

米国加州言語政策227資料（2）

Newspaper articles on 227 (2)

By Hisao Arimura

Abstract

The present paper is a collection of newspaper clippings, editorials and magazine articles which dealt with the issue of proposition 227. These writings were produced in the year of 1997 in the United States. Even though proposition 227 was a Californian issue, it attracted a great amount of attention in the United States. The present author believes it was a confrontation between the maintenance of cultural diversity and the movement toward socio-cultural homogeneity. Naturally, the issue of bilingual education was and is not a simple black and white issue. Some of these articles were supportive of proposition 227 or totally against the adoption of proposition 227 in California.

Unz Pursues Initiative To Ban Bilingual Education

June 3, 1997

By ED MENDEL, Staff Writer

A wealthy former Republican candidate for governor, Ron Unz, is pushing an initiative for the June 1998 ballot that would end most bilingual education in California schools.

The initiative creates the potential for the third racially divisive ballot measure in as many election years -- following Proposition 187 to withhold services from illegal immigrants in 1994 and Proposition 209 to ban affirmative action last year.

Unz has enlisted a Latina co-sponsor, Gloria Matta Tuchman of Santa Ana, and has included a provision in the initiative that would pump an additional \$50 million a year into adult English-language instruction.

Unz, who received 34 percent of the vote in his 1994 primary race against Gov. Pete Wilson, said many Latinos are concerned that bilingual education is slowing the learning of English.

"As liberals and Democrats start getting involved, I think it will become clear that we are talking about a unifying not a divisive issue," said Unz, a resident of Palo Alto, and founder of a computer software firm. But state GOP chairman Michael Schroeder, who personally opposes bilingual education, said he fears that the initiative will raise another controversy as the party tries to broaden its base by reaching out to minorities.

“The Democrats will certainly run out there and say this is just another example of Hispanic-bashing and that they hate people who speak Spanish,” said Schroeder. “It’s not true. It’s not a party-sponsored initiative.”

An attorney for the Mexican-Attorney Legal Defense and Educational Fund said it’s not clear yet whether the issue of bilingual education will stir passions like the initiatives on illegal immigration and affirmative action, both of which have been at least temporarily blocked in court.

“It’s really early,” said Thomas Saenz, a MALDEF attorney. “It’s another one of those propositions subject to a great deal of confusion, and it’s not something that people have had a great deal of information about.”

However, Saenz said, he is concerned that the Unz initiative requires instruction in English, eliminating other options. He also said that Tuchman was connected in the past with U.S. English, a group whose founder made controversial statements about limiting Latino immigration.

“That suggests to me there is something else going on here other than perhaps the best educational interest of the students,” said Saenz.

Unz said Tuchman was named woman of the year by the League of United Latin American Citizens. He said he was prompted to sponsor the initiative by a report last year of Latino parents in Los Angeles protesting the failure of bilingual education.

“There is a significant number of children in California who have been in the public school system for a number of years, starting in kindergarten, who still do not speak English,” said Unz, who plans to help finance the initiative drive but is looking for additional financial support.

Last year, only 6.5 percent of the students in bilingual education made the transition into regular English-speaking classes, according to the state Department of Education.

Unz said the initiative requires that students be taught in English, unless the parents request otherwise. Currently, students with limited English proficiency, 1.3 million or 23 percent of all California students, are eligible to receive bilingual education in their native language.

Unz said the initiative calls for “sheltered English immersion” instruction from teachers trained to handle students who do not speak English. He said the teachers use English, supplemented by pictures and gestures.

While federal courts have blocked other initiatives, Unz said he is confident there is no constitutional basis for requiring bilingual education.

The state law authorizing bilingual education expired in 1987. The program continues to operate under old guidelines, having received \$318 million in state funds last year.

Sen. Dede Alpert, D-Coronado, said her attempts to reauthorize a reformed program have been blocked for the last three years by both the supporters and opponents of bilingual education.

“Both groups object to this more moderate approach, which calls for more accountability and flexibility,” said Alpert.

Unz said his initiative will break the legislative deadlock. He said he plans to put the initiative on the June ballot next year to avoid creating a partisan issue in the November election.

The initiative was submitted to the attorney general last month. Unz said he hopes to receive authorization to begin gathering signatures by July 1.

ENGLISH Campaign Begins!

Saturday, July 5, 1997

Dear Supporter,

Great news! After weeks of deep introspection, the Supreme Bureaucrats in Sacramento have finally issued their official Title and Summary for our initiative, which means we can now begin gathering signatures. The particular Title and Summary which they selected was fairly typical in its convoluted language and cautious analysis, but overall we are reasonably satisfied. Furthermore, we are convinced that future studies will allow the fiscal impact statement’s vague mention of “potential savings to local school districts” to be hardened into a figure of at least \$300 million per year by the time the actual election ballots are prepared. The following is the official Title and Summary, issued late on July 3rd:

EDUCATION. PUBLIC SCHOOLS. ENGLISH AS REQUIRED LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Requires all public school instruction be conducted in English. Requirement may be waived if parents or guardians show that child already knows English, or has special needs, or would learn English faster through alternate instructional technique. Provides short-term placement, not normally exceeding one year, in intensive sheltered English immersion programs for children not fluent in English. Appropriates \$50 million per year for ten years funding English instruction for individuals pledging to provide personal English tutoring to children in their community. Permits enforcement suits by parents and guardians. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: Probably no change in total state spending on K-12 public education. Potential savings to local school districts on programs for students with limited English proficiency.

Even as I type this message, our petitions are printing over this weekend, and should be ready for distribution early this week, at which point we must begin gathering the 650,000+ signatures which we will require to be sure of qualifying our initiative for the ballot, and ending the disastrous system of “bilingual education” in California by June 1998.

And here’s where all of you come in. We need your signatures, we need your time, we need your

dollars, we need your support and your enthusiasm and your energy if our efforts are to succeed. Some of us have already put a lot of our own time and money into this effort; we'll have to put in more. Others have been pledging their support when needed; it's needed now. Still others have been considering helping; it's now or never. If all of us put our noses to the grindstone for about the next four months, the "English for the Children" initiative will qualify for the ballot. For our type of initiative, getting on the ballot virtually guarantees victory at the ballot---in the entire history of the U.S., "bilingual education" has never been put to a vote of the people, and in June of 1998, we'll demonstrate why.

For those of you concerned about working hard to put initiatives on the ballot only to see them quickly blocked by courts, take heart. The 9th Circuit Appellate Court decision of *Guadalupe v. Tempe* (which we have posted on our web site at www.OneNation.org) states in the clearest possible manner that "bilingual education" is optional not mandated under federal law. Thus, once our initiative passes, all California schoolchildren will begin learning English in class the first day the next school term begins.

Remember, though, that this initiative is not about immigration, and is certainly not anti-immigrant. This initiative is also not about directing blame for the dreadful failures in our current system for non-English speaking students---both political parties have their fingerprints on the mess, and I (at least) believe that most of the early supporters of "bilingual education" were well-intentioned and sincere individuals who believed that the system would work in practice as well as it does in theory. But after 25 years of testing, it is clear that they were wrong, and we must now move on to other language methods.

Today, 23.1% of all California schoolchildren don't know English. With your help, we'll send the current system to the junkyard in June 1998, begin teaching English to all the children in our schools at that point, and achieve something closer to 99% fluency among California schoolchildren by January 1999. Let's get the job done!

Just e-mail, fax, or write us for the quantity of petitions which you need. We'll send them out immediately. Also, feel free to forward this or any other message on to whomever you think might also be interested in getting rid of "bilingual education."

Thanks for all your help, including help still to come,

Ron Unz

A Bilingual-Education Initiative as a Prop. 187 in Disguise?

Los Angeles Times Sunday, July 6, 1997

By RUBÉN NAVARRETTE JR.

Bilingual education is back in the news. The Orange Unified School Board has voted unanimously to seek permission from the state to terminate its bilingual education program and replace it with English immersion. Ruben Zacarias, superintendent of the L.A. Unified School District, wants to limit the number of years a student remains on a bilingual track. And new polling data suggest that a majority of Latino parents, notably in Orange County, are worried that their children will become mired in bilingual education; they strongly believe in early English proficiency. Come June 1998, all California may be pulled into the bilingual fray if the English Language Education for Immigrant Children Initiative qualifies for the ballot.

At first glance, the measure appears to be the latest embodiment of the sort of anti-immigrant and anti-Latino prejudice enshrined in Proposition 187. But that oversimplification may mischaracterize the proposed initiative as harmful, when it may be helpful.

The initiative would require that all students be placed in English-language classrooms; provide students classified as “English learners” (limited English proficient in current parlance) with a one-year transition period of “sheltered immersion,” in which instruction is in English but the curriculum and presentation are designed for non-English speakers; allow students’ parents, under certain conditions, to opt for bilingual education, and annually appropriate \$50 million for English-language instruction classes for parents who pledge to provide students with “English language tutoring.”

The initiative, sponsored by former gubernatorial candidate Ron Unz and teacher Gloria Matta Tuchman, is based on a number of suppositions. One, that bilingual education has failed. Two, that school bureaucracies addicted to the additional funding provided for bilingual students ignore complaints of parents who want their children taught in English. And, finally, since schools have shirked their “moral obligation” to leave students with the skills necessary to be successful, including English proficiency, more power should be returned to parents.

The English for the Children initiative will no doubt run afoul of extremists on both right and left. Cultural purists, nativists and those resentful of financing bilingual education in California will balk at either the prospect of paying an additional \$50 million to teach English to parents or the idea of allowing those parents to opt for bilingual education. The pro-bilingual crowd, on the other hand, will bristle at the idea of putting all children in English-language classrooms and will, on the heels of Propositions 187 and 209, decry the initiative as the third assault in as many elections on California’s growing Latino population.

One wild card in all this will be younger Mexican Americans. They opposed Proposition 187 because it blocked access to education. They were conflicted over Proposition 209 because it seemed to both limit opportunity and reward merit. On bilingual education, how will they line up? For the MTV generation, at ease with English, there are no historical scars, no romantic connection to bilingual education as rectifier of linguistic wrongs, no hang-ups over “the way it used to be” in public schools, no hostility toward English and no reluctance to scrutinize the motivations of interest groups. Within a generation that struggles with Spanish and answers its Mexican abuelita’s questions in English, it may prove difficult to whip up hysteria over an end to government-subsidized bilingualism.

Along the way, these young, more open-minded Mexican Americans may be joined by immigrant parents. Early last year, at the Ninth Street School in downtown Los Angeles, where nine of 10 students do not speak English and where only 1% of students master enough English to test out of the bilingual program, dozens of parents, calling themselves Las Familias del Pueblo, revolted against bilingual education, demanding that the school eliminate it and re-emphasize learning English. School officials dismissed their wishes.

A few months later, a survey of 600 Latino parents, by the Washington-based Center for Equal Opportunity, found that 81.3% preferred that their children’s courses be taught in English, while only 12.2% chose Spanish. Those figures are consistent with a 1988 Department of Education study, which revealed that 78% of Mexican parents opposed teaching language-minority children in a non-English language if “it meant less time teaching them English.” They also mesh with more recent findings in a Los Angeles Times poll, which found that 83% of Latino parents in Orange County favor English-language instruction as soon as their children begin school, while only 17% support native-language instruction.

Presented with such figures, school officials and defenders of bilingual education have, up to now, held their ground, contending that parents are “uninformed” and “misguided” and asserting that schools know how best to educate their children.

This old refrain hearkens back to 1968, at the height of the modern Chicano Movement. That was also the year that Congress pushed through the Bilingual Education Act--and sparked 30 years of intermittent debate. It was also the year when thousands of Mexican American students, protesting what they considered to be an inferior education designed by mostly white school officials, walked out of five high schools in the L.A. Unified School District. At school board meetings, the students’ parents rose and spoke in support of their children. The school officials’ response: They knew better.

That story is a poignant reminder of just how far those who profess to advocate for Latinos have,

in 30 years, strayed from their own ideals. Today, advocacy groups, in circling the wagons to preserve besieged programs like bilingual education, no longer ask themselves tough questions about whether such programs are worth preserving in the first place. As a result, Latino parents who have taken a stand against bilingual education have stood alone, at odds with the very groups that are supposed to be their champions.

Meanwhile, the national education system claims, from the beginning, to have used bilingual education to give non-English-speaking students a voice. How ironic that now, in ignoring growing opposition to the program, that same system should deny a voice to their parents.

Ruben Navarrette Jr. is author of a "Darker Shade of Crimson" (Bantam).

Los Angeles Times

Wednesday, July 9, 1997

Campaign Targets Bilingual Education

Former gubernatorial candidate Ron Unz and teacher Gloria Matta Tuchman unveil petition drive for 1998 initiative.

By AMY PYLE, Times Education Writer

A campaign to end bilingual education in California was being launched inside a skid row day-care center Tuesday morning, but the phalanx of television cameras did not interrupt Jose Negrete's construction of an intricate Lego pirate cove.

As former gubernatorial candidate Ron Unz and English-only teacher Gloria Matta Tuchman described their quest for a spring 1998 statewide initiative--which was cleared last week by the state attorney general, enabling a signature drive to begin today--the 10-year-old sorted through a peg-legged pirate, a skeleton, a treasure chest and, of course, the plank.

Although Jose was oblivious to the speechmaking, he was actually an inspiration for the initiative, as one of 80 Spanish-speaking children held out of Ninth Street School by their parents last year after administrators refused to move them into all-English classes.

The Times' coverage of the two-week boycott piqued the interest of software entrepreneur Unz, who decided to renew his fight against bilingual education. "Our initiative ensures that the parents get their wish," Unz said.

Jose's role in what could become a historic moment in California education began in February 1996, when he was a third-grader in a bilingual class, taught mostly in Spanish. Thanks to the boycott, by September he was attending a fourth-grade class taught entirely in English.

"At first, I didn't understand what the teacher was telling me," he said in clear but accented English. Was it scary? "Yes. Then I started learning, little by little."

The value of English is crystal clear to Jose. “When you get big, if you go to work and they talk to you in English and you don’t understand them, they can fire you.”

Now, a quarter of California’s public school students are eligible for bilingual classes. Nearly half the Los Angeles Unified School District students are eligible.

Dubbed “English for the Children,” Unz’s initiative would require that all public school instruction be conducted in English unless a parent can prove a child would learn faster through an alternative--possibly bilingual--technique. Under current state laws, roughly the opposite is true: non-English-speaking children are to be placed in some form of bilingual education unless parents request English-only instruction.

The initiative provides for one year of immersion in English before students are mainstreamed.

Unz said his proposal was prompted by public opinion polls showing that Latino parents want their children in English-only programs and by statistics indicating that bilingual programs graduate only 5% of their children annually into regular classes. “That’s a 95% failure rate,” he said.

Bilingual advocates, poised to battle the measure, say Unz has misinterpreted the data. The 5% “transition rate” is based on all bilingual education students, most of whom are only beginning a three- to seven-year transition to all-English classes.

The impact on bilingual students could be devastating, said Joseph Jaramillo, staff attorney for the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund. “It would send many California schools into crisis because they would be stripped of the very tools necessary to bring children into the mainstream.”

MALDEF is watching the initiative carefully, Jaramillo said, because of its potential for tapping into the same immigrant-bashing that helped pass Proposition 187.

But Republican Unz, who opposed bilingual education when he ran against Gov. Pete Wilson in the primary in 1994, said he wants to avoid becoming another magnet for anti-immigrant rage. He notes that he campaigned against Proposition 187 and that some conservatives already have distanced themselves from his initiative because it would add \$50 million a year to programs that teach English to adults interested in becoming English tutors.

Unz sought out Matta Tuchman to lend classroom reality to his campaign. Matta Tuchman has long opposed bilingual education and teaches an English immersion first-grade class in Santa Ana. She has challenged bilingual education for decades but had virtually sworn off spending time on the cause until she received Unz’s phone call. “After a while you feel like a broken record,” she said. “Isn’t anybody listening?”

English-Only Teachers Need Not Apply

Los Angeles Times

Saturday, July 19, 1997

By:KATHLEEN SALISBURY

I am a fifth grade teacher at one of the 100 lowest-performing schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Part of the performance problem with the schools is the district's bilingual program, which has resulted in a high proportion of novice teachers clustered in the worst schools. In the district's frenzy to hire bilingual teachers, emergency credentialed teachers are pushing out experienced, dedicated, fully credentialed teachers.

Why? Most of those highly experienced teachers do not speak fluent Spanish. Teachers with life-time credentials and 20 or 30 years of experience are being redesignated "teachers in training." In order to keep our current positions, many of us are being required to sign a contract stating that we will become fluent in Spanish in a specific time. (A promise most of us will not be able to keep). Meanwhile we are listed as "misassigned."

And with the district's new bilingual master plan just implemented, we are told that seniority, a long fought for right, no longer counts in our assignments; a bilingual teacher just out of college and with an emergency credential and no teaching experience can "bump" a fully credentialed monolingual teacher from a position.

There are two salary tiers: Teachers who speak Spanish are paid a \$5,000 stipend over teachers who are monolingual English speakers. Seasoned elementary teachers are looking to other districts for jobs or seeking early retirement.

It has been made very clear to us that, regardless of our teaching experience, we are not valued at our schools because we speak only the language of this country. Many good, experienced teachers have left my school, replaced by novices. The demand for Spanish-speaking teachers rapidly increases as the district continues to fail to transition into English the ever-growing numbers of Latino children. The positions for English-only teachers shrink.

The message: Only those who speak a foreign language are qualified to teach California's students. It is commonly said that it takes five years to begin to be a good teacher. Many of the new bilingual teachers will also become effective teachers. But who will pay for those years?

Kathleen Salisbury Teaches at Hooper Avenue Elementary School.

Next Big Push From California: No Bilingual Ed

Wednesday, July 30, 1997, FRONT PAGE.

The Christian Science Monitor

By: Daniel B. Wood, Staff writer

California - home to half the nation's immigrants - has begun what promises to be another soul-searching debate over what constitutes just treatment of America's minorities and its newest residents.

In 1994, Prop. 187 denied education and medical attention to illegal aliens, and last year's Prop. 209 took aim at affirmative action. The target this time: bilingual education in a state with half of all children in the US considered not proficient in English.

"After 25 years of trying, California has proved that bilingual education doesn't work," says Ron Unz, a multimillionaire software entrepreneur in Palo Alto who is underwriting the measure for next year's ballot. Citing a 95 percent failure rate in the state's current program, and polls showing a great majority of minorities prefer English immersion, Mr. Unz is readying his initiative (entitled "English for the Children") for next year's ballot.

The measure would virtually abolish bilingual instruction for 1.3 million public school students who are considered "limited English proficient." Currently these students are put in classrooms where at least part of the teaching happens in their native tongue. The new plan would mandate that all California public-school children be taught in English, and that parents who still want bilingual classes sign a special request.

"We hope this sounds the death knell for bilingual programs in other states as well," adds Unz, who got a third of the vote against Gov. Pete Wilson before losing the 1996 GOP primary.

After meeting with Latino parents who were protesting bilingual policies that kept their children in Spanish-language classes, Unz noticed that nearly a dozen bilingual reform measures had stalled in the state legislature. He decided a citizen initiative was the only way to break the logjam.

He argues that bilingual classes cost too much and that children come out of them not knowing English and therefore not being able to function in society.

The issue is heating up nationwide. Because of tight education budgets, and because reformers elsewhere have taken aim at bilingual programs, California's plan is likely to attract great attention.

In Massachusetts, lawmakers are considering a plan that would screen applicants, limit participation to three years, and set stricter standards for bilingual teachers. Michigan and New Jersey in 1995 adopted measures easing some mandates.

California's laws requiring bilingual education expired 10 years ago, and there have been many

pushes to replace the programs with English-immersion classes. But because of political inertia, say Unz and others, and self-interest of school systems and bilingual educators, they will continue unless citizens act.

“Bilingual education in America is a cash cow for the schools that have these programs,” says Mauro Mujica, director of US English, a Washington, D.C.-based advocacy group. Saying California spends \$4 billion annually -- and the US spends \$12 billion -- on bilingual education, he adds that any state trying to nix the classes will “have a horrendous fight on its hands.”

But defenders of the beleaguered system say the changes would harm minority students.

Immigrants aren’t likely to sign up for bilingual classes, even though they would still be available in limited form, argues Silvina Rubinstein, executive director of the California Association of Bilingual Educators. They will feel a “cultural reticence” to argue for bilingual classes, she says. And without bilingual classes, critics worry some students will fall behind in subjects taught in English - such as math and social science. Harry Pachon, director of the Tomas Rivera Policy Center in Claremont, Calif., fears a return to failed policies of immersion in which immigrants are placed in English-only classes and asked to “sink or swim.”

Opponents concede the initiative will get the 433,269 signatures it needs to qualify for the ballot. Many acknowledge it will be tough to defeat.

But they still argue that the campaign on the issue will be ripe for rhetoric and confusion - and that, based on court challenges to both Props. 187 and 209, perhaps the issue is best left out of the citizen-initiative process.

Desperate to Learn English

New York Times August 15, 1997

By ALICE CALLAGHAN

LOS ANGELES -- Juana and Florencio left the poverty of their rural Mexican village in 1985 and came to Los Angeles to work in the garment district’s sweatshops.

In 1996, they pulled their three children -- all born in Los Angeles -- out of school for nearly two weeks until the school agreed to let them take classes in English rather than Spanish.

Seventy other poor immigrant families joined this school boycott in February 1996, insisting that their children be allowed out of the city’s bilingual program, which would not teach English to children from Spanish-speaking homes until they learned how to read and write in Spanish.

In the end, the parents prevailed.

Yet, throughout California and elsewhere in the country, many Hispanic parents are worried that bilingual education programs are keeping their children from learning English.

These children live in Spanish-speaking homes, play in Spanish-speaking neighborhoods and study in Spanish-speaking classrooms.

With little exposure to English in the primary grades, few successfully learn it later.

This is why many Latino parents are backing a California ballot initiative that would end bilingual education for most children in the state. The measure will be put to a vote in June if enough signatures are gathered to put it on the ballot.

School administrators, Latino politicians and other advocates of bilingual education have denounced the measure.

Though they acknowledge the failings of the system, they insist they can fix it with time.

Yet after 25 years, bilingual education has few defenders among Latino parents. In a Los Angeles Times poll this year, 83 percent of Latino parents in Orange County said they wanted their children to be taught in English as soon as they started school.

Only 17 percent of those surveyed said they favored having their children taught in their native language.

One reason bilingual education is so entrenched is money. Bilingual teachers in Los Angeles are paid extra, up to \$5,000 a year; schools and school districts receive hundreds of dollars for each child who is designated as having limited proficiency in English.

About \$400 million in state and Federal money supports bilingual educational programs in California. Because such money is not readily relinquished, students languish in Spanish-language classes.

Moreover, there are not enough bilingual teachers. In Los Angeles, the shortfall has been so severe that the city has granted emergency credentials to people whose only claim to a classroom lectern is their ability to speak Spanish.

Latino parents know that placing their children in English-language classes will not cure the many problems plaguing California schools, where the Latino dropout rate is 40 percent and Latino students have consistently low achievement test scores. Unless these students can learn in English, future school reform efforts will not help them.

Most parents who participated in the school boycott last year labor in garment district sweatshops.

Others wait on tables, clean downtown offices or sell fruit or tamales on street corners.

All struggle on average monthly incomes of \$800.

Education is their only hope for a better future for their children. The first step is learning English.

Alice Callaghan, an Episcopalian priest, is director of the Las Familias del Pueblo community center.

San Jose Mercury News

August 17, 1997

Bilingual Schooling Is the Next Fight

By CARLOS MUÑOZ, Jr.

CALIFORNIA has a history of setting national trends with bad ballot measures. First it was the anti-immigrant Proposition 187. Then it was the anti-affirmative-action Proposition 209. Now it's the "English for the Children" initiative, which will probably appear on the ballot in 1998.

The proposed measure's objective is to abolish bilingual education. A multimillionaire software entrepreneur, Ron Unz, is funding the effort. He says bilingual education must go because it does not successfully teach children English and is too costly. He calls bilingual education "a bizarre government program."

Unz and his fellow conservatives have successfully recruited a group of Latino immigrant parents to support their initiative. The parents are not conservative Republicans. They are simply upset that their children's school bilingual program is not teaching them English fast enough.

It's understandable that some parents may be disenchanted if the bilingual program their children are enrolled in is not doing its job. But abolishing bilingual education will not solve the problem. It will only make it more difficult for their children to learn English.

Without bilingual education, non-English speaking children will be immersed in strictly English-speaking classrooms. In effect, the state will throw these kids into the swimming pool before they've learned to swim.

Instead of ending bilingual education, California should get better-qualified teachers and provide the resources necessary to make the program viable.

But proponents of the initiative will hear nothing of it. Though Unz has said the initiative should not be interpreted as yet another ballot measure against immigrants, it's hard to take it any other way. The new initiative, much like Proposition 187, will mostly affect immigrant children and U.S.-born children of immigrants.

And proponents of the measure to end bilingual education have more than classrooms in mind. Their agenda is directly connected to the English-only movement that started in the 1970s in California and has spread nationwide since then. In 1986, that movement succeeded in passing an initiative making English California's official language. English-only proponents have fought a similar, but so far unsuccessful, battle in the U.S. Congress to make English the nation's official language.

Backers of the proposed "English for the Children" initiative and other English-only efforts are sadly out of touch. The economic realities here in the United States make it imperative that

bilingual education in our public schools expand into multilingual education, and that multicultural curriculum expand as well.

Our public schools have the responsibility to prepare all our youth -- both immigrant and U.S. born -- with the language skills necessary to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

The Wall Street Journal

August 22, 1997

GOP Confronts Future Without Hispanics: Adios!

By PAUL GIGOT, The Wall Street Journal

California is supposed to show us the future, which is why smart Republicans are nervous. They've glimpsed it and what they see looks eerily like their recent past in Hawaii.

They don't mean palm trees and poi. They mean a politics dominated by ethnic Democrats for decades on end.

That's the future suggested by two internal studies on voter trends and attitudes that are the talk of the former juggernaut known as the California GOP. The home state of Presidents Nixon and Ronald Reagan hasn't elected a Democratic governor since Jerry Brown lost to the medfly after his re-election in 1978. Yet the two studies all but shout that unless Republicans repair their fractured relations with the state's Hispanics, the party will soon be a permanent minority.

What's remarkable is that this warning comes from the staff of the state assembly's Republican Caucus, the heart of GOP conservatism. The state media used to call them "cavemen." Republican Gov. Pete Wilson played off them to display his own moderation.

Yet these studies reveal that Republicans owe much of their weakness with Hispanics to the political strategy of Gov. Wilson himself. His attack on immigration as a political wedge may have helped him win a second term in 1994. But the effort so polarized Hispanic voters that it backfired on Republicans in 1996, and could well cost them the statehouse in 1998 and beyond.

Here's the bad news: GOP voter registration has been lower this decade than at any time since the 1930s. Only 11% of new voters have signed up as Republicans. Democrats have registered 26%, while third parties and those who refused a label total 64%. In the Reaganite 1980s, Republicans outregistered Democrats by more than two to one.

Why the reversal? A two-term presidency explains part of it, because new, younger voters identify with the first president they know, even Bill Clinton. But the GOP analysis also fingers "demographic changes," especially "the political awakening of Latinos."

Thus the really bad GOP news: The Latino share of the vote has increased in California in each election in the 1990s (to 11% in 1996), but the GOP share of that Latino vote has decreased. Mr.

Wilson took one in three Latino votes in 1990 but only one in four in 1994, while Bob Dole's share fell to nearly one in five last year. More ominously, GOP consultant Kevin Spillane says he's seen a poll showing that the likely GOP nominee for governor next year, Attorney General Dan Lungren, now gets only 14% of the Latino vote. *Vaya con Dios, amigo.*

All of this reminds Mr. Spillane of what happened in his native Hawaii 40 years ago when it was a two-party state. Hawaii's first Republican governor, elected in 1959, was also its last. The state's white GOP elite ignored the native Hawaiians and Asian-Americans who flocked into Democratic ranks. Hawaii has since become more Democratic than even West Virginia, tragically evolving into a slow-growth welfare state.

The reaction of the GOP's Pat Buchanan-National Review immigrant-bashers to all of this is to dismiss all Hispanics as hopeless Democrats and recommend building a Tortilla Curtain even faster. To reduce the Hispanic population in the future, in short, Republicans are supposed to drive even more Hispanics into Democratic arms today.

This assumes, in good deterministic logic, that third- or fourth-generation Hispanic-Americans will vote the same way in 2040 as their grandparents did in 1996. So what hasn't been true of Irish or Italians or Vietnamese is certain for Latinos.

This strategy also ignores the fact that Hispanic voter share is going to rise fast no matter what happens to immigration. That's because Hispanics have higher than average fertility rates and because many recent immigrants aren't yet registered to vote, or don't bother to turn out.

Instead of targeting immigrants, Republicans could always try something truly radical -- like asking Hispanics to vote for them today! The GOP assembly analysis confirms that Latinos are more culturally conservative than most Americans--for example, on abortion, crime and gay rights. While Latinos tend to be more liberal on economics, they also have a strong and growing culture of small-business entrepreneurship. They would respond to GOP themes of economic opportunity, lower taxes and education reform.

Republicans are also privately debating whether to require that all students be taught in English. The concept is supported by most Latinos, who know English is the path to upward mobility. But the GOP analysis says the party "must avoid" any "nativist sentiments from infecting its message." The immigrant-bashers may have poisoned the well on even this sensible assimilationist proposal.

One Republican who's shown what's possible is Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan. He won 60% of Latinos in his re-election this year, compared to 43% in 1993. "We haven't spent enough time saying that, one, immigration is valued, and two, the Latino community is valued," says Curt Pringle, former assembly speaker and a sponsor of the GOP Caucus studies.

The good news amid all of these bad portents is that the crusade by a few columnists and British expatriates to turn the GOP into an anti-immigrant party seems to have failed. Immigrant-bashing has proven to be lousy American politics. When even California conservatives admit this, the debate should be over. New York Times

September 5, 1997

First Teach Them English

By *DIANE RAVITCH*

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was intended to help Hispanic children learn English. But nearly 30 years later, it is clear that bilingual education has been a dismal failure.

The United States Department of Education recently reported a dropout rate of 30 percent for Hispanics between the ages of 16 and 24, more than double the dropout rate for blacks or whites in the same age group. The report also found that Hispanic students who spoke English well were far less likely to drop out than those who did not.

In 1994, a New York City Board of Education study showed that more than 90 percent of the students who started bilingual education in the sixth grade were unable to pass an English language test after three years of bilingual instruction. The students most likely to languish in bilingual classes for four or more years were Hispanic.

Despite the failure of bilingual education, the President and Congress have agreed to increase Federal financing for it to \$354 million. That's double the amount spent in 1996, and it will trigger even more spending at the state and local levels.

Moreover, the New York State Education Department is expanding such programs. In June, the state issued new guidelines for students from English-speaking Caribbean nations who speak or understand a Creole language. Many students from countries like Jamaica, Barbados, Antigua and the Bahamas will be routed into bilingual classes if they score in the bottom 40 percent on an English-language test. The state has listed nearly two dozen distinct Creole languages -- including Leeward Islands Creole, Kokoy, Papiamentu and Bermudian Creole -- that must be taught when at least 20 students who speak the language are in the same building and the same grade.

If these students had never left their countries they would have been instructed in English, which is the official language of the Caribbean nations identified by the state in this bizarre initiative. Now that they are residents of New York, they will be taught in their native patois.

Apparently, the purpose of this state initiative is not to help students learn English but to maintain their culture. If this is so, then their parents should be told about the poor track record of bilingual education and asked if they want their children enrolled in such a program. Those who want

their children to learn English should be allowed to withhold consent. Under existing regulations, parents must navigate an elaborate bureaucratic process to withdraw children from bilingual education.

If schools really want to teach English to children with limited proficiency, they can look to the Middlebury College Language Schools' intensive summer immersion program as a model. Students sign a pledge to communicate only in the new language. By summer's end, they are as fluent as someone who has just completed a first-year college course.

Structured immersion, as this approach is called, works so well that it is used exclusively by the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, Calif., where the Pentagon teaches 24 different languages to more than 3,000 students each year. Last year, the City University of New York established six English-immersion centers, in which students study English intensively for 25 hours a week to prepare them for college-level classes. Many students in the university's English immersion program are New York public school graduates whose language skills are so poor that they are not ready for college.

The United States should not be an English-only society. We should encourage the study of foreign languages in schools and universities. But unless students are fluent in English, they will not have a fair chance of graduating from high school, going to college and getting good jobs. All students should learn two languages. In this society, one of them must be English.

Diane Ravitch is a senior research scholar at New York University and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

North County is prime battleground

North County Times

November 9, 1997.

BY: Lisa Humphrey

Alfredo Contreras scans the tiny after-school community center in one of Oceanside's oldest barrios. He singles out a Spanish-speaking teenager with several years of experience in bilingual programs.

"A 10th-grader who cannot a complete sentence in English," he says. "These kids are not learning English the way they should be. They're not learning enough to catch up in the long run."

Contreras coordinates after-school and English programs at the Americanization School in the largely Latino neighborhood east of Interstate 5 and south of Mission Avenue.

Daily reminders---kids speaking broken English or no English at all---have convinced Contreras that the very programs set up to help non-English speakers are failing them.

And failure is why Silicon Valley software entrepreneur Ron Unz says he created the “English for the Children” initiative to dismantle bilingual education. The hotly debated measure would require public school instruction to be conducted in only English unless a parent specifically requests bilingual instruction. Non-English speakers would spend the first year of classes in what Unz calls “sheltered English immersion” classes.

About 650,000 signatures have been collected since the campaign kicked off in July, spokeswoman Sheri Annis said. The campaign needs 433,269 valid signatures, 5 percent of the state’s registered voters, by Friday to qualify for the June ballot.

Proponents of bilingual classes, in which a child learns core subject matter in his or her native language while acquiring English, are hot on the trail of the initiative and are ready to fight to retain the program.

Lisa Platt, a bilingual coordinator for the Vista Unified School District, said she sees successes on a daily basis. But she worries that people will support the initiative when they see the words “English for the Children,” she said.

And she’s concerned with the way campaigners and pollsters present the issue to the public. A Los Angeles Times poll recently found widespread support for the Unz initiative, especially among Latinos.

“(But) if you asked, ‘Do you want to do away with all bilingual education?’ I think the results would be very different,” she said.

“There’s a lot of misunderstanding with what this initiative would do for the kids,” Platt said. “It’s throwing out the baby with the bath water. I think the results would be catastrophic.”

When Platt informed the district’s bilingual advisory council about the Unz initiative, the reaction was pure shock, she said. “They were wondering how we are going to educate our children.”

The initiative comes on the heels of Sen. Dede Alpert’s failed bilingual education bill, which would have given school districts the authority to choose between bilingual or immersion programs, and held districts accountable for students’ progress.

“If we didn’t get something prior to the Unz initiative, we risk getting something like the Unz initiative,” said Lisa Giroux, a legislative aide to the Coronado Democrat. “The initiative route is one that she knew would happen. Dede thinks a bill is a much wiser way to go.”

Alpert intends to reintroduce the bill---for the third year in a row---in January, Giroux said.

1974 case mandates special assistance

In 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered schools to provide special assistance to non-English speakers after 1,800 Chinese students sued a San Francisco school district. The court found the schools in violation of the Civil Rights Act by placing non-English speakers into regular public

school classes.

School districts across the state quickly responded to the lawsuit and developed bilingual education programs.

Nearly 1.3 million public school students in California today are classified as having limited proficiency in English---triple the number from 1982. Bilingual programs cost more than \$300 million annually, the state estimates.

About 7 percent, or 97,000 of California students classified as limited-English proficient attend school in San Diego County, with 25,500 in North County. San Diego County's numbers are third in the state behind Los Angeles County with 40 percent and Orange County with 10 percent, said Lauri Burnham-Massey, a state Department of Education spokeswoman.

Unz, who unsuccessfully challenged Gov. Pete Wilson in the June 1994 Republican primary, and his supporters are making appearances across the state on radio and television and in newspapers. The campaign has posted a Web site featuring stories and other tidbits about the initiative.

"When you look at the current system, it's very bad," Unz said in an interview. "When you look at bilingual education, it's a little bit of a misnomer. It's typically a name given to Spanish-only classes."

"The best thing we can do is to teach our children English," he said.

Educators and researchers say it takes five to seven years for non-English speakers who have had two to three years of schooling in their native language to reach the 50th national percentile on standardized tests in English. For students with no prior schooling, it takes seven to 10 years.

Unz believes students should be able to learn English in several months, not nearly a decade. He said those theories mean a kindergarten student would not grasp the English language until high school.

Language of computer age

Unz's volunteers and paid signature-gatherers are staking out shopping malls and grocery stores in search of support as Friday's deadline nears. Betty Wilkinson of Lake San Marcos joined the initiative campaign by offering a monetary contribution---she wouldn't say exactly how much---and talking about it with her friends.

"English is the language of the future, certainly of the data bank one has to know to become a pilot," she said. "It's the language of the computer age. They speak English all over the world."

But educators like Vista Unified's Platt say they have seen how kids "sink" in strict immersion classes. After graduating from college, Platt recalls witnessing the results of bilingual education in a Santa Cruz County

While her district offered dual immersion---in which Spanish speakers and English speakers learn each other's languages but receive core instruction in their native language---a school down the street immersed limited-English students in English-only classes.

Platt's district discovered that Latino parents who had enrolled their kindergartners in the immersion courses were transferring the children to the dual immersion classes after a few years.

"These kids could talk up a storm, but it was your communicative-type language," said Platt, who taught fourth grade at the time. "They weren't academically proficient."

There are good bilingual programs and there are bad programs, which admittedly are in need of reform, Platt said.

But the programs are essential to the success of non-English-speaking students.

Contreras, the Oceanside after-school instructor, disagrees. He cites his own successful experiences as a Spanish-speaking boy growing up in Tucson, Ariz. He was immersed in English in school and was prohibited from taking Spanish classes even as electives.

"Look at me," Contreras said, "look at my brother and all the other people my age who were given straight English instruction.

"These kids will learn the Spanish in their Spanish-speaking homes," he said. "They should be learning English in school."

Summary

As pointed out at the outset of this paper, proposition 227 signifies the linguistic battle between the heterogeneous linguistic environment and social preference towards a single linguistic social environment. However, it has become apparent that the issue includes another significant element. It is economic in nature. As quoted in New York Times, Unz states "Bilingual education is a bizarre government program that costs hundreds of millions of dollars and doesn't succeed in teaching children English," From an economical point of view, the assertion to stop bilingual education is quite understandable while bilingual education keeps producing an increasing number of drop-outs in the school system because of English language incompetency. And yet, is it possible and rational to deny the cultural diversity because of its cost? The author of the present paper is inclined to agree that the economic approach in bilingual education should not be the only element to judge the advantages and disadvantages of bilingual education.

Reference

http://www.language_policy.net/archives/unz.htm

Issues in U.S. Language Policy

James Crawford

<http://www.google.com/gwt/x?oe=UTF-8&q=newspaper+editorials+in+California+on+227+in+1998&hl=en&ei=f05ETvjJBMT5kAWD762IAQ&ved=0CBsQFjAI&source=m&rd=1&u=http://www.onenation.org/news.html>

Columns by Ron Unz News on the English for the Children Campaign

<http://www.onenation.org/columns1997.html>

Columns by Ron Unz, 1997 -- 37 Items