificates for properties having delinquent taxes for 1931 and 1932. Instead, Seligman urged that New Mexicans implement provisions of Senate Bill Number 241 which provided relief for taxpayers by liberalizing the amount of time they could use to pay delinquent taxes. He encouraged taxpayers to honor their financial obligations in order to keep schools open.28
Sanchez wrote to the Governor to comment on proposed referenda regarding school finance. Citing the state's constitutional provisions which allowed voters to disapprove all laws, except those dealing with debt repayment, general appropriations, and school maintenance, the educator stated that schools would be crippled if newly-enacted revenue-producing measures became invalidated. Sanchez disagreed with Seligman's suspension of Senate Bill 144, entitled the Delinquent Tax Law, because enforcement of the measure would release three million dollars of school funds then tied up in delinquent tax bills. The educator also told the Governor that he supported the severance tax, income tax, and chain store bills which would diversify educational funding. Seligman commented succinctly to Sanchez that he believed the educator's cogent remarks stated well the requirements of school financing.29

Prior to Seligman's veto of the School Equalization Bill Number 183, Sanchez and Tolle prepared news releases advocating adoption of the measure. Marked "confidential" and earmarked for publication in New Mexican newspapers in March, 1933, the two educators criticized the expected demise of the law which had been based upon sound principles of educational finance. They rebuked the substitution of Bill 353, which, according to the educators, had been prepared by persons with limited knowledge of the essentials of sound school
financing. Sanchez pointed out the fallacy of the title "equalization" used for the second law and stated that "un-equalization" more closely approximated the truth. The substitute bill provided for fund apportionment based on average daily attendance. This attendance yardstick gave to each county, regardless of assessed valuation, length of school year, and total school population, a fixed proportionate share of fund allotment. If a school opened for a one-month school year and served merely 100 students for an average attendance ratio, it participated on an equal basis with schools serving students for a nine-month school year. This substitute measure rewarded school districts which had shorter school terms.30

Byron G. Beall, author of the substitute measure, worked to kill the originally proposed legislation. Sanchez and Tolle noted that the current school fund allocated money to school districts based on census figures, regardless of attendance, while the newer law penalized rural schools by failure to fund classroom units proportionately. The authors explained that a one-room school had a higher proportionate cost than a twenty-room unit, but it would receive less money. The small school might operate with an average daily attendance of eight students, while larger schools required attendance averages of twenty to thirty students. The state had 600 one-room schools in 1933 and 621 schools of two rooms or larger. Additionally, the authors explained that the law
offered no compensation differential to high schools which cost more to operate. 31

Bitterly, Sanchez and Tolle asserted that School Equalization Bill 183 had been prepared as a result of educational research done by Paul Mort of Columbia University. He, along with the United States Commissioner of Education, and other financial experts, published the National Survey of School Finance and provided the background material for this new law. Sanchez and Tolle lamented:

> When a bank crisis arises, bankers are summoned for advice and guidance. When a court procedure is in question, jurists are consulted . . . Yet, when legislation or procedure in school finance and administration is the order of the day . . . any Tom, Dick, or Harry is competent and authoritative—Paraphrasing: may the children (future citizens) forgive them for they know not what they do.

Sanchez continued his enthusiastic commitment to improve school financing by urging voters to support proposals to secure tax funds from different sources. He reminded New Mexicans that the state constitution gave voters the right to express their views regarding new laws, and he warned citizens that if they invalidated these new revenue laws then educational funding problems would be increased. 33 He explained that pending measures such as delinquent tax bills, a severance tax act, lubricating oil measure, and chain store bill would diversify state revenue sources and augment inadequate educational funds. The educator reminded his readers that the schools had a great interest in these measures.
Using his background in statistical research techniques, Sanchez did a study comparing the effects of road improvements on educational efficiency. He obviously resented the fact that the road building program had a higher priority among state leaders than the operation of the schools. He examined each county on the following bases: per capita costs of road construction, square mile costs, and gross county costs. He then compared these data with the educational statistics of each school system within the county. He found little relationship between the amount of money spent on road construction and the quality of education. Sanchez concluded that up to the time that he did his study schools had failed to benefit from expenditures of highway construction funds. He asserted that future programs of educational consolidation might show a positive effect of both improved schools and improved roads.34

The legislative fight for educational reform had scarcely ended when controversy erupted concerning the state-wide distribution of a racial attitude scale that had been sent to 3,000 English-speaking high school students. The scale, prepared by Richard M. Page, an instructor in the Psychology Department of the University of New Mexico, attempted to measure beliefs held by English-speaking students regarding Spanish-Americans. Sanchez agreed to distribute the study from the state research office. Seligman learned of the
proposed questionnaire prior to schools receiving the study, and he notified the press. Emotional reactions from Anglos and Spanish-Americans indicated that many New Mexicans opposed the study, and these critics wanted those responsible for its dissemination to lose their jobs.

Sanchez had agreed to send the questionnaire to the schools and willingly accepted full responsibility for its distribution. The University Board of Regents appointed a committee to hold hearings on the issue and summoned Sanchez as one of the witnesses. The research director testified that he had previously distributed research proposals prepared by other authors. He felt that the state research office served as clearing house for different studies, and this did not mean that either he or his staff personally supported any specific study. Sanchez commented that he supported the idea of responsible research in public education. L. S. Tireman, University of New Mexico professor and colleague of Sanchez, wrote to Leo M. Favrot of the General Education Board and told him that Seligman appeared unsympathetic towards the university and used every opportunity to discredit their work.

Committee hearings lasted for three days. Members recommended termination of Page's affiliation with the institution and exoneration of Sanchez's possible culpability in the matter. Members stated that Sanchez may have used poor judgment in agreeing to distribute the survey, but
Page had to be held accountable for this questionnaire. The Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board of the Foundation, as well as Senator Bronson M. Cutting all became involved in this matter. Sanchez later admitted that he had worked with a number of political leaders to quiet the controversy. Political leaders, supportive of Sanchez, successfully protected both him and his research office from unfavorable political consequences.35

Tom Wiley, former professor at the University of New Mexico, commented that this incident was a "rhubarb" too difficult for him to decipher. Wiley was a young school principal in a community comprised largely of Spanish-speaking residents when the racial survey controversy erupted. A number of people in that community became angry with Sanchez for his involvement in the psychology instructor's research effort. Sanchez, because he was Spanish-American, did not suffer as much criticism as Page, an Anglo, experienced. Wiley pointed out that despite Sanchez's total commitment to improve education for the Hispano, he had little patience with the defeatist attitudes that Spanish-Americans sometimes expressed, and he sometimes criticized them for their unwillingness to assert themselves.36

During the years that Sanchez served as a professional educator in New Mexico, the state legislature adopted major changes in both the structure and financing of public education. These changes included the 1923 school code and the
twenty mill taxation limit. Although New Mexican educators had a personal interest in the survival of the public schools, they did not always present a united front to the state leaders. Educators sometimes disagreed how money should be distributed, but they concurred that present revenue allocations should be maintained. After 1934, educators frequently conflicted with the opinions of the large taxpayers.37

Three organizations played different roles in the operation and funding of public education. The New Mexico Education Association, founded in 1886, represented the professional educators and used its collective clout to try to secure more funds for the operation of public schools. The New Mexico Taxpayers' Association, founded in 1916, represented the large taxpayers and strived to operate the school as economically as possible by limiting the tax base to be used for education. The Parent Teachers' Association, founded in 1915, served as the balance wheel between the teachers' organization and the taxpayers' group in order to prevent open attacks against the schools.38

In 1923, the taxpayers' organization recommended their program for educational economies in The New Mexico Tax Bulletin, and their suggestions became incorporated in the school code adopted the same year. They wanted local communities to use their own funds to extend the school term to nine months. They also advocated the consolidation of school districts, distribution of the county property tax on an average daily attendance basis, and restricted use of
transportation for education purposes. The 1923 code gave urban leaders control of city school boards, instead of having city schools administered by county boards of education. However, as the years passed, these urban boards depended upon Santa Fe for funding from state-controlled resources.

Funding problems peaked as economy-minded groups strived to place a twenty mill limitation on taxation. The Albuquerque Journal commented in an editorial on July 10, 1933, that education had too many frills and nonessentials. The newspaper advocated a limitation on funding, while Georgia Lusk, state school superintendent, charged that if the state's voters adopted the twenty mill taxation limit 3,000 teachers would lose their jobs and 141,000 children would be denied an education.

Political tempers heated rapidly as voters debated the question of the twenty mill limit. The New Mexico Education Association criticized the proposed legislation and the Albuquerque Journal criticized the association by reminding its readers that if the proposal passed, any governmental subdivision could tax itself above the twenty mill limitation provided their voters gave their approval. Sanchez rebutted this statement by accusing the newspaper of misrepresenting the facts. Sanchez explained that the proposed amendment clearly stated that people could vote to exceed the amendment only if laws were passed authorizing such additional taxes. Voters had never approved additional taxes for public school expenditures.
The twenty mill taxing limitation passed in September, 1933. This limit included county, state, city, health, and school taxes. The county tax was five mills, the district school tax remained at 4.45 mills, while the current state school fund was limited to one-half mill. To counter balance somewhat this drop in school revenues, the Joint Tax Committee of the New Mexico Federation of Taxpayers' Association proposed other revenue sources to Governor A. W. Hockenhull who became Chief Executive Officer following Seligman's sudden death. These other sources included a gross receipts tax distributed on the basis of average daily school attendance, along with revision of the law to equalize assessments for both individuals within counties and assessments among counties. 43

Following this recommendation, the Governor called a special session of the legislature in April, 1934, to find a privilege tax that could be used to support education. This tax would be levied at 2 per cent of all gross business receipts. Also, oil, gas, and potash mining interests would be taxed at one quarter of 1 per cent. Nonprofit groups and game and ranch products were to be exempt from this gross tax. Professional educators supported these new proposals because they indicated that state leaders now realized that other taxing resources, other than property taxes, could be used to support education.
This twenty mill amendment, according to Wiley, marked a change for New Mexican schools. Before this amendment became law, the state governmental leaders had shown little interest in school matters until pressure groups rose to challenge state authority. These pressure groups included local politicos, as well as taxpayer and education organizations. If the state instituted a new taxing program, all counties would receive the same state support. Local resources, limited to a 7.25 mill taxing limit, would then become increasingly dependent upon state resources for local education needs.

Despite the fact that the new governor seemed to be listening more attentively to the cries of the educators than did Seligman, Sanchez did not relent in his critical attacks against the budgeting procedures used to allocate funds. He believed that the county budget commission should be abolished because local school superintendents and their boards of education were competent to determine local school needs. He decried existing practices of using resident taxpayers from each political party to evaluate a technically detailed document. He advocated centralization of school budgets in the state educational department. Here, the research division, able to provide technical assistance to local communities, could harmonize fund utilization with good educational practices. This budget, according to Sanchez, should then be submitted to the state taxing commissioner who would evaluate proposed budgets in view of existing tax rates. If Sanchez's
proposals were adopted, then he, as head of the research office, would enjoy a key decision-making role.45

The research chief stated that his proposed changes dovetailed research already completed by J. E. Seyfried of the University of New Mexico which had outlined procedures for placing public school administration on a professional basis. Sanchez continued to attack the school equalization measure then in operation, as he charged that budgets adopted for the 1933-1934 school year had erratic and drastic reductions which made it a poor and unfair law. He explained that present budget auditors failed to consider how a school district used its money. For example, a district which had to spend 20 per cent of its budget on transportation, such as De Baca county in rural eastern New Mexico, had less money available for classroom needs. Factors of geography, therefore, could adversely affect the quality of education. The educator also explained that centralized districts with high tax valuations received disproportionately more money than regions with lower valuations and scattered populations. Unfair distribution of business tax receipts, for example, gave Lea county in eastern New Mexico 1,216 dollars per classroom unit, while McKinley county in the western portion of the state received 298 dollars for each classroom unit.46

In order to remedy these inequities, Sanchez suggested setting the following guidelines: adequate school facilities should be made available for all children; taxes should be
consolidated into one fund; funds for a minimum foundation program should be equitably distributed. The county unit should be used as a taxation unit for all current revenues. Under the twenty mill limitation, Sanchez proposed that common schools would receive ten mills, the state five mills, and the counties five mills. Cities should receive legislative approval to exceed the twenty mill ceiling to prevent urban governments from diverting funds intended for education for other purposes. He believed that a new state funding plan should include one fund for all general state revenues. He wanted school districts to budget necessary transportation costs separately from their other operating expenses. Finally, he suggested that state budget leaders apportion funds on a weighted basis in order to establish at least a minimum program for every school in the state.

J. R. McCollum, Albuquerque school principal and strong spokesman for that city's interests, disagreed with Sanchez's reform proposals. He concurred with the research chief that reforms should be based on sound educational theory, but he also believed that laymen contributed a pragmatic approach to questions of school financing. He disagreed with Sanchez's requests for equalized distribution of school funds. McCollum claimed that a current cash shortage would result in inadequate school financing as fund distribution reduced the quality of the state's better schools. The principal took sharp exception
to Sanchez's suggestions of eliminating county budget commissioners and centralizing school fund distribution in the state education department. He maintained that local educators had to justify school expenditures at the local level first in order for leaders to reconcile these needs with stateAllocated funds. The educator asserted that to destroy local responsibility in budgeting matters would increase the risks of setting minimum standards without providing sufficient budgetary support. Sanchez retorted that McCollum glorified the status quo that perpetuated a caste system in education. McCollum took a middle-of-the-road position because he operated on the theory that he had to cooperate with the taxpayers' groups in order to survive. 48

Although Sanchez criticized budget-making procedures, he seemed pleased that the legislature approved a gross business tax to be used for education. He had previously expressed his disapproval of the Substitute Equalization Bill, passed during Seligman's term of office, and he also became disenchanted with the distribution of funds in 1934, done under the leadership of Hockenhull. The 1934 distribution procedure did not serve as a plan but merely based its dispersion of revenues on funds collected this previous year. 49 Sanchez pointed out that in 1934 when state leaders used the 1933 figures as the basis for fund allocations they compounded their errors of inadequate funding.
previous budgets had been cut because of widespread financial difficulties. Using these already-cut figures as a computation base exacerbated the school-financing problem.\footnote{50}

Sanchez continued to voice strong opposition to state procedures for financing public education. He stated that the constitution provided that all collected funds and forfeitures should be placed in the Current School fund, but the state had collected fewer than 7,000 dollars from these sources during 1933 and 1934. This paltry amount failed to represent actual money owed to the state by the taxpayers. The legislature had repealed laws assessing oil severance and excise taxes and provided exemptions in the income tax and sales tax laws which further impoverished public education. Finally, the enactment of the twenty mill limitation had made it possible for business to reduce their taxes for school support by over one million dollars. Sanchez believed that business leaders blatantly neglected their educational responsibilities.\footnote{51}

In 1935, a new distribution plan requested by several committees of the New Mexico Education Association more closely met the schools' needs. The education association proposals, based on a 1932 study, criticized the state for allowing its contribution to education to decline rather than increase. Also, the organization asked state leaders to implement the study completed by Paul R. Mort. This study
estimated the proper number of classroom units for different numbers of students and took into consideration the increased costs of secondary education over that of elementary school. The basic allowances for each county would equal 1934 budget amounts that would then be translated into classroom units.  

Mort's plan was designed to function in any state. He was considered an expert in questions of school financing, and both Sanchez and Seyfried supported his proposals. Although state leaders voiced approval of the educational financial expert's plans, the powerful district superintendents forced a modification of the original proposals. These educational leaders insisted that a basic allowance for distribution be included to guarantee that districts would not receive less than they had received from local taxation before the adoption of the twenty mill limitation.

At the time that Mort prepared his study, the state contributed about 15 per cent of total education costs, but Mort suggested that the state's share should reach 60 per cent of school districts' needs. In 1935 Mort's proposal became law and the state's contribution to education climbed above the 75 per cent figure. Both Seyfried and Sanchez worked to implement the new law.

Other new state legislation protected the equalization deficiency formula, a district received a guaranteed minimum
number of classroom units for its budget year. This same county might be funded for additional units but never less than the basic formula provided. Although this would appear to be a more equitable way of distributing the state's wealth, the richer counties complained that poorer and more sparsely settled regions received identically proportioned minimum basic allowances. 55

Sanchez served as President of the New Mexico Education Association for the 1934-1935 school year and also chaired a committee which recommended modifications in the authority of the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This committee suggested: granting power to the State Board of Education to appoint a Commissioner of Education, giving powers to the State Board of Education which both the constitution and legislature had allowed making the county superintendent an appointive executive role of the county boards of education, restructuring the county boards so that they would have five members elected by voters with overlapping terms like urban boards. They recommended that each school district receive a maintainence budget based on several revenue sources in keeping with previous budget needs. They wanted the state to assume a portion of transportation costs. 56

Sanchez acknowledged his election to the presidency of the state educational organization by pledging that he would continue to work for improved education. He pointed out that
his concerns included the plight of the rural school as well as attainment of more equitable financing for all schools. He wanted the state to guarantee each child a nine-month school year and assure each teacher that he would receive a decent standard wage. He asked that all teachers join him in supporting scientific budgeting procedures so that the educational dollar would buy maximum education.57

Most of the suggestions advocated by Sanchez and the education association failed to materialize because the school auditor, appointed by the governor, continued to make school board members feel like intruders when they tried to participate in their annual budget meetings. The state board had not been able to wrest financial control away from the budget auditor.58

Sanchez's political activities accelerated as he prepared new legislation for the coming session of the legislature. The question of distribution of funds remained a perennial problem, but Sanchez also prepared a budget for the Division of Information and Statistics hoping that the legislature would appropriate money for the agency. The grant from the General Education Board expired at the end of the 1934-1935 school year. Sanchez's plans failed, and political pressure accelerated. He resigned as director of the research agency on May 1, 1935. Sanchez noted that his failure to secure a legislative appropriation for the agency came from his unwillingness to bow to political forces within the state.
He believed that a number of leaders resented his active role in drafting educational legislation. The continuous program of educational agitation that lasted for a four-year period made a number of people angry.59

Sanchez perceived the political controversy correctly, according to Arthur Campa, anthropologist. He locked horns with Governor Seligman because the administration of the University of New Mexico, which the governor disliked, supported Sanchez and the research office. The school budget auditors, whom Sanchez opposed, were the governor's "henchmen," and Sanchez criticized them repeatedly. The educator maintained good relations with some state administrators, like Georgia Lusk, Superintendent of Public Instruction, but he had little patience with those who resisted improving opportunities for Spanish-speaking children. He received personal threats and secured a permit to carry a gun when he attended local budget meetings. Despite all the commotion that Sanchez's efforts generated during his years in administrative leadership in New Mexican education, the educator's effort served to alert the states' citizens that schools could be improved. Sanchez used political clout, not for personal benefit, but as a pressure tool to achieve results. He demonstrated a missionary zeal completely unique in the state's educational community.60

When Sanchez's presidential term ended, he reported that the state still had many unsolved problems. He deplored the
fact that political leaders continued to make unwise educational decisions. He accused these people of "manhandling school finance by their inept participation in management of educational institutions." He also stated that these leaders indulged in "spoils system" techniques to change teaching personnel in the schools. The educators also received criticism from the research chief for their use of political expediency instead of educational service. He considered this kind of behavior to be "social racketeering of the worst sort." This speech marked Sanchez's farewell address from the presidency of the state educational association as well as the end of his career as head of the research office.61

When Sanchez resigned his state position, he worked as a research associate for the Julius Rosenwald Fund from 1935 until 1937. He studied education in rural Mexico and in the southern part of the United States. Later, after he completed that assignment, he was chief technical consultant to the Ministry of Education in Venezuela from 1937 until 1938. He joined the faculty of the University of New Mexico in 1938 as a research associate and associate professor of education. He resigned that position in 1940.62

Sanchez accepted assignments from the Rosenwald Foundation because he had been unable to work out funding for a research project that he had submitted to J. F. Zimmerman, President of the University of New Mexico. Zimmerman wanted
the 28,000 dollar proposal to be funded by the General Education Board. The Foundation refused to make that commitment, and the University lacked the funds to support the proposal themselves.63

In 1938, Zimmerman wrote to Favrot again to ask the General Education Board to fund a study concerning living conditions in New Mexico. Sanchez would do the field work. Favrot replied that the scope of the proposal did not fit into the Foundation's current research. Moreover, the organization did not have an interest in funding any stop-gap measures for Sanchez, but they would finance projects if they would lead to a permanent assignment for the educator. Zimmerman had outlined a two-year proposal with no suggestions for Sanchez's career at the termination of this assignment.

It appeared from the correspondence that the General Education Board had more interest in Sanchez's career than it did in New Mexican educational questions.64 The University managed to secure funding from the Carnegie Corporation, and Sanchez did the field work that subsequently appeared in *Forgotten People*.

Sanchez's resignation from the state education department in 1935 did not end the educational controversy. School leaders continued to quarrel over the allocation of state funds. Sanchez observed the difficulties and eventually became an active participant when he reported that state leaders had misappropriated one million dollars of educational funds.
The *Albuquerque Journal* on December 1, 1938, reported Sanchez's charge. The former research chief also stated that as a result of this misapplication of schools funds, thirteen counties received a short allotment. On December 23, the newspaper stated that children in Rio Arriba county numbered among the specific groups penalized because of inadequate funding.65 The *Journal*, somewhat liberal, represented Albuquerque interests, and Sanchez had said that Bernalillo county, where Albuquerque was located, also suffered from this misapplication.66

H. R. Rodgers, State School Superintendent, bristled when Sanchez publicly broadcast his charge. The Administrator countered by stating that the university should pay attention to its own operation instead of interfering with the operation of the public schools. In early January the *Tribune* reported that since public school officials had failed to refute the charges, these accusations must stand. Following publication to Sanchez's statements, the Sandoval county board of education filed a writ of *mandamus* accusing the state board of failing to calculate accurately the number of classroom units for the 1938-1939 academic year. The Sandoval district asked the state board to make a proper computation including the equalization deficiency for each unit. The court sustained the writ and the state board complied with the order on February 4, 1939.67
After Sanchez opened the "hornet's nest," the State Board of Education appointed a fund commission to investigate further the fund allocation question. The Board promised that after the commission had submitted its report, it would distribute school funds in accordance with laws passed by the 1935 legislative session. The Board also stated that it would ask the legislature for financial relief because of the difficulty they had in administering the funds according to the already existing formula.68

Raymond Huff, Superintendent of Clayton public schools, prepared the legislature for his opposition to further implementation of the 1935 distribution plan, by submitting proposed changes to the legislative committee of the State Education Association. These changes included guaranteeing counties the continuance of the educational level they had already achieved over the past half century. He wanted to reward counties that improved their methods of property assessment, as well as raising general educational standards by equalizing educational costs among the counties. Huff also proposed that maintenance budgets be based on 1938-1939 school year needs, and that 3 per cent of collected sales taxes be placed in a reserve emergency fund. Huff's suggestions received opposition from J. P. Steiner, Superintendent in Portales, who charged the Clayton leaders with the inability to recognize the importance of considering transportation costs along with the virtues of encouraging local initiative in school financing matters.69
Sanchez's exposures challenged school leaders all over the state to continue to press for more funds. They raised their voices to complain about insufficient operating funds and inequitable distribution of available money. The eighteen richer counties led by Huff, who had also served as President of the State Board of Education, defended their position. Thirteen counties under the helm of John Milne, Superintendent of the Albuquerque schools and one of the state's "educational barons," represented the opposite camp. Sanchez complicated the issue further by declaring that lean northern counties under Albuquerque's jurisdiction, received a short count when the state distributed money. Sanchez pointed out that the basic intention of the distribution plan, properly administered, could serve poorer regions' educational needs. However, he reported that the state department had unethically distributed available money for the disproportionate benefit of certain school districts. Although both Clayton and Albuquerque had articulate spokesmen, neither was a rich community because the communities had no mining interests.

The former research chief played a subordinate role to the front page contests between Huff and Milne over the distribution of educational funds, but his challenge to Huff's administration of school funds aired the problem of underprivileged northern counties. Although Milne first believed that Sanchez supported Albuquerque's funding problems, Sanchez
actually had more concern for the problems of the northern counties which happened to be administered by Milne, rather than in the urban system itself. Incidentally, most of the Spanish-Americans lived in these northern counties. Each of the major school leaders cared most about his own region and Sanchez infuriated both of them.  

Sanchez wrote an article in the *New Mexico Business Review* in 1939, asserting that the 1935 Equalization law failed to have its purported ameliorative effect. He substantiated these charges by including tables to indicate errors in fund allocations. He explained that the law stated that prior to meeting equalization fund allowances, state disbursement officers had to first make several computations. Credit had to be taken for a 90 per cent collection of the five mill assessed valuation for each county, along with money apportioned from state, common school current funds, as well as credits against school funds from federal grants. The 1938-1939 equalization fund totaled $2,715,619 as an initial contribution. This money had to be apportioned by the State Treasurer following certification by both the State Budget Auditor and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Budgeting authorities had calculated that the equalization fund would amount to $3,800,000 and would result in a $1,084,381 surplus.  

Sanchez presented a table to illustrate actual distribution of surplus funds. He listed the surplus credits issued against maintenance budgets and charged that amounts failed
to conform to the results obtained if calculations had been legally made. He reported that the law required that the State Education Board had to compute classroom units for each system annually, according to the legal formula. According to the law, the State Treasurer had to give to the county treasurer a percentage equal to the county's deficiency. The Treasurer took these applied percentages from the surpluses in the equalization fund. Sanchez effectively illustrated the misapplication of the funds by showing that counties with the largest budgets were overcredited by the equalization fund, while counties already shortchanged because of fund manipulation had the least to spend.

This accentuation of inequalities is evidenced graphically when it is recognized that Lea County which was over-credited with the Equalization Fund monies, is budgeted in the amount of $2,974 per classroom unit—more than 3-1/2 times the amount budgeted for Rio Arriba County, a county that was under-credited in the amount of $10,000.

The research expert also prepared a charge to illustrate maintenance budgets for each classroom and another table to illustrate what maintenance budgets would have been if the law had been obeyed. He showed that funds which belonged to Bernalillo county and eleven other counties went, instead, to Colfax and Grant counties.

By 1941, even after the legislature had amended the 1935 Equalization Law, Sanchez still voiced suspicions concerning allocation inequities. He noted that attendance figures for the 1938-1939 school years remained fairly constant.
Bernalillo County had a 78 per cent average daily attendance, while the Albuquerque schools within the county approached 80 per cent. Colfax, Taos, and Grant counties reported an 81 per cent figure, while Lea showed a 78 per cent attendance average. These figures seemed to be within normal limits, but Union county on the other hand, reported a 94 per cent average attendance for 1936-1937 and 89 per cent for 1938-1939. The rest of the state averaged 77 per cent daily attendance. Clayton county’s attendance ranged from 96 per cent for 1936-1937 to 93 per cent for 1938-1939. Prior to passage of the Equalization Fund Law, in 1933, Clayton had reported an 83 per cent figure. Union county also had an increase in attendance figures following the passage of the funding measure. Sanchez concluded that at a minimum these data showed that someone had to do additional investigation, because Union county’s newer figures gave it a 10 per cent increase in funding.  

Sanchez also noted that both local superintendents and state educational officers erred in computing statistical data needed for proper implementation of equalization funds. Some counties failed to report vocational education reimbursements, while others padded credits to give them a greater share of the emergency fund. Still others had fictitious credits for delinquent taxes. He concluded that the state school finance administration obviously lacked efficiency, to say the least.
The educational expert worked in New Mexico at a time when the New Deal programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt attempted social engineering efforts to solve problems. Sanchez became inspired by these ideals and wanted his colleagues to consider education in social costs, rather than simply in monetary terms. He remarked that although computation of fund distributions might be the work of financial experts and statisticians, the impact of fund allocation affected cultural stability, personal, and community growth which concerned sociologists, political scientists, and community leaders. These educational goals included levels of education that state leaders deemed desirable. The government would then have to measure these needs to develop the machinery for implementation. Once planners identified goals, the state must then accept the burden of providing supplementary funding for poorer communities unable to reach state standards. School financing questions became inextricably linked with all questions affecting the general welfare.78

Although Sanchez wanted all children to receive a minimum foundations' program, he recognized the problem of equating all education just to dollar costs. He reasoned that if all children had similar abilities and exhibited homogeneity in measurable factors, then financial support might be the primary standard. Since each child was unique, Sanchez believed that school fund distribution had to be weighted to provide additional enrichment for culturally different children.
Sanchez concretized his social justice ideals by computing educational needs in hypothetical unit costs. If an ideal educational establishment had a total of 125 educational units, he believed that 21 units should be based on the literacy index, 50 units on the average daily attendance, 15 units on the population density index, 8 units on population enrollment figures, and 18 units on the child labor index. If 50 dollars represented cost for each unit, then 6,250 dollars was total cost for financing a minimum foundations' program. By using national standards of school support as a yardstick, the educator suggested that New Mexico could raise 5,000 dollars of the 6,250 dollar total, and the equalization fund would supply the difference. He proposed to establish a model that would set aside 1,050 dollars for 21 literacy units, 1,500 dollars for 50 average attendance units, 750 dollars for 15 population density units, and 400 dollars for 18 child labor units.

Sanchez believed that these suggested figures encompassed the breadth of social planning within an educational context. Literacy units included library services, adult education classes, and public forums. Average daily attendance computations figured a school year at 160 days. Calculations of population density considered transportation and visiting teachers' services. Attendance and child labor units took into consideration opportunity classes, attendance officers, and
counselors. Health units consisted of clinics and school and visiting nurses. Sanchez believed that well-intentioned administrators could implement these units to improve educational opportunities for all children, but he recognized that an idealistic program could also be misused by unethical administrators.81

Sanchez left New Mexico in 1940 to become a professor at the University of Texas in Austin. The controversies that he generated lasted long after his departure. J. F. Zimmerman commented that Sanchez had done an outstanding job in establishing the Division of Information and Statistics and deserved most of the credit for creating public awareness for reform legislation in educational funding. The college president suggested that once political heat had cooled, many leaders would be able to give Sanchez the recognition that he had earned.82 Zimmerman reflected the views of the university leadership, who supported Sanchez, but wished that he had generated less controversy in his reform pursuits. Years after the Sanchez equalization question had subsided, Dean S. P. Nanninga, Dean of the College of Education at the University, stated that he regretted that he had failed to back Sanchez properly during his battles for more equitable distribution of school funds. Sanchez made a substantial contribution to education in New Mexico.83 He stood as the first champion for the poorer regions of the state, largely populated by the Spanish-Americans, and he made leaders aware that all children should receive an equal chance.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TEXAS STORY

Texas, unlike New Mexico, never appeared to be the sleepy land of enchantment. Its geographic patterns offered early settlers more opportunities for economic development than did the arid New Mexican region. George I. Sanchez's later career, for a period of more than thirty years, involved dealing with socio-cultural factors in Texas which he perceived kept Spanish-speaking people from reaching their optimum economic and social development. Sanchez came to the university as a tenured Professor in History and Philosophy of Education in 1940. He would have preferred a comparable position at the University of New Mexico, but the administrators at the New Mexican school refused to offer him the same opportunity. He had aroused too much controversy with his attacks against the political powers concerning distribution of educational funds. Although the University of New Mexico faculty recognized that Sanchez had a great deal of ability, they, because of their own biases, seemed unwilling to give one of their "local boys" this recognition.\(^1\)

While Sanchez taught at the Texas institution and studied the economic and educational deprivation of the Spanish-speaking people, he realized that Texas' historical development differed so markedly from his native New Mexican culture that he would need to attempt different ways from those that he
had used in New Mexico to find the means of solving educational problems for this group. Sanchez's activities involved university teaching, membership, and leadership roles in Mexican-American activist organizations, political support for candidates sympathetic to needs of minorities, as well as expository writing designed to arouse Texans to the concerns of the Spanish-speaking. Sanchez used his knowledge of Texas history and culture to combat the institutionalized prejudice he found in educational and political practices in the state.

The educator soon learned that even though the name of Texas came from an Indian word meaning friend, the state no longer reflected Indian influences like those found in New Mexico. Early Spanish explorers, beginning with Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca in 1528, found many different Indian groups. They Christianized the passive ones and killed or attempted to push back the warlike tribes. By the seventeenth century the Spanish had established missions in the El Paso and Presidio regions of west Texas and six missions in east Texas and western Louisiana. San Antonio de Bexar, founded in 1718, became the most important settlement.²

After the signing of the 1763 Treaty of Paris, Spain controlled French Louisiana too, and leaders decided to tighten administrative reins by abandoning all missions in Texas except San Antonio and La Bahia. They pursued their Indian pacification program during the years that they
administered the Louisiana region. The Spanish also continued their policy of forbidding foreigners to migrate into their territory without permission, but the nation lacked enough military strength to enforce this ruling. The years following the signing of the Adams-Onis Treaty and subsequent Mexican independence brought gradual encroachment of unauthorized settlement into the area.

This American settlement stemmed from the initial contact made by Moses Austin, a Connecticut businessman, who had lived in Missouri when that territory belonged to Spain. He received permission to establish a Texas colony for 300 families but he died before the first colonists arrived. His son, Stephen F. Austin, implemented the grant by reestablishing land patent awards with the changing leadership of the independent Mexican government. He brought 272 settlers to the southern portion of the territory by 1824. Once they arrived, the settlers learned that lands had to be administered in keeping with governmental guidelines which meant that foreigners could not settle within two leagues of the coast or twenty leagues of the international boundary without special permission.

The Mexican government united Texas with the province of Coahuila and provided that the region would remain part of the larger state until population increases warranted creation of a separate state. New federal laws encouraged Catholic immigration and stipulated that settlers would
receive land from designated **empresarios** or leaders. By 1831, Austin had received permission to settle more than 5,000 people within the colonization grant.\

By today’s standards the area remained sparsely populated, but Mexican leaders became alarmed at Austin’s enterprising spirit and feared that the region would ultimately be American-dominated. In 1830, Mexico began to tighten its immigration policies. General Manuel Mier y Teran, a soldier who had lived in Texas, warned the Mexican government that Anglos outnumbered Mexicans in Nacogdoches in east Texas and had established an English-speaking school there. He commented that these settlers traveled with their political constitutions in their pockets and knew more about the functions of government than most Mexicans. Because of this warning, the government suspended immigration for a two-year period and attempted unsuccessfully to pass legislation barring slavery to discourage further American immigration.

Texas functioned as a department of Coahuila and had a chief Executive Officer who lived in Bexar. As a part of a larger province, Texans had one representative in the state legislature, but local government had more meaning for the citizenry. Because of different cultural values, Americans had many misunderstandings concerning the fulfillment of their mutual obligations, particularly with regard to the rules of Mexican jurisprudence. Cases were heard locally but were decided by an absentee officer. By 1834 changes in
Mexican laws enabled courts to hold jury trials for both civil and criminal cases, but settlers never completely understood Mexican concepts of justice.

The development of the Mexican anti-slavery policy also perplexed Americans. To appease Austin, the Mexican government interpreted its colonization law to allow slavery in Texas but prohibit slave trade. This law declared that slaves born in the territory would be freed when they became fourteen years old. The 1827 constitution recognized existing slavery, allowed slave importation for a six-month period, and freed children born of slaves. While these laws remained operative, the government legalized domestic slave trade and slave importation. In 1830, the government issued a decree recognizing existing slavery but banned both further slave importation and American immigration. In 1832, slavery was prohibited and peonage contracts had a ten year-limit.

Texas immigrants had to adjust to different religious values as well as business practices when they came to this region. The Catholic church remained the official religion, but little formal religion of any kind existed in the territory. A few Protestant churches were organized after 1832, but no one took religious questions seriously. Texans concentrated on farming, and people traded their crops for manufactured goods. Little money and banking facilities existed and the absence of cash did nothing to encourage trade. The government officially discouraged mercantile activities.
Americans in Texas expressed the same feelings of manifest destiny shared by their countrymen in the United States. In 1826, Hayden Edwards, an empresario, attempted to detach some Texas land into a separate Fredonia Republic, but Austin's militia joined the Mexican government to quell the revolt. In 1833, the liberal, General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, and his equally reform-minded Vice President Dr. Valentín Gomez Farias deposed the conservative Anastasio Bustamente. This governmental change did not mean that future policies would satisfy colonists. Shortly after the start of the new administration, the first clash occurred in Texas. Colonel John Davis Bradburn, a Kentuckyan employed by the Mexican army, assumed command of a customs' post to thwart smuggling activities in Anahuac on Galveston Bay. This new administration fought a Texas mob which included William B. Travis of future Alamo fame, as one of the participants. Texas fought Bradburn as personification of the Mexican government and forced him to abandon the post. Bowie then marched to Nagodoches, defeated the Mexican garrison there, and he forced the vanquished to verbalize support for Santa Anna before he permitted the Mexicans to return home. In 1832, Texans professed loyalty to Mexico but objected to the government's attempt to institute reform measures.  

Standard interpretations of Anglo migration into Texas prior to the Texas independence war generally gloss over the fact that cultural differences between native Spanish-speaking
people and migrating Americans presented different cultural and political values which didn't lend themselves to easy compromises. Rudolfo Acuña indicated from his angry bias that Hayden Edwards and Austin both revealed a disregard for those Mexican values that they were expected to accept under the terms of the land grants. Acuña observed that Anglo Americans became a privileged caste in Texas and continued to implement these ideas of privilege by flouting Mexican slavery restrictions, as well as disregarding the payment of customs' duties for imported merchandise.¹²

Ruth Lamb's interpretation of American settlement supported Acuña's views that Americans failed to have sufficient cause for revolution when the outbreak occurred. Lamb contended that American colonists evidenced unwillingness to adopt different cultural values, and they hastily drew up a Declaration of Causes, which later became the revolutionary cry. This document merely summarized existing deep-seated feelings of resentment. Lamb believed that Austin differed from many of his countrymen because he showed an abiding respect for the Iberian culture and a willingness to adapt himself to the values of his adopted land. He represented the voice of moderation in the shouts of discontent uttered by his fellow colonists.¹³

Lamb also contended that interaction between Texas colonists and Mexicans failed to be one of give and take. Mexicans feared Anglo presence and wondered why their government ever
granted permission to Americans to settle in their midst. Mexicans who supported Anglo settlement hoped that these new arrivals would establish a buffer zone between their sparse settlements and more hostile Indian tribes that roamed the region. As Americans poured into the area in increasing numbers, the government sent two of their important leaders to live among the Anglos. Mexican leaders did not believe Anglo token acceptance of Catholicism, and mounting Anglo feelings of racial antagonism toward Mexican residents gave the government additional cause for concern. Lamb cited Texas historian Eugene Barker who noted that racial matters did play a part in the independence crusade. Barker stated that Americans feared becoming an alien people, and they believed that their way of life, as well as their values, remained superior to those of the Mexicans. 

If it is true that so many Mexicans feared differences between Anglo values and their own, one might ask why they allowed Americans to enter the region at all. One explanation of the American buffer zone against the Indians has already been offered. Another explanation had to do with chaotic conditions in the Mexican government itself. Moses Austin received colonization permission from a government that was about to fall. That government admired principles of the French and American revolutions and hoped to transplant these values to their own country. This government failed and succeeding ones disliked American values. They ended up
honoring the Austin grant, but they had feelings of misgiving concerning American democracy. The word democracy had different meanings to the two cultural groups because of their contrasting value systems.

Texans had some grievances and they voiced them in keeping with their traditions. They showed an overt outbreak of displeasure which clashed with Mexican values. These cultural differences heightened feelings of suspicion and distrust between two groups. In addition, differences regarding legal values added fuel to the fire. Americans believed in English common law which held a man remained innocent until proved guilty, while Mexicans accepted Roman law which stated that a man was guilty until proved innocent. Slavery, another issue considered by Texans to be important, also differed markedly from Mexican labor values and provided another source of American discontent.15

Before the outbreak of the Texas War for Independence, Austin went to Mexico City and successfully secured some reforms, except an agreement by Mexico for Texas statehood. While he was there, he wrote an inappropriate letter to his countrymen advising them to continue their state governmental organization. This letter was intercepted by Mexican governmental agents and Austin was incarcerated by the Mexicans for a two-year period. During Austin's imprisonment Sam Houston, Tennessee pioneer friend of Andrew Jackson, assumed leadership of the minority interested in independence. He capitalized on Santa Anna's changing policies to mould public opinion
to move toward a break with Mexico. The Mexican leader knew that colonists traded chiefly with the United States and failed to pay customs' duties to the Mexican government. Santa Anna sent troops to enforce his country's trade policies, and Americans believed that they had to defend their rights militarily.16

A Texas convention endorsed the liberal Mexican constitution of 1824 and suggested independence as a last resort. They organized a provisional government and named Henry Smith as Governor, James W. Robinson as Lieutenant Governor, Sam Houston as head of the army, and Stephen F. Austin as agent to solicit aid from the American government. By 1836, delegates met in a constitutional convention, declared their independence on March 2, 1836, selected provisionally David G. Burnet as president and Lorenzo de Zavala as Vice-President.17

The Texans reveled in the victories of their short and glorious war. The fight climaxed with the famous Alamo victory by General Santa Anna, the execution of vanquished Texans after the Goliad conflict, and Houston's defeat of Santa Anna at San Jacinto during the siesta hour. When the San Jacinto battle ended, the defeated Santa Anna signed the Treaty of Velasco, which he later repudiated, withdrew his troops, and recognized Texas independence.18

The Republic of Texas survived from 1836 until 1845, and during its brief life had an endless struggle with problems of finance, Indian outbreaks, land sales, and diplomacy problems. Houston, as the first president, tried to
maintain good relations with the United States while he struggled to place the new nation on solid financial ground. General Mirabeau Bonaparte Lamar, the second president, moved the state capital to Austin, increased the size of the Texas Rangers, enlarged the navy to four ships, and fought the Indians. Lamar also weathered another conflict with Mexico and organized an invasion into New Mexican territory, which Texans claimed. Lamar wanted to annex that region so that Texas could profit from the Santa Fe trade and collect additional import duties needed to sustain the starving Republic. Lamar failed with both his ambitious foreign policy and his Indian defense plans. However, he did establish the rudiments of a public school system by setting public land aside in each county for schools, and he also provided for the endowment of two colleges.19

When Texans declared their independence from Mexico, they blamed Mexico for its failure to support actively establishment of public education. During the years of the Republic, legislators provided for public land sales in each county to be used for school funding. The 1840 Law set aside four leagues of land in each county for establishment of one academic school with the rest of the funds to be distributed equally among common schools of the district. This law never had the effect of giving public education an enthusiastic start. The Republic issued charters to seminaries, academies, colleges, and universities as private, and largely
unsuccessful, enterprises. The 1845 constitution set aside 10 percent of the state's annual revenue for support of free public schools. This document also established a policy of aiding people interested in furthering private and community educational efforts. Legislation passed during the Republic had little effect. By 1850, only 15 percent of the state's scholastics received any formal education.  

When Houston returned to power in 1841, he had many problems and education did not stand as one of his top priorities. He ordered retrenchment of state expenses to reduce financial problems, and he implemented the 1838 Homestead Act and solicited actively new European immigration into the region. This policy proved successful and hundreds of German families came to Texas, settled in south Texas, and established New Braunfels. By 1844, the leadership reins passed to Anson Jones, who served as the last president of the Republic. Texas joined the United States following passage of a joint Congressional resolution on March 1, 1845.  

When the United States annexed Texas, Mexico realized that their fears of American manifest destiny had been confirmed. War resulted and the United States emerged as the victor. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the war, and the United States' Senate ratified the document on March 10, 1848. The American government agreed to pay Mexico fifteen million dollars and assumed unpaid debts which American citizens had against Mexico. In return, the United States
received clear title to all areas which Texas had already claimed, as well as the remaining territory in the Southwest. New boundaries of the two nations included the Rio Grande river to the southern border of New Mexico, headwaters of the Gila river down to its confluence with the Colorado river, and across California to an area one league south of San Diego. Mexicans could relocate to Mexico if they preferred, but if they chose to remain in American territory, they had one year to decide if they wanted to become American citizens. If they opted for citizenship, they would enjoy both full citizenship rights and special privileges derived from their previous cultural and legal affiliations with Mexico.22

The original treaty draft included a comprehensive statement guaranteeing all pending and prior land titles, but the Senate refused to ratify the document in that form. The Mexican government objected to the manner in which the Senate chose to handle this agreement. To please the Mexicans, the United States drafted a protocol on May 26, 1848, which read as follows:

The American government by suppressing the Xth article of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo did not in any way intend to annul grants of land made by Mexico in the ceded territories. These grants . . . preserve the legal values which they may possess, and the grantees may cause their legitimate titles to be acknowledged before American tribunals.

Conformably to the law of the United States, legitimate titles to every description of property, personal and real, existing in the ceded territories, are those which are legitimate titles under Mexican
law of California and New Mexico up to the 13th of May, 1846, and in Texas up to the 2nd of March, 1836.23

Article X of the treaty guaranteed to Mexicans choosing to remain in the United States the rights of American citizens, including enjoyment of liberty and property. Many courts have interpreted this provision to mean that United States' law protected land and water rights of former Mexican nationals who continued to live in this country, as well as rights of others who obtained this property through lawful transfer from original owners.24 The record indicates, however, that some Mexican nationals who later became American citizens were unable to document their legal land claims to the satisfaction of American jurisprudence.

Few Mexican nationals relocated at the war's end, because they felt more comfortable where they had already lived for a long time, and they took little interest in daily political events. Geographic factors also persisted in isolating borderlands from more populous regions north and south of the border region. The desert characteristics of the borderlands, according to author Carey McWilliams, served to continue to tie residents to the cultural influences of Mexico, rather than bring them closer to the United States. Anglo-American values seemed less adaptable to the region, and this enabled Mexican values to persist. The Mexicans who lived in Texas when the Treaty of Gualalupe Hidalgo became law numbered about 5,000 people. The majority of them
were of mixed Spanish—Indian blood. They, along with numerous and troublesome Indian tribes, represented an alien cultural group. They symbolized the forgotten link in Anglo-Hispano southwestern relations. Resistance of Indian tribes from 1848 to 1887 protected these Iberian values because Americans considered Indians to be the greater worry. These borderland regions remained separated from both Mexico and the United States by both geographic factors and the Indian presence.25

During the years of the Texas Republic, Anglos settled north and east of the Nueces river, and Mexicans filled in the Nueces area. By 1850, the Mexican population reached 8,500. Early Anglo arrivals became large-scale cattle operators. The King ranch grew from original Mexican land grants in Kleberg county, but few other Anglos migrated to the region. Instead, the life style which developed there included a few large Tejano landowners who organized their communities in feudalistic fashion with peons tending their fields and herds. These peons, generally of Mexican-Indian ancestry, lived in a state of perpetual indebtedness that lasted until well into the twentieth century. Wealthy Tejanos perpetuated Spanish cultural traditions, sent their children to school in Mexico, and took little interest in Anglo politics. Anglo-American cattlemen modeled their lives after these neighbors and also became accepted as the ricos of the region.26
Some energetic Tejanos moved beyond the Nueces river and established themselves in fertile lands in order to farm and raise cattle. These settlers, once the Mexican War began, abandoned their farms and fled south of the Rio Grande. Texans claimed the unbranded cattle of the Tejanos for themselves and occupied deserted lands. Many of the original settlers who remained in the area during the war ended up working for Anglo cattlemen. These early Anglos settlers frequently married Mexican women and adopted the regional customs. In this area historians have noted a growth of a Mexicanized culture that embraced both middle and lower economic groups.27

Charles Stillman opened a trading center in 1846 in the present Brownsville area and became the prototype of the "robber baron," according to Acuña. Acuña charged that Stillman used unethical means to build a fortune. He erected a trading post on land that he had neither owned nor paid for. Court battles followed and Stillman ultimately won. Stillman's tactics had their counterpart in Richard King's adventures. King became a powerful cattle baron in Kleberg county and built his fortune by smuggling, cattle rustling, and appropriating Mexican land grants for two cents an acre. King showed his Confederate allegiance during the Civil War by selling supplies to rebel troops and using his ships to run the Union blockade.28

Americo Paredes, folklorist and student of Mexican corridos, or ballads, supports Acuña's view. Paredes asserted
that Anglo settlers possessed technical superiority in weaponry. They used both rifles and revolvers, while Mexicans depended upon ropes, knives, and rusty muskets. In 1835, it was illegal for Mexicans to carry guns, and they became the Anglos' victims unless they could out-maneuver them with superior horsemanship. Texans failed to trust Mexicans. Paredes noted that stories in the border region indicated that Texans believed Mexicans to be naturally cruel, cowardly, and treacherous. They also thought that stealing came naturally to Mexicans, and their degenerate behavior resulted from mixed blood. This mixed blood represented second-rate Spanish heritage blended with substandard Indians to produce an inferior people. Texans, according to Paredes, believed that they were superior, and the Mexicans recognized their superiority. The author commented that if the Texan had no equal elsewhere in the nation, he developed a special cultural representative by creating the Texas Rangers who epitomized Texas values.

Paredes' account of Ranger exploits from the Mexican viewpoint differed markedly from Anglo perceptions of law enforcement agents of the border region. Anglos viewed Texas Rangers as heroic men and credited them with maintaining peace in areas where restive Mexicans frequently defied the law. Paredes, on the other hand, stated that the Rio Grande valley Mexican residents viewed Rangers as
employees of the King Ranch. They believed that Rangers always carried a rusty gun. When they killed unarmed Mexicans, they reported that they had killed them in self-defense. Mexicans also believed that Rangers tried to catch a sleeping Mexican so that they could shoot him in the back. Mexican residents asserted, according to Paredes, that Rangers needed the support of the United States' army in order to fight.30

Obviously these contrasting interpretations of Texas history from Richardson's and traditional viewpoints to that expressed by Acuna, Lamb, Connor, McWilliams, and Paredes, require that readers give some credence to charges that cultural differences between Anglos and Mexicans in the Rio Grande valley stimulated tensions between these alien groups. It may be that the results of increasing tensions contributed to the growing poverty of Spanish-speaking Texans during the twentieth century.

During the post Mexican War years, Texans concerned themselves with economic survival and gave little thought to improving educational opportunities for the state's children. The legislature passed a law in 1854 which set aside two million dollars in 5 per cent indemnity bonds for a permanent school fund. This money represented part of the ten million dollar sum granted to the state as settlement of its boundary disputes. The state allowed these funds to be lent to railroad companies at 6 per cent interest, and legislators planned to use this income for teachers' salaries.
This 1854 law also permitted school patrons to hire an instructor from a college primary department to establish a common school. This measure placed the state in a position of subsidizing religious and private schools. Establishment of public education lagged. Counties inhabited by German immigrants had a few public schools, and people established a free public school in 1853 in San Antonio. Sectarian and Masonic groups founded some schools during the pre-Civil War years.31

Texans did not improve education further after they entered the Civil War in 1861. Southerners who were interested in expansion of the cotton kingdom welcomed Texas into the Confederacy, even though some well known leaders opposed secession. Most Mexicans who lived in the Rio Grande valley remained politically inactive during the war. Although a few prominent families with Spanish surnames actively supported the Confederacy, the majority viewed the was as a "gringo" affair and ignored it. Union officers tried to stimulate rebellion in the valley, but this failed to materialize. A few of the residents found the war to be so intolerable that they returned to Mexico.32

Texas history from 1861 until 1876 became part of the broader story of American history that unfolded with the Civil War, the defeat of the South and the era of Congressional Reconstruction. Progressive educational development belonged to the Reconstruction Era. Radical Reconstructionists set aside Texas' 1866 constitution which had educational
provisions resembling the 1854 school laws. In their 1869 document, they provided for a state superintendent, the organization of all counties into school districts, and free public education for all children from six until eighteen years of age. The new laws also laid down rules for compulsory school attendance and establishment of a four-month school year. The document reinstituted the permanent school fund and placed county school lands under state supervision. Schools had to be financed in the following ways: 25 per cent of all general revenues were to be set aside for support of schools; poll taxes were to be used to support education; local taxes were to be provided to finance a ten month school year. The new government instituted other radical educational policies which included provisions for Negro education and use of "northern" textbooks in Texas classrooms. These innovative programs ended with the demise of the Reconstruction regime.33

In 1876 at the end of the Reconstruction Era, Texans adopted a constitution which established separate schools for Caucasian and Negro students. The document also restricted use of permanent school funds, abolished the state superintendent's office, ended compulsory school attendance, and made the ages of eight until fourteen years the required period of schooling. Education was restricted further by limiting state support to a maximum of 25 per cent of the occupation and ad valorem taxes, and counties gained control
of their own public lands. The constitution reserved forty-five million acres of land to be used to support schools. Funds accumulated from land sales were to be invested in bonds, and income from these bonds became part of the education funds.34

By 1900, larger communities began to organize independent school districts, and 526 of these districts had been established by the beginning of the twentieth century. These urban areas established high schools which replaced academies of earlier years. Rural areas continued to support ungraded common schools which were staffed by poorly qualified teachers. The office of the State Superintendent, re-established in 1884, began to investigate ways of securing accreditation, and a state Board of Education was created to help schools adopt standard textbooks. Educators voiced concern regarding the poor quality of rural schools, and the state enacted a law in 1911 to establish county education boards. This law classified common schools according to the number of teachers employed, consolidated common school districts, created rural high schools, and made provision for free tuition. The state education board aided rural schools by giving them 50,000 dollars for new equipment. This new law paved the way for communities with sufficient resources to spend more money on education, but it failed to eliminate education inequities. By 1915, the legislature passed another measure which allocated one million dollars to both rural and
small town schools in order to help them improve their educational offerings still further.35

The 1915 Equilization Law, commonly called the Rural Aid Bill, tried to encourage rural communities to build new school facilities. At first only districts with as few as 200 students qualified for rural aid, but later districts with no more than 1,500 students qualified for assistance. As a result of this law, as well as the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act and the growing interest of local high schools in obtaining accreditation, the state education department grew larger to meet its increasing responsibilities.36

During the 1920's, Texans demonstrated a continuing interest in public education. Voters organized a Better Schools campaign to increase the state ad valorem tax so that state funds could be used to purchase textbooks. The legislature also responded to this increased concern and sponsored a commission to investigate conditions in the state's schools. They reported that a few rural school children attended high schools, but less than 1 per cent of common school districts had established four year high schools. The survey also revealed that one-third of all Caucasian students, and 70 per cent of all Negro students attended school fewer than 6 months a year. One-half of all Caucasian students, and 70 per cent of the Negroes lagged behind their contemporaries in other states.37
The educational survey revealed that Spanish-speaking children also exhibited serious educational problems. Many Mexicans began to migrate to this country following the 1910 Mexican revolution, and they remained here to find jobs in the unskilled labor market. They continued to speak Spanish, and their children had little interest in community public schools. The report recommended segregating these children for the first three grades because of their language handicap. The survey stated that school districts used this language-based recommendation to offer Mexican children a shorter school year, poorer buildings, and less competently trained teachers than Caucasian children received. The Commission reported that the purpose of the segregation of the Spanish-speaking child should be to help these children learn English because the state law required that classes be conducted in that language.

Most Mexicans lived in rural communities in the 1920's and 1930's, and they suffered educationally along with their Anglo contemporaries. In 1932, L. A. Woods was elected State Superintendent of Education. He believed that rural schools suffered at the expense of the rapidly growing independent school districts in the urban areas. The Superintendent strived to improve rural education by authorizing the development of curriculum objectives, multiple textbook adaptations, school must programs, and the Texas School of the Air radio programs. He also led the way for increased state appropriations for
rural education and reduction of the total number of common school districts. 39

Even though the administrator demonstrated a genuine concern for education, he parleyed that interest to include political activities which helped people who opposed his programs to organize to weaken the superintendent's political power bases. This organized opposition culminated with the 1949 passage of the Gilmer-Aiken bill which changed the elective office of the State Superintendent to an appointive Commissioner of Education. Additionally, the law required that members of the State Board of Education would be elected, rather than appointed as they had been before 1949. The new law also established a funding formula designed to enable all schools to offer their scholastics a minimum foundations' program. 40

Under this minimum foundations' program both state and local support would be used to guarantee that every school district would receive enough funding for an acceptable program. Larger school districts could supplement this offering, but districts had to use both local school taxes and state funds to finance education. The law created the Texas Education Agency which included the Commissioner of Education, the State Education Board, and the State Education Department. The new automatic funding of the state's schools freed the agency from former financial problems exacerbated by the legislature's biennial sessions. J. W. Edgar became the first permanent Commissioner under the new law. 41
The T. E. A. sponsored staff development programs and established teacher-certification criteria, but it failed initially in efforts to reorganize local school districts. The Texas Research League, a non-productive research organization, studied both the administration and objectives of the minimum foundations' program and pointed out that it contained several shortcomings, one being state-aid apportionment. The researchers recommended using average daily attendance figures rather than scholastic population to determine financial support. This last suggestion indicated that districts which had poor attendance figures would receive less aid. If Mexican-American families remained at home, rather than migrate, schools would receive more state funding.

Congressional passage of the N. D. E. A. law and the Elementary and Secondary School Acts brought more changes for the state educational system. Federal funds became available under the first act to provide for curriculum consultants for mathematics, science, and foreign languages. This law also funded library and media development for school districts, as well as allocating funds for regional conferences. The elementary and secondary school legislation, administered under Titles I, III, and V made massive funding available for reorganization of state services to local areas. Regional service centers, funded under this measure, provided both resource people and materials for local school districts.
New state-level planning services have been financed by this federal legislation. When the educational laws of the Lyndon B. Johnson administration went into effect, the Spanish-speaking child began to receive some additional consideration. The specific problems experienced by this group will be discussed in a later section of this study.

From 1910 until 1930, many Mexicans came to Texas to seek employment. Improved farming technology made it necessary for farmers to use many workers during the growing season, and Mexicans worked on the fruit and vegetable farms of the state. They also sought employment in newly-developing industries which utilized low paid workers. Some farmers tried to unionize during the 1920's, but these attempts failed.

Much misunderstanding exists regarding Texas' population. Texas is not an Anglo-Saxon state in terms of its ethnic population mix. The population includes Asiatics, Europeans, and Mexicans who call this region home. The Mexican population on the whole is a recently-arrived one. In 1850, fewer than 5,000 Mexicans lived in the Rio Grande valley counties of Starr, Cameron, and Webb. Many Mexicans came north of the Rio Grande after the Mexican war ended; and by 1900, the Mexican population reached 70,000 persons. It grew to over 250,000 during the 1920's. Most of the state's residents are first generations Mexicans. Texas' anti-Mexican attitudes increased during the 1920's and 1930's and reflected national xenophobia. The 1930 census listed Mexicans as a separate
population group and enumerators were instructed to include all persons in this class, except obviously Caucasian Spanish-speaking people. The census listed fewer than 4,000 Caucasian Mexican Texans, but the total population numbered 266,240.45

Mexican population declined by 40 per cent during the 1930's partially because of increased border patrol vigilance designed to deport illegal aliens. Prejudice that surfaced during this period caused historians to assume that expressed feelings of hatred had existed for a long time. Mexicans became sensitive to being called Mexicans, and they came to identify themselves as Latin Americans in the attempt to improve their own images. Anti-American attitudes in Mexico were stimulated by anti-Mexican attitudes in the United States. When the United States needed Mexican farm labor at the beginning of World War II, the Mexican government refused to allow braceros to work in Texas until 1952. Mexican officials delineated Texas contracts carefully, assuring American authorities that display of prejudice against Mexicans by Texans would cut off this labor source.46

Not only were aliens plagued by prejudice, but Texans of Mexican descent were tarred with the same brush. During the years between the two world wars, middle class Mexican-Americans organized the League of United Latin-American Citizens, called LULAC, to provide their group with educational and social outlets. The also used their organizational structure to fight discrimination. The Good Neighbor Commission, founded in 1943, also attempted to improve Anglo-Texan relations. By
1950, over forty communities in the state adopted an external policy of expressing friendship to the Mexican.\textsuperscript{47}

Since 1945, Mexican-Americans have resumed their fight to eradicate prejudice. Returning war veterans found themselves excluded from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and American Legion organizations, and they organized the American G.I. Forum to represent their interests. Founded by Hector Garcia, a Corpus Christi physician, the group has 20,000 members, they take a nonpartisan posture and actively support both social and political reform. The national spotlight turned on Texas discrimination policies during the postwar years in the Three Rivers case. The nation learned that a Mexican-American war veteran was denied burial in a Texas cemetery because burial grounds were restricted to members of the Caucasian race. The veteran had to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery instead.\textsuperscript{48}

"Operation Wetback," an attempt to remove illegal aliens from the border region became an active policy during the 1950's. The border patrol activities resembled the alien expulsions during the depression years but involved many more people, and massive repatriations had a negative effect on American-Mexican relations. Many people were deported who had lived in the country for a long time, but the border patrol implemented this policy under federal legislative guidelines. Mexican-American organizations supported measures to regulate immigration because these groups believed that if fewer people
entered the country illegally, then resident Mexican-Americans could improve their economic status.49

The history of the Mexican-American in Texas remained largely a tale of poverty, discrimination, and inadequate economic opportunities for members of this ethnic group. Scholars examining the plight of the Spanish-speaking reveal the usual sociological data; yet, they seldom report examples of cohesive efforts by Mexican-Americans to demand equal opportunities from the dominant Anglo group. Crystal City, county seat of Zavala county in south Texas, illustrated an example of how well-organized Mexican-Americans effectively used political pressure to wrest political control from the Anglo minority.

According to the 1960 census, over 80 per cent of Crystal City's residents were Mexican-American. Most of these people came here as stoop labor for the vegetable growing industry in the winter garden area of the state. Most Mexican-Americans were poor. As recently as 1950, the average Spanish-speaking resident had a little over one and one-half years of schooling and earned fewer than 2,000 dollars per year.50

The Del Monte plant was the major employer in the community. Although workers belonged to the Teamsters' union, they had not used their union strength to demand a political voice from the Anglo minority. In 1963, the Mexican-Americans, encouraged by a young activist organization called PASO, Political Association of Spanish Speaking Organizations,
successfully conducted a poll tax drive and fielded Spanish-speaking candidates for both the city and school board elections. Anglo community leaders tried to coerce the Mexican-Americans to withdraw from the contest, and they used threats of economic coercion as one means of intimidating the candidates.

The Mexican-Americans won the city elections with the help of the Teamsters' Union and PASO, but the Spanish-speaking candidates failed to win a seat on the school board. The victory of the Spanish-speaking majority, considered a major upset in local politics, seemed to indicate that city government would now have a different flavor.51

Anglos did not take their defeat gracefully. They used economic pressure to weaken the strength of the Mexican-American leaders. These Anglos formed an organization called CASAA, the Citizens' Association Serving All Americans, to thwart the efforts of the Teamsters' Union and PASO. The new organization included middle class Mexican-Americans, and the leadership asserted its opposition to outside interference in Crystal City political life. The new group became involved in the 1964 county elections. The county had a larger Anglo population than did the urban area of Crystal City. Rural Mexican-Americans were more economically dependent upon the beneficence of the Anglo population and these factors helped the new group meet with political success. PASO, weakened by controversy in the previous year's contests, won only two
offices, and forced candidates from CASAA into a runoff election for two other offices. Elections were held in May and June when many migrants had left the area making it easier for CASAA to win. Early victories by Mexican-American candidates had been facilitated by outside organized support, and these new winners did not know how to govern. Their lack of expertise and their susceptibility to pressure from the more affluent Anglo minority greatly weakened their political gains.52

The Mexican-Americans and Anglos learned to accommodate their differences in municipal government life, and the Spanish-speaking group has held a majority of city council seats since 1963. Mexican-Americans also made inroads in school board elections. The school faculties by 1969 reflected a 15 percent increase in Mexican-American teachers, but educational achievement among the Spanish-speaking indicated that this group failed to derive much benefit from community schools.

In 1967, a new young activist group, called MAYO, Mexican-American Youth Organization, organized community youth in Crystal City to protest against inequities found in the schools. Although this organization openly condemned the public schools, more and more Spanish-speaking children had been graduated from the high school in recent years. In 1951, only 9 percent of the entering first graders finished high school, but by 1958 the number had reached 17 percent. In 1950, the median years of schooling for Spanish-speaking scholastics was 1.8 years; and by 1960, the number increased to 2.3 years. The community
still had a dropout rate of more than 80 percent in 1968, and 87 percent of the student body was Mexican-American. Although schools had improved, Mexican-American students realized that the schools still failed to reflect their specialized needs. When the United States' Civil Rights Commission held hearings in Crystal City in 1970, they found that the Mexican-American experienced discrimination in areas of preschool testing, counseling, curriculum, and tracking. The textbooks and the attitudes of the teachers also exhibited Anglo ethnocentrism.53

Anglos willingly allowed Mexican-American students to have a limited number of leadership roles, but teachers and administrators worked to keep a majority of Anglos students in key positions. Contests involving selection of school cheerleaders and the homecoming queen served as rallying points of a revolt led by Jose Angel Gutierrez, leader of MAYO and native of Crystal City. Gutierrez organized community residents to present a list of demands to the school board members. He followed this action by helping students conduct a strike to protest against discrimination.

Parents supported the student boycott, and the strikers eventually won some concessions from the school board. Board members agreed to institute more bilingual and bicultural programs and to end the ethnic isolation of the Spanish-speaking child in the public schools. They also promised to allow student leaders to be elected by school-wide student elections.54
Gutierrez used his victory against the school board to launch the La Raza Unida party, and the group entered candidates in the 1970 spring school board and city elections. The new political force captured 55 percent of the school board vote and 60 percent of the city council votes. Party leaders also won victories in the nearby communities of Carrizo Springs and Cotulla.55

Under Gutierrez's leadership the education system underwent many rapid changes. The curriculum began to reflect the needs of the Mexican-American students, and more Mexican-American teachers joined the local schools. The community as a whole did not support the goals of the Spanish-speaking residents, and Anglo school board members offered resistance to Gutierrez's leadership. The young leader continued to pursue confrontation tactics to bring about the kinds of changes that the Mexican-American community wanted. Anglos registered their protests by withholding payment of school taxes and by registering their complaints with the Texas Education Agency. These parents wanted the state agency to revoke the accreditation of the community's schools, but the agency chose, instead, to send in teams of human relations' experts to help resolve some of the conflicts.56

The Crystal City "take-over" had been a unique experience in Texas politics. Other south Texas towns have large numbers of Spanish-speaking residents, but none had used political pressure to institute changes until the Mexican-Americans of
Crystal City paved the way. The new leadership had to deal with many problems, not the least of which has been the resistance of the more affluent Anglos. Mexican-American leadership has made mistakes and has aroused hostilities among many community residents. This kind of political clout demonstrated first by PASO and the Teamsters' Union, and subsequently by MAYO and La Raza Unida, illustrated that a well-organized pressure group can effectively change the status quo.

The example of political changes in Crystal City, along with efforts by the American G.I. Forum and LULAC began to make Mexican-Americans in Texas more aware of the means they could use to improve their lives. Sanchez did not identify with the Crystal City events, but he placed more of his efforts with other Mexican-American organizations. He devoted much time to testifying in court cases involving the segregation of the Spanish-speaking child. These aspects of Sanchez's career will be discussed in later chapters.
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CHAPTER VII

SOCIOCULTURAL MILIEU OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN IN TEXAS: 
ROLE OF LANGUAGE AND SELF-CONCEPT IN THE PERPETUATION 
OF THE "MEXICAN PROBLEM"

I am Joaquin 
lost in a world of confusion, 
caught up in the whirl of a gringo society, 
confused by the rules, 
scorned by the attitudes, 
suppressed by manipulation, 
and destroyed by modern society. 
My fathers 
have lost the economic battle 
and won 
the struggle for cultural survival.¹

Sanchez believed that the Spanish-speaking residents of 
the Southwest had complex cultural and historical antecedents. 
Although Anglos referred to all of them as "Mexicans," only a 
small number were citizens of that nation. Most of the Mexi-
cans used Spanish as their mother tongue, but this Spanish 
varied so markedly in quality and quantity that group members 
failed to display homogeneous language characteristics. 
Sanchez explained that cultural differences among Spanish-
speaking people indicated their heterogeneity.²

When the educator lived in New Mexico and worked in that 
state's education department, he had learned that Hispanics 
generally exhibited a lower achievement level and a greater
degree of overagedness than did Anglos in the public schools. He believed that inadequate educational funding in areas of Spanish-speaking population concentration contributed to the bilingual child's poor educational achievement. Sanchez's writings, both from political and educational viewpoints, indicated that the Spanish-speaking child could not achieve on a comparable level with an English-speaking one until he had the same educational opportunities. Sanchez insisted that children had to be given the same learning experiences before they took the same standardized tests.\(^3\)

Sanchez believed in the survival of diverse cultures and maintained that cultural pluralism in fact if not in practice, gave democracy its basic inspiration. The educator explained that early Spanish-speaking arrivals differed culturally among themselves. Acculturation of Tejanos, later called Mexicans, followed a haphazard route once Texas joined the United States. Spanish-speaking residents, citizens as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, remained culturally isolated and unassimilated, Sanchez stated that "cultural indigestion" flourished in the region whose growth had been stimulated by a continuous flow of immigrants.\(^4\)

Noting that both world wars served to hasten acculturation processes, the critic insisted that neither the effects of war nor the economic problems of the 1930's
generated sufficiently powerful acculturative propellents to eradicate bicultural problems. Texas-Mexicans suffered the most severe economic and social deprivation of any Spanish-speaking group living in the entire Southwest. Additionally, Spanish-speaking Texas lacked sufficient political leadership to prevent Anglos from flagrantly ignoring their civil rights. Sanchez charged that the suppression of civil rights accompanied the Mexican-Americans' poor economic opportunities. "In a manner of speaking, Texas had become the 'horrid example' in the acculturation of Spanish-speaking people." The educator pointed out that in more recent years, state leaders began to become aware of this Spanish-speaking population, but the continuous flow of Mexicans into the region made leaders believe that the problem defied solution. Essentially, the Mexican-American problem manifested itself as one of unaccepted and unresolved biculturalism.  

Manuel P. Servin, Mexican-American historian, observed that the Mexican-American became an immigrant when North Americans migrated into the region. The Mexican was the poor settler on his own soil, and he later became the unassimilable foreigner. In Texas, negative attitudes towards the group increased after the Texas War for Independence and the Mexican War. Servín stated that the few Mexicans who "passed themselves off" as Spanish demonstrated the existence of a small aristocracy which provided an
achievement model for the poorer settler. The author charged that by 1930 Texas, with the largest Spanish-speaking population, enjoyed the reputation of being the most bigoted state regarding their treatment of this group. Spanish-speaking Mexicans who arrived in Texas after the end of the Second World War were despised or ignored by those who considered themselves to be of pure Spanish lineage.7

As early as 1920, authors who used the social-work frame of reference documented the story of Mexican immigration as the "Mexican problem." This data, gathered and classified according to social work techniques, alluded to the weaknesses and inadequacies of the Mexican character. Scholars who used these research methods seemed more interested in consequences rather than causes. Negativistic attitudes also captured later scholars' interest. This method of study had drawbacks because this minority differed from most other immigrant groups since they became a minority by conquest. In this sense, they compared more easily with the acculturation question of the French-Canadians of Quebec. The Mexican-American and the French-Canadian shared similar concerns for cultural survival, and the spatial relationship of the Southwest to Mexico reinforced the Mexicans' desires to retain their cultural roots. In addition, the area witnessed a tri-cultural battle among Indians, Anglos, and Mexicans. Indians
were conquered and hated by Anglos; Mexicans were ethnically related to Indians and were linked to Indians by race conscious Anglos; Mexicans were considered to be racially distinctive because of their mixed ancestry.

As long as Anglos continued to view the Mexican-American as a problem, they had to be able to analyze this concern on several levels. The Spanish-speaking population included native Americans, as well as legal and illegal aliens. The immigrants' widespread problems of illiteracy increased his acculturation difficulties. Anglos tended to group together all Spanish-speaking native born and immigrant peoples, and this has resulted in increased discrimination towards United States' citizens of Mexican descent. Although most Spanish-speaking groups acknowledge feelings of la raza as a cultural bond uniting them, the more acculturated Mexican-American incorporated material aspects of American civilization into his own life experience, while he tenaciously re-retained values that tied him culturally to the Mexican immigrant.

When studies of Mexican-Americans were made and generalizations offered which are supposed to apply to an entire ethnic groups, they generally characterize only poor Mexican-Americans. Edward Casaventes, a psychologist who served as Deputy Chief for Mexican-American Studies for the United States' Commission on Civil Rights, asserted
that characteristics such as anti-intellectualism, preference for close family groups instead of broader-based social relationships, demonstration of machismo, tendency to settle arguments with physical force, extremely fatalistic attitudes and an inability to postpone gratification apply generally to poor people and cross ethnic lines. The psychologist stated that characteristics which many Mexican-Americans do share include: their forefathers came from Mexico or Spain; they are probably Roman Catholic; they speak Spanish, some with a noticeable accent; they possess dark skin which gives them a high degree of visibility. Casaventos insisted that poverty rather than ethnicity prevented Mexican-Americans from receiving their share of the American dream. Prejudice remained the effective deterrent preventing them from demonstrating upward mobility.  

Sanchez believed that life in this country received its basic dynamic force from the many cultural backgrounds found among the populace. People, representing these different ethnic strains and contributing to diversities in American life, presented a stimulating challenge to national institutions concerned with over-all cultural growth and development. Additionally, Sanchez noted that the flavor of the Southwest with its geographic proximity to Central and South America exhibited cultural influences of architecture and language which indicated the actual
existence of several cultures in the region. The disproportionate share of bilingual residents in some southwestern communities offered opportunities for the regional population to incorporate bicultural attitudes and values among all area residents. This cultural variety had not diminished with the passage of time. Sanchez noted that despite similar historical backgrounds common to many Spanish-speaking persons in the region, the immigrant and resident represented all aspects of the educational and economic spectrum.\(^{11}\)

Sanchez criticized usage of the term "Mexican" to refer to bilingual residents. Only a small number of these people represented Mexican immigrants and their assimilation and acculturation demonstrated cultural contacts and cultural conflicts.\(^{12}\) The educator believed that American history included many examples of successful acculturation of some ethnic groups into American life, but he stated that practices of ostracism and segregation have isolated other persons considered to be less desirable by the dominant group.\(^{13}\)

To illustrate his dislike of ostracism practices, Sanchez criticized the use of the umbrella term "Indian" to apply indiscriminately to all Indian cultures. He explained that these people possessed different cultural heritages and lifestyles, but the dominant group considered them to be one people and legislated for them as
if they were all alike. Similarly, he noted that others such as Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, southern hillbillies, and poor whites were classified and ostracized without first attempting to understand their cultural diversities. When Anglos insisted upon categorizing minorities, they reduced acculturation opportunities by minimizing their contacts with the dominant group.  

Ralph L. Beals, professor of anthropology at the University of California at Los Angeles, used a scientific reference frame when he explained that when the anthropologist examined cultures, he obtained an imperfect definition at best. Nevertheless, the scientist showed concern for types of human behavior that are learned as a result of a person's membership in a particular social group. These cultural characteristics may exhibit themselves as unconscious standards. The culture of any group tends to have both a similarity of structure, as well as variations within that structure. The scholar explained that large cultures have many inter-related patterns of subcultures, and stable cultures integrate these subcultures within mainstreams of their cultural patterns.

Using Beal's analysis of culture, the researcher learned that language stands as one of the unique characteristics that continues to separate the Mexican-American from the Anglo. According to the 1970 census tracts, Texas had a total population of 11,195,431 persons which
included 2,159,671 people of Spanish surname or language, a category used by the Census Bureau to identify this ethnic group. A total of 1,840,214 people indicated that they had been born in this country and 1,276,337 reported that they also had native-born parents. Foreign-born residents numbered 219,457 and those of mixed or foreign ancestry numbered 563,877. Since fewer than one-quarter of a million identifiable Spanish-language residents were born outside the United States, it is significant that 1,581,291 native-born residents used Spanish as their primary language, while 212,167 of the foreign-born also relied upon Spanish as their primary communications' medium.\(^{16}\)

The Spanish-speaking population of Texas included 13.4 per cent of the 1950 census, 14.8 per cent of the 1960 census,\(^{17}\) and a little over 18 per cent of the State's 1970 census. Despite scholars' continuous over-generalizing of Mexican-American culture to make it appear that all these people shared similar values and attitudes, it seemed that the presence of the vernacular as the primary communications' medium served as a reasonable group characterization. Scholars who have spent a great deal of time examining Mexican-American life styles in the barrio or the rural areas frequently draw too-broadly based generalizations from these observations. Urban studies of Mexican-Americans in Los Angeles and San Antonio
showed that Mexican-American values fall within the general range of American values in such critical areas as family, social class, and neighborhood preferences. Leo Grebler, sociologist, pointed out, "We found quite a few Mexican-Americans to be 'typical American' in all but a few areas of special knowledge or opinion, and not many who could be said to have a distinctive culture." The study noted that despite the failure of the culture to represent an integrated whole, the use of the Spanish language has been the most persistent of all foreign languages spoken in the nation. Over one-half of the Los Angeles and San Antonio samples indicated that they were bilingual, while only 1 per cent of the Los Angeles sample and 4 per cent of the San Antonio respondents indicated that they failed to converse comfortably in either language. This small number unable to use either language negated the frequent charge that Mexican-Americans could not speak either Spanish or English.

The study also reported that most respondents felt more comfortable speaking Spanish rather than English. Grebler stated that most respondents at all income levels had some fluency in the vernacular. Language competency varied by income levels within neighborhoods. Upper income Mexican-Americans had less trouble with English than their less affluent neighbors. Spanish was more frequently spoken by poorer Mexican-Americans who lived
in the barrios, with a larger percentage of poorer urban dwellers using the vernacular to talk with their children. These sociologists reported a high negative correlation of -.81 of the proportion living in a neighborhood that spoke Spanish with their children and the proportion speaking English. This means that neighborhoods which had a higher percentage of residents who felt isolated from the dominant culture also had a greater number of residents using the vernacular. When the Mexican-American felt less isolated, his use of Spanish decreased, and his oral English increased.\textsuperscript{20}

Some communities immediately north of the Mexican border have a 70 to 90 per cent bilingual population. Leaders in those areas frequently failed to view this language facility as a cultural asset, considering it to be a handicap instead.\textsuperscript{21} Large numbers of bilinguals also live in other southwestern areas further removed from the border to the extent that as recently as forty years ago not more than 2 or 3 per cent of the Spanish-speaking Texans used English as their home language. In the 1930's, the illiteracy rate in countries with large numbers of Spanish-speaking residents reached 25 per cent.\textsuperscript{22}

Because the evidence indicated that Mexican-Americans still used Spanish as their home language, Ellwyn R. Stoddard, sociologist, asserted that if one viewed language
as a medium of exchange as well as a repository of cultural values, this might explain why this group preferred the vernacular. Stoddard asserted that use of language promoted group identity. When complex language functions become absorbed under the umbrella heading of "communication" by Anglos, this group has failed to understand the minority's reluctance to acquire an alien culture. Anglos have already developed three patterns for dealing with this foreign language group. Cultural integration served as the first method. This view, considered ethnocentric by the sociologist, held that non-English culture had little to contribute to American culture. The cultural pluralism model, the second pattern, considered language and culture by norms of more than one group. This view maintained that foreign cultures had a viable place in society. The third view, the cultural segregation pattern, has been used by society's dominant group to isolate the foreign language child, and it is now used by minority activists to isolate themselves in order to prevent their cultural destruction.23

Stoddard stated that older Mexican-Americans felt that use of good English symbolized good citizenship, but younger people rejected English to demonstrate their refusal to lose their cultural identity in order to become Anglicized. He charged that the Chicano's use of Spanish has become symbolic of his resentment towards Anglos.
Unless school officials are taught the difference between English and Spanish language functions (i.e. communication, cultural identity) within the educational milieu, crash programs in bilingual education and remedial English programs will merely accentuate rather than ameliorate present bicultural problems in the Southwest. This viewpoint is largely substantiated by Julian Nava, historian, who charged that from their earliest school experience, Spanish-speaking children's confrontation with English produced deep and lasting impressions that are often destructive. Some children actually experience emotional shock when they are exposed to the foreign language and these reactions instill within the Spanish-speaking child's psyche negative feelings of failure.

Sanchez also believed that Spanish-speaking children, like all other children, required teachers who could respond properly to their educational needs. He pointed out that Texas contained one-half of the total Mexican-American population in the Southwest and this population was concentrated in the counties closest to the Rio Grande river as well as in the south and central portions of the state. Because of this population distribution, residents should become aware of these peoples' needs. This Spanish-speaking group failed to exhibit homogeneity in economic or social status, education, cultural background, or degrees of Spanish fluency. Sanchez remarked that these people exhibited as much cultural variety as any other population sample found anywhere in the nation.
The educator explained that teachers serving in communities with many Spanish-speaking residents had to realize that these children possessed a wide range of individual differences, like any other randomly selected group. He asserted that the problems of teaching this minority group were the same as teaching any other group of scholastics. Bright, mediocre, and dull children came from Spanish-speaking homes and they were able to learn with the same ease or difficulty as any other children. Because their cultural backgrounds and socio-economic statuses frequently contrasted with non-Spanish speaking community residents, they appeared to be different. In actuality, they differed little from any other children in a comparable socio-economic group. Sanchez noted that the low wages received by Mexican-American families made the other poverty statistics, such as poor health, inadequate housing, and poor education follow as a matter of course.

The author also noted that the unfair treatment experienced by the Spanish-speaking children in the public schools didn't help them to solve their problems. He charged that it appeared impossible to prepare children for life in a democratic society with an educational system couched in a concentration camp regime that included segregation of these children. Principles of American education became corrupted with the use of the
segregated school. The educator charged that this type of school reinforced the economic caste system which had already been initiated by the poverty level wages paid to the Spanish-speaking wage earner.27

The educator explained that often public school administrators confused the Spanish-speaking child's language problem with the total galaxy of the group's socio-economic difficulties. The children's use of Spanish complicated but didn't create their educational difficulties. Linguistics affected the methodology and instructional materials used in the school, but it did not affect the school's basic educational goals. Therefore, when school systems segregated these children because of language problems, and then attempted to handle all curricular and language needs within these segregated settings, the children received an inadequate education.28 Sanchez realized that a child might need to receive special attention at the beginning of his school experience, but he feared that administrators would continue to use segregation as the tool to perpetuate the Spanish-speaking child's educational deprivation, and Sanchez insisted that these children needed integrated education if they were to receive equal educational opportunities.29

Language development, according to Sanchez, is, "Experience in experiencing and in giving common symbols
to it-words, gestures, demeanor, and so on." Sanchez observed that teachers became confused by the existence of a foreign language handicap and failed to see that a lack in communications' ability did not become synonymous with a lack of conceptualization skills. This occurred because educators failed to distinguish successfully the concepts the child developed as a result of his experiences and the words which indicated that he could articulate these concepts. Learning a language became a question of degree and this development proceeded through four distinctive phases. First, the child learned to understand oral language. Then, he used that language in speech. Next, he learned to understand written language and last, he learned to produce written language. Speech and reading development could progress together once reading began. Herschel T. Manuel asserted that Spanish could be an important instructional medium for initial teaching.

Although the language problem continued to baffle educators, Vera P. John and Vivian M. Horner explained that language study programs for Mexican-Americans were meaningless unless scholars realized first that they were attempting to teach a conquered people. The Mexican-Americans' attachment to language harkened back to past days of independence and it represented for them a hope for a future of self-determination. If language usage
stayed intrinsically tied to the child's self concept, then it might be said that psychocultural reasons represented an important factor in the Spanish-speaking child's willingness to learn both another language and another culture. If this child felt that his knowledge of Spanish illustrated an asset rather than a hindrance, he would be more inclined to develop comfortable relationships with non-Spanish speakers. Instead, when the child confronted a lack of understanding, disinterest, or even prejudice, he might believe that the outside world rejected him.  

The non-English speaking child, like all other children, drew meanings from his own environment. This child could sense, even if he could not verbalize, how the alien world regarded him. He could grasp cultural conflicts faster than the child from the dominant social group. The non-English speaking child, like all other children, learned his home language from his intimate family group. His self-concept might influence his ability to learn another language.  

Sanchez wanted the non-English speaking child to be treated like all other children so that the child could become a part of the larger society. Richard Rodriguez questioned whether repression of a foreign language might also influence a child's self-concept. Rodriguez reported in an article in the Saturday Review that he had barely
spoken English until he was nine years old. He attended an elementary school where all children spoke English and the nuns in charge of the school asked his parents to speak to him only in English. His parents complied and from that time on they always spoke to him in broken English. Rodriguez reported that his memory of Spanish remained a cultural vestige of the culture that he had deserted. While he studied in England on a Fulbright scholarship, he realized that he suffered an identity crisis. He knew that educational leaders sought his expertise as the representative of the culture into which he had been born but had ceased to understand. He experienced guilt feelings when he was labeled a Chicano. Rodriguez concluded, "Likewise, because of my sense of cultural loss, I may be able to identify more readily than another the ways in which language has meaning simply as sound and what the printed word can and cannot give us." 36

While Rodriguez's articulations of his sense of despair may seem to be an unrealistic exaggeration of the concern for language which many Spanish-speaking people obviously feel, the fact that this group has persisted in its use of their vernacular makes it reasonable to question how peoples' personalities are affected by the link of language and self-concept. The acculturation of the Mexican-American in Texas appeared to be an
interweaving of psychocultural concerns of language and culture. Grebler believed that when the Mexican-American continued to speak Spanish, he did this to preserve not only his inherited linguistic ties but also his cultural ones. Through verbal expression he communicated personalization of relationships and his total sense of self. He placed much value on life's musical rhythms and the importance of inner freedom. Grebler asserted that, "If values are worth preserving, we can best preserve them in those persons for whom they are native, persons from a background which for centuries has been a matrix for these values."^37

If Mexican-Americans exhibited a low acculturation level in both the educational and political spheres of life, this increased their general feelings of alienation. Conversely, their alienation feelings diminished as their acculturation rate increased. When the Mexican-American is both primarily and positively acculturated towards his family relationships, his feelings of powerlessness tended to increase. When a child felt powerless, he believed that he remained unable, through his own efforts, to secure rewards in an educational setting. "... As teachers of Spanish-American students increased their expectation for middle class behavior there was an increase in the students of feelings of general alienation from school."^38

These kinds of conflicts which the child experienced as he
tried to deal with the non-Spanish world could make him more dependent upon the culture of his family and less willing to try to understand the mysteries of the alien world.

As important as cultural values seem to be in the life-styles of all peoples, scholars have not been able to isolate cultural beliefs with the same precision that scientists can deal with quantifiable data in the laboratories. Joan W. Moore reported that poor Mexican-Americans remained more traditional in their cultural patterns than poor Anglos and tended to retain rural village patterns even after they moved to urban areas. This, according to Moore, might imply that children from poor Mexican-American families became more easily discouraged as they confronted the educational process. **La raza** feelings have accelerated among younger members of the group. The younger people may feel more comfortable with Anglo associations than their parents did but they still retain beliefs in their ethnicity.\(^{39}\)

Concepts of ethnicity surface in many ways, one of which is the kind of stereotypes held by the minority group regarding the dominant group. Ozzie Simmon's study of Anglo and Mexican-American values in a community near the Mexican border which he labeled "Border City" reported that the dynamism of these relationships indicated
that Anglos demonstrated dualism regarding their beliefs concerning the minority group. On the one hand, Anglos conceded that the American creed recognized the individual's inherent importance and his complete acceptance by the total society, while they also believed in the Mexican-American's inferiority. Anglos' beliefs in essential inferiority of all members of this ethnic group allowed them to continue to offer Mexican-Americans the community's lowest status jobs. The dominant group maintained that Mexicans appeared dirty, subject to drunkenness and criminality, and usually exhibited low moral values. Since Anglos had determined that the Mexican-American had failed to meet the standard upon which equality was based, they felt no obligation to accord these people equal treatment.

Border City Mexican-Americans also held the kind of attitudes toward Anglos which reinforced their beliefs of unfair treatments. In part, perceptions of middle class Mexican-Americans were generally influenced by their subordinate social status. They believed that they had to internalize some Anglo values to be accorded middle class status, although they sometimes questioned whether acquisition of these values could be worth the price of adopting the American culture. Upwardly mobile Mexican-Americans' acknowledged that it remained important for them to speak unaccented English, but they insisted on retaining their la raza beliefs as protective
devices against their own inferiority feelings. They limited their favorable identification with Anglo values to traits of ambition and industriousness, but they criticized Anglos for their coldness, exploitativeness, and materialism. Simmons explained that when he did his research in the border community, no research had yet been attempted to correlate stereotypes held by specific ethnic groups and their resultant intergroup behavior. The author reported that even though it was not possible to determine if a relationship existed among these factors, it seemed reasonable to note that separatism essentially characterized patterns of contact between divergent community groups.  

Simmons noted that some Mexican-Americans adopted Anglo materialistic values but refused to accept Anglo time concept values and interpersonal relationship patterns. As a means of defending their selective acculturation, Mexican-Americans concluded that both groups exhibited major inconsistencies in the beliefs that would receive equal treatment when the adopted Anglo values conflicted with the belief that all persons were entitled to equality. Mexican-American values also contained inconsistencies since their own inferiority feelings contributed to their negative views of Anglos. 
Research has shown that Mexican-American's self-concept is harmed from contact with the dominant group. Scholars have attempted to learn whether psychotic injury revealed itself in the kinds of stereotypes regarding Anglos held by both native-born Mexican-Americans and foreign-born residents. Anthony Gary Dworkin indicated that those who had been born outside the country held significantly more favorable stereotypes and self-images toward Anglos than did the native-born. Dworkin hypothesized that members of an ethnic group who had experienced a longer period of contact with Anglos also had more opportunities to develop negative stereotypes regarding their feelings towards this group.43

Mexican-Americans' distrustful feelings toward Anglos also existed among both migratory and ex-migratory farm workers who stated that they had no Anglo friends, and their limited contact with Anglos reinforced their perceptions that this group discriminated against them. Horacio Ulibarri stated that in Texas the stream of immigration continued so that new arrivals helped to perpetuate familiar stereotypes accorded this minority group, even though some group members demonstrate both horizontal and vertical mobility.44

Earlier analyses of self-concept and personality of this minority group by Sister Frances Jerome Woods revealed a blending of Spanish values regarding individualism
with Indian beliefs concerning communal life style. These contrasting views, according to Woods, aroused conflicts within the Mexican-American’s psyche. The author examined patterns of ethnic leadership in San Antonio, and she pointed out that some members of this group remained completely unaware of any social obligations towards poorer Mexican-Americans in their community. Other middle class people openly expressed resentment toward their countrymen who charged Anglos with discrimination. These upwardly mobile Mexican-Americans asserted that only the poor believed that they had suffered discrimination from the dominant group. The author admitted that the Mexican-American had difficulty organizing group members for a cohesive pattern of social and political action so that ultimately and reluctantly they adopted group process as a means of improving opportunities for all ethnic members. Some of Woods’ findings differed markedly from those discussed by Simmons and Dworkin.

If prejudice could be considered the obstacle sensed by the Mexican-American as blocking his chances for upward mobility, scholars questioned when young children first became aware of differences among people. Researchers tested a group of four and five year olds who received different colored dolls to play with, and they reported that children preferred to group dolls first by size
and sex before categorizing them by color. When the children began to discriminate between "good" and "bad" dolls, they simultaneously made color judgments. They perceived white dolls as "good" and dark dolls as "bad." After the child completed some school experiences, they tended to identify with the white doll, and boys perceived these dolls as being larger than the darker ones. Because young children handle concrete objects before they handle ideas, it appeared that when children associated darkness with a less favorable trait, this might indicate that even preschoolers had already internalized the prejudice syndrome.  

When scholars examine Mexican-Americans' self-concepts, they examine core values representative of the group and relate these to the total American culture. This culture considers beliefs in democracy to be an essential tenet of its culture complexes. Sanchez noted that democracy remained a process for action, not merely a set of precepts. He charged that "Democracy is a dynamic method of human relationships which motivates and activates individual and social behavior within an altruistic scheme of human values." Sanchez also noted pursuit of democratic principles indicated a course of action to be followed through the practice of the codes of behavior indicated in both the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.
The educator explained that democracy called for, "... the active expression of the principles of our way of life in the daily behavior of each citizen. We cannot let democracy become a mystical cult -- and expect it to live. Democracy is vitalized in action -- and only in action can it survive."  

Sanchez, ever mindful of the problems of the Mexican-American, also pointed out that democracy was not a "closed corporation." He illustrated this assertion by explaining that all ethnic groups could claim their places in society. He charged that people were not born Democrats, Nazis, or Communists, but they learned these modes of behavior in the course of their daily lives. "They are educated, trained, browbeaten or neglected into it. Insofar as their social ideologies and behavior are concerned, people are the products of their upbringing of their experiences."  

Sanchez pointed out that the existence of democracy implied an open society, while Nathan Murillo reported that traditional interpretations of Mexican-Americans failed to acknowledge that this minority functioned either as a participant in history or as an initiator of the historical process. Murillo believed that if one observed the Mexican-American family, he would see a different orientation or style that seemed both more closely defined and adhered to than it did in Anglo families. Because of these differences, the Chicano child experienced
conflicts between the values he learned at home and those taught him at school. At home, he was accustomed to an authoritative structure which contrasted from democratic ideals taught in school. The educational socialization of this child tended to break down family unity.49

Murillo reported that the Chicano felt frustrated when he tried to communicate his thoughts to an Anglo. He might cringe in fear because he perceived that his limited language ability would cause him embarrassment and make him subject to personal ridicule. These same feelings of inadequacy were shared also by the non-Spanish speaking Chicano who felt that he was expected to speak Spanish, yet he couldn't do so. The comments made by Richard Rodriguez support Murillo's position. Sanchez believed that language development was experience in experiencing, and a child needed exposure to language in a non-threatening setting in order for him to learn both his vernacular and a second language.

Murillo believed that the Chicano had a fragile and easily bruised self-concept. Sometimes Chicanos who verbalized this kind of fear may have additional psychological problems too. This fear related to language usage and cultural identity and received daily reinforcement from outside-world encounters. Murillo illustrated his opinion by reporting how a non-Spanish speaking Chicano who looked Indian sensed as a child
such deep feelings of shame when he learned of his Indian heritage that he reported to Murillo he had wanted to cut both his arms so that all his Indian blood would run out. The fact that the Mexican-American had feelings of inferiority became apparent with the examination of Texas' educational statistics which revealed that this minority group had the lowest achievement of any ethnic group living in the state. In 1950, the median years of schooling for the Spanish-surnamed was 3.5, and by 1960, it had climbed to 4.8. Anglo educational achievement for the same period climbed from 10.3 in 1950 to 11.5 in 1960. Non-whites had a median educational achievement of 7.0 in 1950 and 8.1 by 1960. By 1970, Spanish-surnamed residents had attained a median school level of 7.3, while Anglos reached 12 years of schooling and Negroes reached 9.7. Because upwardly mobile members of society use education as their stairway to success, people who don't possess these educational tools cannot easily improve their socio-economic conditions. As children develop, their total environment influences the shaping of their self-concepts, and the educational setting influences the child's search for his ideal self.

When the Mexican-American child entered school speaking Spanish and encountered an educational system
that failed to help him use his home language as a vehicle to deal with the bicultural world, he might lose interest in the very institution charged with his socialization. The failure of the educational system to meet his needs exacerbates his adult problems, and impedes his articulation with the Anglo world on many levels. The poverty data reveal that the Mexican-American is poor. The census data show that he preferred to use his vernacular and that he has achieved little in school. Sanchez maintained that the failure of the school leaders to understand the Mexican-American child's real needs helped contribute to everlasting socioeconomic problems for adult members of this ethnic group.

Sanchez considered that existence of bilingualism and biculturalism in the Southwest as a tragi-comedy unfurled by educators who regarded the child's use of a foreign language as *prima facie* evidence that he had a serious learning problem. He pointed out that scholars throughout history had expressed concern about the education of children who came from foreign language homes. More recently, scholars also considered influences of language development upon personality, but southwestern educators ignored the historical record. Sanchez cited Frank Cheavens' dissertation which is discussed in Chapter Nine to illustrate his abhorrence of attitudes of Texas educators who had insisted that
Spanish-speaking primary school children should receive their instruction in English. Cheavens noted and Sanchez concurred that when the school refused to teach children in their vernacular language, the children failed to receive emotional satisfaction from the learning process and experienced frustration instead.  

Sanchez also cited both psychological and sociological research to support Cheavens' statements. He reported that an experiment had been done with rats which rewarded the animals when they jumped for a certain card and failed to reward them when they jumped for another card. When the cards and consequences were interchanged, the rats, feeling frustrated, crouched on a platform and exhibited a hopeless or defiant attitude. Sanchez stated that he had seen fearful school children who behaved like the rats because they had been forbidden to use their vernacular in the classroom, and their school language failed to meet their needs. Sanchez believed that a person's self-esteem was important in personality formation and educational motivation. He stated that the student's ability to use his vernacular in school contributed to his development of a positive self-concept.  

First grade children's vocabularies reflect their unique early childhood experiences. Children coming from middle class homes have larger vocabularies than
those coming from working class backgrounds. Many children, not just non-English speaking ones, come to school with language problems, and all of them must learn to communicate with adults outside their family group as well as older children and contemporaries. When a child entered school exhibiting a friendly and expectant manner, it probably meant that he had already experienced positive social contacts. In order for him to learn once he entered school, he must sense that the significant others in the school also respected him for himself. 

Children learn attitudes at home and teachers of non-English speaking children must convey to them their acceptance and support. Pervasive prejudice found in society, coupled with adult ignorance of its existence, compound learning problems for minority children. "It is clear that non-English speaking children cannot know acceptance in a situation where they are not permitted to speak to one another in their own language or one in which they are punished or shamed using the language of their home,"

If children were truly bilingual, they would have no special learning problems. What actually happens is that a child uses words from both languages; consequently, fails to understand either language well. The child has a dual language handicap and cannot learn a second language until he achieves a well developed vernacular
in his home language. Children with this handicap may come from deprived backgrounds and lack communication experience in any language. When a child has the double disability of an impoverished environment and a language problem, the result is devastating. The child has to learn to conceptualize first and then has to learn to manipulate these meanings before he begins language training. "The process is more one of remedial work in conceptualization than simply one of 'teaching English.' To ignore this is to put the cart before the non-existent horse."  

Sanchez reported that he was frequently asked whether he thought in Spanish or in English, and he replied that he thought in neither language. He explained that he thought in concepts, the language of the mind. People analyze thoughts with some verbal instrument, perhaps even sign language. If an individual cannot produce intellectual concepts, he has nothing to manipulate. He outlined three principal kinds of language handicaps. First, a child has a normal store of concepts with non-English labels. Second, a child has concepts but is deficient in labels for these concepts. Third, the child lacks well developed concepts and the labels that he uses have no meaning. The child fails to know what he is talking about. In the first case, the child learns to attach English labels to his already-formed concepts. In
the second instance, the remediation is essentially the same, but more care has to be given to this child who appears less accustomed to associating labels and concepts. The third case is the most difficult. Here the child needs a full-scale language program to reach back into his own experiences. This catch-up period must begin at an early age, because the child from an impoverished experiential background suffers cumulative damage and irreparable psychological harm. "In other words, lacking adequate remediation a child suffering from such a deficiency will become progressively more 'dumb,' increasingly maladjusted and frustrated, and more and more incapable of full recovery." 59

Sanchez and Henry J. Otto, Professor of Elementary Education at the University of Texas, prepared a guide for the Texas Education Department for teachers of Spanish-speaking children. They noted that in the past schools placed too much emphasis on differences between foreign language children and the so-called normal children. The educators believed that it would be better if teachers who worked with non-English speaking children looked for similarities among their pupils, rather than differences. They stated that differences within each group of children exceeded differences found between groups of children. "In such matters as capacities for learning, subjects to be learned, conduct and traits of
character, social adjustments, and the like, there can be important differentiation between these groups of children."  

Sanchez's concern with the child's comfort in the learning situation and ease with which he could learn to move from his vernacular to English also mattered to other educators too. Serafina E. Krear, California education professor, stated that a schizophrenic condition existed with reference to bilingualism. It is praised in scholars and belittled in native speakers who differ from members of the dominant culture. In the educational setting, a continuum existed with reference to use of the mother tongue ranging from prohibition to permissiveness. The child who knew no English learned to associate use of the mother tongue with disapproval from those from whom he sought approval. This could contribute to serious emotional problems and even identity loss.

When a society forced a youngster to use a second language and forget his mother tongue, it is tearing up his emotional roots and disrupting his innermost stability, I add to that; it is limiting the degree of bilingualism he can attain by creating a situation in which he will have an inadequate command of two languages. Krear believed that teachers should provide positive attitudes and practices regarding use of the mother tongue in school to show that they accept the non-English speaker.
If this happened, the child would realize that society accepted the worth of both his language and his culture.

Loyd S. Tireman, professor of Education at the University of New Mexico, and an early pioneer in the teaching of English to non-English speakers, believed that even though the emotional processes in learning are not fully understood it still remained an important consideration. If the non-English speaker is eager to learn, he may enthusiastically grasp the challenge of learning a new vocabulary, but if he is frightened and confused from his initial contact with the school, he will withdraw and appear bewildered. The wise teacher grasps the enthusiasm and uses it like "oil on machinery" to create a stimulating environment and offers this new child new and pleasant experiences as part of the total learning process. 62

William Madsden supported Tireman's view regarding the significance of the emotional impact upon learning. Madsden quoted an Anglo teacher in the Rio Grande valley who believed that when Mexican-Americans speak Spanish, they think Mexican. The teacher stated that if the children spoke English, then they would think like Anglo children. Madsden observed that to the Anglo the Mexican-Americans' uses of Spanish remained their unique symbols of foreignness. On the other hand, the Mexican-American
believed that his use of the vernacular indicated his support of *la raza*.63

The 1946 conference on the Education of Spanish-Speaking Peoples in the Southwest supported the teaching of Spanish to mixed classes of English and Spanish-speaking students in order to give the foreign-language child an opportunity to use both languages.64 The 1951 meeting of the same group supported a program to help people participate actively in more than one cultural group without feeling that they must desert one culture to adopt another. If this could be done, conference participants believed that a learning climate could exist which would encourage students to appreciate rather than deprecate differences among children.65

When school personnel considered the Spanish-speaking child to be bilingual, he was actually bi-illiterate. He not only had difficulty switching from Spanish to English, but he also had trouble supplementing his informal vernacular with the formal speech he learned in the classroom. The Chicano floundered as he tried to achieve identity. His parents and peers spoke to him in the vernacular, and the school demanded that he use English. When he began to learn English, his use of it increased until he reached ten years of age. After this age the child used English less as a communication tool, because his *barrio* peers
considered use of the vernacular as indicative of group
loyalty. By the time he reached adulthood, the bilingual
child reduced his use of English to formal occasions only.66

Nava asserted that American society regarded acquisi-
tion of English to be the key used to unlock the total
storehouse of knowledge.

Thus we find it hard to accept that
millions of young and sensitive minds believe
that public education suppresses a major part
of their personality and looks down upon them.
A sophisticated person would say that the pub-
lic school damages the self-image they bring
to the school.87

Wallace E. Lambert supported Nava's view with his study
of French-Canadian adolescents in New England. Lambert
assessed students' relative skills in French and English
and related this to their mode of adjustment they had made
to the bicultural conflicts that they had experienced.
Four groups emerged in this study. The first preferred
to use English instead of French, were more proficient
in English instead of French, and negated the value of
learning French. They had anxiety regarding their English
proficiency and rejected their French background. The
second group preferred to use French, wanted to be identi-
fied as French, and had greater skill in French than in
English. The third group had ambivalent feelings regarding
their bicultural identity and could isolate features of
each culture which they preferred. They had limited develop-
ment in both languages and had made an unsuccessful social
adjustment. The fourth group appeared to be open-minded and nonethnocentric toward people in general. They had a strong language aptitude and attained a truly bicultural identity. 68

Sanchez wrestled with the language problems of the Spanish-speaking child thirty years before many other scholars began to examine these questions. Much of this later research supported views expressed by Sanchez in the early 1930s. Such can be said of Phillip Darraugh Ortego, who charged that the great failing in the educational appraisal of the Spanish-speaking child lay in the inability of most educators to recognize the complexities of the language role. Traditional educators tended to resort to methodology changes to deal with the problem, but Ortego insisted that approach rather than methodology remained the primary consideration. The author noted that teachers who favored conventional teaching techniques assumed that all children began school with the same advantages. This denied the bilingual child's initial problem of having to confront a methodology designed to suit educational needs of the dominant culture. He charged that most methodology used in teaching English as a second language served to repeat the problem rather than solve it. 69

James G. Anderson and Dwight Safer support Ortego's findings in their study of two multicultural southwestern communities to determine residents' attitudes regarding
provision of equal educational opportunities for Indian and Mexican-American children. Authors reported that respondents doubted innate abilities of members of these minority groups, and they believed that their inherent lack of ability, rather than the adequacy of the curricula, resulted in their poor achievement. The authors reported that a self-fulfilling prophecy functioned in these communities. Minority students failed because they considered themselves to be inferior. School administrators admitted that they gave these children less encouragement than they provided for Anglos.

Sanchez, like Anderson and Safer, criticized widely held attitudes in Texas which labeled 300,000 Spanish-speaking elementary school children and the 35,000 secondary school pupils as handicapped simply because they spoke Spanish. He blasted the practices of the state's educational agency which kept 80 per cent of these children in the first grade for at least two years, along with school policies which demanded that children be retained in their grade for several years until they finally dropped out of school completely frustrated by the educational process. Sanchez minced few words when he stated,

To excuse the failure of the Texas schools to do the usual job by accusing the Spanish-speaking children of virtually inherent fault reveals a professional blindspot so elementary that it is difficult not to question the professional competence and integrity of the educators responsible.
To amplify his disapproval of the state policies, Sanchez described summer sessions for bilingual students. He noted that these forty to sixty day sessions tended to reduce the amount of time that these children had to spend in the first grade. With this enrichment, children were then able to complete the first grade in the allotted time period, plus the summer session. Sanchez accused educators of poor methodology if it usually required children two full years to accomplish what innovative programming of one summer session and one school year could do. Sanchez supplemented his argument by citing the 1957 educational statistics which revealed that 61,584 Spanish-surnamed children enrolled in the state in the first grade with only 5,261 students enrolled in the twelfth grade. He conceded that summer school programs improved children's performances, but this did not eradicate the serious deficiency of the regular schools programs which contributed to the high attrition rate. He blamed segregation practices and culturally biased and unreliable test scores as the root causes of the problem.

Sanchez stated that the Spanish-speaking child's initial education should begin in the vernacular, with some English introduced in the content areas of the curriculum. He reasoned that if some of the curriculum was taught in English, then children could attend
integrated classes which would be of benefit to both mono-
lingual and bilingual students. He pointed out that, "Language development takes place best in the language of easiest communication . . . 'Dual language,' properly appreciated, can be an asset rather than a debit in the learning of English. A foreign language can lead . . . to the development . . . of Americans plus." Wilson Little supported Sanchez's views concerning the negative aspects of segregation for the bilingual child. He pointed out that Texas counties with the smallest numbers of bilingual students had higher percentages of these children enrolled in school than counties with large numbers of bilingual residents. Little stated that segregation prevailed in many communities. Some systems used separate campuses for these children, while others kept bilinguals in separate classrooms.

Sanchez's student, Thomas P. Carter, reflected his mentor's views when he noted that the teacher reflected community standards and values. If the teacher acted as an agent of social change then this attitude will be sensed in the educational setting. Carter, Dean of the School of Education of Sacramento State College, charged that both school and society have worked to keep the Mexican in his place so that southwestern society could develop with a cheap labor supply. These schools succeeded
in providing most Mexican-Americans skills appropriate for low status occupations. They had insufficient language ability, minimum reading and computation skills, and citizenship values necessary for law-abiding but non-participatory citizenship. Minority children failed to reach standard norms in any academic achievement area, even though these children performed better in subject areas less dependent upon English language skills. Carter charged that Texas, more than any other southwestern state, used rigid requirements for promotion criteria which worsened the overaged condition of the bilingual child. He noted that 60 per cent of the male students dropped out of school prior to attaining high school graduation. He stated that Texas had the highest dropout rate, while California had the lowest.

Carter believed that political leaders have recently become interested in improving opportunities for this minority, not because of altruistic feelings, but because the economy no longer required masses of unskilled laborers. He charged that when the dominant group viewed this minority, they tended to blame the minority itself for its limited acculturation and assimilation. Carter credited Sanchez with being one of the few voices in the Southwest to advocate school reform, but he stated that Sanchez generally had polite but unresponsive audiences. Educators remained generally unresponsive because they
believed that the educational institutions represented society's core values, making it easy for teachers to blame Mexican-Americans poor record on their socialization and home problems.

Carter noted that despite the recent infusion of massive funding for "target" area programs, these funds have been spent to reinforce community feelings of status quo and have rarely initiated major reforms. The present school structure tended to discourage achievement for the bilingual child and offered him limited opportunity to alter his status. The school might be charged with preparing children for a changing society, yet the community failed to offer expanding opportunities which left the Mexican-American attempting to fit himself for a life unavailable in his local area. Carter observed that educational decisions continued to use traditional criteria such as I.Q. and achievement scores. They maintained tracking for bilinguals and insisted that classes be conducted in English. The tone of the school reinforced the middle class ethic and condemned those who failed to exhibit characteristics attributable to that class. All of these factors combined to offer the Mexican-American child a negative and potentially destructive school environment. Carter concluded that perhaps institutions needed self-studies
from the consumer viewpoint to produce drastic changes in the total educational setting. 80

The teacher stood at the center of the controversy. If the community leaders perceived the instructional role as one of changing culturally deprived children to people acceptant of middle class norms, then they will select the type of teacher who can try to fulfill this task. If, on the other hand, they see the instructional leader as one able to help the child become skilled in both cultures, they will select another type of leader. Hershchel T. Manuel stated that because English is the language of the nation, the Spanish-speaking child must learn English. Manuel believed that the development of a sound language policy could not be based on emotion. 81 Teacher preparation for bilinguals should focus on training, not recruiting. He believed that teachers of Spanish-speaking children needed special help because they would find many "retarded" children in their classes. Manuel asserted that the retardation found among this group stemmed partly from native endowment, which included the cultural poverty of the home that failed to provide intellectual stimulation. This caused the minority child to progress at a slower rate which widened the gap between these children and others of equal potential who had more favorable home learning conditions. Manuel softened his blow by stating that the bilingual child should
have pride in the achievement of his ancestors but not to the extent that he continued to isolate his group from society's main stream. He concluded that the bilingual child must be able to proclaim proudly that he is an American and can identify with the larger community.82

School boards and educational administrators would feel more comfortable with Manuel's recommendations than they would with Carter's. Carter stated that in order to improve the teacher, one had to modify other institutional elements of the educational process. He explained that many see this minority group as either culturally deprived or disadvantaged. The school saw its role as helping the minority group accept middle class values. To do this properly, the school might have to encourage cultural changes within the ethnic community. Carter reported that present social systems in many regions are agricultural communities with caste-like societies offering little chance for advancement. The role the teacher assumed in these regions reflected residents' concerns for both the dominant and subordinate populations. Carter found little evidence to sustain the view that it is possible to remake the Mexican-American child into the standard middle class Anglo. Nor did he find any objective data to indicate that either remedial or compensatory education in the early years
could be sustained with higher achievement and participation in both secondary and higher education. He reported that too little time might have elapsed since these new programs began to evaluate their proper impact upon the adult Mexican-American population.\footnote{83}

Carter conceded that training teachers with technical skills remained an easier task than designing their cultural re-education. He believed that teachers required a different orientation to suit the Mexican-American child's needs. He agreed that this notion had little support because most schools justify their existing programs and offered little flexibility to meet or change local conditions. Carter challenged teacher-training institutions to develop a "new breed" of teacher. He wanted teachers trained in projective techniques in order that supervisors could measure changed teacher behavior as part of their performance criteria to determine their likelihood of success or failure with the Mexican-American child. Additionally, he challenged these teacher-training schools to perform radical surgery on existing programs by removing the structure of previously-required courses, reorganizing curriculum content, increasing teacher-candidates' participation in community life, and using sensitivity training and field seminars as catalysts in pedagogical training.
He explained that all teacher-preparation courses should be organized into the psychocultural, sociocultural, and professional-technical courses. The material in each sphere should be interrelated into a meaningful whole. The educator maintained that of the three spheres, the sociocultural remained the most important. He insisted that teachers must be well versed in history, philosophy, and cultural anthropology prior to the start of their classroom experience with bilinguals. He declared that no teacher could succeed with culturally different children unless he experienced some changes in his own behavior. He wanted teacher candidates to experience "culture shock" and destroy their favorite myths regarding race, achievement, and poverty. He concluded that before one could understand culture objectively, he must understand first his own beliefs.84

Carter requested that behavior modification techniques should be used to develop culturally pluralistic beliefs in educators as one way of dealing with the bilingual child's educational problems. Sanchez affirmed that the belief labeled "Americanism" rests upon the tenet that it is the right of all population segments to contribute their different strengths to American life. "Hand in hand with privilege and responsibility to use each of our resources for the common good, there goes the obligation to seek out the cultural assets of our fellow men that they, too, may participate in
the common task." Both Carter and Sanchez supported acceptance of biculturalism as the primary tool to be used in the acculturation of the Mexican-American child.

The examination of the 1970 census data indicated that the minority group's problems remained largely unsolved. Census statistics revealed that Mexican-Americans can be found throughout the state, particularly in urban centers, but many still live in the counties adjacent to the Rio Grande river. The total labor force in the state numbered 7,624,482 persons with Negroes numbering 871,243 and Spanish-surnamed, 1,179,311 people. Of the families with incomes below the poverty level, 12.4 per cent of Caucasian families, 32.7 per cent of Negro families, and 31.4 per cent of Mexican-American families have income below the cut-off line. Per capita income for the three ethnic groups is 2,992 dollars for Caucasians, 1,561 dollars for Negroes, and 1,521 dollars for the Spanish-surnamed. Median family income for these groups is 8,930 dollars for Caucasians, 5,334 dollars for Negroes, and 5,897 dollars for Mexican-Americans.

These data show that Mexican-Americans remain poor. They have a higher median income than Negro families because they have larger families with more members contributing to the family income. Traditionalists viewing these data can see that the Mexican-American has the lowest school achievement
and the lowest per capita income. These traditionalists might still believe that the Mexican-American is poor because he achieved little education. This conclusion may be improperly drawn. It may be that the school has been unable to meet the cultural needs of the Mexican-American child; moreover, he has withdrawn from the educational process and, therefore, remains poor. Census figures document results, but they fail to indicate causes. Sanchez tried to show how poor teaching, segregated classes, insensitive teachers and administrators, all worked together to perpetuate the problem. It seems that the view presented here which includes the analysis of the role of language in the development of the self-concept of the Mexican-American may be one clue to finding a solution to the group's many problems. Sanchez maintained that educational leaders continued to be insensitive to the needs of the bilingual child. The census data substantiate the charge.
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CHAPTER VIII

SANCHEZ'S WRITINGS DURING HIS YEARS IN TEXAS:

EXPRESSIONS OF ACTIVISM

During the thirty-two years that Sanchez lived and worked in Texas, he publicized continuously both in print and by his participation in professional educational circles the plight of the Mexican-American. He lavished generous criticism on both political and educational leaders who failed to dedicate themselves to finding solutions to the minority's long-standing problems. Speaking to the Southwest Council on the Education of the Spanish-Speaking Peoples in Albuquerque in 1950, he reminded his audience that he had always been noted for his candor, and at that time he felt compelled to notify his colleagues that the Mexican-American's present acculturation rate still languished. He believed that the minority suffered from,

... befuddlement, negligence, and indifference on the part of the leaders and institutions—a state of affairs that clear thinking, plain talking, and decisiveness of action could well have corrected. Skeletons have rattled in our closets, and we have feared to pull them out into the light of day.

Sanchez probably made his audience uncomfortable as he accused his listeners of doing little more than simply attending conferences. He felt that educators should
be able to exhibit the scope of professional leadership that transcended the academic world, a world long noted for its narrowness of scholarly pursuits. He challenged these leaders to join a movement that would teach new and needed educational concepts to colleagues in their own institutions. He reminded his audience that as public figures they shared an on-going leadership role for this minority group. Sanchez stated that local educational leadership, largely native to the Southwest, should understand the Mexican-American's problems and cooperate actively with all other community leaders in their combined search for solutions.

But, look about you and you will have no difficulty in recognizing the appalling way in which our leadership and our institutions have defaulted -- defaulted to laissez-faire [sic.], the path of least resistance to class privilege, and blind prejudice, to venal selfishness, to stupidity.

He also observed that although Mexican-Americans comprised more than 20 per cent of Texas' population, no member of the ethnic group had ever worked at the Austin capitol. He accused state leadership of failing to put forth even minimum effort to help Mexican-Americans become participating members of the American mainstream. Although he focused his main critical thrust against Texas leaders, he distributed a share of blame to political leaders
in New Mexico, too. He asserted that even though New Mexicans took a more active role in their state politics and with political leaders readily admitting that they needed the support of the Spanish-speaking in order to win elections, neither voters nor leaders zeroed in on basic issues concerning the state's minority group. Insofar as basic issues confronting the Spanish-speaking people of the state are concerned, these officials and these voters might as well be in Texas -- or in China.  

Sanchez summarized his highly emotional, accusative speech by saying:

At best this leadership -- and I am speaking of the Spanish-speaking leadership does an unimaginative pedestrian job; discharging its responsibilities with a minimum of energy, without a modicum of creativeness, and with the least possible display of courage or of a sense of social responsibility. At worst -- and, to my sorrow, I must admit that this is all too frequent -- that leadership sees in political position simply an opportunity for selfish gain, for personal enrichment, and for a freedom of behavior that will not stand the light of moral judgment. Usually, however, that leadership dissipates its energies in petty factional maneuvering, placing the success of machine politics above political principle and above the needs of their people.  

He also showed how a lack of morality characterized the business climate in the region by comparing the regional agricultural system to a form of medieval serfdom. Business men with political leaders as their allies continued to import cheap labor both legally and illegally.
These corrupt practices forced the displacement of local people who had to move from their own slum area to new slums in other communities. "No, our English-speaking leaders are not without blame. They have prized a bale of cotton above human decency, a carload of grapefruit above the health and enlightenment of hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children."  

As Sanchez leveled these charges at his audience, he challenged them to begin to do more in their teaching roles than perform the usual classroom rites and dared them to innovate their administrative procedures too. He expected them to recognize that their continuing concerns for statistical averages "spell mediocrity—mediocrity when genius would have been barely adequate." In noting that the Mexican-American child generally suffered from insensitive teachers who punished them for speaking Spanish in the kind of schools which seems more like penal institutions than educational settings, he rebuked educators for allowing both superintendents and school board members to prostitute "not only educational principles but also human decency and the fundamental law of the land." Since the Spanish-speaking educational leadership seemed unable to cope with the sporadic flood of migrant children, they offered these children, as well as the native-born ones, few opportunities to become
acculturated to the larger American culture. "We make no efforts to open social and economic doors to our Spanish-speaking graduates--often, instead, submitting to end supporting class barriers and racism."³

If Sanchez minced few words in his criticism of his colleagues, he also gave barbs to Texas political leaders. Sanchez asserted in an article in the *Texas Observer* that the common man in Texas fared poorly at the hands of those he elected to public office in statewide elections. One did not have to be an economist to see that taxation in this state remained regressive, not progressive. "That is, those Texans least able to pay bear a tax burden that is out of proportion; and those most able to pay get what is virtually a free ride."⁹ He facetiously chortled as he noted that no one can say the phrase "state income tax" except in the sanctity of the home. The legislature avoided levying corporate and pipeline taxes and preferred, instead, to levy assessments on food, clothing, tobacco, and beer. When the state's school teachers needed a salary increase, the legislature enacted a sales tax to pay for it. "The legislature is so good to us, who needs enemies?"¹⁰ he queried.

Sanchez believed that Texas had one of the "most benighted educational programs" in the country, and he theorized that the easily intimidated educators deserved part of the blame for the poor program. Reporting that
he had once led an educational lobby in a neighboring state, he noted that when educators took a forthright stand, they actually improved public education. Texas teachers failed to do so so that they, along with legislators and governors, remained content to perpetuate the status quo. Sanchez maintained that the Mexican-American suffered greatly in this climate of neglect. The Mexicano had failed to realize that he could be an important political force, and his inability to achieve political cohesiveness had continued to allow elected officials to take advantage of him. "It has been a matter of much cynical amusement to me when treated as a "Meskin,' I suddenly turn on my English and 'pull rank.'" Sanchez believed that not too many Mexicanos pulled rank, even in counties where they constituted a numerical majority. Their reticence perpetuated the dominant group's practice of treating them as a "class apart," even though they were listed as Caucasians on census rolls. He concluded that if Mexican-Americans in Texas exercised their political power, they never would have suffered this kind of discriminatory treatment.

Although he observed that frequently the Mexican-American child received an inferior education in Texas, he believed that the discrimination and mistreatment of this minority appeared most obvious in the labor field. The Texas Mexicano continued to be displaced by wetbacks,
braceros, and Mexican commuters. Thousands of Texas residents had to migrate as far as Colorado or Michigan to seek a living wage. Sanchez stated that Public Law 178, commonly called the bracero law, expired in 1964; yet state economic interests continued to pressure for its reenactment. Even the Texas governor had been quoted in the press of Mexico as saying that the bracero failed to replace native-born labor, and Sanchez suggested that if one checked with the state employment commission, he might find a large number of citizens who worked as migrants. 12

He also observed that the commuter problem had reached scandalous proportions. When a United State Secretary of Labor tried to stop this transient labor "the roof fell on him." Government officials suddenly expressed concern about the negative impact on the Mexican economy if the commuter labor ceased. Merchants in border communities worried about their threatened loss of trade, but Sanchez noted that these business men obviously forgot to consider that native labor, receiving higher wages, would benefit the local economy. 13

Sanchez mused that even though he had an interest in the federal government's "War on Poverty" program and recognized that the people in Appalachia suffered because of poverty, he himself suffered more for the poverty in Austin, San Antonio, or the Rio Grande valley. The poverty closer to home remained more shocking because local leaders
expressed complacence regarding the continuous denial of both rights and protection for the American of Mexican descent. "The American of Mexican descent in Texas is, indeed, a 'sleeping giant,' sleeping through a nightmare which is so persistent that it becomes normalcy and therefore, is unperceived as a nightmare," he concluded.

The educator did not confine his polemic attack against discrimination to just Texas audiences, but he received national exposure in an article published in the Chicago Jewish Forum when he charged that this ethnic group, along with Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Filipinos, and Indians remained subjected people with the American of Mexican descent appearing to be the most neglected of all of these minority groups. Citing the fact that Texas had the second highest draft rejection rate for non-Negroes being inducted into the Army during the Second World War, he pointed out that the state with one-twentieth of the national population also had 25 per cent of the deaths caused by infantile diarrhea. Sanchez charged that one reason why this minority group suffered such serious abuse stemmed from the kind of labor politics practiced in the nation. During the First World War, cattle cars filled with peasants from the interior regions of Mexico came to work on American farms. During the Second World War both braceros who received fifty cents an hour for their
labor and migrants from Mexico displaced the native-born worker. "In comparison to a recital of the woes of the Mexican-American, Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* is cheerful."^{16}

Sanchez felt that the federal government had to provide more effective supervision of the border region because it was not feasible to "subsidize the progress of Mexico or that of our businessmen with the misery of the American of Mexican descent."^{17} Migrant laborers had a serious problem, and they needed immediate remedial action to relieve them of the consequences of migrancy as well as the pitfalls of seasonal labor. Sanchez stated that the farm worker required a decent minimum wage and better educational opportunities. He suggested that the United States' Employment Service be given more authority to help solve this problem. Referring to the migrant's labor and educational problems, the author noted that, "We are not at all frightened by the dire predictions of 'federal control.' We are much more frightened by the demonstrated irresponsibility of local-control in the education of our children."^{18}

Conceding that the nation's citizenry seemed interested in increased foreign aid for the world's disadvantaged, Sanchez concluded that the "conservation of human resources, like charity, too, should begin at home."^{19}

Sanchez realized that most Americans remained oblivious to problems of any minority group, until they had close
contact either with the group or with a problem associated with a particular minority. During the Second World War, a group of Mexican-American youths in California became involved in violent activities called "zoot suit riots" in the press. The youthful offenders, labeled pachucos, were accused of beating up American sailors who walked through the Mexican barrio. The violence lasted for several nights. The first night of the melee, a group of Mexican boys were beaten up by a gang of non-Mexican adolescents. The police, after completing their regular shift, became a "vengeance squad" and searched for the Mexican gang that they believed had attacked the sailors. They arrested no one, but the following night 200 sailors in 20 taxicabs invaded the barrio and stopped to beat up Mexican boys wearing long, draped jackets called "zoot suits." Police failed to take action and the following evening the sailors, reinforced with soldiers and marines, returned to the Mexican community and threatened the adolescents. None of the servicemen were arrested, but 27 Mexican youths were jailed.

Inflamed by the press with tales that the Mexicans would riot with broken bottles as weapons, the servicemen and the local citizens invaded the barrio and beat up everyone they found. Eventually, the military declared the barrio to be off limits for servicemen, and the local mayor assured the public that the violence would subside.
Local newspaper editorials bemoaned the fact that service-men were withdrawn before they completed their pacification effort in the community. The Los Angeles City Council handled the affair by declaring it a misdemeanor to wear a "zoot suit."  

Sanchez, in an article, "Pachucos in the Making," stated that the genesis for these adolescent activities began years before, and the violence erupted as a result of discriminatory social and economic practices, unintelligent educational policies, provincial smugness, and self-assigned attitudes of racial superiority. These children experienced social ostracism and became a class apart and, therefore, easy prey to gangsterism. Sanchez believed that the community's segregation practices regarding the Mexican-American created teen violence, rather than their mode of dress serving as the propellent for the unrest. Although President Franklin D. Roosevelt had issued an executive order demanding fair employment practices for all Americans, Mexican-American workers still received the lowest status jobs paying the least money.

Using his knowledge of conditions in Texas to illustrate his charge that gang warfare represented an outlet for teenage frustrations, Sanchez illustrated the frustrations of California youth with similar examples of discrimination experienced by Mexican-Americans in Texas. He reported that Americans of Mexican descent were banned
from public parks, restaurants, movie theaters, except in special sections and were also prevented from buying homes located in subdivisions with deed restrictions that prevented the sale of home to members of that minority group.  

He also asserted that discriminatory educational practices laid the foundation for most of the prejudice found in southwestern communities. He felt that in Texas local and state educational authorities could remedy these discriminatory practices because in 1943 the state legislature authorized the State Superintendent of Education to withhold funds to any school district discriminating against white scholastics. The legislature had also passed a concurrent resolution stating that all members of the Caucasian race were entitled to receive full and equal advantages protected by law. Also, persons who violated this practice also violated the state's good neighbor policy. Because Mexicans were legally classified as "whites," Sanchez reasoned that these state policies also applied to them.  

He observed that oppressive attitudes of self-righteousness enabled the kind of prejudicial social attitudes to flourish which gave rise to anti-social behavior by those who felt discriminated against. He believed that the pachuco symbolized not the guilt of the oppressed Mexican but a,
... cancerous growth within the majority group which is gnawing at the vitals of democracy and the American way of life. The pachuco and his feminine counterpart, the 'cholita,' are a spawn of a neglectful society—not the products of a humble minority people who are defenseless before their enforced humiliation.

Pauline Kibbe supported Sanchez's views as she described the feelings of Mexican-American war veterans who noted that they had been treated as equals while they were in the military service, but when they returned home they met with the same prejudice that they had experienced in the prewar years. Veterans reported that community members called them "Mexican," and they were still unable to eat in the local cafes. Kibbe cited Robert C. Eckhardt, Texas Field Representative of the Office of Inter-American Affairs who asserted that the problem of the Spanish-speaking is complex and could not be attributed to just one cause, such as race prejudices. Eckhardt believed that strained relations remained largely the result of personality clashes between Mexican-Americans and Anglos as a result of their personal contact.

Kibbe stated that George E. Engerrand, University of Texas anthropologist, believed that Americans feared complete democracy.

Ignorance . . . and vested interests make most Americans fear giving equality to minority groups . . . . The world looks to us to . . . solve
minority problems, but people think we are hypocritical when we talk . . . democracy and allow discrimination against . . . the Mexican-American in Texas.

Kibbe, like Sanchez, believed that discriminatory educational practices continually exacerbated the Mexican-American's problems. She stated that during the 1942-1943 school year, only 53 per cent of all school age Mexican-American children actually enrolled in school. Lack of enforcement of the state's compulsory education laws partly explained this statistic, but the author blamed the unscrupulous practices of local administrators for the poor record. She reported that local superintendents filed annual reports which listed a school census with all those eligible for education and received state funds based upon this count. The administrator who prepared the head count and requested educational funds for children, "who have never been enrolled in school and never will be, because insufficient building space and seating capacity preclude their attendance, is acting with intent to defraud the state and to defraud the children of school facilities."²⁷

Quoting Sanchez's summary of a workshop for the education of Spanish-speaking children, Kibbe stated that the educational problem failed to narrow itself to simply one of subject matter, methodology, administration, or language instruction. The problem, instead, remained
grounded in the recognition and acceptance that all basic educational principles applied to the education of this minority group. Additionally, those who teach the Mexican-American child needed to understand that their different cultural backgrounds created certain educational problems for them. Instructors required training, preferably in demonstrative school activities, in order to learn how to correct their problems and compensate for possible environmental deficiencies.  

Author Carey McWilliams conjectured that whatever unity the Spanish-speaking group in the Southwest had achieved resulted from the cleavage existing between them and the Anglo population. This separation appeared to be so recognizable that it obscured the heterogeneity present among minority group members. Citing Sanchez as his authority, McWilliams commented that "the group is so old that it has been forgotten and so new that it has not yet been discovered." These people, according to Sanchez, comprised all possible biological combinations which included initially the heterogeneous Spanish heritage, blended with mestizaje. This diverse ethnic strain resulted from intermarriage of Spanish and indigenous people in both Mexico and the Southwest.  

Mexican-Americans, united by their isolation from the Anglo community, migrated north from their original environs to other cactus growing regions. Economic needs
stimulated the newcomers' trek, and their pervasive poverty enabled American businessmen to offer new arrivals employment in such isolated jobs as mining and gang detail on the railroads. Availability of cheap labor determined wage rates rather than the notion accepted by business leaders that native workers refused to perform tasks easily handled by illegal immigrants.  

Despite the fact that many Americans of Mexican descent prospered economically during the years of the Second World War, this progress disappeared in the postwar era because of the constant deluge of new immigrants. New arrivals brought new problems. The sheer impact of approximately 300,000 strangers coming with their language and color differences made the problem almost insoluble. "In fact, there is little prospect that the Mexican in Texas will ever achieve anything approximating economic and social equality until conditions in Mexico change for the better."  

McWilliams' view regarding the severity of the Mexican American's problems reflected Sanchez's views and echoed the concerns of Joan W. Moore, who condemned continuance of de facto segregation throughout the Southwest. She viewed the effect of segregation and its impact upon education, and she reported that Mexican-American schools, sometimes shared by other nonwhite groups, received fewer educational services, less counseling, more inexperienced
teachers, and poorer physical plants than those schools enrolling Anglos. The "tracking" system used in many nominally nonsegregated schools managed to reserate ethnic minorities for their learning activities. 

More recent studies of Mexican-American educational problems suggest that the apparent lack of family success models, naiveté concerning the advantages of educational achievement, family poverty and cultural values prizing early maturity of young people, compound the severity of stimulating educational motivation for the group. A recent Los Angeles study comparing the potential dropouts among Anglo and Mexican-American students revealed that more Mexican-Americans than Anglos are likely to leave school early, even though testing criteria held constant such factors as social class and I.Q. The study also showed that Mexican-American students attending integrated high schools appeared more ambitious than those enrolled in segregated institutions.

Moore, like Sanchez, recognized the concept of the existence of isolated Spanish traditions believed to be typical of barrio life. Sanchez frequently proposed that Mexican-American cultural roots be used as a bridge to help children function in a culturally pluralistic society, but Moore reported that many Mexican-American leaders capitalized on the isolated Spanish traditions of the colonia. These leaders believed that the ethnic
group's distinct cultural values explained the fact that they continued to remain remote in a competitive society. These leaders prided themselves as defenders of old and rich cultural values which appeared to thrive best in the segregated setting.  

The search for measurable criteria which could document the severity of the segregation of Mexican-American children stimulated Sanchez and Virgil E. Strickland to examine ten Texas school systems in order to evaluate evidences of segregation. They looked at such factors as segregation practices, teaching staff, teacher-pupil ratio, instructional program, administrative staff, classification, and promotion practices. They also analyzed school building facilities which included drinking fountains, sanitary facilities, blackboards and bulletin boards, gymnasia, and libraries. Their concerns for community life motivated them to critique school and community relationships, interschool joint activities, availability of free pupil transportation, and local welfare practices.

The authors focused on the degrees of segregation observable in the specific schools and defined this segregation to mean physical and social separation of children in housing, lunch periods, and play periods. They did not regard the existence of the neighborhood school to mean necessarily a segregated institution, but they did say that segregation could be defined as
physical separation, based upon prejudice. They based their evaluation of educational opportunity on an analysis of: scholastic population, enrollment by grades, average daily sessions, and attendance records. They selected a representative sampling and eliminated from their survey any system known to have an unusually bad situation for either Anglo or Spanish-name students. By visiting school systems, interviewing personnel, touring buildings and grounds, observing teaching procedures, playground activities examining school records dealing with attendance figures, as well as other materials relevant to the study, they managed to indict severely several Texas districts. They included photographs of buildings, equipment, and other physical facilities to document their findings.36

The authors noted that when they questioned educational leaders concerning their segregation practices, they found that educators tended to defend and justify their customary policies. First, they frequently declared that separate elementary schools gave Spanish-name children opportunities to learn both English and other curricula easier than they would be able to do in a more competitive integrated setting. Additionally, because these children had irregular attendance patterns and community Anglo schools were overcrowded, it became feasible to separate the Spanish-speaking children. They reported that local community pressures demanded maintenance of separate facilities for
this minority group because these children required extra help. Anglo community residents expressed the view that Spanish-speaking children appeared unclean and unhealthy, and the educators believed that minority children's social habits needed remediation before they could be integrated with their Anglo peers. Authors also reported that leaders asserted that Spanish-name children needed several years of "Americanization" prior to their integration with the Anglos, even though educators listed only "language handicap" as their official reason, cited in school board minutes, for segregating minority children.\(^{37}\)

Sanchez and Strickland reported that of the ten school systems studied, two practiced no segregation, and the eight remaining ones had various segregation practices. Some separated children through the third grade, while seven other segregated these children for different numbers of elementary school years. One system effectively separated the minority group through the twelfth grade, although they officially maintained that they ended segregation in the eighth grade. This last school even seated Spanish-name children apart from their Anglo classmates. The authors also reported that segregation practices also existed in non-academic activities such as bands, sports, dramatics, and playday programs. The authors reported that only local customs and prejudices determined the segregation practices for each community.\(^{38}\)
Responding to the excuse that poor attendance of Mexican-Americans made it feasible to segregate them from Anglo attendance patterns for both groups. They stated that despite the fact that Anglo attendance patterns appeared to be better generally than those of minority children, this pattern did not appear in all systems. In one school district, the percentage of enrollment in average attendance was 64.2 per cent for Spanish-surnamed children and only 65.3 per cent for Anglos. Grouping the attendance patterns of all schools together, they found that the attendance percentages varied from 51.7 per cent to 91.8 per cent for the Spanish-surnamed and ranged from 60.9 per cent to 92 per cent for the Anglos. The authors concluded that if all figures were grouped together, attendance differences for the ethnic groups evaporated.

Because educational leaders defended their segregation practices on the basis that these children received more individual help from instructors, the researchers expected to find a lower teacher-pupil ratio in the segregated schools. They found the reverse to be true in all but one instance. The ratios of teacher to pupils for Spanish-surnamed children fluctuated from 26.5 to 61, while the range in Anglos schools varied from 15.2 to 42.2. Also, the authors reported that schools failed to use any pedagogically accepted procedures, such as pre-tests, to
determine if these children needed separate educational facilities because of language handicaps. These blanket segregation practices made authors accuse school districts of continuing their discriminatory educational practices that seemed prejudicial both to the growth and development of the Mexican-American child.  

Additionally, facilities and equipment for Spanish-named children attending segregated schools appeared to be inferior. Teachers and administrators in those schools were, on the whole, both comparatively poorly paid and poorly trained. The personnel had less experience and shorter tenure of service than comparable professionals in Anglo schools. It seemed evident that local personnel practices decreed assignment of less experienced professionals to segregated classes and "promoted" them to Anglo schools if they showed promise. Inequities surfaced regarding transportation services, too, and in some cases, only Anglos received free bus service. 

Discriminatory treatment with regard to lunchroom facilities, physical and dental examinations, health instruction classes, sanitary facilities, and educational equipment indicated that Spanish-surnamed children received less than their Anglo counterparts in every instance. Differences in bathroom facilities clearly showed discrimination.
Some segregated schools had only outdoor privies, or old fashioned pit type lavatories, while others had toilets with sewer connections. Many schools had no handwashing facilities for the minority children. The authors found no evidence of these kinds of bathrooms in any Anglo schools.42

Sanchez and Strickland cited the views of L. A. Woods, State Superintendent of Education, who noted that Mexican-American children comprised an important factor in the total school enrollment of the state and deserved to receive the schools' best educational efforts. The Superintendent reminded the state's educators that all personnel efforts should be directed towards offering these children opportunities to maximize their educational development. He condemned any administrative practice which tended to isolate these children, solely on ethnic bases, and pointed out that separation of these children giving them inequitable educational offerings appeared unsound, against state and national policy, and in opposition to children's best interests.43

Attorney General Price Daniel supported Woods' statements in his opinion regarding the Cuero Independent School district. He noted that this district could not segregate Mexican-American pupils based solely on language deficiencies. The legal authority pointed out that administrators concerns for students' individual needs and aptitudes may
indicate establishment of separate classes for certain children, but only after schools first administered examination to all children. He asserted that no part of such classification or segregation may be based solely upon Latin American or Mexican descent. Responding to this opinion, Gus C. Garcia, San Antonio attorney, wrote Daniel that based upon the Attorney-General's opinion, he had concluded that if children required special groupings, it should be based solely upon impartial tests not racial origins. Daniel replied that he concurred with Garcia's interpretation.

The authors observed that educational practices found in the ten school systems indicated that these districts violated both state and federal laws. They concluded that data revealed "irrefutable, objective evidence that the segregation of Spanish-name children in the selected school system is prejudicially discriminatory, and that the good faith of the 'pedagogical reasons' offered for that segregation is questionable." In 1948, Sanchez and Strickland found ample evidence of the existence of segregated schools. Almost twenty years later, school administrators claimed that they used neighborhood housing patterns as the primary determinant for school district attendance zones. These leaders observed that Mexican-American housing patterns differed markedly from those of Anglos. Among Mexican-Americans,
there had been no strong push to the suburbs, but this did not mean that all members of this ethnic group resided in the city's central urban core. Large numbers of Mexican-Americans continued to live in outlying portions of metropolitan areas, and many of today's barrios were yesterday's labor camps. Housing patterns of thirty-five southwestern cities indicated that Mexican-Americans remained less segregated from Anglos than Negroes, but the level of segregation for both minority groups remained high. The most severe segregation existed between Negroes and Anglos, the next highest between Negroes and Mexican-Americans, and the lowest between Mexican-Americans and Anglos.  

The larger the total city population, the higher the incidence of segregation that existed for all three groups. Also, the authors noted that the number of large households for minority groups also increased their degree of segregation. Residential segregation did not seem to be related to low minority incomes per se but rather to income differentials between the minority and the dominant group. Once this minority established a ghetto as its cultural center, it became a way of life affecting relationships of residents to the larger community. The authors concluded that "as long as there is any suspicion that freedom of choice is being abrogated, that full participation is being denied, the problem of residential segregation must be of concern to
Since the Mexican-American has a high degree of visibility, it has been fairly easy to perpetuate this segregation both in his housing patterns and his neighborhood school.

Sanchez believed that educational segregation affected a child's total development, but he maintained that it was a difficult term to define. In some communities, no matter where they live "Mexican" children go to the Mexican school and Anglos to the "white" school. Some communities used the "freedom of choice" plan, enabling some Mexican-American children to attend the Anglo school with only Mexican-American children enrolling in the Mexican school. Other areas established two school zones, placing a school in each zone. This made it possible for children to transfer from one zone to another, allowing some minority children to enroll in the Anglo school with the Mexican-American school enrolling no Anglos. Other communities gerry-mandered school zones so that all Spanish-speaking children staying in one zone and Anglos in another. In consolidated school districts where schools transported children to community schools, buses generally bypassed the Mexican school to send Anglos to their own school. Along with attempting to define segregation, Sanchez questioned if school districts remained free to follow community segregation customs through the use of gerry-mandering, specialized transfer policies, or
Sanchez noted that some schools grouped bilingual children in separate classes on the same campus under the guise of maintaining homogeneous grouping for instructional purposes, and he questioned if educators could defend this arrangement constitutionally. He suggested that if a school system continued to practice this illegal segregation, the influence of state-level authority should be enlisted to halt the practice.

If only the offending school system is enjoined, and segregation is a common practice in other school systems, the Spanish-speaking people in each of those other communities will be faced with the task of bringing legal action against each system individually -- a cumbersome and expensive process.

He noted that if state administrators would effectively end segregation by state-adopted policies, it would be easier for local districts to completely integrate their institutions. State authorities had the clout to cancel teaching certificates and accreditation of offending districts to enforce their wills.

Sanchez cited the Delgado, Texas, case as one important decision which paved the way for the ultimate end of segregation for Mexican-American children. This case, entitled Minerva Delgado et al v. Bastrop Independent School District of Bastrop county, Texas, et al, resulted in an agreed judgment.
in the court of Judge Ben H. Rice, Jr., on June 15, 1948.

The Judge ruled:

The regulations, customs, usages, and practices of the defendants, Bastrop Independent School District of Bastrop County, et al, and each of them in so far as they or any of them have segregated pupils of Mexican or Latin-American descent in separate classes and schools within the respective school districts heretofore set forth are, and each of them is, arbitrary and discriminatory and in violation of plaintiffs constitutional rights as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and are illegal.

The Judge went on to permanently restrain and enjoin the designated district from continuing segregation practices regarding Mexican-American children, and he reminded the school district that these children were entitled to receive the same facilities and services enjoyed by all other children in the area. The Judge allowed these schools to maintain separate classes on the same campus for just the first grade with separation limited to instructional activities only. He noted that these separate classes could be created only after scientific evaluations had been done for all children to determine objectively first the need for separate classrooms. Finally, he enjoined Superintendent L. A. Woods from participating in the custom of perpetuating segregation for Mexican-American children. 52

Superintendent Woods complied with the order and reported to the school districts that separate classes,
under state law, could be continued only for Negro students. He repeated the Judge’s instructions in his letter to the districts and also added that students needing special help could be retained in separate classes for instructions, but they were to be included with all students for the rest of the campus activities. He reminded the districts that he would take the necessary action to insure the fact that the court decision would be obeyed.\(^{53}\)

Sanchez reported that he and Attorney Gus C. Garcia had presented the Delgado case; and he noted that, following the decision, the Texas Board of Education issued the following policy statement May 8, 1950. The Board argued that local school school boards should be given every opportunity to comply with the court ruling of the Delgado decision before making it necessary for the Commission of Education to consider complaints from respective districts. The Board instructed the Commissioner to consider appeals from school districts to determine if these districts had violated court ruling. The Commissioner, after consultation with the Attorney-General, would take appropriate action to correct the problem.

Sanchez believed that the Delgado ruling clearly called for an end to separate schools for children of Mexican descent. If a school system had one school, assignment of children to these schools much be determined by criteria applied equally
for all children. If the schools wanted to use homogeneous grouping as a facade for placing all Spanish-speaking first graders together, the author charged that these systems must first administer objective tests prior to making the class assignment. It seemed unlikely to Sanchez that only Spanish-speaking children would then require this special type of help. He also noted that "late entrants" usually associated with the attendance patterns of the bilinguals but found among Anglos too, no longer would be sufficient reason for segregation, particularly if late-comers received no special educational programming. "There is no place in American educational theory or law which tolerates a 'special education' for children simply because they engage in farm labor and enter school late," he concluded.

Sanchez also blasted local districts' favorite policy of creation of "school zones" to enable them to draw school boundaries based on ethnic lines. He reminded his readers that improperly drawn boundaries did not provide a legal route for the commission of an illegal act of segregation. "That is to say, the creation of a segregated school through the use of the power to create school zones is patently illegal." School zones have been designated as neighborhood schools to identify ethnically the institution. Some communities prefer the euphemistic "freedom of choice" plan to perpetuate segregation. The latter served generally to reinforce community customs, and children usually registered
for the school that they knew they should attend, Sanchez didn't dispute the merit of local schools that reflected honestly the community's population, but he stated that modern educational theory supported inter-cultural education. He believed that segregation practices made it impossible to reach inter-cultural goals, and he refuted the notion that geographic marking such as a railroad track or a main thoroughfare had precedence in determining school attendance zones.57

Citing L. A. Woods' order suspending the Del Rio system's accreditation in February, 1949, for its use of the freedom of choice plan, Sanchez reported that Spanish-speaking community residents indicated their disbelief in the practicality of the community's long-standing custom by enrolling their children the following September in the community's traditionally Anglo school. Because the school building could not accommodate twice its usual number of enrollees this ended the freedom of choice plan. Sanchez also asserted that although states retained the right to educate their children, federal authority is implied. State officials, along with their local counterparts, remained charged with obeying federal law. He noted that all educational officers must comply with Fourteen Amendment provisions indicating that people cannot be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law,
and that a state must offer all its peoples equal protection of the laws. 58

Reminding his readers of the fallacious reasoning used to confuse English skills with education, Sanchez noted that Texas children coming from Czech or German language homes were not isolated in segregated classes, although they, too, may have limited language skills when they first entered school. Moreover, he stated that it remained a specious argument to assert that children learned a foreign language from the teacher alone. He observed that what happened with present educational practice was that children remained segregated because they knew no English and then they couldn't learn to speak English because they had been segregated. He blasted the practice of homogeneous grouping as a means of isolating the bilingual student from his Anglo contemporaries, and he charged that no evidence existed showing that Spanish-language children are homogeneous either in their language abilities or deficiencies. He suggested that if segregation made sense educationally "many of the Spanish-name children should be segregated from the rest of the Spanish-name children (just as many of the English-speaking children)! This could be carried on to absurdity." 59 He concluded that the only homogeneous factor common to all these children was their Spanish names.
He also condemned the use of separate campuses for minority children particularly when these children had inferior facilities and teachers than those afforded to the dominant group. He noted that states having better school systems and large numbers of minority children did not segregate minority group members. Citing Justice Frank Murphy of the United States Supreme Court Sanchez quoted, "At the very least, a low standard of living is barely justification for a statute which operates to keep that standard low. Something more than its own bootstraps is needed to pull such a law up to the constitutional level."\(^6\) Sanchez believed that all six and seven year old children appeared to be more alike than different. All that was needed for a first grader to learn the required work for the school year was a 600 to 700 word working vocabulary. He asserted that the language deficiency was not enough to perpetuate segregation. Foreign-language children learned a new language more easily from their contemporaries in a mixed class than they did in artificially segregated settings.\(^6\)

Sanchez, ever mindful of the structure needed to correct both educational and social abuses, outlined educational procedures to deal with minority children. First, he would place these children in homerooms without prior consideration of their deficiencies. This initial grouping would carry over to all normal classroom activities, even when the foreign-language child had difficulty
participating in these activities. He felt that all children should be allowed to participate to the maximum of their capacities. Second, each child should be tested with an instrument verified for its validity and reliability. The test should not measure the total range of vocabulary used throughout the school, but it should evaluate solely language facility needed for that particular grade or class. The class standard would then determine which children required special grouping for language instruction. During the first few months of the first grade, he noted that most instruction is limited to aural recognition, vocabulary training, and oral expressions. He believed that specialized training should be limited to specific skills best handled in a remedial setting.

The oral and aural development of the already fluent child would not be retarded by his association with the foreign-language child. By the time that the teacher initiated formal reading for all children, these children with limited English ability would also begin to read, as a result of their training in oral and aural English. Full participation in mixed classes, according to the author, served as the best antidote for his language handicap, and he pointed out that no specialized materials existed at that time for teaching English to foreign-language children. He also stated that methods and materials
to be used in primary classes were the same found to be useful for children who already knew English. Recognizing that Spanish-speaking children may require additional drill to correct their pronunciation of English words, Sanchez chided his readers for common regionalisms found in Anglo speech that could also use oral drill. He specifically cited the expression "y'all" for "you."  

Segregation discouraged children from wanting to attend school at all, and it also made them fear the integrated school. These foreign-language children quickly learned that they have never used English in real life situations and feared doing so. Sanchez believed that more children dropped out of school because they experienced discouragement as a result of segregation, which made them afraid to attempt higher education. Additionally, children who attended segregated schools rarely spoke English well. He stated that some who have enrolled in colleges speak English less fluently than those who attended integrated schools. Also, he asserted that psychological handicaps associated with segregation increased further the child's total learning handicap and blocked his future educational aspirations.

Reminding his readers that segregation flouted the American principle of a unitary school system which prided itself on its ability to inculcate ideals of
Americanism in all its students, he noted that the immigrant became Americanized in the public school and went from the school to full participation in the nation's economic mainstream. The school contributed greatly to the assimilation of foreign groups. Sanchez charged that communities which practiced segregated education for the Spanish-speaking generally had backward schools and ranked below other communities with integrated systems.  

Quoting anthropologist Arthur Campa, Director of the language and literature discipline of the University of Denver, Sanchez noted that Campa believed that oral language needed constant recurrence of oral-aural experience to attain proper pronunciation, intonation, and natural expression. Language, essentially a social phenomenon, must be learned in a social experience. No social adjustment occurred when the non-English speaking child and the English-speaking child remained apart. Segregation, according to Campa, reinforced the belief for foreign-language children that English is a foreign language rather than the national tongue. Segregation also helped impressionable minds accept the idea that this separation is society's way of isolating the undesirables from the more fortunate.  

Other educators joined Sanchez and Campa in echoing the cry for complete integration of school facilities. Frederick Eby, Professor of History and Philosophy of
Education at the University of Texas, stated that discrimination against any group of people created social classes like those found in Europe. "The persistence in race prejudice, segregation, class discrimination and exploitation does more to make Communists than all the direct methods of indoctrination the Soviet government can employ," he concluded. Marie H. Hughes, curriculum coordinator of the Los Angeles public schools, noted that segregation increased social distances between people. Segmentation of American communities made some residents non-participants in community affairs.

The attitude of the larger community which permits segregation, with its assumptions of inferiority, so affect the people against whom it is directed that they lose hope and faith in themselves and in the country of which they cannot become a part, she observed.

Herschel T. Manuel agreed with Sanchez that the Spanish-speaking are not a homogeneous people and could not be isolated for educational purposes. He believed that segregation indicated a dangerous practice because children could not learn readily the give and take of democratic living unless they lived democratically. Artificial lines of cleavage stimulated mistrust. Schools, according to Manuel, had to take into account the needs of bright, dull, rich, and poor children, and children must learn to deal with conflict. If they are segregated, on the supposition that this remains
the only way that they can learn to read, they cannot learn
to cooperate with the larger group in society if they con-
tinue to remain apart. Loyd S. Tireman condemned segre-
gation because he observed that it intensified anti-social
feelings among both groups. New Mexican experiences had
taught him that both ethnic groups learned to cooperate if
the school system operated with that in mind.

Sanchez's observations regarding the kind of teaching
most beneficial to bilingual children have been supported
in more recent years by many educators, among them, Theodore
Andersson at the University of Texas. He noted that if
children began bilingual education at an early age, this
became not only language study for its own sake but an
instructional medium in which all subjects could be learned.
He observed that it appeared axiomatic to reiterate that
the child learned best in his mother tongue. However, he
stated that teaching bilingual children in their home lan-
guage initially made them more comfortable psychologically
in school and helped them to identify as members of the
social structure within the school.

Andersson noted that experiments have been conducted
with entering students taught conventionally and other
students taught in their native tongue. He reported that
although no significant learning differences were docu-
mented between these two different teaching approaches,
those taught bilingually exceeded the others in personal and social adjustment. Children from the Spanish-speaking homes evidenced a better sense of belonging, increased feelings of peer acceptance, and an improved self-image, which made their school adjustment easier at a critical stage in their lives. The author stated that if a child felt comfortable, he seemed more likely to learn.\textsuperscript{72}

The linguist noted that because nine out of ten Americans remained monoplots, they believed that everyone in the country must know English. Many people failed to understand the differences involved in using a mother tongue and a second language. This lack of understanding also applied to teachers who expected Spanish-speaking children to perform as if English were their mother tongue. Andersson claimed that bilingual methodology bridged the gap of language to culture and promoted intercultural harmony. If the teachers began to handle classroom instruction in the vernacular, the children used their "Tex-Mex" as their learning tool. He concluded that many educators mistakenly deprecated the use of the informal vernacular, considering it to be an illiterate form of Spanish, but Andersson noted that the native Tex-Mex speaker could be understood throughout the hemisphere.\textsuperscript{73}

Andersson and Sanchez shared similar views regarding the need for intercultural education. Sanchez believed
that United States' school did little to acquaint students with cultural values of other nations in the hemisphere. When curriculum materials reflected foreign cultures, the texts presented only bizarre features of national life or limited presentation to strictly academic statements of historical and cultural events. He also observed that educational materials mirrored the American culture as a well-defined pattern of cultural characteristics which resembled their own regional feelings of provincialism and reflected more accurately the culture of their locale rather than broader trends.74

He also believed that American history texts presented a biased version of international events, including the stories of the exploration era. For that period, most historians emphasized America's struggles with England and France, giving little emphasis to Spain's contribution to western development. Because Sanchez believed that children learned facts to which they could relate easily, he noted that the inadequate chronology of western hemisphere history actually deprived 5,000,000 Americans of Latin-American and European descent of valuable and meaningful cultural information.75

Believing deeply that elementary school students needed more exposure to western hemisphere cultural materials, Sanchez served as an editor for Macmillan Company, book
publishers. In that role he reviewed carefully materials that the publisher considered offering to the nation's schools for adoption. Writing to Editor James A. Michener on September 19, 1942, Sanchez's interest in cultural pluralism surfaced as he noted that a new manuscript which he had just reviewed presented a negative attitude concerning the impact of Spanish colonialism upon the western hemisphere. He believed that the author's views ran counter to present attitudinal trends. He also disapproved of the author's treatment of Catholicism, as well as his coverage of black, white, and Indian relations.

We will have to be on the lookout to prevent phraseology from giving a "holier than thou" impression. Likewise all statements in the book should be positive. Negative interpretations serve no purpose whatsoever in painting the picture of "we Americans."

Sanchez also supervised the publication of Spanish language textbooks. Writing to Editor P. A. Knowlton regarding a proposed manuscript, he stated that he found the book too difficult for elementary school children to use. He noted that the author used poor Spanish that wasAnglo-cized and pedantic. He believed that the author's materials indicated a

Clear example of the extension downward of faulty high school and college techniques. In the course of a few lessons . . . the child is bombarded with an overwhelming broadside of new words and phrases -- many of which he doesn't understand in English.
Sanchez also observed that another proposed Spanish text failed to do a proper job in presenting the material. He disapproved of a book that taught an unknown language by using unknown cultural content. In 1941 Sanchez joined the Macmillan Company as editor and co-author of the Inter-American Series. He supervised the preparation of a collection of school materials dealing with history, culture, and language of the Spanish-speaking people of the western hemisphere.

Writing in both the *Phi Delta Kappan* and the *Curriculum Journal*, Sanchez observed that American schools which attempted to teach Latin American studies did not offer presentations reflecting the "authentic intellectual reciprocity" between the United States and Latin America. He believed that the educational awakening of the 1940's in the Western hemisphere compared to the intellectual ferment in sixteenth century Europe and text materials should reflect this renewed interest in ideas. He also stated that American interest in Latin America did not require new programs of study, but materials for more effective use of cultural resources available in both the United States and Latin America.

Sanchez's interests in cultural pluralism also motivated him to examine reservation life of the Navajo Indians. He lived among the Indians to evaluate their communal and educational needs. Although the Navajo problems differed
in many ways from those faced by the Mexican-American, Sanchez believed that the "bandaid" approach failed to meet Indian needs just as it had failed to satisfy the Mexican-American. 82

Sanchez observed that Mexican-Americans possessed cultural values similar to those of North American Indian tribes. He found that the Mexican-American seemed to be at ease with his own culture, his language and his personal sense of belongingness—like the Navajo or Apache. Both Indians and Mexican-Americans had not asked to migrate to the region, and they resented the fact that more recent arrivals to their homeland discriminated against them. 83 Sanchez's examination of reservation life, along with his frequent statement regarding availability of educational opportunities for the Mexican-American, illustrated his belief that poorer regions of this country needed increased federal aid to improve their living standard. He maintained federal aid actually represented a redistribution of tax money, not a sinister threat to individual or states' rights. He observed that the Northwest Ordinances, enacted early in American history, indicated that the national government officially supported and encouraged public education. He also pointed out that federal aid given through specialized tax exemptions had been common practice for a long time. 84
Sanchez condemned opposition to federally-subsidized free lunch programs by those Texans who avidly sought oil depletion allowance benefits, highway construction aid, and agricultural subsidies. He had examined statistics for federal lunch-aid applications from eighty unselected families in one Texas school to document his thesis that few poor people received "handouts." Of the eighty families being considered, one family with three school-aged children received lunches at no cost. In that instance the family head had been injured, leaving the family with no income. All other families paid at least five cents for their children's lunches. These families had an income ranging from 140 dollars to 260 dollars monthly, and almost one-third of the families had just the mother as the family head.

The author hypothesized that the federal school lunch program illustrated a governmental principle sanctioning use of state wealth to educate children. Believing that the intent of early national legislation paved the way for equalization of educational opportunities, he noted that equal opportunities could be operative on a national scale with the rule of need and equity being applied to the distribution of federal funds. Sanchez anticipated views of federal aid opponents by charging that if the states refused
federal funds for educational purposes, perhaps they would willingly use their oil depletion allowances to support the lunch program. He expected the power structure to refuse to siphon oil funds for school lunches. He then suggested that parents now receiving the benefits of the federal lunch programs be included under a just minimum wage law to enable them to provide adequately for their own families.\footnote{85}

Sanchez did not restrict his observations of injustice just to political attitudes found in Texas, but he freely delivered barbs to professional educators who wore "blinders" when they evaluated students by limiting their judgments to simply quantitative data. He criticized the tendency of those educators to judge the educational process in purely "biophysical" terms. He suggested that those who believed that reliable educational data came strictly from computer analysis reverted to a degenerate form of Positivism. Followers of the philosophical position of Positivism viewed I.Q. scores strictly in quantitative terms. They failed to understand that differences between normal and abnormal behavior remained qualitative judgments, incapable of being reduced to quantitative terms. "To accept an I.Q. measurement uncritically is like measuring virtue by a test based on frequency of church attendance,"\footnote{86} he remarked.

The author stated that schools tended to pattern their local standards after more prestigious institutions. He
reported that former University of Texas President Homer P. Rainey had once remarked that one can begin to achieve greatness if he can break away from the crowd to do what he thinks is right. Failure of institutions and individuals to do this produced mediocrity, according to Sanchez.  

He condemned the pursuit of mediocrity along with the tendency of educational researchers to extract evaluative criteria from many sources, combine their data, and arrive at a conclusion resembling a composite of all criteria considered. Sanchez reported that he had recently questioned a graduate student who attempted to determine the optimum size of elementary schools by using data from professional literature, testing his findings before a competent jury, and arriving at a conclusion based on the composite opinion of jury members. Sanchez asked the student if he would create a similar research design to find the perfect girl, and then marry the candidate who met the specifications.  

Along with ridiculing these popular research techniques applauded by educationists, Sanchez also blasted standards used by school districts to judge excellence in education. He believed that when professionals evaluated education, they referred to physical facilities and teachers' salaries rather than the existence of a free educational climate. He charged that educators had done
little to determine students' real worth and depended exclu-
sively on objective testing for their evaluations. Sanchez
observed that objective testing might well have screened
our famous nonconformists like Winston Churchill and Benjamin
Franklin.

He concluded that use of just objective criteria to
measure human potential revealed that the genius measured
no more than the severely retarded person. "The goals of
education are judged not quantitatively but qualitatively.
The quantitative is a device, a helpful one—but not one
which determines. To think otherwise is to fall under the
delusion of quantity." With this criticism Sanchez re-
stated views that he had expressed many years earlier when
he served as head of the research division in the education
department of the state of New Mexico. His condemnation of
educators' preferences for quantitative data, rather than
subjective judgments, showed his concern for the foreign-
language child who failed to perform well on tests not
representative of his cultural values.

During the years that Sanchez lived in Texas and taught
at the university, he participated actively with individuals
and groups who wanted to improve opportunity for the state's
Spanish-speaking citizens. His writings always reflected
that concern. His articles appeared in professional journals,
newspapers, and magazines. These writings, generally brief,
frequently bombastic, and sometimes repetitive, offered blunt criticisms of the "establishment" whom he perceived to have little sensitivity for the poor, inarticulate, and powerless. His purpose in writing seemed to be to inform people of the problems and arouse the politically powerful to change the status quo. The chapters dealing with Sanchez's political battles and his activities at the University of Texas include additional examples of Sanchez's works.
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CHAPTER IX

STUDENT TESSES AND DISSERTATIONS:

REFLECTIONS OF SANCHEZ'S CONCERNS

When Sanchez joined the University of Texas in Austin in 1940, he served both as a professor and consultant in Latin American education. He wore several hats during his Texas career; and, ultimately, he generated as much heat in his adopted state as he had already done in New Mexico. As a tenured professor, Sanchez taught history and philosophy of Education, education in Latin America, educational psychology, and education of minority groups. He served as a member of the Institute of Latin American Studies and chairman of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education from 1951 until 1959. He became well known outside of Austin because he served on national and international boards of many different organizations, but he devoted a great amount of effort in helping students study the educational and economic inequities experienced by the Spanish-speaking people in Texas.

During his thirty-two year career at the university, he supervised sixty-five master's theses and twenty doctoral dissertations. Forty-nine master's topics and eight doctoral
studies dealt with aspects of Mexican-American problems.\textsuperscript{1} The fact that the overwhelming majority of his students selected topics that interested Sanchez and paralleled some of his own research, made it necessary for this research to include an examination of these works. It is probably true that students who had an interest in Mexican-American problems selected Sanchez as their professor. It may also be true that he stimulated students through his classroom presentations to explore aspects of problems of this ethnic group. Although many of his students failed to demonstrate mastery of research techniques, these students dealt with questions of cultural values, educational problems, bilingualism, segregation, and examples of political, economic, and social injustices experienced by Spanish-speaking people in Texas. This chapter examines those studies dealing with questions of interest to Mexican-Americans.

Many studies by Sanchez's students dealt with problems arising in an Anglo society because of value differences held by Anglos and Mexicans. Angelita Maria Cruz examined Mexican children's stated attitudes concerning money. This thesis attempted to refute the idea that Mexican-Americans, as an agricultural people, did not know how to handle money. Her study of elementary school children in Laredo, Texas, proved that students had realistic values regarding the uses for money, and they readily
understood their parents' financial problems. The author concluded that schools should augment present student interest in financial matters by teaching them how to budget their limited funds wisely.

The fact that elementary school students apparently perceived that education needed to fit them for life may also have influenced their preferences for certain subjects in the curriculum. Margaret Ward Peterson surveyed 1,400 bilingual students in the intermediate elementary grades and reported that 1,211 of them considered arithmetic to be their favorite subject and reading and health to be their least favorite classes. The author theorized that students understood the practical value of learning arithmetic, because they had already internalized parental values concerning the usefulness of the discipline. On the other hand, children disliked reading because they saw little use for it. These children found reading difficult and believed that acquisition of this skill had little bearing on their success in the adult world. Children also exhibited dislike for health classes because they rejected the rote methodology used to present curriculum materials. Only 13 per cent of the fourth and fifth grade students selected English as their favorite subject, citing as their reason their desire to speak English correctly.

Peterson concluded that children chose their favorite school subjects based on their perception of a discipline's
usefulness. The author's data analysis missed an obvious point. It seemed that children also selected subjects based on their own experiences of success in dealing with particular subject matter. This researcher reading this study questioned why Sanchez didn't help Peterson to see that the data lent itself to several interpretations.³

Research considering kinds of linguistic errors made by bilingual students in their English compositions drew heavily upon Sanchez's research concerning language handicaps of the bilingual child. Hermelinda Ochoa showed that children persisted in their usage of Spanish vowel sounds and grammatical construction, because they had received insufficient training in English vocabulary and had had little opportunity to speak English. This author concluded that a good bilingual program in elementary schools would help students overcome these problems.⁴

If the content of social studies curricula had any bearing on the growth of positive intergroup relations among children in elementary schools, Ruth Lorraine Adams believed that materials used in this discipline needed revision. She reported that students learned social studies in segregated classes from teachers who relied almost exclusively on state-adopted textbooks. These teachers gave children little, if any, supplementary materials. Adams charged that instructors should become part of a changing order and should use materials to
modify attitudes of Anglo and Spanish-speaking students in order to improve their inter-group relations. She stated that teaching materials should provide for individual differences. She believed that inclusion of Latin American cultural materials would help break down ethnocentric feelings held by Anglos. The views expressed by this student paralleled Sanchez's ideas concerning cultural pluralism.5

Along with problems of curriculum content, research into the suitability of state-adopted basal readers revealed that the state's reading program failed to meet the needs of the bilingual child. Amando Villareal, Jr., elected to study the suitability of elementary school basal readers, because Sanchez had suggested the topic to him. Villareal pointed out that only one-half of the eligible Spanish-speaking scholastics enrolled in public school. Only 17 per cent of those enrolled performed on an average level and advanced one grade per year. Villareal cited Sanchez's research to support his claim that remedial teaching could raise an I.Q. score. He also credited his mentor by noting that bilingualism and depressed socio-economic conditions served as predisposing conditions to a lower I.Q.

Villareal quoted a study of L. S. Tireman that reported that research involving 8,400 bilingual children showed that these children failed to understand 46 per cent of the words on a fourth grade reading list, considered
essential for children learning to read. Villareal stated that English-speaking kindergarten children had a 2,000 word vocabulary, and Spanish-speaking five year olds had a comparable Spanish vocabulary with no English equivalency for more than one-half of their vocabulary. The teacher of bilingual primary classes had to recognize that students had language handicaps. Since these pupils received little reinforcement at home of their oral English skills, the teacher had the sole responsibility of teaching these children the second language. Villareal cited Sanchez as his authority when he suggested that a reading-readiness program should be provided for bilinguals so that they could learn from 400 to 600 English words before they began their first grade work.  

Sanchez and H. J. Otto, who was a Professor of Education at the University of Texas, had already prepared educational guidelines for the state education department for teachers of bilingual students; and Villareal cited the need to use this work to make the educational system more responsive to the children's needs. The author stated that although methodology and drill played a part in helping children learn English, educational materials had to be well illustrated and contain frequently repeated words that reflected children's interest. Sanchez provided Villareal with the criteria to examine basal readers, and the author
reported that texts used too many proper nouns and had content irrelevant to bilingual children's experiences. He stated that primary texts did not teach enough vocabulary, other than nouns. He pointed out that text materials failed to incorporate bilingual children's preschool vocabulary to help them learn English.\textsuperscript{7}

Elias Vega Hernandez's examination of reading retardation in an Austin elementary school, which had a bilingual student population, repeated the already-documented view expressed by Sanchez; and he showed the inherent bias of verbal I.Q. test. The study concluded that poor language concepts served to lower I.Q. scores.\textsuperscript{8} Rosa Atkinson also examined the educational retardation of bilinguals and criticized, like Sanchez, use of the I.Q. for grade placement. She condemned segregation, and she cited Sanchez's segregation study to support her charge that no evidence existed to support the idea that all bilingual students who were segregated had similar skills in either English or Spanish.

The author also noted that in the past, rural schools often did not segregate the bilingual students who entered school late in the year, but urban schools traditionally separated these students from the rest of the student body. Atkinson cited Sanchez as her authority and reiterated that bilingual children required the same kind of education as English-speaking ones. She believed that adult
education, health classes, enforcement of compulsory education laws, and improved housing were all necessary commitments that communities had to make to solve the problems of their bilingual scholastics.\footnote{9}

Sanchez's students repeatedly used much of his research to document their own findings. Maxine Pleydell Saunders' analysis of educational problems of bilingual children sought to compare problems of Texas children with those of New Mexican scholastics. Saunders cited Forgotten People frequently as documentation of her findings, along with reports of the Texas Human Relations' Commission. Sanchez took a leadership role in this Commission which had ostensibly been created to improve intergroup relations between bilinguals and Anglos. At the time that Saunders did her study, Sanchez served as Vice-Chairman of the group.

Although Sanchez had viewed critically New Mexican education when he lived in that state, he mellowed once he had moved to Texas. Saunders reported that Sanchez believed that New Mexicans had attempted to reform their educational program during the 1930's by changing the method in which they allocated school funding. Sanchez had also said that New Mexico had improved its public health services, practiced more efficient land usage, and encouraged more political participation among its bilingual population than he had observed in Texas. He
stated that by 1940 New Mexican bilinguals had reached a higher degree of assimilation than bilinguals in any other southwestern state.  

Basic to the education of the bilingual child rests the recognition that the school must find the way to cross the bridge between the child's home language and his school language. Sam Frank Cheavens' comprehensive study of vernacular languages and the development of bilingualism asserted that a person's ability to use his native language remained effectively linked with interpenetration of emotion and language. He believed that neglect or repression of the learner's native language damaged his morale to the point that he became apathetic towards the learning process or rebelled against it. Facility with language usage remained intrinsically tied to thinking facility. Cheavens stated that if the second language was introduced at the proper time, it would facilitate the learner's thinking ability so that within six months he would be able to achieve at the same rate as a group of students who had been studying the language for two years.

Cheavens also contended that use of vernacular among minority groups who lived among people that spoke another language hastened the acculturation of the foreign-speaking group. If these minorities resisted using their vernacular language, the author asserted that a continued cleavage continued between minority and Anglo groups.
Many of Sanchez's students examined the use of Latin American curriculum materials in Spanish-language classes to determine if this curriculum stressed, or at least recognized, the need to develop attitudes of cultural pluralism in order to help reduce cultural barriers separating English and Spanish-speaking peoples. Lucille Ashby Dufner believed that it seemed valuable to teach Spanish in elementary schools to stimulate students' interest in other cultures. The author cited many authorities for support, including R. E. Smith, independent Houston oil operator who chaired the Texas Human Relations' Commission and worked closely with Sanchez. Dufner echoed Sanchez's view concerning the use of Spanish in the classroom for all children to improve understanding between ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{12}

Consuelo Flores cited Sanchez's views to support her charge that failure to develop multi-cultural curricula perpetuated educational segregation and social and economic discrimination. The author used the curriculum of the Laredo schools to illustrate how that school district failed to offer curriculum materials about Latin America, despite the facts that many students in the community spoke Spanish.\textsuperscript{13}

Gloria Walker Massey investigated educational practices in foreign language instruction in Texas junior high schools. She pointed out that by 1930 only a few schools in urban areas offered Spanish instruction below the ninth grade, but Texas and California offered more Spanish classes than any of the
other states. By the 1950's enrollment in Spanish classes began to decline in Texas just as it had already done in other parts of the nation. The author noted that school systems had to schedule more time for required curricula, and language classes suffered because of this.14

Even when school systems offered classes in Spanish, some researchers pointed out that these materials failed to meet student needs adequately. Basing this study on curriculum offered in south Texas schools for native Spanish speakers, Julia K. Mellenbruch noted that oversimplified text materials used by schools failed to stimulate student interest. She pointed out that syllabi neglected to place sufficient emphasis on grammar skills, spelling, or colloquial expressions found in popular speech. The author suggested that materials should include good Spanish novels, poems, and essays that would expose the native Spanish speaker to the fine literature in his language. Citing Luisa Sanchez, wife of George Sanchez, Mellenbruch noted that the use of real Spanish language materials in a Spanish class helped to provide students with a broader appreciation of their own culture. The author stated that it was the teacher's responsibility to ascertain accurately the students' abilities to handle a sequential language arts program and to augment their cultural appreciation while they increased their communication skills.15
Melba Thekla Schumann examined a twelve weeks Spanish program for eighth graders in an Austin junior high school. She hypothesized that some students had deep-seated feelings of hostility towards learning Spanish, which the author believed might impede their ability to learn a second language. The author asserted that it was up to the teachers to find appropriate methodology to stimulate student interest in these brief exploratory courses, while these instructors strived to overcome students' apprehensions regarding learning a second language. Sanchez had frequently expressed the view that cultural pluralism remained an important societal goal, and multi-language facility helped people reach that goal. 16

The teaching of English as a second language to Spanish-speaking students required teachers to create a totally new learning environment. Both students and teachers needed a laboratory setting so that they might practice their newly-acquired verbal skill. Elna Laverne Walker studied English language materials from the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, which had already been accepted by educators as the standard methodology to be used to teach English as the second language. The author demonstrated that although the Michigan system seemed worthwhile for adults who already had enough education to handle this sophisticated presentation, this method failed to work for adults with little formal education. Walker sought to revamp the
methodology to make it applicable for poorly educated adults. Sanchez directed this study; and, as the author acknowledged, exhibited a scholarly interest in second language training.17

Using Sanchez's research as a frame of reference, Adelma Chernosky explained that it was possible to teach bilingual students to pass I.Q. and achievement tests. The author amplified Sanchez's already-expressed views concerning curriculum enrichment and asserted that bilingual children required the same good teaching that all children needed. The author advocated widespread use of audio-visual materials for these children. The author, like her mentor, concluded that socio-economic conditions, rather than hereditary factors, contributed to the generally lower scores for this group.

Chernosky observed that brighter children made more rapid gains in achievement than duller children. She pointed out that enriched learning experiences which contributed to score increases did not apply equally to all tests. One portion of the reading score revealed a negative achievement which the author attributed to weak methodology. Finally, she noted that students achieved higher scores on tests requiring little knowledge of English. This indicated the close relationship between measurable learning skills and the ability to understand the English language.18
Concern with language teaching and its effectiveness in building feelings of cultural pluralism served as the theme of several master's theses and one doctoral dissertation. Sarita Soto de Zacijek examined kinds of methodology used with materials available for teaching Spanish on a junior high level, while Barbara L. Priest Emerson explored the quality of Latin American content materials available in schools in Bryan, Texas. Clotilde P. Garcia discussed the use of Spanish-American literature in high school Spanish classes to determine if schools used the kinds of materials which encouraged the appreciation of both Anglo and Spanish cultures. Elna Laverne Walker surveyed the field of juvenile literature dealing with Latin America to determine how stories helped children become more aware of the Iberian culture. When Walker did her study, Sanchez served as an editor for the Macmillan Company, for he had much interest in this field.¹⁹

A thesis reviewing the professional literature which discussed the teaching of English as a second language, served to recap again some of Sanchez's studies. Julia R. Taylor stated, "This study was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. George I. Sanchez. It was his kindness in outlining the problem and directing the method of attack that had made it possible to put limitations on the area of research."²⁰ Citing widely accepted research of the 1930's, the author
used Sanchez's writings and concluded, like her instructor, that bilingual children had a dual language handicap because they lacked a well-developed vernacular in their primary language.

She restated Sanchez's views concerning the need to teach children an English vocabulary before teaching them to read and supported her professor's beliefs that learning a language, actually a social experience, could not be accomplished either in isolation or in a segregated setting.

Claudia Loris Johnson's thesis surveyed the different programs of bilingual education in the southwestern states. The author examined the New Mexican San José experimental school, headed by L. S. Tireman, and the bilingual programs in San Marcos, Texas. Johnson reported that Tireman served as a consultant to the San Marcos project, and he criticized the physical facilities and the curriculum of the Texas system. The New Mexican educator stated that the school's educational objectives, as well as the skills of its faculties, needed modification before the community school could serve as a laboratory school.

The author reported that the San Marcos educational leaders failed to implement Tireman's recommendations. Johnson's study served as an attack on a school system that had a bilingual problem and had not made the kind of substantive changes needed to correct it. This kind of study would have pleased Sanchez who readily perceived the
unwillingness of school systems to make necessary changes to ease the educational plight of the bilingual child.  

Nan Jones Mitchell's study, "An Evaluation of Provisions for the Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in San Marcos, Texas," complements Johnson's study but zeroed in on both the community segregation problem and the existing discrepancies between the state education department's stated goals for bilingual students and their implementation in San Marcos. Mitchell noted that the Texas Good Neighbor Commission said that the state's educational program should be directed toward helping children maximize development of their abilities in an integrated society. Mitchell cited both Commission reports and Sanchez's speeches and studies to attack existing segregation practices.

The author quoted Sanchez's speech to the 1942 National Congress of Parents and Teachers in which he stated that bilingual children, like all children, would benefit from enriched curricula, better teachers, school lunches, health services, vocational training, and other aspects of enlightened education designed to improve the quality of life for all scholastics.

Mitchell's study compared the unequal educational opportunities offered bilingual children who attended one school with the program offered Anglo children at the demonstration school that was sponsored by Southwest Texas State Teachers'
College. Johnson showed the marked differences in the physical facilities of the two schools and pointed out that bilingual children received inferior facilities. She also noted that salaries of teachers at the two elementary schools differed. The college supplemented the teachers' salaries at the Anglo demonstration school, while the teachers of the bilingual students received state minimum compensation. Mitchell's chronicle of unequal educational opportunities and poor teaching for bilinguals amplified an already well documented thesis that the bilingual child received an inferior education. She concluded that segregation of bilingual scholastics retarded development of their language proficiency.24

James Erwin Elms' study, "Attendance of Mexican and Anglo Students in Two Austin, Texas, Schools," pointed out the marked differences in both attendance and achievement patterns between Anglo students at the Metz school and Mexican children at Zavala school. The schools were located fewer than three blocks apart, but Anglo enrollment was confined to one school, while the other institution had Mexican scholastics. Elms' examination of attendance and achievement levels showed that from 1946 through 1949, only 6 per cent of the Anglo students were overage in the first grade, while 23 per cent of the Mexican children were overage. Fifty-seven per cent of the Mexican children
advanced normally through the grades annually, while 92 per cent of the Anglo children earned annual promotion. Enrollment patterns remained fairly constant in the Metz school, but the Zavala school began its school year with 511 students and had 582 pupils six weeks later. The Mexican school's enrollment reached a high of 669 students and dropped to 581 during the last six weeks of the school year. The author also found the 8.8 per cent of the Anglo students attended school fewer than 121 days per year, while 33 per cent of the Mexican students averaged fewer than 121 attendance days annually.25

Charles R. Akin examined school boundaries in east Austin, the Mexican-American residential community, to determine both the existence of adequate school facilities for present community needs and the projection of the neighborhood's future needs. The author called attention to the fact that future school facility planning had to consider elimination of segregation as part of the total plan.

Metz, Zavala, and Govalle elementary schools served the east Austin area and offered service to a rapidly growing school population from 1940 until 1950. The Zavala school's enrollment was completely Mexican, even though housing patterns did not require that Zavala school serve only Mexican children, and the Metz school enrolled
only Anglos. These schools were located so close together that as early as 1944, the Mexican consul in Austin insisted that children living in that community be assigned to schools to balance ethnic enrollments in both present and future schools. Seven years had passed since the consul had made these recommendations, but the Austin school district had failed to implement his suggestions. The author reported that when the Zavala school was built, it was planned as a Mexican school in keeping with wishes of neighborhood Mexican residents.

Although the predominantly Anglo Metz school population had 38 per cent Mexican students included in its total enrollment, the Zavala school had no Anglos. The author concluded that the total Mexican enrollment at the Zavala school reflected a desire to perpetuate segregation. He also maintained that the marked increase of school population indicated that at the time the author did his study, the neighborhood lacked twenty-one classrooms to house properly the present school population. He predicted that the rate of population increase projected by 1960 showed that the neighborhood would need eighty additional classrooms to accommodate the expected population. The author concluded by suggesting that the school district should build additional schools and redefine school boundaries without continuing segregation. This study strongly supported Sanchez's beliefs.26
Ruth Patton Connor studied both community and home problems of bilingual students in Austin, and she found that the Spanish-speaking resident comprised one-sixth of the city's total population, but the schools failed to enroll all eligible bilingual students in schools. In the 1947-1948 school year, 3,369 bilingual students should have been attending school, but only 2,483 were included on school rosters. The author noted that statewide attendance figures for the 1942-1943 school years replicated the Austin pattern. She reported that more than 50 per cent of the bilingual children were enrolled in the first three grades, and overagedness remained the dominant characteristics for all grades. Connor stated that in 1937, of the 553 children who were graduated from Austin high schools, only 5 were Mexican-American, and 60 were Negroes. By the 1946-1947 school year, 679 high school graduates included 22 bilingual students and 101 Negroes.

The author stated that the economic status of the bilingual group contributed to their educational problems. She also noted that Mexican-Americans who completed high school found it difficult to find suitable jobs because of discrimination practices. Connor suggested that the language problem complicated the learning problem for this group, and she cited Sanchez to support this position.
Connor cited Sanchez's research as documentation that the bilingual child needed to have an early exposure to English. She advocated pre-first grade classes for these children. She also stressed teaching cultural pluralism and encouraging Spanish-speaking parents to participate in school activities. The author quoted Pauline Kibbe, author and executive secretary of the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, to explain that bilingual parents remained uncertain of the advantages of education because of their own lack of positive experiences in the educational system. This parental attitude, plus the fact that the state failed to enforce its compulsory attendance law properly, contributed to poor attendance of bilingual children in Austin public schools. The author, like Sanchez, called for the mobilization of community resources to help Spanish-speaking people improve their socioeconomic status.  

Carlos Calderon's thesis, "The Education of Spanish-speaking in Edcouch, Elsa, Texas," supported evidence already presented concerning inequities of school facilities for Mexican and Anglo students. He measured differences in physical plants and learned that Mexican children had inferior facilities. He also looked at the differences in teacher-pupil ratios in both Mexican and Anglo schools. He stated that during the 1948-1949 school year, schools attended by Anglo students had thirty-three pupils per teacher, while
schools attended by bilingual students began their year with forty-one first graders per teacher and increased their teacher-pupil ratio to a high of sixty-three students per teacher by December. Enrollment figures in the Mexican school fluctuated widely during the academic year, while Anglo schools maintained a fairly stable attendance pattern. In addition, class assignment of Spanish-speaking children divided first grade work for all children into two years, whether or not the child needed this.

Calderon's portrayal of unequal facilities for Spanish-speaking children used Sanchez's views to document his own research. The author cataloged the disparities of educational opportunities in Edcouch, Texas, and pointed out that bilingual children lacked medical and dental facilities, received no band instruction, and had an athletic program which limited their competitive activities to the other Mexican schools in the community.  

Several of Sanchez's students studied educational problems common to south Texas schools and pointed out such problems as poor attendance, poor facilities, and poor achievement among the large number of bilingual scholaristics who lived in the region. Johnny Edward Langerhans, "An Analysis of the Attendance in the La Joya, Texas, Schools," studied the attendance patterns in a section of the state inhabited largely by migrant Mexican farm workers. His thesis amplified already mentioned works
which showed that children of migrants entered school late and left school early. Langerhans stated that educational problems faced by students and educational administrators indicated that student interests would be better served if they received training in marketable skills for the brief periods that they attended school. He maintained that first the migrant's economic status had to be improved before community leaders could attempt to find solutions to other socioeconomic ills plaguing the group.

Because the migrant child's poor attendance contributed to his poor achievement, Gladys Riskind Wuest examined problems of migratory parents in west Texas to isolate basal causes of educational problems. The author contacted 199 parents and learned that 119 of them had been born in Mexico, while 80 were born in Eagle Pass or another Texas community. Seventy-four of these people had never attended school, fourteen had one year of education, twenty-two had two years of schooling, forty-five had three years, twenty-three had four years, and thirteen had completed five years of schooling. Of the rest, five had six years of education, two completed the seventh grade, and one had attended school for eight years. She found widespread illiteracy among this group.

Most of these families owned their own homes, but these houses had few windows and generally lacked indoor plumbing. Some of the wage earners averaged a weekly wage of seven to ten dollars, and few earned as much as thirty
dollars weekly. Most of these families traveled by truck to farming areas, and the majority of them stayed away from Eagle Pass as long as seven months annually. Children rarely attended school while parents traveled, and many failed to attend school when the families returned to their Texas homes. Sixty-five per cent of the children remained out of school completely. Age-grade classification of children of migratory parents indicated a severely retarded condition, and most of these children were enrolled in the first four grades.

The author suggested that these children needed individualized facilities so that they could progress at their own rate, and she also stated that vocational training should be offered to them at the junior high school level. She pointed out that this type of training remained extremely important for these scholastics, because they lacked interest in textbook material, dropped out of school after brief periods of attendance, and lacked the means to improve their economic status. Wuest believed that school leaders in Eagle Pass should also maintain better relations with these migrant families because the adults showed little interest in their children's education. Finally, the author suggested a twelve month school term so that the children of migrants could accumulate the necessary days of schooling during the time that parents remained in the community.
She believed that if schools remained open all year, then, parents might have more interest in seeing to it that children attended school regularly. Questions concerning modification of community organization to make leaders more attuned to the needs of the bilingual scholastics paralleled Sanchez's views regarding the improvement of educational opportunities for this group.  

Barbara Stone Yeager's rehash of migrant children's needs pointed out that school systems did little to prepare late entry migrant children properly, and tended, instead to ignore them. She noted that hard working elementary school teachers had little extra time to ease school adjustment problems for these migrant children. The school's failure to forward children's school records when they moved out of the district made it impossible for any other school system to appraise children's progress when they first entered another school. Yeager detailed a long list of suggestions for solving the group's complex educational problems, and she reiterated Sanchez's views which asserted the need to enrich educational experiences for these children by integrating them into the total community's school population. Finally, the author suggested that teacher participation in migrants' community life would help acquaint the residents with available social services. This participation by teachers, as well as in-service education programs to help
them overcome their personal prejudices towards migrant students, remained necessary community reforms.  

Arthur Cunningham, Jr.'s thesis, "The Development of the Visiting Teacher Department in Austin, Texas," stated that Austin, like other communities, began the visiting-teacher program in order to work more effectively with children who had a poor attendance record. Many of these children had parents who were migratory workers. The program began before 1941 and expanded during the postwar years to meet the needs of an increasing population. The duties of the visiting teacher combined the responsibilities of the attendance officer, counselor, and social worker. By 1946, a Spanish-speaking visiting teacher became part of the Austin corps. The visiting teachers provided special assistance to handicapped students, offered adult home counseling programs, and guidance services. Cunningham reported that the Austin visiting teachers' service compared favorably with similar departments in other cities.

Emilia S. Ramirez's study of children of illegal aliens in south Texas examined bilingual children's educational problems in Edinburg, Texas. The author noted that up until the 1949 school year, communities received educational allotments based on a per capita rate of eligible scholastics in the community, rather than on the
actual numbers of children enrolled in school. This funding method failed to encourage communities having large numbers of bilingual students to require their attendance on a regular basis. To do this would mean that these communities would have to tax themselves heavily to educate children who came from poor families. With average daily attendance and the establishment of the minimum foundations’ program under the Gilmer-Aiken Acts, educators in south Texas became more interested in teaching bilingual students whose parents legally belonged in the United States. Community school leaders had no authority to compel children of illegal aliens to attend public schools.  

The author of this study failed to document her findings with appropriate statistical data, but research already published by Wilson Little indicated the difficulty of assessing accurately the actual numbers of Spanish-speaking scholastics in any Texas community. Little explained that the census only separated eligible scholastics into white and black groups. Researchers interested in computing the numbers of Spanish-speaking scholastics had to count the distinctively Spanish surnames detailed on the census lists. This computation method underestimated the number of Spanish-speaking scholastics in every Texas community. The U. S. Census Bureau’s 1940 enumeration no longer listed Mexican-Americans as Mexicans. Instead, the census tabulators
attempted to estimate the number of people who used Spanish as their primary language. This computation also underestimated the Texas Spanish-speaking population. Lyle Saunders, sociologist, stated that although the 1940 census attempted to estimate the total number of this ethnic group in the nation, their computation was based on a 5 per cent test sample and did not include estimates for counties, small cities, or rural areas. This enumeration failed to consider such matters of age groupings, sex ratios, citizenship, education, occupation, or housing. The sociologist observed that family name served as one means of locating this ethnic group, but he believed that subjective identification might prove to be more accurate. Saunders also noted that this ethnic group had more children than the rest of the white population. He indicated that from 1922 until 1942, the total white population registered a decline of .23 per cent, while the Spanish-speaking population increased by 8.41 per cent. The Texas Education Agency reported that before the late 1960's, they did not tabulate separately the numbers of Spanish-surnamed children. Since neither Wilson Little nor Lyle Saunders had an accurate means of assessing the total number of Spanish-speaking people in Texas, this may be another reason why Sanchez encouraged his students to examine educational and socioeconomic problems in sections of the state with many Spanish-speaking inhabitants. Perhaps,
he hoped that if enough students investigated many individual communities, then he and other educators might begin to assess with reasonable accuracy the total scope of this group's educational problems.

A study of school attendance of children of migratory farmers in Grulla, Starr county, reiterated that all too familiar story concerning poor attendance of migrant children. The author stated that school districts needed additional legislation with proper enforcement provisions to compel children to attend school while they lived in the community. Sanchez's student also demanded enforcement of restrictions against the use of "wetback" labor on the factory farms in the community, a point which Sanchez had also made. 38

"A Study of Spanish-Speaking Children in Dimmit County, Texas," also reported that Spanish-surnamed children failed to receive equal educational opportunities. Lura N. Rouse noted that the area had a large Mexican population employed in farming and related occupations, but that Spanish-surnamed people were excluded from participating in area political primaries. The author cited Paul S. Taylor's An American-Mexican Frontier to state that Dimmit county maintained a white primary association which prevented bilingual residents from voting. Rouse cited Sanchez as her authority when she criticized discriminatory educational practices. She noted that Sanchez believed that community
unrest, created by the pachuco group, had its genesis in unintelligent educational measures, discriminatory social and economic practices, provincial smugness, and ethnocentric feelings of racial superiority.

Rouse stated that during the 1947-1948 school year, the county had 1,188 Mexican children enrolled in its five public and one parochial schools. Almost one-half the total number of scholastics attended the Carrizo Springs school which had the best facilities. One school in the county segregated minority children solely in the first grade. The author pointed out that the county's first grade enrollment contained half the total scholastics, and the dropout rate for minority children accelerated rapidly through the elementary grades. Children frequently repeated assigned work three or four times. Some children remained in one grade as long as six years. Rouse cataloged the unequal educational opportunities offered to bilingual students and related this evidence to examples of other discrimination experienced by bilingual Dimmit county residents. 39

Nicholas Akery's study of an experimental primary educational program in one Edinburg, Texas, elementary school illustrated a school's attempt to provide remedial and vocational training for large numbers of overage bilingual students. The innovative program combined remedial teaching with vocational training. This school received
students from the total community who were considered to have learning disabilities. Administrators modified the curriculum to meet students' immediate problems. Methodology included use of role play, exhibits, dramatizations, and visual aids. Edinburg's 70 per cent bilingual population offered area teachers serious educational challenges, but they felt unable to meet student needs on an individualized basis.

Although over one-half the community's total population spoke Spanish, school rules required that bilingual children be segregated into pre-first grade classes. Akery charged that this segregation increased the child's retardation when he entered school. Sanchez maintained that school systems which segregated pre-first graders generally failed to determine these children's language development before assigning them to segregated classes. The professor categorically opposed segregation and charged, according to Akery, that school administrators failed to understand how people thought and how they learned English as a vernacular language. Akery also drew on Sanchez's views to support his statement that children attending integrated classes had greater facility with English than those in segregated schools. Akery also stated that children in segregated classes had poorer teachers and inferior learning materials than scholastics in integrated classes.
The author used Sanchez's study of the bilingual child as the vehicle to criticize the teacher who failed to understand these children's educational needs. Sanchez maintained that bilinguals needed superior teachers cognizant of language development and sensitive to student family and cultural needs. The author referred to Sanchez's belief that teachers needed to be more concerned with teaching children how to think so that they would be able to handle abstract ideas. This, according to Akery, illustrated that teachers cared about a child's total education not just his language fluency. Akery's view reflected Sanchez's frequent statements.  

Maria Jesus de los Santos' study dealt with experimental teaching materials used with a special class of twenty-five overaged students in Laredo, Texas. The author attempted to determine if use of different methodology made any impact upon a child's desire to learn. Most of these children had entered school late. The children ranged in age from fourteen to seventeen years and achieved on third, fourth, and fifth grade levels. The author found that by grouping all of these students into a sixth grade class and devising educational materials more interesting to adolescent children than the traditional elementary schools materials, they learned more rapidly. Test and re-test results indicated that students achieved at a faster rate with new materials.
Joe Harvey Wilson's doctoral dissertation examined dropouts from Texas secondary schools with special consideration to the bilingual students' problems. Wilson noted that Mexican communities included both rich and poor inhabitants. He stated that most of his population was mez
tizo, and he made sweeping generalization to characterize the diversities of this ethnic group. Wilson's study re-ran the cataloging of socio-economic problems which have been repeated ad nauseum, but he did offer examples to show the existence of some Mexico-Anglo cultural fusion in the Southwest. He stated that Anglos accepted some of the Mexican's culture but remained afraid to extend complete democracy to his Spanish-speaking neighbor. He charged that prejudice and ignorance were prevailing Anglo attitudes which contributed to high levels of ethnocentrism among the Anglos of the region. Wilson's statements credited Sanchez's view that ethnocentrism was "cultural indigestion."

The study stated that the bilingual had an extremely high dropout rate, and local school authorities failed to enforce compulsory attendance laws. Wilson believed bilinguals needed an enriched educational program and encouragement by administrators and teachers to help them overcome their educational handicaps. 42

William J. Whiteside's examination of educational implications of population changes in Texas explained that
bilinguals had a higher birth rate than other ethnic groups. His concern for their educational opportunities prompted him to examine the effect of the Gilmer-Aikin Acts, passed by the Texas legislature in 1949, to establish a minimum foundations' program for all children throughout the state. Recognizing the fact that this legislation did not guarantee equal educational opportunities for all children, he analyzed implementation of the laws with reference to funding sources available to school districts and subsequent fund expenditures. The author pointed out that state funding, based on average daily attendance, took into account data dealing with numbers of professional positions in a community, operational units, and transportation costs for each district. Districts had to follow state guidelines to qualify for state funds. Available funds were apportioned by taking into account pertinent economic indices. School districts used local taxation to provide funds to support the minimum foundations' program.

Sources of local funding came from many areas, but the oil and gas industries appeared to Whiteside to be the most important source for all state revenues. He stated that in 1949 the oil industry paid 31 per cent of the total cost shouldered by all state taxpayers. The industry's contribution to education accounted for 49 per cent of the tax monies in the general revenue fund to be used for the minimum foundations' programs. Whiteside
explained that annual oil production fluctuated in the state's 185 producing counties from 127 barrels in McCullough county to more than 59 million barrels in Ector county.

The author charged that oil revenues served as the instrument used to perpetuate educational inequality, although the taxing structure had somewhat reduced this imbalance in recent years. He documented his charge by showing the counties with the highest oil production and correlated that figure with per capita educational expenditures and the number of Spanish-speaking county residents. For the 1951-1952 school year, median county expenditures per student averaged 180 dollars, with the upper 25 percent of the counties spending from 284 to 657 dollars annually. Whiteside took his analysis further by showing that counties with both high oil production and large numbers of Spanish-speaking people spent less money for education than oil-producing counties with a low Spanish-speaking population. He noted that Duval county had a large bilingual population and spent 63 dollars annually per scholastic, while Brooks, Fort Bend, San Patricio, Starr, and Victoria counties produced a great deal of oil, had a large bilingual population and spent fewer than 180 dollars annually per scholastic. Whiteside's study relating availability of taxing resources, number of bilinguals, and per capita annual educational expenditures related directly to the kind of comparison Sanchez had
made in his own dissertation which correlated per capita income, numbers of Spanish-speaking residents, percentages of illiteracy, and overaged students. Whiteside relied on oil industry publications, Texas Almanac, and individual county budgets and rosters of scholastics to determine budgetary allotments. The author extracted students with Spanish surnames from each county's school census. It had already been noted that the state educational agency did not keep separate statistics for the Spanish-speaking until the 1960's.  

John Behner Valerius used population studies completed by Herschel T. Manuel in 1930, Wilson Little in 1944, and Lyle Saunders in 1949 to hypothesize that it remained impossible to assess accurately the actual numbers of this ethnic group residing in Texas by limiting the tabulation to the counting of surnames. Valerius noted that Saunders had already criticized the hypotheses which asserted that the ratios of white scholastic population and total white population remained unchanged or changed at a uniform rate. Valerius documented statistically that during the 1940-1950 decade the white scholastic population dropped in relation to the total white population, but the Spanish-speaking scholastics increased substantially during that same period. Valerius concluded that the bilingual population neither remained constant nor changed at a uniform rate. He stated that the difficulty in estimating accurately these population
fluctuations rested partially in the use of different statistical methodologies for computing the data. Sanchez and Lyle Saunders collaborated, according to Valerius, in 1948 to produce estimates of the scholastic population, but Valerius reported that the study was informally called the "Saunders, Sanchez" study but only Saunders received publication credit. Actually, this monograph appeared under the umbrella title, Inter-American Occasional Papers, and Sanchez served as editor and director of this series. 44

Although questions of funding and population estimates ultimately affected the education of bilingual scholastics in Texas, the question of unequal educational opportunities caused by segregation affected students daily. Ennis Hall Gilbert compared California and Texas segregation practices by examining pertinent court cases dealing with this issue. He stated that segregation of the bilingual scholastic existed throughout Texas, although specific school law failed to set these children in a "class apart" as the black scholastics remained classified during this same period. 45 Roy Price Ashton also examined the legal questions concerning educational opportunities for bilinguals. He reported that although the agreed judicial judgment in the 1948 Delgado decision had prohibited the segregation of bilingual students beyond the first grade, some Texas districts failed to comply quickly with this court order.
He cited the fact that the Del Rio community used the "freedom of choice" plan, and L. A. Woods, State Superintendent of Schools, issued the following decision on April 23, 1949, relevant to that community's practice:

I hereby confirm my previous ruling of withdrawing accreditation from the Del Rio Independent School District, removing them from the accredited list of schools, and do hereby declare it to be an illegally operated school to which teachers who are the holders of valid teachers' certificates, issued through this office, are not eligible to teach without having their teachers' certification cancelled, after the beginning of the school year of 1949-1950, which begins on September 1, 1949. The removal of Del Rio from accredited list is still effective as of February 12, 1949.

Although the State Superintendent took a firm stand in enforcing the court decision, Ashton reported that some school districts failed to comply fully with both the superintendent and the court. The author noted that in counties north and west of Austin little evidence of segregation existed. Burnet, Bell, Lampasas, Williamson, and Coryell counties had a small bilingual population and did not segregate these scholastics. The school leaders exhibited genuine concern for the bilingual group's education. Burnet leaders expressed an interest in establishing and maintaining the kind of community which would produce better jobs for all residents.

Hays, Guadalupe, and Caldwell counties located south and east of Austin had different policies. Buda, in Hays
county, completely, eliminated segregation, while Kyle maintained segregated classes in both elementary and junior high schools. The schools in Seguin had good facilities operated under a "freedom of choice" plan. Here, elementary school children attended segregated classes, but they went to integrated classes during their secondary school years. Luling schools in Caldwell county had desegregated classes, but the Lockhart urban system used the "freedom of choice" plan to perpetuate segregation. The author concluded that state authorities needed to continue to enforce the Delgado ruling. Sanchez had worked actively in helping the plaintiffs prepare research for the Delgado case. 48

Bruce Staffel Meador examined the psychological ramifications of discrimination against minority scholastics in Hays county. He asserted that studies should be made of the relationship between personality and minority group status. He noted that the child who was singled out and discriminated against for minority status felt helpless. In Hays county, the Spanish-speaking experienced discrimination in school clubs, churches, and other organizations. Teachers reported that children generalized that a certain disagreeable personality trait applicable to one member of a minority group applied to all group members.
Meador believed that schools should teach human relations and democratic ideals as carefully as they teach subject matter. This concern by educators for student development should extend to co-curricular programs, too. Schools leaders' concern for the total development of all students, according to the author, included provision for proper nutrition and attention to the overage condition of bilinguals. He stated that school administrators needed to revamp their curricula which required that bilinguals received an automatic two-year first grade assignment. The material presented in this study illustrated some of Sanchez's deepest concerns regarding the bilingual scholastic population.49

Many of Sanchez's students examined education inequities in the state's public schools, but two of his graduate students also explored higher learning institutions to determine how these schools met the needs of their Spanish surnamed students. Richard Roy Renner examined the names of college students in the Texas colleges and universities to approximate the number of Texas-Mexican students enrolled in these schools. Renner reported that 106 Mexican-American students were enrolled at the University of Texas in 1940 while 429 of this ethnic group matriculated in 1956. These students preferred the colleges of arts and sciences and pharmacy to the other disciplines. From 1938 until 1940, 1.2 percent of the university graduates had Spanish surnames,
while the percentage had grown to 2.1 per cent by 1952. Renner cited Herschel Manuel's research to illustrate that even though almost 16 per cent of the state's scholastics were bilingual, only one-half of one per cent of them enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Renner hypothesized that Spanish-surnamed students attended junior or state colleges closer to home. He cited both private and state-supported institutions to prove his point.  

A study examining the effectiveness of college programs in meeting community educational needs in south Texas drew heavily upon Sanchez's views for documentation. Howard L. Putnam cited Sanchez's goals of political action as he described the plight of the bilingual population in south Texas. The author explained that the term "Spanish-speaking people" described persons who spoke Spanish, had a Spanish-Indian-Catholic heritage, and identified with other persons having similar cultural characteristics. The author also stated that cultural descriptions of the bilingual population indicated that these people believed strongly in superstition, demonstrated group cohesiveness, and emphasized strong family ties.

Putnam assured his readers that the Spanish-speaking could not be considered a homogeneous group, and that their needs had to be met on an individual basis. Citing Sanchez as his source, Putnam stated that the Spanish-speaking appeared to be less Americanized, more poorly
acculturated, and more permanently isolated socially than any other large group in the nation. Their problems, compounded by economic difficulties, remained at times intra-group rather than just inter-group. The author stated that a Spanish veterans' group launched a voter registration campaign in a south Texas community, and they urged community residents to pay their poll taxes. The effort was thwarted by other Spanish-speaking community leaders who already enjoyed political power and sought to prevent another group from rising in community stature. Putnam stated that political effectiveness of the group correlated highly with improved community relations. Where Mexican-Americans had achieved some political support, inter-group conflicts diminished. The author failed to name these groups but it appeared obvious that he discussed the conflicts between the older established LULAC group and the newer American G. I. Forum organization. Believing that political clout helped the bilinguals to deliver their message to political leaders; the author, citing Sanchez again, noted that because of the widespread poverty, it appeared difficult for these peoples to organize a cohesive group effort. Putnam believed that their poverty isolated them from the Anglo community leaders, and he stated that education remained the important tool to be used by the bilingual to learn to manipulate the political process.
The author examined college curricula at Pan American College, Texas Southmost College, Laredo Junior College, Texas A. & I. College, and Southwest Texas Junior College to learn if these institutions addressed themselves to the needs of their community residents. He concluded that generally the colleges failed to include bilingual educational needs in their course offerings. Some schools offered English classes for adults, and others included aspects of Hispanic culture in their humanities courses, but he noted a lack of curriculum which would help bilinguals learn how to participate in the political process. Putnam concluded that although some businesses in the region encouraged inclusion of vocational courses, most of the colleges avoided offering any subject matter which could be labeled as controversial. Because Sanchez preached openly about the uses of education to teach minority groups how to learn to manipulate the "establishment," this doctoral study reflected some of Sanchez's deepest beliefs.

Religion also played a part in the acculturation of the Mexican-American into the mainstream of American life, and David C. Harrison examined the educational and administrative policies of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches in Texas that served Mexican-Americans. The author pointed with pride to the evangelical efforts of the three denominations, but he noted that for the most part Mexican
churches remained separated from the Anglo congregations of the same denominations. Harrison indicated that ministers serving these groups were usually poorly trained. These congregations generally received financial assistance from the larger and better established Anglo churches as part of the parents groups' evangelical efforts to proselytize among a group considered to be nominally Roman Catholic.  

Roman Catholics in the San Antonio area, under the leadership of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, were informed that the church leadership strived to eliminate Negro segregation from the parochial schools. As early as 1941, parochial schools in that area began to initiate affirmative action to eliminate scholastic segregation. Lucey reminded his followers that the time of racial injustice had passed. Although the focal point of this study by Genevieve Tarlton Alexander focused on black-white integration problems, the student's research of anti-segregationist actions supported Sanchez's beliefs.

Later studies of the role of religion in the lives of Mexican-Americans in *The Mexican-American People* generally supported the findings by Sanchez's students. This work noted that the three Protestant groups mentioned stressed both evangelical and social work activities to their Spanish-speaking congregants. The Anglo group generally supported the separation of Anglo and Mexican churches, but
in some instances the Mexican congregants themselves preferred their own groups to integration in the larger religious community. The Catholic church, with the support of dynamic bishops, worked actively in social-action areas in order to improve the socio-economic conditions of their congregants.54

If Mexican-Americans clung to the bottom of the economic ladder because they lacked marketable skills, Dorothy L. Dunsmore sought to find out if San Antonio schools, with a large bilingual population, had made an effort to teach bilingual scholastics vocational skills in the public schools. She noted that despite the fact that the city had made some meager beginnings in vocational educational programs, the system still needed to develop technical educational programs which would enable secondary school students to enter the job market qualified for skilled labor employment. The author noted that almost 80 per cent of entering high school students failed to graduate. Local industry needed a skilled labor market but lacked onsite facilities for training. Dunsmore recommended that school vocational programs be structured to suit the needs of the industrial community.55

Dunsmore's charge that public schools did not equip students properly to enter the job market remained substantiated by Forrest Burr Crain's examination of the occupational distribution of persons with Spanish surnames
in Austin. He learned that these people were found most often in semi-skilled and unskilled occupations. He also stated that other Caucasian workers had more opportunities to be offered jobs for which they were qualified than were those with Spanish surnames. He reported that the educational level of the group had a high correlation with job placement, and he found a dearth of Spanish names on union roster lists in the community.  

Perry Morris Broom's analysis of Mexican-American economic status in 1942 showed that although federal census figures revealed that 1.2 per cent of the national population was Mexican, 48.1 per cent lived in Texas, and over 90 per cent resided in all the southwestern states. Between 85 and 90 per cent of the group in Texas were citizens, but 85 per cent of them worked as migratory farm workers. Broom cataloged the usual list of inequities to point out that public schools which had vocational classes usually restricted them to their daytime schedules. Some evening vocational classes, sponsored by the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Organization, were offered. Broom pointed out that bilinguals usually refrained from utilizing services of school guidance counselors or community job placement workers, although 74.5 per cent of the workers questioned by the author indicated that they wanted a job in a different field from their present one. The author concluded that the quality of service offered in job
training and job counseling for this ethnic group indicated that inadequate personnel and sufficient programs failed to do an effective job.  

Sanchez's students also followed their professor's interest in both the illegal alien and the unskilled legal resident of the Rio Grande valley who earned their living as "stoop labor." Bruce S. Meador's thesis, "Wetback Labor in the Rio Grande Valley," resulted from a study in which the author participated as a member of a field research effort supervised by Sanchez, Olen Leonard of Vanderbilt University, and Lyle Saunders of the University of New Mexico. His research became part of the study of "The Study of the Spanish-Speaking People" which Sanchez directed.

Meador quoted Sanchez's and Saunders' criticisms of migrant workers' conditions in which project leaders charged that the state housed up to one-half million people lacking legal residential status, skills, or the means of improving their conditions. This group appeared to the researchers to suffer both social and personal disorganization and remained a growing problem to themselves and to the Spanish-speaking citizens whom they displaced from the labor market.

Meador's study focused on the total socio-economic milieu which contributed to the illegal alien's exceedingly poor status. Citing Sanchez's work, Meador reported that
the professor had examined the extent of the tuberculosis problem in Texas and reported during the 1940's that per 100,000 of the state's population, Anglos had 25 cases, Negroes 54, and Spanish-speaking 159 cases of the disease.

The author stated that the research team experienced great difficulty in attempting to assess accurately the number of "wetbacks" in Texas, but he believed that at least 500,000 illegal aliens found their way across the Rio Grande river. He cited data from the immigration service which showed that as many as 100,000 illegal agricultural laborers were found in the area in a single day. These laborers had been important to the large farmers who had been unwilling to support legalization of agricultural farm laborers in order to prevent their own labor costs from rising. At the time that Meador did his study, farmers in the area paid their illegal laborers fifty dollars monthly.

Meador noted that Hidalgo county had an excessively large illegal alien population. Although it had only 2 per cent of the state's total population in 1949, the county had 18.8 per cent of the typhoid deaths, 35 per cent of the tetanus deaths, and 20.7 per cent of the measles' fatalities. Crime statistics also revealed that 73 per cent of those committed to the county jail were illegal aliens. From 1946 until 1949, 58 per cent of the crimes handled by the office of the district attorney involved
illegal aliens. Meador admitted that "wetbacks" were frequently placed in situations conducive to criminal activity. Local law enforcement officers spent much of their time trying to maintain order among this group. It appeared obvious that law officers identified this group more easily than other potential lawbreakers in the area.

Meador concluded that as farms became more mechanized, the need for this illegal labor would decrease. He asserted that citizens should act to stop the illegal migration of "wetbacks" into the nation, even before farm operations became completely mechanized.\textsuperscript{58}

Leonard Massey also studied conditions in Hidalgo county in his examination of migration patterns of county residents. He learned that 53.8 per cent of the residents over twenty-one years of age were born in Mexico. The total population had a majority of native-born residents, but this figure included the children in the county. Massey found that 57 per cent of the families moved annually for employment in 38 states, and 65 per cent of these migrants were found in the lowest income groups. The author reported that county residents who moved stated that they did so to make a living wage. Since 48.4 per cent of those interviewed claimed that they had no occupation, Massey concluded that these people comprised the stoop labor used seasonally by area farmers. The author concluded that migration patterns of
valley residents served as a symptom, rather than a cause of poverty. 59

Manuel P. Servin, a Mexican-American historian, commented that Sanchez's students did poor work in their research efforts, and he blamed Sanchez for allowing this research to "pass through." He also noted that Sanchez failed to produce any "stars" among his graduate students, and Servin maintained that a professor is judged by the quality of his students' work. 60 Some of Servin's criticisms seem quite justified. The theses and dissertations exhibited little original thinking and drew too heavily upon Sanchez's own research for their own documentation. The cursory examination of the biographical data of many of these students indicated that most of these students served on the grass roots levels in their respective Texas communities. Many appeared to be classroom teachers at the time that they did their graduate work.

Servin justly criticized the uneven quality of the student works. Many topics were repeated ad nauseam in both master's and doctoral studies. The problems in Eagle Pass differed little from those in Dimmit, Bryan, or Edinburg. The student who examined a particular community and then returned to that community or to a similar one, might have become a missionary seeking equal opportunities for the bilingual scholastic. It seemed that Sanchez would have applauded excellent scholarship, but it also appeared that his primary
thrust appeared to have been to "spread the word," create community awareness, and make it uncomfortable for community leaders who applauded the maintenance of the \textit{status quo} to do so when they documented evidence of inequitable treatment of a minority group became public knowledge. If Sanchez viewed his students as potential community irritants, he probably realized many dividends from these many research efforts.
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CHAPTER X

FEISTY FIGHTER FOR FAIR PLAY

Sanchez's academic activities at the University of Texas failed to exhaust all of his energies. He realized from his New Mexican experiences that he needed to participate politically with groups interested in improving opportunities for Spanish-speaking Texans. Although he never ran for political office, he supported zealously candidates and programs which would serve this minority group's needs. This chapter examines some of the professor's political actions and depicts his struggles with Texas leaders determined to maintain the status quo.

Sanchez belonged to the League of United Latin American Citizens, an organization of citizens of Latin descent, founded in Corpus Christi, Texas, in 1929, and commonly called LULAC. He served as Director General for Education for the League from 1940 until 1943 and as President General from 1941 until 1942. LULAC served as a political education force by teaching members to work for elimination of race prejudice while, at the same time, not antagonizing Anglo-Americans. Leaders wanted the Mexican-American citizen to receive equal protection in political activities on local, state, and national levels. Leaders realized that the language
barrier prevented the Mexican-American from gaining easier access into the American mainstream, and they insisted that members speak English at home and in their business activities.

Basing their appeal on the emerging middle class in Texas, the organization adopted a constitution which advised members to use all legal means to gain their constitutional rights and denounced continued segregation of their school children. Although members did not consider themselves to be a political club, they paid their annual poll taxes and stated that they would support politically those candidates who respected their needs and goals. The organization's platform also asked for equal representation on juries, elimination of quasi-peonage, and cessation of mistreatment of minor children. LULAC represented an important development in the life of the Mexican-Americans in Texas, illustrating their first successful attempt to organize collectively. The group had organizational problems from its inception and suffered criticism from its apparent reluctance to include the alien Mexican in its membership. Leaders maintained that the alien failed to possess legal rights of citizens.²

Sanchez supported the organization goals of political education when he addressed the LULAC convention on June 3, 1939. He stated that the American represented the integration of diverse national and ethnic groups woven into an American cultural pattern, through the leveling agent of the English language. Suprisingly, national institutions
gave little recognition to cultural differences among minority groups; and these people, although an integral part of heterogeneous cultural patterns, were kept at a distance by the agencies established for their incorporation. "Our racial minorities of our official interests . . . . Our public agencies manifest a paradoxical blindness to the vital interests in the cultural patterns of these groups and neglect to minister to their distinctive needs." He also commented that the results of institutional blindness surfaced in examples of class hatred, discrimination, economic and political exploitation, poor public services, and social segregation.

Sanchez believed that life in the Southwest revealed many examples of the minority group's social and economic problems. The area shared current national problems of soil erosion, share-cropping, farm tenancy, along with the public education deficiencies. The frontier character of the area accentuated these difficulties and the region's social and economic immaturity helped magnify national problems on the local scene. In 1939, 15 per cent of the people in the Southwest were of Indo-Spanish origin, and their cultural patterns, which evolved during these centuries of residency, represented an important facet of the total national culture. Contrasting what Sanchez believed to be the sobriety and austerity of New England with Hispanic influences in the Southwest, he felt that life here had been enriched with a spirit of "color and gaiety of grace and romanticism."
The banquet keynoter also stated that despite the fact that Anglos associated Spanish-speaking people with seasonal farm laborers who lived in box cars or other substandard housing, the area had bilingual residents who were lawyers, doctors, businessmen, educators, and government officials. These people who had reached middle class status remained able to serve, "... as the liason in bringing about the adaptations in our institutions that are essential if these institutions are to conform to the cultural variants presented by the Spanish-speaking groups." He criticized those who considered the Mexican-American's problem to be merely one of language difficulty. It remained, instead, a question of cultural contacts and conflicts in which geographic isolation accentuated "the normal problems presented by national incorporation and aggravate the deficiencies of an undeveloped rural economy and of a frontier social order." Believing that a "no man's land" existed beyond the scope of existing public service institutions, Sanchez charged LULAC members with igniting the flame of awareness to make all Americans aware of the minority groups' needs.

Writing in a reflective mood in Lulac News in 1940, Sanchez pointed out that the erupting world conflict indicated the need for Americans to realize that democracy encouraged citizens to contribute their own culture to the total amalgam. American minorities, unlike those persecuted by Adolph Hitler, were not social or political outcasts. Existence of cultural
freedom, along with political liberty, gave citizens a unique world position. The spirit of tolerance taught citizens to respect divergent customs, traditions and life-styles of many peoples and contributed to their widespread feelings of cultural self-determination. Sanchez stated that teachers had to alert students to the dangers of the "isms" of the dictators to show them how to evaluate and appreciate democratic values. Tolerance embodied the essence of Americanism. Sanchez stated that at times, under the pretext of patriotism, bigots shouted cries of hate and intolerance, while they carried the American flag. A true American feeling permitted people to express disagreements in an orderly fashion.

Sanchez was on leave from the University of Texas from 1943 until 1945. When he returned, he concentrated his efforts in LULAC in the Austin area. Local leadership, particularly Nash Moreno, a former Austin LULAC president, recalled that Sanchez worked tirelessly there for improved education, removal of discrimination against Mexican-Americans in the county hospital, establishment of a Pan-American community center in the barrio, and an end to school segregation for Mexican-American children in schools near Austin. Moreno commented that he had once reported to Sanchez that in Elgin, Texas, Mexican-American children were not permitted to attend the Anglo high school. If these children wanted to do high school work, they had to use secondary educational materials in the elementary school facility. Sanchez contacted Commissioner
of Education, J. W. Edgar, and the state officer remedied the situation immediately. Moreno stated that Sanchez remained in the background but helped local Mexican-American leadership execute beneficial projects without seeking personal recognition for himself.\textsuperscript{11}

Moreno's views of Sanchez contrasted markedly from those expressed by Joe F. Garza, Corpus Christi LULAC leader and brother of Ben Garza, founding president of the organization. Garza believed that Sanchez was unfriendly, self-centered, and egotistical. "He had had it made--everyone in Texas knew he had it made. He wanted everyone to know that he was Dr. Sanchez. Whenever he was around, he tried to command all the attention and show more than he was." Garza also added that Sanchez lacked the kind of leadership qualities possessed by J. T. Canales, Brownsville attorney, and Manuel Gonzales, a San Antonio leader. Garza admitted that in the early days of LULAC, Sanchez and Carlos Casta\~{n}eda, history professor at the University of Texas, were their only members with earned doctorates. He commented that members used these men as examples for their children. Despite this, Garza disliked Sanchez.\textsuperscript{12}

E. E. Mireles, retired administrator with the Corpus Christi school system, shared Garza's views regarding Sanchez. He observed that Sanchez preferred a militant approach which placed Mexican-Americans in open conflict with Anglos. Mireles commented that some of the LULAC leadership found
Sanchez's militancy hard to take, because they believed that Sanchez wanted to use political pressure to force educational change. Mireles opposed court cases to solve minority group educational problems. Apparent both veteran LULAC leaders resented Sanchez's outspoken approach to injustice.

Sanchez's concern about widespread discrimination against Mexican-Americans also became a national issue when the United States government realized the need to cement alliances with the western hemisphere countries before the outbreak of the war. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's implementation of the Good Neighbor Policy in the 1930's improved American relations with Latin America, but ethnic minority problems in the Southwest related directly to relations between the United States and Mexico. The Southwest with its vast agricultural resources supplied food for millions in the armed forces. Food had to be harvested and local farmers needed labor. The American government arranged bracero contracts with the Mexican government, and Mexican officials expressed concern regarding the mistreatment of their nationals in this country. Mexican consular officials serving in the United States agreed to support American needs for farm labor only if the American government eradicated discriminatory practices affecting both Mexican nationals and Mexican-American citizens in the Southwest.

Nelson Rockefeller, Director of the Office of Inter-American Affairs, in the Department of State, learned of the
dimensions of problems in the Southwest after an aide, David Saposs, returned from a three-month inspection trip of the region. Rockefeller called in a fellow Dartmouth classmate, Victor Borella, to implement a proposed goodwill program. Borella asked Thomas S. Sutherland, a native Texan who also worked in Washington for the same agency, to represent the Office of Inter-American Affairs in Texas as a cultural relation's officer.

Borella briefed Sutherland for the assignment and informed him that federal agency funds would initiate establishment of an office. Sutherland received instructions to request permanent support from the state government. The Inter-American Office realized the need to combat German attempts to build harmonious relations with Mexico. Enemy propaganda agents could show Mexican government leaders' signs in Texas cafes denying service to Mexicans, and these practices were considered detrimental to the organization of an effective war effort. Sutherland met with Governor Coke Stevenson and convinced him to appoint a committee to study the problem. Stevenson complied and asked the legislature to remove discrimination barriers against Mexicans in Texas. Stevenson's request became the Caucasian Resolution House Concurrent Resolution No. 105 on May 6, 1943. The resolution stated,

All persons of the Caucasian Race within the jurisdiction of the State were entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages,
On June 25, 1943, Stevenson issued a proclamation declaring the Good Neighbor Policy to be in effect. Subsequently, the legislature created the Texas Good Neighbor Commission, defined its rules, administrative structure, and purpose. The legislature directed the agency to stimulate inter-American relations without resorting to application of civil or criminal restraints in such areas as health conditions, educational problems, and general welfare of Mexican-Americans in Texas. Stevenson appointed three Mexican-Americans and three Anglos to the Commission, but the policy of equal representation of both ethnic groups failed to continue with later governors. Pauline Kibbe, an able career woman from San Antonio, served as the Commission's first Executive Secretary. Sutherland worked with her to write resolutions needed to effect grass root changes throughout the state. The press gave the Commission much publicity, and this served to inform Texas leadership of existing inequities in their local communities.

Kibbe remained the Commission's Executive Secretary until 1949; then she was fired because she stated publicly that twenty-five cents an hour for farm labor represented an inadequate wage. Powerful agribusiness interests such as the elder Lloyd Bentsen wanted to use cheap labor and objected to Kibbe's criticism of their wage scales. Sutherland replaced Kibbe as Executive Secretary. Sutherland remarked that he "kind of liked Lloyd Bentsen" whom he called "the old pirate,"
but he didn't like John Van Cronkhite, a "rattlesnake fixer" who had worked for Herman Talmadge of Georgia and Huey Long of Louisiana and came to Texas as a "political fixer." Van Cronkhite represented business interests who wanted to retain a cheap Mexican labor market and he ran the political campaign that elected Lloyd Bentsen, Jr. to Congress. Sutherland recounted examples of "dirty tricks" which helped Bentsen defeat his opponent, Laredo lawyer Phillip Kazen. Specifically, Van Cronkhite used a photograph of Kazen and Henry Wallace, the unsuccessful 1948 presidential candidate, to accuse Kazen of pro-Russian sympathies. Actually, the picture had been taken years before when Kazen represented the American government in Peru, and he met Wallace officially as he toured Latin America as Vice President.  

Van Cronkhite's career dovetailed with Allan Shivers who became governor following Beauford H. Jester's sudden death. As Shivers' administrative assistant, Van Cronkhite dealt with Sutherland, and Sutherland reported that Van Cronkhite cultivated him smoothly. In 1949, the honeymoon ended when the Felix Longoria case became public, and the Good Neighbor Commission became embroiled in the controversy involving the burial of the Mexican-American war veteran of Three Rivers, Texas.  

Sutherland and Sanchez knew each other at the University of Texas as students in 1930. Their paths crossed again in Austin in 1942, when Sutherland returned to that city as the
representative of the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Sutherland had been told at that time by a local colleague that Sanchez opposed Sutherland's selection for a position involving the Spanish-speaking because the professor distrusted Anglos. At first this revelation didn't endear Sanchez to Sutherland, but their relationship improved when they began to share their mutual concerns for the Mexican-Americans. Sutherland became convinced that Sanchez's opposition to him represented a political game and didn't indicate that Sanchez sought personal glory. The former Executive Secretary explained that the Professor remained totally committed to the cause of justice for his "forgotten people," and Sanchez questioned appointment of any person who was not his candidate.22

In 1943, Sanchez served as Consultant to the Good Neighbor Commission and addressed an Austin church group telling them that Texas had a poor reputation in Latin America because of bad treatment given to those of Mexican descent by uneducated people in the state. Such incidents as the proprietor of a small restaurant refusing to serve a Latin-American consul can create feelings of international distrust. Citing a Brownsville, Texas, judge who had noted that good people in the state had permitted "honky-tonks to establish the state's reputation with the Spanish-speaking," Sanchez believed that most Texans were not involved in these actions and should condemn this kind of treatment.23
Van Cronkhite viewed the purposes of the Commission quite differently. He noted that the main intent of the Commission was building good relations with Mexico, rather than involvement in state-wide social action activities. Van Cronkhite stated that Sanchez, an able professor, had a quiet way of accomplishing his goals, while Sutherland appeared to him to be a left-wing radical or a Communist. The governor's former administrative assistant observed that during these years no one was crying for great revolutions and local leaders seemed unwilling to accede to any requests for change. The administrator declared that Mexicans remained primarily concerned with cafe signs denying service to Mexicans, and he worked to have those signs removed. Van Cronkhite observed that Sutherland was ready to "blow up things"; so Shivers removed him from the Commission and replaced him with Van Cronkhite, who served briefly in that post.

Sanchez became Vice-Chairman of the Human Relations Commission, appointed by Governor Allan Shivers in 1950. The group came about as the result of the Three Rivers Longoria case. The Good Neighbor Commission became embroiled in the controversy concerning the denial of funeral home use to Felix Longoria, deceased veteran of World War II. As a result of the involvement of some commission members, some members of the state legislature wanted to abolish the organization. Most of the legislature realized that the group had done a good job in developing better relations with Mexico. Shivers did
not reappoint wealthy oilman R. E. Smith of Houston to the chairmanship when his term expired and replaced him with Neville G. Penrose of Fort Worth. Sutherland remained secretary for a brief time under the new chairman. Sutherland believed that his job entailed working in behalf of improved relations with Mexico as well as continuing efforts on behalf of Mexican-American citizens. He stated that he had no intention of turning his back on the Texans of Mexican descent. According to Sutherland, Van Cronkhite, as Shivers' administrative assistant, set out to weaken the efforts of the Good Neighbor Commission by creating a Human Relations Commission which had neither legislative sanction nor funding. Van Cronkhite fired Sutherland from the Good Neighbor Commission post and had him appointed to the weaker organization. To appease the Mexican-American community, Sanchez was named Vice-Chairman of the new organization.25

Texas newspapers learned of the creation of the Human Relations Commission in an official press memorandum issued by the governor's office and prepared by Van Cronkhite on May 4, 1950. This release, circulated widely by the Study of the Spanish-Speaking Peoples of Texas, headed by Sanchez, stated that the new Council's efforts would be independent of, yet coordinated with, the Good Neighbor Commission's goals. The Council would recommend rather than execute policies. Neville G. Penrose, Chairman of the Good Neighbor Commission, was named as a council member, and R. E. Smith, former chairman
of the Good Neighbor Commission, headed the new council. The memo stated that Shivers knew that good relations in public health, schools, employment, and public establishments were important, but he believed that acts of discrimination against Mexican-Americans represented isolated incidents. He commented that, "'This goal of happy relationship between the English-speaking and the Spanish-speaking peoples of this state' can be realized only when both peoples 'recognize and respect the viewpoint of the other.'" Sutherland became secretary of the new organization and left the Good Neighbor Commission on January 1, 1951.

Calling Sanchez to a luncheon at the Governor's mansion on June 26, 1950, to launch the formal opening of the Texas Council for the Study of Human Relations, the Governor stated that he believed that the group would be able to make a noteworthy contribution to "our Texas thinking in arriving at ways and means of improving the relationship between the English-speaking and Spanish-speaking peoples of Texas." Press releases indicated that the Council's purpose would be the study and research of fundamental causes of discord and suggesting their proper remediation.

Sanchez remarked that he believed the Council should concern itself with specific problems rather than deal in vague generalities. He noted that the high tuberculosis rate in San Antonio, the non-attendance of the Mexican-American school age child in public schools, and the need for improved
opportunities should be important issues. Also, the lack of extensive participation in the public affairs of the state by the Spanish-speaking and their lack of recognition for public office remained other viable topics worthy of consideration.²⁹

Sanchez, the inveterate letter writer, informed Neville G. Penrose of the importance of the Council's mission. He told the head of the Good Neighbor Commission that the United States apparently had difficulty identifying with people of color. "... I think we have not developed the 'know-how' of human relationships--and that lack of know-how is a reflection of our behavior at home, and it is reflected in our foreign policies and in the attitudes of our statement."³⁰ Sanchez added that Texas offered Americans a laboratory for them to work out relationships with minority groups.

The organization had a budget of 24,000 dollars and received office space at the University of Texas. One of their first projects was the proposal of an "anti-discrimination" measure to the legislature. Commission members decided to include all people in their proposal and not single out merely Mexican-Americans for special consideration. Sanchez drafted the proposal which said that every individual in the state "should be protected as to his person and dignity from the unrestricted exercise of proprietary rights in establishments catering to the public."³¹ The Commission believed that proprietors should be made subject to civil action if they continued discriminatory practices.
Sutherland traveled extensively throughout the state and helped local leadership establish councils. He served as a resource person for groups interested in expanding services in their local areas. He notified Sanchez of all his activities. Sanchez cooperated with Sutherland, made some trips with him to different communities, and also worked to eliminate discrimination in public housing projects in Austin.  

Notifying members of the Austin City Council and the Public Housing Authority Board of their discriminatory practice of residential assignments, Sanchez sent both groups a report which documented incidents of discrimination. A. J. Wirtz, Austin lawyer and Vice-Chairman of the Housing Authority, replied to Sanchez that no residents in the Austin projects complained about the separate housing arrangements. He admonished Sanchez that before there was any further "agitation" there should be a full discussion involving both the Human Relations' Council and the Austin Housing Authority. Sanchez notified Hubert B. Jones, Housing Authority Chairman, of Wirtz's letter and noted that segregation of Mexican-Americans in public institutions remained both an indefensible practice and a censurable act. This segregation also constituted a violation of the law, and individuals could not acquiesce in the denial of their constitutional rights. He asserted that public officials should not stand idly by while the law is openly violated.
Sanchez's exposure to the City Council and the Housing Authority of their discriminatory practices generated sufficient controversy to warrant Van Cronkhite, as Executive Secretary of the Good Neighbor Commission, to write to Attorney General Price Daniel requesting information of existing legislation pertaining to segregation in public housing projects. The Attorney General notified him that neither state nor federal law had measures which either allowed or prohibited segregation of Latin Americans in public housing projects.\textsuperscript{34}

In 1951, the Human Relation Council circulated a report prepared by Joe Belden Associates informing local mayors of the percentage of Spanish-speaking residents residing in their counties, and they held meetings with civic leaders to discuss the problems of this ethnic group. Their educational missionary work continued on a grass roots level until June, 1952.\textsuperscript{35} Sanchez stayed in the background for much of this activity and gave his views to Sutherland when called upon. The two men never had a close personal relationship, but Sanchez made the necessary political moves in the state and had a great deal of influence with younger political leadership in the state like Ed Idar, Jr. of Laredo and Chris Aldrete of Del Rio.\textsuperscript{36}

Sutherland as the Executive Director of the human relations organization wrote in a \textit{Saturday Evening Post} article that relations between Anglos and Latin Americans varied widely in different communities throughout the state. He reported examples of discrimination encountered by minority groups
and stated that one of the most active spokesmen for the bilingual Texan was George I. Sanchez. Sutherland called him a "one man brain trust who is consulted by leaders of the Spanish-speaking minority throughout the United States." Noting that Sanchez had dedicated his life to the struggle for his "forgotten people" to obtain their constitutional rights, he said that Sanchez enlisted top scholars and attorneys in the effort.

By the Spring of 1952, it became apparent that the Human Relations Council was foundering because of a lack of support. Ed Idar, Jr., State Chairman of the American G. I. Forum, wrote to the Governor on May 8, 1952, to inform him of his displeasure with the results of that organization. He stated that Texans of Mexican descent welcomes the creation of the Council and had pride that Shivers, while running for governor, appeared to be aware of their multitudinous problems. He asserted that Mexican-Americans and hoped that in contrast to the Good Neighbor Commission, the new body would be outside the realm of politics and able to function effectively.

Pointing out that because the American G. I. Forum membership had wanted the Council to succeed, they had abstained from any public criticism of its efforts. Forum leaders notified Van Cronkhite privately of their views because they believed that he had been entrusted with the task of dealing with this minority group. Idar stated that they now had to
announce publicly their displeasure with the organization and urge their friends, such as Sanchez to sever their connections with the group. Idar noted that Sanchez owed it to the Spanish-speaking people to take this step; otherwise, they will be placed in the position of approving the poor record of accomplishment. ³⁹

Idar also wrote Sanchez his criticism of the Council results. He stated that the American G. I. Forum membership had been told that the group would be free from political pressure, but through Van Cronkhite, "it has been tied to the Governor's apron strings." ⁴⁰ This has made him believe that this has actually been the Governor's policy and that Mexican-Americans were naive if they assumed that the Council could become an effective body.

Sanchez responded to Idar's request by resigning on June 30, 1952. He told the Governor that the Texans of Mexican descent had been highly critical of his continued membership. "They saw no good coming from it; therefore, they regarded it as an empty gesture with possible political implications." ⁴¹ He noted that he received criticism from organizations, such as LULAC and American G. I. Forum, and he valued highly the opinion of these groups. He expressed disappointment that the Council had failed to receive the support to enable it to accomplish its purposes.

By 1947, Sanchez's anti-segregation views received exposure in the university newspaper. He charged that
discriminatory educational and economic practices created a system under which children of Mexican extraction suffered. He stated that many school districts made little or no effort to encourage school attendance of minority group members. These children received both poorer facilities and instructors than the Anglo group. Sanchez's sense of prescience became evident as he charged that these discriminatory practices, unquestionably illegal, would be stopped if challenged in federal court. That challenge came in the Delgado case, discussed in the previous chapter and the agreed judgment which paved the way for future litigations.

Carlos Cadena, Associate Justice of the Texas Court of Civil Appeals, believed that Sanchez deserved the major credit for the spadework in the preparation of the Delgado case. Although the Professor had no legal training, the jurist noted that Sanchez had a clear understanding of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution and worked out his theories with Al Miron, California civil rights attorney and Gus C. Garcia, trial attorney. The case never came to trial, but it was settled in an agreed judgment. Attorney General Price Daniel told the law firm representing the Mexican-Americans that their case lacked certainty. The Delgado case could not be considered a landmark decision because it was an agreed judgment, but Cadena noted that it stood as an interesting case. The U. S. District Court really decided nothing that had not already been agreed to, but the fact that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was enjoined
by the court from participating in any practice which tended to segregate any Mexican-American child gave the entire question of school segregation greater importance.\textsuperscript{43}

Ed Idar, Jr., student at the University at the time of the Delgado case, didn't believe that Attorney General Daniel's recent opinions regarding segregation of Mexican-American students for language instruction really represented the best interests of the minority group. Idar stated that it was possible to find all kinds of loopholes that could be used to perpetuate segregation. Idar, a member of the Laredo student club, drafted a resolution criticizing the Attorney General's actions, and the club supported the resolution. The Alba club, comprised of Latin American students, and the American Veterans' Committee joined in their support, and these student groups generated a controversy which lasted over two months.\textsuperscript{44}

Idar admitted that in 1947 Daniel was considered to be one of the more liberal state officials. He and other university students believed that because Daniel wanted to prepare for a future governor's race, he didn't want to generate too much controversy concerning school segregation. Idar and other students tried to convince Daniel to modify his opinion regarding his view making segregation permissible for language instruction. Sanchez stepped into the controversy at that point and tried to convince the students to modify their approach. As a result of student efforts, along with those of Sanchez and Gus Garcia, Daniel agreed to modify his opinion
on a couple of points. Idar believed that in this instance Sanchez acted as a compromiser, because the Professor wanted Daniel to concede as much as he could in order to placate student activists without risking his own political future. Idar noted that both Sanchez and Garcia believed that Daniel would seek the governorship, and they felt that he would be a more acceptable and liberal candidate than some of the other contenders. On the other hand, Hector P. Garcia, a Corpus Christi physician and founder of the American G. I. Forum, did not believe that Daniel acted selfishly in his opinion regarding Mexican-American education, because he felt that Daniel had always been a fair man.

Sanchez publicly praised Judge Ben H. Rice's decision in the Delgado case and considered it a step forward for Americans of Mexican descent. The decision reaffirmed the fact that schools are open to everyone, and he punctuated that view with the barb, "You can't teach democracy in a concentration camp." Sanchez's initial flush of victory remained short-lived. Although he convinced L. A. Woods, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, that Mexican-American children in Del Rio received segregated instruction, and the state officer removed that district's accreditation; this proved to be a Pyrrhic victory. Cristobal P. Aldrete, Del Rio attorney, filed the complaint against the Del Rio school system on January 7, 1949, and Woods notified the offending district of its lost accreditation February 12, 1949.
The action proved to be an empty gesture because on June 1, the state legislature transferred the powers of the office of the Superintendent to a new education commissioner. Woods remained as an advisor for the rest of his elected term of office, and then this position was abolished. The legislature declared that they took this action as an emergency measure. Two months before the beginning of the school year the state board of education reversed Woods' decision in the Del Rio Case. 48

Although Sanchez involved himself in much litigation during his career, the Hernandez v. Texas case of 1954 marked the most important court case in which he participated. This case involved Pete Hernandez, a migrant cotton picker from Jackson county, who had been found guilty of murder with malice and sentenced to life imprisonment. Sanchez worked with Attorneys Gus Garcia and Carlos Cadena to help them develop the "class apart" theory at a time when the accepted legal doctrine dealt solely with differences arising between Caucasians and Negroes. Courts had ruled that Mexicans were white, but the pleadings presented in the case showed that members of this ethnic group had never served on the jury in Jackson county. Because of this, and other evidence, the minority suffered as a "class apart." Sanchez pointed out to the lawyers that the Fourteenth Amendment failed to recognize two classes, and the "equal protection" clause was designed to protect all people treated unequally. This theory won United
States Supreme Court acceptance at a time when constitutional law doctrine was just emerging. The Warren court by a unanimous decision reversed Hernandez's conviction, rendering their opinion on May 3, 1954.

Former state political leader Maury Maverick commented that one reason contributing to the success of the Hernandez case came from Sanchez's spadework in the Delgado decision, along with funding the Professor obtained from the Rockefeller Foundation to sponsor scholarly research concerning problems of the Mexican-American in Texas. Maverick considered the Hernandez case to be a climax to previous efforts aimed at correction of past injustices. He admired Sanchez and called him methodical, courageous, and an intellectual who possessed peace-making abilities.

The 1948 Delgado decision did not end segregation but merely legitimized the years of struggle which followed that court ruling. In 1948 and 1949 Hector P. Garcia, as President of the American G. I. Forum, made on-site inspection of fourteen schools, took appropriate pictures, visited classes, and prepared a detailed report of widespread evidence of segregation. At this same time, Sanchez's graduate students began their examination of specific school districts for master's thesis credit. The net result of the research did not produce immediate changes but paved the way for additional court cases. Garcia stated that he has already participated in 100 suits, and the job remains unfinished in the 1970's. He reported
that it was easier to obtain community support for desegregation in communities which had active American G. I. Forum chapters. From 1948 until 1972, it appeared that many local school districts never intended to obey court rulings. Explicit segregation of Mexican-American children remained limited to elementary school, but children seldom received encouragement to move beyond that level. State authorities compounded the problem by failing to restrain local authorities and by allowing bond issues to be approved for new school construction in areas which served to increase segregation.

After the successful 1948 decision, Chicano leaders filed complaints against twenty-two cities with J. W. Edgar, the new Commission of Education. Attorneys quickly realized that state educational authorities became less cooperative following the new 1949 "emergency law," and attorneys learned that they first had to exhaust the administrative procedure route prior to initiating court action. Commissioner Edgar notified all school and county superintendents, as well as presidents of boards of trustees on June 21, 1950, that segregation of Mexican-American children was illegal. He also told them that any appeals which came to his office could do so only after the local authorities had tried to work out the problem first. Once the Commissioner received the appeal he would determine if violation of school or constitutional rights had occurred. Sanchez, according to both Edgar and Garcia, was involved in all school desegregation cases. In
some he served as the expert witness, representing Mexican-American interests and in the rest he offered counsel to those preparing their legal strategies.\textsuperscript{55}

Not all cases resulted in gains for the Mexican-American school children, but the Del Rio case which adopted the "freedom of choice" plan worked to the advantage of the minority group. Garcia stated that before the start of the school year in that community, he visited Del Rio, traveled throughout the barrio using a public address system on his car, urging all Mexican-American families to enroll their children in the Anglo school. Cadena stated that Sanchez also went to that town and helped organize the parents. When the school opened in the fall, the officials realized that all the children had enrolled in the too-small Anglo school, and they had to build a new facility to integrate their total school population.\textsuperscript{56}

Commissioner Edgar heard a number of appeals dealing with segregation, and he ruled cautiously in each case. In \textit{Perez vs. Terrell County Common School District 1} the plaintiffs testified that the Sanderson school board grouped children chronologically which perpetuated segregation for the Mexican-American child. Edgar said that he doubted that this kind of grouping would resolve the segregation problem, and he warned the school board to give careful consideration to this classification procedure. He promised to audit the school during the coming year; and if he found that Sanderson perpetuated segregation illegally, he would order the practice
stopped. In Max Ortal vs. Board of Trustees of Hondo Independent School District, plaintiffs complained of segregation on separate campuses for first grade and continued segregation for grades two through eight. Edgar noted that when the district changed its grouping of students from an alphabetical one to one based on achievement tests, he found no evidence that this action of itself constituted segregation, but he did rule that the district illegally segregated first graders on separate campuses.

Commissioner Edgar decided in favor of defendants in Marcos Barraza et al vs. Board of Trustees Pecos Independent School District in 1953. Here plaintiffs stated that the proposed new junior high school to be built in the Mexican community would increase the segregation of their scholastics. Edgar did not find the school would increase segregation and decided in favor of the defendants. The historical record indicated that the plaintiff's charge proved correct, and the school has become increasingly Mexican. Other schools in Pecos remained closed to this minority group until 1965.

Rocha vs. Board of Trustees Kingsville Independent School District, 1955, and Guerrero vs. Mathis Independent School District, 1955, also required the Commissioner to decide the segregation question. In the Kingsville case, like the Pecos one, the Commissioner ruled that the school board's proposed location of a new junior high school did not perpetuate segregation, and he dismissed the charge. In the Mathis school case he found
that the school officials segregated Mexican-American children illegally, and he ordered the school board to cease that practice. 61

Cases in Kingsville, 1956, Carrizo Springs, 1955, and Mathis, 1957, also resulted in dismissals of plaintiffs' charges. In the Kingsville case Gus Garcia, using the argument that Mexican are "other whites," presented school board minutes to show that segregation had been practiced in that community since 1914. In Carrizo Springs the school board promised cooperation and in Mathis an agreed order was entered when the anonymous expert witness appeared afraid to testify. The Mathis community closed its Mexican school, but Mexican-American children were placed in segregated first grades. The district was ordered by the Commissioner to cease its arbitrary practice of retaining all minority children for two years in the first grade. They were also ordered to desegregate their upper grades. The district failed to comply quickly, and the Commissioner revoked their accreditation. The district then proceeded to remediate their problems. 62

In the Driscoll case, Herminio Hernandez et al vs. Driscoll Consolidated Independent School District, filed June 14, 1957, Sanchez testified as the key witness. The plaintiffs in the suit charged that the Mexican-American students were segregated in the first and second grades with most children being required to spend three years in the first grade. Once the suit was filed, the school district began to permit minority children
to leave the first grade after two years. School personnel tested children when they entered the first grade but failed to retest them during their three or four years of segregated instruction. 63

In his testimony Sanchez blasted segregation and charged that school districts which segregated first grades usually produced poor results which became evident when children reached the sixth grade. He also stated that fewer children graduated from high school who had attended segregated elementary schools than those who came from integrated ones. 64 Sanchez explained that teachers working with foreign-language children in a class that included English-speaking ones used the same methodology as those instructors teaching monolingual children. He conceded that teachers may have to vary teaching procedures in a class including bilingual students, but he noted that all teachers have to vary their techniques to meet the needs of their individual students; even English-speaking ones. 65

Plaintiffs introduction of a child with a Spanish-surname who had been placed in a "Latin" class and who spoke no Spanish proved to be one of the ironies of the case. The parent had to ask help from an attorney in order to have the child transferred to an English-speaking class. This indicated to the federal judge along with other evidence, that the district willfully intended to segregate minority children. Accordingly on January 11, 1957, James V. Allred ruled that the
district had segregated these children on racial bases. The jurist noted that if the district chose to retain non-English speakers in separate first grade classes for purposes of remediation, then it had to be done on a good faith basis. Allred said that in 1951, Sanchez had conceded that separate classes for first graders on the same campus would be acceptable. Noting that Sanchez had changed his mind and now opposed any segregation at all, the Judge pointed out that not all authorities agreed on that point.\(^66\)

As of 1968, 66 per cent of all Mexican-American students in Texas still attended racially identifiable schools, with 40 per cent of those enrolled in schools that were 80 to 100 per cent Chicano, and almost 21 per cent in schools 90 to 100 per cent minority children. The elementary schools exhibited the greatest ethnic imbalance.\(^67\) Despite the efforts of George I. Sanchez and Hector P. Garcia as two of the leading proponents for integration, segregation remained as prevalent in 1972 as it had been in 1948 at the time of the Delgado decision. School districts used such ruses as "freedom of choice," gerrymandered school zones, transfer policies, and selection of school construction sites to perpetuate segregation.\(^68\) Early civil rights cases used the phrase "other white" to point out that the American of Mexican descent received discriminatory treatment by school district officials, but more recent cases have drawn on the "equal protection" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to support their charges.\(^69\) Sanchez and the attorneys
in the early cases had demonstrated that since the Mexican-American had been treated as a "class apart," he failed to receive the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Commissioner Edgar recalled that when he became Commissioner, Sanchez came to see him and asked him to follow up on L. A. Woods' action of reminding all school districts of the meaning of the Delgado decision and informing them of the illegality of Mexican-American school segregation. Edgar said that after he consulted with the State Board of Education, he decided not to follow Sanchez's advice; but he believed, instead, that he would deal with each case on an individual basis. Sanchez realized in 1948, that desegregation could be most easily accomplished by state-wide action. Carlos M. Alcala and Jorge C. Rangel, authors of the civil rights' report dealing with de jure Mexican-American segregation, echoed Sanchez's sentiments in 1972 calling for a state-wide suit against the Texas Education Agency, commonly called T. E. A., to show clearly that the Chicano is an identifiable minority needing relief.

The segregation battle reached federal court again when Sanchez testified for the federal government in its case against the Austin Independent School District in 1971. The government charged the school district with de jure segregation of both Negro and Mexican-American students. Joseph Rich, the federal government attorney, stated that the district had the duty to eliminate all vestiges of the dual system, including past school district policies resulting in the isolation
of Mexican-American students. Rich also stated that the district's selection of school construction sites since 1952 confined the Mexican-American student to the east Austin community.\textsuperscript{72} Sanchez agreed that choice of building sites had increased segregation.\textsuperscript{73} Sanchez also testified that he considered it to be criminal and psychologically damaging to prohibit students from speaking Spanish in school, a practice long adopted by Texas school districts. "It destroys their concept of themselves and their sense of dignity. They lose respect for the language of their parents and for their family."\textsuperscript{74}

Donald Thomas, Attorney for the school district, in an attempt to refute the government's charge pointed out that Sanchez, as a Mexican-American, lived outside the predominantly Mexican-American residential area to indicate that the community failed to practice residential segregation. In an attempt to further discredit Sanchez's value as a witness, Thomas introduced into evidence theses done by the professor's former students which dealt with educational problems in the east Austin community. He questioned Sanchez on specific details included in research papers done more than twenty years before, and Sanchez told the attorney that he had checked theses materials when he approved the completed papers, but he did not verify the individual research.\textsuperscript{75} Sanchez pointed out that if his former students had observed the overcrowded conditions in the east Austin schools, their observation had little to do with the original assignment of children to those schools.\textsuperscript{76}
The judge ruled in favor of the school district, but the case was appealed.

Following the announcement of the federal judge's ruling in the Austin case, Jack L. Davidson, school Superintendent, discussed the district's proposed integration plan on a local television station. Sanchez listened to the address and sent a scathing letter to the school administrator condemning him for his repeated reference to "whites, Negroes, and Mexican-Americans." He told the administrator that under state law Mexicans are classified as "white" but recognized as a "class apart" entitled to constitutional protection. He further noted that "Whether Mexican-Americans are segregated in Austin schools is a matter of fact no opinion . . . . Zavala School is . . . an illegal school, and the school authorities can be sued not only for noncompliance with the law . . . but for monetary damages." 77

Ed Idar, Jr., Attorney for the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund, worked on the preparation of the plaintiff's appeal. As he reread the transcript, he noted that in Thomas' questioning of Sanchez regarding student theses the Attorney had taken material out of context. The Attorney for the school district demonstrated a patronizing attitude of the kind of person who would say, "'Some of my best friends are Mexicans' and believe at the same time that he is not a racist," Idar remarked. 78
Idar also noted that in preparing for the appeal, he found new evidence which he planned to present. The Austin City Council had once authorized a pauper cemetery in the community, and Idar had received a copy of the plat map outlining the location of grave sites. The plat, roughly square in shape, was divided into two halves. The upper half was clearly divided into quarters where it is stated Mexican Paupers and Negro Paupers. "The real kicker is when you look at the size of the plats for Mexicans and Negroes, the sites are one-half as large as the plats in the rest of the cemetery. The plat was approved by Mayor Tom Miller." 79

Sanchez also served as the expert witness in the Dallas school desegregation case, Eddie Mitchell Tasby et al vs. Dr. Nolen Estes in July, 1971. Judge William M. Taylor, Jr., U. S. District Judge, allowed the plaintiffs to include information indicating the apparent segregation of both Negroes and Mexican-Americans.80 Sanchez testified that educators can identify the Mexican-American child by his own self-identification, his physical appearance, his surname in some cases, and his use of the vernacular language. Sanchez noted that students can be considered Mexican-American if they identify with other members of that ethnic group. He stated that this minority is comprised of a complex of subgroups with some common cultural elements. The dominant group has also determined who is Mexican-American because they placed him in a subordinate ethnic status. Creation of the Texas Good Neighbor
Commission and the recognition of the separateness of the minority by the Bureau of the Census also helped establish their ethnicity.\textsuperscript{81}

Sanchez also testified that the Mexican-American child needed a good American school which would be a unitary system, rather than a school for classes or castes. He noted that the term "equal" is a philosophical concept and not just a term explaining measurable items. Sanchez denied the merit of singling out these children alone for bilingual education, pointing out that bilingualism and biculturalism profited all children alike. Sanchez also charged that the Mexican-American's problem was not one of culture but of a poor school, and the social-economic situation of the bilingual child has been used as the excuse for giving him differential inferior treatment indicating that his social status prevented his receiving equitable treatment.\textsuperscript{82}

Sanchez also disagreed with a proposal of grouping Negro and Mexican-American children together, pointing out that this, too, is segregation. He stated that the idea behind segregation affected the child by implying that there is an inferiority or a superiority between himself and the group from which he is isolated. He noted that the child suffered both mental and physical injury from this differential treatment.\textsuperscript{83}

Judge Taylor ruled that despite the fact that the Mexican-American constituted a clearly identifiable ethnic group, the plaintiffs had failed to show that they had been subjected to
de jure segregation. He added that this finding might not prove to be too significant because he explained that he was creating a Tri-Ethnic Committee, representing all ethnic groups, to work out solutions to the school problem. The case has been appealed. 84

Many negotiations between Mexican-Americans and school districts never reached the floor of the courtroom. In some instances, relief was secured for the minority group following meetings with school superintendents and boards of trustees. Cadena remembered that kind of conclusion occurred in San Marcos. He and Sanchez met with the Superintendent, and the administrator told them that they had one aim in San Marcos—to produce people who were best in their field. "If little Josalito comes here, and his father is a cobbler, we are going to guarantee that Josalito will be the best cobbler in San Marcos," stated the Superintendent. Sanchez replied, "Well, I am glad you were not the superintendent in my town in New Mexico. You would have made me a sheep herder and I wanted to be a college professor." 85 In other cases, Mexican-Americans failed to contest segregation more frequently because it took hard work to raise the large sums of money needed for court cases. Sanchez noted that the Delgado case had required a great deal of money, and the American G. I. Forum and LULAC did much of the work to raise these funds. It was impossible to do this each time a case of discrimination surfaced. The result has been that most of the
violations have not been tested in the courts, not because leaders feared the outcome of the court decisions, but because they lacked financial resources to initiate litigation.\textsuperscript{86}

Sanchez's consuming concern for the plight of the Mexican-American child kept him in frequent contact with Commissioner Edgar. In fact, Edgar commented that he never knew when he would pick up the newspaper and find Sanchez blasting him in the press. When asked why Sanchez criticized him, Edgar replied whimsically, "because he thought I moved too slowly."\textsuperscript{87} The Professor prodded the Commissioner to begin to gather data concerning the Latin-American child. He noted that Texas had produced some good research in earlier years, but there had been no studies done recently examining educational problems of this ethnic group. Specifically, he reminded Edgar that the state agency had no data concerning migrants and no guidance for handling their special needs. He believed that the state policy emulated the ostrich by ignoring obvious concerns. Additionally, he charged that many communities solved their "problems" by confining them to segregated schools and observed that "equivocal practices are the rule, rather than the exception."\textsuperscript{88} The Professor asserted that the minimum effort that should be undertaken by the state agency included enumeration of the scholastics, grade levels, migrancy problems and language practices. If the state would do this kind of research, Sanchez believed the next step would be to
evaluate curricula, administrative practices, and remedial procedures.  

Sanchez motivated Edgar to authorize a pupil study for the 1955-1956 school year that would include the coding of scholastics by ethnicity and grades. Sanchez promised the agency that he would work with the American G. I. Forum and LULAC to secure endorsement and support. The agency acted in good faith, notified school districts, and held regional meetings to acquaint residents with the purposes of the study. Some school superintendents balked at having to do additional work, but Edgar explained to them in detail why the study was needed. Surprisingly, not all Mexican-American groups gave this project their wholehearted support. When members of the Texas Education Agency research staff held a meeting in Laredo with Superintendent J. W. Nixon and officers of LULAC including Oscar Laurel, the organization's national leader, the agency representative reported that Mexican-American spokesmen had serious doubts of the value of the project because they interpreted it as another form of segregation. Guy C. West, Texas Education Agency's Supervisor of Research, told the Laredo delegation that if this concerned them, they could indicate the Anglo population if they preferred, since over 80 per cent of their school population was Mexican-American. They didn't seem to like that suggestion any better. Although Sanchez received support from some Mexican-American organizations, he
failed to have a total commitment from this ethnic group. Nevertheless, the state agency went ahead with its plans.

The T. E. A. research division released the findings in August, 1957. They reported that one out of every six pupils during the 1955-1956 school year had a Spanish surname and the heaviest concentration of minority students were found in the thirty-one counties closest to Mexico. The report also revealed that the ratio of the number of first grade pupils to the number of twelfth graders was twelve to three for all students. For the Spanish-surnamed child, they learned that they enrolled twelve first graders in contrast to one twelfth grader. The elementary school attendance figures of minority children fell below total attendance pattern in the elementary schools, but Mexican-Americans surpassed general attendance figures for the high school. The withdrawal rate of 11.33 per cent for Spanish-surnamed children was almost double the 6.23 per cent for the total number of pupils in the state. For the state as a whole, more scholastics left school permanently in the tenth grade, but the seventh grade ranked next to the first grade having the highest dropout rate for the Mexican-American child. The study confirmed Sanchez's beliefs.92

Sanchez continued needling Edgar about the Spanish-speaking child's unmet needs, and his frequent letter writing irritated oil millionaire R. W. Byram, member of the state Board of Education. Byram wrote to the Commissioner that, "Dr. Sanchez is not the type of person who should be consulted
by the Agency, and . . . I recommend that any consultation
with him be avoided in the future." Sanchez received a
carbon copy of the letter from Byram and he responded to the
board member that his recommendation to the agency was
"superfluous because, the Agency had been quite consistent
in that regard." Sanchez wrote to Edgar that he believed it
was officious for Byram to suggest that he be blacklisted by
the T. E. A. He added, "I am sure that you did not intend
to have him try to pressure me; for, as you know, I do not
pressure worth a damn . . . . As for Mr. Byram, poor soul, let
him stick to geology and oil--this field is just too slick
for him."94

By October 1964, Sanchez wrote to Edgar telling him
that he still remained displeased with Edgar's explanation
of the Migrant Education Project which he had received sev-
eral months before. He noted that the new Civil Rights' Act
now made it possible to invoke the services of the
U. S. Attorney General to investigate and prosecute cases
of discrimination if necessary. He informed Edgar that
President Lyndon B. Johnson had named him as a member of
a national citizen's committee to advise the Community
Relations' Service of problems, so that the agency could
deal with them in a friendly and equitable manner. In
that vein, Sanchez believed that now he had an official
responsibility to inquire once more about the migrant pro-
ject and to remind the Commissioner that he believed the
present project to be in violation of the federal law. He noted that the federal government had ruled that even if separate schools are superior to regular schools, "the federal courts have ruled that the practice is unconstitutional." In another letter, Sanchez asked Edgar how he would evaluate these special migrant schools if the children in south Texas were Negroes.

In 1966, Sanchez notified Edgar that he was Chairman of the Mexican-American Joint Conference, an organization comprised largely of Texas Spanish-surnamed leaders. This group expressed concern regarding the educational level of Mexican-American children, and they requested that the Commissioner send to the organization a report concerning the current state of education by counties, as well as school districts. Additionally, they wanted information explaining how the agency was dealing with teaching of Spanish and the Spanish-Mexican heritage of Texas. The organization wanted a list of T. E. A. consultants in the field of curriculum development. He concluded by saying that the Mexican-American Joint Conference would have some recommendations to make at the next session of the legislature as the representatives of two million Texans.

Sanchez reminded Edgar once more that the Mexican-American Joint Conference still wanted to know the statistical data relevant to the Spanish-speaking child. Edgar notified him that he could not supply that information; but, instead, he
reported to him of the progress of the Texas Project for the Education of Migrant Children. During the 1963-1964 school year, the five districts of McAllen, Pharr-San Juan-Alamo, Edinburg, Weslaco, and San Benito began this new program. The program's purpose was to offer to children of migrant families, through an extended day, a six-month program equivalent to the regular nine-month year. This program was expanded to ten districts for the 1964-1965 school year and to forty for the 1965-1966 period. Twenty of the forty districts used the extended day program while the rest enrolled migrant students in regular classrooms. Approximately 20,000 children with Spanish surnames had been registered in the new pilot project.  

Edgar also explained that additional federal funding made possible the employment of extra teachers, counselors, nurses, and visiting teachers. Additionally, two communities experimented with a federally funded pilot project to keep older children in the community during the summer so that they could begin school on time in the fall. Edgar also noted that the pre-school program for non-English speakers, begun in 1959, enrolled 18,000 youngsters each summer. Moreover, the agency administered federal funds, available under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide expanded educational and welfare services to educationally disadvantaged students. The agency also sponsored bilingual
workshops, tapings of Spanish and Mexican heritage materials, adult basic education and an adult migrant program, all largely subsidized by the federal government.  

Sanchez expressed pique in his reply to Edgar because he could not obtain the statistical studies that he felt the agency needed. He also remarked that he knew all about migrant programs, but the migrants comprised only a portion of the Spanish-speaking population. He believed more current data for all scholastics of this ethnic group were needed. He also chided Edgar for talking of programs for "migrant" and then saying that he could not identify ethnic group members. Sanchez accused the Commissioner of double-talk and concluded, "It insults my intelligence to be thought of as so gullible and so deficient in the English language, that I would placidly swallow such lack of logic and such deviation from fact."

During the summer of 1967 Sanchez notified Senator Ralph Yarborough about existing segregation practices in the migrant education projects and Yarborough contacted Harold B. Williams of the U. S. Office of Education concerning the problem. Williams responded to Yarborough, summarizing information supplied to him by Leon Graham, a high-ranking administrator for T. E. A. This information essentially summarized the material included in Edgar's explanation to Sanchez already discussed. The education officer, like Edgar, completely sidestepped the segregation issue.
Sanchez took to the stump in the Texas Observer to criticize the state-funded program of summer sessions for non-English speakers. He charged that summer sessions would be good for all children, not just the non-English speaking ones. If some enriched program managed to remove a "language handicap" in a few short weeks, something was wrong with the regular school program that it failed to accomplish the same result. The state would make better use of its money if it spent it to improve its regular program. He believed that the intention of the new summer activity was intended to treat the child to "genteel segregation" and to compound the felony by asserting the child had both a deficiency and a handicap. This attitude failed to be in consonance with modern educational policy. He concluded by saying, "For those well-intentioned souls who have endorsed these programs one can only ask forgiveness, for they know not what they do."  

In 1949, Sanchez spoke to the University Alba Club, a Latin American student group, stating that the "wetback" problem remained Texas' most critical problem. He said that the segregation fight now loomed very small compared to the "pyramiding misery of displaced persons which the entry of thousands of wetbacks into the United States brings about." Sanchez believed that at the time he made the speech, the school segregation matter consisted of "mopping up" operations in some communities, but that the illegal labor problem grew dangerously in its impact upon local
labor. He told the students that formerly Texas-Mexicans made from twelve to sixteen dollars a day chopping cedar near Austin. With the advent of illegal labor willing to work for two dollars a day, the wage rate fell, and more Mexican-American children dropped out of school. He concluded that Texas growers and packers encouraged the migration of illegal aliens to increase their profits.104

Sanchez secured a 41,000 dollar General Education Board grant to conduct further studies of Mexican-American problems. This research, entitled, "Occasional Papers" was published by the University of Texas Press from 1946 to 1951 and added additional information concerning the Mexican-American's plight. Two reports dealing with the illegal alien done independently from the viewpoint of the economist as well as the perspective of the sociologist told essentially the same story—exploitation of illegal labor. The economists found that the lower Rio Grande valley, sometimes called "Magic Valley," and comprising Cameron, Willacy, and Hidalgo counties engaged in agriculture almost all year round. The valley farms produced citrus crops, cotton, and vegetables; and farm owners used a great deal of labor in their farming operations. Several months a year the labor requirements dropped, and farm hands moved elsewhere for work.105

The authors noted that it remained difficult to report accurately the labor supply in the region, because illegal aliens tried to avoid census enumerators. They did find,
however, the scholastic population increased at a somewhat lower rate than the general population. They reported that on any given day, more than 40 per cent of the eligible scholastics stayed out of school, with a higher absence rate occurring for those above fourteen years of age. They found that they could find no significant trend back to the classroom for school age children. Stating that this school absenteeism might not have any significance for the study, the authors commented that any measurable labor force had significance.\textsuperscript{106} The result of the influx of illegal aliens depressed local wage rates considerably below other Texas communities.\textsuperscript{107}

Senator Yarborough confirmed the exploitation of the alien labor by stating that when he campaigned for governor in 1952, it was common knowledge that the Bentsen's and Shivers' plantations which were side by side in the valley used "wetbacks." The farms used an alarm system to alert illegal aliens to cross the river when immigration officials came to inspect the premises. In 1952, this labor earned from ten to fifteen cents an hour in the valley.\textsuperscript{108}

In 1949, Sanchez and Lyle Saunders, Sociologist, released a preliminary report prior to the formal publication of the second study, \textit{Wetback in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas} and they said:

\textit{The wetback is a major source of social and economic infection. He is a focal point from which flow social poisons that manifest themselves in symptoms of various kinds: disorganized migratory populations; segregated}
schools; hostilities and tensions; political apathy; economic waste; peonage and divided citizenry.

When Lyle Saunders and Olen Leonard's study was published in 1951, the saga of the illegal alien became well known in Texas. The two sociologists carefully detailed the poor wage rates, exploitation of aliens by both Anglo and Mexican-American residents, poor health, haphazard school attendance, and inadequate housing. As an adjunct of their research, the scholars included unnamed interviews with leaders in the region. One interview with a member of the Texas legislature indicated that this lawmaker voiced the same bigotry and lack of understanding regarding minority group problems as did many of the residents in the area. Additionally, interviews with a prosperous farmer and a well-schooled employment counselor also revealed the widespread bigotry that authors easily documented. When this study became public, tempers flared.

Ed Idar, Jr. served as an officer of the American G. I. Forum at the time of the release of the report. He went to see Sanchez, discussed the report with him, and Sanchez gave him 200 additional copies of the study to distribute to Forum members. When the publication reached the valley, and residents learned what people had been saying about them, they exploded, started holding public meetings, and passed resolutions. Many Mexican-Americans totally misconstrued the monograph. Some LULAC chapters criticized Sanchez for
releasing the report, but most Forum members supported both Sanchez and the study. The state politician who remained anonymous in the publication but who was Rogers Kelley, took exception to the report and contacted Brownsville lawyer and LULAC leader, J. T. Canales. The lawyer wrote to Sanchez, threatened to sue him, the authors of the study, and the university. Idar reported that he and others secured testimony from those who had conducted the interviews, and they knew that if the matter came to court they had the facts. The Chancellor of the university discussed this entire matter with Sanchez; and when he learned all the facts, he believed that the truth could be proved, and he supported both Sanchez and the study.\textsuperscript{111}

Valley farmers protested when the wetback study revealed that they paid farm laborers twenty to thirty cents an hour. They insisted they paid more. However, when the U. S. Employment Service demanded that valley farmers pay braceros forty cents an hour minimum wage, the valley men responded that twenty-five cents an hour remained the prevailing wage rate. One valley representative stated that farmers could not afford to harvest their crops because they had been "sold down the river." Sanchez retorted that rather than farmers being sold down the river they had been "asleep at the switch."\textsuperscript{112}

Sanchez reacted viscerally to all kinds of injustice, and this became apparent when he addressed the Austin Human Relations Commission bemoaning the existence of irresponsible
leadership in the field of human relations. Specifically referring to a recent action by the state legislature which had passed "anti-integration" laws, he charged lawmakers with irresponsible conduct. The only way Americans could change the Supreme Court ruling regarding integration would be to amend the Constitution. Educators who capitalized on community prejudices to avoid obeying integration rules, playing instead on community preferences for differential treatment for ethnic minorities not based on sound judgment, earned his condemnation. 113

Sanchez also reacted vociferously to political action by elected leaders when he wrote expressing interest in Governor John Connally's recently expressed statement regarding school dropouts. He reminded the state leader that one had to recognize first the causes of school dropouts and then implement measures needed to correct the problem. Zeroing in on the bilingual child, he criticized the Texas Education Agency's belief that all entering Spanish-speaking children were doomed to retardation by their approval of the widespread practice of retaining these children for at least two years in the first grade. Along with the imposition of retardation, T. E. A. offered these students overcrowded classes, watered-down curricula, improper evaluative criteria for determining progress, and suppression of Spanish usage. He noted that "most public schools in Texas that have large numbers of Spanish-speaking children are 'assembly
lines for the production of illiterates and juvenile delinquents.' " Believing that a poor educational system contributed to a high dropout rate, he stated that "the school system is a sorry one because it is led by sorry leaders, and because it is financed by a niggardly legislature." Sanchez believed that if state leaders wanted first class education, they had to allocate adequate funding to accomplish that task.

Sanchez's continuing interest in education manifested itself again when he submitted a statement to the Senate hearings considering the amendment of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary School Education Act to include provisions for bilingual education. He told the committee that Spanish actually represented a native language for five million residents in the Southwest who were not immigrants. He added that recent tests conducted in Canada indicated that bilingual students scored higher on intelligence tests than monolingual ones. This did not mean that bilinguals were more intelligent, but that they simply made better use of their native abilities. Reminding the lawmakers that ability to communicate in Spanish enabled Americans to function more effectively with the nations of the hemisphere, the Professor stated that Spanish is a natural cultural resource of greater worth than either oil or cattle. Sanchez concluded by condemning the Texas Education Agency's certification policies
which granted licenses to teachers who knew little about their prospective students, and he admitted that teacher-training institutions shared part of the blame. 

Sanchez's constant intertwining of politics and education surfaced in April, 1967, when the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Inter-American Center of the T. E. A. sponsored a Texas conference for Mexican-Americans in San Antonio. Participants in the meeting included Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez, Senator Ralph Yarborough, Governor John Connally, T. E. A. officials, and faculty members from several universities. The conference participants presented papers indicating issues of interest to this ethnic group, showing both areas where progress had been made and problems which still remained unsolved. Sanchez remained conspicuous by his absence. He had noted his displeasure concerning the meeting in a letter to Joe Bernal, Texas Senator from San Antonio. He told the lawmaker that Senator Yarborough, the highest ranking state official, had originally been selected as the feature speaker; but the program indicated that Governor John Connally received the keynote position, and Yarborough had been relegated to the "postscript" place. Sanchez told Bernal that he could not go along with the change, partly out of a sense of embarrassment and, secondly, because he disapproved of the treatment of his friend of long-standing. He noted that, "I am disappointed at what seems to be a game of political musical chairs that has entered into this
Sanchez withdrew from the conference. Yarborough's address had been rescheduled for Saturday morning, after many conference participants had already left the meeting. Governor Connally's forces did not want Yarborough to have the key slot at the meeting.

The Professor did attend a San Antonio conference when he was subpoenaed to testify at the United States' Civil Rights' Commission meeting on Mexican-Americans held in San Antonio in 1968. Sanchez told a reporter that the subpoena did not mean that he was attending reluctantly, but that was simply the legal way of assuring attendance of all witnesses. He added that this would be the first hearing devoted solely to issues concerning Mexican-Americans and came about partly as a result of a six-month tour of the Southwest by a special civil rights' team.

Sanchez reported to the Commission that the curriculum offered in Texas schools, appropriate for the Middle West, failed to meet the needs of the Mexican-American child. Lack of materials dealing with the Southwest represented part of the cultural void. Also, methodology used for first graders failed to prepare adequately foreign-language children for regular classroom work, because they required more time for oral English before they learned to read. Additionally, the University of Texas offered no courses to prospective teachers to help them deal with these children. He explained further
that one of the major barriers to educational reform in Texas resulted from the Mexican-Americans' widespread poverty and his lack of effective political organization on a state-wide basis. The population numbered over two and one-half million, but these people have been unable to harness political weight to institute reforms. The continuing migration of illegal aliens, along with the bracero program, served to exacerbate the problems and make it increasingly difficult for the group to raise their economic standards.  

Hector P. Garcia, a member of the Civil Rights' Commission, questioned Sanchez concerning the legal basis for school segregation. Sanchez explained that the state Attorney General ruled in the early 1940's that segregation of children through the third grade was permissible, and schools then established segregation throughout the system. The Delgado decision in 1948 enjoined the state educational authorities from continuing this practice, but local schools had already drawn school zones with segregation in mind. When Garcia reminded Sanchez of the plan used in many communities of pre-primer classes, primer sections and then first grade classes designed to isolate the minority child for at least three school years, Sanchez responded that there was no reason for having children repeat first grade one or more times. He believed that any achievement deficiency could be met in the normal course of three or four regular school grades. When asked how he should improve educational conditions for this ethnic group
in large urban areas, Sanchez replied that he would redraw school attendance zones to promote integration, modify curricula to make it meaningful, select teachers able to relate to this ethnic group, and adopt textbooks more representative of the culturally pluralistic values present in the state. He concluded that the only way to correct these problems was through the use of continued political pressure by Mexican-Americans to both the state board of education and the legislature to insist that these changes be made. 121

Although Sanchez's first commitment always remained with education, his actions clearly indicated that political pressure had to be the partner of educational reform. He believed that the political process should be used to its fullest, and he stated many times that the minority group will effect change as soon as they function effectively politically. Because he wanted Mexican-Americans to help shape public policy, he strongly opposed adoption of a literacy test as a prerequisite for voting, as a committee on election law changes had recommended to Governor Jester in 1949. He charged that if election frauds are committed they are committed by literates not illiterates. He believed that it illustrated the height of folly to penalize victims rather than perpetrators of fraud. Commenting that he liked the New York state literacy test Sanchez stated that the Empire state had made a conscious effort for the past
century to improve the educational level of its people. "In
Texas no such effort has been made . . . it would be 'dis-
honorable' for the state to penalize people whose lack of
literacy is a result of state policies of education."

Sanchez identified leaders interested in the Mexican-
American cause and supported them actively. Ralph Yarborough
stated that when he ran for governor in 1952, the LULACS
appeared to be supporting Allan Shivers for that office.
Sanchez brought Yarborough to the organization's meeting
himself, because the group had refused to invite the can-
didate to attend, and Sanchez delivered such a rousing speech
that the candidate won their support. Subsequently, Sanchez
supported Yarborough in all his campaigns with most of
Sanchez's efforts centering in south Texas. Sanchez made
radio tapes for Spanish-language stations and sent endorse-
ments to Spanish-language newspapers. He was not as active
in Yarborough's senate races as he had been in the political
leader's earlier attempts to win public office.

Garcia noted that Sanchez was always a liberal and his
liberalism stayed tied to humanitarianism. Sanchez had loved
the 1952 Democratic presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson,
but when he attended the Democratic convention, the Shivers'
forces chased him and his followers out. Sanchez campaigned
for Stevenson, as did Lyndon B. Johnson, the only Texas poli-
tical leader who openly campaigned for the unsuccessful
candidate.
Sanchez served as an advisor to the "Viva Kennedy" and "Viva Johnson" clubs, and Johnson had a great deal of respect for Sanchez. Garcia noted that he himself had no way of knowing what Johnson's personal feelings were regarding Mexican-Americans, but he believed that Johnson was a man able to overcome his personal feelings. Kennedy appointed Mexican-Americans to boards and ambassadorial posts, and Garcia commented that they contacted Johnson as the intermediary to talk to Kennedy. Garcia, Sanchez, and Johnson had a long association dating back to the 1949 Three Rivers case. Garcia served as the prime mover, but Sanchez helped him make telephone calls and write letters to people in public office able to change policy.125

Ed Idar, Jr. viewed Sanchez's political activism somewhat differently. He conceded that Sanchez was a liberal, but he would support a moderate or even a conservative for public office if that person would implement relief for the Mexican-American. Illustrating Sanchez's manipulation of the political process with an anecdote concerning Price Daniel in 1962, Idar related the following incident. The gubernatorial candidate attended the El Paso meeting of PASO, a new Mexican-American organization, to secure their political endorsement. Sanchez ideologically supported the liberal candidate Don Yarborough, but he met with Price Daniel prior to his going to the convention and briefed him
as to the kinds of concerns that delegates would voice at the meeting. Daniel made a good showing, and the convention supported him. Sanchez had feelings of friendship for Daniel and realized that the organization might do better to support a moderate. 126

Tony Bunilla, first vice-president of LULAC in 1975, provided another dimension to understanding the significance of the PASO meeting. He stated that the organization originally came about after the 1960 election and secured its original support from "Viva Kennedy" groups. Sanchez played an active role with this group, meeting with members and teaching them about the machinations of political leaders in Texas. The organization, originally called MAPA, Mexican-American Political Association, was led by Albert Peña of San Antonio and Hector Garcia of Corpus Christi. Bunilla stated that the PASO leadership became divided at the 1962 election, and the more liberal faction did not support Price Daniel. Sanchez was identified with that liberal group. Judge Cadena noted that the political difference grew to be a personal one between Sanchez and Garcia, who supported Daniel, and affected somewhat their personal relationship in later years. 127

E. E. Mireles, retired Corpus Christi school administrator and LULAC member, saw Sanchez's activism as a power play to force educational change. He stated that Sanchez insisted that equality remained the first consideration
before anything else. Although Mireles disapproved of Sanchez's approach to solving problems, he remarked that he had once had a good relationship with the professor until he began to write Spanish books. Sanchez told Mireles that he was wasting his time, because this was not the way to help the bilingual child. Mireles recalled that Sanchez was so annoyed with his project that he even spoke out publicly against the Corpus Christi educator's publications. 128

Lyle Saunders, author of the wetback study, observed that Sanchez, small in stature and disabled because of lung surgery, transferred his earlier tenacity in the boxing rings to the social action area. Saunders perceived Sanchez as determined, aggressive, and possessing a reasonable amount of certainty of his ability to solve problems. Sanchez knew political forces and knew how to move them; but rather than use the suave and diplomatic approach, he used direct confrontation. "He knew how to energize the Spanish-speaking community and take advantage of the pressures that they could apply," 129 the author stated. Additionally, Saunders noted that he sensed that Sanchez may have become disappointed at not becoming a national leader of this ethnic group, and he believed that Mexican-Americans weren't pushing any members of their own group for national leadership. If Sanchez was disappointed because he would not speak for all members of this minority on a national level, Saunders believed that
he came as close to achieving it as anyone could have done at the time.

Sanchez may never have received the status of "national leader," but the Kennedy-Johnson years brought him recognition for his long years of service to the cause of equal opportunities for Mexican-Americans. President John F. Kennedy appointed him to a Citizens' Committee concerned with a New Frontier Policy for the Americas. The committee members included former Ambassador Averill Harriman, United Nations' delegate Adlai Stevenson, and historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Sanchez wrote a position paper for the group in which he pointed out that power in Latin America now rested with the masses, and it became necessary for the federal government to reevaluate its Latin American policy. Ralph Yarborough commented that Sanchez's appointment was a significant choice, because the professor had "complete understanding of the people of the Americas; his intellectual power and knowledge of the overall problem, his exceptional record of educational service," made him an outstanding choice.

Kennedy appointed Sanchez to the Peace Corps Board of Directors. He was also invited to participate as a panel member in Los Angeles, in November, 1963, on the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, chaired by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony J. Celebrezze.
At the Los Angeles meeting, the Secretary made a speech informing panel members of the federal government's plans for the Mexican-American people. At the conclusion of his remarks, Sanchez told the administrator forthrightly that the time for paternalism had passed, and Mexican-Americans stood ready to plan their own remediation programs.133

In 1966, Senator Yarborough recommended Sanchez to succeed Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. as head of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In the letter that the Senator wrote to President Johnson recommending the appointment, he stated that although he realized it was difficult for the President to name a Texan to this post, he believed that this recommendation should be given consideration because of Sanchez's qualifications for the position.134 Dallas Congress- man Earle Cabell expressed surprise at Yarborough's recommendation because Dallas resident Luther Holcomb, permanent Vice-Chairman and Acting Chairman, should logically be elevated to the new post. The Dallas lawmaker didn't want to criticize the Senator's recommendations but he believed that Holcomb was eminently qualified for the post.135

Even though President Johnson failed to act on Yarborough's recommendation, he had already extended recognition to Sanchez by inviting him to the White House for the signing of the War on Poverty bill and appointing him to assist the Community Relations Service implement the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This service, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce,
received the charge of achieving the preservation of order and equal treatment as well as equal opportunity for all Americans by affirmative effort. 136

Sanchez probably relished this last honor because it gave him the opportunity to notify the executive branch of the government of the growing dissatisfaction of Texans of Mexican descent with their current status. He called for crash programs to prevent the 2,000,000 Texans from becoming "disillusioned and cynical." He offered Johnson his services to effect improvement. This letter to the President included a summary of a meeting held by the Joint Conference of Mexican Americans in Austin on January 7, 1967, in which the organization itemized their areas of concern. 137

Sanchez may never have become the national leader that Saunders thought he should have been, but the administrations of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson gave him many accolades. As a result of the dreams of Kennedy and the actions of Johnson, a number of new federal programs initiated in the Southwest served as evidence that the federal government did care about the welfare of this minority group. Johnson indicated this concern at a reception honoring Congressman Henry B. Gonzales of San Antonio on November 21, 1965, when he said:

As a young teacher in a Mexican school in Cotulla, I came to know what it meant to many of your children not only to be poor, but to be poor without hope. As a young assistant to the
Congressman from this district, I came to know your dreams and your ambitions. As a State Director of the National Youth Administration during the great depression, I came to know your dignity and your dogged determination.
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CHAPTER XI

"OBEDZCO PERO NO CUMPLO—I OBEY BUT I DO NOT COMPLY!"

The University of Texas in Austin, founded in 1883, leads the state's higher education system in prestige and enrollment figures. Actions of the faculty and administrators of the institution have spawned frequent quarrels with the State Board of Regents concerning both goals of higher education and practices to be pursued for their implementation. For example, the school's small minority group enrollment had been one issue which irritated faculty members, including Sanchez. Only 6.6 per cent of the 42,000 member student body in 1973 included members of minority groups. As recently as 1973, one year after Sanchez's death, the university enrolled 412 black students, and by 1974 the number climbed to 521. The number of Spanish-surnamed students climbed from 1,792 students in 1973 to 2,096 by 1974. Texas' statistics indicate a large total number of college graduates, but 3 per cent of the population never attended school at all. The Spanish-speaking have the lowest achievement level.¹

The minority enrollment issue served as just one point of argument between faculty and members of the Board of Regents. Views of the Board of Regents reflected beliefs of
the state's conservative governing class, and as such often-
times generated a great deal of controversy for educators
charged with the institution's ongoing operations. In its
ideal state, a university represents organized efforts in the
pursuit of truth, but in the pragmatic truth it is created
by society to serve its perceived needs and values. During
the 1940's, President Homer P. Rainey became involved in a
bitter controversy with the Board of Regents regarding ques-
tions of institutional reform and academic freedom. He
was fired because his openly expressed views displeased indi-
vidual regents. More than two decades after this occurred,
Rainey reflected about this experience in a book entitled
The Tower and the Dome, as he tried to explain why the aura
of controversy appeared as a constant factor in the govern-
ance of the institution.

The former President charged that political control
frequently ran counter to the institution's intellectual
ideal, because appointed members of the regents' board often
tried to coerce university leaders to implement their will.
Rainey stated that university standards mirrored universal
goals that are apparent in all similar institutions, and
these schools could not be ruled by the whims of politically
appointed leaders. Goals of the university underscored so-
ciety's timeless values and should not be made to conform to
any popularly current political philosophy. He stated that
a well-known faculty member had described those political
leaders who wanted to exercise control as "native Fascists,"
determined to direct not only the university but also all organized education in the state.\textsuperscript{2}

The former President stated that the university, created by the state constitution, remained controlled by a nine-member Board of Regents appointed by the Governor with Senate confirmation who served for six-year terms. Under the current constitution and prior to the 1974 gubernatorial election, the Governor served for two years. If he served more than one term, he could use his appointment powers to control selection of a majority of the regents. Such a policy became apparent during the tenure of W. Lee O'Daniel, as he used appointment powers to mirror Texas politics. These politics largely reflected the fact that the state had more than one-half of the nation's oil and gas reserves. Industry leaders associated with these natural resources wanted to maintain a free hand in their development and exploitation. The government, via the governor and the legislature, generally supported business interests. The press, particularly in large urban areas, reinforced business leaders' views to the public, which aided leaders to accomplish their goals. The leadership believed that the tone of the state's educational policies affected the scope of its power, and they worked to guide, direct, and control education of all residents. By the early 1940's, the university enjoyed a freer intellectual climate than any other state institution, and the governor, through the regents, sought to alter that condition.\textsuperscript{3}
Rainey asserted that individual regents objected to comments by faculty members; the faculty supported the principles of academic freedom as stated by the American Association of University Professors. They even sought to receive permission from the state attorney general to subvert the goals of freedom for this group. When they learned that they legally remained powerless to do this, the regents, through manipulations of promotions and salary increases, exercised their tight control. Rainey noted that the power to withhold salary increases and promotions enabled the regents to vent their revenge against faculty and administrators whom they disliked. Faculty members who resisted this type of pressure became aware, nevertheless, that some regents wanted liberal faculty members to leave.

Sanchez's activities, speeches, and writings during his thirty-two year career at the university indicated that he tended to disagree with political and educational groups that sought to retain the status quo. The professor wanted minority students to benefit from university training, and he frequently became one of the campus spokesmen as the students' representative of the disadvantaged segments of society. He also upheld, proudly, principles of academic freedom, and he resisted pressures from university administrators or political leaders whom he perceived attempted to subvert those rights treasured by the academic community. Sanchez never tempered these views throughout his career. As he grew older, he became increasingly
impatient with all long-standing examples of injustice, and he voiced sharp criticisms against them.

Almost twenty years after the famous "Rainey controversy," Sanchez indirectly supported the former administrator's view when he criticized exclusion of professional educators from the state Coordinating Board in a speech, "The Autonomy of the University." He noted that the argument that active educators should be excluded from policy-making decisions because they represented a vested interest in education seemed humorous. He pointed out that the university belonged to the world of scholarship and should resist political entanglements and control. The search for truth, according to the professor, must operate in a climate of freedom, but in an intellectual role the "teachings of scholars may have profound effects on socio-political goals and processes." He stated that members of the university reserved the right as citizens to challenge goals of society, but he asserted that the political world had no right to meddle in the world of scholarship, except to protect, applaud, and encourage it.

Sanchez also observed that it remained commonplace for state legislatures to argue as to what courses should be taught on a given college campus. Lay advisory boards also believed that they had the right to determine requirements for degrees. Sanchez believed that this kind of interference made as much sense as if he were the one to determine which of his students required an appendectomy and which doctor
should perform the surgery. He also stated that it remained an affront to both academic freedom and civic responsibility for trustees to dismiss a professor because they disliked his politics or withhold merited promotions and salary increases for the same reason.

Academic freedom may have been the burning issue of the 1940's, but the question of integration, as the chief campus social concern, surfaced in the early 1960's when President Harry Ransom served. Ransom found himself in an unpleasant position of being buffeted between liberal demands of the faculty and student body for integration and the traditionally racist attitudes of the regents who opposed it. Students had voted to integrate the athletic program, and the faculty had voted by an overwhelming margin to protest continuance of segregated dormitories. Ransom responded to these concerns by appointing a committee to consider the issues. As soon as Ransom had indicated that he shared their concerns, both professors and students turned their attention to other examples of segregationist practices and began to picket movie theaters located near the campus which refused to admit blacks. After their picketing stimulated both arrests and a great deal of conversation, theater owners eventually agreed to integrate their establishments.

Regents who advocated segregation had been appointed by governors of the preceding decade who also advocated segregation. Allan Shivers and Price Daniel both felt more
comfortable with a segregated university, according to Ronnie Dugger. By 1965, the regents began to change their minds about integration when they realized that the university would lose federal grants if the administrators failed to complete total integration. By 1963, the university removed all outward segregation signs, except the football team. Although black athletes had played against the Texas team for many years, the regents balked at integrating this important activity that continued to tie the institution to its graduates. Sanchez, a football fan, recalled that when the University of Southern California team, comprised of both Negroes and Mexican-Americans, played the Texas Longhorns, a fan in the stands shouted, "Those inferior races are beating the shit out of us Texans."^ It was not until 1970 that a Negro player made the varsity team, stimulated by pressure from the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's inquiry concerning the school's program for recruiting athletes from minority groups.11

Sanchez found himself operating within this aura of controversy during his years at the institution. As a fully tenured professor, he served the university in many different ways. Although Herschel T. Manuel, Professor of Educational Psychology, had requested that the Dean of the College of Education include a budgetary allocation for a Professor of Latin American Education as early as 1938, these funds did not become available until 1940 when the federal government
allocated necessary funds to the institution. Sanchez served as the first Professor of Latin American Education. He helped to establish an Institute of Latin American Studies for the purpose of bringing together Latin American interests of students with university facilities. The Institute became part of the total cultural program of the institution and Sanchez's position, considered to be an interdepartmental one, was funded from the budgets of the Departments of Educational Psychology as well as History and Philosophy of Education. The scope of Sanchez's activities included university committees and special projects. He also participated in regional and international activities sponsored by other colleges and philanthropic foundations, as well as studies supported by both state and federal government offices. Sanchez received more recognition regionally, nationally, and internationally than he did from his campus colleagues.

Sanchez manifested his interest in promoting bicultural understanding by organizing a summer field school in Laredo, Texas, during the summer of 1941. The purpose of the program included introduction of materials and techniques to enable participants to incorporate aspects of this culture in their curricula offerings. More than 100 persons participated in this innovative educational adventure that used Laredo public schools as the laboratory and the environs of northern Mexico for field trips. Sanchez believed that participants
would be stimulated by the regional cultural offerings. They would have a chance to learn "informal Spanish in its natural setting, the market place of old Mexico, Mexican music and folklore, and other aspects of an inter-American culture in the making— all to be studied and appreciated," he noted.

Sanchez received financial backing from the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation and served as editor of the Occasional Papers, published by the university. The series consisted of nine studies, some of which have already been discussed in other parts of this study. Sanchez co-authored with Reginald C. Reindorp and Bernice M. Boswell a bibliography entitled, Reference of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language: A Bibliography, published as Inter-American Occasional Papers IV in 1949. He also co-authored with Clarice T. Whittenburg, Materials Relating to the Education of the Spanish-Speaking, Inter-American Occasional Papers II, published in 1948. Additionally, he served as editor for a monograph by Lyle Saunders entitled, The Spanish-Speaking Population of Texas, Inter-American Occasional Papers V, published in 1949. This study attempted to update earlier demographic studies to inform the public of current needs and problems of this ethnic group. Frederick Meyers received partial funding from the Human Relations Council in his study of Spanish-Name Persons in the Labor Force in Manufacturing Industry in Texas, Inter-American
Occasional Papers VIII, published in 1951. This tract examined both income and occupational distribution of Mexican-Americans in different regions in the state. Also, Sanchez served as editor for Ruth Ann Fogartie's *Texas Born Spanish Name Students in Texas Colleges and Universities*, Inter-American Occasional Papers III, published in 1948.

Fogartie's study provided Sanchez with a great deal of ammunition for his subsequent tangles with university administrators. The author reported that during the 1945-1946 school year the Mexican-American group comprised 1.6 per cent of the college population, even though the ethnic group numbered over 20 per cent of the state's total school age population. These students attended twenty-two of the thirty-three institutions of higher learning, found in widely scattered regions of the state. The students declared their career choices when they enrolled, and their favorite choices included engineering, business, and medicine. Many also selected education, science, and Spanish as occupational choices. Women enrollees outnumbered men. Fifty-five per cent of these students were freshmen, 23 per cent ranked as sophomores, 12 per cent were juniors, 7 per cent were seniors, and 3 per cent enrolled as graduate students. During a twenty-five year period their enrollment at the University of Texas had increased from 0.64 per cent to 1.25 per cent of the student body.¹⁴

The question that Fogartie raised concerning relevancy of college curricula to student needs indicated that 27 per
All but 100% of the schools surveyed offered courses centering around education of Spanish-speaking people. Eighteen per cent offered special courses primarily for Spanish-speaking students. Twenty-three per cent of the colleges provided special counselors for this minority group, while 41 per cent offered scholarships for which members of this group were available.\textsuperscript{15}

The author concluded that the Mexican-American college population increased at an extremely slow rate. She noted that some institutions in their response to the questionnaire managed to confuse foreign-language students with Latin American foreign students. Fogartie stated that some evidence existed indicating that these institutions paid more attention to their foreign students than they did to their native foreign-language ones.\textsuperscript{16}

Sanchez's participation in the Faculty Senate also illustrated his commitment to university life. In 1946, the secretary of the Faculty Senate reported that the Faculty Council held a special meeting concerning changes in admission procedures. The Council recommended the restriction of admission of both Texas and non-Texas applicants based on a grade-point average evaluation of their previous college work. They suggested use of class standing if no college work had been attempted. They proposed to make requirements more stringent for out-of-state applicants. Sanchez responded to these recommendations by stating that he didn't think foreign students would be affected to any considerable degree by the proposed
policy change. Many of the applicants would already have graduate standing and the registrar could easily determine admission policies for others, based on grade-point averages. Sanchez expressed overt concern for foreign-language applicants coming from another institution in this country who, because of language difficulties and cultural differences, had found it difficult to earn high grades. This policy would affect that student who wanted to transfer to the University of Texas from another school. Sanchez's position on this issue clearly illustrated his concern for the Mexican-American student.

In July, 1947, Sanchez responded to a faculty committee that had been studying the problem of student absences. He stated that the question of disciplinary action which the administration might want to take regarding absences had little bearing on the individual instructor's purposes and procedures. He noted that a rule may be satisfactory for the administration but not for different instructors, who might have several hundred ways of dealing with the problem. Sanchez recommended that absences be handled in two ways. First, the faculty should report absences to the administration for their special purpose. Second, the instructor should be given the authority to handle absences as he saw fit. He agreed that this had been the essence of the committee's recommendations, except that they believed discretionary powers should remain with the department chairman rather
than the instructor. In this instance, Sanchez revealed his conviction of the right of an instructor to adhere to principles of academic freedom in the performance of his professional responsibilities.

On May 8, 1956, the Faculty Senate debated a resolution which had already been introduced and discussed at their April 16 meeting concerning faculty members' right to participate in political activities. The regents had expressed concern regarding involvement of university personnel in partisan politics. Sanchez wrote a protest statement on April 20, 1956, concerning a proposed policy change. He believed that a change in present policy would constitute a violation of the staff's civil liberties. He also considered it to be a dangerous and highly discriminatory proposal.

At the May meeting, Sanchez amplified the remarks that he had made in the protest statements by telling his colleagues that his ancestors had lived in the region for 350 years, and he took his citizenship responsibilities seriously. He stated that he loved the "right to be wrong in my political choices... I take great pride in discharging my responsibilities as a citizen... I cherish the right of public advocacy of the candidate of my choice." He pointed out that he had already spent thirty-three years in education, sixteen of which had been at the university, and he believed that he knew well the proper decorum of good professional behavior, enabling him to harmonize his citizenship and his professional
life without coercion. He agreed that the faculty should refrain from involving the university in partisan politics, but he opposed inclusion of the phrase "involve the university in partisan politics" in any written policy statement. He explained that some future administrations might interpret the phrase to restrict further faculty participation as citizens and, thereby, also serving to limit their academic freedom. "Were this proposal to be enacted into university regulation, I would be sorely tempted to say, like some of my antecedents at times said when dealing with the Spanish crown, 'Obedezco pero no cumplo'-- I obey but I do not comply." The faculty adopted a motion restricting university members from active advocacy in political contests for governor, lieutenant governor, and legislative races but allowed open participation in all other political activities as long as staff personnel refrained from speaking as institutional spokesmen.

In 1960, a debate concerning inclusion of a resolution to repeal a disclaimer included in the National Defense Education Act occupied the attention of the Faculty Senate. The Congressionally enacted disclaimer required that any person receiving benefits from this legislation had to sign a statement stating that, "He does not believe in, and is not a member of, and does not support any organization believing in teaching the overthrow of the United States government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional
methods." 23 Sanchez supported the faculty effort to disavow this disclaimer and seconded the motion to that effect. In his seconding remarks, he stated that he objected to differential treatment being accorded professors and students. He explained that the government didn't require similar statements when they supported business, and he noted that the legislatively enacted disclaimer represented a threat to academic freedom. He reminded his colleagues that the old scripture, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you Free," implied the unrestricted search for wisdom. He felt that to believe otherwise would mean the search for truth in a concentration camp. "There one could silverplate the fence posts, hang garlands of roses on goldplated barbed wire, and spray the whole with Chanel No. 5--it would still stink!" Sanchez concluded by saying that it would be a sad day if university professors ever endorsed this disclaimer, because it would indicate to him that they had lost both their professionalism as well as their sense of dignity. 24

Sanchez total commitment to fight injustice kept him in the limelight for the last twenty-five years of his career. Many of his activities revolved around important court cases concerning discrimination against Mexican-Americans. His concern for cultural pluralism and its implication that people should enjoy and respect other cultures became apparent during his early years in Austin. He frequently discussed ways of improving inter-American relations as one means of improving
opportunities for Mexican-Americans. As the first Professor of Latin American Education, he told university and lay audiences alike of the need to correct cultural conflicts found in the region. Sanchez's conference sponsorship began in 1943 with the Inter-American Conference, funded by a grant from the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. When he attended public meetings, he frequently spoke of improving inter-American relations. He believed that establishment of good relations among culturally diverse peoples required education of both the minority and dominant groups, along with political and legal action. He felt that it remained easier to educate the minority, rather than the majority because many dominant group members had warped attitudes which complicated any resocialization efforts.

The University News and Information Service reported on March 20, 1963, that Sanchez would direct a new Center for International Education, established by the College of Education. He stated that the new program would enable prospective teachers to qualify simultaneously for service both in this country as well as some foreign countries. Sanchez envisioned also using the center for foreign educators and government personnel who might want to take advantage of the institute's short courses.

Sanchez organized the first conference dealing with the education of the Spanish-speaking in the Southwest in 1945. At that meeting he told his audience of professional educators...
that seemed to be orphans who needed to begin a state or national organization. Reminding them that they appeared to be the only minority group which failed to have either a publication or an organization, he challenged them to organize themselves for these purposes. He also told his audience that the entire question of Latin-American and Anglo antagonism in Texas had been nurtured by the public schools. "If we are going to attack it, it should be through the schools and through the elimination of segregated schools . . . . We can do it by existing laws; we don't need any new ones," he concluded.

Sanchez exercised his rights and obligations as a citizen by testifying against a legislative proposal that would increase college tuition rates. The Texas Observer reported the accomplishments of a heated legislative session that had considered the issue of mandating higher tuition fees to institutions of higher learning. The bill passed by a two vote margin in both houses with all liberal legislators opposing the measure. Sanchez testified as a private citizen, and the reporter excerpted some of Sanchez's testimony for a magazine article. Sanchez stated that he opposed the policy of charging higher tuition fees because it negated the purpose of public education. He zeroed in on the needs of the Mexican-American as he voiced his opposition. He reported that 1,500,000 Mexican-Americans lived in Texas. The group earned a median income of 980 dollars annually in 1950, contrasting
to 1,754 dollars for the total white population, which also included the Spanish-surnamed. He noted that at best the minority group had one-half the income of the white population which gave them one-half the ability to pay for educational services. These people remained in dire need of education, particularly higher education, Sanchez stated.

In 1950, the educational statistics revealed that the Spanish-speaking had achieved 3.5 years of schooling, compared to 9.7 years for the total white group. This latter figure, according to Sanchez, also appeared depressed because of inclusion of Spanish-speaking people in the total. He explained that a 1948 study of Spanish-speaking college students showed that the ethnic group comprised 1.6 per cent of total college enrollment, indicating that they enrolled in numbers far below their numerical proportion of the state population. The 1950 census also indicated that .8 per cent of the ethnic group completed high school as compared to 6.5 per cent of the total white population. Sanchez reminded the legislators that compared with other white Texans, the Spanish-surnamed had only a one-eighth chance of graduating from college. He noted that after the Second World War with availability of veteran benefits under the G. I. Bill of Rights, Spanish-surnamed enrollment at the University of Texas increased from 1.5 per cent in 1947 to 2.7 per cent of the total enrollment in 1956, indicating Mexican-Americans sought higher education when financial help became available.
Sanchez concluded that his comments applied equally for all poor people, and the inability of the group to be able to attend school represented a waste of society's potential.

Sanchez expressed similar views in a letter to the editor of the Daily Texan in which he stated that the state owed to talented individuals the opportunity to utilize the opportunities afforded by higher educational institutions. He wanted public monies to be made available to give these talented applicants funds for tuition as well as room and board. He maintained that the state's enlightened self-interest groups should be stimulated to encourage these actions. He did not believe that all applicants remained entitled to a free public education, or that a high school diploma or a score on a standardized test automatically determined a candidate's qualifications. He asserted that it no longer seemed crass to correlate individual interest in better higher educational opportunities with the collective needs of the industrial community. Although he maintained that he was old fashioned enough to feel that higher education had value for what it gave the human spirit, he warned of a price barrier for those who lacked the financial means to pay for university training. He urged admissions officers not to limit admission requirements to merely statistical data which have only relative reliability and validity and cannot replace "judgment of a competent jury of men of intelligence; of vision; of a realization of the worth
of talent, whatever it may be." He mused that some readers might consider him to be a Socialist or a Communist because of his views, but he considered himself to be a democrat who believed that democracy prospered only as it capitalized upon all of the talents of its diverse population.31

Sanchez's relationship with university administrators and colleagues from 1964 until 1972 evidenced frequent examples of his irritability and irrascibility in his dealings with peers and supervisors. Perhaps, these same attitudes also appeared prior to that date, but the review of his correspondence remained limited to the indicated time period when copies of his letters appeared in both his personal files and the departmental files of the Department of Cultural Foundations of Education. In 1973, the Dean of the College of Education, Lorrin G. Kennamer, refused to permit examination of his own correspondence files, so that materials presented here reflect essentially many of Sanchez's own biases as well as some quotable comments from associates.

J. G. Umstattd, Sanchez's friend and colleague; L. D. Haskew, former Dean of the College of Education; and Americo Paredes, Sanchez's friend and colleague, willingly commented about Sanchez's role at the university. Umstattd noted that Sanchez's battlefields "reached far beyond his college and the University of Texas. All his life he joined forces against persons and laws that discriminated against the poor and dispossessed of the entire region."32 L. D. Haskew
remarked that he had perceived Sanchez to be a "lone wolf" who worried little about working for collaboration and consensus. The former Dean remarked that Sanchez's commitments caused some university people to label him a "Dean's headache," because of his activities both on and off the campus.33

Haskew, who served as Dean from 1947 to 1963, explained that Sanchez always regarded the deanship with respect, even when Haskew's office acted as the conduit for decisions made elsewhere in the administrative structure. The former Dean remembered that on almost all issues he and Sanchez had reached a détente. Haskew believed that Sanchez respected him because the outspoken professor realized that Haskew interposed his position "between him and the punitive actions contemplated or threatened by others."34 The former administrator admitted that he and Sanchez had had heated discussions dealing with Sanchez's personal attacks upon colleagues, but they remained friends when the battles had ended.

Haskew remembers Sanchez's pugnacity; and W. Gordon Whaley, former Dean of the Graduate School, explained that Sanchez's health was failing during his last years at the university. Whaley recalled that Sanchez's protests became more hostile during that period. Whaley explained that Sanchez was an acknowledged anti-administration professor who, "gave my predecessor and the "President's office as much opposition as he ever did me--sometimes verbally--frequently in the student newspaper."35
Sanchez's pugnacity has been confirmed by several of his colleagues, but the former professor's friend, Americo Paredes, Professor of English and folklore, noted that in Sanchez's final years he held on to life "mostly through courage." Paredes believed that Sanchez knew that his life was drawing to a close, but he still devoted his energies to fighting the same battles "usually with frustrating results. That would be enough to make a person irritable," Paredes observed.  

Sanchez's views concerning salary increases surfaced in his letter to Norman Hackerman, Vice-Chancellor, on June 23, 1964. He complained that despite the fact that he suffered little personal hardship, his infrequent salary increases indicated discrimination. Recognizing that Hackerman would be the first to defend his political posture as long as he did not involve the university, he told the Vice-Chancellor that he never permitted himself to be identified with the university even when he addressed public meetings. Sanchez recounted the history of his discriminatory treatment. He stated that during the early years of Shivers' administration, he served as a close consultant to both the Governor and John Van Cronkhite, the governor's public relation's officer. Sanchez explained that he had persuaded Shivers to establish the Human Relations Commission, which was funded privately and headquartered at the university. Members of this group became disgusted with the
Commission's inaction, and following Sanchez's lead, they all resigned. After the demise of the organization,

It was then that pressure was put on me to remain in Shivers' camp and organize the "Mexican" leadership. I was openly threatened "with the Regents" if I did not cooperate. I pled respect for the Regents and ignorance of organizational politics. Then my troubles began.

He reminded the administrator that he came to the school in 1940 as a full professor at the normal "starvation" salary. He received increases along with his colleagues during his first few years in Austin. He paid little attention to salary increases until he became aware that recommendations on his behalf were rejected. "I tried to get an explanation from Haskew, from Wilson, from Boner. No satisfaction," he explained. In desperation, Sanchez took the matter to the Academic Freedoms Committee to which he belonged. "They found that the Regents had acted improperly in 'red-pencilling' an individual's salary increases. This did not change matters, as administrative officials (above the level of Chairman and Budget Council) took on where the Regents had left off."

Sanchez wrote to William Drake, his friend and departmental chairman, in 1967 also complaining of the discriminatory salary treatment that he received. He noted that his self-pride became injured when he realized that he received the same compensation as a colleague whom he obviously failed to respect. He felt that rather than reward his colleague,
these salary funds would have been better spent in compensating the teaching assistants. 39

Sanchez wrote to Ronnie Dugger of the Texas Observer shortly before he died about the salary discrimination he had experienced at the university. He reported that he had been the lowest paid professor at the school for years, and his colleagues who had received less national recognition than he had received higher salaries. He stated that in 1968 all administrators from the dean on up to the chancellor recommended unanimously for a salary increase of 2,000 dollars. When the recommendation reached the Board of Regents, Sanchez noted that "There the grapevine tells me, one regent (guess who) objected: 'Two thousand dollars for that Sanchez guy? Give him two hundred. I don't like his politics.'" 40

The professor also stated that he could have gone to other schools years ago at a much higher salary, but one reason that he chose to stay at the University of Texas stemmed from the fact that he resisted being "pushed around." "I'll play politics outside the university, but I'll not brown-nose anywhere," he stated. Sanchez estimated that the institution's salary policy cost him 150,000 dollars since 1950, an average of 6,000 dollars a year for twenty years. 41

Reviews of the salary budgets adopted by the Board of Regents proved Sanchez's charges to be correct. When he came to the school in 1940, he received a 4,000-dollar annual salary. A colleague with more seniority earned 4,200 dollars.
From the 1946 school year until 1952, his salary increased from 5,100 dollars to 6,600 dollars. In 1951, he became Chairman of the History and Philosophy of Education Department. Beginning with the 1953 school year, his salary remained consistently behind his equally-ranked colleagues. The gap ranged from a low of 500 dollars in 1953 to a high of 1,700 dollars in 1958. He surrendered the department chairmanship to William Drake in 1959. Drake reported that he had worked diligently to eliminate the disparity between Sanchez's salary and that of his colleagues. By the 1961-1962 school year, Sanchez received 10,000 dollars, the same compensation as his colleague. When he died in 1972, Sanchez's salary was 18,800 dollars for that school year.

Some interesting facts surface as one examines the salary schedules. First, Sanchez served as departmental chairman from 1951 until 1959, yet during that period he earned significantly less money than any of his colleagues. During the last year of his chairmanship, the difference grew to 1,700 dollars. From 1946 until 1951, Sanchez, working with the General Education Board grant, directed numerous studies dealing with the Spanish-speaking people of Texas. The controversial study of wetbacks appeared in 1951, along with his own tract on school segregation. The 1950's marked the peak years of Sanchez's participation in court cases involving segregation of Spanish-speaking children. The Hernandez case, the Driscoll school case, and numerous appeals to the Texas
Education Agency bear this out. It is possible to surmise that his political and legal activities inflamed individual regents to the point that they penalized the professor financially, since they remained powerless to alter his tenured status.

Repressive policies of the University of Texas Board of Regents paralleled administrative practices in other colleges in different parts of the nation. The Educational Testing Service surveyed officers of selected public and private institutions. They found that one-third of the administrators in public institutions and more than 20 per cent of those in private ones disagreed with the idea that faculty members should be able to express their opinions freely in any of the college's communications' areas without fear of reprisal. Information coming from over 2,000 university social scientists indicated that during the 1950's, professors accused of speaking too freely were dismissed in 18 per cent of the cases and had promotions withheld in 12 per cent of the situations. Ten per cent of the social scientists questioned admitted that they had toned down their writing to avoid controversy.44

The American Association of University Professors could defend professors who had been dismissed for political reasons, but governing boards used other means to reach their desired goals. John Silber, former University of Texas Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, reported that his crusades for
integration cost him 2,000 dollars in salary annually until President Ransom corrected the situation. Page Keeton, former Dean of the Law School, had been asked to withhold a salary increase from a progressive Republican professor so that he might find another place to teach. Irwin Spear, a vigorous, outspoken, and able botany professor, had been receiving from 3,000 to 10,000 dollars less annually than his more reticent colleagues. Sanchez's assertions have sufficient documentation to substantiate the veracity of his charges.

Sanchez's irrascibility may have had some effect on the mood of all the instructors of the Cultural Foundations of Education Department, because Wayne H. Holtzman, Dean of the College of Education, remarked that students criticized the department members' seeming lack of cohesion and their manifestation of overt dissension. Holtzman had also observed that department members seemed isolated from both the other departments with the College of Education, as well as other divisions of the university. Sanchez retorted by saying that student talk of dissension appeared to be untrue. He also refuted the Dean's charge of isolation by stating that department staff members enjoyed both national and international recognition which negated the significance of the administrator's charges that they remained isolated from their colleagues.
Holtzman's concern regarding students' perception of departmental dissension manifested itself again with a statement Sanchez made to students as a response to their attempts to recommend a replacement for William Drake who was retiring as department chairman. Sanchez stated that these activist graduate students suffered under delusions of their importance in the functioning of the department. He told them that the faculty welcomes student input in the decision-making process, but he reminded them that the faculty remained in charge, and that students served as "apprentices." He strongly condemned their participation in their own independent search for a new departmental chairman and explained to them in detail why their role in initiating this action remained improper. Calling them "spoiled children," Sanchez concluded that he would not argue those points which he had spelled out in his statement, because he confined his arguments solely to his peers.47

Sanchez donned his verbal boxing gloves as he tangled with W. Gordon Whaley, Dean of the Graduate School, regarding a doctoral candidate. He remarked that he knew that Whaley was referring the candidate's case to the Graduate Assembly, and this indicated to him dismissal of the graduate committee with a "no confidence" vote. He chastised the administrator for his action and indicated his displeasure at being made to appear incompetent. He informed Whaley that if he needed advice, then he could consult with the committee whom he had
already appointed. If he wanted to dissolve the committee, he could set forth his reasons for doing so. He concluded with this barb, "The Graduate Dean may have need of advice from a committee of the Graduate Assembly in the performance of his duties, I do not in the performance of mine." 48

The acerbity of Sanchez's tone in communication with his colleagues increased during the 1970-1972 time period. One of his primary areas of concern continued to be procedures used by the university for admitting candidates into the doctoral program, as well as the form, structure, and legality of the graduate committee which had to evaluate the candidates. He became fixated on a few points and continually rehashed the same arguments. Stating his case on April 27, 1970, Sanchez noted in a letter to his departmental colleagues that the advisor for the graduate student should have free rein in determining the student's course selection, until a supervisory committee was appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. When this committee assumed this leadership role, they usually deferred to wishes of the supervisor-chairman. Prior to the creation of this graduate committee, recommendations, rather than conditions, should be used as suggestions for the candidate's program changes. Believing that the candidate's admission to candidacy should be determined by a majority vote, he noted that any examination administered prior to arrival at this decision should be one
to assess the candidate's potential rather than his ingestion of subject matter. 49

Sanchez's defensiveness grew increasingly apparent as he commented concerning his exclusion from one student's doctoral committee and another candidate's doctoral examining committee. In the first instance, the Professor believed that the Dean deliberately removed him from the committee and he considered this action to be both a personal affront and a violation of professional ethics. He sensed that he was excluded from the doctoral committee because committee members wished to question the candidate regarding academic specifics. Sanchez, to illustrate his own intellectual acuity, included a list of questions which he believed committee members would be unable to answer. 50 In the second instance, Sanchez was excluded from the committee that examined a Lebanese student whose research dealt with Arabic influences on Spanish culture. Believing once more that his professionalism was being impugned by his exclusion, Sanchez challenged his colleagues by including a list of questions which he believed had pertinence for the student's study. 51

Sanchez's apparent commitment to the belief that graduate committees should be governed by majority rule regarding a candidate's admission to the doctoral program motivated him to recall his personal experience with majority rule. He told his colleagues that during the Second World War, he had been hospitalized and was near death because he was
drowning in his own blood. He weighed barely seventy-five pounds at the time, and a distinguished surgeon decided to use him as a guinea pig to try a new surgical procedure. The surgeon had been unable to collapse Sanchez's diseased lung, and he realized that he had to make a decision quickly in order to save the patient's life. He could remove the lung, sever the adhesions which had prevented him from collapsing the lung, or collapse the lung by a series of operations to remove ten ribs. Sanchez became the focus of a medical debate, and the surgeon won over a majority of the members of the committee and proceeded to collapse the lung by removing the ribs. Sanchez believed that even after thirty years had passed, he still retained confidence in the efficacy of majority rule.

Sanchez grew increasingly possessive of his right to determine a graduate candidate's qualifications and spelled out his concern repeatedly to his colleagues. He noted that he advised his students what they should do before they qualified for the preliminary examination. When he believed that his student seemed prepared, he would then ask the graduate faculty committee to submit him to a joint oral or three-hour written examination, or both, to verify his ability as a potential candidate. This committee would then recommend modifications in his program. The student would be recommended for candidacy, pending concurrence of the graduate faculty. This recommendation, according to Sanchez, did not have to
include the committees' suggestions to the candidate. The graduate advisor, according to the Professor, limited his advisement to procedure, not program content. Sanchez added that his students would not be submitted to an "inquisition on matters that I even can't recall."52

Sanchez also told his colleagues that he would be bound solely by the rules of the graduate faculty of the university, and these committee recommendations served merely as advisory suggestions. He agreed to ask the committee to vote concerning his candidate's readiness. He noted that even if the committee rejected his candidate, he still reserved the right to consult directly with the Graduate School Dean. Charging that he refused to accept dicta as to the time and content of examinations, he declared that he would not place his student in an academic strait jacket. He negated the value of considering a student's personal desire in program-planning along with his rejection of student evaluations of the academic program.53 Here, it appeared that Sanchez felt that he accepted majority rule if he agreed with the decision, but he would resist any decision that he deemed unfair no matter how it had been determined.

The question of student evaluation of faculty members surfaced again, and Sanchez drafted another memo to ventilate his views. His communication considered the evaluation of a colleague who had received a poor rating from his students. He regarded the entire evaluation procedure as invalid.
and unethical, commenting that the only judgments which had merit were those made by peers. He believed that students and colleagues should give their criticism face-to-face and stated that "If they haven't the guts to tell me their views to my face, their views aren't worth a damn." He also remarked that the rating list used in the evaluation had asked for comparisons among faculty members; this he considered to be a rigged popularity contest. The evaluation of teacher competence belonged to the department's full professors who also comprised the Budget Council, according to Sanchez.

Sanchez's bitter view regarding student evaluations seemed to have become more intense as he grew older, because in earlier days he had a more accepting attitude of student evaluations. Sanchez had once provided a doctoral student with an appreciative comment given to him by one of his classes. The students admired the professor's scholarship, his broadmindedness, and his tolerance. They noted that he made himself available to them both in his office and at home. They appreciated the amount of time and energy that he devoted to them. These examples of Sanchez's student interest motivated students to express to them their love and concern.

Sanchez's tolerance and broadmindedness which students enjoyed didn't apply to Dean Whaley's attempts to modify the graduate studies committee by including faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences on committees in the Department of Cultural Foundations of Education. He expressed his
strong views to the administrator, and Whaley replied. Whaley attempted to explain that he had made this decision based upon a faculty motion which the Graduate Studies Committee of the College of Education passed in 1967. The Dean of that college had signed that motion, which indicated faculty approval to Whaley. This motion included a statement saying that all committee members, including those from other colleges, would have a vote on the committees on which they served. Whaley stated that he assumed that this decision had also been approved by the faculty of Sanchez's department too. He believed that it appeared necessary to establish uniformity in the committee selection process. He concluded that if Sanchez believed it to be necessary, then he would call another meeting to re-open the issue.  

Whaley's explanation further inflamed Sanchez, and he expressed open hostility regarding a committee which the Professor considered to be non-existent, noting that the Dean's actions indicated his desire to "pack" the committees in his own department. Sanchez also asserted that inclusion of outsiders made it possible for members of their department committees to lose their voice in decision-making, and resented the implication that Whaley appointed outsiders to their committees in order to "upgrade" them. Sanchez continued his fight concerning new committee member assignments in his department meetings, and he informed his
colleagues that he resented the idea that administrators assumed their department needed improving. 59

Whaley had asserted that Sanchez as a member of the Graduate Studies Committee showed resentment towards administration efforts to improve the status of the institution. Whaley believed that Sanchez, and some of his department colleagues ran a "weak program." The administrator explained that when the committee was expanded with the addition of younger men then, Sanchez became uncooperative and failed to attend the meetings. Although the former Dean admitted that he had little personal contact with Sanchez, he did have problems with him concerning some of the professor's graduate students. These difficulties centered around Sanchez's defense of graduate work that had been in progress from as few as six to as long as forty years. Whaley stated that when he put these questions before the Graduate Council, the Council rejected the work. These incidents led to heated encounters between the Professor and Whaley, with Sanchez representing himself as the sole judge of the student's capacity. Whaley noted that seldom did these conflicts involve minority students. Sanchez would be defended by the older colleagues in the department in these incidents and opposed by the younger members. 60

Whaley remembered that his greatest conflicts with Sanchez concerned students whom the administrator felt to be unqualified. He stated that at first Sanchez's hostility to him
compared with his overt hostility to the administration, generally and to changes occurring at the institution in which he played only a small part. "In time with advancing age and physical disability accompanied by increasing isolation, it took on a more acid and somewhat personal character," Whaley concluded. Whaley's perceptions of his conflicts with Sanchez added a note of pathos and tragedy to the explanation of why the educator fought so vehemently with those in command. Sanchez's overt negativism seemed to have weakened his position every additional time that he locked horns with the administration.

Questions centering around evaluation of faculty, courses, and degree plans for graduate students continued to generate additional controversy in Sanchez's department. Colleagues discussed results of questionnaires administered to first year teachers who had been their former students. The faculty disapproved of their expressed preference for more methodology courses and for their rating in both courses and instructors whom they believed to be effective or ineffective. Sanchez negated the validity of student responses, but other colleagues believed that they should explore reasons for student views.

The evaluation question continued to concern department members, and they invited an outside evaluating team to examine their courses. Sanchez commented that in recent years they had been evaluated as a "first rate" department, but he
believed that with "carpetbaggers" now in power that evaluation no longer stood. In addition to his open opposition to the proposed visit by the evaluating team, Sanchez also opposed the charge that had been made which implied that he seemed too "soft" on students. He responded that his accusers should "put up or shut up."  

The evaluators came in December, 1970, and the members were R. Freeman Butts of Columbia University, Phillip G. Smith of Indiana University, and William O. Stanley of the University of Illinois. They discussed the functioning of the Department of Cultural Foundations of Education with faculty members, students, and administrators. They found that the most serious problem seemed to be deep-seated divisions within the department, and all other difficulties stemmed from this one area of concern. The department, according to the evaluators, seemed unable to achieve its potential because of these personality problems. They stated that "These divisions . . . are so enervating and crippling that normal processes of compromise and orderly change and improvement appear to have broken down."  

They also suggested that the department needed to institute three different types of doctoral degree programs, and they submitted a suggested outline. One program should be specialized to lead to competency in the various disciplines offered by the department. This would include Philosophy of Education, History of Education, Latin American studies, and
Anthropological and Sociological Foundations of Education.

A second program, might be designated as a General Cultural Foundations of Education and would prepare graduates to teach in colleges not offering advanced curricula in History and Philosophy of Education. A third major, titled Cultural Foundations of Education, would equip students for leadership roles. The evaluating team believed that present course offerings failed to prepare students properly for any one of these three majors.65

The team also recommended that these students needed a common curriculum core, limited to two semesters, and students should then select their areas of concentration when they had successfully completed an examination. They also stated that a graduate studies committee should assess a student's ability, and the supervising professor and doctoral committee should determine his area of concentration. They discussed the long-standing complaint of "outsiders" voting as members of the graduate studies committee, and they recommended that the committee should be expanded to include only members of the full-time departmental faculty with the rank of assistant professor and higher. They softened this suggestion by stating that they believed this faculty should continue to cooperate with faculty members from other departments.66 Additionally, the evaluators suggested that the Budget Council permit all full-time department members, beginning with the rank of assistant professor, to vote. This
group would then recommend to the department chairman promotions, new appointments, and fund allocations, except salary increases. 67

The team then focused on the department's required course entitled, Cultural Foundations of Education, stating that this course should be retained as a requirement, but it failed to meet student needs in its present form. They believed that the content should be made more meaningful; otherwise, the course would lose its preferential status. They believed that all department members should cooperate to restructure course content. They charged that the course in its present structure represented "the worst possible strategy for engaging students in the intellectual concerns represented by the department." 68

Sanchez evaluated the evaluator's report by noting that the department lacked "divisions" until the Dean appointed outsiders to the committees. He objected to the team's conclusions that the department members had the "potential" for greatness, and he listed his personal accomplishment record to disprove their point. He also pointed out that when the evaluators suggested that they add more courses in their department, L. D. Haskew, a former Dean, had already eliminated some of their departmental offerings. He also took exception to the evaluators' suggestions that the Budget Council served as an advisory body, and he stated that as it was presently constituted the chairman headed the group but retained no
veto power. Finally, he explained that the evaluators' perceptions of departmental weaknesses stemmed from their poor financial condition. The faculty debated the report for many months; and on September 24, 1971, they adopted a revised program for their graduate degree offerings which embodied some of the evaluators' recommendations.

Sanchez registered his protests to the Deans of the College of Education as well as to his own colleagues. As early as 1964, he wrote to C. C. Colvert, Acting Dean of the College of Education, that he objected to be named as a consultant on the "Robert Peck" Committee which had been asked to study grants available from the United States Office of Education. He stated that he had never had the opportunity to meet with the committee, because he was not consulted as to meeting times, and he had schedule conflicts. He also expressed displeasure at being excluded from a list of experts on cultural problems, particularly those with reference to Negroes and Spanish-speaking. "As your know, and I say this with all modesty, I am regarded as the top authority on Spanish-speaking people in the country--the record will bear this out," he explained.

Robert Peck replied to Sanchez's letter to Colvert and reminded him that with the exception of one emergency meeting he had received at least one week's notice of each meeting. He regretted that Sanchez failed to take the time to respond to memoranda by making constructive suggestions. He also
commented that Sanchez had indicated to Dean Colvert that he was "mad," and Peck observed that many people had remarked about Sanchez's chronic state of anger. In a postscript Peck stated, "Next time, if you'll call me on the phone, we probably could obviate the need for letters. I don't want to spoil your fun though; so write if you must." 71

Sanchez's communications with the Deans of the College of Education centered mainly in three areas: charges that he received unfair treatment; questions of legality of administrative decisions; and personal news. Most of the letters concerned Sanchez's perceptions that he received unfair treatment. In 1966, Sanchez received an offer to teach a summer school course in Oregon which necessitated his leaving his Austin summer school class seven days early. Although he had made arrangements for a substitute instructor to cover his class, the Dean told him that he would have to take a leave without pay because he could not receive income from two institutions simultaneously. Sanchez protested this action, but ultimately complied. 72

A year later Sanchez complained to the Dean that some graduate student had been assigned to a desk in his office. He stated that he himself had many graduate students, and he also had a great deal of work to do. He didn't want another graduate student in his office. Holtzman replied that he appreciated Sanchez's problem, but he had to find space
to accommodate fifty additional students in a graduate science education program. He suggested that Sanchez work out a schedule for the use of his office with the department chairman. 73

Sanchez reported to the Dean that if their department hired a certain faculty member the salary differential of 9,000 dollars, which the new staff member would receive, would be charged to the department's existing budget. This meant that they would lose their teaching assistants. He stated that he now had eighty-six students in his large class, and he willingly would lecture to two classes, but he required help from teaching assistants. 74

In January, 1972, just a few months before his death, Sanchez wrote to Kennamer complaining of his impossible teaching situation. He stated that he had a graduate class of fifteen students which met three times a week and an undergraduate class of ninety students. He charged that although he had asked repeatedly for the services of a teaching assistant, his requests had been denied. He informed the Dean that because he remained unable to secure needed help, he would have to limit the size of his classes for the coming school year. He stated that "butcher-knife" budgeting may be convenient for unimaginative administrators, but he believed it to be an inefficient way to "run a railroad." He reminded the administrator that he had his doctorate in school administration and finance which indicated that he
knew how to administer effectively. He also stated that he had taught a number of places both in the country and abroad, and he never experienced this kind of treatment. "I've put up with this kind of discrimination here for years. Now I'm 'up to here,' so no more."76

Sanchez reacted reflexively at the least hint of high-handedness of administrative policy. This became clear when he wrote to Holtzman challenging the legality of a vote taken by the faculty of the College of Education that included participants from the College of Arts and Sciences as well as teaching assistants. He noted that if Arts and Science faculty also voted with the Education faculty, they enjoyed a double franchise, enabling them to control an election in a close vote.77 Holtzman replied to Sanchez that tellers tallied the standing votes. No teaching assistants and few faculty members from the other faculties participated. The Dean concluded that he believed the election procedure to be both fair and legal.78

Sanchez wrote to Holtzman to protest the procedure being used to seek a new Dean for the College of Education. He objected to the inclusion of other faculties in the selection process, and he believed broader-based faculty voting practices would lead to power politics and block voting. He concluded that the selection of a Dean should be left to a committee appointed by the President comprised of the "elder"
statemen. He believed that the rules of political democracy remained inoperative in the selection of the dean.\textsuperscript{79}

He followed this protest with a letter to the Search Committee. He told committee members that he objected to their consideration of a "non-education" person for the position. He believed that the candidate appeared to be a "pure" psychologist with no administrative experience in the education discipline. He queried as to why committee members had failed to seek an experienced educator for the position, and he included names of several people whom he thought would make worthy candidates.\textsuperscript{80}

Not all of Sanchez's communications to the administration came in the form of complaints. On May 16, 1969, he wrote to Holtzman informing him that he had received a letter from the Search Committee of Stanford University asking him if he would allow his name to be included for consideration for the post of assistant to the president. He declined graciously and submitted names of appropriate candidates. He remarked to Holtzman that the offer seemed flattering, but he knew how difficult it would be to trouble-shoot an ethnic studies program on that campus.\textsuperscript{81} He also wrote to Dean Kennamer to inform him that he would now receive his honorary law degree from the University of New Mexico \underline{in absentia} which the university had originally awarded to him in 1967.\textsuperscript{82} Recognizing that the administration realized Sanchez's deep commitment to the Mexican-American, Sanchez
relished his communication with Holtzman when he told him that he would be part of a forty-two man team of Mexican-American specialists who would visit San Francisco State University campus to help mediate their problems. He expressed pleasure at being selected for this assignment. He recalled that years before he had also been involved in a mediation assignment during the pachuco incident in Los Angeles.  

Sanchez pugnaciously defended his position in many different situations, even when it came to having verbal tussles with Congressmen. He wrote to Congressman Wilbur Mills of Arkansas in 1969 complaining about some charges made by Texas Congressman Henry B. Gonzalez of San Antonio. Gonzalez had publicly complained about activities of Mexican-American student activists, and he alluded that monies made available from the Ford Foundation helped encourage this kind of behavior. Sanchez told Mills that he knew that the Mexican-American Legal Defense Fund received Ford Foundation support. He knew the officers of the organization and the program they pursued, and he judged both to be worthwhile. He also told Mills that he served as faculty sponsor for MASO, the Mexican-American student organization on the university campus, and this too represented a non-violent activist group. He accused his friend Gonzalez of talking "poppycock" and noted that he had made irresponsible charges. He concluded by observing that from the tone of Gonzalez's statements that he received the
aroma of "overripe grapes and of envidious spite. Henry may have the floor of Congress, but he doesn't have the ear of his fellow Mexicanos and of their true friends. To Henry, I'll put the old American challenge: Put up or shut up." 84 Gonzalez probably bristled when he learned of Sanchez's views regarding his statement about the Ford Foundation because he stated that although he knew Sanchez for a number of years, he did not stay in close contact with him. He remarked that Sanchez had been one of his supporters when he ran for governor of Texas in 1958, but he later disagreed with him on aspects of the militant Mexican-American movement. He felt that despite this disagreement that they remained in close accord. 85

Sanchez always identified with university and political life in an active manner. He appeared to do this for many reasons. First, he seemed to enjoy the stimulation of campus activities. Second, he regarded himself as the spokesman for the Mexican-American, and in that vein he rose to confront any attempt by any person or group who displayed an unfair attitude toward that minority. William Drake, Sanchez's close friend and colleague, noted that Sanchez as a humanist and a cultural pluralist, reacted strongly to any instance of discrimination. He made his feelings known without the slightest hesitation. Sanchez reacted with extreme sensitivity, according to Drake, to the question of the minimum score of 1,000 as a cut-off on the Graduate Record Exam which was used to determine admission of candidates into graduate
programs. Sanchez fought this policy tooth and nail, both in the department and with administrators. He refused to compromise his views. He realized, according to Drake, that many potentially able students, such as the Mexican-Americans and foreign students, would be unable to achieve this score and would be automatically disqualified from the graduate program. Sanchez fought, too, with members of his own department whom he perceived to me "mechanistic" in this attitude toward curricula and students. 86

Several other people also recalled incidents of Sanchez's conflicts with university administration. Loren Mozley, a boyhood friend of Sanchez who taught in the Department of Art at the university, recalled that Sanchez had locked horns with Dean L. D. Haskew. Sanchez believed that Haskew restricted him too closely. Mozley spoke to Haskew to defend Sanchez's viewpoint to the administrator. 87 Hector Garcia commented that Sanchez was restrained by the Board of Regents and the administration of the university. 88 Carlos Cadena, San Antonio judge, noted that Sanchez's conflicts occasionally involved the president of the institution. When Sanchez believed that he was right, he had no qualms concerning making his point known, even to the president. 89

John Silber, President of Boston University and former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Texas, stated that he had remained tangentially aware of Sanchez's efforts on behalf of minorities--blacks as well as
Mexican-Americans. Silber stated that he joined Sanchez in voicing opposition to the use of the 1,000 point minimum on the Graduate Record Exam. He added that Sanchez's thinking regarding test scores influenced him when he prepared an address for his faculty in which he discussed both the I. Q. and the S. Q. He stated that instead of selecting students solely on the basis of I. Q. scores, admissions' committees should consider the S. Q. or "soul quotient." He felt that many different kinds of students had something to contribute to the totality of university life. He stated, "It is as important that our middle-class students experience the freshmen of autonomous self-expression by learning to do their own thing as it is for students from our ghettos to learn middle-class refinements of language and behavior." Silber also stated that in the years that he served as Chairman of the Philosophy Department and later as Dean, he occasionally heard Sanchez's name come up for discussion among administrators. Words used to describe the Professor, according to Silber, included...

...flamboyant, abrasive, passionate, dedicated, eloquent, and, once or twice, almost fanatical. But I don't recall ever having heard him spoken ill of. It was my impression that the administration viewed him with great respect and believed that he was sincerely dedicated to the causes he supported.

Silber also substantiated the charge that Sanchez had received penalties financially because of his outspoken manner.
Robert Cuellar, one of Sanchez's former doctoral students, commented that many people considered Sanchez a "nuisance" on campus because he always spoke his mind. Cuellar, who assisted Sanchez during the year that he lost his sight because of cataracts, believed that the courses he had with the professor stand out as stimulating and exciting experiences. He stated that Sanchez, in addition to offering students factual detail regarding the Spanish-speaking child, presented the material in such a manner that students grasped easily the uses of social action. Cuellar concluded that a good professor is one who stimulated students to think, and Sanchez did that successfully.  

Drake substantiated Cuellar's perceptions of the professor by commenting that Sanchez always spent a great deal of time and effort challenging students to think about issues. To Drake, Sanchez's classes represented education in its broadest sense.  

It becomes obvious that Sanchez made his presence felt to the total university family. For those whom he challenged or opposed he loomed as a constant irritant. For those he supported he remained a loyal and devoted friend. Whether people on campus liked or disliked the professor, they knew who he was and what he stood for. The years of Sanchez's conflicts with some administrators also stood as a period of declining productivity for the professor. The
vita indicated that he published his last survey in 1963 and served as chairman for a completed doctoral dissertation in 1965. He died in 1972. Former Dean Whaley, for example, failed to recognize that during the professor's total career at the university, he chaired committees for sixty-six master's theses and twenty doctoral dissertations. The former Dean had stated that he did not believe his conflicts with Sanchez centered around the professor's concern for minority students. Whaley also said that he failed to remember that Sanchez ever had a great many minority students. Whaley erred in his judgment in this matter, because throughout his thirty-two year career in Austin, Sanchez supervised nineteen students with easily-recognizable Spanish surnames. Seventy-five of the total of eighty-six student works dealt directly with questions of discrimination or segregation of the Mexican-American, historical studies pertaining to the Iberian world, or cultural questions meaningful to those who had an interest in Latin America or Spain. This illustrated the historical pattern of Sanchez's influence. The record of his national recognition also showed that Sanchez received his "strokes" from those persons not living in Austin or representing the university family. This may partially account for the rising rancor and bitterness he displayed. Sanchez infuriated, irritated, provoked, challenged, and goaded the university leaders to become sensitive to the needs of the Spanish-speaking peoples. Members of the university community were
always made aware of Sanchez's concerns, even though they might not have accepted and implemented his proposals.
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CHAPTER XII

THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

George I. Sanchez always had a sense of "place," a deep identification with his historical roots, a great sense of pride in his own ethnicity as well as the ethnic characteristics of his cultural group. These feelings surfaced as he addressed a meeting on comparative education in Los Angeles, in 1964. He stated that he was a New Mexican, or better yet, a Nuevo Mexicano whose lineage dated back to the time of earliest settlement. He reported that his people preferred to call themselves, "Spanish-Americans" because the name "Mexican" had unpleasant connotations to them. He jested as he reported that the late Maury Maverick, a liberal Texas politician, used to say that in Texas a Mexican who paid his poll tax became a Latin-American. Sanchez believed that a Spanish-American was simply a Mexican who had learned to speak English. The identification of name bothered members of his audience because those of California, according to the speaker, preferred to be known as Mexican-Americans. To Sanchez the label mattered little for, "Llamenme lo que llamen, pero llamenme a comer," he said. This meant, "Call me what you will, but call me for dinner." Appearing in a pensive mood as he good-naturedly
chided his audience, Sanchez stated that he had always been concerned with eating. He came from a poor family, spoke only Spanish at home, and knew no English when he began to go to school.¹

He told his audience that he began to teach in a country school just before he reached his seventeenth birthday, and he made the weekly roundtrip from his home in Albuquerque to the school on horseback most of the time. His professional baptism to the rigors of rural education during the 1920's along with his long educational career in which he continually challenged inadequate educational opportunities available for the Spanish-speaking, convinced Sanchez that the schools had hurt his people. He shuddered when he recalled the kinds of programs to which these children still remain subjected. He charged that the federal government's present interest in Latin American nations had an empty ring to him. Neighbors to the South realized that charity began at home, and the record revealed patently that Americans failed to love Mexicans who lived across the railroad tracks. He wondered how American leaders could work effectively with the Peace Corps and other foreign grant programs if they could not work at home with ethnic minorities.²

Sanchez expressed both deep-seated anger and hostility for the American attitude that he had encountered in this country and in his foreign assignments in Mexico and Latin America which revealed that American leaders had no basic
respect for the "natives" of the lands to which they had been assigned. Sanchez reported that both government officials and educational leaders, treated citizens of foreign nations with condescension. He concluded by charging that if American leaders wanted to relate well to nations south of the border, they simply had to demonstrate the same kind of behavior at home. He admitted that he exuded cynicism but he concluded, "I can document my cynicism as to our obtuseness, as to our treatment of the Mexicano in the Southwest thoroughly -- and I can make a good case in support of my cynicism as to our operations in Latin America."³

Sanchez agonized throughout his life concerning the hardships of his "forgotten people." He recognized that the New Mexican represented a different cultural pattern from mainstream America, but he acknowledged that the residency of the New Mexican in North American had a longevity second only to the Indian. The long-standing backwardness of the Spanish-speaking ethnic group came from many causes, one of which surfaced as the inept system of education provided for inhabitants. Sanchez noted that in the eighteenth century educational developments in New Mexico mirrored the system used in Europe, with educational opportunities being considered a privilege of the rich rather than a right of the masses. Once leaders both in the United States and Europe recognized that educational opportunities should be made available to all inhabitants, implementation of this idea moved
forward effectively in some parts of the United States during
the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but failed to take
effect contemporaneously in New Mexico. 4

Both the Mexican and American governments recognized
the need of widespread educational opportunities prior to
1850, but the United States did little to implement this
promise in the post 1846 years. When the United States ad-
ministered the region, their rule lacked "all the salient
benefits of good, sympathetic, democratic government which,
almost without major exception, have characterized the na-
tion's dealings with minority people's elsewhere." 5 New
Mexicans had always expressed concern regarding their con-
tinuing lack of educational opportunities; but, despite the
urging of local leaders, the national government did little
to foster establishment of schools before the twentieth cen-
tury. Although territorial leaders founded institutions of
higher learning during the earlier period, this failed to
meet the peoples' needs because they did not receive re-
quired preliminary schooling to enable them to profit from
college training. Additionally, university programs failed
to make allowances for entering students who might exhibit
educational deficiencies. 6

The federal government had made inadequate land grants
for educational needs and failed to offer any kind of addi-
tional subsidy which would enable local leaders to cope with
their problem of sparsely populated extensive territorial
expanses. Natives, unable to govern themselves effectively because they lacked familiarity with American governmental processes, also failed to possess economic resources needed to surmount problems of poverty. Sanchez believed that errors made by the federal government during the nineteenth century contributed largely to present educational backwardness extant in the state. The unresponsiveness of national leaders to the inhabitants' cultural needs manifested itself in governmental practices of land use, management, and taxation on federal, state, and local levels.\textsuperscript{7}

Sanchez never considered the New Mexicans' problems insoluble, but he recognized that because the national government had contributed to the genesis of the difficulties, leaders should also respond equally to the amelioration of these hardships. He believed that a review of the state's political and educational history would illustrate that the record indicated clearly how past governmental methods exacerbated regional problems. Sanchez maintained that the alert observer could easily perceive the kinds of innovative approaches which could be used to solve historical problems.\textsuperscript{8} Sanchez neglected to note that the Catholic church opposed establishment of tax supported schools during the nineteenth century.

Sanchez's recognition of the power of community political structure remained to him the most viable means of effecting
change. He learned that one had to be able to both recognize and manipulate this force in order to effect social change. In his first teaching assignment in Yrrisarria, a one-room school, and in El Ojo Hediondo, the "stinking springs," he saw that in order to survive in these primitive communities he had to work with community leaders. After he completed his teaching apprenticeship in Ojo Hediondo, he married the granddaughter of Don Andres Romero, a wealthy, and politically powerful regional patron of the area. He soon learned that his new wife's family opened up better opportunities for him, and he left the remote country school to become principal in Los Padillas, a community near Albuquerque. There he worked with community residents as if they were family members. By doing this he managed to recoup valuable home economics equipment which had mysteriously disappeared from the school. This method used by the educator to manipulate the political power structure to benefit the educational community, reinforced in Sanchez's mind use of political strategies to serve educational needs.  

Sanchez told his New Mexican audience that he once had several different opportunities to work for improved education in New Mexico, including his leadership of the Division of Information and Statistics of the state education department. In that role his political community included the entire state, and he experienced a political baptism while he headed the agency. Sanchez had contact with different
state governors. He spoke to one to urge him to sign a piece of desirable educational legislation and to another to endorse a school equalization funding bill which would apportion school funds equitably throughout the state. In this second instance the Governor had promised to sign the measure, and then he reneged by delivering a veto message to the legislature instead. Sanchez was asked by a state political leader, Tony Fernandez, to refute the Governor's remarks. He reported that he exhibited visible anger and "tore the hide off the Governor" in his address to the state lawmakers, resulting in his being blacklisted by the administration. This served merely as a temporary setback, because he later served as president of the New Mexico Education Association and in that role could exhibit political pressures again.

Sanchez really became enmeshed in the inner workings of the political struggles between "haves" and "have nots" when he attended school budget hearings held annually throughout the state. Previously these sessions had been attended solely by the state educational budget auditor, tax specialists of the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads, local real estate interests, and an official of the state Taxpayers' Association, a group financed by railroad and real estate interests. Educators, except for local superintendents and school board members, remained unwelcome at these sessions, but Sanchez went anyway. He believed that
it remained of vital importance to state educators to have input into these decisions concerning educational expenditures. The power structure threatened Sanchez because he insisted upon attending these meetings, and he often had to wear a revolver for self-defense. His persistence brought results. Eventually, these budget hearings changed from closed door sessions to open deliberations dealing with the ways to expend school funds most effectively, and budgets were reviewed on state, county, and local levels.¹¹

Sanchez indicated that his position as head of the Division of Information and Statistics taught him a great deal of the workings of the state political structure. He learned that the Taxpayers' Association, supported by railroad and real estate interests, decided in an unofficial capacity on every important state expenditure. This silent arm of government worked out appropriations budget so that the members of the legislature rarely engaged in open debate concerning state expenditures. The taxpayers' group resembled the "big brother" who made all major financial decisions for state residents. Because New Mexico functioned with effective two-party politics, the legislators did not avoid debate on controversial issues, because they believed that if they supported these measures they would win votes in future elections. However, when lawmakers worked to support financial measures needed for education, they had to weigh their own political interests in line with the
amount of expenditures that big taxpayers would allow. Ultimately, legislators arrived at program expenditures that the decision-makers would dislike the least.¹²

Sanchez became exposed to local politics as he taught school and studied simultaneously for his baccalaureate degree in the evenings and during the summers at the University of New Mexico. University administrators readily recognized the young student's intellectual abilities and recommended him for graduate training. Leo M. Favrot, regional representative of the Rockefeller Foundation, arranged with the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of New Mexico, to fund Sanchez for a fellowship for his master's degree. This assistance gave the New Mexican a 1,700 dollar year stipend during the 1930-1931 school year in Austin, Texas.¹³

Sanchez studied under Herschel T. Manuel, educational psychologist, and completed a master's thesis entitled, "A Study of Scores of Spanish Speaking Children on Repeated Tests." This work examined the performances of Spanish language children on repeated I. Q. tests and affirmed the fact that children's scores can be raised by aiming teaching toward test concerns. The thesis also noted that environment and language skills, rather than racial factors, influenced the Spanish-speaking child's achievement. The young graduate student realized that educators needed to compile data concerning the educational needs of this minority group.
In January, 1931, while Sanchez attended the University of Texas, he proposed creation of a New Mexico bureau of research and statistics that would be funded by the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation for a four-year period. This agency would work cooperatively with both the University of New Mexico and the state superintendent of education. He believed that after the agency completed a four-year trial period, it would then become a state supported office under control of the state superintendent. Sanchez hypothesized that if this agency received a semi-independent status for its novitiate period, it would not degenerate into just another political office. He envisioned that a new research agency would work to develop testing programs, evaluate teaching methodologies then in use, and work with experimental schools to gather and compile needed statistical data. He believed that this bureau should serve a pragmatic and administrative function.14

Both Zimmerman and Georgia Lusk, School Superintendent, supported creation of the agency. They wanted the new bureau to gather statistical information to assist local educational units with reorganization of their systems as well as local budgeting. The General Education Board allocated 6,000 dollars for the 1931-1932 fiscal year for establishment of the research bureau and planned to support it for a four-year period.15
Sanchez threw himself into his new assignment with enthusiasm and quickly developed new attendance reporting forms and issued reports concerning local districts financial problems. From the vantage point of the state capital, Sanchez moved rapidly ahead in his two-pronged effort to look for ways to supplement funding on the local level as well as to document educational deficiencies apparent in the Spanish-speaking scholastic population. He received the attention, if not the complete support of state educational leaders, and he expressed disappointment that the state board of education accepted professional educational ideas but found it necessary to bow to political expediency rather than expedite these suggestions.\(^{16}\)

Sanchez functioned in the political arena of state politics while he amassed his educational statistics. Working with the New Mexico Education Association, he led an educational lobby to pressure the state legislature for needed educational changes. The General Education Board sensed his growing frustration with state political forces and made it possible for him to have a year's "breather" to complete his doctorate at the University of California in Berkeley during the 1933-1934 school year. The fact that the General Education Board had more interest in Sanchez than they did in the state's problems with research became apparent when the Foundation suspended payment of most of its grant to New Mexico for the year that Sanchez studied in California.\(^{17}\)
Sanchez still harbored hostilities toward the state political system when he returned to the research bureau in 1934, and he continued to mount an energetic campaign to secure better educational funding for poor districts in the state. The research specialists' personal situation grew increasingly intolerable, because those political leaders who opposed him mounted efforts to oust him from his position. Although leaders, such as J. F. Zimmerman, tried to intercede in Sanchez's behalf, Sanchez's personal relationships with the political structure deteriorated rapidly. By 1935, it became apparent that leaders became overtly hostile to Sanchez's actions, and he realized that he would have to find another position until the "heat" subsided in his home state.

Zimmerman recognized that despite the fact that Sanchez's excellent work record had brought about the passage of progressive educational legislation, he created so many political enemies as an adjunct to his actions that he had to leave the state temporarily. Sanchez found his face-saving assignment in a research project in Mexico sponsored by the Julius Rosenwald Fund. 18

Sanchez's six-month assignment with the Fund became extended to a longer tour of duty. He examined rural education in the South after he completed his Mexican project. In Sanchez's absence Zimmerman approached the General Education Board to fund a research division once more but under university sponsorship this time. The Foundation's support for the
first division ended when Sanchez resigned the post, and the state legislature failed to fund its continuance. Zimmerman wanted Sanchez to head the new research agency. Negotiations became bogged down when it became apparent that despite the university president's stated desire to have the former bureau head lead the new agency, he really cared more about having the agency under university sponsorship than he did in finding a permanent assignment for Sanchez. Zimmerman had stated that he remained aware that political forces still opposed Sanchez, and he believed that Sanchez should resume his leadership role when these antagonisms had abated. After Sanchez decided to extend his assignment with the Rosenwald Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation withdrew its grant offer for the University of New Mexico project. In this second instance it also became apparent that Rockefeller Foundation leaders cared more about Sanchez's personal fortunes than they did the state's statistics' agency. 19

Sanchez served as a consultant to the educational ministry of Venezuela in 1937-1938, when he finished his assignment with the Rosenwald Fund; and then he returned to New Mexico. He spent two years as research associate and Associate Professor of Education at the university and published his famous tract, Forgotten People, under Carnegie Corporation sponsorship.
Sanchez's inability to stay out of the public eye soon became apparent once more when he charged the state educational leaders misappropriated 1,000,000 dollars in educational funds for the 1938-1939 school year. Sanchez's charges generated a great deal of publicity and controversy. He expressed regret that someone else hadn't found the financial error. He believed that the state needed an independent agency to prevent this kind of malpractice from occurring. Eventually state leaders corrected this misapplication of funds and arrived at a more equitable distribution of state monies to support state schools.

In 1940, Sanchez left the University of New Mexico to accept a professorship in the University of Texas Department of Intercultural Relations. Jackson Davis, ranking administrator for the Rockefeller Foundation, reported an interview with Zimmerman in which the President had stated that Sanchez was brilliant but tempermental. The President believed that Sanchez had failed to be helpful in training other people in his division as research chief, and he had been unable to work effectively as a team member in larger projects. Sanchez remained exclusively concerned with his own studies which he executed brilliantly. Davis reported that Sanchez had been successful in working with the recently completed Taos project, but he stated that Sanchez, "did a little sabotaging on the side when he learned that another person would head the endeavor." Davis also criticized Sanchez for failing to
remain long enough with the state research agency for his influence to count. He criticized the educator for his inability to effect changes within the state education department.\textsuperscript{22}

The General Education Board continued to follow Sanchez's career with interest during his early years in Texas. In 1943, the organization funded the professor's exploratory study of the Spanish-speaking people in Texas. The proposal received approval of both L. A. Woods, State Superintendent of Education, and President Homer P. Rainey of the University of Texas.\textsuperscript{23} The General Education Board leaders continued to observe the progress of the study, led by Wilson Little, and to express concern regarding the changing political climate at the institution. Sanchez had reported to the Foundation that President Rainey had been criticized by members of the Board of Regents when he stated that the University belonged to all Texans "regardless of race, creed, or circumstances."\textsuperscript{24} The Rockefeller organization also became aware that three members of the social science faculty had been dismissed by the university administration. The Foundation interpreted this as a symptom of repression.\textsuperscript{25}

The Foundation gave Sanchez money to defray costs of the December, 1945, meeting concerning Spanish-speaking children held in Austin. In 1947, they also funded the Socio-Economic Survey of the Spanish-Speaking People in Texas. The numerous publications, entitled \textit{Occasional Papers},
resulted from that grant. The Foundation believed in Sanchez, and they offered him a great deal of encouragement, as well as financial assistance. Once the sand had settled, the professor's old friends in New Mexico also realized that he had made a worthwhile contribution to education in that state. They offered him an honorary Doctor of Laws degree in 1967. Sanchez appeared pleased to receive this honor, but he did not want to go to Albuquerque to receive the award. He had serious personal problems which precluded his ability to return easily to his native state. The university leaders appeared unwilling until 1970 to award this degree in absentia. In 1970, Sanchez wrote to Frank Angel, then Associate Dean of Education at the University of New Mexico, and told him how his political involvements had hurt him in New Mexico. He stated that Zimmerman had wanted to offer him an educational professorship, but vituperative political forces prevented him from doing so. Instead, Zimmerman offered to make him an assistant to the Dean of the College of Education. Sanchez told Angel that he invited Zimmerman to, "Kiss my ass," when he turned down the job offer.  

The professor's activities continued to generate controversy and his activist tone became apparent in his writings in his early New Mexican days. Scholars apparently concede that Forgotten People stands as Sanchez's most important book, because this title appears on many bibliographies. In this volume, the author chronicled the plight of the Spanish-speaking
New Mexican in Taos. He recapped the history of the area to highlight the thesis that residents in this region had been forgotten by state decision-makers, and they continued to survive in a state of inescapable poverty.

Sanchez's articles dealing with language problems had one theme—that insensitivity of the dominant culture contributed to the severity of the bilingual American's long-standing difficulties. As Sanchez detailed incidents of the Spanish-speaking child's problems, he also made a plea for acceptance of cultural pluralism by all Americans. These writings, frequently polemic in tone, reiterate the same theme. Inequality existed because of insensitivity of decision-makers to all peoples' needs. Sanchez's doctoral dissertation, "The Education of Bilinguals in a State School System," reaffirmed his commitment to political action to effect social change. In this work, the author became so concerned with the need for social action that he failed to produce the kind of educational research that would have been valued primarily for its contribution to the field of scholarship.

His career in Texas, from the vantage point of a professorship at the University of Texas, took on a broader spectrum that his New Mexican career. In his adopted state, he easily found many examples of patent discrimination against the Mexican-American, and he attacked this problem on many fronts. At the university, he served as a Professor
of Latin American Education, Educational Psychology, Chairman of the Department of History and Philosophy of Education, and a member of the graduate faculty. He also served as a Consultant to the Texas Good Neighbor Commission and the state Department of Education, and he served in Washington for the Inter-American Educational Foundation. He diligently strived to stimulate growth in cultural pluralism by organizing conferences to discuss solutions to the Spanish-speaking child's educational problems. He worked with Mexican-American groups like LULAC and the American G. I. Forum to seek actively problem solutions.

Publication of the Occasional Papers by the University of Texas chronicled the minority group's specific needs. These studies dealt with concerns of school segregation for Spanish-surnamed children, illegal aliens in the lower Rio Grande valley, college students of Mexican-American descent, sociological characteristics of Spanish-speaking, bibliographies applicable for teachers of this ethnic group, and other studies pertaining to labor needs. Sanchez served as editor for this project and took a great deal of interest in disseminating facts documents in the works. The tract dealing with illegal aliens created the most controversy. Lyle Saunders and Olen Leonard had carefully pointed out how the power structure in the "magic valley" exploited the illegal alien. Following release of this monograph, political leaders mounted a protest, but the facts stood as presented.
Sanchez's own study regarding school segregation of this minority also generated controversy. He clearly pointed out that the bilingual child had been shortchanged educationally by state community leaders. He demanded the amelioration of the group's problem through creation of integrated schools. The tract was published in 1951. When Sanchez died in 1972, the task remained unfinished. Sanchez favored integration and cultural pluralism rather than bilingual education per se. He admitted that the Spanish-speaking child may need additional vocabulary skills initially before he begins to learn to read, but he always asserted that this child needed quality teaching in an integrated setting more than anything else.

The professor worked constantly to develop culturally pluralistic attitudes with his university students as well as community groups with which he worked. Serving as editor for the Macmillan Company, he wrote and directed the publication of text materials which would help young children recognize the totality of the brotherhood of man. Studies done by his own students largely reflected Sanchez's own concerns in these matters. Some theses and dissertations examined problems in specific school districts which had large bilingual populations, and others offered ways of expanding standard curricula to give it a multi-cultural flavor. A few of his students explored specific Hispanic cultural and historical questions.
Manuel P. Servín, historian, criticized Sanchez's students' work. He felt that Sanchez approved studies that appeared poorly done. He believed a scholar judged a professor by the quality of his students' efforts. An honest and objective review of the theses and dissertations indicated that, taken collectively, the works reveal uneven research. Too many students relied too heavily on Sanchez's own writings for their documentation. There were many studies which duplicated similar problems in different communities, and some studies seemed superficial and sketchy.

Sanchez's former students appeared to be working on the grass roots level. The professor recognized that in order to be successful, these problems of segregation and discrimination had to be handled on the local level. These student efforts could stimulate an end to segregation in individual communities. If Sanchez sought grass roots support to end school segregation, he gathered many "apostles" for this cause.

Sanchez exerted his greatest activist efforts towards improvement of opportunities for the Spanish-speaking by his participation in many court cases. His courtroom career began with the 1948 Delgado decision which, by an agreed judgment, supposedly ended segregation of Mexican-American school children in Texas. The record indicated that the Delgado case resumed where the 1930 Salvatierra case ended. The fight has continued since. Sanchez played an important
role in most of the cases tried in Texas courts. In some of these actions he served as the "expert witness" who testified against segregation evils. In the Hernandez v. Texas Supreme Court case, he wrote the appendix to the brief and also helped attorneys develop the "class apart" theory which broadened both the interpretation and implementation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The professor also carried his fight to the Texas Education Agency where he regularly chided Commissioner J. W. Edgar for his failure to move more rapidly and effectively to improve opportunities for the bilingual child. He frequently reminded the Commissioner that the agency lacked sufficient statistical data to appraise accurately true educational needs of the minority population. Edgar readily admitted that Sanchez frequently needled him because he moved too slowly. Also, Sanchez criticized the establishment of the migratory education programs in south Texas which he charged served as another form of segregation.

The professor waged many fights at the University of Texas. His concerns for the Mexican-American and black minority students prompted him to tangle readily with the administration leaders whom he believed cared little for the unique needs of these groups. He verbally lacerated institutional policies of using test scores as the important consideration for admission to candidacy in the academic programs. In this fight he
had the support of John Silber, former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Sanchez also verbalized his discontent with changing policies at the institution which threatened him. He sensed that he was being left out of the formulation of new programs and policies, and he resented this. His own failing health and poor eyesight began to compound the difficulties of some of his interpersonal relationships among his campus colleagues. He maintained close personal contacts with his personal friends on the staff but resorted to lacing the others with bitter letters and memos. Sanchez's frequent display of rancor at the end of his career alienated him from many younger professional associates. These associates failed to understand that Sanchez had made many worthwhile contributions during most of his years of service in professional education.

George Blanco, head of the Bilingual Education program at the university, remarked that "Sanchez was a troublemaker," when he was asked if he knew the educator. Blanco saw Sanchez solely as an irritant and probably never understood the basis for Sanchez's irascibility. 27

Severo Gomez, Assistant Commissioner of Education in charge of bilingual education, believed that Sanchez stood alone as the first prime mover who strived to secure equal educational opportunities for Mexican-Americans in Texas. Gomez noted that Sanchez worked in this movement at a time when it was dangerous to express such unpopular views. In
boards and commissions. Sanchez concluded that discrimination fights, along with manipulation of political forces of local communities remained vital, not academic issues. Those able to provide educational leadership criticized Sanchez frequently in order to take the easy way out and succumb to pressures of the uninformed community power structure, rather than fight the hard fight.  

The former university professor did a great deal of writing from 1931 until 1952. He produced works dealing with ethnic concerns and wrote books analyzing history and education in Mexico, Venezuela, and Peru. He also wrote a survey on Navajo education in 1948 for the Department of Interior. His vita indicates that he wrote at least eighty articles. Many of these were short releases to the New Mexico press, but he also had articles published in scholarly journals and magazines interested both in his point of view as well as the needs of the Mexican-American. The Texas Observer, a liberal magazine published in Austin, which frequently assumed an anti-establishment posture, gave Sanchez's views and activities frequent exposure. The articles that Sanchez wrote concerning people of Mexican descent largely chronicled the frequent incidents of social injustice. He wrote frequently of economic discrimination and educational segregation. He always tried to alert the dominant group in American society of the Mexican-Americans' needs. Although his writings contained adequate documentation to substantiate
later years the professor, according to Gomez, did not work with La Raza Unida, although he had formerly been associated with both LULAC and the American G. I. Forum. Gomez noted that Sanchez never agreed with the political tactics used by La Raza Unida. Many of these younger members of the Mexican-American student activist groups mistakenly identified Sanchez with the "establishment" and consequently failed to credit him with the true breadth of the university professor's accomplishments. 28

When Gomez was asked why Sanchez failed to support efforts of the Austin-based organization called, Southwestern Development Laboratory, which had published bilingual educational materials in the 1960's, Gomez stated that Sanchez, like others, had little faith in the group's efforts. People who developed the materials were monolinguals, and no native Spanish speakers held decision-making positions with that organization. Gomez also admitted that Sanchez had less contact with him once he joined the Texas Education Agency. Gomez noted that the professor believed that T. E. A. had failed to address itself properly to the needs of the Spanish-speaking child. When Gomez joined that organization, Sanchez felt that he had "sold out" to the establishment. 29

Joe Bernal, former Texas Senator from San Antonio, knew Sanchez for thirty years and believed that the professor ranked as the "number one Chicano in education." The former legislator stated that Sanchez pioneered the entire concern
of bilingual and bicultural education many years before other people seemed aware of the problem. Bernal noted that Sanchez always believed that the American culture should capitalize on its existent heterogeneity. The former legislator also stated that the professor always tried to make the dominant group aware that the Chicano had a different "beat." Unless the schools recognized the Chicanos' specialized needs, he would continue to remain alienated in the educational setting and withdraw prematurely from it. Back in the 1940's, according to Bernal, Sanchez tried to make people aware that use of Spanish by a large population segment need not be considered a handicap.

The San Antonian also recalled that Sanchez cared greatly about all human beings and believed different kinds of people could live together with mutual respect. Sanchez always let people know candidly how he felt about issues whether he spoke to a university administrator or a member of the Board of Regents. Bernal agreed that Sanchez's propensity to speak his mind caused him financial suffering.

The former lawmaker believed that letters Sanchez wrote to the T. E. A. may have helped influence creation of new policies and programs on the state level for the Spanish-speaking child. He remarked that Sanchez received little credit for his efforts by the power structure, but he felt that even though the establishment appeared to ignore Sanchez's efforts, his viewpoint ultimately did make a difference.
Bernal also commented that Sanchez's participation in court cases indicated his widespread influence. Sanchez, always a liberal and pro raza, maintained that the Mexican-American should be progressive and not isolate himself from the American mainstream. The political "heavyweights" such as John Connally, former Governor, and Frank Erwin, former Chairman of the Texas Board of Regents, opposed Sanchez. Sanchez incurred establishment wrath with his outspoken protests. \(^{31}\)

The former professor spoke with a strong voice to encourage both faculty and students to secure a louder voice in the administration of university affairs. His concern for reform at the university moved into the general community to urge election of candidates, such as Ralph Yarborough. Additionally, he gave Kennedy clubs his active support. "Sanchez was a real macho who stuck to his guns," Bernal concluded. \(^{32}\)

Sanchez's perennial commitment to activism surfaced as he addressed a group in Las Cruces, New Mexico, in 1964, and reported to them of political problems in Texas. He stated that in Texas, a one-party state, control of political power belonged to the few representatives of big moneyed interests. That power structure opposed taxation based on ability to pay and supported sales and real estate taxes instead. He noted that political values in Texas contrasted markedly from those in New Mexico. The latter state managed to use both progressive and regressive taxation, such as income and sales
taxes, to support education. Liquor and severance taxes became part of the school equalization fund, a measure that Sanchez proposed and lobbied through to successful enactment.

Sanchez told his audience that he came to the University of Texas in 1940 because he had made political enemies in New Mexico. He admitted that his exposure of misapplication of school funds under the equalization bill frightened his supporters, such as Zimmerman of the University of New Mexico, so that he could offer him only a nontenured position. Sanchez said that he willingly accepted the Texas position because he knew that he could not overcome the overt opposition organized in New Mexico against him.33

Sanchez mused that he had hoped to find peace and tranquility in his Austin home but found a "mess" instead. From his previous assignment with the Julius Rosenwald Fund, he had learned a great deal of the plight of the Negro in the South. He observed that the Negro had no civil rights in Texas too, and although he was tempted to help propel the Negro's cause, he quickly learned that the lowly Mexican had to receive his first energies. Repeating for his audience some of the blatant examples of inequality experienced by those of Mexican descent, Sanchez stated that the power structure in Texas, and the rest of the South, remained highly discriminatory. He reported that he had aired these views at White House conferences and told government officials of the lack of Spanish-surnamed representatives on national
his assertions, Sanchez usually wrote polemically with the underlying desire of arousing his audience to take action aggressively to right wrongs of long-standing. The activist tone of many of Sanchez's writings provide a continuous theme throughout many of his works. For example, Forgotten People tells of the mistreatment of the Taosenos and The People recounts the plight of the Navajos, but both the problems and projected solutions appeared the same. Essentially, Sanchez believed throughout his life that social planning with redistribution of wealth might be used to help the disadvantaged claim a "piece of the action."

A review of Sanchez's writings indicated that some of his more significant articles focused on the fallacy of considering the foreign language child to be handicapped. These articles, "Bilingualism and Mental Measures: A Word of Caution," "The Implications of a Basal Vocabulary to Measurement of the Abilities of Bilingual Children," and "Group Differences and Spanish-Speaking Children," all assert that bilingualism need not be a learning impediment if properly handled. In these and other publications, Sanchez criticized the then accepted infallibility of the I. Q. test. He recognized in the early 1930's that psychometrists could not administer the same test instrument and secure the same results if all children failed to receive identical learning experiences. At the time that Sanchez voiced this criticism, many educators worshipped the infallibility of the I. Q. readings.
Joe Bernal, speaking to the Human Resources and Leadership Conference in Austin on June 23, 1972, commented that he was pleased that the proceedings of the meeting had been dedicated to Sanchez's memory. In his dedicatory remarks, the speaker noted that for the last three decades Sanchez had spoken out fearlessly when his was the only voice calling for an end to segregation. He said that Sanchez's task had been a lonely one. \(^{35}\) He concluded his laudatory remarks by reporting that Sanchez took pride in being blackballed by T. E. A. bureaucrats, and that he always remained a critic of the conservative establishment. Sanchez knew when "the jugular vein was on the issues and that's what he went after." \(^{36}\)

The Texas Senate adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution number 15 on June 16, 1972, to honor Sanchez's memory. The resolution ended by saying:

RESOLVED: By the Senate of the 62nd Legislature, 3rd Called Session, the House of Representatives concurring, that this Resolution stands in memory of Dr. George I. Sanchez, distinguished educator, father of Mexican-American studies, intellectual leader of the Mexican-American movement in Texas and the Southwest, and servant of the Citizens of the State of Texas and of the United States of America.

The Faculty Senate of the University published a memorial to him in September, 1972. The memorial stated that the professor who had served broadly as consultant and director of many educational boards and foundations always regarded teaching as his first love, and he had a wide following of students from
many university disciplines. Sanchez always valued his public service efforts to improve the life of both the Mexican-American and Negro. 38

J. W. Edgar, who frequently had an adversary relationship with Sanchez, showed affection as he recalled that "Sanchez was a pioneer, with all of the problems of being a pioneer." 39 Judge Carlos Cadena considered him to be "a genius canalized between well-defined banks—flowing inexhorably to well-defined goals." Cadena saw Sanchez as a genius that "ran riot absorbing ideas from everywhere." 40

The tone of Sanchez's articles and the record he accrued both in New Mexico and Texas indicated the professor's total commitment to efforts to equalize opportunities for Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest. He had limited personal resources in order to try to accomplish this task; therefore, he frequently sought and received aid from major philanthropic foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Rockefeller Foundation, with the last being his most consistent supporter. These three groups, interested in improving educational opportunities for the disadvantaged minorities in the nation, recognized that Sanchez, a member of a minority group himself, served as an able advocate for this cause.

Lyle Saunders of the Ford Foundation who worked with Sanchez during the 1940's and authored The Spanish Speaking Population of Texas and co-authored Wetback in the Lower Rio Grande Valley stated that Sanchez had many contacts on
a national level which facilitated his being able to secure foundation assistance. Saunders believed that the totality of the professor's accomplishments would not rate as high as the casual observer might assume. He criticized Sanchez's contributions to scholarship because the tone of many of his articles appeared polemic rather than scholarly. Saunders evaluated his own comments by noting that his criticism may have been too harsh and his judgment unfair, but he believed that Sanchez failed to reach the attainments that his talents indicated. 41

Taken from a purely scholarly frame of reference, the researcher has to recognize the merits of Saunders' criticisms, but when one views the results of the professor's efforts in the political and social arena, the critique assumes a different hue. Sanchez always prized activism as a means of securing desired results. His students noted that he taught them the tools of social action, along with academic material in his courses. His membership in national and international boards and committees reveal that Sanchez believed that one had to participate whole-heartedly to accomplish a goal. With that type of personality, it seemed that Sanchez used his skills as a scholar to effect social change rather than to authenticate research data simply for the sake of scholarship. If that remained his primary goal, then Sanchez succeeded. He used his talents in court cases, newspaper articles, many letter, and leadership positions on boards and organizations
to "sell the cause." Those who opposed Sánchez's efforts, such as political leaders, school superintendents, and university administrators saw him as the perennial anti-establishment figure who basked in negativism for its own sake. That attitude appeared to be an unfair judgment of the university professor. The record reveals that he received his greatest plaudits far from his Austin community. When political and educational leaders on the national level appraised Sanchez's views, they saw that his primary concern for reform remained the viable goal. Closer to home, those who associated with him frequently may have misread his long-range goals because they became disenchanted with the confrontation approach he used to realize his aims. Sanchez always exemplified the concept that thought must be followed by action.

Sanchez died on April 5, 1972, in Austin, Texas. By April 12, the Daily Texan editors commented that they had waited for over a week for someone from the university administrative staff to issue an appropriate tribute to the deceased professor. When none came, the newspaper rebuked the administration for their inexcusable behavior and challenged faculty and students to establish an appropriate memorial for "one of the most eminent educators the University has ever seen." On March 1, 1975, the Mexican-American library project of the Garcia Library of the University of Texas was dedicated to honor the memories of Sanchez and Carlos
Castañeda, historian. The dedicatory program chaired by Americo Paredes, English and Anthropology Professor, offered remainders to ceremony attendees of the contributions of both scholars to the field of Mexican-American education. The meeting had a note of pathos because no major representative of the University of Texas Board of Regents or the school's administration spoke at this posthumous recognition of these scholars.

The Nation on June 5, 1972, published an editorial to honor Sanchez and said that he was a great deal more than a scholar. "In the finest sense of the term, He was an activists." The magazine stated that Sanchez's efforts facilitated the job of other scholars; Mexican-American activist of the present era reflect his views even though they had never been taught by him. "He was a man of rare courage and infectious high spirits who never hesitated to say what he thought about bigotry and prejudice and institutional stupidities; he was never in awe of the high and mighty."44 The magazine cited a remark made by Austin Congressman Jake Pickle on May 2, 1973, in the House of Representatives. Pickle stated that Sanchez had served well the cause of the Spanish-speaking peoples both in the United States and abroad, and this record indicated that he had served mankind everywhere. "The Washington Establishment will erect no memorial to him, but he deserves a place of honor in the Peoples' Pantheon of the Future," Pickle concluded.45
One day when the entire issue of inequality of opportunity for minority groups in the United States remains a "quaint" concern for students of history, Sanchez's struggles will be noted as one of the building-blocks used by Mexican-Americans to surmount these problems. When the fight can be remembered with distance and affection, then the accomplishments of this Mexican-American leader will stand out for the strengths of his attainments, and his personal foibles will be forgotten. Homer Barrera, writing in Los Angeles, in 1973, called the university professor the "Don Quixote of the Texas Range," as he summarized eloquently his feelings about Sanchez:

**Dr. George I. Sanchez Don Quixote of the Texas Range**

I never met Dr. George I. Sanchez.
But I know he was a good man.
I knew of him, of course. Who didn't?
I even have a sister who was once his secretary.
That's about as close as I ever got.
I must have gotten closer to LBJ once, during Linda's commencement.
As far as that goes, I must have brushed closer to George Hamilton
than I did to Dr. Sanchez, a matter for which I reclaim constant remorse
for my tactless logistics.
Even then I knew he was a good man, this intellectual giant,
this Texas-Mexican Don Quixote of the Texas Range.
I felt his determination, I felt his bitterness, his hurt.
His outrageous sense of justice overcame me.
You see, I wore the same shirt.
I knew of his pain and his endless toil
And I am convinced I even touched his dreams.
Those dreams which are not lost beneath the soil because they are the dreams, I assure you, of those whom he helped and guided,
those who read his papers and heard his screams
against injustices he cited,
one by one for deaf politicians, two by two
for dead Presidents,
and legion upon legion for that god-forsake
region
destined to be called, "Texas my Texas" by the
anglo-saxon nexus
until Gabriel Blows Their Ever-Lovin Minds.
No. I never met Dr. Sanchez.
But simply to know that he lived to accomplish
that which had been forbidden by all the laws
of the frontier which he conquered
with his mind is nothing less than a miracle.
And that is the wonder of it all.
I never met Dr. George I. Sanchez. Educator
extraordinaire.
But I knew him.
I was just another Mexican. But I knew him.
Even now, I know his spirit well and I can
chuckle at the dear lady
who once advised me, "Son, why don't you say
'Latin American'?
It sounds so much nicer."
You see, remembering, we can afford to forgive,
but forgetting, we are nothing.
Yes, I guess I knew him after all. And that's
what makes me feel just a
little bit special now. It's so difficult for
anyone of us to feel like just
another Mexican now. And I am glad.
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