

*OFFICIAL ENGLISH? NO!*TESOL's Recommendations for Countering the Official English Movement in the US, TESOL 1996

A Brief History of Language Restrictionism in the United States

by Thomas Ricento

Introduction

The current movement to declare English the official language of the United States began in 1981 when the late Senator S. I. Hayakawa of California introduced a constitutional amendment (S.J. Res. 72) into the US Congress. The proposed amendment was never reported out of committee, but over the next decade, 18 states passed initiatives naming English as their official language. Hayakawa was no doubt a maverick, and dismissed by more "mainstream" politicians, but he helped spark a movement that continues to this day.

There are a number of reasons the official English movement picked up steam in the early 1980s. Ronald Reagan was elected President in 1980, ushering in a new era in domestic politics in which the "old," proud America, the "shining city on the hill," would replace an America mired in malaise, still paralyzed by the "Vietnam syndrome." The ethnic revival movement of the 1960s and 1970s, and federal support for so-called bilingual education programs, were being criticized by some in the popular press as divisive, and in the case of bilingual education, unnecessary and expensive. Nothing could be taken for granted anymore, so the argument went, even the preeminent status of the English language. With the dramatic increase in immigrants from Asian and Latin American countries beginning in 1965, many Americans, especially in large cities, felt their way of life was under assault. The sounds of Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Arabic, and many other languages were heard with increasing frequency in American towns and cities; the American border in the southwest was too porous; projections of demographic patterns showed that the older immigrant populations were not replacing themselves as quickly as were the newer, non-European groups. Amidst this uncertainty and relatively rapid increase in immigrant populations, English became a symbol, and its protection a cause around which disgruntled citizens could rally.

Certainly, a renewed commitment to "American" values was a central theme of the 1980s; and as in earlier periods of social change and international turmoil, reaffirmation of the status of the English language symbolized a desire to reassert the power of groups who felt their influence, their place, was being eclipsed by uncontrollable forces. During the colonial period, again in the 1830s with the first wave of large-scale European immigration, and during the great wave of European immigration from roughly 1880 to 1920, movements to restrict the public use of non-English languages led to the passage of English-only laws in education, voting, and the judicial system. The period immediately prior to, and during US participation in World War I, saw heightened anti-German hysteria, an assault on German organizations and publications, and an aversion to foreign cultures and ideas, generally. A similar phenomenon occurred during World War II, especially with regard to Japanese and German Americans.

Although throughout US history most immigrants have traveled to America to start new lives and embrace opportunities in the "promised land," ethnic enclaves along the eastern seaboard and in other parts of the country often provided necessary cultural and linguistic linkages between the old and new worlds. Some immigrants objected to total assimilation if it meant renouncing native language and culture. Such attitudes helped fuel anti-foreigner hysteria prevalent in Americanization campaigns that sought absolute loyalty to so-called American ideals. It was around this time, in the early part of the 20th century, that the cleavage between those who championed total assimilation (the melting pot) and those who supported cultural pluralism (hyphenated Americans) first appeared. The effects of the Americanization campaign of this period, which led to the virtual elimination of not only bilingual German-English education, but also to a significant decrease in the number of students studying German as a foreign language in the schools, are felt to this day. It wasn't until a half century later, in 1968, that the federal government would fund any bilingual education programs, and even that funding had as its clear and only goal increasing fluency in English among limited English-speaking students in the southwest. The idea that being American meant giving up one's ancestral language and values was expressed by Theodore Roosevelt, in a message to the American Defense Society in 1919:

for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed or birthplace or origin. But this is predicated upon the man's becoming in very fact an American and nothing but an American. If he tries to keep segregated with men of his own origin and separated from the rest of America, then he isn't doing his part as an American... We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding-house. (Crawford, 1992, p. 59).

Of course, this discussion has thus far not addressed the status of involuntary immigrants--enslaved Africans--for whom assimilation was not a viable choice, or so-called colonized peoples, including Native Americans, Mexican Americans who were incorporated into the US as a result of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, Puerto Ricans who have lived between two cultures, and peoples in current and former US territories and protectorates, none of whom have had much, if any, say in language policy issues.

Despite disclaimers by supporters of official English, the indirect--if not direct--goal of English-only policies is to restrict the domains in which non-English languages can be used. Historically, where such restrictions have been implemented, they have effectively disenfranchised large numbers of immigrants from access to government services, voting, and equal educational opportunities. The reasons given in support of officializing English have varied over the years, depending on the circumstances, but common themes can be listed: to keep America "American" in the face of large-scale immigration; to safeguard national security in times of war; to speed up the assimilation process for groups which seem to resist assimilation; to ensure the safety of workers (and sometimes as a recruitment tool for unions); to ensure public discourse does not break down. Yet, nothing in the proposed bills to make English the official language of the United States would address any of the hypothetical concerns listed above. Indeed, even though only 2% of the US population speaks English "not well" or "not at all" (according to the 1990 census), voter apathy and distrust of government are higher than ever.

A Brief History of Language Restrictionism in the US

All nation states have mythologies about their origins, their special destiny, and their defining characteristics. The United States is no exception to this principle. At the time the US Constitution was drafted and ratified, many languages were spoken in the United States in addition to English, including German, Dutch, French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Greek, Yiddish, Arabic, as well as hundreds of American Indian languages and African-based creoles. Yet, in the *Federalist Papers*, John Jay characterized the nation as "one united people--a people descended from the same ancestors, *speaking the same language* [italics added], professing the same religion...very similar in their manners and customs" (Crawford, 1992, p. 32). This was the *idealized* America, envisaged by the prosperous elite who described a norm that excluded many Americans--the non-English, non-

White, non-Protestant, and non-English-speaking. The fact that the America of 1787 encompassed many cultures and languages was not seen as relevant or problematic by the Founding Fathers. Such myopia was perhaps understandable in an era when African Americans were property and Native Americans were considered "heathen savages," neither group a part of the discussion. Although James Madison, again in the *Federalist Papers*, acknowledged that societies are divided into different sects and interests, he was probably not thinking of ethnic and linguistic groups. As James Crawford notes, "...in 1787 cultural pluralism was a *concept* [italics mine] yet to be invented" (1992, pp. 33-34).

However, the presence of non-English speakers (although of European background) did become an issue in certain sections of the country where their numbers created a noticeable presence, most notably with Germans in Pennsylvania. Benjamin Franklin worried that the German influence, if unchecked, would supersede Anglo supremacy, not only in language, but in terms of culture and political values. In a letter to Peter Collinson, a British member of parliament, dated May 9, 1753, Franklin proclaimed that "those [Germans] who come hither are generally the most ignorant Stupid Sort of their own Nation...and as few of the English understand the German Language, and so cannot address them either from the Press or Pulpit, 'tis almost impossible to remove any prejudices they once entertain" (Crawford, 1992, p. 19). Franklin was doubtful whether German immigrants would be capable of understanding the precepts of republican government laid down by the Founding Fathers. Similar fears were expressed by Thomas Jefferson in 1803 about the abilities of French-speakers in the Louisiana Territories to govern themselves. Franklin and Jefferson, among other colonial leaders, worried that immigrants from non-democratic countries, and especially from non-Protestant religious backgrounds, would bring monarchist views to the New World and might not easily embrace the tenets and responsibilities of constitutional democracy. It was further believed that the use of non-English languages would perpetuate foreign ideas and threaten civil society. Yet, German immigrants, although they established German-towns, maintained an active German language press, German cultural societies and clubs, were strong supporters of American independence, and fought and died in the American Revolutionary War, many in German-language battalions. The articles of confederation were published in German and little was lost in the translation, apparently. Franklin's concerns about German ideas prevailing over English ideas, or about divided loyalties or opposition based on cultural or linguistic differences, were put to rest. Interestingly, as the German-American community assimilated and the Anglo conformity model was affirmed, Franklin softened his opposition and promoted the establishment of the first German-language institution of higher education in the US--Franklin & Marshall College.

Other immigrant groups were similarly discriminated against in the 19th and 20th centuries. A few further examples illustrate the pattern. Discrimination was usually based on differences in religion, race, cultural or social values, and beliefs. Language was often a convenient symbol under which racial or cultural discrimination could be subsumed. For example, the Know-Nothing Party, beginning in the 1850s, espoused anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant views which led to language restrictionist policies in California and other states. Chinese immigrants were attacked, barred from employment, disqualified from owning land, not allowed to vote due to English literacy requirements, and were not allowed to testify against Whites in court (Crawford, 1992, p. 47). In the 1880s, laws restricting the use of German in public and parochial schools were passed in Wisconsin (the Bennett Law) and Illinois (the Edwards Law). Although both laws were later repealed, the fundamental fear and distrust of cultural pluralism which informed those measures continues to motivate language restrictionist policies today.

The Americanization campaign of the early 20th century affected not only German speakers, but Japanese, Korean, and Chinese Americans, as well as Spanish speakers and other subjugated groups that resided in what was to become the United States before the arrival of Europeans in the 16th century. Attempts to prohibit the teaching of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean in private schools in California and Hawaii were voided by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1926, which also overturned laws prohibiting the teaching of other non-English languages in at least 22 other states (Tamura, 1993, pp. 44-45). In New Mexico, Spanish-speaking citizens resisted an English-only language policy, not only in the public schools, but for "all State officers and members of the State legislature" (Ricento, 1995, p. 42). Delegates to the 1910 constitutional convention passed

antidiscrimination protections for Spanish speakers in voting and education, even allowing loopholes for provision of bilingual English-Spanish education (Crawford, 1992, pp. 52-53). Although many attempts to outlaw or restrict the use of non-English languages have been overturned by elections or court decisions, the cumulative effect on public attitudes has been profound. The unchallenged dominance of English is so unquestioned, that most Americans, when asked, assume that English is already the official language. It is further assumed that anyone in this country should speak English, and if they don't, there must be something the matter with that person. Americans also tend to expect that when they travel abroad, people in other countries will speak English.

The preeminence and vitality of English as the public language has never been challenged at any time in US history, including the present day. However, while most voluntary immigrants have been assimilated, members of indigenous groups, such as Native Americans, of involuntary immigrant groups, such as African Americans, and members of subjugated groups, such as Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Americans have suffered from long-standing, English-only assimilationist policies that have tended to undervalue, and hence undermine, their ancestral languages and cultures, ultimately impeding the assimilation process. Speaking English was no guarantee of upward mobility for generations of members of these groups; today, many groups, including many Native American tribes, have realized that reestablishing and reconnecting to their cultural/linguistic roots is a necessary prerequisite to being valued by, and integrating with, the dominant society. Further, English-only really means standard English-only; speakers of non-standard varieties of English such as Black English, Chicano English, Indian English, and Appalachian English (to name a few) are also denied access to social and economic mobility by gate-keeping institutions such as schools, and by employers.

The Current Official English Movement

In the decades 1901 to 1910, and 1981 to 1990, more immigrants arrived in the U.S than in any other ten-year period since the census has been conducted (8,795,000 and 7,338,000, respectively). Is it merely a coincidence that in each of these periods, laws and initiatives were passed restricting the linguistic, and in some cases, civil rights of non-English speakers? In both periods, calls were made for restricting both the number and countries of origin of immigrants. Whereas in the earlier period, it was more acceptable to publicly deride the intelligence and values of certain groups, today pundits such as Patrick Buchanan and William F. Buckley, Jr. claim we should be more careful in whom we admit, because anyone would agree that, in the words of Buchanan, it is easier to acculturate someone from England than an African Zulu. Today, as in 1900, claims are being made about the inherent inferiority of some groups compared to others (refer to, for example, the recently published book *The Bell Curve* by R. J. Herrnstein and C. Murray, Free Press). It is well for us to recall that the earlier period of large-scale immigration prompted an interest in the newly developed "science" of IQ testing (imported from France and based on the work of Alfred Binet); it was found that certain groups (e.g., "negroes" and persons from eastern and southern Europe) scored lower on these tests. In fact, based on tests administered by Henry Goddard in 1912, in English, it was found that 83% of the Jews, 80% of the Hungarians, 79% of the Italians, and 87% of the Russians who had recently arrived in the United States were "feeble-minded" (Kamin, 1977, p. 55). These "scientific" findings helped persuade the US Congress to pass the Johnson-Laird Immigration Act of 1924, which established national origin quotas of 2% of the number of foreign born already in the country as determined by the census of 1890, before the arrival of the "feeble-minded" immigrants. Today, as was the case nearly 100 years ago, large changes in population characteristics have led to somewhat predictable results. Politicians have seized on anti-immigrant prejudice to win elective office; in California, Governor Pete Wilson probably owed his reelection in 1994 to his support of Proposition 187, an initiative passed by California voters by a 3:2 margin, which would deprive undocumented aliens from receiving public education or services, except for emergency medical care. California voters also approved Proposition 63 in 1986 (77% of voters approved), which made English the official language of California. Some states are considering restricting benefits to legal immigrants as well.

As far as federal legislation is concerned, four official English bills were introduced in the 103rd Congress, three in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate. One of the House bills seeks to amend the US Constitution

(H.J. RES 171); the other three are more narrow in focus. H.R. 123 would modify Title IV of the US Code, making English the official language of government; the bill offers no specific programs or funding to achieve its stated goals. A companion bill, H.R. 124, provides incentives for employers to provide English language training for their non- or limited-English-speaking employees (it would do nothing for those who are unemployed, or whose employers choose not to provide English language training). Another bill, H.R. 739, introduced by Rep. Toby Roth (Republican, Wisconsin), establishes English as the preferred language of communication among all US citizens, "reforms" current naturalization requirements, and seeks to repeal all federal bilingual education and voting rights programs (Inman, 1994, p. 11). H.J. RES 171, introduced by Representative John Doolittle (Republican, California) would amend the US Constitution, requiring that English be used for all public acts, including every order, resolution, vote, or election, and for all records and judicial proceedings of the United States Government. Passage would require a two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress, and ratification by three fourths of the states within 7 years of its submission. With the recent take-over of the 104th Congress by Republicans, the likelihood that one or all of these bills will be voted out of committee and debated on the floor of the Congress has increased significantly.

The first new "official English" legislation of the 104th Congress was introduced by Congressman King (Republican-New York) on February 21, 1995. Titled the "National Language Act of 1995," this legislation would: declare English the official language of the Government of the United States (all business, publications, income tax forms, and informational materials would be in English only, with four exceptions: for religious purposes; for training in foreign languages for international communication; for programs in schools designed to encourage students to learn foreign languages; or by persons over 62 years of age). It would also: terminate federal support of bilingual education programs by repealing the Bilingual Education Act of 1968; terminate the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (OBEMLA); repeal the bilingual voting requirements by repealing Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (Section 337(d)), to read "All public ceremonies in which the oath of allegiance is administered pursuant to this section shall be conducted solely in the English language." This bill would repeal laws and policies that enhanced educational opportunities and allowed for greater access to the electoral process for language minority persons for the past 30 years. Its passage would only make matters worse for non-English speakers by doing nothing to improve their chances of acquiring English, while imposing greater social (and financial) costs on the general public. Lack of information in non-English languages for pregnant women, for example, will only increase the likelihood of higher medical costs for everyone; lack of multilingual ballots will mean an even greater non-participation rate of eligible voters who are non-English speakers; and abandoning federal support for bilingual education will result in pull-backs on the state level as well. As it is, only a small fraction (15%) of limited-English-proficient (LEP) children are in bilingual programs which receive federal support. If states reduce or eliminate entirely their support of bilingual education, the effect will likely be the reinstatement of the submersion "sink or swim" method, a well-documented failure.

US English

Since its inception in 1983, the political lobbying organization US English has spent millions of dollars--\$28 million between 1983 and 1990 (Crawford, 1992, p. 4)--to promote the passage of a constitutional amendment, as well as federal and state laws, declaring English the official language of the United States (more recently, they have focussed their attention on making English the official language of government at all levels). Other groups with similar agendas include English First and the American Ethnic Coalition. In general, these groups warn that unless English is made the official language, nothing will prevent the US from devolving into a balkanized collection of ethnic collectivities, led by power-hungry ethnic leaders. These sorts of mindless scare tactics are effective with individuals already convinced that there are too many "undesirable" immigrants in the United States (or perhaps too many ethnic and racial minorities altogether). For other, more open-minded citizens, appeals are made with ads in national publications such as *The Atlantic Monthly* and *USA Today*. In these ads, "ethnics" who have made it are pictured, usually busily at work at some prestigious job, proclaiming that "To make it in America,

you need to speak my language" (i.e., English) (*The Atlantic Monthly*, December 1993). The person pictured has a Ph.D. from Columbia University "...involved in cutting edge genetics research--living proof that English is the key to opportunity in America." The ad goes on to state (rather deceptively) that US English supports projects "...that will ensure that all Americans have the chance to learn the language of equal opportunity." In fact, US English has spent precious little of its funds on English language education, and only began to do so when critics of the organization pointed out the hypocrisy of promoting English as the official language, while spending virtually nothing on English education. Certainly, foreign students studying for advanced degrees in American universities do not need to be convinced that English is necessary to achieve success. In fact, the entire US English approach is based on a totally false premise, i.e., that immigrants are resisting learning English. The real problem is that the vast majority of children needing English language instruction in the US are not receiving it. For example, in the 1990-91 school year, at least 521,000 limited-English-proficient (LEP) children needing English instruction did not receive any. Of the roughly 3 million school-age LEP children in the US in 1993, **only 15 percent** were in federally funded bilingual programs (Winn-Bell Olsen, 1993) (Keep in mind that the goal of these so-called bilingual programs is to improve the English proficiency of LEP students so they can be mainstreamed into English-only classrooms as soon as possible.) In addition, thousands of adults are on waiting lists for available slots in overcrowded ESL programs across the country.

What is really behind the US English campaign? An examination of internal documents, funding sources, and written statements of leaders provides some of the answers. [A more detailed discussion of US English is provided in Crawford, 1992, pages 148-175.] The founder of US English, Michigan ophthalmologist John Tanton, has long been interested in restricting immigration to the US, particularly from countries south of the border. In 1979, he founded the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), serving as chairman until 1987. US English was a spin-off of FAIR, sharing personnel and funding sources, and a common ideology, namely, unless immigration of (largely) non-White groups is reduced, the United States could become a "majority minority" society by 2020. Although critics sensed an anti-immigration, and especially anti-Hispanic, agenda underlay the zero-population growth rhetoric of FAIR and US English, it was difficult to prove their case. However, the publication in the *Arizona Republic* of portions of a confidential internal memo written by Tanton in 1988 provided more than enough evidence that fear of a Hispanic takeover was very much on the mind of the group's founder. Tanton wrote, in part:

Will the present majority peaceably hand over its political power to a group that is simply more fertile?....Can *homo contraceptivus* compete with *homo progenitiva* if borders aren't controlled?.....Perhaps this is the first instance in which those with their pants up are going to get caught by those with their pants down!....As whites see thier power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night? Or will there be an explosion? (Crawford 1992, p. 151).

Questions about the intelligence and values of Latin American immigrants were also raised:

Will Latin American migrants bring with them the tradition of the *mordida* (bribe), the lack of involvement in public affairs....Is assimilation a function of the educational and economic level of immigrants? If so, what are the consequences of having so many ill-educated people coming in to low paying jobs?....What are the differences in educability between Hispanics (with their 50 percent dropout rate) and Asiatics (with their excellent school records and long tradition of scholarship)?....(Crawford, 1992, p. 154). Tanton also questioned whether the brand of Catholicism imported from Mexico would eventually threaten the doctrine of the separation of church and state. Revelation of the memo led to the resignations of US English President Linda Chávez and John Tanton, as well the resignation of Walter Cronkite from the US English advisory board. But that was not the end of the story.

Financial records of US English revealed that the organization had received \$680,000 between 1982 and 1989 from the Pioneer Fund, an organization dedicated to "race betterment" through eugenics. The Fund was

established in 1937 by Harry H. Laughlin, a consultant to the House Immigration Committee who had convinced Congress that eastern and southern Europeans were racially inferior to northern Europeans. Another contributor to US English was Cordelia Scaife May, an heiress to the Mellon fortune. In 1983, May's foundation contributed funds to distribute a controversial French novel, *The Camp of the Saints*, by Jean Raspail, in which third world refugees invade Europe. The book was praised by several US English leaders; Linda Chávez was appalled by the racist sentiments it expressed.

While these and other revelations concerning financial irregularities damaged the reputation of US English, the organization has rebounded, and continues to promote its agenda of officializing English and opposing bilingual education, multilingual ballots, and access to public services in non-English languages. The organization operates as a tax-exempt, charitable organization, even though it actively lobbies Congress and finances legislation-related activities. Further, it provides a relatively small portion of its annual income to promote adult English literacy, even though it claims in its promotional literature that it only wants to "...support efforts to enable all Americans to learn English--the language of equal opportunity" (cited in Crawford, 1992, p. 175). Who would oppose such an innocuous-sounding goal? Yet, making English the official language of the United States, or its government, would not enable anyone to learn English. The simplicity of the message, one which few Americans would question, accounts for the success US English has enjoyed, and for the fact that 19 states have adopted English as their official language, all but five since 1981 when the current movement, led by US English, began. However, removing bilingual ballots, enforcing English-only (submersion) education for all students, disallowing elected political officials from talking to their constituents in any language other than English, discontinuing public service announcements and important health and safety information in non-English languages, removal of non-English signs in public offices, withdrawing of public monies for non-English media services (the list goes on and on) would not be in *anyone's* interest. (For an extended discussion on the far-reaching effects such legislation would have, see Ricento, 1994.) Restricting access of citizens and non-citizens alike because of a language barrier is not only bad public policy, but an insult and a calculated provocation, the initial step to what would certainly be a protracted conflict between English and non-English speakers.

When one considers the historical record of the immigrant experience in the US, two pictures (at least) emerge. One is of the ethnic and linguistic richness that we all accept as part of the American story; ethnic food and music, the many Chinatowns and Little Italies, the heroes from the fields of sports, entertainment, and politics. The other is the pain experienced by many of being "different," of being an identifiable "ethnic," even after generations of residence in the United States. The indignity is even greater for African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanic Americans whose ancestors predate the arrival of the more recent European groups. The ideal is that we can all become Americans; the reality is that it is easier for some than for others to be accepted as "American." The English language has often been used as a marker of one's "American-ness", and the use of non-English languages as a marker of one's "foreign-ness." Penalizing non-English speakers by limiting their access to public services, voting, and education is illogical, for it would *further* stigmatize non-English speakers, rather than help them acquire the language. If some Americans choose not to learn English, that will be punishment enough. To deliberately fortify the status of English by officializing it will merely add insult to injury for the vast majority of non-English speakers struggling to learn the language.

Everyone involved with English education should take it upon him- or herself to oppose official English legislation wherever and whenever possible. TESOL supports the notion of English-plus, that is, the right of all Americans to acquire English *in addition* to their native language (if it isn't English), not as a replacement for that language. For native English speakers, the learning of another language should be encouraged. Being bi- or multilingual is the norm in most countries. Monolingualism is a costly policy; undervaluing other languages, and by extension other cultures, does little to strengthen "American" culture. Languages are resources of great political, economic, and strategic value, a view clearly not embraced by those who support the official English movement in the United States. But how about other countries? In 1986, US English published a survey of 161 constitutions from around the world, and reported that 64 designate an official language. What the report fails to mention is that

of these 64 countries, all but 17 protect the rights of linguistic minorities by naming more than one official language, or by stipulating specific antidiscrimination guarantees. Perhaps most interesting is the fact that of the 14 countries that call English their official language, not one has named English its *sole* official language (Crawford, 1992, pp. 237-238). As Crawford notes, "in a world with approximately 160 national flags and some 6,000 languages, the odds weigh heavily against unilingualism" (1992, p. 238). Perhaps it is time that the United States caught up with the rest of the world.

References

- Bureau of the Census. (1990). Census of population: General population characteristics, United States. US Dept. of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Bureau of the Census. (1993). Statistical abstract of the United States, 1993, 113th edition. US Dept. of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration.
- Crawford, J. (1992). Hold your tongue: bilingualism and the politics of "English only." Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Inman, J. (1994). The politics of English in the US. *TESOL Matters*, 4, (1)1, 11.
- Kamin, L. J. (1977). The politics of I.Q. In P. L. Houts (Ed.), *The myth of measurability*. New York: Hart Publishing Co., 45-65.
- Tamura, E. H. (1993). The English-only effort, the anti-Japanese campaign, and language acquisition in the education of Japanese Americans in Hawaii, 1915-40. *History of Education Quarterly*, 33, (1), 37-58.
- Ricento, T. (1995 to appear). Language policy in the United States: An overview. In M. Herriman & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language policy in English dominant countries: Six case studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ricento, T. (1994). Partitioning by language: Whose rights are threatened? To appear in T. Ricento & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language and politics in the US and Canada: Myths and realities*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Winn-Bell Olsen, R. E. (1993). Enrollment statistics of limited English proficient students in the United States (1985-1993). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
-

About the author: Thomas Ricento is Associate Professor of Applied Linguistics, Division of Bicultural-Bilingual Studies, The University of Texas at San Antonio. His book, *Language and Politics in the US and Canada: Myths and Realities*, co-edited with Barbara Burnaby will appear in 1996. He is co-editor of a special topic issue of *TESOL Quarterly* to appear fall 1996, *Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Profession*. He edited the Sociopolitical Concerns column in *TESOL Matters* from 1991 to 1994.

Copyright © 1995 by Tom Ricento

All rights reserved. Copying or further publication of the contents of this article are not permitted without permission of the author, except for limited "fair use" for educational, scholarly, and similar purposes as authorized by US Copyright Law, in which case appropriate notice of the source of the work should be given.

[\(Return to Table of Contents\)](#)

The HTML version of this document was prepared by NCBE and posted to the web with the permission of TESOL.

[NCELA Home Page](#)

www.ncela.gwu.edu