

Rationalizing Racism: Arizona Representatives

Employment of Euphemisms for an Assault on Mexican American Studies

Maryam M. Shakir

University of Arizona

Summer Research Institute

### **Abstract**

This study details the political climate and logic priming the termination of Mexican American Studies in elementary and high school programs within the state of Arizona. The author applies conceptual content analysis and intertextuality to decode euphemisms incorporated by opponents of the program. Primary sources by the state's Attorney General Tom Horne and school board Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal are examined for rationales used in the elimination of a pedagogically empowering program for Latina/o students within Tucson Unified School District. Repetitive paradoxes in arguments against Mexican American Studies are found to have implicitly formed a threat to the majority. Reasoning in public statements by the aforementioned politicians and frames for discussion of the program are concluded to have appealed to mainstream audiences as a decoy from alternative motives of maintaining current power structures with Latina/os subjugated to lower socio-economic statuses compared to White counterparts.

Keywords: Mexican American Studies, education policy, Ethnic Studies, Tucson, race

#### **Introduction**

An increasing number of politicians have turned in studies on the contexts and issues concerning Ethnic Studies and Tucson Unified School District's (TUSD) Mexican American Studies. While data proving students underperformance in the state of Arizona compared to the vast majority of other states has been established, TUSD's students of color are consistently depicted as subpar in performance and crises in the traditional American school systems pedagogies compared to their White counterparts. School Board Superintendent John Huppenthal (2011) alludes to this dilemma up on a partial level in his Official Statement on TUSD violation:

“At the same time we work to bring the District into compliance in this regard, I will also strongly encourage TUSD officials to take this opportunity to review all of their schools' programs and curricula, particularly in their schools which primarily serve minority students. Schools serving these students are among the worst performing schools in Arizona. Their minority students' academic growth, year after year, substantially lags behind other TUSD schools and Arizona peers. This is unacceptable. Every child needs access to a quality public education, and these children are being underserved” (p. 2).

The department commonly referred to as Ethnic Studies, housing African American Studies, Pan Asian Studies, Native American Studies, and specific to this paper, La Raza or Mexican American Studies has been the source of much contention for

#### 4 ARIZONA REPRESENTATIVE'S RATIONALE FOR ATTACK ON MAS IN TUSD

---

the past decade or so, drawing criticism from Arizona State Attorney General Tom Horne and School Board Superintendent John Huppenthal. While Ethnic Studies as a whole has been condemned, it was in the year of 2006 overt attacks began on MAS specifically (2011).

A year prior to the bill essentially banning Ethnic Studies (HB2281) there was another by the name of Senate Bill 1070 which permits enforcement officers to pull suspected immigrants over where "reasonable suspicion exists" and arrest them in the case they do not have documentation on them (Senate Bill 1070, 2010). This bill festered hostility towards Latina/o people in particular for a number of reasons namely the profiling of Latinos it is said to promote due to the broadness in definition of "reasonable suspicion," and the growing number of Latina/a's in the state. SB 1070 may have had a role to play in the passage of HB 2281, released in May 11, 2010 and designed by the Arizona House of Representatives prior to any audit or sit in of the class by the legislators.

Despite the existing body of literature in this area, substantial research on the rationales articulated by those representing the opposition parties is ostensible at best. Evidence remains to be analyzed in order to complete considerations of implications Horne and Huppenthal use to discriminate against MAS and get away with is in power-discourse circles. A thorough examination of the language in primary texts such as editorials, and findings of noncompliance by Horne and Huppenthal regarding Mexican American Studies must occur, although proponents offer valuable insight vital making self-sustaining estimations on any side of the ideological bases of the issue.

### *What's so controversial? MAS Offerings*

Cammarota and Romero (2009) contextualize the engagement exhibited by Mexican American Studies subjects by examining the conceptual underpinnings driving the MAS program. They propose that it is through the threefold process of Critically Compassionate Intellectualism in educational frameworks that these students of color are able to achieve insurmountable progress in school. This process encompasses Critical Pedagogy, based on Freire's (2002) *Pedagogy of The Oppressed* (2000) and the knowledge of student's "perception of themselves as oppressed [sic] impaired by their submersion in the reality of oppression" (p. 27) and the remedy of each individual captivating back the right to "say his or her own word, to name the world" (p. 33). Cacho (2010) goes on to reinforces Freire in maintaining that multifaceted US history is not enough, and that "struggles for social justice have to go beyond 'keepin it real,' they need to 'make it surreal'" (Cacho p. 34), becoming multidimensional. The prior quote enforces the necessity to not only to analytically examine the past and present, but the crucial component of vision to offer and enact solutions to social issues for the future. Cacho couches this claim in her description of academic legitimacy for cohorts, and appraisers of academia alike. Authentic Caring largely originates from Valenzuela's (1999) conceptualization of students not being blank slates, but teachers seeing students outside of school and utilizing culture as an asset, with students active in this process (p. 7, 38, 40). Cacho (2010) legitimizes this emotion in academic settings for students and teachers of Ethnic Studies despite popular put downs of such teaching methods acknowledging preexisting feelings that are conjured to such curriculum (Cacho, 28). The third component Critically Compassionate Intellectualism is Social Justice Content, essential to enforcing educators to probe beyond the surface of social problems, *with* instead of *for* students, in a culturally relevant manner (Cammarota and Romero p. 22).

Caberra, Meza, Romero, and Roderiguez (2013) vie for counter narratives to the retired rhetoric of student-led activism in the defense of Ethnic Studies as trite rebellion done in naivety with the support of Freire's theories. Through the incorporation of Cammarota and Romero's *Critical Compassion* (2009) on the part of teachers, MAS pupils are explained as having developed a transformative resistance to oppressive institutions. Individual professors, teachers, and students involved in the struggle for freedom from construed images of their progress (p. 5, 7, 8). These counter narratives provide context amidst muddled coverage of the MAS. This context is for the benefit of scholars nationally as well as any interested in explicit empirical evidence for the existence of storylines outside the opposition's.

### *HB 2281 and Analyses of Perceived Threat of MAS*

In order to examine the disparity in Tucson Unified School District's (TUSD) Ethnic Studies courses representation by Attorney General Tom Horne and State Superintendent of Public instruction John Huppenthal context is necessary. That context is thoroughly given in "Assault on Ethnic Studies" by coauthors O'Leary, Romero, Cabrera and Rascon (2011), describing the proposed HR 4437, Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act a year prior mass protest in response to legislation, with a sizeable amount of youth participation and drawing on that which is essential to the examination of the Ethnic Studies education policy debates in Tucson: the hostile socio-political rhetoric priming the resentment toward the MAS classes. The controversy began in 2006 when Dolores Huerta gave a speech on what seemed to be a pebble in the shoes of Attorney General Tom Horne and later Superintendent John Huppenthal. According to above authors, word reached Horne that Huerta, declared that "Republicans hate Latinos" at a Tucson Magnet high school assembly in a speech (p. 98), and a reprimand took place on the part of Republican Horne particularly in the form of

Deputy Superintendent, Margaret Garcia Dugan, who shares the party affiliation of Horne and the ethnicity of her subjects, but did not allow questions. The students resisted by turning their backs on the deputy literally, and it was following this stage Arizona's attorney general drafted his first call for the dissemination of Ethnic Studies, citing Mexican American Studies teachers and curriculum as the cause of 'students act[ing] rudely...in defiance of authority' (Horne, 2007 p. 7). HB 2281 designated the Mexican American Studies, (for abbreviation purposes in this article we will refer to them as MAS) classes as unconstitutional and as a result MAS classes and curriculum were banned by the state of Arizona. Prior research by Orozco (2011) concerning how this supposition sustains its contention in the face of academic achievement contribute tremendously to the fields growing segment of literature on the subject, in addition to Simpson (2009) who thoroughly analyzes Horne's Open Letter to the Citizens of Tucson.

Michael W. Simpson (2009) analyzes Tom Horne's primary attack on Ethnic Studies in An Open Letter to the Citizens of Tucson, an initial appeal to ethos and logos for the elimination of MAS. At the core of Horne's reasoning is what Simpson describes as

“[t]he denial of racism in society...essential to the strategy of denying charges of racism as figments of imagination and that those who allege such are in fact the intolerant persons who see racism everywhere. Horne exhibits this by alleging that ethnic studies is racist by using the euphemism that they teach ‘a kind of destructive ethnic chauvinism’” (p. 8)

This ‘ethnic chauvinism’ is framed as fanatical and rooted in ‘an almost totalitarian climate of fear’, progressive ideology, etc. as well as a consistent referral of himself, his deputy

his party affiliates, and 'them' (9) highlighting in and out-groups (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 57) Simpson describes as constructing through narrative structures and storytelling. Simpson also details the misappropriation of Dr. Martin Luther Kings "I Have a Dream Speech," conflicting with the context of King's message in the previous and proceeding statements and the overall theme of the March being a start as opposed to a finish (p. 17). This kind of appropriation is characteristic of the "contemporary racism is its denial" (Van Dijk, 1992). This denial, channeled into privileged discourse circles then works to paint a picture of those who acknowledge race head on as a frightening other (p. 23).

Orozco (2012) analyzed how Tom Horne's language in legislative hearings operated opposition toward the classes enough to pass HB2281. Through critical discourse analysis and Van Dijk's concept of discourse-power circle, Orozco argues Horne's privileged access empowered him with the ability to sway the political power base, tap into, and pass HB2281. Orozco bolsters the antagonistic discourse "vis-a-vis Mexican ethnics in 2010 and TUSD's Mexican American/Raza Studies program" (p. 2), supporting the sentiment that Mexican American Studies is essentially "anti-American" (p. 10) also primed the application of the aforementioned actions.

Cabrera (2012) builds on Orozco's findings, maintaining that the only acceptable form of multiculturalism for Tom Horne is one that denies the existence of contemporary racism. This functions as a state mandated epistemology of ignorance (Cabrera, p. 132). From March 2<sup>nd</sup> to May 2<sup>nd</sup> in 2011 Cambium Learning, a National Education research group was commissioned by the state to do a curriculum audit of some TUSD's MAS classes primarily to verify whether the program was in compliance with HB2281 in a one-hundred twenty page document detailing everything from AIMS scores of the school over all and MAS students alone, to teaching

methodologies and so on. While auditors failed to find any violations of ARS 15-112, Superintendent Huppenthal found MAS out of compliance because “reviewed materials present only one perspective of historical events--that of the Latino people being persecuted, oppressed, and subjugated by the ‘hegemony’ otherwise known in this material as White America” (Huppenthal, 2011) and a plethora of other reasoning’s largely centered on the illegitimate nature of the role of holistic education that acknowledges and even encourages emotion in a way that supports education. Cacho (2010) touches on the tireless apprehension on the part of MAS opponents through their unrealistic demands that United States history be taught neutrally. She corroborates this demand fallible in that truthful record of human agency necessarily records human culpability (p. 34). These pieces are authored in order to create collective comprehension of the manner in which these classes have been invalidated by major politicians. These articles assist in analyzing a perceived threat classes that incited a passion rarely realized in Tucsonan and national citizens of the United States, in particular, members of education branches, their students, and governmental agencies. This analysis assists in further satisfying a gap in the literature detailing the historic discrimination of politics in the city of Tucson against Latina/os beneath a buffer of repetitive euphemisms.

### *Impact*

The previous encounters and others were notably sited in perhaps the most encompassing of the literature: Sleeter (2011) commissioned by the National Education Association to offer comprehensive insight into the Ethnic Studies curriculum in order to generate fresh outlooks on the relationship amid achievement and Ethnic Studies. She too reflects the success of Ethnic Studies in garnering not just students of color’s full academic potential but also White Students who are also compelled to critically analyze their veracities and apply those to inventive action

(p. 8, 16). It is interesting to note she too infers Cammorota and Rommero's Critically Compassionate Intellectualism (2009) is crucial well taught Ethnic Studies curriculum (p. 20).

*In A social justice approach to achievement: Guiding Latina/o students toward educational attainment with a challenging, socially relevant curriculum* by Cammarota (2007) 93% of students from his experimental Social Justice Education Project expressed gratification in terms of academic engagement, community involvement, college interest and social awareness (p.90-94). In the same manner, Cammarota, Romero, and Arce (2009) reflect this success where opinions of teachers are also engaged in a critically reflective pedagogy resulting in an increased fluidity in classes and achievement for Latino students (p. 222), i.e. "If students see their teachers as human beings, they are more likely to invest their humanistic capital in that teacher" (p. 223), freeing both from the historic dehumanization of degrading, traditional classroom settings by validation of a mutual and authentic relation of culture. The aforementioned, comprehensive cohesiveness is achieved and targeted toward the empowerment of marginalized communities within them, namely, Latina/o students and educators, prompting contemplation of why these classes are discussed as threat to representatives as opposed to an innovative asset.

When contemplated in light of one another, the prior articles present a fascinating thread of questions virtually unexplored pertaining to MAS programs in TUSD. While Orozco points to frames of 'threat' employed by local politicians transformative youth resistance and the School of Ethnic Studies goes further in presenting a counter narrative to the negative opposition to Raza studies student's passion and defense for the classes. Cacho reinforces both pieces with the validation of emotion in classroom settings and in fact encouraging it as a symbol of genuine components of learning and growth. Freire is the core reading behind all theories in this realm of research however all of above articles and findings are essential to research seeking to rejoiner

how despite the glut of achievements Mexican American Studies incited in school, it could be framed as deleterious and pitilessly prosecuted by politicians Horne and Huppenthal

### **Methods**

Santa Ana precludes Brown Tide Rising with the consideration that, “[t]his is an inquiry into how the general public so readily accepted this irrelevant viewpoint. This book does not center on history or ethics, but on language” (Santa Ana, 2002, p. 7), in a similar manner, this article’s methodology is focused on exploring the logic of two representatives at the forefront of Arizonan institutions responsible for the abolishment of MAS, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Horne (2003-2010) and Huppenthal (2011-present) with content analysis. The foundation for this method delineated in italicized portions.

#### *Data being analyzed*

The following will be investigated, Findings of Noncompliance: Finding By The State Superintendent Of Public Instruction Of Violation By Tucson Unified School District Pursuant To A.R.S. § 15-112(B), Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal’s Official Statement on TUSD Violation of A.R.S. §15-112, Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal Rules Tucson Unified School District Out of Compliance, Statement of Superintendent of Public Instruction John Huppenthal on Administrative Law Judge’s Decision that the Tucson Unified School District’s Mexican American Studies Program is in Violation, Opinion Editorials Horne Takes to Task Raza Studies Teachers, Race-Based Studies Can’t Be Justified, and the transcript from Huppenthal’s interview on the Bill Buckmaster Exhibit.

It can be inferred the level of this researches analysis will be relatively shallow because of the plethora of data being utilized and the number of angles they could be examined with.

### *How concepts are distinguished*

Because the focus of this research is on rationales, the context various adjectives are placed in for condescending MAS teachers, students and curriculum is presented based on existence rather than frequency although all concepts are reoccurring. In particular, coding based on intertextuality was channeled to create greater meaning of concepts presented. The adjectives presented will are coded as both explicit and implicit; implicit being euphemistic in nature, or implied and explicit being denotative in nature, i.e., stated. All adjectives used for the previously outlined are negative in denotation and are applied in general terms i.e. "hypocrisy" can be derivative of "hypocrite" and vice versa.

### *Boundaries of the analysis*

The general guidelines for concept analysis are to be adhered to for a greater cohesion in conclusions. Irrelevant information is limited in this particular studies' conceptual analysis as nearly all words and phrases within the data build up to a greater argument and concept underlying that rationale. Therefore, 'irrelevant' information primarily equates to the weaker arguments that and concepts realized; they will be incorporated in a broad fashion when concluding findings of stronger rationales. While intertextuality involves integrating what Orozco (2011) designates as "words and phrases, be they quotes or allusions, from a given text to other passages, written or oral" (p. 6), conceptual content analysis is largely based on selective reduction in search of patterns.

### *Target of the inferences*

Analysis emerging from this data will strengthen research in the discipline surrounding the attacks against the MAS program on the part of key statesmen and the underlying rhetorical

strategies of Horne and Huppenthal’s elimination of the valued MAS in choosing not to confront glaring data outlining the benefits of MAS curriculum.

*Analysis of MAS Student Proponents As Depicted By Horne & Huppenthal:*

Table A. 1

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Impressionable	explicit
<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Rude	explicit
Racist	implicit
Uncivil	implicit
Threatening	implicit

Both Horne and Huppenthal’s authoritarian propagation of Freire’s (2000) Banking Concept of education is apparent through comments made on Mexican American Studies students, most notably when Horne (2011) itemizes:

“All these kinds of racist propaganda are fed to young and impressionable students, who swallow them whole, as illustrated by the rude behavior of some students during an address by Margaret Garcia Dugan and subsequent demonstrations. The education they are receiving, to deal with disagreements in an uncivil manner, will be dysfunctional for them as adults” (p.9).

Characteristic to Freire’s (2000) Banking Concept of education is that of students being like empty receptacles solely to be filled or invested in with little to know active contribution to

their depository mode of instruction (p. 53). Subsequent arguments for actions deemed immoral on the part of MAS students are therefore attributed to teachers and the MAS curriculum, and therefore many if not all adjectives for students by Arizona representatives of our analysis are essentially interchangeable with analyses of adult proponents and MAS curriculum. Mexican American Students are depicted in a similar euphemistic manner as their older counterparts; because of this much of the previous observations of Professor Rodriguez’s and MAS teachers is applied to the students in a round a bout method. In this way the focus is taken completely off of the student’s rights and successes the program empowered them with.

*Analysis of MAS Adult Proponents As Depicted By Horne & Huppenthal:*  
Table A. 2

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Hypocritical	explicit

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Dysfunctional	implied
Failing	explicit
Un-American	implicit
Racist	implicit
Irresponsible	implicit
Communist	implicit

Perhaps the most solid sources for conceptual analysis emerged from opinion editorials, specifically in Tom Horne’s “Race-based studies can’t be justified” (2012) which is somewhat of a retort to adult proponents of MAS studies. The subject for our initial analysis of Horne’s

argument against adult proponents of MAS is Roberto Rodriguez, an Assistant Professor of color at the University of Arizona's Department of Mexican American Studies and "longtime-award-winning journalist/columnist" (University of Arizona College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2013). Horne opens his opinion editorial touting Rodriguez should "get Hypocrisy of the Year Award for his column" (2012) for describing the injustice in the demonization MAS program. Within the first sentence of the editorial an explicit adjective is utilized to premise his logic for the distaste the average audience should have for the program and its proponents via an appeal to ethos. The proceeding adjective serves as a multi-level descriptor to further the premise of Horne's argument describing MAS program as "teaching ethnic chauvinism" or descriptively "ethnically chauvinistic." Under the mere umbrella of MAS, it can be inferred our subject is referring to MAS student proponents, curriculum, and adult proponents outside the program, including Professor Rodriguez. Ethnic chauvinism is described by Horne (2007) as "Teaching people to make their primary personal identity the ethnic group they were born into rather than identifying as an individual in terms of character and ability" (2013). Horne particularly ascribes proponents of MAS to 'ethnic' chauvinism, which using his definition to understand would mean, "an attitude of superiority toward members of the opposite" ethnicity (2013). Despite the nebulous nature of Horne's label 'Ethnic chauvinism,' it can be inferred denotatively to mean racist and thus unjust. In this way adult proponents of MAS such as Professor Rodriguez are depicted as hypocritical within the frame Horne categorizes them in i.e. "ethnically chauvinistic."

Another instance of proponents such as Rodriguez's 'hypocritical' description is based on the idea of MAS as failing not just ideologically by socially as well. When elaborating on Rodriguez's column, Horne quotes him as saying (in reference to HB 2281) "the process that led

to the dismantling of MAS was “but a metaphorical attempted assassination against an entire culture” (2012) then follows with “[n]o professor. You get an F on that one” (2012). This display of condensing rhetoric asserts that a man who has gone through a certified Mexican American Studies PhD program, published, taught, and progressed far along enough in his career to earn title of ‘Professor’ somehow is failing in his area of expertise of MAS and as a person of color in a higher education position. Horne furthers this distracting argument of proponents like Rodríguez as ‘hypocritical’ in ascertaining, in allusion to HB 2281 “This law affirms the fundamental American value that we are all individuals, that what is important is our knowledge and character, and not what race we were born into, and that students should be taught to treat each other as individuals, rather than based on race” (2012). Placed strategically after a statement of Rodriguez failing, Horne argues Rodriguez is not only dysfunctional in his personal comprehension of MAS, but is interpretation of American law and essentially as an American citizen, and oxymoron for a person of his caliber, rendering him incredible by faulty association.

*MAS Program As Depicted By Horne & Huppenthal:*

Table A.3

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Racist	implicit
<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Category</b>
Resentful	explicit
Propaganda	explicit
Conspiring	implicit
Separatist	explicit
Anti- American	implicit

---

Marxist	explicit
Anti-white	implicit
Alienating	implicit
Intimidating	explicit

---

Perhaps most crucial to the analysis of justifications for findings of noncompliance are those found for (ARS) §15-112 (4) and his theoretical support of individualism. Horne is especially adamant about this point, continually citing a trip he made as a teen to the march on Washington where he exhausts the same misappropriated quip from Dr. Martin Luther King's I Have a Dream speech. As discussed on p. 7 of this study, and in analysis by Simpson (2007) of Horne's Open Letter to the Citizens of Tucson, this faulty parallelism on the part of Horne is crucial to the dismantling of MAS where Simpson notes "King recognized the hypocrisy of Whites denying the assistance they have received from the government while telling others to do so without government (p. 12). Not long after the "I Have a Dream" speech, King said his dream was turning into a nightmare" (p. 13) because people of color were still disparate in fundamental American institutions such as schools where African-American children were taught "sixty ways to despise himself" and the "white child" 134 ways to adore himself, and thereby perpetuate his false sense of superiority" (p.13). Horne (2012) denies the reality of Dr. King's meaning when he cites HB2281 as affirming the "Fundamental American value that we are all individuals, that what is important is our knowledge and character, and not what race we were born into, and that students should be taught to treat each other as individuals, rather than based on race" (p. 1) which is the opposite of what Dr. King promoted. There is little need for delineation on the crux of Horne's rationale on what the fundamental, ideological wrong the department of discussion

had committed was, as it is elaborated on via his own intertextuality without ever having to really outright state his stance logically on the issue.

Horne (2010) elaborates on this threat to the 'fundamental American value' by appealing to the White mainstream, in as euphemistic a manner as possible, that their power structures are being threatened. He speaks through Ward, an exception to the average MAS teacher who he specifies as a Latino to qualify his prejudiced accusations of MAS. Horne alludes to MAS promoting an "Anti-capitalist and anti-Western Civilization ideology" with "Ethnic solidarity as their vehicle of delivery" against what they are 'programed' to believe is "a White power structure to suppress them and regulate them to second-class existence"(p.5). When citing written materials he consistently refers to Pedagogy of the Oppressed where Freire is vehemently referred to as a 'Brazilian Marxist' by both Horne and Huppenthal and Critical Race theory as "question[ing] the very foundation of the liberal order" (9) which Europeans are known to have "carved out in the empty wilderness which Indians were a part...and the lesser races have been moved aside for superior European" (Huggins, 1995, pp.181-82). It is clear he is appealing to the majority, White people when he states "[u]nfortunately I am not the only one to have been intimidated by the Raza studies department in this way" (p. 5). The way he is referring to is the traditional Western socio-economic scheme where primarily White upper class dominates the people of color politically, and that MAS threatens that power structure with alternative forms of government such as Marxist ones, a cliché conservative red scare tactic.

Inherent to Huppenthal's statements of TUSD's MAS program violations are his own partialities to a certain form of education and curriculum that contradicts cyclical logic employed in the termination of MAS. Before even diving into his statement on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Huppenthal (2011) admits "While I have read superintendent Horne's finding of violations by

TUSD, I have not had the opportunity to review all the facts and evidence he has compiled in this matter and, therefore, will not prematurely comment on specifics” (p. 1) proceeded with “[d]espite clear evidence to the contrary, the Board insisted that the program in question was already in compliance” (2011, p.1). The premise of Huppenthal’s rhetorical strategies is support of Horne’s repetitive and paradoxical descriptions of the program, even admitting he has yet to read even his colleague’s facts, and professing to not have specific comments on curriculum/pedagogical violations on the part of the MAS program.

As the new Superintendent of Public Instruction Huppenthal sponsors an investigation by the Arizona Department of Education to present a summary of reasons MAS curriculum violated (ARS) §15-112 (outlined below)

“A school district or charter school in this state shall not include in its Program of instruction any courses or classes that include any of the following:

1. Promote overthrowing the U.S. government;
2. Promote resentment towards a race or class of people;
3. Are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic race; and
4. Advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of pupils as individuals.”(HB 2281, 1-4 p. 1)

Despite admission of a disparity in curriculum materials reviewed (p. 1) Huppenthal submits “the limited materials the auditors reviewed and materials submitted to ADE contained content promoting resentment towards a race or class of people” (p.2) which he calls clear violations of the statute. The logic essentially references reviewed materials that he implies is

one-sided in that they only present one perspective, “that of Latino people being persecuted, oppressed and subjugated by the “hegemony” – or white America”(p. 2). This sentiment is later echoed literally and metaphorically by Horne (2012) with “[s]chool is a place to broaden horizons, not narrow them. And students should be taught to treat others as individuals, and not on the basis of race” (p. 2). These assumptions of how and what MAS students ‘should’ be taught present a paradoxical appeal to ethos that, as O’Leary, Romero, Cabrera and Rascon (2011) assert “[i]s decidedly authoritarian in that it assumes local school districts are not capable of oversight and implementation of local programs, and thus require direct supervision by state officials” (p. 104). Apple (2009) reiterates “school districts throughout the country are constantly looking over their shoulders, worried that their... programs will be challenged by the forces of the authoritarian right” (p. 242).

Huppenthal continues with this contradictory rationale primarily by citing the MAS section on TUSD’s website and target demographic as indicating it is “[d]esigned primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group-Latino students” (2011, p. 2) which is a violation of the previously established ARS § 15-112 A (3). Because the MAS department website states its formation is as Horne explains “explicitly directed toward Latino students” (p. 2) and designed to “enhance the academic success of Latino students” (p. 2), it defies the state’s standards. This directly conflicts with a description on the Bill Buckmaster show transcript (2011) referring to curriculum development as “week-by-week, through the entire process, what are they supposed to know, what kind of materials are coming into the classroom...large support staff that can detail the curriculum” (p. 3), essentially a “public input process might go back and forth as they look that over and the citizens would talk about whether it’s appropriate or not” (p. 4). Buckmaster even raises the concern of ‘folks’ confused over his findings of noncompliance in

MAS curriculum without having looked at the actual curriculum and an audit that concluded MAS classes compliance with ARS § 15-112 (p. 2). Based on this more holistic approach Huppenthal purports it would follow Huppenthal would verify this suspicion with confronting the support staff, sticking with the audit that actually outlined the literature utilized in the classes, and getting public input, including that of those actually in the city of Tucson and preferably of some relation to the class, rather than merely citing a few sentences on the success of the program under contention electronically with no interpersonal action. Based on the 'findings' of Tom Horne, and a few sections on the Mexican American Studies program's website a slippery slope rationale for MAS's erroneousness ensues on Huppenthal's behalf. In focusing on MAS as a singular piece of the Ethnic Studies program and failing to provide solid evidence outside of that particular department's website Huppenthal assumes that there is cognitive unity across the board in communication (Santa Ana, 2002, p. 27, 28) and portrays Mexican American studies as more threatening than other Ethnic Studies departments.

### **Discussion**

In our primary methodology source Santa Ana (2002) summarizes "[i]n coarse terms, the public was reminded to put Mexicans in their place." (p. 7). Through Supt. Huppenthal and the Arizona State Attorney General's repetitive, and euphemistic arguments against a program found in compliance, red herrings occurred as a decoy from alternative motives of continuing "business as usual," with Brown children's ongoing fill of watered down versions of education. Despite many slippery slope implications employed in the attack of Mexican American Studies, inferences and explicit statements on the part of the two Arizonan representatives alike emerge to unveil deceitful reasoning to the public for this upward battle on the part of Arizona's education system against a particular city's school district, Tucson.

The following rationales promoting the programmatic elimination of MAS were extracted from the transcripts including but not limited to; associating race consciousness with racism, red scare tactics, misappropriations of Martin Luther King Jr.'s words, all in the form of euphemisms to create a red herring for their general logic: to incite a general fear in America's general population and foundational in-group; those of Anglo-Saxon origin. Student responses and outcomes are limited to those of their instructors and curriculums 'programing' taking the focus off of what really matters, the upward mobility of majority minority schools whose academic growth every year, as Huppenthal (2011) proclaims "substantially lags behind other TUSD schools and Arizona peers" and is "unacceptable" (p. 2) despite the positive academic changes MAS was proving to promote in TUSD. Reasoning in public statements by the aforementioned politicians and frames for discussion of the program are concluded to have appealed to mainstream audiences as a decoy from alternative motives of maintaining current power structures with Latina/os subjugated to lower socio-economic statuses compared to White counterparts in education.

Santa Ana (2002) again offers insight into the paradoxes frequently used in American political discourse referencing people of Latina/o descent, "[e]ver since the declaration of Independence, America has manifested a schizophrenic personality on the question of race. She has been torn between selves-a self in which she has proudly professed democracy and a self in which she has sadly practiced the antithesis of democracy. . . . Indeed, segregation and discrimination are strange paradoxes in a nation founded on the principle that all men are created equal" (p. 127). The Arizona state representatives of our discussion employ this very same contradictory tactic in eliminating a structure they see as threatening the norm of tolerance by bringing attention to unjust in-group political practices. These claims are substantiated through

intertextuality and concept analysis for a greater transparency in the objectives of authoritarian and rhetorically deceptive politicians.

### References

Cammarota, Julio, and Augustine Romero. "The Social Justice Education Project: A Critically Compassionate Intellectualism for Chicana/o Students." *Handbook of social justice in education* (2009): 465-476.

Cammarota, J. (2007). A Social Justice Approach to Achievement: Guiding Latina/o Students Toward Educational Attainment with a Challenging, Socially Relevant Curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(1), 87-96.

Cacho, Lisa Marie. "But Some Of Us Are Wise: Academic Illegitimacy And The Affective Value Of Ethnic Studies." *Black Scholar* 40.4 (2010): 28. *MAS Ultra - School Edition*. Web. 19 June 2013.

Cabrera, N. L. (2012). A State-Mandated Epistemology of Ignorance: Arizona's HB2281 and Mexican American/Raza Studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 9(2), 132-135.

Cabrera, N. L. (2013). "If there is no struggle, there is no progress": Transformative youth resistance and the School of Ethnic Studies. *The Urban Review*.

Cabrera, N. L., Milem, J. F., & Marx, R. W. (2012). *An empirical analysis of the effects of Mexican American Studies participation on student achievement within Tucson Unified School District*. Tucson, AZ: Report to Special Master Dr. Willis D. Hawley on the

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory*. NYU Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Routledge.

- Horne, T. (2007). Horne Takes Task to Raza Studies Teachers. The Arizona Daily Star. Retrieved July 10, 2013 from [http://azstarnet.com/news/opinion/horne-takes-to-task-raza-studies-teachers/article\\_421ecc35-1ca5-5899-a761-fc20839619df.html](http://azstarnet.com/news/opinion/horne-takes-to-task-raza-studies-teachers/article_421ecc35-1ca5-5899-a761-fc20839619df.html)
- Horne, T. (2010). Findings by the state superintendent of public instruction of violation by Tucson Unified School District pursuant to A.R.S.§15-112(B). Retrieved July 1, 2013 from <http://www.azag.gov/issues/TUSD%20%20Ethnic%20Studies%20Findings.pdf>
- Horne, T. (2010). Findings by the state superintendent of public instruction of violation by Tucson Unified School District pursuant to A.R.S.§15-112(B). Retrieved July 1, 2013 from <http://www.azag.gov/issues/TUSD%20%20Ethnic%20Studies%20Findings.pdf>.
- Horne, T. (2012). Race-based studies can't be justified. The Arizona Republic. Retrieved July 25, 2013 from <http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/opinions/articles/2012/06/07/20120607race-based-studies-horne.html>
- Huppenthal, J. (2011). *Official statement of Superintendent of Public Instruction*. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.
- Huppenthal J. (2011). *John Huppenthal on his determination regarding the Tucson Unified School District's violation of A.R.S.§15-112*. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.
- Huppenthal J. (2011). Exhibit D.Huppenthal Buckmaster Transcript of June 21 2011 Buckmaster Show. Tucson, AZ.

- Huppenthal, J. (2012, January 6). TUSD Mexican American Studies violations of A.R.S.§15-112. Retrieved May 10, 2012 from <http://tucsoncitizen.com/Perspectives/135/press-releases/2012/01/06/huppenthal-tusd%E2%80%99s-mexican-americanstudies-program-is-in-clear-violation-of-a-r-s-%C2%A7-15-112/>  
Downloaded by [University of Arizona] at 14:51 23 July 2013
- O'Leary, A. O., Romero, A. J., Cabrera, N. L., & Rascon, M. (2012). Assault on ethnic studies. *Arizona firestorm: Global realities, national media and provincial politics*, 97-120.
- Orozco, R. A. (2012). Racism and Power Arizona Politicians' Use of the Discourse of Anti-Americanism Against Mexican American Studies. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 34(1), 43-60.
- Romero, A., Arce, S., & Cammarota, J. (2009). A barrio pedagogy: Identity, intellectualism, activism, and academic achievement through the evolution of critically compassionate intellectualism. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 12(2), 217-233.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American public discourse*. U of Texas Press.
- Simpson, M. W. (2009). Tom Horne, Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction Verse Tucson Unified School District's Ethnic Studies: A Critical Discourse Study. Available at SSRN 1372387.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2011). The Academic and Social Value of Ethnic Studies.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: US-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Suny Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Van Dijk, T. (1986). *Discourse, racism and ideology*. Tenerife, Spain: RCEI.

Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and the denial of racism*. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)(pp. 506-520). New York: Routledge.