

Answers chapter 5 La Casa Blanca

1. titles of nobility
2. St. Denis; trade(money)
3. 10 years
4. San Antonio de Valero
5. two of the following: Apaches, “no-good” soldiers, lazy, unresponsive Indian “converts,”
6. Apaches
7. vaquero
8. Indians
9. Colorado and Brazos
10. $177 \times 0.125 = 22.125$ (\$22); much cheaper than American land
11. Juan Veramendi (vice-governor)
12. Erasmo Seguin
13. union with Coahuila (Texas was not a separate state)

Discussion/Essay

1. The rank the Canary Islanders now had caused problems; they expected to be the “noble” class, but there was no lower class to employ as labor.
2. The “normal” purpose of missionaries, that of conversion of the lost, is not sufficient as an answer here, although those friars who were sincere must have held that as an important goal. The overall purpose was more than conversion, it was assimilation into the Spanish feudal society. Americans tended to steal from, crowd out or even kill the native inhabitants of the land; the mental framework of the Spanish was quite different. They were conquistadors, bringing Spanish rule to the people living in an area. The place of Catholicism in Spanish society may have to be emphasized since our tradition of religious liberty makes such a concept foreign. It is important to bring out to the students the basic difference in thought here, and it may not be out of place to mention that placing Indians in a position of servitude is not necessarily worse than what the Americans have

done; that may be an interesting topic to discuss all by itself. The second part of the question is no, they did not succeed, or at best, only marginally.

3. This question has no “given” answer in the text; ask the students what they think. The most obvious conjecture which is brought out in the history books is that the Apaches were trying to play both sides against the middle. They had strong enemies to the north, the Comanches, and obviously were not at peace with the newcomers to the south. They were being crowded, having been pushed out of their former hunting grounds, but the Spanish were ignorant of this fact. The Apaches led the friars to a place within the territory of the Comanches. This fact speaks for itself.

4. Ranch life on the frontier broke down some of the rigidity of the feudal relationship. Practicality demanded that the Indian and mixed-blood vaqueros be mounted, and this gave them a freedom and prestige unknown in the south. It may also be mentioned that the difficulties of life on the frontier may have unified the ranch community in a way not known elsewhere in New Spain. But this is not necessary; it was not brought out in the text.

5. The Church, the military, and the upper-class Spaniards formed the essential power blocks in the society. The “most important difference” part of the question is an “opinion” question which may have several possible acceptable answers, as long as the student cogently forms his opinion.

One possibility has to do with the gospel. I have not brought this out in the text, but New Spain did not experience the great awakenings that the United States did. Perhaps there were some infusions of gospel light, it would be great to find out, but the gospel never permeated Mexico to the degree that it has done in the U.S. The gospel influences society, bringing light where there is darkness, knowledge instead of ignorance.

Another valid “difference” has to do with the fact that there was no educated citizenry. Many in the upper classes were very well educated, but the large mass of the country was not, in comparison to the U.S., where even simple farmers made sure their children knew how to read and write.

The tradition of self-government in the republican style is another thing Mexicans were lacking. They did not have the long tradition of the rule of law as the Englishman did, but were just coming out of a religious/feudal state.