

Paved With Good Intentions: Progressivism and the Education of Mexican Migrant Children, California 1910-1940

Caroline Wheeler

“The American people have always regarded education and [the] acquisition of knowledge as a matter of supreme importance. We have recognized the public schools as a most vital civic institution for the preservation of a democratic system of government, and as the primary vehicle for transmitting the values on which our society rests... [B]y depriving the children of any disfavored group of an education, we foreclose the means by which that group might raise the level of esteem in which it is held by the majority.”

William J. Brennan
Plyler v. Doe 457 U.S. 202 (1982)

The question of how, or whether, to provide public education for the children of Hispanic migrant workers has been a heated topic in American politics. In 1982 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that state efforts to deny K-12 education to undocumented immigrant children violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment because such children are “persons in any ordinary sense of the term.”¹ In spite of this, opponents of educating migrant children periodically file law suits, especially in states with large Hispanic populations, seeking to limit or deny education and other social services to such children. Meanwhile, supporters of broad access to public education continue to be troubled by statistics regarding Mexican Americans and education. In 2003, for example, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that more than 25% of Mexican American adults had not completed the ninth grade. Fewer than 30% graduated from high school and, of those who did, fewer than 5% received a college degree.² Clearly, even if schools are offering access to Hispanic students, they seem to be doing

This paper was written for Dr. Charles Hanson’s Advanced Placement U.S. History class in the spring of 2013.

a very poor job of providing meaningful education.

Both those who criticize universal public education and those who fret about the low quality of such education for migrant children unconsciously echo a debate from the Progressive Era in California. From 1910 to 1940, this argument played out in a fierce struggle about the purpose and reality of public education in California. State education officials, for example, publicly expressed and worked to implement progressive ideas about education, which included treating all children equally.³ However, they faced strong resistance from local communities (especially in rural areas), which had both economic and racist arguments for restricting education to migrant children. Teachers often were caught between pressure from state officials and local school boards. Teachers also had their own self-interests to protect, since their social status as professionals depended on positive reviews by their local school boards.

The interplay between social justice ideals and racist sentiments, between selflessness and self-interest, between educational integrity and tacit acceptance of prejudice, is a complicated mixture with a few clear villains and no outright heroes. This paper will discuss, first, the efforts on the part of state education officials and public school teachers to extend universal public education to migrant children in California during this period. Then, it will describe the pushback from local communities. Finally, it will comment on how and why Progressive intentions failed to have immediate positive effect, and to some extent actually made the migrant children's education less equal.

Changing Times: The Progressive Era

The Progressive Era began in the late nineteenth century as a response to the rapid transformation of the United States from a rural, homesteading economy into an urban-industrial one. Industrialization threw agricultural workers off the land and replaced skilled craftsmen with cheap, unskilled labor. The profound social unrest that these changes caused posed a major problem for traditional ideals of American democracy. Previously, these values rested on the image of the yeoman

farmer: self-reliant, virtuous, and independent. However, the growing imbalance in wealth between the corporations and the working classes raised the troubling image of a society divided by class issues.

In response, a generation of educated professionals (businessmen, journalists, professors) set out to reconcile American values with the new economic situation. In place of the individual self-reliant farmer or tradesman, these “Progressives” envisioned a society of people educated in and comfortable with the scientific method, people who could find creative solutions, rather than political partisanship, for social problems that affected entire communities. Progressives looked to government agencies as impartial institutions that could study problems, balance competing private interests, and find solutions that served the “public” interests, or the greater good.

Public education was a central issue for Progressives. In the face of fears that immigrants would harm American democracy by introducing foreign ideas, some Progressives argued that civics, or “Americanization” education, was vital for helping immigrants to fit into American society. Felix Warburg, a prominent New York banker and philanthropist, gave an interview to the *New York Times* in 1919. In it, he argued that the U.S. had a duty to provide a civics education to immigrants. “Make the immigrant a conscious American,” he said, “a human being who understands what this country stands for...and he will make...a strong asset to the building up of this country.”⁴

Warburg was among many philanthropists who funded Americanization programs at settlement houses, such as the Henry Street house in New York. Settlement houses in the urban Northeast and Midwest served as community centers for immigrants from all over Europe. They were places where adults could take classes in childcare, housekeeping, and sewing and could socialize with English speakers and learn about American customs.⁵

Other Progressives, like the education reformer John Dewey, believed that, while helping the immigrant assimilate was good, schools also

needed to focus more on developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Students who could look at problems rationally were more likely to come up with new ideas for handling the unanticipated problems that arose in industrial societies. Because they believed that rational thinkers generally arrived at similar solutions, these Progressives believed that scientific thinking would lead to social harmony and prosperity. In progressive educators' views, new educational practices would lead students to be more socially conscious. In turn, they would be more apt to support reforms that improved all of society. Thus, Progressives focused on training and certifying teachers, and on establishing government oversight of curriculum and school quality.⁶

Progressivism in the California State Department of Education

In 1912, Californians elected the Progressive Hiram Johnson as Governor. Along with instituting political reforms, Johnson laid the groundwork for a state Department of Education (DOE), expanding the role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to include an oversight commission and separate bureaus for teacher credentials, elementary, secondary, rural, and immigrant education.⁷ In 1921 and then again in 1926, the state legislature passed laws specifically funding demonstration schools for migrants, Americanization classes for adults, and credentialed social workers to replace truant officers. Government support for migrant education continued throughout the Depression. In 1933, in response to an effort by the conservative California Taxpayers Association to cut the education budget, the legislature actually granted new taxes for school revenue, including stipends for teachers in rural areas with large influxes of migrant families who both moved into and around California.⁸

Helen Heffernan, a follower of Dewey's philosophy of education, was State Commissioner of Elementary and Rural Education from 1926 until 1965. She continually expressed her belief in education as the right of all children. "No problem," she wrote, "is more urgent than that of providing educational opportunity for migratory children...[This] is a challenge to the humanitarian impulses of growers, citizens, and educators. Shall

these children, deprived of childhood's right to a home, be also neglected and underprivileged to suffer educational deprivation?"⁹

At first, state officials believed that migrant children should be educated in the same schools as other children. Georgiana Carden, the first State Attendance Officer, reported in 1924 that separate schools were not desirable and that the most important thing to do was to incorporate migrant children into regular classrooms as efficiently as possible. However, by 1926, Carden had changed her mind. In her attendance diary for 1926, Carden wrote that migrant children tended toward a "swamping" of the regular school to the detriment of the regular students. She was responding to a complaint from Isleton, a town in Sacramento County. Just before the end of term, a large group of Mexican migrant children showed up at this school, bringing with them a case of measles, which forced the school to close for a month. Outrage from the white community members following this incident resulted in the establishment of a separate school room for the migrant children shortly thereafter.¹⁰

It is important to remember that although state officials could recommend and encourage equal opportunity, in practice schools were run by local boards of education. The latter raised most of the money for their own schools and they reflected the interests and (often prejudiced) attitudes of their local communities. State officials had the best of intentions but few ways to turn these intentions into reality.

Local Opposition

Although technically it was illegal in California to separate Mexican and white children into different schools, in practice informal segregation was widespread in both rural and urban school districts.¹¹ The practice was less visible in urban school districts because there frequently was more than one school building per district and effective segregation was glossed over by the concept of drawing boundary lines for specific "neighborhood" schools. In rural districts, however, there often was only one school. The protests that Georgiana Carden mentioned were just one of a constant stream of complaints about educating Mexican

children in the same schoolroom as white children.¹²

In his 1976 article “Always the Laborer, Never the Citizen: Anglo Perceptions of the Mexican Immigrant During the 1920s,” historian Mark Reisler explored the popular perception of Mexican workers as passive and obedient. They were said to be possessed by an inherent laziness, “mañana spirit,” meaning that they did not effectively plan ahead and therefore never felt the need to compete with American farmers for work, content to remain in the lowest paying, yet most physically demanding jobs.¹³ The Mexican workers were seen as unfit for any job other than manual labor, a view that was used to justify the segregation of children from Mexican families, believing that they had no need of proper education. In this circular reasoning, Mexicans had no need of proper education because their rightful place, maybe even their preferred place, was in the field.

State officials and teachers continually confronted the unwillingness of local school boards to provide anything other than the absolute minimal funding for migrant education. In his “Biennial Report to the State Department of Education 1927-1928,” William J. Cooper, California State Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1927 to 1929, recalled the negative reactions of white citizens to the idea of providing money for the cause of educating migrant children. Their reaction, he explained, was caused by their intense prejudice and anger at the Mexican children for slowing down the normal school process due to their lack of knowledge of the English language and American customs.¹⁴ Similarly, a young rural schoolteacher named Nora Kreps quoted opinions expressed by white ranch owners, one of whom scolded her for her work, saying, “teach them and they are no longer good for ranch work.”¹⁵ Kathleen Weiler also quotes a farm manager: “Mexicans are a happy people,” he said. “They don’t want responsibility, they want just to float along, sing songs...Education doesn’t make them happier; most will continue to do the same sort of work at the same wages as if they had never attended school. It only... teaches them to read the wrong kind of literature.”¹⁶

Even when state officials bowed to public pressure and created separate schools, there were still constant attempts to avoid educating migrant

children. An article in the *San Jose Mercury Herald*, for example, written by a member of the California Schoolmasters' Club, noted the success of a special migrant school. The children attended from 7:30 in the morning until noon, when they were released early to go work in the fields, harvesting walnuts with their parents for the remainder of the day. With this system in place, the article noted proudly, the workers were able to pick more walnuts than they had prior to the creation of the immigrant schools.¹⁷ State officials elsewhere noted that, in Ventura County, the separate migrant schools were held in "an apricot drying shed, one garage, one machine shop...two cloak rooms with the partitions removed." Superintendent Cooper noted wearily, "We find in the wealthiest districts the coldest hearts, and a very strong sentiment in opposition to any schooling for these Mexican children.... Today one trustee told us, 'Here we have twenty-six of our own children...and we have given up our anterooms to the Mexicans so that our children have no place to hang their hats. We positively cannot take any more, and will do nothing more to help take care of them.'¹⁸

Caught in the Middle: Schoolteachers

If state officials were benevolent but ineffective and local school boards were antagonistic and all too effective, what about the teachers? Teachers were on the front lines of the struggle between state officials and local school districts. In the 1910s and 1920s, state officials pushed hard to get schools to hire instructors, but many school boards considered it "madness to discuss spending money...for these despised people."¹⁹ Americanization teachers—people who didn't teach many academic subjects but focused on language skills, civics, and hygiene and nutrition—were hired, reluctantly. Rural teachers like Nora Kreps walked a fine line. They knew they had to appeal to enough Mexican families to justify the cost of their salaries, but they couldn't speak out on behalf of these families without offending the agri-business leaders who had great influence over the rural school boards, and thus over the teachers' jobs.²⁰

Most Americanization teachers were young, college-educated women, not from particularly wealthy families. They were inspired by Progressive

ideals to see teaching as a benevolent profession in which they could help schools work harmoniously with local communities to meet social needs. These teachers also had to be somewhat adventurous, for they were making a cross-cultural journey, getting to know and work with people of different ethnicities and economic classes. Kathleen Weiler provides insight into the role Americanization programs played in creating social position and status for these teachers in the eyes of their pupils and in society. Americanization programs were relatively well-paying and steady jobs that gave teachers an aura of competence and cultural superiority in their role as overseers of migrant lifestyles. There also was the subtle, yet unmistakable, “power of whiteness” that was derived from working in a room full of foreign immigrants.²¹ It is impossible to evaluate the teachers without taking into account both their ideals and their interests.

The State DOE provided sample curricula and guidelines for setting up classrooms for migrant children. Although officials like Heffernan were well aware of the discrimination against such children, the guidelines reflected the most optimistic of educational ideals, emphasizing dramatic play, nature studies and independent projects as appropriate lessons.²² In the kindest interpretation, such guidelines reflect the joy that many teachers took in expanding their own world views by learning about the lives of their pupils.²³ Almost immediately, though, teachers of migrant children confronted the brutal realities of their students’ lives. First, there was the simple lack of funding and supplies within the schools themselves. In her 1927 article, “Teaching the Children of Seasonal Workers,” Clara Coldwell discusses, among many other reasons, how lack of equipment, especially the “shortage of suitable textbooks,” made educating the children of migratory workers a challenge.²⁴ Beyond supplies, classes were held in drying sheds, there was massive overcrowding, attendance officers ignored children who were absent because they were working in the fields, and friends and neighbors continually wondered why teachers were wasting their time on such people.

Some Americanization teachers recognized that the stereotypes about Mexicans reflected the living conditions in migrant camps more than

their innate character or intelligence. While school board members could criticize migrant families for “the indifference...to social standards that, if not carefully supervised, may lower or break down pupil morale of the entire school,” teachers saw the difficult problems children faced: they were in poor health, lacked proper nutrition and clothing and frequently were tired and disoriented from constant travel.²⁵ Migrant teachers frequently had to appeal to the charity of local women’s clubs, another Progressive institution, for emergency food or clothing donations.

Positive attention from teachers was noteworthy for migrant families. For example, Cesar Chavez, the leader of the United Farmworkers Union and the son of migrants, remembered a young teacher who came to visit his family, curious about why Chavez and his siblings were behind in school. He noted how astonishing such a visit was, because the teacher cared enough to get to know them as people.²⁶ Chavez’s account of his experiences as a migrant child is significant because it provides a firsthand example of a positive relationship between schoolteachers and migrant children where the teacher wanted to understand how to help the children succeed. Similarly, in her “Diary of a Schoolteacher in the Imperial Valley,” Nora Kreps expressed affection and concern for the wellbeing of her students, to whom she made home visits and also provided “wholesome” after-school activities and evening social events for teenagers. Kreps, who kept the diary on behalf of the Survey of Race Relations, a project sponsored by Stanford University under the direction of the sociologist Robert Park, was not free of prejudice. She used stereotypes regularly. However, as she got to know their lives and troubles and ambitions, she marveled in her diary, “I am getting to the point where I am almost more at home with brown faces than with white.”²⁷

Teachers like Kreps and Corinne Seeds, who began her teaching career as an Americanization teacher in 1914 and went on to become a nationally recognized leader in progressive education, clearly grew to understand the social limits and frustrations of their students. Their observations of themselves as teachers reflected a mixture of unease,

compassion, stereotyping, and a very clear understanding of the exploitative working conditions under which their pupils lived.²⁸

However, Americanization teachers were not, and were never intended to be, academic teachers. Americanization programs aimed to socialize adults. They were not intended to be substitutes for children's primary education. In California's rural counties, by contrast, Americanization programs often were the best, indeed the only, education that could be offered to Mexican migrant children.

Results of Progressive Reform

Did Progressivism improve the lives of migrant children? On the face of it, the answer has to be "no." After 1926, state officials largely gave up trying to integrate Mexican children into rural white schools. Given the resistance from local school districts, separate schooling was the best available alternative. There is ample evidence to support the argument that such separate schooling had a negative effect on Mexican children's education. In "Children of the Harvest: The Schooling of Dust Bowl and Mexican Migrants During the Depression Era," Paul Theobald and Ruben Donato examine the interplay of prejudice, economics, and inferior schooling. It was easy for schools to justify segregating Mexican children, even those who were American citizens, by arguing that they had special language needs. The arrival of white Dust Bowl migrants made the economic issues more visible because white migrants (like many Mexicans) spoke English but were behind in schoolwork due to frequent interruptions caused by following the harvest. School districts either had to acknowledge the socioeconomic conditions that affected all agricultural workers or treat the white "Okies" as inferior as Mexicans. School districts largely chose the latter, isolating all migrant children in special classrooms and treating them as problem students who threatened the morals of the local white children. Since migrants were seen as fit only for fieldwork, classes focused on vocational training and domestic management. Then, this second-class education was used as an example of why migrants were incapable of academic work and therefore never gained the opportunity to escape fieldwork.²⁹

Similarly, Gilbert Gonzalez, in “Segregation of Mexican Children in a Southern California City,” discusses how the idea of Mexicans as intellectually inferior made educating them seem like an unnecessary financial burden on the white community. He offers a harsh critique of Americanization education, saying that, by definition, it implied a deficiency in the immigrants’ culture.³⁰

Interestingly, in “Becoming Mexican,” David Torres-Rouff offers both a critique of segregated schools and a sort of indirect support for their effects. Torres-Rouff traces the way in which urban school districts also came to create separate white and Mexican schools by the late 1920s. While not allowed legally to segregate the two communities, local districts bowed to pressure from white-dominated PTAs and drew school boundary lines that generally isolated Mexican neighborhoods from white ones. They also gave superintendents the power to transfer white pupils into white schools if their homes happened to be “stranded” in a Mexican area. Ironically, this segregation was justified by using the sympathetic-sounding phrase that “the special needs” of Mexican children weren’t adequately being met in white schools.³¹

The consequences of such separate schooling have played out ever since. Beginning in the 1930s, IQ testing became very interesting to the education community. Mexican and white schools became opportunities for researchers to study student achievement. But with Mexican schools still focusing on language learners and vocational rather than academic skills, lower scores for Mexicans reinforced the rationale for separation.³² Torres-Rouff discusses the vicious cycle set up by IQ testing, in which prejudice leads to conditions that limit test scores, which in turn reinforces perceptions that Mexican students were inherently inferior.³³

Is there a more positive way to read these results? Torres-Rouff argues that it was ironic that Americanization programs offered all sorts of socializing activities, but never allied with or recognized the existence of ethnic/religious organizations that also were engaged in efforts to organize ethnic communities (church groups, athletic leagues, men’s

clubs, etc.). When the school communities became ethnically isolated, Mexican families turned back toward their own cultures, developing a Mexican identity and, in Torres's words, "Becoming Mexican" as a source of identity and pride.³⁴

Benny Andres offers a different reading of Americanization. Using Nora Kreps as an example, he argues that the system of Americanization schools offers an example of a positive race-relations cycle, in which individuals go through stages of separation, accommodation, and then acceptance of a culturally pluralist perspective. Kreps was not free from the prejudices of her day, but she was open-minded and perceptive and, as she grew to know her pupils, she found things to value in their culture even as she grew more critical of the consumerism and crassness of some aspects of American culture.³⁵ Under this interpretation, Americanization might have positive consequences, as white teachers first became comfortable with people from other cultures and then became good examples for others.

Probably the best criticism of Progressive efforts came in the form of a 1946 court case. With Gonzalo Mendez, a prosperous farmer, as lead plaintiff, a group of Mexican American parents sued their school district in Orange County, California for preventing their children from attending the white school in their neighborhood. Importantly, they did not claim racial discrimination. Instead, they sued for discrimination on the basis of national origin and the supposed language deficiency of children whose families had been in California for generations.

On February 18, 1946, Senior District Court Judge Paul McCormick ruled in favor of Mendez. He found that segregated schools were an unconstitutional denial of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. The school district appealed to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, claiming that Federal courts had no jurisdiction over education. The schools argued that students were separated because of the handicap of language barriers and that non-English speaking students needed separate schools until they acquired language proficiency. Several national organizations, such as the NAACP (represented by

future Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, who eight years later argued the *Brown v. Board of Education* case) filed amicus briefs supporting the Mendez family and the District Court ruling.

In early 1947, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the lower court decision, but not on the equal protection grounds. That would have overruled the 1896 Supreme Court case, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which established the “separate but equal” ruling. Instead, the 9th Circuit upheld the case on the grounds that California law provided for segregation *only* for “children of Chinese, Japanese, and Mongolian parentage.” Because “California law does not include the segregation of such children because of their Mexican blood,” the Court held that it was unlawful to segregate the Mexican children.³⁶

The *Mendez* case apparently was the first case in which segregated education was successfully challenged in Federal Court, but it is interesting here because the California Governor at the time was Earl Warren, who later was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by President Eisenhower in 1953 and who presided over the *Brown* case. As a young lawyer, Warren was strongly influenced by the Progressive governor Hiram Johnson. He was elected as a Republican Governor in 1942 and then re-elected in 1946 and 1950 on the basis of his Progressive principles to modernize the state government to make it more efficient and honest. Following the 9th Circuit decision on *Mendez*, Governor Warren signed a law in June 1947 that repealed all remaining school segregation statutes in the California Education Code.³⁷

Conclusion

What does the *Mendez* case say about Progressive efforts to educate migrant children? First, it does tilt the argument more in favor of Gonzalez’s analysis and away from that of Torres-Rouff. Gonzalez harshly criticized the Americanization schools. Torres-Rouff argued that separate schools allowed Mexican families to create a community and define a separate identity as “Mexican.” The *Mendez* case demonstrates that Mexican families were well aware of the second-class status of their schools and wanted their children to be able to attend the academically superior white schools.

The case also challenges the Progressive desire for social harmony and the belief that an independent government agency could find a solution that was best for society. Progressive principles were hopeful, supporting as they did a vision of a world where people found common ground. In rural California, however, education officials and teachers encountered overwhelming human misery that, at the same time, seemed invisible even to those who lived in daily sight of it. It is hard to judge them harshly for sacrificing one ideal in order to achieve a modest level of social services and training for migrant children. However, the *Mendez* case shows that, in giving in to the desires of white families to have separate schools while trying to get Mexican children some education, the California state education system placed the idea of balancing private interests above protecting individual rights.

It does little good to condemn the education officials and Americanization teachers because they did try to help the migrant children at a time when local schools ignored or isolated them. The best that can be said of the Progressives is that they were witnesses. They didn't turn away, and for some, like Heffernan and Seeds, they spent the rest of their lives working on behalf of educational improvement. The experience allowed the white teachers like Kreps to expand their own horizons and see their pupils as unique human beings rather than part of a faceless, foreign crowd. In that respect, these educators set the stage for Americans to become comfortable with cultural pluralism. Still, the *Mendez* case approached the issue as one of individual, not social, rights. From this perspective, the Progressive viewpoint failed to see that social balance—while it might be easier—actually was dangerous to the individual's right to equal treatment. ●

Notes

1. Plyler, Superintendent, Tyler Independent School District v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982).
2. "Barriers to Educational Opportunities for Hispanics in the United States," in M. Tienda and F. Mitchell, *Hispanics and the Future of America: National Research Council (U.S.) Panel on Hispanics in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2006), 6.
3. Helen Heffernan, "The Education of Migrant Children in Ventura County," *Western Journal of Education* (1929): 8, in Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 119.
4. Felix Warburg, "Urgency of Americanization," *New York Times*, July 6, 1919.
5. Louise Carroll Wade, "Settlement Houses," In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. N.p.: Chicago Historical Society, 2005.
6. John Dewey, "My Pedagogic Creed," *School Journal* 54 (1897): 77-80.
7. "Agency History," Department of Education Records, F3752: California State Archives, at: www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/tf3779n5p1/admin/#bioghist-1.33 (Online Archives of California)
8. Kathleen Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children: California, 1920-1940," *History Workshop* (1994): 119-122.; *Meeting the Challenge: A History of Adult Education in California*. (Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2005) 4-5.
9. Heffernan, "Education of Migrant Children," 8.
10. Georgiana Carden, "Georgiana Carden Papers," University of California – Berkeley, Bancroft Library, 1920-46 in Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 199, 122.
11. David Torres-Rouff, "Becoming Mexican: Segregated Schools and Social Scientists in Southern California, 1913-1946," *Southern California Quarterly* 94, no. 2 (2012): 92.

12. Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 124-127, 134-136.; Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Segregation of Mexican Children in a Southern California City: The Legacy of Expansionism and the American Southwest," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 16 (1985): 55-76.; Benny J. Andres, Jr., "I Am Almost More at Home with Brown Faces than with White": An Americanization Teacher in Imperial Valley, California, 1923-1924," *Southern California Quarterly* 93, no. 1 (2011): 81-87.
13. Mark Reisler, "Always the Laborer, Never the Citizen: Anglo Perceptions of the Mexican Immigrant during the 1920s," *Pacific Historical Review* 45 (1976): 234.
14. William J. Cooper, *Biennial Report of the State Department of Education 1927-1928*, (1928) in Weiler, "Schooling of Migrant Children," 125.
15. Nora E. Kreps, "Diary of a Schoolteacher in the Imperial Valley," *Survey of Race Relations Collection* Folder 57, Box 24 n (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institute Archives, Stanford University, 1924): 27.
16. Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 125.
17. "Principals' Club Meets in Gilroy: Will C. Wood Speaks to School Heads of Four Counties," *San Jose Mercury Herald*, 1922.
18. Cooper, "Biennial Report," 37. in Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 125.
19. Ethel Richardson, "Doing the Thing That Shouldn't Be Done," *The Survey* 56 (1926): 298. in Andres, "I am Almost More at Home," 81.
20. Andres, "I am Almost More at Home," 84-86.
21. Kathleen Weiler, "Corinne Seeds and the Avenue 21 School: Towards a Sensuous History of Citizenship Education," *Historical Studies in Education* (2002) 1-10.

22. Gladys Potter, "Specific Suggestions for the Organization of Instruction in Emergency Schools," *California Journal of Elementary Education* 7, no.3 (1939): 134-48. in Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 137.
23. Hazel B. Poole, "Americanizing the Teacher of English," *The English Journal* 16 (1927): 705-10.
24. Clara Coldwell, "Teaching the Children of Seasonal Workers," (1927). in Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 124.
25. Weiler, "Schooling Migrant Children," 135.
26. Cesar Chavez, in Studs Terkel, *Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1970), 56.
27. Kreps, "Diary of a Schoolteacher," 22.
28. Weiler, "Corinne Seeds," 1-10.
29. Paul Theobald and Ruben Donato, "Children of the Harvest: The Schooling of Dustbowl and Mexican Migrants during the Depression Era," *Peabody Journal of Education* 67 (1990): 29-45.
30. Gonzalez, "Segregation of Mexican Children," 55-76.
31. Torres-Rouff, "Becoming Mexican," 102.
32. Gonzalez, "Segregation of Mexican Children," 55-76.
33. Torres-Rouff, "Becoming Mexican," 120-123.
34. *Ibid.*, 109.
35. Andres, "I am Almost More at Home," 72, 106-107.
36. Mendez, et al., v. Westminster School District, et al. [64 F. Supp. 544 (C.D. Cal. 1946), 161 F. 2d 774 (9th Cir. 1947)].
37. Brian P. Smentkowski, "Earl Warren," In *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
Encyclopedia Britannica.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Agency History, Department of Education Records, F3752: California State Archives, Secretary of State Office, Sacramento, California.

Carden, Georgiana. "Georgiana Carden Papers." University of California – Berkeley, Bancroft Library, 1920-46. in Weiler, Kathleen. "Schooling Migrant Children: California, 1920-1940." *History Workshop*, 1994, 117-42.

Coldwell, Clara. "Teaching the Children of Seasonal Workers." 1927. in Weiler, Kathleen. "Schooling Migrant Children: California, 1920-1940." *History Workshop*, 1994, 117-42.

Cooper, William John. "Biennial Report of the State Department of Education 1927-1928." 1928. in Weiler, Kathleen. "Schooling Migrant Children: California, 1920-1940." *History Workshop*, 1994, 117-42.

Chavez, Cesar in Terkel, Studs. *Hard Times: An Oral History of the Great Depression*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1970.

Dewey, John. "My Pedagogic Creed." *School Journal* 54, (1897): 77-80.

Kreps, Nora E. "Diary of a Schoolteacher in the Imperial Valley." *Survey of Race Relations Collection*, Box 25, Folder 57. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institute Archives, Stanford University, 1924.

New York Times (New York, NY). "Urgency of Americanization: Felix Warburg Discusses Methods of Dealing with the Foreign Born." July 6, 1919, 36.

Plyler, Superintendent, Tyler Independent School District v. Doe, 202 U.S. (1982).

Poole, Hazel B. "Americanizing the Teacher of English." *The English Journal* 16 (1927): 705-10.

Potter, Gladys. "Specific Suggestions for the Organization of Instruction in Emergency Schools." *California Journal of Elementary Education* 7, no.3 (1939): 134-48. in Weiler, Kathleen. "Schooling Migrant Children: California, 1920-1940." *History Workshop*, 1994, 117-42.

Richardson, Ethel. "Doing the Things That Shouldn't Be Done." *The Survey* 56 (1926): 298. in Andres Jr., Benny. "'I Am Almost More at Home with Brown Faces than with White:' An Americanization Teacher in Imperial Valley, California, 1923-1924." *Southern California Quarterly* 93, no. 1 (2011): 69-107.

San Jose Mercury Herald (San Jose, CA). "Principals' Club Meets in Gilroy: Will C. Wood Speaks to School Heads of Four Counties." 1922.

Secondary Sources

A History of Adult Education in California: From the Beginnings to the Twenty-First Century. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education, 2005.

Andres Jr., Benny. "'I Am Almost More at Home with Brown Faces than with White:' An Americanization Teacher in Imperial Valley, California, 1923-1924." *Southern California Quarterly* 93, no. 1 (2011): 69-107.

"Barriers to Educational Opportunities for Hispanics in the United States." In *Hispanics and the Future of America: National Research Council (US) Panel on Hispanics in the United States*. Edited by M. Tienda and F. Mitchell. Washington DC, US: National Academies Press, 2006.

Cooper, John Milton, Jr. *Pivotal Decades: The United States, 1900-1920*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 1990.

Gonzalez, Gilbert G. "Segregation of Mexican Children in a Southern California City: The Legacy of Expansionism and the American Southwest." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 16 (January 1985): 55-76.

Reisler, Mark. "Always the Laborer, Never the Citizen: Anglo

Perceptions of the Mexican Immigrant during the 1920s.”
Pacific Historical Review 45 (May 1976): 231-54.

Smentkowski, Brian P. “Earl Warren.” In *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
Encyclopedia Britannica.

Theobald, Paul, and Ruben Donato. “Children of the Harvest:
The Schooling of Dustbowl and Mexican Migrants during the
Depression Era.” *Peabody Journal of Education* 67 (1990): 29-45.

Torres-Rouff, David. “Becoming Mexican: Segregated Schools
and Social Scientists in Southern California, 1913-1946.”
Southern California Quarterly 94, no.1 (2012): 91-127.

Wade, Louise Carroll. “Settlement Houses.” In *Encyclopedia of Chicago*.
N.p.: Chicago Historical Society, 2005.

Weiler, Kathleen. “Corinne Seeds and the Avenue 21 School: Towards
a Sensuous History of Citizenship Education.” *Historical Studies in
Education*, 2002.

Weiler, Kathleen. “Schooling Migrant Children: California,
1920-1940.” *History Workshop*, 1994, 117-42.

Wiebe, Robert. *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*. New York, NY:
Hill and Wang, 1967.

