

LANGUAGE WARS: THE IDEOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE DEBATES ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

René Galindo
University of Colorado at Denver

ABSTRACT

The debates over the future of bilingual education call for conceptual frameworks that can illuminate the variety of issues that are implicated in those debates. Building from the fields of sociology of language, language policy, and language ideology, a conceptual framework is presented and employed in the analysis of the ideological debates, occurring in Colorado and California. The analysis is concerned with the identification of different ideological positions regarding the value of bilingualism and bilingual education, the Spanish language, and the linguistic capital of working-class Latino-immigrant families. The debates are seen as competition for value between different constituencies that take place through the manipulation of symbolic assets such as language(s), and in which Latino parents are displaced from their position as legitimate participants in their children's education through the devaluing of their linguistic capital.

Language and immigration are important policies closely associated with the Latino population in the public discourse carried out through the media. Latino community members and others have been active at every level of government addressing concerns in these two areas including educational, social, and political access (Schmidt, 1997). These two areas have recently been brought together in educational policy debates over the future of bilingual education. Across the United States, school districts and states are reconsidering their support for bilingual education programs, and some areas are even making efforts to eliminate bilingual education programs. In one example discussed in this paper, the Orange County Unified School District petitioned the California State Board of Education for permission to dismantle their bilingual education program in favor of an English as a Second Language approach and received permission over the summer of 1997 (National Public Radio, 1997). These national trends aimed at dismantling bilingual education come at a time when other minority rights are also being challenged, as illustrated by anti-affirmative action and anti-immigrant California initiatives.

The state of California took the lead in these national trends by passing the anti-immigrant Proposition 187 in 1994 and the anti-affirmative action Proposition 209 in 1996. The California English-Only initiative which passed in 1986 as Proposition 63 was the first installment of the language wars. It was the first Official English measure passed by ballot initiative. Included in Proposition 63 is a provision allowing anyone living or doing business in the state to sue state or local governments for actions that diminish or ignore the role of English

as the common language of the State of California. The anti-bilingual education Proposition 227, passed in June of 1998, was the second installment of the language wars.

Proposition 227 called "English for the Children," passed in 1998, mandates instruction in English and also requires parents to sign a special request for bilingual education. Envisioning that California would again take the lead in the culture and language wars, spokesperson Ron Unz—a software millionaire and unsuccessful candidate in the 1994 Republican gubernatorial primary—stated, "We hope this sounds the death knell for bilingual programs in other states as well" ("Next Big Push" p. 5). Under this new proposition, linguistic minority students undergo a transitional year of instruction in "sheltered English immersion" before being placed in English-only classrooms. Parents who request a waiver must annually submit their request in writing and the waivers must be approved by the superintendent under guidelines to be established by local boards of education and the State Board of Education. Waivers might be granted if a student already knows English, the student is ten years old or older, or the student has emotional, physical, psychological, or educational special needs and has been in an English language classroom for at least 30 days.

Proposition 227 characterizes bilingual education as a failed experimental program that wastes financial resources. While highlighting the role of English as the national language and the importance of English literacy, nothing is stated regarding the value of bilingualism. Attacks against bilingual education have been interpreted as attacks against the Latino community that are intended to devalue one of its primary symbolic assets - the Spanish language. Efforts to eliminate bilingual education, such as Proposition 227, and language restrictionist policies, such as Proposition 63, reflect a shift to language-based discrimination as Woolard & Schieffelin (1994) note, "symbolic revalorization often makes discrimination on linguistic grounds publicly acceptable, whereas corresponding ethnic or racial discrimination is not" (p. 62).

Current debates over the future of bilingual education call for the development of analytic frameworks that can contribute to a better understanding of the variety of issues involved in the debates. The main purpose of this essay is to contribute to the development of such a framework with a special concern for the analysis of the ideological dimensions of the debates especially as they are revealed in the public discourse in the debates. The utility of the framework will be illustrated through the analysis of examples from debates over the future of bilingual education. A primary contribution of this essay is the distillation of important concepts from a range of research fields that can be useful in understanding the sociopolitical and ideological dimensions of the debates.

In this article, I analyze competing public discourses surrounding bilingual education by examining the ideological assumptions that serve as the basis for the positions developed in support of or in opposition to bilingual education, because the ideological dimensions of the debates warrant examination in

order to make apparent underlying values, attitudes, and beliefs. I begin with a brief discussion of ideology and language ideology, followed by a presentation of Bourdieu's views on language politics and language and symbolic power. His views contribute to understanding the debates on bilingual education as the competition for value between different communities that takes place through the manipulation of symbolic assets such as language(s). A discussion of language policy follows that places the debates over bilingual education within a broader framework for understanding sociopolitical issues related to language in general. It also presents Ruiz's (1984) heuristic for the analysis of debates over the roles of language(s) in a multilingual society.

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY

Ideologies are systems of ideas that function to create views of reality that appear as the most rational view; a view that is based on "common sense" notions of how the social world ought to be. Although presented as the basis for rational constructions of reality, ideologies operate on the basis of values, beliefs, and attitudes - what may be termed unexamined assumptions - that make problematic the controlled comparisons of competing perspectives of reality in everyday discourse such as in newspaper articles. The rationality debates in the social sciences have demonstrated this difficulty (Dallmayr & McCarthy, 1977). One exception may be public debates although hidden assumptions and attitudes are rarely made explicit during debates. Rather, ideologies are usually employed in everyday life in the establishment and institutionalization of privileged interpretations of reality that can be used to challenge and dominate divergent points of views--other ideologies. The persuasive force of ideologies that ground debates on taken-for-granted assumptions lead to Gardiner's (1992) views that ideology is "intimately connected with the art of rhetoric--the ability to persuade through emotive phrases or force of conviction rather than rational argumentation" (p. 125). In addition, he cites Ricoeur (1981) to illustrate the taken-for-granted manner in which ideologies operate. "An ideology is operative and not thematic. It operates behind our backs, rather than appearing as a theme before our eyes. We think from it rather than about it" (in Gardiner, 1992, p. 175). Bourdieu (1991) notes how ideologies function to make the interests of specific social groups appear as the interests of all, "ideologies serve particular interests which they tend to present as universal interests, shared by the group as a whole" (p. 167). In addition to presenting common sense and taken-for-granted views of the world, Hasan (1986) notes in her definition that ideologies naturalize social constructions of reality, "a socially constructed system of ideas which appears as if inevitable" (p. 126). Ideologies also function to maintain the status quo by legitimating current power structures. Thompson (1981) develops this aspect of ideology in his definition,

a system of signification which facilitates the pursuit of particular interests. Structural conditions generally ensure that certain groups

occupy the dominant institutional positions, so that the prevailing ideology is commonly a legitimation of the status quo. Insofar as subordinate groups accept such legitimations, they lack a counter ideology through which divergent interests may be articulated and pursued. (p. 148)

Thompson uses the term “counter ideology” to describe the tension and competition for privileged, that is dominant, interpretations between conflicting and competing ideologies.

Ideological struggles, which focus on language, are termed “linguicism” by Skutnabb-Kangas (1988). She defines linguicism as

the ideologies and structures which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of language (on the basis of their mother tongues). (p. 13)

Linguistic resources are symbolic of social groups and the valuing of some linguistic resources at the expense of the devaluing of other linguistic resources is what Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) calls linguicism. Linguicism is also defined as the absence of language rights including the following:

Every child should have the right to identify positively with her original mother tongue(s) and have her identification accepted and respected by others, 2. Every child should have the right to learn the mother tongue(s) fully, 3. Every child should have the right to choose when s/he wants to use the mother tongue(s) in all official situations. (p. 19)

She wonders whether monolingualism is a reflection of linguicism-the domination of one language at the expense of another.

The struggle over languages is not a debate over linguistic codes. Rather, the debate involves much more. Bakhtin (1981) notes, “We are talking language not as a system of abstract grammatical categories, but rather language conceived as ideologically saturated, language as a world view” (p. 271). Languages become representative of perspectives or points-of-view, in other words, of ideological positions. In addition to the symbolic value of languages, the debates over bilingual education also exemplify how, “social institutions such as the nation-state, schooling, gender, dispute settlement, and law hinge on the ideologization of language” (Wollard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 56). Debates over linguistic resources are ultimately debates over the valuing and devaluing of languages in the competition for status between groups of speakers. As Phillipson (1988) says, “In linguicist ideology, the dominant group/language presents an idealized image of itself, stigmatizing the dominated group/language, and rationalizing the relationship between the two, always to the advantage of the dominant group/language” (p. 341).

The attitudes, values, and beliefs that come into play in debates over bilingual education are those that relate language to broader social issues

such as nationalism, cultural identity, the aims of education, and more broadly, the roles of language(s) in society (Ruiz, 1984). Consequently, the intersection of discourse and ideology, known as language ideology, becomes a central notion in the development of conceptual frameworks for the analysis of competing public discourses on bilingual education. Language ideology has been defined by Heath (1977) as “the self evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of that group” and more recently as,

A variety of integrated assertions, theories, goals that attempt to guide collective sociopolitical beliefs and actions regarding language choices in communication systems. Such language values and decisions prescribe one language or language variety (including dialect, register, and style) over another and attempt to dictate the linguistic preferences and practices of international alliances, as well as nation-states, national and regional institutions, and local communities. (Heath, 1989, p. 393)

Irvine (1989) proposed another definition, “the cultural (or subcultural) system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests” (p. 255). The analytic rationale for linking language and ideology is to examine connections between cultural and symbolic forms, social history, and issues of power along with the investigation of the processes by which “essential meanings about language are socially produced as effective and powerful” (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994, p. 58). The notion of language ideology is also useful in discussing the self-perceptions of different communities regarding socioeconomic needs as well as the role of language in the rationalization and achievement of those needs. Historical and contemporary problems regarding the role of Spanish in U.S. society have been numerous.

In discussions about bilingual education, knowledge about language policy is more developed than that of language ideology. A more equal balance between both areas is needed to better understand why bilingual education continues to be caught up in ideological debates in the public discourse of this country. The following questions proposed by Heath (1977) address areas that need to be investigated regarding language ideologies: (a) What values do speakers bring to language, not just their own but to language in general? (b) How do these values relate to the status of languages? [defined as the ability of a language to fulfill a designated purpose - in this case, education]; (c) How does the evaluation of a language’s status relate to reactions of using that language for bilingual education? Heath (1977) suggests research into the ideological dimensions of bilingual education in order to clarify “guidelines, methods, and materials in the practice of language planning for bilingual education” (p. 55).

LANGUAGE AND SYMBOLIC POWER

Bourdieu's (1977, 1991) work addresses the issue of how relations of power reproduce themselves through symbolic struggles that entail competition for the imposition and inculcation of legitimate views of the social world and in the process also reify a legitimate--that is dominant--language or languages used to express valued communicative competencies such as monolingualism or bilingualism. The imposition of these views of the social world and the valuing or devaluing of linguistic resources is not recognized as an arbitrary ideological move due the manipulation of symbolic assets that results in the imposition of political systems of classification under the guise of other types, such as educational systems of classification. For example, the opposing views of bilingualism as a problem or as a resource require corresponding positions of deficit or recognition views regarding the status of minority communities (Vasquez, Pease-Alvarez, Shannon, 1994). However, those positions are typically not expressed directly as such but are expressed through other discourses - such as those advocating nationalism or pluralism-- with agendas that are not always overtly expressed such as linguistic assimilation or cultural maintenance.

Bourdieu (1991) points to discourses that surround political arenas and agendas as the site par excellence for studies of language and symbolic power. In this context language is used to create constituencies and ideologies that are represented through discursive acts such as political slogans. Symbolic power refers

not so much to a specific type of power, but rather to an aspect of most forms of power as they are routinely employed in social life ... power is seldom exercised as overt physical force: instead it is transmuted into a symbolic form, and thereby endowed with a legitimacy that it would not otherwise have ... Symbolic power requires, as a condition of its success, that those subjected to it believe in the legitimacy of power and the legitimacy of those who wield it. (Thompson, 1991, p. 23)

In other words, symbolic power is concerned with how the exercise of power is often disguised through symbolic means so that it is not recognized as such.

Another critical institution for examining the issue of language and symbolic power is educational systems since they are involved in the evaluation and inculcation of linguistic competencies--such as bilingualism--that determine whether the linguistic resources of minority communities will function as linguistic capital and due to their role in the reproduction of legitimate views of the social world. Commenting on the role of social institutions--such as schools --in allocating value to the symbolic assets of communities--such as their linguistic resources--in the exercise of symbolic power, Thompson (1991) states, "institutionalized mechanisms have emerged which tend to fix the value accorded to different products, to allocate these products differentially and to

inculcate a belief in their value” (p. 24). As an example, the achievement of bilingualism has been viewed differentially according to the role of formal education in its acquisition. While bilingualism may not be officially valued within the educational system for Latinos who speak Spanish as their native language, it is recognized as an accomplishment for native English speakers. This distinction has been termed elite versus folk bilingualism (Gaarder, 1976 cited in Trueba, 1979).

Bourdieu (1991) discusses the role of discourse in the exercise of symbolic power as follows:

Symbolic power - as a power of constituting the given through utterances, of making people see and believe, of confirming or transforming the vision of the world and, thereby, action on the world and thus the world itself, an almost magical power which enables one to obtain the equivalent of what is obtained through force (whether physical or economic), by virtue of the specific effect of mobilization - is a power that can be exercised only if it is *recognized*, that is, misrecognized as arbitrary. (p. 170, emphasis in original)

In other words, symbolic power operates through ideologies that establish the perspectives of given groups as the “natural order of things” and disguise the self-interest and cultural production involved in establishing such a view of the world. The consequences are the subordination and devaluing of other symbolic resources, perspectives, and views of reality. One example of creating visions of the world through the exercise of symbolic power is the institutional power to name things--such as new ethnic categories in the national census--thereby creating “new” groups of people and giving legitimacy to their recognition as a distinct group. Stam (1988) comments on this aspect of language and symbolic power and notes its relationship to public discourse, “Political power consists partly in the capacity to place one’s terms and phrases and tropes into wide circulation” (Stam, 1988, p. 122). Another example of the power to name things in creating particular visions of the world is demonstrated by recent debates over the language policy area of Ebonics where efforts to bring recognition to Black English vernacular as a legitimate communicative system drew opposition and controversy. A belief in the legitimacy of words and those who utter them is needed to give words and slogans the power to maintain or subvert the social order. However, words by themselves do not create this belief; they do so only in conjunction with sociopolitical and other kinds of power.

The central role of the notion of cultural capital in Bourdieu’s work is well known (Bourdieu, 1986). In brief, capital can be defined as something that gets you something else by way of some kind of exchange. Linguistic capital concerns the manner in which a given language or communicative practice, such as bilingualism, can function as a symbolic asset that gives value to its speakers by bringing recognition to the use of two languages as a legitimate,

important, and worthwhile manner of communication. Whether a language or communicative practice functions as linguistic capital depends on the markets in which it operates. Social arenas have to recognize given languages or communicative practices as having value, and different social arenas may give different value to the same language or communicative practice. Thompson (1991) notes the relationship between linguistic and other types of capital:

The distribution of linguistic capital is related in specific ways to the distribution of other types of capital (economic capital, cultural capital, etc.) which defines the location of the individual within the social space. Hence differences in terms of accent, grammar, and vocabulary ... are indices of the social positions of speakers and reflects on the quantities of linguistic capital (and other capital they possess). (p. 18)

In the competition for value, the economic and political worth of the populations who speak a certain language, as compared to resources of other populations, enable them to appropriate linguistic capital. Ben-Rafael (1994) makes an important distinction between the market value of a language versus the social status of the original carriers. These two types of value contribute to whether a given language can function as linguistic capital for its speakers in a given social arena/market. He provides examples from Israel regarding the status of English, French, Yiddish, and Arabic in relation to the status of the carriers. He concludes that the higher the status of the original carriers, the greater their capacity to retain their hold over their linguistic resources.

PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE POLICY

In a review of language policy and planning research, Ricento and Hornberger (1996) identify current interest in examining how language policies serve as mechanisms of social control by dominant elites and also stress how all policies are ideological in nature although the ideology may not be apparent or acknowledged. Tollefson (1995) also discusses how language policies at all levels reflect relations of unequal power and that language policies are both outcomes of and sites for power struggles. Among other contributors to language policy analysis is Ochoa (1995) who presents a five-step typology that constructed a continuum from subtractive to additive bilingual education policies. He describes the prevailing practices in the United States as “transitional bilingualism” operating under an assimilationist ideology. Another contributor, Schmidt (1997) describes the three positions of linguistic pluralism (advocating acceptance and respect for linguistic diversity along with the right to non-discrimination on the basis of language and the right to ethnolinguistic-cultural reproduction), linguistic assimilationist (language loss in the name of socioeconomic “advancement”), and “Latino nationalist” (creation of Spanish dominant language domains within the U.S.) in current debates surrounding language policy that affect Latino communities.

Language policy in the United States has been characterized as lacking coherence and being composed of different components that act at cross-purposes to each other (Schiffman, 1996). A primary question that needs to be addressed in language policy research is why a particular polity exhibits a particular policy. To examine that question Schiffman introduces the notion of “linguistic culture.” For Schiffman (1996), language policy is ultimately grounded in linguistic culture which he defines as:

the set of behaviors, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and the religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language. That is, the beliefs (one might even use the term myths) that a speech community has about language (and this includes literacy) in general and its language in particular (from which it usually derives its attitudes toward other languages) are part of the social conditions that affect the maintenance and transmission of its language. (p. 5)

Schiffman’s term “linguistic culture” is similar in meaning to the notion of language ideology discussed above. The term was developed to analyze both covert and overt language policies and the attitudinal-cultural-sociopolitical assumptions that underlie them. The locus of covert policy is the linguistic culture of a society, which Schiffman (1996) says is the basis for overt language policies. In the United States, the claim for dominance of English does not derive from legal grounds but from ideological ones based on assumptions held by many Americans about language. He also identifies as primary influences in the development of language policies the assimilative power of the highly developed American linguistic culture and the dominance of English as important features of the linguistic landscape of the United States. For Schiffman (1996), the seeds of monolingualism are present in U.S. linguistic culture by way of covert language policies that are not neutral, but which favor English.

Ben-Rafael (1994) notes the connection between language policies and different types of dominant cultures by discussing examples of how countries have developed different types of language policies to address the linguistic diversity found within their territory. He lists two general types of dominant cultures: unifying and pluralistic. In his analysis he links these connections to the social significance of diversity and its symbolization within different societies--a reminder that how a society deals with linguistic diversity is connected to how sociocultural diversity in general is treated within that society. Within the context of the United States, García (1995) identifies a historical pattern of linguistic restriction illustrated by the linguistic assimilation policies of boarding schools established for Native Americans and that is also most recently illustrated by efforts to pass constitutional amendments and state propositions to make English the official language and efforts to eliminate bilingual education. The policies operative in the U.S. context contributed

heavily to language loss which has been characterized as the process of “Americanization.” However, for the generations involved, that process can also be characterized as an “attack against family language, cultural identity, and family communication” (Wong Fillmore, 1996, p. 438).

A HEURISTIC FOR LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY ISSUES

Ruiz (1984) presented a framework for interpreting language planning and policy issues based on orientations to language that he defined as “a complex of dispositions toward ... languages and their role in society. These dispositions may be largely unconscious and pre-rational because they are at the most fundamental level of arguments about language” (p. 16). He notes the importance of making these dispositions evident in discussions of language planning and policy by identifying them in existing policies and proposals or by advocating new ones. The three orientations presented by Ruiz are language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource. These orientations operate as contexts for the reproduction of language attitudes by delimiting the range of acceptable attitudes toward languages and by making certain attitudes legitimate through the institutionalization of specific policies such as transitional versus maintenance bilingual programs. The orientations most commonly associated with bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States have been the opposing views of language-as-problem and language-as-right.

The orientation of language-as-problem is associated with issues of development and modernization in national contexts where questions of literacy, code-selection, standardization, and orthography need to be sorted out (Ruiz, 1984). In the context of the United States, viewing language as a problem connects bilingual education with other social “problems” such as unemployment and low educational achievement associated with the Spanish-speaking population, and is often viewed as a cause of those social problems. Thus “fixing” the language problem is seen as a way to solve these related social problems. In addition to social problems, the maintenance of a low-status first language is associated with intellectual limitations and linguistic deficiency--judged by the absence of English, provincialism, and irrationalism. This orientation influenced the remedial and compensatory nature of bilingual education contained in the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and subsequent policy discussions on bilingual education. The purpose of bilingual programs was perceived to be the elimination of the language problem so that students could function without the additional language support provided by these programs. This language orientation was translated into policy that dictated transitional models of bilingual education without regard for native language loss while defining the target student population as the poor and needy. A central assumption for the language-as-problem orientation is that “English is the ‘real’ language of the United States and that speaking another language is a ‘handicap,’ a barrier that must be overcome” (Schmidt 1997, p. 351).

García (1995) questions “whether loyalty to Spanish, even after the acquisition of English, is a problem or a resource, and whether it functions differently for diverse Latino groups” (p. 148). She challenges the assumption that a complete language shift to English will be accompanied by socioeconomic success for “nonwhite, unskilled, and colonized” (p. 144) social groups. Rather, she proposes that, “the loss of the native language often sinks them even further into the silence of the oppressed” (p. 144). She also points out that English monolingualism has not brought socioeconomic success to many African-Americans. In response to her original question, García (1995) presents Cuba-Americans as a social group that has experienced economic success without assimilating linguistically. A popular belief is that Latino immigrants’ loyalty to Spanish reflects their reluctance to learn English. However, Nicolau and Valdivieso (1992) note that the Veltman Report documents that “by the time they have been in the country for 15 years, some 75 percent of all Latino immigrants are speaking English on a regular daily basis” and that “more than half the immigrants who arrived in the United States before they were fourteen have made English their usual, everyday language” (p. 318-19).

Another assumption basic to the language-as-problem orientation is that multilingualism leads to national divisions while English monolingualism insures national unity. The orientation of language-as-problem reflects other deeply held attitudes besides language-based beliefs and values that are reflected in the unresolved tensions related to this society’s inability to come to terms with its ever growing diversity. These tensions are illustrated by recent anti-affirmative action and anti-immigrant efforts in California and Texas and current anti-bilingual education efforts across the country that are taking place contemporaneously with President Clinton’s celebration of federal intervention in school desegregation during the twentieth anniversary of the Little Rock Seven. The irony of the historical celebration of minority rights related to desegregation during current national efforts to dismantle other minority rights illustrates the adage “one step forward-two steps backward” and an ambivalence toward minority rights in general.

The language-as-right is another orientation presented by Ruiz which locates linguistic issues related to bilingual education within the arenas of civil and human rights. Language rights have been defined as, “the rights of a people to learn, to keep and use its language in all manner of public and private business. This is a human right. But it is not always a civil right” (Hernández-Chávez, 1988, p. 45). Hernández-Chávez identifies the importance of language rights for the politico-economic participation of Latinos who otherwise will continue to participate in society on a limited basis. Language rights cover the areas of bureaucratic and civic encounters such as voting and employment services but also personal freedom of expression and enjoyment.

Professional organizations and international bodies have made declarations regarding language rights. In an international context, the recent World Conference on Linguistic Rights (1996) held in Barcelona supported language-

as-right by declaring that “All language communities are entitled to an education which will enable their members to acquire full command of their own language, including the different abilities relating to all the usual spheres of use ...” (p. 8). The Linguistic Society of America (a professional organization of linguists founded in 1924 to advance the scientific study of language and with a membership of approximately 7,000 persons) issued a resolution against the official English movement in March of 1987 and also a statement on language rights in June of 1996. In their statement they acknowledge that the majority of the world’s nations are at least bilingual if not multilingual and that multilingualism by itself is rarely an important cause of civil discord. It rejects the orientation of language-as-problem and supports language-as-resource. It proposes the following language rights: (1) Free public and private expression in the language of choice; (2) maintenance and transmission of native language to children; (3) translators provided by courts and other state agencies; (4) the affirmative acknowledgment of children’s native language and the use of the native language in education as well as the ensurance of their acquisition of English; (5) conduct of business in the language of their choice; (6) ability to use their preferred language for private conversations in the workplace; and (7) the opportunity to learn to speak, read, and write English. The statement concludes by noting that promoting English need not and should not come at the cost of violating the rights of linguistic minorities (Linguistic Society of America, 1996). The main professional organization of anthropologists, the American Anthropological Association, also issued a language rights statement on January 1996, rejecting linguistic restrictionism. In addition to advocating language-as-right, the statement adopts a language-as-resource position and,

... urges Congress to pass legislation that will provide opportunities, not only for the mastery of English, but for the development of other languages spoken in our communities, and will respect linguistic rights among fundamental human rights, and will recognize that the development of our diverse cultural and linguistic resources enriches our national heritage and the lives of our citizens.

Among the historic and legal precedents that have been proposed as the basis for the language rights of Mexican Spanish-speakers is the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that discussed the rights of Mexicans who had become new U.S. citizens. The treaty states that the rights of these people “shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction” (Crawford, 1995, p. 32). Crawford (1995) notes that while not mentioned explicitly, “a guarantee of certain language rights was strongly implied ... such rights have rarely been respected” (p. 32). Viewing language as a right connects bilingual education with other legal issues such as the Office for Civil Rights reviews under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and also historically connects bilingual education to the era of Chicano civil rights movement (Trujillo, 1996). During this era in New Mexico in 1969, Reies López Tijerina invoked articles VIII and

IX of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo for legal and moral force in an unsuccessful bid to require that all subjects be taught in both Spanish and English in the New Mexican schools. The district court ruling stated that the treaty:

does not contemplate in any way the administration of public schools. In addition we are not of the opinion that the treaty confers any proprietary right to have the Spanish language and culture preserved and continued in the public schools at public expense. (Griswold del Castillo, 1990, p. 106)

The court ruling expresses a common sentiment that excludes Latinos from the term “public” and ignores their tax contributions as part of the “public expense” when in fact Latino students comprise the great majority of students in many inner-city schools. In these schools and communities, Latino adults and children *are* the public.

The language orientation of language-as-a right has never been part of the Anglo-American linguistic culture (Schiffman, 1996, p. 216). According to Schiffman (1996), linguistic rights were only paid attention to when they were connected to religious rights. A language-as-right orientation assumes that communities have the right to language maintenance across all spheres of social life. Latino communities must continue to play a central role in guarding their language rights. Wong Fillmore (1996) notes, “It is at the community level that people in this society must defend their rights to their own language and culture” (p. 438).

An additional orientation elaborated by Ruiz presents language as a resource not only for those who speak it, but also for society in general. In such a perspective bilingualism is seen as an individual and collective asset. Linguistic resources should be developed, managed, and conserved in the same manner as other human resources. The areas of utility of a nation’s linguistic resources include diplomatic or commercial foreign service, educational and personal value, and military preparedness and national security. The question remains concerning how a society that has historically defined linguistic diversity as language-as-problem can begin to redefine its linguistic resources as language-as-resource. The Native Americans Languages Act of 1990 is one example. Unfortunately it came too late for the many indigenous languages that have become extinct and for the many Native Americans who no longer speak their tribal language (Crawford, 1995). In the context of Latino communities, the move from viewing Spanish as a problem to one viewing it as a resource involves the study of the relationship between minority language maintenance and the structural incorporation of an ethnolinguistic community into society in general. It also means asking “whether the speakers of the minority languages are oppressed minorities categorized by others through their language characteristics, or whether they are capable of self-categorization and of negotiating a resourceful role for their language” (García 1995, p. 156).

The issue of self-definition becomes central to this process. That is, Latino communities must continue to recognize Spanish as both an individual and collective resource and resist the devaluing of their linguistic resources as a cover for the devaluing of the Latino community itself.

THE RESEARCH FOCUS

Building on Bourdieu's notions of linguistic capital, language and symbolic power, and the language policy heuristic presented by Ruiz (1984), I undertook an analysis of the competing discourses in the debates surrounding bilingual education with special regard for the identification of different ideological positions and evaluations regarding the value of bilingualism and bilingual education, the Spanish language, and the linguistic capital of the working-class Mexican-immigrant parents and their children. I paid special attention to Mexican-immigrant parents' perspectives and concerns since their children are the recipients of bilingual education, and because their perspectives have received relatively little attention in the English language media. The focus of my analysis is on public discourse on debates over bilingual education. As public discourse, the oral and written texts that form the data were circulated publicly including distribution through the media or as part of the public record of legal proceedings. Data come from two recent debates over bilingual education; one in Colorado and the other in Orange County, California. Data include a Colorado school district's written proposal for a revised bilingual education program, a flyer written and distributed by a Mexican immigrant mother in Colorado in December of 1996, seven newspaper editorials from two major Colorado newspapers written across a six month period from December 1996 to May 1997, an interview of Mexican immigrant mothers televised in a Colorado news report in the spring of 1997, and legal declarations made by eight Latino parents in Orange County California in the summer and early fall of 1997, as well as Orange County newspaper accounts from January to September of 1997.

I begin with a brief discussion of the way in which the Spanish language itself is a point of conflict. One historical and two contemporary examples are provided to illustrate how even outside the arena of bilingual education, the Spanish language is part of a controversial public discourse.

SPANISH AS A POINT OF CONFLICT

Central to the debates over bilingual education is the value of the Spanish language in relation to English as perceived by supporters and detractors of bilingual education. Detractors of bilingual education can not deny that Spanish is a world language, nor that it has a long role in the history of the United

States, especially related to the colonization and development of the southwest (Santa Fe is this country's oldest European-origin capital). Economic trade agreements such as NAFTA are constant reminders of a global economy in which Spanish plays an important role. The market value of Spanish as a language of commerce is not directly challenged by the detractors of bilingual education, only its value as a language of K-12 education. High schools and universities continue to offer Spanish electives to both native and non-native speakers. These efforts are not challenged by the detractors since they can be viewed as ancillary and not central to students' education, and the Spanish language is not required; students may select another language for study.

Spanish has a long history in what is the United States of America and was involved in many European firsts. In 1513, Ponce de Leon recorded his arrival in Florida in Spanish; in 1665, St. Augustine was founded by the Spanish as the first permanent European community; the first reading grammar text was written in Spanish in Georgia in 1658; the first theatrical works written and performed in Spanish were performed in New Mexico in 1598; and the first scientific journals were written in Spanish during the 1540 expedition of Coronado (Candelaria-Greene, 1994). Notwithstanding, Spanish also has a long history of being a point of conflict since the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. An early example comes from California regarding conducting judicial proceedings in Spanish. In this example, the public discourse sounds uncomfortably familiar and contemporary. The original California constitution of 1849 stated "All decrees, regulations, and provisions which from their nature require publication shall be published in English and Spanish" (Schiffman, 1996, p. 266). Regulations that narrowed the scope of this provision were enacted in 1852 and 1863. The provision was almost totally gone in the new constitution of 1863 (Schiffman, 1996). A brief excerpt from *Debates and Proceedings of the Constitutional Convention of the State of California, 1878-1879* (Crawford, 1992) documents Spanish as a point of conflict during the constitutional convention. One of the delegates, Mr. Rolfe, voiced his opposition to an amendment that would limit publications and judicial proceedings to English. He did not see a need to continue publications in Spanish but supported allowing judicial proceedings in Spanish because, "there are Justices of Peace in my county [San Bernadino], and their proceedings are judicial proceedings, who are intelligent men, and very able Justices of the Peace, who have no knowledge of the English language." Mr. Rolfe further stated that there are communities that are almost entirely Spanish speaking. Another delegate, Mr. Tinnin responds to Mr. Rolfe by stating,

This is an English speaking government, and persons who are incapable of speaking the English language certainly are not competent to discharge public duties. We have here in the capitol now tons and tons of documents published in Spanish for the benefits of foreigners.

Mr. Rolfe responds, "Do you call the native populations of this State foreigners?" Mr. Tinnin replies, "They had ample time to learn the language." (Crawford, 1992, p. 53). Other examples of conflicts involved Spanish in the workplace and Spanish in the home.

Two recent examples of Spanish as a point of conflict in the U.S. appeared in the news media and received both national and international attention. One of the examples involved two Latinas who were fired for speaking Spanish in the workplace. The two, Rosa Gonzales and Ester Hernandez, were hired (because they were bilingual) by an insurance company located in the center of Amarillo's Latino neighborhood. Approximately 90% of the customers of the insurance agency were Spanish speakers. The husband and wife team (Mr. and Mrs. Polk) who owned the small insurance company was irritated with the two Latinas because they spoke Spanish to each other during the workday. They asked the employees to sign a pledge that defined the office as English-only except when employees were speaking to Spanish-speaking clients. One employee signed the handwritten form but Ms. Hernández and Ms. Gonzales refused, and a dispute exists whether they were fired or quit. According to the Amarillo Globe-News ("Rudeness Doesn't Wash," 1997), the women were acting rudely by talking in a language that their colleagues did not understand.

Yet another example, in what has been called the case that relegated the Spanish language to abusers, ignorants, and maids, a Texas judge involved in a child custody case stated that a mother was abusing her 5-year old daughter by speaking Spanish to her. The mother is bilingual and speaks Spanish to the daughter at home because she wants the daughter to also be bilingual, "I'm giving her an advantage that not everybody has" (Morales, 1995). The judge is quoted as saying,

If she starts first grade with other children and cannot even speak the language the teachers and the other children speak, and she's a full-blood American citizen, you're abusing that child and you're relegating her to the position of a housemaid.

The judge also stated "Now, get this straight. You start speaking English to that child because if she doesn't do good in school, then I can remove her because it's not in her best interest to be ignorant" (Morales, 1995). The judge's statement brought well deserved tongue-in-cheek comments from Latino writers such as "I'm still recuperating from the discovery that my parents abused me for the 18 years I lived in their home" (Cepeda, 1995) and,

I'm at a loss when I try to imagine what could have become of the legions of teachers, lawyers, politicians, psychiatrists, clergy, businesspersons, and leaders of all types if they hadn't been brutalized by their Spanish-speaking parents. (Landa, 1995)

In all three examples, English is equated with "America" as if other languages did not have a historical presence in the United States before English

and as if any language other than English was “un-American”. Never in the colonial or national history of the United States has there been a time when only English was spoken within its territory. Nevertheless, for many, the English language is a symbolic marker of “Americanism” rather than the social and political ideas behind democracy. Mackey (1977) refers to the one language-one nation language ideology, “The popular image of the United States as a nation united by one language and one culture has always been illusory. It was an ideal engendered by the now outmoded values of nineteenth century nationalism” (p. vii). Mertz (1982) examined the connection between the English language and perceptions regarding “American” identity in the social history of the requirement for proficiency in English for U.S. citizenship. She identified a folk theory or language ideology that equates the English language with “American” identity and the capacity to understand democratic principles through the following chain of reasoning:

[l]anguages shape the range of conceptualizations of their speakers; thus early exposure to particular languages is a critical and lasting force in forming a person’s mind. Now if certain concepts are language specific - that is, if U.S. political concepts are only understood through the English language - then early exposure to a particular language has consequences for political identity. Socialization in English doesn’t only shape children’s cognitive ranges, it specifically shapes their ability to understand political concepts and thus to feel political loyalty. (p. 10)

For Mertz, the language ideology that connects English with American democratic principles is the backdrop to the requirements for English-only education for children as illustrated by the 1923 Meyer v. Nebraska case - a Supreme Court ruling that overturned state legislation that mandated English-only instruction even in private parochial schools (Schiffman, 1996). As in current times, shifts towards this reasoning at the turn of the century “corresponded with increased xenophobia, attempts to limit immigration, and efforts to discriminate against certain immigrant groups” (Mertz, 1982, p. 14). These examples have illustrated that the Spanish language itself is a point of controversy in the public discourse.

THE ORANGE COUNTY CASE

In January of 1997, the Orange Unified school board sought permission from the California State Board of Education to eliminate its bilingual education program. About 1,300 students in the district receive instruction in their native languages out of about 7,000 students who are identified as limited English proficient (the total number of students in the district is approximately 30,000). The demographic make-up of the school district’s students is 50 percent White, 34 percent Latino, 11 percent Asian, and 2 percent African-American (“Bilingual bellweather,” 1998). In a school board meeting on February of 1997, the school board voted 7-0 to go ahead with its proposal despite complaints from parent

members of the district's own Bilingual Education Committee who had not been consulted on the changes and despite a petition with 742 signatures of people opposed the board's plan. The Latino parents who attended the meeting were asked to step outside of the building to hear the translation of the meeting; the parents refused. On April 18, the board voted again 7-0 to go ahead with its plan over the objections of approximately 200 parents who attended the meeting. In early July 1997 the Orange Unified District was able to go ahead with its plan for one year because a deadlocked California State Board of Education, for the second time in one month, failed to act on the district's request. At the end of July, a group of Latino parents and advocacy groups went to court to block the plan. On August 19, Judge Shubb, a Sacramento County Superior Court Judge, issued a temporary restraining order suspending the English-only instruction that had started on the first of August. Then, on September 10, the same judge lifted the restraining order and allowed the Orange Unified district to continue with their English-only instructional plan. Lawyers representing the plaintiffs vowed to continue court action. In November, voters in the Orange school district overwhelmingly approved advisory Measure A, which asked whether they agreed with the recent school board decision to replace the bilingual education program with an English immersion program. Eighty-six percent of the electorate voted yes and only 14 percent voted no ("Bilingual bellweather," 1998).

DEVALUING LATINO PARENT OPINION

Latino parents made legal declarations against the Orange Unified English-only plan that were part of the documents submitted by the lawyers in their court action. In their declarations, the parents voiced their support for the current bilingual education program and their concerns over the proposed English-only program. The limited capital and political power that the Orange County Latino immigrant parents presently hold is indicated by Judge Shubb's lack of reference in his written decision to the parents' declarations and by the Orange Unified County school board's dismissal of the objections of "more than 800 parents" (Weintraub, 1997). The devaluing of the Latino parents' perspectives by the board was made even more apparent when in February they ruled in another matter. The school board decided against a year-round calendar for some elementary schools after a few parents complained (Menéndez, 1997). The Los Angeles Times (Anderson, 1997) also reports on the disregard for the concerns of Latino parents,

Hundreds of parents also have protested the plan, saying they prefer to keep bilingual education as an option. Silvina Rubinstein, executive director of the California Association of Bilingual Education, a plaintiff in the lawsuit, said the district has been 'disrespectful' of parental rights.

Latino parents themselves spoke out on how the school board disregarded their perspectives and concerns. The president of the district's Bilingual Education Committee stated,

The climate for Latinos is not good. We're always being talked about that we're this or that ... There's a lack of respect, and this is why they make decisions without our input. We are simply tired of that. (Menéndez, 1997)

A consequence of efforts to eliminate bilingual education programs is the politicization of Latino parents as they become involved in challenging those efforts and as they assert their rights as parents (Menéndez, 1997). The former coordinator of the bilingual education program - she resigned to protest the English-only policy-stated "Parents who wouldn't say boo before are going up to a reporter or a camera and saying this is how I feel" (Menéndez, 1997). However, a Latina mother commented on the difficulty some Latino parents find in publicly voicing their concerns, "So many parents see things happening and they want to scream, they want to say things, but can't get the nerve ... They're just afraid. It's the sleeping giant every Latino has inside of them" (Menéndez, 1997). In addition to a perceived lack of respect and a minimizing of their concerns, Latino parents also faced paternalistic attitudes that lead to language policies that deny them the opportunity to decide for themselves the type of instructional program which is best for their children. This paternalistic attitude is illustrated in the following comments made by an Orange Unified school board member,

I would have thought that most parents would want their children to learn English as quickly and fluently as possible, and I'm quite surprised that so many are unhappy. I think we're doing their kids a favor. (Menéndez, 1997)

RESTRICTING THE LEGITIMATE PARTICIPATION OF LATINO PARENTS

Mexican-immigrant parents from Orange County in California voiced their support for the bilingual program that was replaced by an English-only one. The following parent comments appear in English in the documentation submitted by Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy Inc. and the California Rural Legal assistance in court actions against the elimination of bilingual education in Orange County. The comments of eight parents are summarized here. They supported the bilingual program because they were pleased with their children's school success and with their learning of English. They credited the school with helping their children become bilingual and mentioned that they were familiar with what took place in the bilingual classrooms because they made frequent visits to the school to observe in the classrooms. The parents identified several main issues, including access (to the teacher and school's written communications), communication (direct face-

to-face conversations with the teacher) and, involvement (in the life of the school and in their children's education). These three areas will be collapsed under the term "legitimate participation."

Parents were concerned that they no longer would be able to participate in their children's schooling as they had previously by visiting the classroom and reading books to students, volunteering in the school (e.g., helping students check-out books in the library), and helping them with their homework. They recognized the important role of parental support in their children's education and wanted to demonstrate their interests in concrete ways such as helping with homework. As one parent stated, "it is important to me that my child knows I can help him." The parents valued being able to conduct face-to-face communication in Spanish with the teacher regarding children's progress and problems because they felt they would be better prepared to help their children. They wanted to have the opportunity to continue participating in meaningful ways in the classroom, "If the bilingual program is gone ... the opportunity for parents like me to be a real part of the teaching program will be lost too." The parents felt that a school environment that recognized their language also recognized and encouraged their participation in the life of the school.

New changes introduced since the elimination of the bilingual program included no longer writing the school bulletins in both English and Spanish. One parent's reactions to these English-only communications was,

I felt that I as a parent was set aside and that I no longer can be part of those activities. I now understand that the bilingual program had shown me the opposite - how to be a part of the school and how to be a part of my child's education. With the loss of the bilingual program, I know how parents will feel to be left out.

This parent's comments point out a dimension neglected in the debates over bilingual education; bilingual education is more than classroom instruction. As reflected in the comments of these parents, it can also be an educational philosophy that helps connect the school with parents and the community. Her comments also point out how parents feel especially targeted by the new English-only policy,

I believe that as parents, the more we participate, the more our children are going to see that education is important. If they take away bilingual education they are going to take away our communication with the teacher and we will no longer feel welcome at the schools nor will we be able to participate in the school community. It will harm the parents as well as the children.

The parents' comments indicate their strong feelings regarding bilingual education. These feelings, which they willingly submitted to the legal record, demonstrate the role that bilingual education plays in the areas of parental access, communication and, involvement. The opposite of these three areas is

exclusion. Parents face being excluded not only from the life of the school but also from the lives of their own children,

We do not have the depth of understanding we would need to solely help him in English. We would feel bad about not being able to help them. We would not be able to be part of their world.

Several parents mentioned that they knew families where the children had difficulty communicating with their parents because their Spanish-speaking ability had atrophied in English-only schools.

One parent addressed the specific issue of the learning of English and crafted her response within the language-as-resource orientation,

Some people think that immigrant parents do not want their children to learn English. This is not true. Of course we want our children to learn English; however, I also want my children to be bilingual. I believe that if they are able to speak more than one language, they will have a better future and more opportunity to have a better profession that I could ever have.

The parents' comments on the three areas identified above are a reminder that schools operate as marketplaces for the identification and differential distribution of valued symbolic assets. What the parents' comments contribute to this observation is the reminder that parents are also implicated in this process. The debates over the role of the use of Spanish in instruction and other school-wide contexts is related to whether Spanish and what it represents as a symbolic asset will be valued in the schools. The denial of legitimate participation can be seen as an unwillingness to acknowledge the value of the Latino communities' symbolic assets. One parent's perspectives on this issue is addressed in the following quote in which she presents herself as a legitimate interlocutor by mentioning how the teacher communicated directly with her and by the way her language and culture were valued in the classroom, "The teacher was able to speak to us directly in Spanish and the classroom was set up in such a way that the children knew that their language and culture had value and was welcome."

LANGUAGE AS BOUNDARY

An additional orientation to the three introduced by Ruiz (1984) was identified in the comments of one of the Orange County parents. One mother commented on language-as-boundary by metaphorically presenting bilingualism as a bridge between communities and bilinguals as the mediators who break down boundaries between them by traversing across the bridge in search of better understandings between them. This example might be collapsed under the language-as-problem orientation. However, a boundary does not necessarily constitute a problem or a resource. The attitude taken towards the boundary determines how people respond to it. The mother's comments bring attention to boundaries that different languages create but more importantly to

the role of the bilingual person as a boundary-mediator. In a manner not quite present in Ruiz's three orientations, language-as-boundary highlights the agency of the bilingual person in addressing the opportunities and challenges presented by multilingualism. Giving an immediate and specific example of this metaphor she says,

the most important thing is that my child is now bilingual in English and Spanish. As a parent I feel that I will continue to be able to communicate as a parent should, teaching him about how important it is to be bilingual, to be able to communicate with his own family. He also can now be our family translator and help our family out in that way. But I also believe that being bilingual, he will be able to integrate better in the larger community and help his own Spanish speaking community because he can open up communication between two communities that do not totally understand each other. He could help the English speaking community understand his community that I represent because of my Spanish-speaking background. I have seen how in our community the person who is bilingual becomes the intermediary, the bridge between two different cultural communities.

SOME OPPOSING VIEWS

Some Latino parents in California have publicly expressed their opposition to bilingual education. Newspapers have reported parents who are concerned that their children are not learning enough English in bilingual programs. This concern has led to their opposition to the bilingual program. An example from Los Angeles involved a group of parents who organized a boycott of an elementary school because they were dissatisfied with the amount of English that their children were learning. Approximately 80 children were kept from school. One father said, "A lot of us want our kids to learn Spanish so they can write to their grandpas or whatever. But I want my children to learn English so they won't have the problems that I've had." In order to address their concerns the principal of the school in question said that more English was being used earlier in the students' schooling (Pyle, 1997). Like other Latino parents, these parents want their children to learn English. However, unlike the Latino parents who support bilingual education, they do not seem as convinced about the importance of the continued development of literacy in the native language in school contexts. Their brief comments contained in short newspaper articles do not provide enough information from which to categorize them according to Ruiz's language orientations; they do not provide clear pronouncements regarding language as a resource while also not making reference to language as a problem or right.

THE COLORADO CASE

The Colorado school district's student enrollment is approximately 66,000 with 48% Latino, 26% White, 21% African-American, 4% Asian American, and 1% American Indian. Of the 31,000 Latino students, approximately 13,000

are in the bilingual education program. In 1969, the Latino student population was only 20 percent. During the last four years, between 1992 and 1996, the Latino student population grew by 21 percent. The current bilingual program is the result of a 1984 federal court ruling that found that the district had violated federal law and was providing inadequate instructional services to linguistic minority students. In 1994 the organization of Latino educators who originally had taken the district to court filed a motion for civil contempt against the district for its failure to fully implement the 1984 court order. Their concerns were the lack of qualified bilingual teachers, the lack of teaching materials and resources, and the lack of accountability in ensuring that the literacy goals for linguistic minority students were being met. In 1995 the federal judge decided that instead of a Motion for Contempt, the school district should be given the opportunity to propose a Motion to Modify the original 1984 Consent Decree thereby giving it permission to propose a revision to the original bilingual plan (LeDoux, 1997). In writing its revised program the district did not solicit community input from local professional educators, community organizers, or the Mexican-immigrant parents whose children are the students in the bilingual program. Concern over the lack of community input in the new proposed plan along with disagreement over proposed changes to the program led to a press conference/rally in December of 1996 where Latino parents, elected public officials, and community organizers expressed their opposition to the new plan. During January and March of 1997, Latino community organizers and educators held two community meetings to inform Latino parents about the research basis for bilingual education and the district's proposed changes. Also, Latino parents attended school board meetings where they expressed their concerns regarding the proposed changes. The school district in early March publicly released the new plan and in late March and early April held four community forums to provide an opportunity for community members to voice their perspectives regarding the new plan. Across all four forums, all the Latino parents, bilingual educators, and university professors who spoke were against the proposed changes. Not one person spoke in favor of the new plan. In spite of the overwhelming lack of community support for the new plan, the school board submitted the plan for approval to the federal judge involved in the 1984 ruling.

The Colorado district provided the following reasons for the program modifications introduced in their new plan: drastic increase in numbers of linguistic minority students from 5,500 to 13,500 during the years 1984 to 1997; the need for placement and exit criteria to be reviewed; and concern over the lack of progress in students' acquisition of English. The new plan that the school district developed contained changes to the original 1984 plan that minimized the importance of native language instruction and gave priority to the instruction of English as a second language (provisions for ESL instruction were also included in the original plan). Among the biggest points of disagreement in the proposed plan between the school district and the Latino

community was limiting participation in the bilingual program to three years. Individual instruction plans would need to be developed for every student not ready to transfer to an all-English instructional environment after three years. The district plan lists as the first major revision the clarification of the goal of the bilingual program:

There have been two different interpretations as to the goal of the program: (1) for students to learn English so that they can transition into the mainstream, English language program, or (2) to develop and maintain students' fluency in two languages. The goal of the program is now clearly stated: *for students to learn English using the most efficient and effective approaches so that they can be successful in the mainstream, English language instruction program* (emphasis in original). Consistent with this goal, the Department of Bilingual/ESOL Education will be renamed the Department of English Language Acquisition. (p. 1)

The instructional goal of the program was narrowly defined in terms of the acquisition of a language. An aspect of language and symbolic power is also illustrated in the renaming of the department so that the term "bilingual education" was eliminated, which proposed a new view of reality not only for the department but also for the students it was intended to serve. This institutional move devalues bilingualism, the Spanish language, and the linguistic capital of Latinos. By contrast, an alternative construction of goals for a bilingual education program can be found in the following goals from the Tucson Unified School District:

The goals of bilingual education are to promote individual student achievement, to provide full access to the curriculum for all students, and to provide each student the opportunity to acquire and demonstrate mastery of at least two languages, one of which will be English. (Tucson Unified School District, 1993, p. 4)

In another major change, English speaking students in the Colorado district who wish to become bilingual would no longer be able to enroll in bilingual classrooms. Such a compensatory-remedial perspective toward bilingualism limits bilingual education to Spanish-speaking students and denies interested English-speaking families the opportunity to have their children develop biliterately. Such a perspective makes it impossible to present bilingual education through an enrichment perspective as illustrated by two-way programs of bilingual education whose goal is the development of bilingualism by all the students regardless of ethnicity.

Three Mexican immigrant mothers will be used to illustrate community perspectives, specifically parent perspectives, which opposed the new plan. Two of the mothers appeared on a television news broadcast that comprised one part from a series of reports on bilingual education in which parents' concerns were highlighted. The series appeared on the daily local newscasts on the regional affiliate of a national Spanish language network that is watched

by many in the Latino community. The mothers responded to two questions. The first question was, “Why do some parents strongly oppose the new plan?”

The first mother began by stating that the feeling in the community was that bilingualism was being devalued. She mentioned that she wanted her children to speak two languages, to write and read and speak English as well as Spanish. She noted that it was not necessary nor right/fair (Spanish: “no es justo”) to ask children to leave one language in order to learn another. She stated that it was very important for Latino children to have two languages and that it was also important to be able to move back and forth between two worlds. Using herself as an example, she then commented that the new plan would require parents to indicate that they wanted their children in the bilingual program. She said that four years ago that she did not have the knowledge that she does now regarding the importance of native language instruction for the acquisition of basic concepts and would have opted to place her children in an English-only classroom thinking that, “We are in the United States, we need English.” Her final comment was that it was not realistic to set a three-year limit for students to shift from bilingual instruction to English-only instruction.

The second mother responded to the question, :What would you like to see in a bilingual program? The mother’s reply was that an ideal bilingual program would be one where students’ knowledge was recognized. She said children in the community knew two languages and that she wanted a program where their knowledge of both languages can develop and where both languages were equally valued without giving preference to one at the expense of the other. She also stated that it was the responsibility of the school to develop the resources that students brought to school including their linguistic resources. She noted that in the new plan the students’ native language would be used only as long as required to learn English. In such an approach she wondered aloud what would happen to the native language that she characterized as enriching the students’ lives. She responded by saying that it would be neglected until they enter college and then they will have to pay to acquire a foreign language. Initiating a new topic and addressing the reporter, she stated that she would like the media to broadcast reports on a regular basis on the benefits of having citizens who are truly bilingual. She said that children in the community need to see in the media that they can be bilingual doctors or architects and that they can cure people around the world and thereby bring recognition and pride to themselves, their community, and to the country where they live. She wanted them to be able to work for companies that recognize their bilingual resources and for them to have a bright future that will be full of success.

Another example of parents’ perspectives involves a handwritten flyer that advertised the press conference/rally that was organized to protest the proposed changes to the bilingual program. A mother had written the flyer and passed out xeroxed copies before and during the press conference. She is a

member of a parent community group that has advocated improvements in the bilingual program.

Boletín Urgente

[City]

[Date]

A: Todos los padres de familia de las Escuelas Públicas. Hacemos el comunicado que estamos siendo fuertemente atacados, por parte del Distrito Escolar al querer estos negar y quitar definitivamente la educación bilingüe.

No! lo permitamos, unámonos y luchemos por el derecho de nuestros hijos ya que si permitimos que se les quite la educación bilingüe estaremos permitiendo la deserción de nuestros hijos de la escuela.

Demos la cara y levantemos nuestra voz en un solo deseo- mantener la educación bilingüe.

No! permitamos ser burlados, humillados y mucho menos permitamos la traición. Esta señora no es una buena representante ni defiende la educación bilingüe. Todos unidos lograremos a que nuestros hijos logren obtener el triunfo y el éxito en su vida. La persona bilingüe es importante para el desarrollo y prosperidad de América.

Hoy reunamos a [time and location], ya que ellos darán una conferencia de prensa. Hagamos acto de presencia y apoyemos esta lucha.

¡Unidos lograremos la victoria!

No lo olvides, contamos contigo....

Atentamente: [Name of Group]

The flyer was written entirely in Spanish and was titled “Urgent Bulletin” at the top of the sheet. It was addressed to all the parents in the district and stated that the purpose of the flyer was to communicate to the Latino community that it was being strongly attacked through the district’s plan to deny and eliminate bilingual education (Although the district’s proposal did not request the complete elimination of native language instruction, many community members perceived it as a step in that direction.) The flyer also stated, “No! We will not permit it. Let us unite and fight for our children’s rights seeing that if we allow them to be denied bilingual education we will be contributing to them dropping out of school.” The flyer continues, “Show up and let us raise our voice in one united desire - to maintain bilingual education ... United we will help our children triumph and obtain success in their lives. The bilingual person is important for the development and prosperity of America.” The flyer ends by listing the time and location of the press conference/rally and with the name of the parent group listed at the bottom of the flyer. (For a complete translation, see Appendix A.)

THE ROLE OF THE PRINT MEDIA

The contributions of newspaper editorials to the public discourse are discussed next. Two aspects of the editorials will be discussed here. Those are the editorials' position regarding what the focus of the bilingual program should be and their use of specific Hispanics (this term is used in the editorials) involved in the debates as "ideological role models" which are defined here as minority persons used to represent a given ideological position. One function of these ideological role models is to present convergence of perspectives between non-minority and minority agents or else to present the image that an organization in question is not entirely composed of non-minority persons and to consequently show that its perspectives are not held exclusively by non-minority people.

Three Hispanics are mentioned by name in the editorials. Two of them represented the district's perspective and the other opposed the new plan. One of the Hispanics was the director of the bilingual education department, the other was a parent and school board member, and the last one directed a private secondary school. Both the school board member and the director are identified as Hispanics. The director is presented as being involved in "improving the process by which students whose native language is Spanish achieve fluency and literacy in English" by working on "a new, improved program." The editorial then goes on to discuss the "failure" of bilingual education programs in New York as well as in Colorado in helping students master English. The director is characterized as being conciliatory and is quoted as saying, "I'd really like a chance to try to explain to them what we're trying to do." In contrast, opponents of the new plan are characterized as "activists" who "threaten continuing litigation." The school board member is characterized as a leader who in daring fashion has supported the new plan in spite of pressure she has received from "interested groups." She is also characterized as being "well qualified to both evaluate the success of the bilingual education program and to prescribe improvements." The editorial mentions these qualifications as her negative personal experiences as a parent with the program, as well her role as a member of the school board. Her views are summarized as: (a) students have been kept too long in the program to the detriment of their learning, and (b) supports giving parents "greater authority" over when their children can be withdrawn from the program. Consequently she (c) advocates improved assessments to reduce the number of students entering the program and to increase the number of students moving back to the non-bilingual program. The editorial notes that her views may not yet be the dominant views in the Hispanic community. The editorial supports her position regarding parents' choice and also regarding the removal of federal judicial constraints and calls for local control in tailoring programs for schools.

The only Hispanic, mentioned by name, who opposed the new plan is characterized as a demonstrator and one of the organizers of the press conference/rally organized by community groups opposed to the new plan.

Approximately 150 people were in attendance including many parents and children. No information is provided in the editorial regarding why this particular person was selected from the eight or so other Latino community members and elected public officials who spoke at the press conference. The editorial states that the Hispanic demonstrator threatened to start a recall of the entire school board if they backed away “from quality bilingual education.” The editorial questions her ability to represent the parents and their children who attend public school since she runs a private school. The editorial continues by pursuing the topic of what constitutes a quality bilingual education program. The editorial’s position is that the students spend too many years in the bilingual program. The editorial cites evidence, without providing any citations, that early exit programs are more effective than late exit ones (this technical terminology is not used by the editor). The editorial then mentions that the demonstrator needs to come to grips with this fact, which is driving the district’s current efforts to modify its program.

The editorials from both newspapers also support the district’s position that the goal of the bilingual program should be the acquisition of English. The editorials do not attribute any value to being bilingual or to developing biliteracy and they also challenge the effectiveness of bilingual education as the best way to teach English. They support the proposed changes in the bilingual program because, according to the editorials, the new plan will “refocus on the original purpose of these programs: to teach students English.” The editorials do not describe any of the objections raised about the new plan and do not discuss the charges leveled against the district regarding its lack of consistent implementation of the bilingual program. Neither do they present the concerns and perspectives of the Mexican-immigrant parents who support bilingual education. They do not even describe problems that the district itself had identified. In one issue of the newspaper, an editorial supports the district’s new plan while an article titled “District not bilingual enough, it admits” on the front page of the same section reports that, “Nearly half of [the district’s name] bilingual teachers during the last school year weren’t fully qualified for their jobs under the district’s own standards officials said Friday.” The unrealistic expectation that any educational program would be able to produce expected results when only 50% of the teachers have the proper credentials is never raised in the editorial. The district’s role in hiring and placing those unqualified teachers in bilingual classrooms is also never raised.

DISCUSSION

Language-as-problem was the first of the three orientations presented by Ruiz (1984). The Colorado district’s position operates from this orientation as reflected by their remedial and compensatory view of the bilingual students and by the goal that they propose for the bilingual education program. The district defines students by what they do not have - the English language - and not by what they do have - the Spanish language - or by their potential to

become biliterate. The role of the students' native language is strictly limited to a bridge to an all English instructional environment. Neither bilingualism nor biliteracy are mentioned in the district's new goal for the "English Language Acquisition Program." The same orientation of language-as-problem is evident in the editorials' position. The other two orientations, language as a right and language as a resource do not appear in either the Colorado district's nor the editorials' discourse; rather, they reinforce each other. An additional perspective seen exclusively in the editorials' discourse is the use of three Hispanics as ideological role models. This reproduces the perception that bilingual education is strictly a Hispanic rather than a broader educational issue. Of course within the context of the current debate over bilingual education, the students most impacted are minority community members, but, as two-way bilingual programs demonstrate, bilingual education is also of interest to non-minority parents (Crawford, 1995). A shift in ideological position would be required for the newspaper editors and district administrators to view language as a resource and as a right. Such a perspective would facilitate a further shift that would move bilingual education and bilingualism away from an ethnic and remediation issue to an enrichment issue that could be offered to all students who are interested in becoming bilingual regardless of their ethnicity. In spite of the current federal court order in the Colorado district, language-as-right is not found in the discourse of the school district or in the editorials.

The bilingual nature of the neighborhoods in which these students live, the importance of the native language in the maintenance of familial relationships, and the possibility that being bilingual and biliterate will increase students' future educational and occupational opportunities in a global economy does not enter into editors' or school administrators' discourse. Consequently, the Spanish language, being bilingual, and the learning that can take place through Spanish is devalued. In the editorials, bilingualism is not presented as something that would benefit all students' learning or the welfare of the country; a view that is held by the parents.

In contrast, the parents' discourse reflects an orientation to language as a resource, for students, their communities, and for the future well being of the country. In their discourse, there is no allusion to language as a problem. The parents wanted their children to develop bilingually with this bilingualism contributing to their having successful careers. The two mothers who were interviewed by the television reporter stated that they opposed the way that the district's discourse devalued their native language and bilingualism. Only one direct appeal to language as a right orientation was found. It came from a line in the flyer that stated, "Let us unite and fight for our children's rights." However, one mother's comment during the news interview, "no es justo" (it's not just-right) makes reference to a rights orientation based on a moral rather than legal economy. This appeal to the moral economy may lead to further examinations of the different types of notions of "rights" expressed in public discourse that invoke human moral dimensions of fairness and a sense of right

and wrong without necessarily being based on legal precedent. There is no convergence between the mothers' discourse and the district's or editors' in terms of overlapping orientations toward language. No evidence appears that would indicate that monolingual English-speaking editorial writers or school administrators receive information from Spanish language news broadcasts and avail themselves of the perspectives of Mexican immigrant parents. Consequently, the public debates surrounding bilingual education are carried out largely through two mutually exclusive public discourses distributed across two channels of print and electronic media, one in English and the other in Spanish.

The Orange County parents' involvement in their children's education, termed here "legitimate participation," was related to the areas of access, communication, and involvement that facilitated a direct participation in which mediators (translators) were not needed. In the bilingual education program, the parents were able to operate as legitimate actors by participating meaningfully in these areas through active involvement, not only in classroom interactions but also in school-wide contexts and activities. In doing so they were able to demonstrate to their children and teachers in many concrete ways their concern and interest in their children's education. Their ability to occupy the social position of legitimate participants depended on the recognition of their linguistic resources as linguistic capital by the marketplace of schools. Now, under the English-only language policy, they fear being left out and excluded from their children's education. The consequence of the elimination of the bilingual program in Orange County is not only the devaluing of the linguistic resources of the Latino community, but also the resulting simultaneous devaluing of the role and contribution of Latino parents in supporting their children's education. The shift to English-only imposes, through the symbolic means of language policies, a view of the world that disables the Latino-immigrant parents' legitimate participation by classifying and evaluating them and their linguistic and other types of capital. As a result, their legitimate social position within the education of their children, both at school and at home (e.g., assisting with homework) has been displaced. Under the guise of educational programmatic decisions, the parents have been covertly classified as being unprepared or unqualified to be active participants due to their limited knowledge of English while ignoring their abilities in Spanish to read books to classrooms and to participate in other school activities as they have done in the past.

Through the indirect channels of educational language policies, Latino parents are defined as not being competent to contribute directly to their children's education, and their capacity to advocate for their children's formal education has been undermined. The exercise of symbolic power through this shift in language policy denies these parents and others a visible role in the schooling of their children by denying them the participatory role that they desire to play. In this case, symbolic power is exercised to exclude and deny full

participation by covertly limiting legitimate participation, in terms of direct and unmediated (not through translators) communication, to the English language. The social position that parents could occupy as direct interlocutors in relation to school personnel and during school functions will decrease over time. It will be more difficult for them to demonstrate themselves as competent adults since they will be unable to demonstrate their competencies through the Spanish language. The possible future negative consequences for the educational careers of their children is difficult to overestimate. Also, it will be difficult for a school to present a welcoming attitude towards parents when it is implementing a language policy that devalues their linguistic and cultural resources and that is contrary to their wishes that their children develop bilingually. The displacement of parents from the social position of legitimate participant results from a "labor of representation" (Bourdieu, 1991) that reproduces, in a transformed form, the state of symbolic relations of power. This labor of representation functions to locate immigrants within a social space and position prescribed by dominant interests that minimizes their political power by devaluing their linguistic and other types of capital. Also, it is a move that imposes a view of the social world based on definitions of the present multicultural United States, in terms of past immigration patterns of linguistic assimilation, in an attempt to control a future in which Latinos will be this country's largest minority group. The resulting vision of the world is reproduced, in part, and made legitimate by, institutionalizing language policies in which English is made dominant over Spanish-English bilingualism.

As struggles involving ideological conflicts, the current debates over bilingual education that are taking place across the United States involve the struggle over who gets to determine the public value of the symbolic assets of ethnolinguistic communities--in this case the value of being bilingual, of the Spanish language, and of the competencies of Latino parents that facilitate their direct involvement in their children's education. The result of these struggles is the imposition of institutionally sanctioned views of the world that create educational and other types of markets where the value of linguistic resources is determined. These debates illustrate the role of schools as bureaucratic social systems in the institutionalization of particular language ideologies that are reflected in language policies including those that utilize formal schooling to "promote a single language code that will mark the educated person" (Heath, 1989, p. 394). In terms specific to bilingual education, language policies, such as transitional versus maintenance approaches and their possible consequences, linguistic assimilation, or language maintenance and the development of biliteracy, function to value or devalue the linguistic capital of minority communities. Regardless of the final outcomes of efforts to dismantle bilingual education, the debates bring with them all types of consequences. Thompson (1981) defines ideology as systems of signification which facilitate the pursuit of dominant interests and states that counter--ideologies are needed to articulate divergent interests. Bilingual education as a pedagogical

philosophy operates as a counter- ideology for the Latino-immigrant parents through which they resist linguistic assimilation and articulate and pursue divergent interests. As we have seen through the examples from the data, these divergent interests that claim value for bilingualism and for the Spanish language in the face of English-only pressures, can be pursued by shaping the discourse surrounding bilingual education in terms of language as a resource and language as a right rather than language as a problem, thereby bringing recognition to the Latino community's linguistic capital.

Although Latino parents have articulated their perspectives regarding the value they place on bilingualism and on their native language, their opposition to the devaluing of their linguistic capital, and bilingual education as a counter-ideology that can make their linguistic resources function as linguistic capital within the marketplace of schools and society, it does not appear that either school administrators, newspaper editors, nor policy makers have taken those perspectives into serious consideration. Instead, they have reduced bilingualism and bilingual education to an ethnic issue related to linguistic assimilation rather than examining it within the broader educational parameters of the aims of education, the development of a pluralistic society, and the preparation of students for a global economy. Building from this conclusion, a working definition of ideological conflicts involved in competing public discourses on bilingual education is proposed: Ideological conflicts involve the "said" and the "unsaid" in the competition for value, where what is "unsaid" indicates what is devalued as illustrated by the lack of reference to the Latino community's linguistic capital (biliteracy and the Spanish language) in the district's proposed new goal and name for the bilingual education program and by the exclusion of Mexican-immigrant parents' voices and perspectives from the newspaper editorials. On the other hand, what is "said" is a claim for linguistic capital, as illustrated by the goal for the district's new program, "for students to learn English using the most efficient and effective approaches so that they can be successful in the mainstream, English language instruction program" and by the Mexican-immigrant mother's writing, "The bilingual person is important for the development and prosperity of America." These utterances operate as slogans that are intended to mobilize constituencies and ideologies in the competing public discourses on bilingual education.

CONCLUSIONS

The main issue with linguistic capital is not whether communities and their members have it or do not have it, but whether social institutions such as schools will recognize the language and communicative resources of minority communities as linguistic capital. This was made apparent by the research on cultural and linguistic differences between minority communities and schools that later become associated with the home-school mismatch hypothesis in which teachers' knowledge and language attitudes played important roles in valuing or devaluing the linguistic resources of minority communities (e.g.,

Heath, 1982; Michaels, 1981; Philips, 1972). Besides the role of teachers, institutional recognition of the linguistic resources of minority communities, such as official policy statements that recognize their value, play an important role in the appropriation of linguistic capital. An example is the K-12 maintenance bilingual school board policy adopted by the Tucson Unified School District in 1981 that states in part,

Bilingual education is based on ... theories that emphasize learning through the use of the student's primary language as an initial and *continuing* medium of instruction while also emphasizing second language acquisition as an essential part of the student's total learning experience. (emphasis added, Tucson Unified School District, 1993, p. 4)

The educational value and contribution of the native language is recognized and institutionalized through this document. Current efforts to dismantle bilingual education reflect continued resistance to provide similar official recognition of the role and importance of the native language in a student's education.

While Latino-immigrant parents acknowledge the importance of English and the desire that their children become literate in English, the standard of English-only ignores the daily demands of living in bilingual neighborhoods and in regions of the country, such as the southwest, where both Spanish and English literacy are needed. One of the Mexican mothers interviewed in the television report illustrated the importance of the need to be bilingual within her socioeconomic world by pointing to the role of the bilingual television newscaster as exemplifying the types of occupational demands that her children would face. However, monolingual newspaper editors and policy makers are basing decisions of what Latino students need on their own socioeconomic worlds that do not require bilingual competencies while also choosing to ignore the increasing global nature of the economy that requires and rewards multilingualism. Of course, it is not only the monolingual--some bilingual Latino educators and policy makers support English-only policies and are used as ideological role models. Parents as well as children are implicated in these debates and the devaluing of linguistic resources also holds implications for their exclusion from legitimate participation in their children's schooling. With the elimination of bilingual education programs, children will not only be deprived of a strengths-based education that native-language instruction facilitates, but their cultural identity will not be affirmed - especially critical in overcoming negative stereotypes of Latinos and Mexicans. English-only policies also sabotage one of the most important educational supports that any parent can give their children, which is being an effective advocate for them.

Voter-initiated propositions mobilize segments of the population in struggles to maintain the status quo by invoking language ideologies and grand narratives of history in efforts to present privileged interpretations of

U.S. history (Bretzer, 1992); the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo is not likely to be invoked by proponents of anti-immigrant and anti-bilingual education initiatives. Initiatives mobilize segments of the population by sponsoring the constitution of electoral coalitions that are linked by ideological themes (Woolard, 1989). In the case of the anti-bilingual education initiative, those ideological themes crystallize around language ideologies concerning the English language that present it as the prototypical symbolic asset of American identity and grand narratives of immigration history that present previous immigration patterns of linguistic assimilation and language loss as the most natural and inevitable route to "Americanization." In the debates over bilingual education, English functions as a symbol of how the social world ought to be--English-speaking, and also functions as the emotive phrase that serves as a call to arms in guarding and protecting what grand narratives of U.S. immigration history define as the "tried and true" essential meaning of American identity. English is appropriated in claims for privileged interpretations of the past in order to influence and attempt to control the present as well as a future in which the demographic landscape of the U.S. will be drastically altered. As Bourdieu (1991, p. 236) notes, the categories constitutive of the social world are the stakes of political struggle. In the case of the Unz initiative, "English for the Children" and district-based efforts to eliminate bilingual education, language is reinforced as a boundary marker between recent immigrants and others by prioritizing English over Spanish-English bilingualism. Voter-initiated propositions operate to impose ideological positions in social arenas that are hotly contested. They impose either/or versions of reality; either the presence or absence of bilingual education. Consequently, these propositions can be seen as examples of symbolic domination through the exercise of symbolic power that take place not through direct physical or economic force, but rather through political force which masks the manipulation of symbolic assets under the electoral process of voter-initiated propositions or school board decisions.

The current debates over bilingual education are but the most recent chapter in the long history of conflicts over the role of Spanish in U.S. society and the issue of immigration. As in past times, these current debates over relationships between immigration and nationalism - what it means to be an American and symbolic markers of that identity - come at a time of increased anti-immigrant sentiment and efforts to discriminate against a specific immigrant group (Mertz, 1982). It is no coincidence that the targeted group, Latinos, are projected to become the largest minority group during the early part of the next century, making the Latino population and the associated Spanish language a critical factor in the demographic make-up of the country. Given these trends, notions of nationalism that were developed within historical contexts and conditions that do not fit current immigration patterns need to be challenged so that definitions of what it means to be an American take into consideration factors that impact current immigrants, such as cold-war era imperialism in Latin America and southeast Asia (Feagin, 1997), as well as conceptual issues,

such as transnationalism and borderland-hybrid cultures. Consideration of these historical and conceptual issues may contribute to the development of new notions of nationalism that more adequately reflect the experiences of current immigrant populations. Drawing from a biblical metaphor, new wineskins of nationalism are needed to hold the new wine that current Latino immigrants represent. The old wineskins will no longer do and will become more obsolete as the next century unfolds. As Mackey (1977) notes, myths that portray a country as being comprised of one language-one culture serve antiquated notions of nationalism.

Operating under a language-as-problem orientation, detractors of bilingual education do not recognize it as a legitimate educational philosophy in its own right whose goal is the learning of academic content and the equal development of another language plus English. They see it as a remedial program in which students are perceived to be underachieving as long as they remain in it. The language-as-problem orientation also does not address the importance of bilinguals as mediators/cultural brokers in an increasingly culturally diverse society. Ruiz (1984) discussed the importance of making language orientations evident in existing policies and also of advocating new ones. Language-as-boundary is presented for consideration as a possible new language orientation. In this orientation, the contributions arising from the intervention of the bilingual person as a possible mediator in the current debates and misunderstandings between different ethnolinguistic communities is presented. However, the ideological dimensions of the debate need to be addressed in order to make apparent hidden assumptions; the mere presence of bilinguals in debates over bilingual education does not insure their function as mediators/cultural brokers. The ideological dimensions of debates over bilingual education need to be addressed in the public discourse so that other issues and unexamined assumptions implicated in discussions of bilingual education, such as language ideologies and orientations, ideologies of nationalism, and grand narratives of immigration history where linguistic assimilation is presented as the norm, can be challenged and discussed. Unfortunately, if bilingual education programs continue to be replaced by English-only programs, as took place in Orange County, there will be fewer bilinguals who can fulfill this important mediation function.

REFERENCES

- American Anthropological Association.* (1996). Statement on language rights [On-line] Available: <http://www.ameranthassn.org/language.htm>
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Anderson, N. (1997, September 11) Judge Oks district's attempt to curb bilingual education. *Los Angeles Times*, p.A3.
- Ben-Rafael, E. (1994). *Language, identity and social division.* Oxford: Claredon Press.

- Bilingual bellweather? (1998, January). *California Journal* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.onenation.org/0198a.htm>
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). Economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16, 645-668.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). NY: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bretzer, J (1992). Language, power, and identity in multiethnic Miami. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English language controversy* (pp. 209-228). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Candelaria-Greene, J. (1994). Misperspectives on literacy: A critique of an Anglocentric bias in histories of American literacy. *Written Communication*, 11, 251-269.
- Cepeda, A. (1995). My life as an abused, Spanish-speaking child [On-line]. Available: <http://www.latinolink.com/his9172e.html>
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English language controversy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, J. (1995). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- Dallmayr, F. & MacCarthy, T. (1977). *Understanding and social inquiry*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Feagin, J. (1997). Old poison in new bottles: The roots of modern nativism. In J. Perea (Ed.), *Immigrants out: The new nativism and the anti-immigrant impulse in the United States* (pp. 13-43). NY: New York University Press.
- Gaarder, A. (1976). Linkages between foreign language teaching and bilingual education. In J. Atlatis & K. Twaddell (Eds.), *English as a second language in bilingual education* (pp. 199-203). Washington, D.C.: TESOL. In Trueba (1979).
- García, O. (1995). Spanish language loss as a determinant of income among Latinos in the United States: Implications for language policy in schools. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 142-160). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardiner, M. (1992). *The dialogics of critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the theory of ideology*. NY: Routledge.
- GOP bid to mend rift with Latinos still strained. (1997, August 31). *Los Angeles Times* [On-line]. Available: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCRAWFORD/LAT6.htm>
- Griswold del Castillo (1990). *The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A legacy of conflict*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Hasan, R. (1986). The ontogenesis of ideology: The interpretation of mother child talk. In T. Threadgold, E. Grosz, G. Kress, & M. Halliday (Eds.),

- Language, semiotics, ideology* (pp. 125-146). Sydney: The Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture.
- Heath, S. (1977). Social history. In *Bilingual education: Current perspectives. Vol. 1: Social Science* (pp. 53-72). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Heath, S. (1982). Questioning at home and school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling* (pp. 103-127). NY: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston.
- Heath, S. (1989). Language ideology. In *International encyclopedia of communications* (Vol.2, pp. 393-395). NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hernández-Chávez, E. (1988). Language policy and language rights in the United States: Issues in bilingualism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 45-56). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Irvine, J. (1989). When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy. *American Ethnologist*, 16, 248-267.
- Landa, V. (1995). *Cantinflas answers judge: "Ahi esta el detalle"* [On-line]. Available: <http://205.134.250.196/his9103e.html> Language and program limits at issue. (1997, April 30). *Education Week*, 6.
- LeDoux, D. (1997). *The history of bilingual education*. Unpublished manuscript. Linguistic Society of America. (1996). *Statement on linguistic rights* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.lsadc.org/langrite.html>
- Mackey, W. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition* (Forward). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Menéndez, A., & Moraga, A. (1997, April 17). Hispanic parents speak up for their children's schools: Reserve gives way to calls for bilingual education. *Orange County Register*. p.A1.
- Mertz, E. (1982). Language and mind: A Whorfian folk theory in United States language law. *Working papers in sociolinguistics* (no. 93). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Michaels, S. (1981). Sharing time: Children's narratives styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society*, 10, 30-34.
- Morales, A. (1995, August 30) Lawmakers blasts judge's comments on language. *Austin American Statesman*. p.B1.
- National Public Radio (1997, May 5). *Report on bilingual education in Orange County, California*.
- Next big push from California: No bilingual ed. (1997, July 30). *Christian Science Monitor*, 1, 5.
- Nicolau, S. & Valdivieso, R. (1992). Spanish language shift: Educational implications. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English language controversy* (pp. 317-322). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ochoa, A. (1995). Language policy and social implications for addressing the bicultural immigrant experience in the United States. In A. Darder (Ed.),

- Culture and difference* (pp. 227-253). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Phillipson, R. (1988). Linguicism: Structures and ideologies in linguistic imperialism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 339-358). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Pyle, A. (1997, January 16) Bilingual schooling is failing, parents say. *Los Angeles Times* p. B1.
- Ricento, T. & Hornberger, N. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 401-427.
- Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. NY: Cambridge University Press. In J. Thompson (Ed.), *Critical hermeneutics: A study in the thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jurgen Habermas*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudeness doesn't wash in anyone's language. (1997, August 15). *Amarillo Globe News* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.amarillonet.com/stories/081597/wash.html>
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *National Association for Bilingual Education Journal*, 8, 15-34.
- Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. NY: Routledge.
- Schmidt, R. (1997). Latinos and language policy: The politics of culture. In C. García (Ed.), *Pursuing power: Latinos and the political system* (pp. 343-367). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 9-44). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Stam, R. (1988). Bakhtin and the left cultural critique. In A. Kaplan (Ed.), *Postmodernism and its discontents* (pp. 116-145). NY: Verso.
- Thompson, J. (1981). *Critical hermeneutics: A study in the thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jurgen Habermas*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J. (1991). Editor's introduction. In *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tollefson, J. (1995). *Power and inequality in language education*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Trujillo, A. (1996). In search of Aztlán: Movimiento ideology and the creation of a Chicano worldview through schooling. In B. Levinson, D. Foley, & D. Holland (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person* (pp. 119-149). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Tucson Unified School District (1993). *Comprehensive plan for bilingual education*. Tucson, AZ: Tucson Unified School District.
- Vasquez, O., Pease-Alvarez, L., Shannon, S. (1994). *Pushing boundaries: Language and culture in a Mexicano community*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Weintraub, D.M. (1997, July 11) State stall is go-ahead for english-only plan education. *The Orange County Register*. p.A1.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1996). What happens when languages are lost?: An essay on language assimilation and cultural identity. In D. Slobin, J. Gerhardt, A.

- Kyrtziz, & J. Guo (Eds.), *Social interaction, social context, and language* (pp. 435-446). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Woolard, K. (1989). Sentences in the language prison: The rhetorical structuring of an American language policy debate. *American Ethnologist*, 16, 268-278.
- Woolard, K. & Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23, 55-82.
- World Conference on Linguistic Rights (1996). Universal declaration of linguistic rights[On-line]. Available: http://www.troc.es/mercator/CMDL_E.htm

APPENDIX A

Urgent Bulletin ...

[City]

[Date]

TO: All the parents of families in the school district. We communicate that we are being strongly attacked by the school district who wants to deny and eliminate bilingual education.

No! we will not permit it. Let us unite and fight for our children's rights, for if we allow them to eliminate bilingual education we will be permitting the dropping out of our children from school. Let us show ourselves and raise our voice in one desire - to keep bilingual education.

No! we will not let ourselves to be mocked, humiliated and much less will we permit treason. This woman is not a good representative nor does she defend bilingual education.

United we will obtain that our children achieve triumph and success in their life. The bilingual person is important for the development and prosperity of America. Today let us meet at [time and location], seeing that there will be a press conference. Let your presence be known and support this struggle.

United we will obtain victory!

Don't forget, we are depending on you ...

Sincerely: [Name of Sponsoring Group]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research support through a National Academy of Education-Spencer Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship is gratefully acknowledged. Thanks also to Margaret LeCompte and the students and visitors in her seminar for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this article. The title of this article owes its origins to Aaron Ramirez.