

Korzenny explicates in order to identify Hispanic identity by saying (2006).” It been seen throughout history that every human being needs a sense of belongingness in society. Society as a whole is a complex set of different groups in which people associate themselves to use as a reference. Therefore, people tend to identify themselves with these groups according to what they think that they belong to, and may identify with such groups without belonging to them. It is not a simple process, as we need to look at ourselves and first of all determine who we think we are, and then choose a reference group. The label that Hispanic people use to identify themselves is said to represent their cultural identity-it gets really complicated for them, because they have to go back and forth between being only one or the other- Hispanic or American (except for the people who have labeled themselves as Chicanos, those who claim that they are not one or the other, but both).”

### Introduction

Without the slightest doubt, June 2, 1998 was indeed an epoch-making day in the State of California as far as bilingual education was concerned. Furthermore, it was shocking as well as frustrating. It was the day when Proposition 227 was passed by a vote of 61% in favor to 39% opposed. The whole thrust of the contention underlying the bill was to deny the validity of bilingual education in California. English was the language which should play the very central role in the process of educating those children attending the schools

throughout the state. Mexican-American Legal Defense, Education Fund and other civil rights groups filed the petition, which was eventually defined on July 15, 1998.

The man behind proposition 227 is Mr.Unz. He was born in Los Angeles in 1961 and has quite an impressive educational background. He received his undergraduate training at Harvard University. After having completed his undergraduate program, he went through a graduate program at Harvard, too. He is quite a multi-talented person in multifarious fields. He is not only a theoretical physicist but also a Chairman of Wall Street Analytics, Inc.

Mr. Unz has been interested in social problems. One of the problems he exhibited his strong interest in was in the field of public policy issues. In particular, his insatiable interest revolves around the issue of immigration as well as educational problems. He contributed articles to The Los Angeles Times and The New York Times to name only a few. This only indicates how widely he is known in California,

It was in 1997 that he began to initiate the English for the Children campaign in the State of California. As a result of his efforts, Mr.Frank Bruni describes Mr.Unz's role on the front page of New York Times, June 14,1998 by stating (1998), "But by successfully promoting a statewide initiative that, if it withstands legal challenges, will essentially wipe out bilingual education in California, Unz emerged last week as a new force and a new kind of figure in California politics, the ardent ideologue who circumvents the telegenic requirements and messy compromises of a traditional candidacy by working his will through a voter referendum."

Mr. Unz convincingly postulates his stance with reference to the status quo of the English language in the United States. He believes that English has not been given due credit as the most legitimate language. In the Los Angeles Times, October 19, 1997, he demonstrates his theoretical stance by adding(1997), "But if other languages such as Chinese or Spanish are of growing world importance, English ranks in a class by itself. Although English is not and never has been America's official national language, over the past 20 years it has rapidly become the entire world's official language, utterly dominating the spheres of science, technology and international business. Fluency in Spanish may provide a significant advantage, but lack of literacy in English represents a crippling, almost fatal disadvantage

in our global economy..”

Despite the fact that the definition of bilingual education should have fifty-fifty instruction time in two languages, Mr.Unz criticizes that such claimed bilingual education is not followed. He once again states in The Los Angeles Times, October 19, 1997, “During this same period, many of America's own public schools have stopped teaching English to young children from non-English-speaking backgrounds. Influenced by avant-garde pedagogy and multiculturalist ideology, educational administrators have adopted a system of bilingual education that is usually "bilingual" in name only.”

As a result of disregarding the importance of English language instruction, Mr.Unz arguably laments in the same article of The Los Angeles Times, October 19,(1997), “Too often, young immigrant children are taught little or no English--in Los Angeles, only 30 minutes a day, according to the school district's longstanding bilingual master plan. This is based on the ridiculous notion that too much English too early will damage a child's self-esteem and learning ability.” The reality in bilingual education does not reflect genuine bilingual education. Rather, teaching grammar, reading, writing and other subjects are instructed in Spanish which is a foreign language on the soil of California.”

Another person who has significantly contributed to the campaign of Proposition 227 is Ms.Tuchman. She taught at elementary school in Santa Ana. Her professional strength as an elementary school teacher has always been dealing with those school children whose English proficiency is lower when compared with other elementary pupils. As part of her career endeavor, she was once president of her local school board. Interestingly enough, she is a Mexican-American herself. She was honored as LULAC Woman of the Year in 1988. (the League of United Latin American Citizens), Ms.Tuchman illustrates how futile bilingual education is in California. She seems to have an unshakable conviction that bilingual education in California creates more harm than good. She has this to say in “The politics of bilingual education” by saying(1997), “Tony has been placed in a bilingual classroom. Instruction in English is not a part of his daily lessons. ...No matter that Tony and his parents speak primarily English in their household. No matter that Tony's parents have asked the school to move their son out of the bilingual education class so that he may instructed English. They were told no!

Ms. Tuchman makes an attempt to elucidate why Tony has to be placed in a pseudo-bilingual education setting. She attributes this conundrum to the political as well as financial aspect of bilingual education in California. She argues in an article entitled *It Will Take Initiative to End the Failures of Bilingual Teaching* (1997), "It will Take Initiative to End the Failures of Bilingual Teaching" by stating, "Why would a school reject a parent's wish to have her child learn English? "Money, to the sum of \$400 million each year, is a fitting reason. For the past 20 or 30 years, California schools have been locked into a bizarre policy of bilingual education, which actually means that many of these young schoolchildren are taught little or no English, but instead receive nearly all their instruction in their native language (usually Spanish), often from uncredentialed teachers."

The above economic as well as political component produces nothing but a disastrous upshot. Again, she speaks about bilingual education as follows(1997), "While the bilingual education budget has doubled in the past decade, test scores and English literacy for English learners has fallen. With 33 years of specializing in teaching English learners, I can tell you that bilingual education has been a disaster. Since 1968, when the federal bilingual education act took effect, many people and special interest groups have been trying to justify the existence and success of the bilingual education program."

What the above quotation insinuates is that those children in what they call bilingual education programs are victimized by being in the program. Ms. Tuchman in *Orange County Register, Commentary* published on Sunday, September 7, 1997 explicates (1997),

"But I can tell you from firsthand experience since 1964 teaching English learners that bilingual education is not the solution. I feel that primary language teaching leads to frustration and confusion. Many pupils are often as handicapped in the knowledge of their so-called mother tongue as they are in English. The time and effort devoted to bilingual instruction decreases the time and effort given to English and other subjects. The result: English learners increasingly are left farther and farther behind their peer group and age level"

## II

This segment of the paper will make an attempt to shed light upon the reason what really motivated both Mr. Unz and Ms. Tuchman to produce Proposition 227. One of the predominant components has a great deal to do with demographic circumstances. Since such a large number of school children whose English proficiency is quite low primarily

because they are placed in a bilingual classroom situation where they are not so much equally exposed to English compared with the time they are exposed to Spanish. Consequently, this can be and is indeed detrimental to their studies. Therefore, the author of the present paper firmly believes that being familiar with the statistical background of Proposition 227 is extremely significant so as to get to the core of the whole debate of the proposal.

As it can be seen below, the total number of Hispanic population is almost half of the Non-Hispanic populations in California. Of course, the definition of Hispanic is rather ambiguous or too broadly depicted. U.S. Census Bureau characterize this by explicating (2000), "Hispanics or Latinos are those people who classified themselves as such in one of the specific Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino categories listed on the Census 2000 questionnaire- "Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano," "Puerto Rican", or "Cuban" -as well as those who indicate that they are "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino." Persons who indicated that they are "other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" include those whose origins are from Spain, the Spanish-speaking countries of Central or South America, the Dominican Republic or people identifying themselves generally as Spanish, Spanish-American, Hispanic, Hispano, Latino, and so on."

The below charts have been taken from Crawford's "Latest Census Data on Language Use. Gateway to Census 2000 (U. S. Census Bureau site)

Table 2.1 Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Populations in California, 2000

				% of California Population	
	Person	Households	Families	Total	Hispanic
Total Hispanic	10,966,556	2,566,688	2,159,241	32.4	100.0
<i>Mexican</i>	8,455,926	1,899,677	1,623,311	25.0	77.1
<i>Puerto Rican</i>	140,570	47,118	32,804	0.4	1.3
<i>Cuban</i>	72,286	27,944	18,644	0.2	0.7
<i>Other Hispanic</i>	2,297,774	591,949	484,482	6.8	21.0
Central American.	576,330	165,223	140,862.	1.7	5.3
<i>Guatemalan</i>	143,500	40,236..3	34,509	0.4	1.3
<i>Honduran</i>	30,372	7,866	6,467	0.1	0.3
<i>Nicaraguan</i>	51,336	14,658	12,206	0.2	0.5
<i>Salvadoran</i>	272,999	77,019	66,944	0.8	2.5
<i>South American</i>	161,822	55,062	40,837	0.5	1.5
<i>Argentinean.</i>	23,218	9,400	6,513	0.1	0.2
<i>Colombian</i>	33,275	10,702	7,806	0.1	.0.3
<i>Ecuadorian</i>	18,115	6,105	4,810	0.1	0.2
<i>Peruvian</i>	44,200	13,617	10,676	0.1	0.4
Non-Hispanic	22,905,092	22,905,092	5,760,808	67.6	
<i>White alone</i>	15,816,790	6,697,480	4,168,393	46.7	
<i>White alone or in combination</i>	16,538,491	6,900,284	4,297,107	48.8	
<i>Black alone</i>	2,181,926	775,250	510,163	6.4	
<i>Black alone or in combination</i>	2,370,367	816,645	536,152	7.0	
<i>Asian alone</i>	3,648,860	1,096,371	838,562	10.8	
<i>Asian alone or in Combination</i>	4,030,025	1,182,210	897,102	11.9	

Sources: Census 2000 Summary File 2 TablePCT1, PCT6 and PCT24

Table 4.10A Enrollment in California Public Schools (Grade K-12) by Race/Ethnicity, 1986/7--2001/2

School Year	Total Enrollment	America Indian	Asian	Black	Filipino	Filipino	Pacific Islander	White
1986-87	4,301,140	0.74	7.04	9.23	2.05	29.59	0.49	50.87
1987-88	4,407,907	0.76	7.34	9.10	2.14	30.15	0.50	50.02
1988-89	4,512,963	0.77	7.56	8.84	2.20	31.35	0.52	48.76
1989-90	4,668,495	0.77	7.75	8.64	2.22	32.95	0.53	47.15
1990-91	4,842,174	0.77	7.91	8.51	2.24	34.32	0.54	45.71
1991-92	5,001,670	0.81	8.06	8.47	2.31	35.27	0.55	44.53
1992-93	5,089,808	0.80	8.21	8.50	2.38	36.09	0.56	43.47
1993-94	5,166,261	0.82	8.29	8.53	2.43	37.01	0.56	42.35
1994-95	5,242,078	0.86	8.30	8.59	2.44	37.81	0.56	41.44
1995-96	5,367,926	0.87	8.31	8.63	2.43	38.69	0.58	40.50
1996-97	5,512,155	0.86	8.28	8.60	2.41	39.68	0.59	39.58
1997-98	5,633,646	0.86	8.22	8.63	2.41	40.42	0.61	38.86
1998-99	5,748,344	0.86	8.18	8.56	2.40	41.30	0.63	38.06
1999-00	5,865,057	0.86	8.15	8.47	2.39	42.30	0.64	37.19
2000-01	5,967,170	0.87	8.11	8.36	2.42	43.33	0.65	36.27
2002-02	6,068,928	0.88	8.17	8.28	2.47	44.38	0.66	35.17

*Source: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 2002.*

Again, it becomes quite obvious that the total number of Hispanic students in both elementary and junior high schools has dramatically increased from the years 1986-87 to 2001-02. As a matter of fact, the ratio of Hispanic Grade K-12 has surpassed that of Whites.

Having taken a brief look at the Hispanic population and elementary as well as junior high school students in California, let us look at the demographic element from a national perspective. The charts introduced down below are intelligently looked at and scrutinized by Crawford.

**Chart I**  
**Language Spoken at Home and Self-Reported English-Speaking Ability,**  
**U.S. Residents, Age 5 and Older – 1980, 1990, and 2000**

	1980	%	1990	%	Change in 1980s	2000	%	Change in 1990s
All speakers, age 5+	210,247,455	100.0	230,445,777	100.0	+9.6%	262,375,152	100.0	+13.9%
English only	187,187,415	89.0	198,600,798	86.2	+6.1%	215,423,557	82.1	+8.5%
Language other than English	23,060,040	11.0	31,844,979	13.8	+38.1%	46,951,595	17.9	+47.4%
Speaks English very well	12,879,004	6.1	17,862,477	7.8	+38.7%	25,631,188	9.8	+43.5%
... well	5,957,544	2.8	7,310,301	3.2	+22.7%	10,333,556	3.9	+41.4%
... not well	3,005,503	1.4	4,826,958	2.1	+60.6%	7,620,719	2.9	+57.9%
... not at all	1,217,989	0.6	1,845,243	0.8	+51.5%	3,366,132	1.3	+82.4%
... with some "difficulty"*	10,181,036	4.8	13,982,502	6.1	+37.3%	21,320,407	8.1	+52.5%
Total U.S. population	226,545,805	100.0	248,709,873	100.0	+9.8%	281,421,906	100.0	+13.2%
Foreign-born	14,079,906	6.2	19,767,316	7.9	+40.4%	31,107,889	11.1	+57.4%

\* Includes all persons who report speaking English less than "very well," the threshold for full proficiency in English, as determined by the U.S. Department of Education.

Sources: 1980 Census of Population, vol. 1, chap. D, pt. 1 (PC80-1-D1-A); U.S. Census Bureau, "Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English for United States, Regions, and States: 1990" (1990 CPH-L-133); 1990 Summary Tape File 3 (STF 3) -Sample data; Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table DP-2.



<b>Chart II</b> <b>Spanish Spoken at Home and Self-Reported English-Speaking Ability,</b> <b>U.S. Residents, Age 5 and Older – 1980, 1990, and 2000</b>								
	1980	%	1990	%	Change in 1980s	2000	%	Change in 1990s
Speakers of Spanish at home, aged 5+	11,116,194	100.0	17,339,172	100.0	+56.0%	28,101,052	100.0	+62.1%
<b>Speaks English very well</b>	<b>5,534,875</b>	<b>49.8</b>	<b>9,033,407</b>	<b>52.1</b>	<b>+63.2%</b>	<b>14,349,796</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>+58.9%</b>
... with some "difficulty" *	5,581,319	50.2	8,305,765	47.9	+48.8%	13,751,256	48.9	+65.6%

\* Includes all persons who report speaking English less than "very well," the threshold for full proficiency in English, as determined by the U.S. Department of Education.

Sources: 1980 Census of Population, vol. 1, chap. D, pt. 1 (PC80-1-D1-A); U.S. Census Bureau, "Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English for United States, Regions, and States: 1990"(1990 CPH-L-133); Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table DP-2.

<b>Chart III</b> <b>Language Spoken at Home and Self-Reported English-Speaking Ability,</b> <b>U.S. Residents, Age 5-17 – 1980, 1990, and 2000</b>								
	1980	%	1990	%	Change in 1980s	2000	%	Change in 1990s
All speakers, age 5-17	47,493,975	100.0	45,342,488	100.0	-4.5%	53,096,003	100.0	+17.1%
English only	42,925,646	90.4	39,019,514	86.1	-9.1%	43,316,237	81.6	+11.0%

<b>Language other than English</b>	<b>4,568,329</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6,322,934</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>+38.4%</b>	<b>9,779,766</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>+54.7%</b>
Speaks English very well	NA		3,934,691	8.7		6,286,648	11.8	+59.8%
... well	NA		1,480,680	3.3		2,171,142	4.1	+46.6%
... not well	NA		761,778	1.7		1,090,925	2.1	+43.2%
... not at all	NA		145,785	0.3		231,051	0.4	+58.5%
... with some "difficulty"*	NA		2,388,243	5.3		3,493,118	6.6	+46.3%

\* Includes all persons who report speaking English less than "very well," the threshold for full proficiency in English, as determined by the U.S. Department of Education.

Sources: 1980 Census of Population, vol. 1, chap. D, pt. 1 (PC80-1-D1-A); U.S. Census Bureau, "Language Spoken at Home and Ability to Speak English for United States, Regions, and States: 1990"(1990 CPH-L-133); Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table DP-2. The author of the present paper has made an attempt to excerpt what Crawford summarized in the above charts.

When one takes a good look at the above illustrated charts, one is forced to come to the realization that the whole notion of majority or minority is not promised to exist forever. In other words, the relationship of power between majority and minority can be reversed. Therefore, the status of those Hispanic people who currently belong to the minority group can predominate the social fabric in the United States. Thus, the kind of role that the language Hispanic people employ as a means of communication will dramatically change. More number of people will make an attempt to learn the Hispanic language. The potential implication of this kind of possible change in the linguistic mapping in the United States will be expatiated upon in the next section.

When a minority language threatens a majority language in a certain society such as the United States, society as a whole can react to this kind of change in linguistic

mapping. Crawford addresses himself to this specific linguistic phenomenon by saying (2002), "A new release of Census data always seems to bring out the alarmists, zealots, xenophobes, and language restrictionists. When the 1990 Census reported a U.S. language-minority population of nearly 32 million, it sets off predictions of demographic doom. Census 2000, which counted nearly 47 million Americans who speak a language other than English at home, is proving no different when it comes to media hysteria."

For the purpose of substantiating the dangerously rising anti-bilingual sentiment, Crawford quotes the Washington Post's view upon the validity of bilingual education in the United States. In the Washington Post paper, published on Thursday, August 9, 2001, "Unfortunately, the bilingual education offered in most parts of the country does not promote English fluency. But bilingual programs often involve teaching mainly in Spanish, with rather desultory efforts to teach English as a second language on the side. Though empirical studies deliver a mixed verdict on this question, it seems likely that students would learn more English if they were immersed in it." In a nutshell, the Post insists as its title asserts, "Teach English."

Crawford immediately makes an attempt to expatiate upon what the Post further propounds (2001) "Nevertheless, the *Post* finds the Census numbers "shameful," Dismissing the demographic factors, it prefers to blame the public schools. Since "children pick up languages with relative ease," it reasons, "the school system ought to be able to deliver near universal fluency. But bilingual programs often involve teaching mainly in Spanish, with rather desultory efforts to teach English." The editorial goes on to recommend the all-English "immersion" approach recently mandated by voters in two states. Finally, it cites "encouraging" achievement test scores for English learners after California "did away with bilingual education." It is more than obvious that exposing school children to a monolingual education environment is far more productive and far less time consuming than to acquire English in comparison with the situation where English is simultaneously taught and learned. However, it would be a situation of cultural deprivation on the part of those children with Latino cultural background.

### III

In the following segment, the author would like to scrutinize a few major articles of the proposition. By so doing, it will become apparent why this proposition is extremely divisive in nature.

The article 1(d) can be properly understood by making an attempt to shed light upon what is being hidden in it. That is to say, the nature of this particular article exhibits a sense of linguistic imperialism. Thus, it is not viewed that bringing up the young children in the state of California would not be conducive in terms of its future positive development. Rather, these bilingually raised children would presents the dire reality that the English proficiency of these children would be inevitably poor. It can possibly change the cultural make-up. In other words, the above illustrated article in the proposal can indeed deprive the Latino people of their cultural heritage.

Article 1(d) asserts that implementing and maintaining bilingual education is costly. Even though it is expensive, it produces only a negative result, “,,demonstrated by the current high drop-out rates...” As far as the financial aspect of the article is concerned, the reader should be reminded to take a look at the results of the 1992 study.

	Late-exit Bilingual	Early-exit Bilingual	English Immersion	ESL Pullout	2-Way Bilingual	Overall Average
Direct Instruction	\$59	\$20	\$3	\$1,042	\$186	\$123
Admin. & Support	\$90	\$129	\$106	\$99	\$472	\$120
Language Assessment	\$22	\$43	\$60	\$46	\$24	\$36
In service Training	\$9	\$22	\$6	\$11	\$194	\$19
Total Avg. Supp. Costs	\$180	\$214	\$175	\$1,194	\$876	\$298

*Source: Chambers and Parrish 1992.*

Crawford makes an attempt to refute article (d) by saying, “It turned out that bilingual approaches cost no more — and in some cases considerably less — than English-only approaches. By far the most expensive were programs in which children were "pulled out" of class for tutoring in English as a second language, an approach that requires an extra complement of teachers.”

In the next segment of the present paper, the author will make an attempt to discuss a few provisions of the Proposition 227.

- (a) WHEREAS the English language is the national public language of the United States of America and of the state of California, is spoken by the vast majority of California residents, and is also the leading world language for science, technology, and international business, thereby being the language of economic opportunity; and because language has always been used to identify one's cultural background, it represents his/her belongingness to the culture largely formulated by its linguistic system.
- (b) In order to solidify the national oneness in the United States, the English-only movement became an absolutely requisite. What the above (a) asserts dovetails with the movement to instill the notion of oneness into the minds of people in California.

Blume

(1998) concurs with this line of argument by saying, "This section consists mostly of flag waving for America and the English language. The meat of the initiative is further down. But this preamble nonetheless establishes an ideological frame for the proposition."

(b) WHEREAS immigrant parents [2] are eager to have their children acquire a good knowledge of English, thereby allowing them to fully participate in the American Dream of economic and social advancement;

Tuchman must be talked about in discussing the above article (b). She epitomizes the ideal case where a Latino person has successfully assimilated herself into the mainstream of American culture. Blume (1998) again has this to say, "His pro-Latino credentials are arguably stronger than those of co-sponsor Gloria Matta Tuchman. She brings the credibility of being both a teacher and a Latina to Unz's cause. She was also, however, a board member of U.S. English, an organization devoted to making English the nation's official language and the language of all commerce as well as government and public agencies." The author of the present paper, however, does not render his full support to Blume's statement, "U.S. English has had to fight off its own allegations of cultural racism." In a larger sense, it is significant to have an official language what everybody shares regardless of one's cultural difference.

With reference to the notion of cultural racism or cultural deprivation, Marry Dorrego directs a very straightforward question to Unz, "What happens is they lose their own culture; they lose their own identity; and the kids, young children, are going to learn English. My own son's first language is Spanish, and you look around here, everything is

English. His baseball teams are English. His Power Rangers are English, his friends on the block are English speakers. And the struggle is not learning the English; the struggle is maintaining the Spanish, because the children grow up in English all around them, and they're going to get English." The author of the present paper is hesitant to quote only part of what Maria Mendoza says simply because her question is extremely vital in discussing the validity of the Proposition 227.

For the purpose of alleviating the questioner's concern about cultural deprivation, she has this to say(1997), "The parents themselves of these children want their children to be taught English as quickly as possible. I mean, most parents feel that the culture of the family background is more the responsibility of the family, and that the school's responsibility is teaching children--giving children the educational tools they need to succeed in our society." In short, the better one understands English and is able to employ it not only in an academic setting but also in the real world the better one succeeds in one life.

- (f) THEREFORE it is resolved that: all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible.

Those of us who are either teaching English as a second language or those of us who are keenly interested in unraveling the whole process of second language acquisition would not accept the terms used above. They are "rapidly and effectively". It is far more excruciating and painstaking to acquire a second language. Furthermore, we do know it does require an over-extended period of time to master one's second language. Therefore, the two terms quoted above do represent a serious problem. Bluni again argues(1998), "For the most part, bilingual-ed supporters don't accept that the terms "rapid" and "effective" belong together when talking about learning English. The typical bilingual-ed program is presumed to last five to seven years, with instruction conducted in the students' primary language for most of that time. Some researchers have asserted that primary-language support may be needed for even longer."

Article 2(305) talks about once English learners have acquired a good working knowledge of English,

The unacceptable aspect of the above is that the expression of "a good working knowledge of English can be awfully subjective- not objective. Being fluent in English is one thing. Being able to catch up with what the school expects in an academic respect is another. We are inclined to be naive toward someone who is fluent in English. When we meet someone like that, we immediately assume that person can survive without encountering any serious problems. However, we are expected to be aware of the fact that being fluent does not necessarily guarantee one's academic success. Therefore, the article should have been far more specific and concrete in defining "working knowledge of English." If the school children acquire working knowledge of English, what will happen to their Spanish?

Another significant aspect with reference to the content of the Proposition 227 is to look at it from a legal perspective. One possible interpretation accrued from the proposition has a great deal to do with the question of whether or not the proposition interferes with the existing educational law of California. Riley has this to say (1999), "Passage of Proposition 227 can be expected to result in violations of federal civil rights laws if children who are judged by their teachers to need bilingual education in order to progress are denied it or if children who are not prepared for regular classes are placed into them after just one year of special support. The one size fits all approach is inconsistent with educational practice and research that tells us that children learn in different ways and at different rates. The real question that we are expected to address ourselves to is whether or not we can potentially deprive the minority children of their educational rights that they inherently deserve as immigrants. Are their teachers perfectly entitled to judge if the child does or does not have to be placed in a bilingual classroom situation. The answer of those who are against the proposition is a definite "No."

#### Conclusion

Like any other language policy, Proposition 227 has produced two diametrically opposed ideas with reference to its positive aspect as well as its negative side, "Language and identity are not mutually exclusive. As a matter of fact, one cannot be explained without making any reference to the other one.

American socio-cultural milieu is not homogeneous by any means. From a historical perspective, America is America as long as it allows and encourages domestic cultural as well as linguistic diversity. Japanese is the language spoken not only by Japanese in Japan but also mainly by Japanese Americans in the United States.

Being socio-culturally homogeneous is inherently a wonderful thing to be flourished in one nation. That nation, however, is expected to encounter a host of complicated internal problems that a linguistically homogenous nation does not have to experience. Sharing the common language in a nation would easily facilitate and solidify national pride which can be expediently used to promote its political as well as economic power in the international arena. Therefore, being a bilingual nation has two sides. It would be interesting to observe which direction that the United States will go as far as bilingual education is concerned.

#### BIBLIOGRSAPHY

Frank Bruni 1998

The California Entrepreneur who Beat Bilingual Teaching

<http://www.onenation.org/0698/061498.html>

James Crawford 1997a

Demographic Change and Language

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCrawford/can-pop.htm>

James Crawford 1997 b

Analyzing the Impact of Unz

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/linguistics/people/grads/macswan/impact.htm#9>

Jams Crawford 1998 1998a

Language in the U.S.A. The Paradox of Bilingual Education

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/paradox.htm>

James Crawford 1998b

The Bilingual Education Story: Why Can't the News Media Get it Right ?

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/jwcrawford/NAHJ.htm>

James Crawford 2000



## Latest Census Data on Language Use

Gateway to Census 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau site)

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCrawford/census02.htm>

James Crawford a 2001 (ok)

Bilingual Blame Game?

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCrawford/blame.htm>

James Crawford b

Canard of the Month, August 2001. Click on Daffy for a response.

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/JWCrawford/WPOST6.htm>

James Crawford 2000

At War with Diversity: US Language Policy in an Age of Anxiety.

<http://edrev.asu.edu/reviews/rev195.htm>

Felipe Korzenny (ok)

Hispanic identity and Marketing

<http://www.cheskin.com/blog/blog/archives/000805>

Matthew Miller

This Man Controls California

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

Gloria Matta Tuchman a

The politics of bilingual education

<http://www.cheskin.com/blog/archives/000805.html>

On 227

Gloria M. Tuchman 1997

The Pitched Battle Over Bilingual Education: it Does More Harm Than Good

<http://www.onenation.org/tuchman083197.html>

Gloria Matta Tuchman 1997

It Will Take Initiative to End the Failures of Bilingual Teaching

<http://www.onenation.org/tuchman090797.html>

Maria Escalante Mendoza 1977

Leadership of the "English for the Children of Arizona" Campaign

<http://www.onenation.org/azcampaign.html#MM>

Richard W. Riley's ?

Secretary of Education

<http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/humnet/linguistics/people/grads/macswan/riley-qa.htm>

Ron k.Unz a 1997

Bilingualism vs. Bilingual Education

<http://www.onenation.org/unz101997.html>

Ron Unz

California and the End of White America

<http://www.onenation.org/9911/110199.html>

Jenifer Warren

Savoring Victory, Prop. 227 Author Ponders New Efforts

<http://www.onenation.org/0798/071698.html>