



T E X A S
F R E E D O M
N E T W O R K
E D U C A T I O N
♦ F U N D ♦

Taking Politics Out of Classrooms: *Recommendations for Revising the Texas Social Studies Curriculum Standards*

A Report from the Texas Freedom Network Education Fund

FEBRUARY 2018



ACADEMIC CONSULTANTS

These scholars worked with the Texas Freedom Network Education Fund to develop the recommendations in this report.

Dr. Edward Countryman is University Distinguished Professor in history at Southern Methodist University in Dallas. Professor Countryman is the author of numerous scholarly articles and books, including *Contested Spaces of Early America* (2014), *The American Revolution* (1985/2003) and *A People in Revolution* (1981). He is also winner of the prestigious Bancroft Prize, and his work has been published in the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and other major news outlets.

Dr. José María Herrera is a clinical assistant professor in the College of Education at the University of Texas at El Paso. Dr. Herrera's research interests include the practice and policy of social studies education and teacher preparation, the deficiency of economics education within teacher preparation, the use of electronic databases for social studies instruction, new methods for social studies instructions, the effect of Texas state policies upon the instruction of the social studies, the Mexican Era of Texas History, U.S. foreign policy in Latin America 19th-20th century, the Early Mexican Republic, antebellum American history and the Spanish Civil War.

Dr. Emile Lester is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science and International Affairs at the University of Mary Washington in Virginia. Professor Lester is author of *Teaching Religions: A Democratic Approach for Public Schools*, co-author of a research report on religion in public education published by the First Amendment Center, and has written numerous articles for scholarly journals such as *The Review of Politics*, *Polity*, *Journal of Church and State*, *Politics and Religion*, and *Public Affairs Quarterly*. He is a member of the editorial board of the peer-reviewed journal *Religion & Education*.

Dr. Nicholas Roland is an instructor in United States and Texas history at the University of Texas. His dissertation and primary research have focused on the Texas Hill Country during the Civil War era. His publications examine Texas in the Civil War and Reconstruction and the 1936 Texas Centennial. His 2016 article in the *West Texas Historical Review* was recognized as the best article published in the *WTHR* for the year. Dr. Roland is a veteran of the U.S. Army.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Texas Social Studies TEKS Streamlining: How We Got Here **4**

Distorting the History of Slavery and the Civil War **7**

Politicizing Civil Rights **13**

Pushing a Religious Agenda **16**

Neglecting Native American and Mexican American History **24**

Promoting an Ideological Agenda **27**

Endnotes **33**



Texas Social Studies TEKS Streamlining: How We Got Here

The State Board of Education’s adoption in 2010 of new social studies curriculum standards, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, or TEKS, was in many ways a triumph of ideology over facts. Those standards guide what publishers put in textbooks and what more than 5 million Texas public school students learn in their classrooms. Curriculum teams made up of educators, specialists and scholars worked the previous year to draft standards they thought were pedagogically and factually sound. But state board members then spent the spring of 2010 tearing the drafts apart. They made hundreds of changes, many based largely on their own personal beliefs and pet causes.

The process was often chaotic. Board members heatedly debated proposed changes while often armed with little more than information they gathered from cursory Internet searches (including searches while sitting at their desks during the debate). Board consultations with actual historians and other experts were virtually nonexistent during the debates. In fact, some board members openly derided scholars in sometimes stark political attacks. Not surprisingly, this led to embarrassing mistakes. At one point, for example, the board banned from the standards the listing of an author of a popular children’s book – *Brown Bear, Brown Bear, What Do You See?* – because one member’s hasty Internet search led her to believe mistakenly that the author was a Marxist.ⁱ At another point the state board voted to strip labor and civil rights icon Dolores Huerta from a Grade 3 standard listing individuals who have exemplified “good citizenship” because members charged that including a socialist in the standards was inappropriate. Yet the board kept Helen Keller in the very same standard, apparently unaware that Keller was an avowed socialist whose views were considered so radical that the FBI put her under surveillance.ⁱⁱ

Board members often flatly rejected the advice of scholars. One constitutional scholar, for example, pleaded with the board not to include in the standards the suggestion that Moses, an ancient biblical figure important to Jews and Christians, influenced the writing of foundational American documents like the Constitution. Moses, he and other scholars pointed out, had nothing to do with framing those documents. But board members insisted they knew better and kept Moses in the standards.

‘Politicized Distortion of History’

A scathing review of the U.S. History TEKS from the conservative Thomas B. Fordham Institute – *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011* – highlighted just how bad the final version of standards was.ⁱⁱⁱ Published in February 2011, the report pulled no punches, calling the standards “a politicized distortion of history” filled with “misrepresentations at every turn.” To be sure, the Fordham review’s authors criticized the thematic structure of the standards, calling it a tool of “the relativist and diversity-obsessed educational left.” They also argued that “most of today’s state standards either strive for political balance or tilt leftward.” But that, they warned, was not the case with Texas standards, which board members deliberately slanted to the political right:



“(T)he leading edge of the conservative effort is in Texas, where a highly public and blatantly partisan battle has erupted into the national media. The conservative majority on the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) has openly sought to use the state curriculum to promote its political priorities, molding the telling of the past to justify its current views and aims. Indeed, the SBOE majority displayed overt hostility and contempt for historians and scholars, whom they derided as insidious activists for a liberal academic establishment.

“Throughout the Texas standards, dozens of references (even the title of the high school economics course) offer a drumbeat of uncritical celebration of ‘the free enterprise system and its benefits’ – resembling, in an inverted historical echo, Soviet schools harping on the glories of state socialism. Native Americans, disproportionately discussed in many other states, are almost totally missing. Slavery is downplayed and segregation barely mentioned.... Members of the SBOE also showed themselves determined to inject their personal religious beliefs into history education. ‘Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)’ and ‘Moses’ are, incredibly, listed as the principal political influences on America’s founders. The separation of church and state, a much-debated and crucial concept in the drafting of the state constitutions (1777–1781) and the federal Constitution (1787), is simply dismissed.”

The review went on to skewer the board-approved standards for obscuring slavery’s central role in causing the Civil War; failing even to mention terms like Black Codes, the Ku Klux Klan, sharecropping and Jim Crow; attempting to vindicate McCarthyism; portraying opposition to the civil rights movement as coming only from Democrats; and promoting “specific right-wing policy positions,” such as encouraging students “to condemn federal entitlement programs ... and to mistrust international treaties.” The authors charged: “(H)istory is distorted throughout the document in the interest of political talking points.”

‘Ignored Principles of Sound Pedagogy’

A November 2011 report published for the Social Studies Faculty Collaborative of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board – *Bridging the Gap Between K-12 and College Readiness Standards in Texas: Recommendations for U.S. History*^{iv} – explained how the focus on politicizing the curriculum standards undermined the quality of the final, approved document:

“(M)idway through the process the publicly elected board of education abandoned its committees (composed of practicing educators) and its expert reviewers (some of whom were trained historians and college professors). Over the course of eight months, the lawyers and realtors and dentist on the board made hundreds of changes to the standards. As the politicians squabbled over the politics of who should be in or out, they tacitly adopted a bi-partisan agreement to ignore principles of sound pedagogy.”

The *Bridging the Gap* report warned that the resulting “combined mass of all of [the standards] is, for all practical purposes, overwhelming” for teachers and students. Moreover, the report explained that state board members had virtually ignored the importance of ensuring that the state’s College and Career Readiness Standards were incorporated into the



new social studies TEKS – a criticism the state board’s chair, Gail Lowe, R-Lampasas, had already acknowledged publicly was accurate.^v

A New Opportunity

The *Bridging the Gap* report went on to make suggestions for how teachers could resolve problems created by the failure of the deeply flawed U.S. History TEKS to align with the College Readiness Standards. As the state board now prepares to “streamline” the standards in 2018, its members should keep those recommendations in mind. But they should also take this opportunity to remove misinformation – often inserted to satisfy political biases – that distorts factual history and undermines the ability of educators to teach and students to succeed. The following recommendations from the Texas Freedom Network Education Fund highlight some key areas in the social studies curriculum standards that need the most work.



Distorting the History of Slavery and the Civil War

A majority of Texas State Board of Education members deliberately downplayed the central role of slavery in causing the Civil War. In fact, one board member even argued that slavery had really been just an “after issue” or “side issue” of the war.^{vi} So the history standards place slavery last – behind “sectionalism” and “states’ rights” – in the list of causes (even though those two “causes” were largely outgrowths of the deeply divisive debate over slavery). Yet another board member muddied the waters even more by successfully adding to the standards a requirement that students study Confederate President Jefferson Davis’ inaugural address – a speech that doesn’t even mention slavery. It is unclear what pedagogical purpose this requirement serves. But it is hard to escape the conclusion that one major goal is to persuade students that slavery wasn’t the cause of secession or the war. Additional speeches by Davis and other Confederate leaders as well as state declarations of secession make clear that protecting slavery was the primary cause of the war, but they’re not noted in the standards.

Drawing on primary sources, scholars have repeatedly pointed out that the argument that the South didn’t fight over slavery is misleading history. Prof. Edward Countryman of Southern Methodist University made this point in helping review the history textbooks submitted to Texas by publishers in 2014:

“(F)irst-order southern sources make it entirely clear that the decision to break up the United States turned on the perceived danger to slavery from the rise of the Republicans as a northern party committed to active government and to slavery’s eventual destruction, and to the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. The state secession documents of South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas advanced different specific arguments, each drawing on its own state’s situation, but all of them identified slavery as the *primary* reason for the action that they were taking, using the word slavery openly and without shame.”^{vii}

For example, the Declaration of Immediate Causes passed by South Carolina, the first state to secede, complained that the non-slaveholding states “have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery” and that their hostility to slavery had been aided by the federal government:

“A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. He is to be entrusted with the administration of the common Government, because he has declared that that ‘Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free,’ and that the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction.”^{viii}

From the Texas Declaration of Causes:

“We hold as undeniable truths that the governments of the various States, and of the confederacy itself, were established exclusively by the white race, for themselves and



their posterity; that the African race had no agency in their establishment; that they were rightfully held and regarded as an inferior and dependent race, and in that condition only could their existence in this country be rendered beneficial or tolerable.”^{ix}

The conservative authors of the Fordham review sharply criticize the Texas standards for failing to emphasize the central role of slavery in causing the war and for a failure to address adequately the systemic and brutal discrimination black Americans experienced after the Civil War:

“During and after Reconstruction, there is no mention [in the standards] of the Black Codes, the Ku Klux Klan, or sharecropping; the term ‘Jim Crow’ never appears. Incredibly, racial segregation is only mentioned in a passing reference to the 1948 integration of the armed forces.”^x

The state board compounded the problem by including Confederate General Thomas “Stonewall” Jackson in a citizenship standard about “effective leadership in a constitutional republic.” Jackson’s role in the Civil War, particularly his leadership in the Confederate Army, is historically significant. But it’s appalling to suggest that someone who took up arms against his country in defense of slavery be presented as a model of citizenship for students. Equally appalling is listing Jackson in that standard alongside Frederick Douglass – who escaped slavery, dedicated his life to promoting equality for black Americans and did not betray his country. The Texas curriculum standards should neither shade the real history of the Civil War and what caused it nor glorify Confederate heroes as political role models for students.

One distressing result of the misinformation that hides and even erases this history is that Texas students leave their classrooms without a sound understanding of the origins of important issues that, sadly, continue to divide our nation. Indeed, too many Americans have difficulty even agreeing on the critical facts of our common history. That makes resolving serious problems, particularly on matters regarding race and discrimination, more difficult today.



Grade 5 Social Studies TEKS	Student Expectation
(4) History. The student understands political, economic, and social changes that occurred in the United States during the 19th century. The student is expected to:	(E) <u>identify the causes of the Civil War, including sectionalism, states' rights, and slavery, and the effects of the Civil War, including Reconstruction and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the U.S. Constitution</u>
<p>Recommendation Clarify TEKS 4E by emphasizing the central role slavery played in causing the Civil War: “<u>identify the causes of the Civil War, including sectionalism, states' rights, and particularly the central role played by slavery, and the effects of the Civil War, including Reconstruction and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the U.S. Constitution.</u>”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Currently, TEKS 4E suggests that sectionalism and states’ rights were more important than slavery in causing the Civil War. Historians have made clear that this was not true. Protecting slavery was the cause of southern secession and the war that followed.• Slavery was the underlying cause – economically and politically – of the sectionalism that divided the country. Moreover, the “right” that southern states were demanding was the right to maintain and even expand the institution of slavery. Southern states even sought to force non-slave states to disregard their own laws and return escaped slaves to their “masters.” That clearly violated the principle – states’ rights – that southern apologists have used to justify secession.• Requiring students to learn that “sectionalism” and “states’ rights” caused the Civil War perpetuates a historical mistruth promoted by southern apologists after the war. The central cause was slavery.	



Grade 7 Texas History TEKS	Student Expectation
(5) History. The student understands how events and issues shaped the history of Texas during the Civil War and Reconstruction. The student is expected to:	(A) explain reasons for the involvement of Texas in the Civil War <u>such as states' rights, slavery, sectionalism, and tariffs</u>
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Clarify TEKS 5A by emphasizing clearly the central role slavery played in causing the Civil War: “explain reasons for the involvement of Texas in the Civil War, <u>particularly the central role played by slavery.</u> such as states' rights, slavery, sectionalism, and tariffs.”</p> <p>Require that students analyze the Texas Declaration of Causes of secession, as the <i>Bridging the Gap</i> report recommends.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Currently, TEKS 5A suggests that sectionalism, states’ rights and tariffs were equally important to slavery in causing Texas secession. Historians have made clear that this was not true. Protecting slavery was the central cause of southern secession and the war that followed.• Indeed, as secessionists openly and unashamedly said, slavery was the underlying cause – economically and politically – of the sectionalism that divided the country. Moreover, the “right” that southern states were demanding was the right to maintain and even expand the institution of slavery. Southern states even sought to force non-slave states to disregard their own laws and return escaped slaves to their “masters.” That clearly violated the principle – states’ rights – that southern apologists have used to justify secession.• Requiring students to learn that “sectionalism” and “states’ rights” caused the Civil War perpetuates a historical mistruth promoted by southern apologists after the war. The central cause was slavery.	



Grade 8 U.S. History TEKS	Student Expectation
(8) History. The student understands individuals, issues, and events of the Civil War. The student is expected to:	(B) explain the causes of the Civil War, <u>including sectionalism, states' rights, and slavery</u> , and significant events of the Civil War, including the firing on Fort Sumter; the battles of Antietam, Gettysburg, and Vicksburg; the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation; Lee's surrender at Appomattox Court House; and the assassination of Abraham Lincoln
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Clarify 8B by emphasizing clearly the central role slavery played in causing the Civil War: “<u>explain the causes of the Civil War, including sectionalism, states' rights, and particularly the central role played by slavery</u>, and significant events of the Civil War, including the firing on Fort Sumter; the battles of Antietam, Gettysburg, and Vicksburg; the announcement of the Emancipation Proclamation; Lee's surrender at Appomattox Court House; and the assassination of Abraham Lincoln.”</p> <p>Require that students analyze the Texas Declaration of Causes of secession, as the <i>Bridging the Gap</i> report recommends.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, TEKS 8B suggests that sectionalism and states’ rights were more important than slavery in causing the Civil War. In fact, one board member explicitly argued that this was the case during the 2010 debate, calling slavery a “side issue.” The secession documents make it clear that this was not true. Slavery was the central cause of the war. • Slavery was the underlying cause – economically and politically – of the sectionalism that divided the country. Moreover, the “right” that southern states were demanding was the right to maintain and even expand the institution of slavery. Southern states even sought to force non-slave states to disregard their own laws and return escaped slaves to their “masters.” That clearly violated the principle – states’ rights – that southern apologists have used to justify secession. • Requiring students to learn that “sectionalism” and “states’ rights” caused the Civil War perpetuates a historical mistruth promoted by southern apologists after the war. The central cause was slavery. 	
	(C) analyze Abraham Lincoln's ideas about liberty, equality, union, and government as contained in his first and second inaugural addresses and the Gettysburg Address and <u>contrast them with the ideas contained in Jefferson Davis's inaugural address.</u>
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing the reference to the Davis inaugural address OR replace that address with Davis’ April 1861 “Message to the Confederate Congress” (a teaching strategy recommended in the <i>Bridging the Gap</i> report) or Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens’ “Cornerstone Speech.” Both of those important speeches by Confederate leaders make clear the central role that</p>	



slavery played in causing secession and war.

State declarations of secession, including the Texas declaration, would also be a more valuable primary source for students to analyze. Those declarations made clear that slavery was the central cause of secession and the war.

Reasoning

- The board, not the curriculum team, added Davis’ address to the standards. The inclusion of this address not only needlessly adds detail to the standards, but also is deeply misleading for students.
- Davis’ message to the Confederate Congress of April 29, 1861, which announced ratification of the Confederate Constitution, focused on protecting slavery as the primary reason for southern secession. Requiring students to analyze Davis’ inaugural address instead appears to be a deliberate effort to hide what Davis held to be true elsewhere: that slavery was the cause of Union’s rupture and the war that followed.

(22) Citizenship. The student understands the importance of effective leadership in a constitutional republic. The student is expected to:

(B) describe the contributions of significant political, social, and military leaders of the United States such as Frederick Douglass, John Paul Jones, James Monroe, Stonewall Jackson, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Recommendation

Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “Stonewall” Jackson from TEKS 22B.

Reasoning

- Jackson’s name was added to this standard by the board, not by the curriculum writers. It’s unclear why the board member who wanted the addition thought Jackson was appropriate for this standard, but Jackson has become a mythical figure for certain religious conservatives.^{xi} Jackson’s inclusion in this standard appears primarily to be an effort to promote an ideological point of view rather than serve a pedagogical purpose.
- Jackson is simply an unsuitable role model for “effective leadership in a constitutional republic.” The state board should not require Texas public schools to glorify Confederate heroes who took up arms in rebellion against the United States and in defense of the deeply repugnant institution of slavery.



Politicizing Civil Rights

During the State Board of Education’s debate over civil rights, indifference toward the struggles of women and minorities for equality was clear in a number of instances. At one point, board member Don McLeroy even suggested that TEKS drafters suggest to students that the real champions in the struggle for equal rights were those in the political “majority” – essentially, white men. “For instance, the women’s right to vote. ... The men passed it for the women,” he insisted.^{xii}

So it shouldn’t be surprising that board members revised various standards in ways that obscured the actual history of discrimination and efforts to promote equality. One board member, for example, insisted that the standards note that Japanese-Americans weren’t the only people interned in the United States during World War II. Discrimination against Italian and German American during the war was real, but the treatment of Japanese Americans was particularly harsh and systematic. The Fordham review’s authors criticized the board for “exaggerating the comparatively trivial internment of German and Italian Americans, ... thereby obscuring the incontrovertible racial dimension of the larger and more systematic Japanese American internment.”^{xiii}

Conservative board members seemed particularly intent on politicizing the civil rights movement of the mid-20th century and other efforts to aid the poor and promote equality for women and minorities. For example, the board adopted one standard that identified only Democrats as opponents of the civil rights movement despite the fact that opponents included conservative Republicans. Moreover, a Democratic president and Democratic-led Congress succeeded in winning passage of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. The state board’s distortion of this history was too much for the Fordham review’s authors:

“Opposition to the civil rights movement is falsely identified only with ‘the congressional bloc of Southern Democrats’—whose later metamorphosis into Southern Republicans is never mentioned.”^{xiv}

The Fordham review also criticized the board’s treatment of federal programs like affirmative action and the Great Society:

“Specific right-wing policy positions are inculcated as well. For example, students are explicitly urged to condemn federal entitlement programs, including Texas-born Lyndon Johnson’s ‘Great Society.’”

The state board’s attempts to politicize and distort the important progress toward civil and equal rights in the United States does a disservice to the real heroes whose sacrifices made those advances possible. The state board has the opportunity now to correct these offensive errors.



High School U.S. History TEKS	Student Expectation
(9) History. The student understands the impact of the American civil rights movement. The student is expected to:	(G) describe the role of individuals such as governors George Wallace, Orval Faubus, and Lester Maddox and groups, including the <u>Congressional bloc of southern Democrats</u> , that sought to maintain the status quo
<p>Recommendation At a minimum, TEKS 9G’s list of examples of those who “sought to maintain the status quo” should be clarified by also noting “<u>some conservative Republican members of Congress</u>” also sought to maintain the status quo. It would also be appropriate for the standards to address how divisions on civil rights contributed to partisan political change in the South.</p> <p>If such revisions are not possible in this streamlining, TEKS 9G should be clarified as follows: “describe the role opponents of civil rights legislation, from both major political parties, played in maintaining the status quo.”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As currently written, TEKS 9G is factually inaccurate because it misleads students by falsely suggesting that opposition to the civil rights movement came solely from southern Democrats. While most southern Democrats in Congress did oppose the civil rights movement, the bulk of the Congressional votes for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 actually came from Democrats. And the bill was pushed through and signed into law by a Democratic President from the South. Votes on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were less a partisan issue than one based on geography and ideology. Most of the votes against the act came from conservative senators of both parties (including Republican Sen. John Tower of Texas) and House members (including Republicans Bruce Alger and Edgar Foreman of Texas), particularly in southern states. Moreover, while most southern Democrats voted against the bill, some supported it. But Arizona Sen. Barry Goldwater, the conservative Republican nominee for president that fall, and other conservative Republicans from outside the South also voted against the bill. Some conservative Democrats who opposed civil rights, including South Carolina Sen. Strom Thurmond, switched to the Republican Party following passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. 	
	(H) <u>evaluate</u> changes and events in the United States that have resulted from the civil rights movement, including increased participation of minorities in the political process
<p>Recommendation Return the wording of TEKS 9H to “<u>identify</u> changes and events in the United States...”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to TEA documents tracking the revision process, TEKS 9H changed from “identify changes and events” to “evaluate changes and events.” As it now reads in 	



<p>the board-approved standards, this language suggests that there are legitimate arguments against “increased participation of minorities in the political process” and other accomplishments of the civil rights movement. It is unclear just what those legitimate arguments would be in a free, equal and democratic society.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If state board members think “increased participation of minorities in the political process” has had negative consequences of some kind, they should have the political courage to say precisely what those negative consequences have been rather than put teachers and publishers in the untenable position of crafting political arguments in instructional materials. 	
<p>(17) Economics. The student understands the economic effects of World War II and the Cold War. The student is expected to:</p>	<p>(D) identify actions of government and the private sector such as the Great Society, affirmative action, and Title IX to create economic opportunities for citizens and <u>analyze the unintended consequences of each</u></p>
<p>Recommendation Return TEKS 17D to its original version as drafted by teachers and scholars, removing “and analyze the unintended consequences of each.” This will remove the partisan attack on policies that aid the poor and promote equality for minorities and women. Moreover, this will save classroom instruction time and advance the primary goal of the streamlining process.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican SBOE member David Bradley, R-Beaumont, succeeded in adding the “unintended consequences” language to TEKS 17D. It’s unclear just what “unintended consequences” the board wanted students to learn. • If state board members think students should learn about supposed “unintended consequences” of these policies, they should have the political courage to say precisely what those “unintended consequences” have been rather than put teachers and publishers in the untenable position of crafting political arguments in instructional materials. • The current language of TEKS 17D simply advances a partisan political argument against the policies listed. As such, the requirement serves no legitimate instructional purpose. Public school classrooms are not the place for state board members to grind political axes. 	



Pushing a Religious Agenda

It would be impossible for students to truly understand the roots and history of the United States without an understanding of religion's influences on the Founders and the nation over time. To be sure, the social studies TEKS adopted by the State Board of Education rightly note these important influences. For example, an entire standards section in Grade 8 U.S. History – with multiple requirements for student mastery – focuses on “the impact of religion on the American way of life,” including the importance of religious freedom, the religious motivations of some colonists and immigrants, and the influences of religious revivals and movements such as the Second Great Awakening. The world history TEKS also require students to learn about, as examples, the development of major world religions, Christianity's role as a unifying social and political factor in medieval Europe, and the impact of the Reformation. There are many other examples of how the standards address the influence of religion in history.

But the State Board of Education went too far in dealing with religion and casting doubt on separation of church and state in the 2010 curriculum standards. The conservative authors of the Fordham review were appalled:

“(B)oth in public hearings and press interviews, the leaders of the State Board of Education made no secret of their evangelical Christian-right agenda, promising to inculcate biblical principles, patriotic values, and American exceptionalism. ...

“Biblical influences on America's founding are exaggerated, if not invented. The complicated but undeniable history of separation between church and state is flatly dismissed.”^{xv}

Board member David Bradley, R-Beaumont, even argued during the TEKS debate that separation of church and state is not a key constitutional principle:

“I reject the notion by the left of a constitutional separation of church and state. I have \$1,000 for the charity of your choice if you can find it in the Constitution.”^{xvi}

He and other board members specifically objected to a proposed requirement that students study how the founders “protected religious freedom in America by barring the government from promoting or disfavoring any particular religion above all others.” The board instead adopted a different requirement that students “compare and contrast” the language of the First Amendment with the phrase “separation of church and state” – as if a wealth of scholarship and numerous Supreme Court rulings supporting the constitutional principle of church-state separation were wrong.

The exaggerations and inventions about religious influences noted by the Fordham reviewers are scattered throughout the standards, particularly for courses in U.S. history, world history and U.S. government. Current Texas textbooks, which are based on those standards and were adopted by the state board in 2014, reflect those distortions. One prominent government textbook, for example, declares that “the roots of democratic government” lie partly in



“Judeo-Christian philosophy, dating back thousands of years to Old Testament texts and Biblical figures such as Moses and Solomon.” In his review of that textbook, Prof. Emile Lester of the University of Mary Washington pointed out the absurdity in such a claim:

“The forms of government mentioned in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible are theocracy and monarchy. Prominent figures in the Old Testament are occasionally critical of monarchy but did not advocate democracy as an alternative, and the limited monarchy occasionally practiced in ancient Israel bears little resemblance to American democracy. Even if it were accurate that government in the Old Testament had democratic features, the text never tells us how these democratic features directly influenced the Founders. Similarly, if the text claims to find roots of democracy in Judaism and Christianity, it also should mention that there was much in the theory of and practice of biblical and historical Christianity that is contrary to democracy.”^{xvii}

Curriculum standards that force publishers either to include outright false information or write textbook passages so vague that they were misleading have real consequences for student learning, Prof. Lester wrote:

“Unfortunately, the result of this at once overly controversial and overly careful strategy is the failure to provide students with an understanding of the influence of religion on our Founders that rests on sound scholarship and captures the diversity of the Founders’ views. These textbooks too often settle for giving students’ vague impressions about the Founders and religion while denying them the crucial information necessary to evaluate these claims. The [State Board of Education] and these textbooks have collaborated to make students’ knowledge of American history a casualty of the culture wars.”^{xviii}



High School World History TEKS	Student Expectation
(20) Government. The student understands how contemporary political systems have developed from earlier systems of government. The student is expected to:	(A) explain the development of democratic-republican government <u>from its beginnings in the Judeo-Christian legal tradition</u> and classical Greece and Rome through the English Civil War and the Enlightenment
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “from its beginnings in the Judeo-Christian legal tradition and” from TEKS 20A. The inclusion of “the Judeo-Christian legal tradition” distorts the history of the origins of the concepts noted in the standard.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• As currently worded, TEKS 20A is too vague because it fails to substantiate what aspects of the Judeo-Christian legal tradition influenced “democratic-republican government.” The New Testament has nothing explicitly to say about political institutions besides Paul’s statement in his Epistle to the Romans, Chapter 13: “Let every person be subject to the governing authorities.” Paul does not distinguish in this chapter between obedience to democracies and obedience to other forms of government.• The Bible was often used in the American tradition to oppose “democratic-republican government.” For instance, Romans, Chapter 13, was a significant obstacle for Americans who supported revolution against the British, and Tories used it to defend the colonial government.• The Hebrew Bible offers no precedent for “democratic-republican government.” The forms of government mentioned in the Hebrew Bible are theocracy and monarchy. Prominent figures in the Old Testament are occasionally critical of monarchy but did not advocate democracy as an alternative.	
	(B) identify the impact of political and legal ideas contained in the following documents: Hammurabi's Code, <u>the Jewish Ten Commandments</u> , Justinian's Code of Laws, Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “the Jewish Ten Commandments” from TEKS 20B.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The connections between contemporary political systems and core concepts in many of the documents listed in TEKS 20B are clear. But that is not the case with the Ten Commandments. In fact, its inclusion in the standard is unsupported by sound	



- scholarship.
- The disconnect between the Ten Commandments and the U.S. political system is particularly stark. For example, the Ten Commandments are religiously exclusive and don't suggest equal rights for those with different religious beliefs. But the U.S. Constitution strongly guarantees such protections for all regardless of their religious beliefs. Moreover, not a single Founder cited the Ten Commandments as the basis for the U.S. legal system.
 - John Adams in an 1825 letter to Thomas Jefferson went out of his way to deny that the Ten Commandments were the basis of the U.S. legal system.^{xix}
 - John Locke, who is celebrated particularly among conservatives as the thinker whom the Founders most relied on wrote that the "the law of Moses does not obligate Christians"^{xx} and as such could not be part of the law of the commonwealth.

(22) Citizenship. The student understands the historical development of significant legal and political concepts related to the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. The student is expected to:	(B) identify the influence of ideas regarding the right to a "trial by a jury of your peers" and the concepts of "innocent until proven guilty" and "equality before the law" that <u>originated from the Judeo-Christian legal tradition and in Greece and Rome</u>
---	--

Recommendation
Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “the Judeo-Christian legal tradition” from TEKS 22B.

- Reasoning**
- The inclusion of “the Judeo-Christian legal tradition” in this particular standard is really a political claim that is unsupported by sound scholarship.
 - The elements of law identified in TEKS 22B derive not from the Judeo-Christian legal tradition but from other legal systems. The American usage of “innocent until proven guilty,” for instance, derives from the English common law tradition. In fact, the concept has a long history in England’s law but not in the law of other European nations. If the concept were derived from the Judeo-Christian tradition, its usage would have been common in all European legal systems.
 - Elements of the Judeo-Christian tradition are at odds with the concepts noted in TEKS 22B. The Old Testament includes numerous references to and justification of slavery, for example, which is at odds with the concept of “equality before the law.” Similarly, Paul directs his fellow Christian worshipper Onesimus to return to his slave master in the New Testament’s Epistle to Titus.
 - To speak of a Christian legal tradition deriving from the Bible is problematic. Paul and early Christian worshippers expected the Second Coming to occur in their lifetimes or shortly thereafter. The New Testament does not include any recommendations about political or legal systems aside from obedience to existing authorities. This advice hardly squares with the notion of “equality under the law.”
 - TEKS 22B employs a troubling tactic common in the standards and the textbooks based on the standards and adopted by the state board in 2014. It includes vague claims about how general concepts may share something in common with ideas from



the Bible. Numerous passages from the Bible allude to equality, but this does not constitute evidence that the Bible was the specific source for the Founders' adoption of "equality before the law."



High School U.S. Government TEKS	Student Expectation
<p>(1) History. The student understands how constitutional government, as developed in America and expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the U.S. Constitution, has been influenced by ideas, people, and historical documents. The student is expected to:</p>	<p>(B) identify major intellectual, philosophical, political, and religious traditions that informed the American founding, including Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law), English common law and constitutionalism, Enlightenment, and republicanism, as they address issues of liberty, rights, and responsibilities of individuals</p>
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “including Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)” from TEKS 1B.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contention that “Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)” was a major influence that informed the American founding is an exaggeration intended to promote a political viewpoint, not an understanding of factual history. • TEKS 1B ignores crucial differences between traditional Christian conceptions of liberty and the Founders’ conception of liberty. The American Puritans employed the traditional conception in arguing that liberty is only properly used to obey God’s law. This conception of liberty was used to justify laws restricting individual rights. John Locke as well as Jefferson and other key Founders endorsed the liberty of individuals to be relatively free from government intervention. • A crucial element of individual responsibility in the Judeo-Christian tradition of political thought is the responsibility to adhere to biblical law. John Locke and the Founders specifically rejected the right of government to enforce adherence to biblical law. Locke wrote that the “the law of Moses does not obligate Christians”^{xxi} and as such could not be part of the law of the commonwealth. • The Founders’ views on individual rights and responsibility were shaped by their views on the social contract. Jefferson and other key Founders derived their idea of the social contract from John Locke. Locke’s version of the social contract was a repudiation of the biblical covenant. The parties to the biblical covenant were God, the people and the government. The purpose of government in this conception was to help its members live according to God’s will. By contrast, the goal of the Lockean social contract was to secure important natural rights belonging to the individual.^{xxii} • The inclusion of “including Judeo-Christian (especially biblical law)” in TEKS 1B is unsupported by sound scholarship and thus inappropriate for the Texas curriculum standards. 	
	<p>(C) identify the individuals whose principles of laws and government institutions informed the American founding documents, including those of <u>Moses</u>, William</p>



	Blackstone, John Locke, and Charles de Montesquieu
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “Moses” from TEKS 1C.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of Moses in this standard is not supported by sound scholarship and is factually inaccurate. During public hearings on the standards, state board members rejected concerns raised by scholars that suggesting Moses influenced the writing of the Constitution is absurd. • Contemporary accounts of the crafting of the U.S. Constitution – the foundational document for American government and laws – note no influence from Moses. While the ideas of influential thinkers such as Blackstone and Montesquieu are noted in The Federalist Papers, for example, Moses gets no mention at all. Not a single Founder cited the Ten Commandments as the basis of the U.S. legal system. • John Adams in an 1825 letter to Thomas Jefferson went out of his way to deny that the Ten Commandments were the basis of the U.S. legal system.^{xxiii} • Specific and fundamental aspects of our institutions can be traced to the influence of the other political theorists mentioned. For instance, the Founders acknowledged Montesquieu’s defense of the separation of powers as a primary influence on their own thought about this subject. No evidence exists tying the Founders’ views on fundamental elements of our government to Mosaic influence. • Actions and legal principles associated with Moses are directly contrary to the basic principles of our founding documents. For example, Moses engaged in the persecution and execution of religious heretics, a practice most notably recorded in Exodus, Chapter 32. Similarly, the first four of the Ten Commandments dictate religious practice and worship. By contrast, the First Amendment guarantees the right to the free exercise of religion. • The inclusion of Moses in TEKS 1C is unsupported by sound scholarship and is thus inappropriate for inclusion in the Texas curriculum standards. 	
(7) Government. The student understands the American beliefs and principles reflected in the U.S. Constitution and why these are significant. The student is expected to:	(G) <u>examine the reasons the Founding Fathers protected religious freedom in America and guaranteed its free exercise by saying that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and compare and contrast this to the phrase, "separation of church and state."</u>
<p>Recommendation Replace TEKS 7G with: “Identify how the Founders protected religious freedom in the United States by barring the government from promoting or disfavoring any particular religion above all others or any view about religion in general.”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state board’s coy wording for TEKS 7G was crafted to suggest to students that separation of church and state is not a key constitutional principle. In fact, 	



constitutional scholars and the courts have demonstrated clearly how constitutional church-state separation protects religious liberty in the United States.

- The First Amendment protects both the religious and those who practice no religion at all.
- Prior to the drafting of the federal Constitution, Virginia’s Statute for Religious Freedom^{xxiv} endorsed separation of church and state by guaranteeing freedom of religion to all faiths and prohibiting the use of tax revenue for the support of an established church. The bill was drafted by Thomas Jefferson in 1777, was guided through the state legislative process by James Madison, and was enacted in 1786.
- James Madison was the principal drafter of the First Amendment to the Constitution. Madison described liberty of conscience as “a natural and absolute right.”^{xxv} Madison opposed Congressional support for payments of military chaplains and vetoed a Congressional law providing land to a Baptist Church in Mississippi. In an 1822 letter, he wrote that “every new and successful example therefore of a perfect separation between ecclesiastical and civil matters is of importance.”^{xxvi}
- The phrase “wall of separation” derives from Thomas Jefferson’s Letter to the Danbury Baptists.^{xxvii} Jefferson and Madison shared similar views about separation of church and state. It is more than reasonable to conclude on the basis of Madison’s own statements and actions, and the affinity between his views and Jefferson’s on the topic, that the First Amendment intended to “separate” church and state.
- The inclusion of TEKS 7G was one of the most blatant examples of how state board members tried to use the Texas curriculum standards to promote a political argument that is unsupported by sound scholarship (as well as the nation’s courts). Thus, its inclusion in the Texas standards is wholly inappropriate and deeply misleading for students.



Neglecting Native American and Mexican American History

As noted earlier, the conservative Thomas B. Fordham Institute’s review of the Texas standards was particularly critical of the paucity of coverage of the history and experiences of Native Americans: “Native peoples are missing until brief references to nineteenth-century events.”^{xxviii} Critics also complained that the standards did a poor job of covering the history and contributions of Mexican Americans in Texas and U.S. history. Conservatives on the state board often responded by claiming that they added a number of Mexican American names to the standards, but that often appeared to critics as little more than incoherent tokenism rather than a true effort to address the experiences of Mexican Americans.

The concerns of those critics were hardly allayed when David Barton, a prominent conservative activist appointed by the state board to serve as an “expert adviser” on the curriculum standards revision, suggested on his radio program that only one Tejano leader had been at the Alamo and that he had fled before the fighting started. Appallingly, one state board member – David Bradley, R-Beaumont – made the same claim during the formal debate over the standards. The former Texas state historian, Dr. Frank de la Teja at Texas State University, had to correct the record, pointing out that 8-10 Tejanos had died defending the Alamo. Moreover, he made clear, the Tejano who left the Alamo, Juan Seguín, had actually been sent out by his commanders to seek assistance for the defenders. Seguín later served at the Battle of San Jacinto and was commended, along with his company, for gallantry.^{xxix} The version of history promoted by Barton and Bradley would brand Seguín as a coward. (Barton also called for removing labor and civil rights icon César Chávez from the standards. He argued that Chávez’s political views made him a poor role model for students.)

So it shouldn’t be a surprise that scholars and advocates continue to criticize the curriculum standards for poor coverage of Mexican American and Native American history. Adequately correcting this poor coverage – such as by providing a more thorough treatment of the history and experiences of Native Americans, the profound effects of the Mexican-American War, and important Mexican American civil rights leaders like Gustavo (Gus) Garcia – would require a much more comprehensive revision of the standards than is intended for the current “streamlining” process. But some suggested changes below would at least improve the existing standards.



Grade 7 Texas History TEKS	Student Expectation
(3) History. The student understands how individuals, events, and issues related to the Texas Revolution shaped the history of Texas. The student is expected to:	(D) explain how the establishment of the Republic of Texas brought civil, political, and religious freedom to Texas
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing this student expectation. The State Board of Education, not the curriculum team of teachers and scholars, added this item during the 2009-10 debate.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other student expectations in this and following standards already focus student instruction on the causes and effects of the Texas Revolution and the establishment of the Republic of Texas. As such, TEKS 3D is essentially duplicative.• The board’s addition is a glib recitation of aspirations and does little to aid student understanding of the experiences of people who lived in Texas following independence. Indeed, the suggestion that independence “brought civil, political, and religious freedom to Texas” ignores the experiences of Tejanos, other people of Mexican descent, Native Americans and black people who experienced severe discrimination and even enslavement.	
(19) Culture. The student understands the concept of diversity within unity in Texas. The student is expected to:	(C) identify examples of Spanish influence and the influence of other cultures on Texas such as place names, vocabulary, religion, architecture, food, and the arts
<p>Recommendation Clarify by revising as follows: “identify examples of <u>Mexican and</u> Spanish influence and the influence of other cultures on Texas such as place names, vocabulary, religion, architecture, food, and the arts”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mexican culture has had as much or more of a profound influence on the history of Texas than has Spanish culture. Spanish culture and Mexican culture are not one and the same.	



Grade 8 U.S. History TEKS	Student Expectation
(2) History. The student understands the causes of exploration and colonization eras. The student is expected to:	(A) identify reasons for European exploration and colonization of North America; and
<p>Recommendation Clarify by revising as follows: “identify reasons for European exploration, <u>conquest</u> and colonization of North America”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Simply noting exploration and colonization implies that no one else already lived in North America at the time Europeans arrived. The European conquest of native peoples throughout the Americas was brutal, bloody and deeply consequential for the peoples who already lived here.	



Promoting an Ideological Agenda

Throughout the 2010 debate, State Board of Education members used the standards in numerous ways to promote pet political heroes and their own particular political viewpoints on issues. In addition to concerns regarding the failure of the curriculum standards to incorporate the Texas College and Career Readiness Standards, for example, the *Bridging the Gap* report noted how the 2010 standards promote a “one-sided analysis” of the free enterprise system. The conservative Fordham Institute’s review addressed this concern as well:

“Throughout the Texas standards, dozens of references (even the title of the high school economics course) offer a drumbeat of uncritical celebration of ‘the free enterprise system and its benefits’ – resembling, in an inverted historical echo, Soviet schools harping on the glories of state socialism.”^{xxx}

State board members even argued that using the term “capitalism” somehow portrayed the free enterprise system in a negative light. Board member Terri Leo, R-Spring, was among board members who successfully argued that the standards should use the term “free enterprise system.” Leo bizarrely insisted that the board not “compromise with liberal professors from academia”:^{xxxi} “Let’s face it, capitalism does have a negative connotation. You know, ‘capitalist pig!’”^{xxxii}

Board members used the standards to promote their political views on other topics as well, such as Sen. Joseph McCarthy’s red-baiting in the 1950s. “Read the latest on McCarthy – he was basically vindicated,” wrote board member Don McLeroy, R-College Station, in a memo to the curriculum team.^{xxxiii} Board members also revised the standards to promote their political beliefs about international treaties and government taxation and regulation.

For each example listed below, board members proposed and voted on changes without inviting a single scholar or educator to address the full board to provide advice on the issue. The result is a standards document that often elevates the pet political causes and grievances of board members over facts and sound scholarship.



Grade 8 U.S. History TEKS	Student Expectation
(14) Economics. The student understands the origins and development of the free enterprise system in the United States. The student is expected to:	(A) explain why a free enterprise system of economics developed in the new nation, <u>including minimal government intrusion, taxation, and property rights.</u>
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process, correct factual inaccuracies and add clarity by revising TEKS 14A to read: “explain the role government and free enterprise played in the economic development of the new nation.”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The state board added “including minimal government intrusion, taxation and property rights” in 2010 without the advice of scholars and educators. This addition adds unnecessary complexity and detail to the standards while providing no instructional value.• In fact, the current standard distorts the history of economic development in the United States. None of the standards in the Economics strand for Grade 8 U.S. History specifically note government’s role in internal improvements and economic expansion. For example, the Erie Canal – an early, government infrastructure project that was critically important to economic development – isn’t even mentioned in the Grade 8 TEKS (or, for that matter, in TEKS for ANY grade level).• The language added by SBOE members in 2010 simply promotes a political viewpoint that often portrays government as always a negative force. Public school classrooms are not the place for SBOE members to grind political axes.	



High School U.S. History TEKS	Student Expectation
8) History. The student understands the impact of significant national and international decisions and conflicts in the Cold War on the United States. The student is expected to:	(B) describe how Cold War tensions were intensified by the arms race, the space race, McCarthyism, and the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), <u>the findings of which were confirmed by the Venona Papers</u>
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing “the findings of which were confirmed by the Venona Papers” from TEKS 8B OR revise TEKS 8B as follows: “describe how Cold War tensions were intensified by the arms race, the space race, <u>espionage</u>, McCarthyism and the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC).”</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The state board added TEKS 8B in 2010 without the advice of scholars and educators.• TEKS 8B reads like a blanket exoneration of the disgraceful red-baiting promoted by the House Un-American Activities Committee and Sen. Joseph McCarthy in the 1940s and ‘50s.• Academic research on the Venona documents has added to the historical record important detail about very real and troubling Soviet espionage in the United States during the Cold War. But those documents do not “confirm” the many scurrilous charges by reckless politicians that destroyed reputations and wrecked the careers of Americans across the country in the 1940s and ‘50s. The suggestion that they do is scandalous.• SBOE members added the language on the Venona documents to promote a political viewpoint, not to add instructional value. Public school classrooms are not the place for SBOE members to grind political axes.	
10) History. The student understands the impact of political, economic, and social factors in the U.S. role in the world from the 1970s through 1990. The student is expected to:	(E) describe the causes and key organizations and individuals of the <u>conservative resurgence of the 1980s and 1990s, including Phyllis Schlafly, the Contract with America, the Heritage Foundation, the Moral Majority, and the National Rifle Association</u>
<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing TEKS 10E, which the SBOE during the 2010 debate without the advice of scholars and educators.</p> <p>Reasoning</p>	



- The addition of this arbitrary list of conservative icons and causes by board members was duplicative, inaccurate and biased. As a result, TEKS 10E unnecessarily added complexity and detail to the standards.
- The standards already require students to learn about the administrations of conservative Republican presidents (TEKS 10A, 10B) of the era as well as “significant social and political advocacy organizations, leaders, and issues across the political spectrum” (TEKS 11B).
- The Contract with America was in 1994, outside the time period of TEKS 10.
- Neither TEKS 10 nor TEKS 11 includes a similar list of liberal/progressive leaders, organizations and causes important in the era. The addition of TEKS 10E simply promotes pet political heroes and causes of certain SBOE members.
- This imbalance can be corrected and unnecessary detail and complexity removed simply by deleting TEKS 10E.

<p>(11) History. The student understands the emerging political, economic, and social issues of the United States from the 1990s into the 21st century. The student is expected to:</p>	<p>(C) <u>evaluate efforts by global organizations to undermine U.S. sovereignty through the use of treaties</u></p>
---	--

Recommendation
 Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing TEKS 11C, which the SBOE added in 2010 without the advice of scholars and educators.

Reasoning

- TEKS 11C is duplicative. Standard 19E, also added by the SBOE in 2010, at least takes a neutral and balanced approach to the same topic: “evaluate the pros and cons of U.S. participation in international organizations and treaties.” So TEKS 11C is both unnecessary and politically biased.
- All countries that enter into treaties voluntarily give up some freedom of action in order to reach a mutually beneficial agreement. That’s the nature of treaties. But the politically slanted wording of this standard suggests that international treaties are somehow part of a foreign conspiracy against the United States.
- Certain board members might oppose international treaties and organizations, but public school classrooms are not the place for grinding political axes.



High School U.S. Government TEKS	Student Expectation
(5) Economics. The student understands the roles played by local, state, and national governments in both the public and private sectors of the U.S. free enterprise system. The student is expected to:	D) <u>understand how government taxation and regulation can serve as restrictions to private enterprise.</u>
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing TEKS 5D, which the state board added during the 2010 debate without advice of scholars and educators.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TEKS 5D is duplicative and provides no added instructional value. Teaching to TEKS 5A, 5B and 5C would already include covering how taxation and regulation can both restrict and aid free enterprise and the economy overall. As a result, TEKS 5D adds unnecessary complexity and detail to the standards.• TEKS 5D ignores how taxation and regulation can have positive effects for the free enterprise system, suggesting that there are only negative effects. For example, taxation funds infrastructure – such as roads, bridges, seaports and airports – needed by private enterprise to move goods to market. Moreover, regulation can bolster public confidence in products sold by private businesses.• The addition of TEKS 5D simply promotes political beliefs by board members opposed to taxation and regulation. Public school classrooms are not the place for SBOE members to grind political axes.	



High School Economics TEKS	Student Expectation
(13) Economics. The student understands the role of the Federal Reserve System in establishing monetary policy. The student is expected to:	(D) <u>analyze the decline in value of the U.S. dollar, including the abandonment of the gold standard.</u>
<p>Recommendation Advance the primary goal of the streamlining process by removing TEKS 13D, which the SBOE added during the 2010 debate without the advice of scholars and educators.</p> <p>Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TEKS 13D is duplicative and provides no added instructional value. Teaching to other TEKS, including TEKS 12A and TEKS 12B as well as TEKS 13B and TEKS 13C, would already include covering the various factors that influence the value of the U.S. dollar. As a result, TEKS 13D adds unnecessary complexity and detail to the standards.• A review of the debate from 2010 suggests that board members added TEKS 13D simply to promote their ideological opposition to the abandonment of the gold standard. Public school classrooms are not the place for SBOE members to grind political axes.• 13D is out of place in a standard about the Federal Reserve System.	



Endnotes

- ⁱ “Confused Texas Education Board bans kids’ author from curriculum,” *Dallas Morning News*, 1/24/2010. <https://www.dallasnews.com/news/education/2010/01/24/Confused-Texas-Education-Board-bans-kids-9385>
- ⁱⁱ “Helen Keller’s Forgotten Radicalism,” *TIME*, 6/26/2015. <http://time.com/3923213/helen-keller-radicalism/> (Retrieved 10/18/2017)
- ⁱⁱⁱ *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{iv} *Bridging the Gap Between K-12 and College Readiness Standards in Texas: Recommendations for U.S. History*, Texas Faculty Collaborative for Social Studies, by Keith A. Erikson, http://www.txfacultycollaboratives.org/images/tfc/social/docs/Erikson_BridgingTheGap.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^v “College readiness overlooked in social studies fight,” *Austin American-Statesman*, 3/19/2010, <http://www.statesman.com/news/state--regional-govt--politics/college-readiness-overlooked-social-studies-fight/tbNQmGgXblvmp5BvidYH3L/> (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{vi} “Texas officials: Schools should teach that slavery was a ‘side issue’ to Civil War,” *Washington Post*, 7/5/2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/150-years-later-schools-are-still-a-battlefield-for-interpreting-civil-war/2015/07/05/e8fbd57e-2001-11e5-bf41-c23f5d3face1_story.html?utm_term=.5d57153bfdd2 (Retrieved 2/8/2018). A fuller transcription of the board member’s comments can be found at “Don’s Rewriting History... Again,” *TFN Insider*, 7/10/2015, <http://tfn.org/dons-rewriting-history-again/>: “Yes, this is historically correct. Sectionalism, states’ rights were the real issues behind the Civil War. Slavery was an after-issue. It was part of the reason for the sectionalism and the states’ rights deciding whether or not they could have slaves moving to the other states, etc. But the real issue that the South broke away was because they wanted to have the right to say that they could do that and that sectionalism was the idea of moving slaves to other sections of the territories. So those were the real reasons for the Civil War. That’s why they would have those first. Slavery came about as a side issue to the Civil War. And, so it’s not the reason for the Civil War. It was not slavery.”
- ^{vii} *Complying with, Getting Around, and Bypassing the TEKS History Standards: A Review of Proposed Texas, U.S. and World History Textbooks in Texas*. September 2014, Texas Freedom Network Education Fund. On file at TFNEF.
- ^{viii} http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_scaresec.asp (Retrieved 9/25/2017)
- ^{ix} <https://www.tsl.texas.gov/ref/abouttx/secession/2feb1861.html> (Retrieved 9/25/2017)
- ^x *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{xi} Hettle, Wallace. *Inventing Stonewall Jackson: A Civil War Hero in History and Memory*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011.
- ^{xii} “TX Board of Ed Member: Minorities Must Be Thankful To ‘The Majority’ For Giving Them Rights!”, *Talking Points Memo*, 9/18/2009, <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/muckraker/tx-board-of-ed-member-minorities-must-be-thankful-to-the-majority-for-giving-them-rights> (Retrieved 9/28/2017)
- ^{xiii} *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{xiv} *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{xv} *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)
- ^{xvi} “Texas Conservatives Win Curriculum Change,” *New York Times*, 3/12/2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/13/education/13texas.html?mcubz=0> (Retrieved 9/28/2017)
- ^{xvii} *A Triumph of Ideology over Ideas: A Review of Proposed Textbooks for High School U.S. Government in Texas*. September 2014, Texas Freedom Network Education Fund. On file at TFNEF.
- ^{xviii} *A Triumph of Ideology over Ideas: A Review of Proposed Textbooks for High School U.S. Government in Texas*, September 2014, Texas Freedom Network Education Fund. On file at TFNEF.
- ^{xix} Letters from John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, January 23, 1825, and November 4, 1816, in Lester J. Cappon, ed. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters* (U NC Press, 1959), 607–08, 493-495.
- ^{xx} See John Locke, “A Letter about Toleration,” <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689b.pdf>
- ^{xxi} See John Locke, “A Letter about Toleration,” <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689b.pdf>
- ^{xxii} See John Locke, “A Letter about Toleration,” <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/locke1689b.pdf>



^{xxiii} Letters from John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, January 23, 1825, and November 4, 1816, in Lester J. Cappon, ed. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters* (U NC Press, 1959), 607–08, 493–495.

^{xxiv} Discussions of this statute and reproductions of its pages can be found at the Virginia Historical Society website -- <http://www.vahistorical.org/collections-and-resources/virginia-history-explorer/thomas-jefferson> -- and at the Library of Virginia website -- http://edu.lva.virginia.gov/online_classroom/shaping_the_constitution/doc/religious_freedom.

^{xxv} From James Madison’s autobiography, noted at the Library of Congress web page <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/connections/james-madison/history.html> and with a link to https://www.loc.gov/resource/mjm.27_0220_0243/?st=gallery.

^{xxvi} Letter from James Madison to Edward Livingston, July 10, 1822, http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/amend1_religions66.html.

^{xxvii} Letter from Thomas Jefferson to the Danbury Baptist association in Connecticut, January 1, 1802, <https://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>.

^{xxviii} *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)

^{xxix} See Dr. Frank de la Teja’s response to David Barton’s claims about Tejanos at the Alamo, posted April 15, 2010: <http://tfn.org/yes-another-historian-corrects-barton/>.

^{xxx} *The State of State U.S. History Standards 2011*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, by Sheldon M. Stern and Jeremy A. Stern, February 2011. http://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/SOSS_History_FINAL_7.pdf (Retrieved 9/22/2017)

^{xxxi} “State Board of Education Right-Wingers Remove the Word ‘Capitalism’ From Textbooks,” Houston Press, March 11, 2010, <http://www.houstonpress.com/news/state-board-of-education-right-wingers-remove-the-word-capitalism-from-textbooks-6711635> (Retrieved 9/27/2017)

^{xxxii} “Texas Conservatives Win Curriculum Change,” New York Times, 3/12/2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/13/education/13texas.html?mcubz=0> (Retrieved 9/28/2017)

^{xxxiii} “More McLeroy Malarkey, Part 1,” TFN Insider, October 21, 2009, <http://tfn.org/more-mcleroy-malarkey-part-1/> (Retrieved 2/2/2018)



T E X A S
F R E E D O M
N E T W O R K
E D U C A T I O N
◆ F U N D ◆

The Texas Freedom Network Education Fund supports research and education efforts
that promote religious freedom and individual liberties.

P.O. Box 1624
Austin, TX 78767
Phone: 512-322-0545
www.tfn.org