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DEDICATION

Antonia Ferraro and Vincenzo Lo Bianco
This is a study of the discourse contest concerning the officialisation of English in the United States. It consists of an analysis of the language of that discourse shaped by a belief that discourse is a rather neglected but potentially illuminating area of examination of language and literacy policy. The study seeks to understand the processes and content of language policy as it is being made, or performed, and is influenced by a critique of the theory and practice of language policy which tends to adopt technicist paradigms of examination that insufficiently elucidate the politics of the field.

Accordingly a systematic gathering of the texts of language disputation in the US was collected. These texts were organised in response to the methods of elicitation. Semi-elicited texts, elicited texts and unelicited texts were gathered and tested to be sure that they constituted a fair representation of the concourse (what had been said and was being said about the issue) over a 15 year period. Those statements, or texts, that had particular currency during the 104th Congress were selected for further use. An empirical examination of the subjective dispositions of those activists involved in the making of official English, or of resisting the making of official English, was conducted.

This examination utilised the Q methodology (inverted factor analysis) invented by William Stephensen. The data from this study provided a rich field of knowledge about the discursive parameters of the making of policy in synchronic and diachronic form. Direct interviews were also conducted with participants, and discourse analysis of ‘naturally occurring’ (unelicited texts) speeches and radio debates and other material of persuasion and disagreement was conducted.

These data frame and produce a representation of the orders of discourse and their dynamic and shaping power. Against an analysis of language policy making and a document analysis of the politics of language in the United States the discourses are utilised to contribute to a richer understanding of the field and the broad conclusion that as far as language policy is concerned it is hardly possible to make a distinction with political action.

The theoretical implications for a reinvigorated language policy theory constitute the latter part of the thesis. In the multi-epistemological context that postmodernity demands, with its skepticism about the possibility of ‘disinterest’, the thesis offers its own kinds of data triangulation, and the making central of subjective dispositions and political purposes and engagements of the principal antagonists.
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CHAPTER OUTLINE

Chapter I
Chapter one comprises three sections. The first section addresses the reasons for the selection of official English as the focus of the present research. The second section introduces language policy and planning as a field of both scholarship and intervention, and sets out a series of criticisms to which it has been subjected in recent years. The third section discusses the anomaly of heightened attention to language within the social sciences contrasted to the insecure status of language policy and planning within the academy.

Chapter II
Chapter two gives a general description of US linguistic demography, the policy framework and periods within which policy work has occurred, and analyses three domains of policy in which official English is involved: voting, bilingual education and citizenship swearing-in ceremonies.

Chapter III
The methodology for the research is presented in this chapter. Three kinds of data are gathered: texts that were directly elicited by the researcher, texts that were semi-elicited, and texts that were not in any way elicited by the researcher. Q-methodology is used to analyse the ‘subjective dispositions’ of key actors and observers engaged in official English politics. From Q-analysis the overall discourse formations of official English are identified and these in turn are subjected to analysis. The results are reported in Chapter IV. Second, there is an examination of three radio debates and a book chapter on official English. The results appear in Chapter V. The third data source and analysis comprises semi-structured interviews undertaken with 44 participants in official English politics during the 104th Congress, and the researcher’s participation in official Hearings at both the Senate and House of Representatives. This is reported in Chapter VI.

Chapter IV
This chapter reports the results of the Q-analysis. 54 participants rank 64 statements that were collected as a structured sample of what has been said (the concourse) on official English-bilingual education and multiculturalism over a representative period of 15 years. All of these statements, regardless of who uttered or wrote them originally, were selected because they were encountered in actual discourse and argument during the 104th concourse. The resultant discourse organisation of the statements is analysed at content level and also in relation to its underlying ideological structuring.

Chapter V
The first debate is of a single advocate for official English, George Tryfiatis, the debate moderator and twelve callers. Analysis is undertaken of the language of the advocate, and since he provides extended exposition of his case the transcript contains the details of long elaborated turns. The advocate
concerned is from the *English First* organisation, a more radical break-away group from the main *US English* organisation. The responses of the callers are discussed in detail because these interrupt, challenge and sustain the advocate’s arguments and introduce a dialogic component to the essentially monologic character of the first part. The second debate is a dyad between one of the official English Congressional sponsors Bill Emerson and a key opponent, Jim Lyons from the National Association for Bilingual Education. Three callers’ statements are also analysed. The third radio text has a polyadic format with the US Chamber of Commerce and three Democrat and Republican Congressmen, a moderator, and an announcer. The final text analysed is a written one, House Speaker Newt Gingrich’s *English as the American Language* from his best-selling book *To Renew America*. This piece located official English within the overall program of the ‘Conservative Restoration’ that the 104th Congress represented.

**Chapter VI**
This chapter analyses and presents data under various themes that emerged from the semi-structured interviews conducted with participants in the arguments/debate/talk on official English in the 104th Congress. The excerpts refer to the transcripts which are located under corresponding (but not identical) headings in the appendices. The interview evidence extends the discourse organisation and arrangements contained in the previous two chapters. At the conclusion of Chapter VI a diagrammatic representation of the overall argument (policy on the move) is included. This diagram seeks to represent the totality of the organisation of official English talk and politics as a structure of specifications within which the performance of the acts of oficialising English occur. Thus it is a map of the ‘officialisation territory’; two sets of claims, both of which preclude compromise and negotiation and which form the perimeter within which is located a space where dialogue, conversation and compromise are possible and occurring.

**Chapter VII**
The final chapter returns to the theme of the performance of language policy and planning in discursive politics. The chapter considers the main theorisations of *lpp* and how ideology and modernity have been critiqued in scholarship that has identified dialogical encounter, discourse, as a key site of struggle and contest in contemporary society. The chapter concludes with implications for a re-invigorated theory of *lpp* that employs these insights.
CHAPTER I

‘LANGUAGE’ & ‘PLANNING’

Language is the place where actual and possible forms of social organisation and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity is constructed. (Weedon 1987:21)

Perhaps the most significant feature of twentieth-century intellectual development has been the way in which the study of language has opened the route to an understanding of mankind, social history and the laws of how a society functions. (Coward and Ellis 1977:1)

IMPROBABILITY OF OFFICIAL ENGLISH

This thesis is an examination of one aspect of language politics in the United States. The focus of study is the ‘discursive politics’ that influence the formulation of language policy. In particular the thesis examines the performative, ‘political’ function (the ideological work) of discourse as it relates to the legislative moves in the 104th Congress (1994-1996) to declare English the official language of the US. The intention is to describe and understand the constitution of language ‘problems’ so as to contribute this understanding to explanations of the phenomenon of English politics but also to inform theory in the scholarly field known as language policy and planning (henceforth lpp).

Since the US is the world’s dominant socio-political and cultural power and the cultural, economic and political entity most directly responsible for the vast globalisation of English since the conclusion of the Second World War the movement to declare English the language of state contains many improbabilities. These improbabilities constitute an important motivation in the selection of the official English movement as the object of this study. Contained within the improbability (the counter-intuitive sense that the US legislature and senior politicians would devote substantial time, resources, legal litigation and media and political attention to the issue of the de jure standing of English) may reside answers to several undertheorised dimensions of lpp scholarship. In particular more theoretical effort is required concerning the relation between discursive performance of politics (the ‘constitution’ of language problems), the subjectivity of language planners and the processes of the construction of policies. Essentially these undertheorised dimensions of lpp concern the politics that precede and accompany lpp.

One aim of this thesis therefore is to elicit from the experience of US language politics insights that can inform a reinvigoration of lpp theory. This theory is evolving in an intellectual climate of post-modern
challenge to its central concepts and post-structural challenges to its epistemic dependence on categories of learning and language derived from autonomous linguistics and specifically its sub-fields and cognates of sociolinguistics and applied linguistics.

In the current historical epoch English enjoys the status of the world’s dominant and prestige linguistic code, the *Lingua Mundi* (Jernudd 1992), or at least the sole claimant to the more modest title of ‘global language’ (Crystal 1997). This fact alone would make moves to declare English “official” redundant if not absurd. The global dominion of English is reflected in its *de facto* status as the dominant and prestige linguistic code in America.

The evidence for this is substantial. The total published commitment to foreign languages in US government practices is tiny. In 1995 Senator Richard Shelby (R-Alabama) brought on a Congressional examination of 400,000 titles produced by the Government Printing Office in Washington DC between 1990 and 1995. Suspecting a vast industry of translation and non-English language literature production the investigation turned up only 265 translated documents. 99.94% of the printed public and governmental dealings during that five-year period were solely in English; only 0.06% of documents surveyed were translations (Crawford 2000:40; GAO 1995).

Further, according to the 1990 Census (the one closest in time to the 104th Congress) some 95% of the US population spoke English “well” or “very well”, with most speaking *only* English. Only 0.8% reported speaking no English at all, and even this represents a significant increase in non-English language claimants during the 1980s (US Census Bureau 1993 and US Census Bureau 1994). New arrivals learn English relatively quickly or wish to (Stevens 1994; Macias 2000). Spanish speakers transfer to the exclusive use of English intergenerationally at rates equal to and sometimes higher than comparable groups of earlier US immigrants (Veltman 1983, 1998) and of those who speak Spanish at home about half speak English “very well” (US Dept of Commerce 1993), and the demand for English classes typically outstrips supply (Ewen, Wrigley, and Chisman, 1993).

In other words this is a study of an anomalous socio-political moment. At least at face value, the kind of language policy that we see occurring – formal moves to ascribe legal status to the undisputed national and *de facto* official language of a polity – should not be happening according to any past criterion of which kinds of ‘language problems’ need to exist to invoke *lpp* processes. Fishman (1973:31) has commented that language planning is often ‘nationality planning’ since it depends on and interacts with culture as constructed in nationalism (heroic and mythic identity, emotion and canonical national texts). What then would be the kind of nationalism being planned by the *official* English movement, since the
American nation incontrovertibly exists without further need of creation? The ‘already-made’ state of the American polity and its sustaining nation, and the clear character of its nationalism, may be expressed by what Billig (1995) has called ‘banal nationalism’ involving the almost subliminal and continual reminder of attachment and belonging to the nation.

The (apparent) contradiction is that the world’s most powerful linguistic medium in the world’s most powerful economy and the world’s most pervasive deployer of transnational cultural norms should be the object of concerted attempts at legal officialisation. Even more remarkable, astonishing even, is the fact that a large part of the discourse of this attribution of status to English uses the vocabulary of protection (Birkales 1986) when advocates for the revival, restoration or reinvigoration of the languages of indigenous communities in America (many spoken by fewer than 100 individuals) also use a justificatory discourse of protection and conservation (Hinton 1994; Krauss 1998; Fishman 2001). This disparity of power (powerful English/relatively powerless native languages) combined with the identity of their politics (protection for thriving American English and for dying American native languages) suggests a (relatively) autonomous existence of discourse and perception in politics from actually encountered realities. What kinds of problems are these that demand policy attention? Are problems ‘constructions’ (fabrications)? How can the disparity between ‘concrete language problems’ and their discursive representation be reconciled? Questions such as these interrogate the kind of politics that the official English moves constitute and what tools theories have to reach explanations and understandings of such elusive, complex and ‘strange’ phenomena. Indeed eminent scholars make recourse to ‘ghosts and myths’ in trying to explain official English asking “Why are facts so useless in this discussion?” (Fishman 1988: 127).

 Clearly, official English is a special kind of language policy making.

Compounding these improbabilities is a virtual consensus in the political culture of Western democracies concerning expansive government. Both mainstream left and right political formations concur in seeing ‘big government’ as intrusive and illiberal. For conservatives this is part of a re-emphasis of ‘small government’ ideology whereas for left governments and intellectuals it is part of ‘third way’ ideologies through which they have adopted market based theorisations of political practice (Giddens 1994, 1998). And yet conservative politicians in the US seek the intervention of the highest legislative authorities in Western society to ‘protect’ English; a series of ‘facts’ that invites curiosity as to the nature and purposes of the official English movement (Crawford 2000) and indeed about language policy and its broader relationship to politics. English is the language that radical language planning scholars dysphemise as a ‘killer’, described even in its UK source among Celtic language
scholars as a ‘predator’ tongue (Price 1984; Skutnab-Kangas 1995) and indeed the same language whose words the Académie française works energetically to keep at bay (Schiffman 1996).

As Lingua Mundi English is the inevitable, recurring, cultural ‘other’ in most of the rest of the world’s language policy making. It is the ubiquitous necessary additional language but the universal cultural and political problem (Phillipson 1991, 1992; Phillipson and Skutnab-Kangas 1996; Pennycook 1994a; Graddol 1997; Crystal 1997). A commercially motivated demand for English acquisition animates debates about language policy almost everywhere. Indeed the works by Graddol and Crystal are remarkable for the fact that both were commissioned by authorities concerned with the status of English in the world. Graddol’s study was commissioned by the British Council interested to know whether the language will sustain its preeminent standing in global affairs into the foreseeable future (concluding that more than one billion people are presently studying English, that it is far and away the world’s most commonly utilised lingua franca but that a small number of other languages are growing faster in the demographics of monolingual users but are outpaced by English in relation to ‘auxiliary’ language usage). Crystal’s study was prepared ‘at the suggestion’ of US English, the largest of the organisations in the United States which is campaigning for official English. While Crystal’s work contains an anomalous expression of concern about the need for effort to retain the long term maintenance of the trend for English it is as overwhelming in its conclusion as Graddol’s assessment about likely Anglophone dominance.

Phillipson’s controversial (1991,1992) conclusion that English is not merely spreading, but spreading in a motivated linguistic world imperialism has animated a contest about the notion of ‘imperialism’ in language and about the ‘complicity’ of the English language teaching profession, British and American cultural agencies, academic researchers and advanced country language planners within the imperialism construct. Metaphorical characterisation of languages involving notions of ‘death’, ‘extinction’, ‘murder’ and ‘suicide’ is defended “because languages are intimately connected with humans, our cultures, and our environment” (Nettle and Romaine 2000: 6).

Murder and killing are associated with languages that invade the domains of distinctive social semiosis of indigenous groups and bring about the linguistic equivalent of species extinction. The ‘extinction’ phenomenon is well supported by research in relation to a projected loss of up to 90% of the presently spoken languages of the world within two generations (Krauss 1992; Wurm 1993; Fettes 1998; Grenoble and Whaley 1998). In the work of Skutnab-Kangas and Phillipson the practice of ‘killing’ small languages is nominalised as ‘linguicide’ with an ideological correlate ‘linguicism’ whose counter is ‘linguistic human rights’ (1994). This role is shared by several languages of expansion (Chinese,
Spanish, Portuguese, Indonesian, French) especially prominently in ex-colonial settings in which large masses of people are drawn into structures of national feeling and techno-economy relationships that disrupt the domains of traditional languages. Many of these scholars connect the accelerating rates of attrition of distinct languages to the globalisation of processes of economic modernity which both reflects and produces social structure: nationalism, capitalist production modes, literate standardised national languages, mass literacy education, bureaucracy, separation of science, religion and law and industrialism. The semantic coding of these relationships and processes of economic modernity are largely unavailable in languages of ‘traditional’, pre-industrial and agrarian societies (Gellner 1983) and the incorporation of traditional societies into the globalised spread of economic modernism has led to the immense attrition of diversity in languages. The rapid absorption of previously marginal territories into consumer capital society spreads language attrition pressures to all corners of the globe as unique social spaces become incorporated into Western World View propagating social orders.

This macro level consideration of the sociolinguistics of relations among languages (ecologies of communication) has multiple internal inflections for English. One has spawned a field of scholarship on polycentricity in languages and especially of World Englishes (with several national norm setting centres co-existing) and the exploration of national Englishes as languages of local identity and not external imposition (Kachru 1992; Knowles 1997; Rajagopalan 1999) and questions of the retention of inter-dialectal English intelligibility (Leith 1997). Another is seen in the globalisation of disputes about appropriate teaching standards in response to the emergence of hybrid language forms in the wake of post-colonial retention of formerly colonial English (Honey 1997; Canagarajah 1999) and the emergence of societies able to be classified sociologically in relation to the extent of English penetration (Jernudd 1992). A third is the defensive identification of English lexical loans and transfers into national languages across the globe, into both powerful regional and international languages as well as geographically circumscribed languages. A fourth (perversely in this context) is the isolated move in the United States to declare the language associated with most of the rest of the world’s defensive lpp the code requiring protection and legal sanction. The face value anomaly of a protectionist discourse being mounted on behalf of English makes the recent legislative moves especially interesting and important.

**Why official English?**

There are then three characteristics which motivated the selection of official English as the subject of this thesis. First, the dominance of English globally, and, within the US its *de facto* official status. English is the unmarked form, the ‘other’ that provokes protective and defensive lpp: the notorious efforts of the * Academie française* to distance borrowings from English, official Japanese pronouncements about ‘declining English language competence’ (including proposals to make English
co-official with Japanese to enhance its native-like mastery); the adoption of English in cross-straits ‘tension-talk’ between China and Taiwan; the politics of national versus foreign Englishes in India and Sri Lanka (Parakrama 1995) are all instances of English as the ‘other’ in much language policy in the world.

Focussing on English departs from a pattern of lpp scholarship which has been to focus on developing nations, on minority languages and on ‘non-settled states’; that is, states that had still to establish the governing institutions after independence from colonialism or where these institutions may be settled (Canada, Belgium, Spain) but are contested by strong territorially based language-defined citizen populations. The American instance of sustained language politics has been selected precisely because it occurs in a ‘settled’ dominantly English-speaking context where the ‘protection discourse’ that animates the politics of lpp promises to contain a level of ideological materiality. The US is in Kachru’s (1992a) ‘inner circle’ (an ‘old native speaker nation’) in which English is dominantly used by ‘original’ native speakers and in which the correctness norms are generated endogenously.

The second motivating factor in the choice of setting is the nature of the problem being addressed. In much lpp scholarship a ‘problem neutral’ approach is followed. This means that lpp is seen as a set of practices that intervene once authoritative intervention has been approved by an appropriate body. In the public policy literature there is considerable attention paid to the constitution of problems, seen as the site of struggle to define the scope, purpose and nature of intervention. Locating lpp on a continuum from Politics to Policy to Planning most lpp scholarship is located at the Policy-Planning end. The ‘problem’ which lpp scholarship often addresses is taken to be self-evident, ‘out there’ and established and not therefore the focus of lpp analysis or procedures. English in the US offers the possibility of a radical departure from this orientation. An examination of the politics around English offers the chance to scrutinise an instance of ‘policy in the making’ and therefore disputation about the nature of the problem to be addressed (language politics). By addressing this dynamic of the lpp process the static and post-hoc character of some lpp scholarship can be avoided with the additional prospect of gathering evidence that can tie the discursive domain of the constitution of policy problems into a reinvigorated lpp theory. For these reasons the data which form the basis of the present study are discursive, performative data and constitute the raw material on which the analysis proceeds in Chapters IV-VI. In turn this produces a recursive pattern: language evidence about language problems in language politics.

The third factor that influenced the choice of study was the settled state of English. English, like the US, can be considered ‘settled’. ‘Settled’ is an abstraction and should not imply stasis or completion. What is intended is that the platform from which change occurs (lexical expansion, grammatical modifications) is so high that any such language reform within English is not typically discussed as
‘modernisation’ which is the common characterisation of internal language developments for many languages. The specific intent here is to focus on a national context where the main institutions are well established and have become conventionalised, and where a similar principle applies to the language.

Therefore the focus of the language policy making is not social change, which Cooper (1989) argues is the principal focus of lpp, but rather the re-production and maintenance of a given and powerful social order (see also Williams 1991). ‘Settled’ nation states with ‘settled languages’ are often naturalised, or unmarked, in lpp discussion. Much lpp is appropriately developmental and modernising and addresses juridical language status setting, corpus planning that aims to ‘intellectualise’ a target language and is intra-linguistic and technical in orientation. The aim is usually for the target language to achieve standards of terminological and discursive representational capacity presumed already set by other languages, and canonically by English.

Existing explanations of the phenomenon of official English are numerous. They range from a face-value acceptance of the position of those who push for English to be 'protected' (Hayakawa 1985; Chavez 1991; Gingrich 1995; Pedalino Porter 1995) to various levels of analysis, critique and position-taking (Baron 1990; Crawford 1992a and 2000; Donahue 1995; Sonntag 1995; Tatalovich 1995; Combs 1999). If evidence emerges to support a hypothesis that official English is a kind of lpp aiming not to change society at all but to reinforce and underscore existing social relations and roles then it may constitute an expansion of the purview of lpp scholarship. Perhaps official English aims to arrest or interrupt changes underway in society or to arrange national symbols in such a way as to project symbolically the material order of social relations, and under these possibilities it too is a kind of lpp that would be interesting and important in the light of contemporary lpp theory.

**Lpp & Its Critics**
The scholarly field which has most directly engaged with the conversion of language to an object of public policy is called language policy and planning. As an academic discipline lpp is a struggling and modest endeavour, a fact conceded even by some of its most ardent advocates (Kaplan 1994: 3) “...essentially overlooked except as an academic enterprise... a couple of lectures in the introductory course in sociolinguistics.” Even worse, not all theorisations of sociolinguistics are welcoming nests for lpp. Chambers’ *Sociolinguistic Theory* (1995) reserves ‘sociolinguistics’ essentially for variation theory and evicts lpp out of language studies altogether, placing it under political science. Chambers’ is an exemplary (and possibly extreme version) of *correlative sociolinguistics* (language reflects society) analysing the co-variation between language and diverse social phenomena and categories. A counter school can be described as ‘constitutive sociolinguistics’ which is based on the notion that language and discourse constitute social categories and phenomena, though there is no sense of agreement about how often language is constitutive, under what conditions and when not.
Despite academic marginality the theorisation and discipline of lpp has come under sustained and severe attack in recent years.

Perhaps the most extensive critique alleges that lpp is complicit with socially repressive national projects in the interests of state and class (Luke, McHoul and Mey 1990). These critics and Mühlhäusler (1995) have also alleged that when lpp is applied by developed-country experts from ‘Europeanised’ settings (used to operating with ‘one national language’) to traditionally multilingual but intergenerationally stable nations in post-colonising contexts, lpp leads to the creation of hierarchical diglossia among existing languages or language varieties. This, in turn, inevitably produces erosion and ultimately the death of minority languages as such nations are made to resemble Europeanised models of the nation-state. Another strong criticism has been that lpp has been used to entrench economic inequalities for immigrants in immigrant-receiving first world societies by language educational schemes directly or indirectly designed to track immigrants into low-paid and marginal occupational categories (Tollefson 1991). A global extension of these criticisms holds that the spread and imposition of semantic and cultural ideologies of an Anglophone and Westernising modernity onto non-Western, plurilingual nations and peoples leads to the destruction of their distinctive lifeworlds and more generally the depletion of human social alternatives that reside in diverse linguistic systems (Williams 1986; Phillipson 1991; Skutnab-Kangas 1995; Phillipson and Skutnab-Kangas 1996; Mühlhäusler 1995; Nettle and Romaine 2000).

In addition to these politico-ideological criticisms the practice of lpp, and its theory, is criticised for favouring positivistic, rationalist epistemology (a ‘pretence to science’) and for relying exclusively on technicist-scientistic methodologies (Luke, McHoul and Mey 1990). For Moore (1996) lpp theorists stand accused of adopting an uncritical stance towards their own practices within a-theoretical and excessively descriptive parameters. The archetypal methods of lpp practice (the sociolinguistic survey (Sibayan 1974) and the rational choice matrix) are criticised for ‘masquerading’ as neutral information-collecting instruments when in effect, it is claimed, these allow state agencies and even private corporate interests to gain bureaucratic and technocratic control over previously private domains of the lives of marginalised minority indigenous communities (Sommer 1991).

These criticisms of the epistemological base of lpp allege that the formal processes of lpp analysis and of lpp in the service of its commissioning agencies manufacture ‘factive’ knowledge of communities otherwise removed from centralising and hegemonical state apparatuses, and implicitly deliver such knowledge to authority. The knowledge is usually framed as information required by state
bureaucracies to ‘solve’ social, educational and occupational problems, invariably called ‘disadvantage’. Moore’s (1996) critique utilises Dorothy Smith’s sociology in which scholarship (sociologists, and by extension applied linguists) are involved in ‘relations of ruling’ (often un-self-consciously) whose practices of knowledge creation apply ‘abstractions’ of lived realities, naming others’ lives and experiences, and then inscribe these appropriated experiences into orders of action that impose the ‘invented’ categories onto those from whom they were extracted. This ‘overwriting’ kind of domination is a recurring allegation against lpp writings. According to such critiques lpp introduces knowledge about minorities (constructed as linguistic communities when they may not always identify this way themselves) into operational and bureaucratic systems employed by colonising agencies. The kinds of agencies involved are governmental bureaucracy, statistical documentation bodies, corporations and proselytising religious orders.

A further strong allegation against lpp concerns an anti-democratic and technicist exclusion of groups affected by lpp interventions (Alexander 1989; Luke, McHoul and Mey 1990). In fact very little actual lpp practice utilises lpp theorisations, researchers or specialists. Mostly statesmen, generals, poets and technology make lpp (Grillo 1989; Lewis 1999) though not of course always.

The final (and perhaps rather perverse) criticism of lpp is that it has failed to appeal to power, failed to command the attention of policy makers who rarely engage its specialist trained practitioners to address vexed problems of language in society which politicians, bureaucrats, teachers and others nevertheless, tackle daily. To this end Kedourie’s withering assessment of the role of specialist academic contribution exemplifies one (extreme) view of the practice and prospects of a scholarly field of autonomous language planning.

It is absurd to think that professors of linguistics ... can do the work of statesmen and soldiers. ... academic enquiries are used by conflicting interests to bolster up their claims, and their results prevail only to the extent that somebody has the power to make them prevail....Academic research does not add a jot or a tittle to the capacity for ruling... (Kedourie 1961: 125).

This view constitutes a real-politik extreme of the knowledge-power field within assessments of the possibility of an autonomous language planning discipline exercising scholarly intervention in conflicts and debates of language. Even naming of languages rarely rests with linguists operating independently (except as Mühlhäusler (1995)) points out when tribal language chains are ‘interrupted’ by namers of convenience) but language naming is usually an act of nationing and located within particular kinds of politics (Lo Bianco 1996). The ‘emergence’ of national languages in the wake of the dissolution of formerly trans-ethnic states and their re-making as smaller (nation-based) states is ample demonstration
of this plasticity, e.g. Bosniak’s (re-) emergence since the dissolution of the wider state of Yugoslavia in which its nation-name did not exist, or Corsican as the asserted nation-named language of an aspirant state (Connor 1994; Jaffe 1999). Nation-naming of languages already has a politicised history, one which the trans-national tendencies of globalising economies, and supra-national institutions, makes vulnerable and is yet another example of the a-historicity of much of the criticism waged in recent years against the discipline of Lpp.

Lpp is also enmeshed in a deeper dilemma inherent in its founding discipline, linguistics, and of its more immediate disciplinary progenitors, applied linguistics, and socio-linguistics. This dilemma, a fundamental issue of intellectual orientation, concerns a dichotomisation of activities which are either concerned with description or prescription (Newmeyer 1986; Bruthiaux 1992). The dilemma of orientation in language scholarship, between normative and regulatory knowledge [which much of the wider public expects of language expertise (Cameron 1995) versus descriptive categorisation, is unresolved. Indeed it is largely unresolved, since it is not an issue of ‘science’ so much as of the ‘values’ that motivate scholars’ work. In some recent actual policy work the exclusion of linguistics from Lpp processes is traced to the descriptivist refusal of linguistics to adjudicate on ‘non-standard’ varieties what Coulmas (1989:177) has called the “prescriptive abstinence”.

Language forms (grammar, vocabulary, orthographic conventions) are intimately connected with the semantic domain of language. It is to this field of meaning potential (Halliday 1985) that the bulk of politics around ‘language’ is in fact directed. This kind of Lpp concerns the ‘planning’ of the permissible and sanctioned discourses of a polity, a discipline or a political movement. Knowledge about language, as produced by linguists, is even utilised in political ideologies of race, exemplified by Nazi linguistics (Hutton 1999) with its strong association of language and Volk but encountered generally in contexts where difference is involved in seeking constitutional separation. Language, from a Herderian prospect of constituting essentialised differences among peoples is intimately involved in nation-politics (Alexander 1989). The political ideology that utilised the views of Herder and even Humboldt went much further in the essentialisation of languages as a “dream of a world of autonomous authentic national essences living side by side but preserving their distinctiveness” (Hutton 1999: 288) but this spirit had sinister consequences when German-proficient Jews under National Socialism in Germany were seen to threaten a primordial link between ‘mother tongue’ and ‘race’ thereby “heralding the dissolution of language and thought” (p 288). Taking the distinctive-language=distinctive-thought association to extremes involved seeing that each nation’s distinctive thoughts (World View) as expressed in the ‘spirit language’ (the politicised mother-tongue) could be ruptured by bilingualism.
**Lpp in practice**

Despite the re-emerged importance of language in understanding human sociality and identity (see below) and the trenchant critiques of lpp theory, the actual practice of lpp (undertaken by state agencies but rarely utilising trained linguistic specialists) is very common, of major international significance and expanding in all parts of the world (Tucker 1994).

For example the practice of lpp served Apartheid’s originators in their efforts to justify and legitimate forced removal of African peoples into constructed nations by conducting scholarship aimed at ‘describing’ differences among varieties of language located in interconnected communication chains of mutually related and largely intelligible varieties, devising different orthographic conventions for them, and thus rupturing the interconnected speech matrix, driving speech forms into different languages and then arguing that unique languages were the evidence of separateness necessitating divided geo-political space (Alexander 1989:22).

Several centuries earlier lpp produced in Sweden the highest literacy rates in the world (and far higher literacy rates for women than exist in the majority of countries even today) an outcome motivated not by any literacy or language-specific interest but by the conviction of religious authorities about direct, unmediated encounter with God’s word (Gee 1996: 37). In the eighteenth and then the nineteenth centuries the world’s biological and chemical terminologies were reformed and rationalised by Linnaeus and Berzelius, both scientists reflecting a national attitude diametrically opposed to that found in English speaking countries (Dahlstedt 1976; Ferguson 1979). From this experience the Swedish Academy has evolved a social function independent of the state and regularly issues language reforms that are widely accepted in both popular and technical domains.

In the third century BC a stark national-cultural contrast in lpp emerged in Asia. After converting to Buddhism, Indian Emperor Ashoka adopted a goal of political unification via linguistic toleration. In the same century Qin Shihuangdi, first emperor of a united China, suppressed script varieties from China’s regions and inaugurated an entirely opposite policy for precisely the same objective, the selection of a single standardised writing (the Small Seal) variety, and its mandated use (Ferguson 1979). Today these ancient precedents have modern manifestations in the Indian constitution whose promotion of diversity continues Ashoka’s pluralism, whereas China steadfastly maintains a unitary literacy-language policy.

Similarly, in the West, ancient practices of language planning are based on ideology theory and show that both change and anti-change are invoked. In ancient Greece political contest and philosophical speculation revolved around the different intellectual propensities revealed by text genres and talk types;
that is the association of different kinds of organisation of talk (recitation, rhetoric, chit chat, debate, conversation, argument) and different text genres (stories, poetry, letters, edicts). The ancient Whorfian inclinations these hold are prominent in Plato’s advocacy of literacy (free literacy) with political will. Plato’s commitment to dialogic language correlated with his political goal to ‘break the power base of Homer and traditional culture’. His technique for ‘disenchanting’ Athenians from the blandishments of Homeric verse (which he believed contained dangerous ‘magic’ making the citizenry pliable and unthinking) was individual literate capability (as distinct from shared and communal poetic recitation) and individuals’ engagement with rhetoric (Gee 1996: 32-35).

These ancient kinds of lpp stand in stark contrast to contemporary criticisms of lpp some of which seem to operate on an assumption that demonstrating contemporary deficiencies of theorisation could result in an abandonment of the practice.

Further evidence of both the ubiquity in time and place and the regularity of practice of lpp is its inflection for national setting. This refers to the array of national policy styles. The Swedish Academy’s authoritative standing allows it to propound on (and succeed in the adoption of) terminological, pronunciation, spelling and other language changes. This is claimed to reflect the ‘total Swedish societal ideology’ (Dahlstedt 1976) and sustains a wide national commitment to rational lpp. This interventionist and expert-driven cultivation of a large number of linguistic domains of contemporary Swedish reveals such national ideals as ‘Nordic regionalism’ (regional linguistic intelligibility) and ‘democratism’ (a view that everyone will have equal access to the resources of the language) and is generally held to be unproblematic, largely conducted by specialists working in conjunction with ‘ordinary language users’ but without overt, and usually without any, government involvement (Dahlstedt 1976).

The Swedish instance, and the cases of Tanzanian planning on behalf of the progressive replacement of English in primary education by KiSwahili, the modern revival of spoken Hebrew, and the development of Bahasa Indonesia as the replacement language for colonial Dutch and the romanisation program for Turkish under the direction of Kemal Ataturk in the 1920s (Lewis 1999) represent frequently cited instances of major lpp. The configuration of historically sanctioned social, economic and technological relations and their language-literacy correlates form clusters of variable, localised and contingent practices of lpp.

It is rare that language planners as a distinct category of specialists, and even more rare that principles of language planning theory, inform such lpp endeavours. More usually language policy activism is
dispersed among communities; everybody is engaged in some kind of reaction or action to language polices promulgated by elites, power wielders or centralised sources of direction. Language practices, inherited as tradition, language populated with the meanings, associations and ideologies of past speakers and present arrangements, constitute the inherited pattern of past ‘policy’ (or past accommodations) of the struggle for the distribution and order of the language resource of a collectivity.

**Lpp & Language Praxis**

The politics of language, and the ‘ideologies in action’ which constitute the politics of language, engage many layers of affected societies because confirmation or disconfirmation of promulgated new norms is participation in *lpp* in its broadest arc (Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998; Jaffe 1999; Blommaert 1999a). This connection between ideology and language is shown by Shannon (1999) to operate as ‘default’ among US bilingual teachers. In the absence of explicit policy formulations she finds that ‘practice’ becomes policy out of habituation.

A ‘popular’ policy problem has been distinguishing indigenous languages from dialects. A consequence of the nation-naming of languages (the elevation and elaboration of selected codes or varieties) has been to call remaining forms ‘dialects’, a pejorative refusal in popular speech to extend the honour of ‘language’ to the category of speech forms that colonisers encountered for the first time, or that remain in the wake of nation-formation in colonising states. This practice is symmetrically aligned with the related notions of ‘culture and imperialism’ (Said 1978, 1993) both within established nation states and in colonised ones. Mühlhäusler (1995) argues that in Pacific island nations languages were ‘created’ (not identified or discovered) by administrators and proselytising missionaries. Naming a language where a name was not already attached to the speech form by its speakers, or where its boundaries from cognate speech forms were not determined, is more than an act of taxonomy. By this logic these scholars want to extend political purpose to ‘ordinary’ scientific work, however inadvertent it might be. Significantly the 5 809 presently spoken human languages have more than 41 000 names (Ethnologue 2001).

Alexander’s (1989) demonstration of the overt political mission of such scientific nomenclature allocation indicates that even linguistic classificatory practice is a form of *lpp* saturated with politics. In the South African case languages were invented to justify, or bolster, the Apartheid language policy project of “breaking up the black people into a large number of conflicting and competing so called ethnic groups” (Alexander 1989: 21). This history makes the idea of a ‘technical’ language planning in the South African context impossible, and has infused language policy work there with liberation politics.
The located or contingent nature of the meanings of lpp is demonstrated by the different constructions of the practice of bilingual education which is both liberatory and progressive or regressive and oppressing. In Australia two-language teaching is an educational practice associated with progressivist acknowledgement of ethnic minority language rights (Djite 1994) but also with politics that claim bilingual education is a failed method for imparting English literacy to indigenous children (Lo Bianco 1999). In Canada bilingual education can involve both politicised concessions to Quebec linguistic nationalism and educational and social enrichment for anglophones (Heller 1999). In the US anti-poverty social planning (Schneider 1976) is invoked for legislated ‘bilingual education’ (Chapter II) but Two-Way Immersion education “integrates language minority and language majority students in the same classroom with the goal of academic excellence and bilingual proficiency for both” (Christian, Montone, Lindholm and Carranza 1997). In South Africa in 1976 protests against the policy of using both official languages by introducing teaching of arithmetic and social studies in Afrikaans became “the immediate cause of the 1976 Soweto uprising” that resulted in the deaths of many students (Juckes 1995: 147-149). Introducing the languages of minority pupils in bilingual education in many settings around the world (including now African languages in South Africa) is transformative, socially just and pluralistic in orientation (Cummins 2000).

Integral to the post-structural, critical linguistics and neo-Marxian criticism of lpp is a presumed obligation on lpp to be overtly socially transformative in intention, or that at least it not be complicit with serving extant power accommodations. The claim eliminates the possibility of neutrality (Fairclough 1989); based on the idea that unless lpp adopts a socially transformative agenda (a liberatory ethos and practice against languages of wider communication, opposition to Westernisation and modernisation, and advocacy on behalf of minority population rights) its practice makes natural an acceptance of established hierarchy and repressive social orders.

Language and discourse, in their power of naming and framing problems and, thereby, in forming an epistemological premise of all disciplinary fields are commonly conceived as constitutive of reality and perception. In a later part of this chapter the centrality that language is now accorded within wide fields of human scholarship in its role in constituting sociality is discussed. One theme of this study is the deep discrepancy between the growing focus on language in actual planning, i.e. as an object of such planning (and its centrality in scholarship in human sciences) contrasted to its substantial failure as a disciplinary practice.

An analysis of the lpp literature indicates that much of the original orientation of lpp was directed towards the production of a body of knowledge to be applied to the language problems of developing
nations (Eastman 1983: 115-117). This preoccupation of the field of language planning modelled for developing nations a teleology that saw development towards Western state organisation as inevitable, involving a social trajectory of increasing modernisation. In essence this modernisation was understood as progressive specialisation in economic domains; the lessening of clan, tribal and ethnic bonds and their substitution with the typical features of modern nation states in which technified, standardised, codified national languages and universal or near universal literacy was unproblematically assumed to be the end-point of processes of de-colonisation.

Since much of the early theory of *lpp* was conceptualised for developing nations the principal language function stressed was national unification and ‘modernisation’ (Rubin & Jernudd 1971; Eastman 1983; Hobsbawm 1993; Ricento 2000). From this functional purpose the pattern of assumptions of the nation-state was drawn from European monolingual polities (or their ‘new world’ recreations), at least in the designs of the nation-makers (Edwards 1994; Smith 1995). These designs rarely coincided with local views of the relation between polity and language (Mansour 1993) but were posited as the norms against which developing nations would measure their progress. In some versions of *lpp* multilingualism characterised poverty and backwardness while monolingualism in literate standard languages characterised developed nation states.

While this legacy has changed in recent years, partly through the increased prominence of Asian and African theorists of *lpp* (and with the effects of multilingual ‘problems’ ‘coming home’ to Europe and Europeanised states such as America and Australia) the underlying rationale, some of the critical categories and the methodological bias of early *lpp* still betrays the era of its emergence. Within this there can be noted the elevation to paradigmatic status of notions of efficiency of governmental and societal functioning. There is therefore centrally within the discipline of *lpp* the idea that a possible goal of *lpp* is the facilitation of the removal of the pluralism. By foregrounding multilingualism as a principal problem the logic of the endeavour of language planning leads to hierarchisation of patterns of communication via differential status allocations, differential literacy elaborations and different ideological associations so that narrowed language diversity results (Pattanayak 1986, 1987, 1991; Mühlhäusler 1995).

**Interested Lpp**

Rejecting the extreme criticisms of *lpp* Fishman (1994) calls on its scholars and practitioners to take a position, unlike some who have claimed for it a value-free character (Cobarrubias 1983) or others who attribute to it a ‘unity of purpose’ (Eastman 1981, 1983: 126). For Fishman *lpp* does not reside in some ideology-free zone but is used by “*ethnicisers, nativisers and traditionalisers*” who “*engage in
language planning for their own purposes” (Fishman 1994: 96). Similarly Labov (1972: 324) sees an ‘interested’ relationship between linguists and their ‘subjects’:

Most linguists ...must recognize in themselves a natural prejudice in favour of the survival of their subjects. The anthropological or comparative linguist will intuitively fight for the existence of his group, and he resists the notion that the cost of bilingualism is too great to be borne. He refuses to weigh the value of a language or a dialect in terms of its attractiveness to printers, the size of its literary output, or how well it prepares children to fit into a European school system. Linguists must recognize that they are interested parties in this argument.

Explicit language planning is rarely the organising practice for other domains of activity and more rarely still does *lpp* command theoretical primacy in collaborative processes of which it is a part. More commonly *lpp* is an adjunct practice for nationalistic legislation, cultural restoration politics, plans for enhancing economic competitiveness, or a support for foreign imperial adventures.

In his analysis of general public policy Ball (1993) distinguishes between policy as text (the legislative or administrative form that policies take), and policy as discourse (the talking and writing that precedes, and succeeds and accompanies policy) and that provides the framework for its interpretation. This distinction is useful in that it expands the scope of what constitutes public policy beyond formal declarative texts. Incorporating a discursive element into policy analysis is important in pressure group democratic contexts where contestation about intentions, meanings and interpretations of declared public policies shapes and frames the policy itself.

**Officialising Language**

This thesis is entitled *Officialising Language*. The ambiguity is intentional. *Officialising language* names the face value project of the official English movement (making English the state language of the US) but also suggests that the kind of language (*Officialising language*) that is adopted to advance this project of officialisation is itself part of the program, and therefore can be an object of investigation. The question is whether there is a kind of language practice that officialises. This implies performativity, the examination of which is the central preoccupation the present study. Essentially, the question involves whether to recurrently speak of and represent English in discourse parameters that ‘naturalise’ a need for officialisation constitutes a critical part of that very process.

The contention of the thesis is that the making of policy involves the exercise of *performative language*, speech acts which aim to affect public thinking and behaviour about language, culture and society, and in affecting these behaviours to effect the ideological character of the issue so that English is apprehended as needing legal protection. The study of speech acts derives from the work of philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) but has had many elaborations and applications into
different languages (Havertake 1984) and ethnographies (Reiss 1985). Austin’s early classification involved a trichotomy. First, utterance contain a propositional (or locutionary) meaning (literal meaning). The second level involves illocutionary meaning (the social function of the utterance or text). The final layer is the perlocutionary force (the effect, outcome or result of a text or utterance in a given social context). Austin’s overall distinction is between constatives and performatives, the former referring to language use whose principal function is information transfer between interactants, the latter involving language as action.

Thus we distinguish the locutionary act (and within it the phonetic, the phatic, and the rhetic acts) which has a meaning; the illocutionary act which has a certain force in saying something; the perlocutionary act which is the achieving of certain effects by saying something (Austin 1962: 120).

Searle (1969) and Hatch (1992) have located speech acts into five categories:

**Commissives**
Threats, guarantees, vows or swearing, pledges, promises which commit the user to a specified course of action: I promise to tell the whole truth; I pledge myself to pay back her loan.

**Declaratives**
Declarations or decrees that alter ‘real world’ conditions by utterances such as: You’re Fired!; I Hereby Baptise You; I Resign!

**Expressives**
Complaints, apologies and expressions of gratitude which communicate an attitude to a state of affairs: I welcome our Chinese visitors!; I deplore the violence that ensued; I apologise for the airforce’s invasion of sovereign airspace.

**Directives**
Commands, requests, suggestions in which the user tries to hold the listener/reader to a specified course of action: I insist that you stop smoking indoors; I demand that you speak to her; I suggest that you rewrite your thesis.

**Representatives**
Claims, reports, denials, affirmations, belief-assertions and other assertions that commit a speaker to the truth claim of a proposition: I deny any wrongdoing; I believe that environmental protection is lax; I report findings of studies that show that phonics teaching can work well.

Performatives succeed when particular criteria are satisfied. These felicity conditions require that the utterer of the speech act must have recognised authority to perform the action, and some speech acts depend on rituals, certification or institutional processes of validation (Baptisms, Arrests), and certain expectations are shared culturally and institutionally among participants. Subjectivity, as manifested in speaker intentionality (truthfulness or authenticity), constitutes a major stumbling block for speech act research. Humour, sarcasm and various levels of indirectness also complicate the picture for speech act research.
The present study utilises an understanding of language as performance, of a kind of speech act, in its examination of the making of policy, i.e. the politics of policy (a policy praxis), and seeks to add this discursive dimension into an elaborated theorisation of language policy and planning. A methodology has been devised to examine the subjective constructions of activists for and against official English. The use of speech acts is also informed by the work of Jürgen Habermas (1984) who locates speech acts (elaborated in his case to be more pertinent to political contexts) alongside other kinds of ‘activity’ (Chapter III). The lpp activists in the US are understood as ‘language strategists’ (Weinstein 1979, 1983), i.e. as individuals engaged in the praxis of policy. As participants in the making of policy their political subjectivity (defined as ‘dispositions to act politically’) in relation to language, culture, society (and the role of government in relation to these realms) is of central importance to the present study.

Inevitably the tool that language strategists utilise to do their work of lpp is the production of texts, acts of language that perform social functions to the extent that they gain perlocutionary force. The acts that are examined in the present research therefore are acts of officialisation. The texts that seek to perform these perlocutions (persuading the American public on official English) are naturally occurring texts that are available for examination. They occur without researcher solicitation, while other texts have been deliberately elicited.

Given the contentious character of this topic a series of ‘triangulations’ is conducted. Key activists are interviewed directly, their writings are examined, they rank a set of statements that have been collected in response to criteria that seek to capture critical dimensions of the issue being examined, and their participation in settings in which they espouse their views is scrutinised. This process is reflexive: written and spoken texts are studied with a view to understanding how as ‘language about language policy’ these texts are political (performative); i.e how they seek to make policy as they are used. The key data are texts: the real utterances of the activists engaged in the officialisation of language and those who resist them. These are re-circulated as selected samples from the concourse (the body of statements made about official English) back to the activists. Some of these texts will have been ‘authored’ by the respondents to the study, or contested by them. This means that the statements or their common meanings are familiar to participants and are recognised and available for ranking and evaluation by them.

The examination of language in politics (rhetoric, propaganda) is not the principal focus of the present study. The focus here is on the much less well studied (Sonntag 1995) domain of the contest about power, symbolism and interests which are better embraced by the term the politics of language. The
precise focus of attention is the elusive interaction between the otherwise clear entities of language and politics, policy and planning. The data from the analysis is then placed against understandings of language that come from the contemporary salience of language within scholarship, a salience discussed below.

**THEORIZING THE SIGN**

Burke, Crowley and Girvin (2000) identify three fundamental orientations to semiotic theory, Saussure’s belief that meaning resides in internal structure, Croce’s location of all language meaning within volitional, voluntaristic aesthetics and Voloshinov’s characterisation of meaning as a dialogic, negotiative and socially situated practice. In different ways each has shaped the prominence of language during last century. The second half of the 20th century saw the emphatic elevation of the category *language* to a central position in many fields of scholarship. Something called *language* (or its manifested state, *discourse*) is now endowed with explanatory power in many dimensions of social and personal existence. Language is held to be a defining variable in social and economic position, mobility in society and human identity. Indeed language is accorded recognition as the principal institution of society and even its prime constitutive force (Burke, Crowley and Girvin 2000).

The elevated attention devoted to the constitutive functions of language is encountered across diverse domains of scholarship, including fields of knowledge influenced by post-structural thinking, among adherents of various schools and traditions of sociology, scientists (Lemke 1995) and increasingly among political theorists, including ‘post-Marxist’ schools as well as many liberal and nationalist theorists, and finally in the work of a variety of communitarian theorists. The principal characteristic of language which attracts such attention is the felt need to characterise subjectivity within scholarly understanding and the promise that language as the tangible mediator of experience and consciousness offers in this regard (Győri 2001). Attributions of significance beyond the communicative function of language are made both for language as structure and form, as well as for language in its manifestation as *discourse*.

According to Bakhtin (1981), to have a subjectivity (to be human) is ‘to dialogue’ our way into life. Bakhtin’s many admirers from literary studies to linguistics, psychology and sociology concur with his notion that our self is social, and that we have a social mind. We enter into human consciousness via dialogue, and into all social consciousness via formed and performed dialogues, that is discourses; what Bakhtin would call the polyphony of voices of the social complexities that form us. Halliday’s (1993a) claim that our world is semiotically ever more complex, with semiosis refracting and remaking signs that refer in complex ways only to other signs requires a kind of ‘language science’ that locates
language intimately in social context and space, not reifying and abstracting it from communication and meaning. For Halliday language is “organised according to what it has evolved to do” (Lemke 1995: 155); for Lemke this organising principle of language is “more fundamental” than either “truth” or “reality” (p 156).

This wide remit of claims for language is expressed by the philosopher Richard Rorty as a truth/world dichotomy:

\[
\text{We need to make a distinction between the claim that the world is out there and the claim that truth is out there. To say that the world is out there, that it is not our creation, is to say, with common sense, that most things in space and time are the effects of causes which do not include human mental states. To say that truth is not out there is simply to say that where there are no sentences there is no truth, that sentences are elements of human languages, and that human languages are human creations. (1989:3-4)}
\]

Rorty belongs to a tradition that sees truth as ‘for us.’ Who is included under ‘us’ is defined by inter-subjective agreement that presupposes a communicative practice. These practices in turn produce inter-subjective understanding. ‘Critical’ schools of thought (exemplified by the work of Habermas) accept that validity claims are particular and made in specific contexts but Habermas argues that the validity to which the claims aspire transcends both time and space. Achieving this requires that communicative practices remove ‘systematic distortions’ (Habermas 1984). In Habermas’ work language and communication theory have occupied a central importance in politically engaged theorisations of law, state and politics (Outhwaite 1996).

Postmodernism as an interpretive sensibility in response to post-modernity echoes and enlivens these attributions to language (Anderson 1995:7) largely because postmodern analyses abjure ‘totalising’ theories of human sociality and prefer to focus on local and contingent truths. These approaches to knowledge are congruent with the idea that linguistic mediation affects content. Relativist orientations to language (which in recent times have been reinvigorated, viz, Niemeier and Dirven 2000; Pütz and Verspoor 2000) are compatible with such ecological visions of truth (or truths) as ‘epistemic regimes’, or truth as possible readings. If ‘truth’ is a system or way of knowing (a take) rather than a pre-existing entity available to us to uncover or discover within nature and society, then at the very centre of ‘truth’ is language; language not as rules or even as representations (Edwards 1997; Linnel 1998) but as ‘meaning’ (Lemke 1995). Since language both reflects and helps fashion culturally specific constructions of knowledge, it is inevitably central in the making as well as the communication of knowledge, mental states and subjectivity, interpersonal relations and personal intentions.

Each time that ... the question of language comes to the fore...signifies that a series of other problems is about to emerge, the formation and enlarging of the ruling class, the necessity
to establish more ‘intimate’ and sure relations between the ruling groups and national popular masses, that is the reorganisation of cultural hegemony (Gramsci 1971: 16).

The appeal of the quote from Gramsci is not that he seeks to establish a connection between language and antagonistic social groups, but rather that it identifies in the ‘question of language’, and especially in the moment when the language question becomes socially and culturally prominent, an indexical quality. Changes to the social compact around language suggest that cultural hegemony is being reorganised. In this regard language is accorded a barometrical function, providing its readers with information that allows wider, perhaps deeper, insights into culture and society. Gramsci’s hegemony introduces a distinction between rule as force, coercion or compulsion, and rule by compliance and submission. In this way Gramsci’s work connects the realm of ideas with physical materiality, for our present purposes it characterises language as discourse in a crucially mediating social function.

In a related way Steiner sees in language an overt ‘possibilising’ function. In Steiner’s depiction however, language, and specifically ‘grammars’ (understood in both technical and metaphorical dimensions) are invested with a high degree of autonomous performativity.

...it is the constructive powers of language to conceptualise the world which have been crucial to man’s survival in the face of ineluctable biological constraints, this is to say in the face of death. It is the miraculous...capacity of grammars to generate counter-factuals, ‘if’-propositions and, above all, future tenses, which have empowered our species to hope, to reach far beyond the extinction of the individual. We endure...creatively due to our imperative ability to say ‘No’ to reality, to build fictions of alterity, of dreamt or willed or awaited ‘otherness’ for our consciousness to inhabit.....the utopian and the messianic are figures of syntax (Steiner 1992: xiii-xiv).

In Steiner’s conception language not only can reflect and identify wider/deeper cultural configurations, but at an individual and social level, indeed at the widest ‘civilisational’ level, language is capable of inverting apparent realities and constructing utterly different, alternate, contesting ones. This ‘possibilising’ character of language attributes to it more than a disruptive function. Language ‘performs’ the social acts of creation, even for individuals. In Steiner’s notion language is not only autonomous but it is capable of species-wide creativity beyond the world itself.

This materiality of language takes political form in relations of colonisation fraught with deep misunderstanding. According to Wright (1994) in such indigenous-coloniser relationships words hurt more than sticks and stones: ‘“Civilisation”, like “freedom” and “democracy”, is a word that kills’ (p 100). Language is capable therefore not merely of warranting action, either retrospectively in justification, or prospectively in propaganda, but of making possible extreme actions of politics and
domination. This constitutive power of language must impact on theories of language planning. The embedded and contextualised nature of language must impact on lpp theorisation.

In its most transparent manifestation language is the means through which thought and ideas are communicated. This instrumental and common sense character of language accompanies its celebrated role as an instrument of human solidarity, as the principal means for fostering and reproducing intergenerationally manifold forms of personal and group identity. Nations are formed on the basis of claims to statehood which utilise ‘language’ or, rather, languages, as discreet, essential or even primordial definers of peoplehood. States are dissolved (the separation of Bangladesh from Pakistan) or are challenged to dissolution (Sri Lanka) on the basis that language differences are seen to constitute rivalrous groupings that deserve separate state structures (Moniruzzaman 1979; De Silva 1998). Groups and individuals are marked and made by language: Street gangs act as micro-nations (Conquergood 1994), ‘secret languages’ form criminality and religiosity boundaries (Mehrota 1977; Eco 1994), human genders are marked and recognise each other in signs of talk (Holmes 1995) and individuals’ personal identity and psychology are made and pathologised by talk and talking (Harre and Gillett 1994). The young and the recently arrived are socialised and inducted into initial membership and continual performance of identity.

This pervasive and ubiquitous character of ‘language’, i.e. as definer and arbiter of group memberships (both the content and the boundaries of social belonging) and the ambitious claims for its potential to explain human social life and experience, carries and constructs ambivalent and ambiguous meanings. This is mainly because if language and languages have such differentiating power it is also the case that languages are manifestly not destiny. Individuals and groups have shifted language; it is possible to command many languages and history is replete with language death, shift and multilingualism. That language is not destiny (Coulmas 1997) does not mean it is pure ‘decision’ either; language carries ideology and interest but is not synonymous with either (Fishman 1998). The shifts, deaths and multiplications of language that separate it from biology, primordiality and destiny are influenced and constrained by the concrete and historicised settings in which they occur.

However, language is more than either or both of these oscillations of language as solidarity-identity or language as communication and high order cognition. This other broad representation of language’s character is performance. Within this paradigm resides a wide field of possibilities: language as politics, as influence, i.e language as a multiplicity of actions. It is in the iterative dialogic quality of language, language as discourse and discussion, that resolves, or dissolves, the tension of agentive capacity versus restricting structure.
More specifically, for the purposes of the present work, language emerges as a deeply problematic object of human intervention and especially of human intervention via the conscious processes of policy and planning. Policy and planning are interventions into ‘natural’ ecologies, with their processes of evolution and diversification. The most general purpose of such intervention is to assert human control and management over domains otherwise beyond such subjugation. The imposition of deliberative, consciously-intended ends onto realms of life that otherwise have ecological character as substantive fields with their own developmental processes and histories raises a plethora of questions about the degree of control that is exercisable by intervention, the ambiguity of effects of such intervention, and the politics and processes of such intervention. The long history of the evolution of standard literary forms of language and the grammatical, terminological and semantic constraints that facilitate the emergence of the discursive and rhetorical fields of scholarly disciplines provide ample evidence that language does not yield standard forms naturally (Coulmas 1988) and that what constitutes ‘eloquence’ and the power of that eloquence are culturally specific and variable (Joseph 1987; also Coulmas 1994) and therefore political, and subject to dynamic processes. Standards tend to evolve and change in response to social diversity and purpose, technological innovation and the available forms for the conduct of affairs.

This ecological characterisation of language contains both a diversifying tendency and a standardising one. Identity in its broadest sense is served by the former, while communication, in its broadest sense, by the latter. They are iterative in that after divergence comes a time for standardisation, before rupture re-emerges. Identity formation involves out-group distinction; and in-group solidarity and standardisation (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Tajfel 1981). The correlate for planning is of a conscious centripetal force marshalled against a centrifugal tendency. Planning seeks to constrain and unify (consolidate, integrate, homogenise) against the diversifying and centrifugal forces that ‘come naturally’ to unplanned language. Of course what planning actually is and how conscious intervention needs to be before it is called ‘planned’ are moot issues, since even basic kinds of verbal communication involve some kind of deliberateness (or at least consciousness) for their execution, and therefore can be said to involve constraint on the infinite possibilities of expression to produce comprehensible output; and therefore constitute a kind of ‘planned intervention’ deployed into the naturally divergent rush of communicative possibilities.

Even acts of individual communication (instantiations of a wider communicative practice) immersed in gestural, located and contingent communicative possibilities (Hanks 1996), exhibit this tension between creativity and divergence, identity and standardisation, effectiveness (and therefore the retention of
effective forms) and identity (and therefore the evolution and adoption of new forms). No doubt cave-
dweller communication involved an initial point, or many, when ‘decisions’ that language signs, words,
were useful led to their ‘retention’ therefore the commencement of memory, social memory, and the
possibility of elaborated social life. This surely would constitute a moment of language planning, and
policy, perhaps the most important one ever taken thereby providing a diachronic component to the
present enhanced attention to the ubiquity of language as a society-explaining phenomenon.

Because all the practices that make up a social totality take place in language, it becomes
possible to consider language as the place in which the social individual is constructed. In
other words, man can be seen as language, as the intersection of the social, historical and
individual (Coward & Ellis 1977: 1).

Relativism & Language Ideology
Any prospect of realising ideological projects through language is dependent on the plasticity of
language, a relativistic ideal in which languages are capable of constituting realities rather than simply
conveying pre-existing orders of objective worlds between interlocutors. If the communicative function
were all that language deploys the entire nature of politics would be unrecognisable. However there are
many kinds of relativism that can be imputed to language. Linguistic relativism expressed by ‘engaged’
or critical linguistics has a different history from that of the ‘internal’ linguistic relativism that emerged
from north American anthropological linguistics. The latter arose through anthropological fieldwork
and is especially recognised in the influential ‘Sapir-Whorf hypothesis’. Canonically Whorfianism
deploys both a ‘hard and a weak’ version. The former describes a ‘determinative’ relation between
language and thought while soft Whorfianism refers to an ‘influential’ relation of different languages on
thought; one in which distinct languages may pre-dispose their users to particular World Views but do
not constitute linguistic prison-houses (Sapir 1921; Lee 1994, 1996).

Half a century of unprovability of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis lessened interest in its immensely
important claims but these have re-surfaced in recent years armed with methodological improvements
and new energy (Niemeier and Dirven 2000; Pütz and Verspoor 2000). However, recent (re)-allocation
of importance to language has been a consequence not of Whorfian systems but of the so-called
‘linguistic turn’ in the social sciences. This is in turn manifested most strongly as the ‘ideology of
discourse’ a kind of linguistic relativism located in pragmatic usage of language, and the pre-disposing
ideologised character of language-thought relations. This, in its own turn, derives from new
understandings of sociality in which the constitutive power of human subjectivity (and its mediation in
communicative practice) have given rise to energetic commitment to discourse as the site of identity and
relations (including domination).
The origins of this new-found commitment to a language-connected relativism has separately derived from neo-Marxist social enquiry (exemplified in the linguistics of Voloshinov and Bhaktin); is strongly represented in the work of ‘critical theorists’ such as Habermas and the Frankfurt School; from Foucauldian genealogy which understands discourse as power-saturated ideology (Woolard 1998); and also from within linguistics, most powerfully in the systemic-functional grammar scholarship of MAK Halliday, in which linguistic form is attached to processes of social semiosis as the realisation of meaning intentions-potential and cultural shape.

The field methods of anthropology induced Sapir and Whorf to hypothesise linguistic determinism-relativism in across-language incommensurability of World View, primarily based on lexico-semantic evidence gathered from speakers of indigenous north American languages contrasted mostly with English. By contrast the discursive focus of ‘critical disciplines’, Marxist oriented linguistics, genealogy studies and functional grammar concentrate on the constitution of ‘within-language’ ideological divides, the incommensurability of the epistemological constructs of contingent discourses, and how these have evolved historically. These approaches to analysing language in context, though very different among themselves, share a common commitment to the constitutive character of language in use/discourse.

The language planning of centralised communist states (Calvet 1998: 187) like its counterpart in Nazi ideologies of language (Hutton 1999) is only concerned with linguistic form to the extent that it realises a discursive, and material, project of changing the mental states of citizens. Language ideology is itself a growing field of scholarship that emerges at the intersection of language, society and cognition but its popular realisation is well established. George Orwell’s (Orwell 1974a, 1974b) famous dictum that political language is intended to make lies ‘sound truthful and murder respectable’ is based on this idea that manipulative-despotic authority aims to colonise human mental states, to shape the thinkable by restricting the expressible. This brainwashing is discourse planning (an extreme version of the central preoccupation of the present study) where there is little or no concern with linguistic form as an end in itself. Advertising, political language, (any persuasive talk) can be examined to ascertain its relation to deception, subverting conscious individual action (Carey 1997). This quality makes Orwellian scenarios sinister. The language ‘reforms’ of Big Brother and His acolytes in Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty Four are an explicit directed at the appropriation and subversion of individual consciousness (Fox 2001).

The centrality of language in projects aiming at re-making human subjectivity depends intimately on its ‘political’ character being naturalised, forgotten, or ‘understood’ to be neutral of politics (Althusser
Totalitarianisms of all kinds have always aimed to bring about regulated discourse in the form of permissible opinion or what Foucault (1977) describes as ‘constraints on what is said and what may be said’. Rather than simply planning the form, i.e. how things are said, this kind of lpp applies to the legitimation of ruling desired by political regimes. Despots and welfare workers, officers in government bureaucracies and small town developers contort the linguistic (or, more properly, the discoursal) realm of particular fields to make natural the state of the universe that synchronises with ruling interests and desires (or, if they are acting with ‘false consciousness’, as agents of interests whose ideologies they have internalised) while they seek to de-legitimise contesting or unsympathetic readings of the world (Bolinger 1980; Blommaert 1999a, 1999b). This practice constitutes a kind of planning, and specifically a kind of lpp, in that what is planned are the discourses that constrain and channel what is thinkable, what is able to be said, by engineering the language available to the constituency in question. Whether this planning is lpp in any strict sense is a question that will recur through the consideration of the data collected as part of the thesis. What is difficult to deny is that the politics of discourse engages and involves claims on expanding, restricting or channeling the semantic realm of language.

Political contest involves display and struggle over what is named as requiring the deployment of effort and resources (Edelman 1977; also Brett 1994); a contest about which meanings, and the language/discourse forms which will come to be deemed natural, ontology, common-sensical, unproblematic, normal. This line of thinking sees the content of language and language itself, as synonymous (or co-terminous) and the unity of language as form and language as content as being located in discourse.

Political correctness, and its conservative counter, patriotic correctness (Hughes 1993: 33) are particular structurings of general discourse for partisanly preferred meanings to prevail. PC advocates do not simply wish to change language forms, but through these changes (as a result of them, integrally with them) to change the fundamental reality of which they speak. The qualification of linguistics with critical, and political (Blommaert 1999a), producing critical linguistics and political linguistics, brings into being scholarship categories that espouse an inseparability of language signs from their signified. They are based on the idea that language is constitutive of reality, not merely reflective of an ‘out there’ reality independent of the signs that bring that reality into ‘conversation’.

For Gramsci (1971) there is a constant interaction and iteration between national standard languages and local dialects as a continuous interplay of historicised conflict. Similarly, Bakhtin’s (1981) arguments about how language use indexes connections between human subjectivities and ‘the symbolic’ in
dominated and dominating ‘voices’ locates language in use to a flow of history. Past sanctions are not neutral, but residues (results) of struggles to name. These recall Barthes’ insight (1972) that social struggle (the ‘stakes’ involved in struggle) and cultural arrangements are ‘forgotten’, made into ‘history’ and taken for granted.

This process of ‘naturalising’, or social forgetting, makes new struggles for language change, and the symbolic and material consequences of these struggles, appear as though they are contesting nature itself, ontology, things as they ‘just are’ rather than any ongoing struggle about representation. Understood this way communicative acts in the here and now (because they involve selections which must confirm, or depart from past acts of meaning) stand always in some relation to the inherited order. By this kind of understanding communication involves choice and is always interested and motivated, even if unaware of itself (Blommaert and Bulcaen 1997).

Language, and related communication practices, operate as ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu 1982, 1991) when they confer advantage. Cultural capital (kinds of ruling through language and its forms) animates inherited practices and exhibits mastery of their present perlocutionary force. Some of the asymmetrical patterns of language can be identified in the most overt layer of language: language names (some codes carry national names: French; others are called standard; others are not named for their power but carry its effects such as prestige phonologies, lexemes of status etc)15 while others struggle to be even acknowledged as language (dialects, “Aboriginal”, yak yak yak); as well as in communication practices that organise language resources unevenly, distribute the ‘voices’ that language can represent in hierarchies of status and prestige (Bakhtin 1981) and conceal the struggles that power-unequal interactants engage in (Voloshinov 1926/1983).

God, Linguists & Everyone Else

Lpp is primarily an offshoot of linguistics, or sociolinguistics (Paulston and Tucker 1997), and applied linguistics, and shares with these fields an intellectual inheritance which eschews normative and prescriptive intervention. Anthropological orientations within the field of autonomous linguistics have yielded a view that: "When it comes to linguistic form, Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd, Confucius with the head-hunting savage of Assam” (Sapir 1921: 219).

This ‘equality’ of languages applies to grammars in which there are even inverse relations of complexity, with indigenous tribal languages deploying grammatical features such as complex noun classifier systems that languages of wider communication do not contain, or have discarded as simplifying compromises in language contact situations have dictated over time. This is the case with English (Leith 1997; Knowles 1997). The ‘inequality’ among languages concerns not grammatical
features but social prominence and elaboration. "Only before God and the linguist are all languages equal. Everyone knows that you can go further with some languages than with others" (Mackey 1978:7).

‘Everyone’ is focussed on criteria radically different from intrinsic features of form. Sapir invokes equal value by transcending instrumentalism and basing his assertion on empirical demonstration of properties of grammatical complexity. Mackey’s rejoinder invokes complete instrumentality (‘going further’); a principally economic rationale. A version of this divide between academic linguists’ characterisation of language against popular beliefs-ideologies is encountered in the evidence from empirical examination of the subjectivities of participants in the dispute about official English.

We encounter this repeatedly in subsequent chapters in which English is construed in discourse as ‘opportunity’ and associated discursively by officialisers with democracy, capitalist consumerism, occupational mobility and modern individualist American identity. On Corsica French is characterised in the ‘ideologies in action’ as being ‘useful’ whereas Corsican is relegated to the domain of the ‘past and the local’. This discursive tie to the overt policies of the state recruits popular hegemonical adherence to French government lpp (Jaffe 1999). Mackey’s ‘everyone knows’ (everyone other than ‘God’ and ‘the linguist’) is an appeal to ‘common sense’ knowledge; also a recurring trope in the data chapters on official English. Common sense is a claim for habituated acceptance of the natural order, for forgetting that it too is a construction. The knowledge of language that linguistics produces results in an estrangement of professional language experts from the practice in which their subject matter is made policy and action and where it is allocated authoritative attention.

Newmeyer’s documentation of the critiques that surfaced in the wake of the birth of autonomous linguistics reflects this divide of anticipated relevance and application:

humanist intellectuals object to its failure to embody a system of aesthetic standards. Marxists see its much vaunted claim of “scientific neutrality” as nothing but a cover for an implicit support for the status quo, while moralist sociologists deplore its irrelevance to the important contemporary social concerns (Newmeyer 1986: 129).

Similarly Rossi-Landi’s longstanding (1973) critique of the ‘ideology of linguistic relativism’ as ‘bourgeois’ and as a manifestation of ‘guilt for the destruction of American Indians’ takes its place in this conflict about whether characterisations of value in languages can remove themselves from contexts and settings of those who make these valuations.
Separating language from social context allows scholarship to equate Plato and Confucius with ‘swineherds’ and ‘head-hunting savages’; embedding languages within communicative contexts, (themselves embedded in all the transactions of exchange and marketing that constitute an economy of language with its history of others’ meanings and use) obliterates scholarly characterisations of transcendent equality. Economics is a science which derives its core existence from the idea of scarcity. Scarcity produces transaction valuation of resources and kinds of capital (Bourdieu 1991), including linguistic codes. Scholarly linguistic knowledge is not directed towards domains of scarcity since languages are abundant to the needs of their speech community, and lpp exists to redress identified shortfalls between the meaning power of a language and deficits its speakers wish to overcome. In the data chapters it becomes evident that characterising English as Economy powerfully taps into underlying popular ideologies of which languages allow you to ‘go further’.

The emergence of internationalised, if not global, systems and structures, gives rise to multiplying, diversified and hybrid forms of culture and language, and therefore of settings and purposes for language planning (Featherstone 1999; Apparadurai 1999). Even if classical lpp were adequate to the task of addressing societal plans for language in the predictable and ‘settled settings’ of nations and education systems, it may require modification for the new and emerging contexts. Such new conceptualisations will require a grounding in theoretical work beyond the mainstays of classical lpp in linguistics and applied linguistics. In these lpp is called upon to explain and intervene in the symbolic arrangements of old settled states conducting language politics reminiscent of earlier eras of people-nationing and nationality planning (Fishman 1973).

**Modernity Critique**

Max Weber’s (Weber 1947; 1978) famous formulation of the distinctiveness of modernity refers to the differentiation of the cultural value spheres. Essentially this holds that the domains of aesthetics-arts, ethics-religion-morals and science (which in pre-modern society were infused with each other’s rationality) came to be seen and to operate as fields of endeavour with separate and distinctive rationalities. For both Weber and Habermas (1984) pre-modern economic-social structuring suggest archaic, magic and mythic World Views that roughly corresponded with base modes of production such as foraging, horticulture and agrarian cultivation.

The slow emergence of the modern World View allocated distinctive space, recognised the unique epistemic order and reason to aesthetic expression, empirical truth-seeking and to religio-moral practices and belief. Pre-modern states were pre-differentiation states. Modernity and differentiation in turn led to discrete and particular modes of reason. Aesthetics evolved into a subjectivist mode of practice and appreciation, morals demanded either inter-subjective agreement or trans-subjective belief while science
pursued an independent road of objective truth-demonstration via empirical methodology. These
differentiations were the conditions that in turn made possible the Enlightenment (a kind of culmination
of modernity) and the emergence of the individual human subject, with rights invested in its separate
political existence. The separation of church and state made this latter task possible and new kinds of
national-state identity correlations made it useful and even necessary. This process of separation from
the pre-differentiation status in pre-modern society has continued unabated. The emergence of the post-
national network society (Castells 1998) further elaborates the denuding of the state of religious and
ethnic character so that it responds ever more precisely to citizenship-defined subjects rather than blood,
ancestry or creed ‘citizenry’.

It was the expansion of the Enlightenment objectivist rationality towards positivistic scientism that
necessitated and produced the modernity critique. It has been the emergence of conditions of post-
modernity (contradictions of co-existing attachments to pre-modern identities alongside their
redundancy in other domains, incommensurate fields of knowing that co-exist) and the emergence of its
ideology of post-modernism (with its exaggerated manifestation as extreme deconstruction) that has led
to the collapse of all reality into designs of subjective meaning. The liberal and diffuse nature of the de-
centralising state that followed in the wake of the differentiation that Weber identifies at the core of
modernity produced the notions of individual freedoms, rights and the political achievements of
modernist citizenry primarily through the detachment of the domains of organised morality (church)
from the state.

The positivist exaggerations and domination of modernity provoked Romantic, Idealist and ultimately
Post-Modern (and deconstructionist) rebellion as movements to recuperate synthesis between overly
differentiated domains or as a reaction against the sublimation of aesthetic-humanist or moralistic
domains to positivist absolutism. The three differentiated realms each had a mother tongue, a meta-
discursive frame. The rebellions can be metaphorised then as refusals to listen to the mono-logic
monotone of the science-technical order with its procedures of demonstration (of suspending belief, of
falsifiability, of provisionality, of material evidence) and an insistence on a dialogical encounter for
defining society, nature, law and the human subject.

The ‘linguistic turn’ is, in large part, a call for human multi-vocality. In the Western world the first
rebellion of giants was Immanuel Kant’s demonstration that pure reason was a monologue, appropriate
to organic or sense-motor reason, but incapable to speaking to and for worldly freedom, the
transcendent, and the ‘domain of the soul’. By delimiting reason’s application Kant’s 1781 Critique of
Pure Reason delimited the cognitivist doubting procedure and epistemology on which it draws and
removed its application from metaphysical realms and belief. Since empirical reason could not prove nor disprove God, freedom or the human soul; the terrain of reason made room for faith.

In his second critique (Practical Reason 1788) Kant explored the powers of dialogical reason, holding that a rationality of interaction and iteration could suggest a faith-field, a transcendent domain that truth-reason (science) could not enter. To operate a moral sense requires the presupposition of transcendent experience, at least its potentiality. In his third Critique (Judgment 1790) Kant attempted to integrate moral and scientific rationality through the recuperation of aesthetics, the expressive epistemology, construing the human subject as a reasoning entity governed by an ethical inter-subjectivity but integrating the differentiated domains under aesthetic pursuit and reasoning. Objectivating truth can deal only with its distinctive realm and cannot lead to the transcendent; the inter-subjective practice of morality-ethical rationality suggests the existence of a transcendent field (or must be based on its assumed existence) while the integration of objective with inter-subjective rationalities within an overarching ethic of artistic expression, of a deep aesthetics, infused with a moral order, can transport humans to its place. The Romantics and others who succeeded the Kantian rebellion against the mental repressiveness of scientific rationality over instinctive and moral life such as Freud, Nietzsche or Shopenhauer succeeded also in glorifying instinctive life or contingency over the general, the inter-subjective and the distinctive domain of objective truth. Postmodernism’s extremes continue the repudiation of reason.

Ideology critique has had an intertwined relationship with modernity critique. A central figure in the critique of modernity in the latter part of the 20th century has been Habermas and his colleagues variously located in and around the Frankfurt School in Germany which commenced a project of interdisciplinary Marxist critical scholarship in 1930 under the leadership of Max Horkheimer. Habermas’ own career has centred on his critique of ‘technocratic positivism’ and science as ideologies (knowledge and interest) and in the latter part of his career on the evolution of a Universal Pragmatics, culminating in his 1981 Theory of Communicative Action (Outhwaite 1996). In what follows the modifications made by Habermas to the speech act theorisation from British philosophy is explored as a premise for a critique of the communicative action, the discursive practices, of the lpp for official English. This is important because any theory of communicative action involves an ethics, and it is this positionality that is a critical difference between Habermas-inspired social analysis and Foucauldian genealogy (Ashenden and Owen 1999). Critical scholarship has had to reconcile a tension between its Marxian origins and the compulsion of a post-Marxist realisation. Legal and democratic practice has engaged attention for Habermas since his theorisation aims to generate practices of political engagement and intervention. The Theory of Communicative Action is a vastly ambitious intellectual project that seeks
to inscribe a moral philosophy within a discourse and critique of modernity (not its wholesale rejection) and an engagement with dilemmas of state and law via an understanding of the relation between ‘facts’ and ‘norms’.

In this latter regard Habermas makes a decisive move for the purposes of the present work. He rejects a ‘values freedom’ that he identifies in Weberian sociology and politics, insisting on a distinction between a scholarly and a political discourse. This enables Habermas to centre the idea of ‘systematically corrupted discourse’ within an overarching approach to activity. In these regards Habermas differs strongly from the Foucauldian sense that discourses have agentive capability. Habermas retains ideas about the reification of products in society (including discourse) that was an early 20th century reworking by ‘western Marxists’ (Outhwaite 1996) of the Marxian ‘commodity fetishism’.

Accordingly, products cannot be dissolved entirely into ‘process’ practices, like discursive formations, but these can be removed from contextual practice in operations that take away from some speakers and citizens control of key defining parts of their lives. By thus retaining a critical scholarship sense that ideology is a masking of such workings in society Habermas locates change and political mission centrally within his thinking. The Theory of Communicative Action carries within its anatomy a history of critical scholarship that has had to engage with the tyrannies of fascism, Stalinism and the power-accumulating practices of technocratic managerialist capitalism which for critical scholars in Western Europe has meant an almost permanent attitude of oppositionality. Habermas shared the Frankfurt School’s critiques of Enlightenment ends-means technical rationality as a kind of ‘new enslavement’ but much more vigorously embraced democratic participationism as a counter, the latter taking the form of practical reason or, more relevantly for our present purposes, rational political discussion. The dependency of ideas on interests which ideology critique gifted to critical thinkers is the starting point for positing a notion that discourse is systematically corrupted and that this ‘site’ represents a key domain for a struggle for policy and power via language acts.

But Habermas distanced himself also from a simple anti-positivism which often makes recourse to phenomenological and hermeneutic understandings, such as Georg Gadamer’s notions (Outhwaite 1996: 9) that to understand texts (which mediate all humanly experienced reality) involves existential encounters that change both the recipient and the producer of textual information. Rejecting positivism’s attempt to dislodge human understanding from ‘history’ and experience, but also rejecting the alternative that requires symbolically pre-structured reality be understood only through participation, Habermas evolved the idea that both observation and participation contribute different kinds of understanding and explanation (Verstehen and Verständnis).
Rationalists and positivists ‘inflate’ the importance of the human knowing subject while deconstruction, genealogy and post-modernist theorisation are dismissive and sceptical about it. Participants in interaction are able to co-ordinate communication and achieve inter-subjective agreement. Defenders of Foucault counter that this constitutes a Habermasian ‘utopianism’ and indicate his attachment to modernity as an ‘incomplete’ process rather than an irremediable and defective phase of human history. In this criticism they sometimes draw a parallel Chomsky-like idealisations along the lines that the ideal speaker-hearer of Chomsky equals the idealised notion of a possibility of ‘uncorrupted’ discourse; optimism and idealisations that the critics consider unacceptable (Ashenden and Owen 1999).

In a different trajectory during the latter quarter of the 20th century the direction of ideology critique has been profoundly non-Marxist, even anti-Marxist (Baudrillard 1988; Foucault 1977, 1979; Lyotard 1989). This intellectual ferment has altogether repudiated foundational principles of Marxist and all modernist and structuralist orientation. The rejection of economic and political domains as privileged ‘sites’ of political contestation from which to understand society, much less from which to change society, has brought the discoursal domain into prominence.

Such a trajectory substitutes utterly the entire corpus of writings on the superstructure-base problematic with the rejection of classical sociology’s preoccupation with the effects and character of modernity as well as the content and possibility of ideology critique seeing both the critique of ideology and the formation of ideology as two sides of the same coin and the substitution of contingency and relativism in place of all the ‘meta-narratives’ of modernism, science-progress-freedom as much as Marxist critique.

A realist analysis of policy can adequately account for policy conceived as text (Ball 1993) since it permits social agency and intentionality. However, with a Foucauldian conception of discourse policy analysis is able to comprise restraint and constraint as well. Discourses for Foucault are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak“ (1977: 49) a definition that contains a high degree of performativity. Discursive understandings of policy therefore relate to the constituting power, and therefore the delimitation, bounding, and exclusion of possibilities. In addition for Foucault discourses also conceal their own protagonist role in the formation of objects (policies in this case).

Discourse in this respect is larger than speech, and certainly larger than language (Foucault 1977). Ideology and Foucauldian discourse are dissimilar operationalisations of a cognate understanding, that constraint and inherited or delimited possibility, structured possibility, has been identified and isolated
as a factor in human action, it is the other of those conceptualisations that would render to agentive power and force the chance to effect and impact.

One kind of modernity has dislodged the familial-dynastic systems from the state, another has been to denude the state of overt religious feeling, and a more recent form is to remove the nation from the state. The separation of the state from the ethnus, creeds and families that have often constituted it is far from a universal pattern, many states are becoming clothed with nationality, religion is both resurgent and dead and dynastic rule takes new form. There are multiple and contradictory trends in the world, globalisation makes recovery of the past both possible and its abandonment active. New Westernising influences are inflected in local settings to generate hybrid cultural forms and mathematically add to kinds of diversification. Processes of globalisation, regionalisation and localisation are proceeding concurrently and indeed refract and cause each other (Giddens 1999). One consequence of these world-shaping and re-shaping trends is that apparently contradictory phenomena are the outcome of the same processes, which are inflected in particular circumstances according to local conditions, histories, memories and the outcomes that are made possible in each case.

Billig’s (1995) notion of ‘banal nationalism’ asserts that nationalism has been naturalised in many Western settings. It is a warning against those who from presumed post-national circumstances would judge displays and overt demonstrations of nationalist discourse and activity as typical only of nations under stress, as an exotic, foreign, developing-nations phenomenon, or a phenomenon of extreme times. In this work he identifies an almost subliminal nationalism that is like background noise but is ever present and contradicts some modernists’ idea that the age of the national-state has passed. This background character of nationalism in developed, established states, pre-eminently in Western industrial and post-industrial democracies, tends to make observers fail to see the pervasive nature of nationalism in all nation-states.

The ideological habitus that Billig’s notion captures enables the reproduction of established nations, western and non-western. As the unmarked nature of things banal nationalism ‘indicates’ the nation to its citizens; in continual and taken for granted ‘little ways’, practices and routines of life and governance and social ritual. For Billig nationalism is ‘the endemic condition’ (p 6) and it follows that both ethnic and civic dimensions are encountered in all nations.

**Discourse and Identity**

Perhaps the decisive or founding moment in autonomous descriptive linguistics was the postulation in 1786 by Sir William Jones of a lexical correspondence, a link of origins (and family) between some European languages and Sanskrit (Hutton 1999:294). Jones’ essay also established the discipline of
comparative linguistics and field methods for its conduct. This birth of a science (or rather its re-birth since ancient Indian and Greek speculations about grammar) constituted a major Enlightenment-era accomplishment but led to a crisis for the political and ‘race’ identity of Europeans. Sanskrit was not only postulated as a connected European cognate, Jones suggested that it was a critical and superior linguistic source. According to Jones Sanskrit was “more perfect than the Greek; more copious than the Latin and more exquisitely refined than either” (Newmeyer 1986: 17).

In the face of the undeniable reality of deep human difference the scientific evidence of linguistic (and therefore cultural) commonality demanded reconciliation. Postulating a link between language and race with all its disturbing moral and political consequences was one of the ways in which European intellectuals debated Jones’ troubling finding. From its genesis therefore linguistics was absorbed in the action-consequences of its own knowledge creation. Many of its practitioners actually repudiated what linguistics was ‘finding out’, that is linguistics furnished information whose implications linguists acting not as scientists, but as westerners with interests and World View, found uncomfortable.

Saussure made a categorical distinction between the system of language shared by speakers, which he called langue, and the instances of its manifestation, which he called parole. This distinction has been a profound dividing line in the science of language. Saussure considered that parole was not amenable to systematic examination being contingent and highly variable, and so the discipline of linguistics that emerged, substantially influenced by Saussure’s work, eschewed ‘actually occurring language’ as manifested in speech or written texts in preference for the abstract system of shared underlying knowledge (Robins 1990). The latter was taken to constitute both the appropriate domain of study of language and its true or essential nature.

However the analysis of meaning in language could not be adequate with simply an account of its abstract system. From anthropologically oriented linguistics as well as from theoretical, pedagogical and most powerfully from sociological critique, and especially from critical linguistics parole has came to attract more attention. In parole scholars found structures additional to those that Saussure’s system of Sign=Signifier and simultaneous Signified. Meaning had always been perceived to involve more than the denotative system that semantic analysis had been able to demonstrate. This additional layer has come to be called connotative and can be defined as a secondary system of meaning that expresses the value and social significance of utterances or of texts.

So powerful has the attention to the socially determined and socially constituting structures of meaning in the connotative realm been that it has become one of the key distinguishing features of post-
structuralist scholarship. This rehabilitation of parole has elevated language to centrality among the social sciences since its mediation of experience and thought makes it amenable to incisive analysis.

Systematic tools for the analysis of discourse, of parole, were not available to Saussure and their elaboration, though still evolving and indeed somewhat contested, forms the twentieth century resulting linguistic turn of modern sociology (and, interestingly, a parallel social turn in linguistics), and, due to its formative relationship with politics and the science of policy analysis, with these areas as well. Parole concerns language in use, and it is this status of language in use, in the ways that use has been found to instantiate wider meanings and social structures that has given it an explanatory power that Saussure could not have predicted.

There is a macro conceptualisation of discourse, larger even than discourse as ‘socially accepted association’ (Gee 1996) which attempts to delineate ideological constellations of meaning and practice. In the work of Foucault (1977) these are called ‘discursive formations’ and are seen to operate systematically to organise knowledge and its correlative systems of power. The utilisation of discourse analysis in sociology is therefore concerned to uncover larger meanings than sentence oriented discourse (narrowly linguistic discourse analysis) addresses.

Foucault argues that the chainings of meaning are discursively related and that these serve to repress alternative formations and are historically produced (though loosely structured) combinations of statements. This analysis is popular today since it enables a non-reductionist analysis of the ideal realm whose relationship to materiality had been either determinative in Hegelian philosophy or subordinate in Marxism. The determinative power of discursive formations operates both on what is said (rather than the linguistics stress of how things are said) i.e. on actually occurring discourse and on what may not be said, how discursive formations serve to repress alternative sayings.

In these ways parole becomes not only central to social science but to political and historical analyses. This combining of diachronic focus with synchrony is another claimed outcome of Foucauldian ideas. Connotative meanings are rendered possible and analysable by the examination of the discursive formations that produce and constitute them and by the alternatives they repress. Methodologically Foucault offered archaeology and genealogy as the approaches to the uncovering of discursive formations.

Discursive formations are powerful because their conditions of possibility (the social and institutional contexts in which they arise, the issues that they address, the authority and social identity of their
‘authors’ and the interrelated ‘grid of specification’ which is used to separate one set of concerns of a given discursive formation from another) are reproduced and reinforced socially. These ‘grids of specification’ form intellectual templates upon which human subjects, political possibilities and lifeworlds can be tracked, constructed and located. The discourse produced adds meaning to langue, well beyond how things are said, which is more than connotation. Jointly interacting with langue discursive formations produce ‘statements’ (not ‘sentences’). Sentences are the manifestation of linguistics-oriented approach to discourse whereas the ‘statement’, as conceived by Foucault, is the joint product of discursive formations and the system of language.

The ‘statement’ is a series of signs that takes on a particular subject position for the speaker, i.e. it locates the speaker in relation to a body of knowledge and its values, and projects onto the signifiers a particular constitutive pattern or dynamic. For Foucault these statements possess materiality in that they are distinctively different from alternative statements. Foucault also argues that at any one time there are only some ‘available discourses’ though these are always constrained by context, setting and relative power, and knowledges (forms of register choice).

In its application to the policy sciences it is this wider sense of discourse which is followed (Dryzek and Berejikian 1993:51; Yeatman 1990) or in political theory (Edelman 1977 and 1988). Dryzek and Berejikian utilise Q-method in conjunction with political discourse analysis to establish the overarching ‘concourse’ or totality of discourses that characterise an issue in debate and to ascertain its features. Such ‘reconstructive science’ of power draws on ways of understanding political disposition and action and is claimed to offer advantages over “ungrounded philosophical assertion, unconstrained ethnographic interpretation, and restrictive opinion survey operationalization” (Dryzek and Berejikian 1993:50).

Habermas has identified in corrupted language, and especially in corrupted discourse, constraints against what his work sees as moral or just democratisation. Any prospect of policy settlement in politically contested areas therefore would benefit from the inclusion of analysis or understanding of the political subjectivities of interactants and of the critical appraisal of the Habermasian ideal of ‘speech community’.

Foucault's influence is palpable in the new searches for understanding of these relations, though his work departs sharply from the notion that it is possible to have ‘uncorrupted’ discourse, seeing discourse as inevitably and materially interested. His critique of disciplinary knowledge and its impact on power relations militates against the aspirations of earlier generations of social scientists to apply to
human endeavors the methods of the natural sciences if that means the negation of subjectivities, or interests. For Foucault “There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time, power relations” (1979: 27).

Can Discourse Be Planned?
Bartsch has observed that underlying the possibility of language planning is a particular notion of language which holds that “.. language not only serves human action and interaction .... it is also subjected to human action and control, as far as specific linguistic norms are concerned. To this extent language is manageable. This insight is the basis for all language planning” (Bartsch 1988:147). Similarly Eastman (1984:261) comments that “Language planning is impossible if what planners mean by language is a static system of grammar and speech associated with a particular speech community” but Ferguson (1979) maintains that unvarying attitudes of linguists hold that such language engineering as is made possible by such views of language is unlikely to be possible and if possible it is undesirable.

The observations by Bartsch and Eastman may be accepted as “possibilising” one dimension of lpp, its focus on the code. A widely accepted and cited definition of language planning is Fishman’s statement that: “language planning is the organised pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level” (1973: 23-24).

However, another, and a centrally important one to the present study, concerns not the code but its functions. In their criticism of lpp Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990) conclude that even if language can be planned, discourse (they claim) cannot. They find consolation in this incapacity for it yields the possibility of dissenting political and social space, a possibility of dissent that is not subject to the predations of what they see as an incursive, rationalist-technicism advancing in the naiveté of language planners, or perhaps in the deliberate intrusiveness of lpp as an agency of statist control and manipulation, into the most important, possibly the most valuable, human possession. In this they are surely wrong. The planning of discourse is what every powerful institution has always sought: armies, political parties, religions, ideological movements; all want to influence human mental states.

In his analyses of American public policy and politics, Edelman also sees language not as some kind of neutral device for describing events but itself an active force in events “..political language is political reality; there is no other so far as the meaning of events to actor and spectator is concerned” (1985:10).

For Habermas corrupted discourse is a major obstacle in working for participatory democratic politics. For Foucault discourse (what it is possible to say, not so much its form and shape, but its content, the
parole rather than the langue) has always been channelled and constrained, by church, state and
disciplinary modalities, by those who determine insanity’s boundary, sexuality’s limits and what
constitutes ‘countable’ economic activity (also Carey 1997; Fox 2001).

The failure to quarantine a segment of social reality and name it policy is a consequence of seeing the
materiality and historical durability of discourse, and a related process called naturalising. Barthes’
(1972) analysis of ideology located a key role to “...the central insight is that as historically specific
social states and cultural configurations are forgotten as history, they come to be taken-for-granted,
and perceived as natural...process of social forgetting” (Collins 1999:214). Practice is then a
continuation of once contested states as the natural order, dislodged from contest. Gramscian notions of
hegemony are clearly central to this understanding.

Ideology & Plans
Ideology suffers a popular repudiation as synonymous with defective thinking or the opposite of factual
or rational thinking. Berger, Berger and Kellner give the term a wide remit as “any theoretically
articulated propositions about social reality” (1973:159).

Gee (1996: 3-7) traces two root sources, a Marxian and a Napoleonic genesis. Enlightenment
philosophy in France had provided an intellectual legitimation for the French revolution, especially as
expressed by Antonine Destutt de Tracy whose proposal for a new ‘science of ideas’, an ‘idea-ology’,
which rejected innateness of ideas (biological or divine) and sought to substitute a sort of evidential
systematicity on the basis of sense-perceived information.

For de Tracy, according to Gee, the rational basis of ideas would constitute the ground for “humane
social policy and... decent laws and government”. Such ideals conflicted with Napoleon’s belief that
established authority ought to determine social programs, and imperial stratagems. He succeeded in
attaching seriously pejorative meaning to the progressive tenor of de Tracy’s ‘ideology’ and to invoke
its subsequently negative connotation as ‘defective thinking’, or social programs motivated by
‘conscious social theory’ as distinct from Napoleon’s preferred ‘practical knowledge’, ‘real world
knowledge’, ‘knowledge of the human heart’ requiring at the same time a nationalist deferral of
sovereignty to the hands of the all-powerful despot from the populace who could not be trusted to
govern ‘sensibly’; dismissing de Tracy and his fellow thinkers as ‘ideologues’.

Marxian origins of ideology are more prominent and the popular perception of the term and its
meanings and uses owes more to these than to its early 19th century French manifestation. Marx’s
contribution might more accurately be called ideology critique, in that its effect was not so much to
posit a science of ideology as de Tracy had sought to do (this was his related but separate theory of historical materialism) but rather to interpret the ruling ideas of society to be nothing other than the extension into the ideal realm of the material interests, power and wealth of the ruling class. For Marx this was how material relationships are ‘grasped as ideas’.

This ‘interested’ nature of social theory i.e. that things are the way they are because it is natural and inevitable that they should be so (which Marxist theory argues masquerades as the natural social order) gives rise to ‘false consciousness’ among the oppressed by their acceptance of the ‘naturalness’ of social and material relations, rather than their constructedness in the interests of the dominant economic class.

For Marxist views, at least ‘orthodox’ Marxism, ideology is a hidden truth. The German Ideology (Marx and Engels 1970) epitomises ideology critique and in the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels locate this within a political program (especially strongly expressed in the Eleven Theses on Feuerbach in the famous quote: “The philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways, but the point is to change it”). Ideology critique ‘exposes’ the false conceptions that “men have constantly made up for themselves...about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be” (1970: 37).

‘Scientific’ Marxism would expose the interests preserved by the ‘ruling ideas in every epoch’, showing how their genesis is concealed, and in this exposure the liberatory program, made possible primarily by economic alienation and oppression which would produce ‘conscious class interests’, would be unleashed. In earlier writings, especially in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (Marx 1843-4/1963) Marx gave more prominence to the political role of consciousness in the construction of the communist revolution whilst in later works the stress is more strongly on historical materialism with its inevitable, predictable, inexorable, alienation-provocation of revolutionary activity.

Ideology therefore has multiple histories. One is a connection to relations of materialism (a superstructure constructed on a material base), another is the genesis of a sociology of knowledge (one that far-reaching exceeds Marxist thinking). Later this was itself transformed (even in Marxist thinking, and certainly in what is described as neo Marxism) to take a discursive character as the bridge between material and ideological realms.

The most important extension of the Marxist schema came from Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks (Hoare and Nowell Smith 1971) whose contribution was to show how in popular culture, as well as in the more formal modes of intellectual life envisioned by Marx, there is a consolidation of ruling ideas through hegemony as these ideas are diffused widely throughout culture and society in quotidian form. From
the standpoint of hegemony ideological transformation and liberation is required in all sites in which the ideological workings of capitalism sustain themselves (becoming perceived as the natural order of things). A political program would operate via exposure of naturalised relations of power which reflect and sustain the material interests of ruling classes and the alliances they make to secure power and wealth.

Another powerful Gramscian legacy in the neo-Marxist tradition (emerging out of the failure of Marx’s ‘scientific’ prediction of capitalism’s overthrow) was to allocate autonomy and agency to the ideas and the general intellectual realm of a culture so that it became itself causative rather than rigidly determined by the economic base. In the Gramscian scheme ruling ideas are not only determinative they are also directly contestable and the realm of culture (including language) become ‘sites’ of struggle. In this way hegemony theory has deeply influenced ‘cultural studies’ whose program of work has concentrated on mass culture in capitalist society and its hegemonical-ideological character, with an inclusive approach to culture, favouring the ‘ordinary’ and the everyday over the ‘high’ and the traditional. The trajectory of cultural studies then has been about societal relations, realities and constructs, in late-modernity, rather than ethnography’s focus on ‘the different’ or the ‘other’. This focus on the ordinary and everyday, and the diffusion of culture, and power, throughout social relations, correlates closely with the language and discourse critiques made earlier.

Other formative contributions reworking ideology critique are those of Althusser (1960/1984) and Laclau and Mouffe (1985 and 1987). These extend (and in the case of the latter, radically alter) the relation of base-superstructure which has been one of the signal problems of ideology critique. Althusser’s notion of ‘ideological state apparatuses’ sought to give materiality to the discursive realm and to see their structuring. Left political theory increasingly involves a ‘retreat from class’ Wood (1986), or rather a progressive admitting of sites of oppression other than class, or class alone, attributing to Althusser the role of inaugurator of the concern for language and consciousness. Language is attributed the most general and pervasive function as mediator in ideology formation. Language is here understood as practice, as parole. Language mediates between individuals and social conditions or relations, actually creating individuals as subjects, in a process Althusser calls interpellation or hailing.

Laclau and Mouffe (on the other hand) represent a dramatic reworking of Marxist social critique (a post-Marxist critique) locating the agency for revolutionary change in the discoursal realm.
In Laclau and Mouffe social critique politics inheres in the discursive character of the state, (autonomously from any economic base) and can be contested in its manifestations (without the necessary involvement of a self-conscious working class) through the substitution of a rival hegemony within an accepted democratic pluralism. In this mould the social realm emerges as the location for revolutionary struggle since it is constituted discursively and therefore represents points at which mobilised opposition may be mounted. Struggle however still needs to establish ‘dividing lines’, rhetorically constituted as alliances of interests of various subordinated categories of subjects, so that they emerge as a coherent program of opposition.

The remarkable success of capitalist society over its rivals has stimulated liberal thinkers, non, anti-, and post-Marxists, among others, to adopt ideology critique, differently fashioned, to explain capitalism’s longevity and features, proposing radically different purposes for ideology. Mannheim (1960) argued for a general sociology of knowledge in which Marxism itself would be seen as a product of its own discourse of how ideas are fashioned by interests to serve those interests and conceal their interestedness, of how Marxism could itself, systemically, be an object of ideology critique, replete with its own illusory explanations.

Fairclough (1989: 3) points out that "ideology is pervasively present in language" and that power relations are maintained through (manufactured) consensus as they also are by coercion and that ideology is the prime means for the manufacture of such consent.

According to Billig “ideologies are patterns of belief and practice ,that make existing social relations appear ‘natural’ or inevitable” (1995: 15) and invokes the term ‘banal nationalism’ to mean the ways that established nation states are ‘routinely reproduced’ (p16) by focussing on non-extreme, here-and-now practices of national reproduction. Billig pays attention to ‘daily-life’ nationalism, being a native of a nation as it is enacted in mundane, banal, ways via habits and ‘mindless’ practices. This kind of habituation (which is beyond the self-conscious) is evident in contrastive encounter, such as arises through travel or displacement. These taken-for-granted ways of nationalism have a salience for newcomers more than for practitioners.

With the bulk of the world’s land surface administratively constituted as nations and states (and ‘trapped’ within these, many claimant-nations and states) “Nationalism is the most successful ideology in human history” (Birch 1989:3) far exceeding any economically-inspired transnational ideology, such as capitalism or communism, or religious-state ideologies.
For Heller we can see peoples and nations and languages within particularised histories that inflect general patterns in sometimes radically different ways, and in doing so ‘create linguistic minorities’, only possible when a politics of identity elevates the problem of authenticity. Linguistic state nationalism has, then, two connected facets: one which “brings the people to the state by giving them the state’s language, and one which brings the state to a people which defines itself in terms of shared language” (Heller 1999: 8).

If globalisation and global culture (Featherstone 1990/1999) represent the undermining of national boundaries then the diasporic connections of minorities (whether they can only claim or actually have a ‘homeland’) can give rise to notions of advantaged capital for their multilingual capabilities, rather than these constituting a sign of inadequacy, or unequal difference, within bounded entities of the nation-states where they reside.

For Foucault (1970/2000) the emergence of ‘grammar’ as a scholarly discipline in eighteenth century Europe has a parallel life with economics and medicine. The emerging modern state, the nation-state, was forming tools with which to impose uniformity and ‘discipline’ on its people; the replacement of Latin with vernaculars, selected codes later to be nation-named (French, Italian, German) depended on the kinds of predictable, stable uniformities that ‘grammar’ would yield.

**Chapter Summary**

A goal of the present chapter has been to outline the approach to language that the thesis adopts. Seen principally as social action, the thesis is selecting a vision of language different from the grammatical system that formal linguistics uses, and different also from the psychologists’ notion of language as code for thoughts, emotions and ideas. These other visions of language are suitable for different domains and purposes of investigation. Speech as action is itself located within an understanding of *lpp* which is experiencing a dramatic period of re-formation after intense criticisms directed at its formalisations and abstractions. The main task of the thesis involves examining discourse as the performance of the officialisation of language. Planning is an activity of intervention into ecologies of social organisation, in the present case, the relations among languages and their roles in the vastly pluralistic United States. The next chapter describes the context of American languages, some representations of the periods and types of policies that have been practiced and concludes with an examination of the domains of policy that are most significant for the official English movement.
CHAPTER II

THE AMERICAN SCENE

The lack of an official Federal language policy or of any public institution devoted to language issues broadly defined in the United States is rather remarkable for a nation of its size and linguistic heritage. The United States has never had an official language nor a language academy (Ricento 1996: 122).

ADVERSARIAL LEGALISM

This chapter explores aspects of the ‘national policy style’ (Howlett 1991) and the history of language policy in the United States. Policy making in the United States is located within an overarching matrix of socio-cultural experience that Kagan (1991) characterises as ‘adversarial legalism’. American public policy is conditioned by expectations that ultimate recourse to legal resolution is both possible and in many arenas probable. This expectation operates to influence consideration of new policy as well as the regular requirement for re-authorisation of existing measures. The framework of adversarial contest within the overarching determination of the law is a pattern of policy making virtually unheard of in common law societies. Among its formative sources are a tradition of legalistic formalism in relation to rights (Primus 1999) which are elaborated explicitly and buttressed by class action provisions.

Culturally, adversarialism involves a belief that the display of opposing positions before authorised adjudication is the appropriate method for the resolution of disputation. A further dimension of distinctive American socio-legal practice is what Hawkesworth (1988) calls ‘atomistic individualism’. In her analysis of an array of public policy measures Hawkesworth’s study identifies the notion of separate and bounded human subjectivities as a critical assumption of the practice of public policy in the US. As a quintessentially social practice, language fits uncomfortably within understandings of rights, of entitlements or of traditions that stress individualism and legalism and which are based on adversarial contest.

The law and the practices of adversarial adjudication may absorb particular kinds of language claims and understandings, but they are notoriously difficult to apply to collective notions of language rights (Paulston 1997). McGroarty (1997) suggests that we include unofficial practices and attitudes in lpp in the US and therefore injects into the American lpp experience the realm of the informal and conventional. These formidable complexities are further compounded by the overlapping and asymmetrical distribution of powers and responsibilities between local, state and Federal authorities.
Where there is no law to guide action conventions, attitudes, and practices fill the gap. Absence of explicit policy therefore does not constitute an absence of language-influencing practices.

These considerations condition the politics of official English directly in that a set of contradictory practices is given life, conservatives who favour small government and who laud a tradition of liberal politics now advance the involvement of government into a field of social life normally utterly off limits to them. In response, ‘liberals’ and multiculturalists whose view of constitutionality fits with Tully’s (1997) Age of Diversity challenge to Western constitutional practice, oppose a move to add language to the legal texts of the nation which they might otherwise be expected to support.

On June 2 1998 Californians voted 61% to 39% to approve Proposition 227, an English-only instruction to the State Legislature which has the effect of banning bilingual education in California. This remarkable instance of personalised lpp was initiated, funded and directed by a private individual, Ron Unz, a computer software developer. The ballot initiative was called English for the Children and exemplifies both a time-honoured practice in lpp in which ‘language strategists’ are able to exercise disproportionate influence compared to state instrumentalities, as well as a distinctive American national policy style of legalism, formalised adversarialism and the deployment of democratic participationist principles. It also highlights the intensity of the struggle over the public and institutional roles of languages in a state that, if it were an independent country, would have the 7th largest economy on earth, in a nation that is the largest producer of language-mediated culture in human history.

**Constitutionalism**

When California Senator S.I. Hayakawa inaugurated the modern phase of seeking official status for English in the United States he proposed a ‘constitutional amendment’. He and every other commentator, observer, participant or activist acknowledges the de facto reality of English’s status within the United States, though Hayakawa argued that Hispanics were engaged in a politics of seeking to make Spanish ‘the second official language’ (Crawford 1992: 150) and in this respect were unlike all other immigrant groups who accepted only English would ever have official status.

In Hayakawa’s writing and in the tone, if not always the substance, of the advocacy since Hayakawa’s time, the phrase ‘constitutional amendment’ has come to assume a great significance. It is as though the Bill of Rights (which is a series of amendments to the Constitution widely seen to have made ‘more perfect’ the American constitutional genius) needs to insert this bolster for English as a kind of blemish correction. Amending the constitution is culturally akin to inserting into the textual register --the ‘sacred writings’ of the secular religion of the nation (Rossiter 1961) -- at its highest and most emblematic, an acknowledgement of the overriding obviousness of the place of English. The result
would be ‘protection’ for the most powerful linguistic code in human history. The kind of politics that
this constitutes is the dominion of the symbolic repertoire of American meanings, and an act of
language ideology, whose full dimensions are far from clear.

Along with the French revolution the American revolution made a distinctive contribution to the theory
and practice of constitutionalism by inaugurating the idea that a constitutional state possesses a
specifiable identity as a nation, an imaginary community to which ‘all nationals belong and in which
they enjoy equal dignity as citizens’ (Tully 1997). This enshrining of the evolving idea of a cultural
communion between rulers and ruled, as co-citizens of a nation, indeed the very notion that a nation is a
horizontal affiliation of attachment, behaviour and cultural commonalities (Enloe 1981), and that these
kinds of unity underlie the state, reverses premodern state conceptualisations in which there was no
desire to make the nation and the state culturally synonymous; with the result that cultural diversity and
multilingualism was a normal condition of political life. There was no expectation of an identity of
cultural characteristics between population and ruling elites and accordingly state theory did not seek or
imagine such communion (Edwards 1985, 1994).

Although interpreted differently in each society constitutionalism:

...engenders a sense of belonging and allegiance by means of the nation’s individual name,
national historical narrative and public symbols. By naming the constitutional association
and giving it a historical narrative, the nation and its citizens, who take on its name when
they become its citizens, possess a corporate identity or personality (Tully 1997: 68).

The American constitutional debate had to resolve the sense of divergent entities, many kinds of peoples
and geopolitical colonial structure and the desire for singular and uniform structure. To a considerable
degree the constitutional contest pitted the vision exemplified by the Federalist Papers against Thomas
Jefferson’s notion of ex uno plures.

Jeffersonian ex uno plures is one directional pattern in which American constitutionalism has sought to
reconcile difference and unity, the ultimately triumphant e pluribus unum of the Federalist papers is
another. In present day debates whether the many make one, or the one is many, takes popular
metaphorical form in images of salad bowls (in which independent elements constitute a whole without
losing their particularity) and melting pots (in which the elements fuse together to constitute a wholly
new amalgam in which traces of the old are not separately identifiable). In this way the old
constitutional tension continues to be manifested in popular discourse today, given quotidian life in
culinary inspired popular metaphorising.
In the Declaration of Independence (1776) Jefferson favoured a confederation of the 13 colonies, as sovereign states, in a confederal structure. His is often described as an anti-Federalist stance. Jefferson’s ideal was in part realised in the Articles of Confederation of 1778. After the War of Independence sovereignty would devolve to these sovereign states formed in a confederal system, continuing the constitutionalism, in Republican form, of the colonial assemblies of a century’s duration. He put such a view of constitutional continuity in a pamphlet *A summary view of the rights of British America* (1775).

**The Federalist Papers**

In contrast to the Jeffersonian ideal was the centralised Federalism espoused in the Federalist Papers of 1788, *E pluribus unum*. The Federalist Papers are an important source of early Republican thinking about questions of community, language and nation as much as they are important for political theorisation. The Federalist is a collection of 85 letters to the public that appeared over the *nom de plume* Publius in New York City newspapers between October 27 1787 and August 16 1788. Publius was a composite of Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay. Of the Federalists John Jay is most explicit about language, identity and peoplehood. Jay “salutes the Union and pays special attention to the physical, cultural and linguistic and sentimental oneness of the American people” (Rossiter 1961: xix). In Jay’s words “Providence” provided

...one connected country to one united people—a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs ... (1961: 38).

The silence on issues of language of the “sacred writings of American political theory” (Rossiter 1961: vii) constitutes a critical silence full of potential meaning for present day politics concerning the status of English. In the absence of explicit declarations pluralist ideologies of language constitute the silence as authorising a pluralist mandate, for assimilationists and restrictionists the silence simply means that the matter was too obvious for explication.

In the final resolution to the founding constitutional arrangements in 1787 the anti-Federalist option was defeated. The new constitution established the Continental Congress with sovereignty over the states, and with uniform national institutions, over an ‘undifferentiated’ people.17

The unity-disunity dichotomy that is prevalent in the discourse of S.I. Hayakawa and the official English movement he created was at the core of the American public conversation about the state. The Federalist constitution identified itself with a ‘united America’ and attached the anti-Federalist alternative, the confederal state, to ‘a disunited America’. In the writings of the Federalists ‘America’
was both state entity and nation (peoplehood). It is interesting to observe that in neither case was imperial expansion precluded, indeed its possibility (perhaps even the sense of its inevitability) was common ground. The association in the Federalist papers between uniformity (cultural sameness) unity (political) and imperialism (expansion) (and the disunity and weakness that would befall a confederal constitutional arrangement) was made assertively. There is even a record of a Cherokee attempt to join the Union as an independent state, something which the confederal structure might well have permitted.

Quite unlike the challenge to contemporary constitutions that Tully argues will come from ‘diversity’, seeking ‘the dignity’ of textual acknowledgment in the highest writings of a polity the current American constitutional debate in fact derives from conservatives wishing to enshrine a single language of the nation. This is, even by their own acknowledgement, an anti-diversity, pro-assimilation move. The diversity they counter is cultural, their political position requires them to valorise political pluralism, at least formally, but cultural pluralism is constituted as state-threatening, thus justifying its restriction.

American national attitudes to public intervention on language have been judged to be a combination of British-derived attitudes about the illiberal nature of language planning (Ferguson 1979/96) and a strain of constitutional anti-monarchical Republicanism (Heath 1976a). Ricento (1998) talks of these as ‘deep values’ which impact directly on the capacity for language planning being undertaken in a direct or overt way, while Collins (1999) sees the early phase as a moral economy in which the prevailing ideology was how literacy and language (America’s distinctive kind of English) was character-forming for the self-governing, independent and egalitarian (excluding racialised minorities) ethos of the new Republic.

Older constitutionalism made use of ideas that cultures were nations and nations should be states. In Tully’s view essentialised views of culture ‘are no longer acceptable’, because cultures are not “separate, bounded and internally uniform” but are “overlapping, interactive and internally negotiated” (Tully 1997:10) and so contemporary constitutional demands are typically for the recognition of diversity, difference and pluralism.

Tully’s view of a constitution as “an activity, an intercultural dialogue in which the culturally diverse sovereign citizens of contemporary societies negotiate agreements on their ways of association over time in accord with the conventions of mutual recognition, consent and continuity (p. 184) is a radically different notion from that to which the participants in this study adhere.

The present challenge to American constitutionalism is not a claim to expand its range of toleration or recognition, but rather to make American constitutionalism more ‘traditional’, more like older nation
states, like the 40% of the 161 world constitutions examined in a study commissioned by US English (Blaustein and Blaustein-Epstein 1986).

Later in this chapter three domains of American language policy are discussed being the three areas to which the official English movement has devoted most attention. However LPP analysis in American has instead divided its analysis into ‘spheres’ where language policy applies and into periodisations of the colonial and national phases. These are considered below.

**SPHERES**

The main work of American historical language policy is Heinz Kloss’ *The American Bilingual Tradition*, written in German and only available in English from 1977\(^{18}\). In this work Kloss distinguishes between spheres of ‘jurisdiction’ and spheres of ‘sovereignty’.

**Jurisdiction**

Essentially for Kloss the first part of this distinction describes the 48 contiguous states which are fully incorporated within the American polity (so that the Constitution is effective without limitations) and ‘unincorporated territories’ which are exclusively and without ambiguity under the US sovereignty.

**Sovereignty**

The term *spheres of sovereignty* encompasses territories which while under American jurisdiction are not under American sovereignty. These are subject to diverse forms of ambiguity and governed by particularities that will not be addressed here except insofar as their ambiguous status is sometimes materially part of the creation of internal exceptions or precedents to the official English advocacy. This clearly occurred in relation to the extension to all minority language speakers of the language-related rights which resulted from non-language entitlements that inhere in the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* and the *Voting Rights Act of 1965*. Puerto Rico is in this respect a ‘thorn in the side’ of US English (Zentella 1999) since its constitutional presence within the American polity implies heavily an official or semi-official Spanish language status; or at least a *de facto* official status for Spanish.

A significant facilitating factor in the emergence of a differential relationship among geo-political entities and the United States is the division within the US constitution into what Kloss describes as ‘fundamental-compulsory provisions’ and ‘flexible’ ones. It is the role of the judicial element of the American political system to determine the boundary between these. This characteristic of the Constitution results in the possibility of differential admission to the US polity of new territories. Kloss shows how this role of the legal interpretive system and indeed the possibility of such differential status has been a crucial factor in the progressive incorporation of Pacific, Caribbean ‘flag territories’ of the US and other areas that come under US control. Puerto Rico has been the determining factor in many of
these progressive establishments which have influenced the United States Supreme Court in decisions relating to Hawaii in 1903, the Philippines in 1904, Alaska in 1905, American Samoa and the American Virgin Islands among others (Kloss 1998:195-196).

**Influence**
Kloss’ analyses of spheres deals with the formal, explicit and policy-marked manifestation of American language accommodations. However, beyond either sphere, of jurisdiction or sovereignty, lies a sphere not identified by Kloss but clearly powerful: an American sphere of influence. Just as it is useful to distinguish between formal rights of citizenship and the substantive realm where concrete practices of inclusion and exclusion make or break formalised citizenship (Benhabib 1999) there is also a substantive field of popular culture where formal linguistic relations and encounters take on a different life.

In consumerist cultural practices, in cultural production sectors of music, popular writing, humour, and the lifeworlds of American sociality, Spanish and English (other languages too but preeminently Spanish) accommodate to each other by stretching the semantic field, formalities, and boundaries of both languages to create a hybrid, intervening space. This is especially vibrant in street, youth and anti-establishment cultural practices and very prominently in contemporary music production.

English and Spanish (and English and Spanish merged) come together in a marketed popular consumerist culture matrix. The combination of words and gestures project globally a set of contemporary, transcultural meanings and messages. Spanish loans interspersed into English, in both talk and song, are emblematic of this hybridising socio-culture especially well represented via distinctive urban multicultural (transnational) music. The linguistic and cultural ‘crossings’ (Rampton 1995) that represent communicate a transgression of boundary that realise post-modern behaviours.

In dramatic juxtaposition with the policing of the official roles and statuses for language, popular culture violates stipulations of role and function and celebrates the hybridity of communication practices. Spanish is already an urban American cultural practice; not its ethnic and tradition-marked forms but its ability to project a rhythmic, dynamic lifeworld of music identities and contemporary youth identities. The kinds of community that are invoked violate both atavism from minorities and uni-directional assimilation towards the standard language Anglophone majority. These practices are often ephemeral in their particularity, continually emerging, changing and then fading, but the practice of using Spanish, Spanishness and Hispanic mannerisms, vocabulary, gesture and values within an American English matrix is likely to be permanent. It signals dynamic but
always new, hybrid, boundary transgressing practices drawing on the vast reservoir of popular culture that the Hispanic worlds represent for American consumer culture and daily life.

**AMERICAN CONTEXTS**

This section traces briefly key dimensions of linguistic demography and the societal treatment of languages during both the colonial and national periods (Zelasko 1991). Contemporary US society is a layered linguistic demography (Macias 2000) similar in important ways to Australia’s, with one powerful difference. The United States is physically contiguous with the main source of its immigrant sending nations. This difference is accentuated by the fact that the source nations (though diverse, different, sometimes antagonistic among themselves) are essentially homogenous in the perception of many ‘established’ Americans, being Catholic in religion, Latino-Hispanic in ethnicity and (crucially for the purposes of the present study) Spanish speaking.

It is difficult to periodise language policy work with precision. The periods that are selected, the names they are given, prove to be motivated constructions pressed into dispute and argumentation to validate a position, or to rebut another. The attempt to periodise also reveals a significant deficiency with the adoption of the vocabulary, concepts and tools of language planning as the ordering framework. In Kloss’ schema of identifying spheres and attributing an overall tradition to the entire historical period a serious deficiency becomes evident. The claim that an ‘American bilingual tradition’ characterises periods of time, both colonial and national, that on closer analysis defy such singular characterisation, or, worse, which could be justified only by focussing exclusively on the treatment of some European immigrant language groups in isolation from all other language communities.

Most disrupting of an attempt at comprehensive characterisation is the ‘off-staging’ in Kloss’ work of a very intolerant tradition regarding the languages of enslaved Africans (Morgan 1999). Conscious and enduring ‘language policy’, such as compulsory illiteracy, and (in common with Native Americans) general linguistic denigration, was practised. However, to see these features is to do two things uncommon in *lpp*: first to see that explicit/overt language measures are only a part (in all likelihood a very small part) of the totality of what ought to be considered ‘language policy’; and second to dismantle the linguistics-oriented gaze that removes from its purview actions that have an impact on language but are manifested as measures directed at managing race differences, class, religion, ethnicity and sex differences. The ontological *lpp* yields categories such as languages, dialects, texts and grammars. These formulations have little to do with the bulk of what social relationships in economic, health and legal domains comprise, but have a dramatic, if indirect, language policy effect. Therefore, locating policy moves within periods needs to distinguish between a scholarly heuristic and the making
of traditions with ideological effects. Declaring overarching traditions is to intervene into current language politics where sanction and authority for present policies is recruited from reference to pasts, however invented, selective or fragmentary.

Further, to participate in periodisation of the kind that allocates central attention of policies overtly on languages is to collude, intentionally or unwittingly, in an appalling discrimination against fair consideration of African and Native American language histories on the basis of categories and analysis that are drawn from largely inapplicable European ones. It is also the case that ‘linguistics-based language policy analysis’ allocates excessive focus to interesting but relatively trivial matters such as the admittedly bigoted views of Benjamin Franklin towards German Pennsylvanians in the colonial period (and his later retractions) compared to the dramatic events unfolding for Native American and African American languages, where nothing that could be remotely called ‘toleration’ prevailed, and yet little that was overtly was practised.

Explanations of interracial relations based on economy and race characteristics, rather than ‘lingual’ relations, account for a greater quantity of the of the colonial period. Disagreements about state-construction, about the structure of the new Republic (confederal or Federal), about the bias in the unity-diversity balance of national culture (between a Jeffersonian ex uno plures and a Hamiltonian-Jay-Madisonian e pluribus unum) did not preclude a wider unity in the idea that the new Republic would lay claim to lands and territories to the west of the colonies. This implicit colonisation imagined cultural and linguistic hegemony as much as it might have practised limited fields of linguistic toleration. In some ways the new Republic functioned like an old state, indeed well ahead even of 19th European nation forming era which recruited the idea of single national languages as defining and even constituting claims to unique constitutions (Hobsbawm 1993). American political practice, while conscious of its new and original visions of the political subject and relations between citizens and state made use of a familiar language of nationing its peoples in cultural conformity.

PERIODISING NEVER-THE-LESS

The desire to package the complex history of American language policy into regular and internally coherent periods typified by overarching cultural, political and economic ideologies and administrative arrangements is notoriously difficult to realise. The main reason for this defiance of history to be classified and taxonomised is that very different sets of cultural, political and economic ideologies and arrangements apply to the different categories of the American language matrix. African American languages and speech forms cannot be discussed with the same set of ideologies that characterise public policy (both formal/declared and informal/covert policies) that were applied to American Englishes, immigrant languages and Native American languages (Morgan 1999).
Political expansion also created major language management consequences. The ‘in trust’ status of
some Pacific territories and the ‘special’ status of the Philippines have been managed within different
kinds of policy logic from the assimilatory purpose applied in permanently incorporated territories.
The specific kinds of literacy ideologies, and indeed of American English cultivation, defy
periodisation within the same schema as the languages of ‘others’ since policies in relation to English
literacy are seen as policies ‘for us’ and typically seek to inscribe mass socialising, industrial needs and
economy-driven objectives. The following then are the main categories around which periodisation of
language and literacy in the US might be written.

**FIGURE ONE: CATEGORIES OF LANGUAGE/COMMUNICATION COMMUNITIES**

**ENSLAVED AFRICANS**
Pre-slavery Native African languages and their evolution in the US
The extinction of the majority of these languages in the US slave experience and the speech forms which emerged
in their wake (Creoles, Pidgins and ultimately various Engli
Other colonial languages (French principally) known by enslaved African populations

**IMMIGRANTS**
Standard and non-standard European immigrant languages (a significant variation concerns the Eastern-Southern-
Northern-Western (British and Irish) European provenance and the presumed cultural proximity to prevailing
American religious-cultural and political values)
The national status of immigrants (displaced persons, stateless persons, diasporic minorities)
Standard and non-Standard Latin American languages (Spanishes and various indigenous/native languages of
Latin American immigrants)

**NEIGHBOUR FOREIGN LANGUAGES**
The ‘national’ languages of US geographic neighbours (Quebec French, Mexican Spanish)

**NON-NEIGHBOUR FOREIGN LANGUAGES**
Prestige languages for cultural acquisition (Jefferson’s enthusiastic francophone promotion, modern examples in
Japanese and European French; even European Spanish)
Languages of American commercial, geo-political and strategic interest (34, 000 Federal government jobs are
‘foreign language essential’ (Lay 1995))

**COLONY-DESCENDED OCCUPIED PEOPLES’ LANGUAGES**
The European languages of pre-expansion US (Louisiana & Maine French, New Mexico & Florida Spanish)

**NATIVE POPULATIONS WITHIN THE CONTIGUOUS STATES**
The Native American languages (whose territories did not conform to the political divisions imposed by the
colonial and national authorities)
Itinerant or mobile populations

**NATIVE POPULATIONS IN NON-CONTIGUOUS SPHERES OF AMERICAN JURISDICTION**
Hawaiians, Filipinos, Pacific Trust and Flag Territories

**COMMONWEALTH TERRITORIES**
The special status of Puerto Rico Spanish & Puerto Ricans’ special American citizenship

**ENGLISH & ENGLISHES**
British-American models as exemplified in the history of American dictionary writing, status of British norms, moves to officialise ‘American’, early Republic thinking on America’s ‘more democratical English’

Regional Dialects
Social Dialects
“National, Racial or Ethnic Dialects” (e.g. Ebonics)
Language Islands (Gullah, Chesapeake and other Englishes)
Hawaii Creole English and other creoles in spheres of jurisdiction
Speech codes and reform movements: counter sexist and non racist English, political correctness etc

SIGN LANGUAGES
American Sign Language and other Sign Languages in the US
Non-Anglo American Sign users
Private initiatives, Gallaudet University, Washington DC
Oscillation between ‘oral’ and ‘manual’ dominance in pedagogy (Strong 1999)

These categories constitute a heavy burden on any attempt to create periods within which to grasp even broad trends. It is nevertheless useful to locate actions within overarching categories as a means to view trends and patterns over historical time. Some attempts at periodisation are now discussed that focus on spoken languages and the immigrant-foreign-native categories. Dicker (2000: 47), using a 1985 analysis by Ofelia Garcia, identifies a three part pattern to policies and locates these three tendencies within the late colonial to national historical periods. The tendencies are:

Tolerance-oriented policies (accepting the private use of non-English languages)

Promotion-oriented policies (accommodating non-English languages into public institutions)

Restrictive orientations (repressing languages).

FIGURE TWO: DICKER’S LANGUAGE POLICY TENDENCIES

1770-1880s
Tolerance oriented policies

1880s-1950s
Restrictive policies such as the change in immigration source nations from Northern to Southern European and the anti-southern European prejudices this gave rise to; the forced removal of Native American children from family settings and their education in boarding schools; the anti-German hostilities during the First World War; the English-only practices in the Spanish-speaking South West; (by 1924 34 States had mandated English-only education)

1923-1942
A tolerance period as a ‘brief respite’ occasioned largely by the effects of the Supreme Court ruling in the Meyer v. Nebraska case

World War II
Restrictive orientations in policy re-emerge
1958-1980

A foreign languages promotional period with some positive ‘spin-off’ effects for ‘ethnic languages’; occasioned by the launch of the Sputnik satellite by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the sense of alarm about the possible technological and military superiority that this might indicate for the USSR over the USA. Effects of this were the National Defense Act 1958 which considered language competence as a strategic national capability and the Fulbright Hays Act 1961 which was motivated by the strategic advantages accruing to foreign language and culture knowledge for the US in its geo-political and strategic international interests; and the early 1960s Civil Rights Movement resulting in the Civil Rights Act 1964; the passing of the Bilingual Education Act 1968 aimed at ‘remedial native language instruction’; the 1965 Court Interpreters Act 1965 and the 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act.

1980 to now

The official English movement; which is seen by Dicker as aiming to restore repressive policies, while permitting the private use of languages other than English and the encouragement of strictly ‘foreign’ language study; and influenced by factors such as the ‘third great wave’ of immigration in US history; a change in source countries from generally European origins to developing nation sources, and the effect of greater jobs competition between new arrivals and established residents.

Dicker’s analysis of the official English movement locates its emergence within rivalry for employment and argues that official English is embedded in the ‘xenophobic atmosphere’ arising from “fading dreams of upward mobility for middle-and working-class people” which cast immigrants as “rivals for educational and social opportunities” (p 48). What is notable in the periodisation is the coincidence between periods of strong state interest in social and population policy and language. Promotion oriented policies coincide with notions of language as a social resource in projects of economic and social reconstruction most closely identified with Lyndon B. Johnson’s ‘Great Society’ initiative as well as cold-war rivalry. Sputnik, the legislative culmination of Civil Rights and Great Society programs all made salient communication issues and multilingual community resources were able to tap into national ideologies of both defence and social improvement.

An alternative characterisation from Wiley (1999: 21) is based on a criticism of Kloss’ The American Bilingual Tradition (also Wiley 1996, 1998a, 1998b). Kloss is generally well disposed towards American language policies, contrasted mainly with his sense of how these differ from nationalistic European precedents with their one nation=one language ideologies. Wiley extends the Kloss typology to the following: Promotion, Expediency (Accommodation), Tolerance, Restriction and Repression. He challenges the Kloss depiction as overly optimistic. Wiley uses a ‘Historical-Structural’ approach seeing lpp as an ‘instrument of social control’. He finds official English policies across ‘broad social domains’ and notes the differential effects according to social groups against whom such policies are targeted. The level of application of policy is influenced by the ‘degree of hostility’ towards particular groups. Associating language measures with other ‘discriminatory devices’ Wiley is able to show that language policies operate as surrogate or support for racist politics.
The ‘Historical-Structural’ approach that informs Wiley’s analysis and schema comes from the work of Tollefson (1991). This approach invites researchers to study structural cases of compounding practices in which language policy takes its place alongside social, administrative and political practices in the management of societies. Kloss is criticised for a superficial characterisation of discrimination in seeking evidence in terms only of cases of individual prejudice. Wiley aims to include ‘covert language policy’ or to reconcile any explicit focus in language with wider and contemporary social policy. A ‘linguistics-based’ lpp can have the effect of mis-reading the intent of overall policy configurations, or even of blindness to social, economic and political effects of language planning (Heath 1976a; Schiffman 1996; Lo Bianco 1999).

**FIGURE THREE: WILEY’S OVERT AND COVERT POLICY PERIODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1779-1880</strong></th>
<th>No explicit designation of English at governmental levels and a great tolerance to the ‘use’ of languages other than English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1880-1920; &amp; then until WWII</strong></td>
<td>Official designation of English at State and Federal levels with clear use of these language requirements to exclude and discriminate against various minorities and immigrant groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWII to 1980s (but especially during 1960s)</strong></td>
<td>Relaxation of the restrictions and even encouragement of other languages until the mid 1980s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1980s to the Present</strong></td>
<td>Tendency back towards restrictionism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Wiley, the first three phases work well for policy towards European languages and their speakers, however, there are exceptions to the pattern (the famous Benjamin Franklin anti-German tirades; the linking of religion with ethnicity by the 1836 American Protestant Vindicator; two decades of Know Nothingism; and anti-Catholic language issues). Wiley states that the schema does ‘not work well’ for enslaved Africans where ‘there was brutal punishment for the use of their languages’ (including compulsory English illiteracy) and for Native Americans where different chronologies are needed. The more than 1 000 native languages in N. America are located under a different typological scheme and chronology by Spicer (cited in Wiley 1999: 30) Separation, Co-ercion, Tribal Restoration phase I; Termination and Tribal Restoration phase II.

Investigating US language ideologies Collins (1999) addresses the “importance of literacy, print, and schooling in the American project of self-construction” (p. 216) in an ethnographically oriented approach (also Wiley 1996). The connection between literacy and schooling is located within a larger system of ‘meanings and practices’ that Collins calls ‘economies’ (cultural-textual economies) which
his analysis locates in correspondence to the political economy of the US. Race issues are intimately associated with political economy. The three phases and associated ideological matrices that organise language/literacy and schooling practices foreground what Collins calls a moral economy of literacy that typified the agrarian, democratic optimism of the late colonial- early Republic era; a technical economy of literacy that characterised the closure of opportunity that followed the end of expansion westwards and the ‘possibilising culture’ this had animated, and finally a ‘cultural economy of literacy’ which has been the reaction of the Conservative Restoration (Apple 1996) to the pluralistic openings of the Great Society/Civil Rights era. Collins’ schema (1999: 216-221) appears below with a paraphrase of his text.

**FIGURE FOUR: COLLINS’ PHASES OF LITERACY ECONOMY**

**EARLY-NATIONAL PHASE (1780s-1880s)**

**Late colonial period>Jeffersonian Republicanism> Early Industrialism**

A colonial concept of citizenship and print-based public life merge with Jeffersonian Republicanism stressing equality of small producers as part of a literate civic-virtuous governance which in turn cedes to an industrial economy with concomitant acceptance of class divisions. Prospects of ‘equality’ are founded on the ‘West-pushing frontier’. In the colonial period newspaper publishing and literate practice were essential to the anti-English foment and the formation of citizenship ideals of participation-active citizen-subjects; with the push for public universal schooling and its view of the ‘disciplinary potential’ of literacy/schooling for shaping the character of the desirable citizen-subject. Moves for an American English accompanied this ferment, an American English that would ‘express the democratic impulse’. This pluralistic culture of literacy excluded on a racial basis. In the slave based southern agrarian economy literacy was denied to slaves in firm conviction of its politically empowering potential. Laws forbade blacks to be schooled. The common school project was fundamentally racialised. Political emancipation after the Civil War (1861-1865) and southern Reconstruction Period (1865-1976) were undermined by Jim Crow segregation until the Civil Rights era of the 1960s (Zinn 1995).

**MATURE-NATIONAL PHASE (1880s-1960s)**

**Post Civil War Period>Closure of Expansionist Opportunity>Stratification and Skilling**

The closing of the Western Frontier led to a phase of standardising in American life, technical efficiency and quantification became critical features of elite rationality (Collins 1999: 218), the industrial economy’s requirements led to a restriction of democratic possibility, the emergence of educational crises of valuation between needs of ‘schooled English’ and inadequate literacy levels. ‘Common schooling’ ceded to individualised and ability-ranked schooling (with stratification, norming, public accountability, testing). A technical economy of literacy of standard English, literacy as autonomous skill replaced the character-formation moral economy. Social mobility and ‘meritocracy’ followed the closure of the Western frontier as democratic aspiration ‘shrinks’ to encompass only an ‘aristocracy of (schooled) talent’. A restriction of language diversity inaugurated a ‘official hierarchy’ between English and other languages.

**LATE-NATIONAL PHASE (1960s to the present)**

**Civil Rights>Conservative Restoration>Global Era**

Globalisation and domestic ‘de-industrialisation’ characterise this phase, scholarly investigation into diversity in language/literacy has shown a persistence of social stratification and has fuelled concern for complex equality recognition not based on cultural sameness. A conservative reaction deploying a standard English/literacy skills orientation combined with anti-multicultural ‘cultural literacy’ and a canonical literature framework.

The overall effect of these schematic representations of chronology is to suggest not only change over time but the contingency of language and literacy policies and actions. These co-occur with other social management practices, sometimes are elevated to separate focus in their own right, and at other times fulfil deeper and even covert national projects, cultural politics and aspirations. Rarely is language the
exclusive object of policy attention (Christian 1988) and almost never can the espoused goals of *lpp* be taken at ‘face value’ (Stubbs 1986). This is not to suggest that there are nefarious forces whose conduct of language policy is accompanied with a mission to conceal conspiratorial ends. Rather it is to indicate the ambiguity and multi-valence of language, it is always medium and message, means and content, symbol and practice; and those who make and deliver policies have and operate with personal and group subjectivities which formal approaches to understanding and explanation of *lpp* neglect at considerable cost. As Fishman (2000) has shown, even the most technical of language policy work, corpus planning, carries within it a status agenda, perhaps inevitably; and Collins’ work in associating literacy and language ideologies within an ethnographic examination promises to uncover pervasive cultural structuring of otherwise seemingly unconnected phenomena.

**First Nations**
In contrast to the fine precision that is available for other languages (there were 6,000 Dutch speakers of the 75,038 total population in 1664 in America and 279,200 of the total population of 3,929,000 spoke German in 1790 (Wiley 1998b; Macias 2000: 13-14)) the statistical record for Native American languages and speakers is very thin. It is estimated that approximately 1 million Native Americans inhabited the North American continent, north of the present borders of Mexico and south of the Arctic circle region, prior to the established settlements of Europeans in the seventeenth century. None of the languages spoken had a formalised and conventionalised writing system, and given the dispersion of the population over vast distances there were several distinct families. Possibly hundreds, certainly scores of languages have become extinct in the contact period (Krauss 1992; Crawford 1995). Crawford cites evidence that some 175 languages are still spoken today but about 155 of these, almost 90% he considers ‘moribund’. He cites the Census Bureau whose 1993 estimate, based on 1990 census collection data, is that more than one third of the languages still spoken had fewer than 100 speakers and a further 22 had fewer than 200 speakers. Discussing how languages die, or are killed and whether speakers ‘collaborate’ in the process, Crawford cites evidence for ‘a campaign of linguistic genocide’ perpetrated by Federal government authorities and explicit documentation from 1868 establishing language education practices and residential-boarding arrangements whose purpose was that the “*barbarous dialects should be blotted out and the English language substituted*” (p. 157).

Institutionalised boarding school arrangements and the removal of children from family and community contexts continued for a much longer period under the aegis of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); with formal amelioration commencing in 1933 but not altering the main practices until a generation after that. Deliberate post-conquest policies of herding humbled Native Americans onto reservations, and thereby aggregating speakers of more than one language, in some cases obviated the need for the learning of English and therefore, ironically, may have contributed to the intergenerational maintenance of some
languages. However, the overall pattern of arrangements (social, economic, residential and educational) eroded all socio-cultural domains and led to massive dislocation of traditional intergenerational transmission practices (Fishman 1991/2001).

Today the BIA formally recognises 550 tribes. In 1980 there were some 800 000 Native Americans and more than 33% claimed regular use of an American native or an Alaskan native language. The largest by far is Navajo (45% of all Native American language speakers), in whose nation 148, 530 speakers used the language regularly in 1990 according to Crawford. However, Navajo also needs to be considered endangered given high intergenerational attrition in its spoken domains, rapidly growing numbers of young English monolinguals and progressive exposure of the nation’s institutions and economy to wider US society (Zepeda 1990; Brandt 1990; Benally and McCarty 1990).

Native American languages today occupy a distinct place in the debates about official English. The Native American Language Act of 1990 (NALA) is the most explicit and most pluralist orientated language law in US history. Whereas the 1968 Bilingual Education Act concerns the effective delivery of education via the use of children’s first languages NALA articulates an explicit and pluralising objective of government language policy, and aims to conserve languages. In policy debates today (from their deathbeds) native languages marshal a discourse of ‘heritage’ and territory distinguishing them from immigrant languages. Theirs is a power of association with place and over time that makes immigrant language claims vulnerable to an additional kind of exclusion. For native languages this is a recent and forlorn discursive power. As powerful communication mediums of fighting nations with a clear sense of territoriality and sovereignty they encountered policies of oppression (Hinton 1994). As they weaken sentiment attaches to them as indexing place, locality and national distinctiveness.

Today even conservatives who support official English make reference to the nation-serving role of Navajo as a code for communicating strategic military information during the Pacific War (Transcript Two; Appendix Seven).

The advocacy for Native American languages also draws on the familiar territory of the effectiveness of bilingual education in children’s general education and enhanced acquisition of English (Cummins 2000), and ecological arguments about the threat to the world’s biological resources that would follow from the extinction of languages (Nettle and Romaine 2000) as well as the impoverishment of the cultural and intellectual stocks of humanity from language deaths. The policy responses are disappointing, little more than token acknowledgements undertaken when the languages are in extreme states of weakness.
The Colonial Period
The first permanent settlements were established independently by England at Jamestown, Virginia in 1607, and by the French at what is now Quebec City. The first permanent European settlement was the Spanish St Augustine in Florida in 1565.

Cuba was colonised by Diego Velasquez in 1511 and three years later the Spanish conquest of Mexico was led from Cuba by Hernan Cortes. From Mexico the present American Southwest was progressively added to Spain’s American territory with permanent settlement in present New Mexico from 1598 and Santa Fe 1609. Arizona, Texas and Colorado were also settled. Contest with other European powers led to eastward expansion in opposition to French interest in Louisiana and westward into California to contain English and Russian interest (Zinn 1995). With expansion due to territorial acquisition, annexation and new exploration, there emerged in the Southwest as well as in Florida a toponomastic overlay to much of the present United States that animates minor irredentist stirrings and colours debates about languages and belonging to this day and in which the mythical name of Aztlan (or Azatlan, the Spanish language Aztec or Indian kingdom of the Southwest) is occasionally raised.

Much further north the bases of late twentieth century language politics were being laid with the settlement by French traders and explorers after Samuel de Champlain’s arrival in Nova Scotia in 1604 and founding of Quebec (present day Quebec City) in 1608. Travelling down the Ohio and Mississippi rivers the French settlers established a presence in the contiguous territory of the United States in what came to be called the Louisiana Territory in 1682. The sale to United States’ third president Thomas Jefferson of the Louisiana territory in 1803 and the termination of the French political base in the eastern US in the French and Indian Wars (1754-1763) effectively extinguished any political presence of French language institutions and politics in the USA although to this day residual French communities abut Quebec in Maine, French retains some political status in the State of Louisiana where it is required to be taught in schools and according to the 1990 census there are more than 1.6 million Americans who come from French-speaking homes. The French and Indian Wars pitted French soldiers and native American warriors against British soldiers and American colonists. Spain gained New Orleans and all French territory west of the Mississippi River as a result of the defeat of the French, and Britain gained Canada and all French territory east of the Mississippi.

The French population was replenished with new immigration over the eras of American recruitment of new settlers and also today from refugee admissions and recruited immigrants from Haiti. Dutch was established as the initial European language of New York (originally New Amsterdam) after the
founding of the New Netherland colony on the Hudson River in 1624 but this lasted only four decades before annexation by British colonists.

The Pennsylvania Germans are the other main Europeans in the seventeenth century in North America, who despite their miscategorisation as Dutch (Deutsch) came to represent about one third of the population of that strategically pivotal state in the War of Independence, and consequently gave rise to one of the narratives that is regularly contested in today’s debates about the officialisation of English.

It was the English however whose language came to predominate and whose politically contiguous colonies came to dominate their European rivals in the new world.

The English came without the explicit sponsorship of national institutions, a fact of quite major importance in the decisions about language policy that came to be required as a consequence of the gaining of independence with the Treaty of Paris of 1783. Sir Walter Raleigh failed to start a colonial presence in North America in the late 1580s after persuading Elizabeth I to grant him a charter in the late 1580s. In 1606 James I gave to a group of businessmen a charter called the Virginia Company of London, to establish a colony and seek gold in Virginia. The 120 people who arrived on May 14 1607 established the first permanent English settlement in the Americas at Jamestown. By 1619 the London Company granted the colonists a say in their own government via a legislature; the House of Burgesses. Tobacco, not gold, came to be the economic mainstay of the Jamestown settlement but it reverted to a royal colony after it burned in 1698.

The first African Americans were slaves sold to the Jamestown colonists by the Dutch as early as 1619. The Mayflower brought the Pilgrims who were headed to join the Virginia colony from Plymouth England in 1620 as part of their religious goal of separating from the Church of England. Blown off course the Pilgrims landed at New England’s Cape Cod bay where they named a new Plymouth, signed the Mayflower Compact and commenced a new colony in Massachusetts.

Between 1620 and 1732 thirteen British colonies were founded in North America, principally divided by Christian denominational adherence and varying in political structure from a governor appointed by the king, to a ‘colonists elected’ legislature with varying powers, to a ‘proprietor’ selected by the governor. The colonies, although physically contiguous, early on came to have geographic denominators viz, the four New England colonies (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire), the four middle colonies (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware) and the five Southern Colonies (Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia).
The strict taxing and greater control that Britain subjected its colonies to after the defeat of the French in the French and Indian Wars caused the resentment that ultimately contributed to the War of Independence.

**Revolution**
The American Revolution was fought from 1775-1783. In mobilising support among non-British settlers in the 13 combatant colonies the Revolutionaries utilised multilingual communication. French, but more importantly German, came to be an issue. The Continental Congress issued translated documents, or extracts from documents such as the *Declaration of Articles Setting Forth Causes of Taking Up Arms* and others in German as well as English and other documents in French (Piatt 1990: 8-9). Heath (1976a), Piatt (1990) and Crawford (1995) consider it important to document the tolerance of languages other than English in the early Republic. Commentators construe the late colonial and early Republican period as libertarian and tolerationist (Crawford 1995: 22-23; Zelasko 1991) towards speakers of other languages.

American attitudes to English, the colonial inheritance and the language of rebellion against it, were given a concrete test in 1790 (according to Piatt 1990:9); or 1780 (according to Crawford 1995: 22). John Adams proposed to the Continental Congress that an American equivalent of the European language academies be established (Crawford 1995: 38; endnote 5; Heath 1976a; 1976b). The prescriptive mission of Adams’ proposed Academy, along with the proposal itself, were in the end rejected. Commentators generally agree that this rejection indicates the presence of a language ideology (homegrown or inherited) that language is a private matter in which governmental regulation is inappropriate. Appropriately, Noah Webster’s private initiative of 1789 to create an American dictionary bore fruit. Webster’s program was explicitly nationalist, seeking to mark, identify and elaborate American English, and thus represents the first in a long line of attempts to seek to distinguish American English from its British fount.

A further attempt along these lines came in 1820 when *The American Academy of Language and Belles Lettres* was put forward to Congress for support. The move for the creation of this Academy was advocated by some of the most prominent political leaders of the time (including Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, James Madison and John Adams) in recognition of the past resistance to the creation of such a public authority for language regulation. *The American Academy of Language and Belles Lettres* also failed to gain support in the newly founded Republic, despite its remarkable political prestige, and there ended formal moves to establish a governmentally sanctioned language academy. It is likely that the Enlightenment idealism of the American founding fathers, with their unresolved views about
whether natural laws govern the lives of polities, was unfavourable in philosophy to the regulation of language.

The idea nourishing the desire to ‘regulate’ language to enhance its expressive power, vocabulary range, or to intercede to halt changes that were underway, sustains a view that language is in some kind of decline. Ferguson’s observations about such declinist thinking indicate that there has long been this type of attitude towards language. “There can be no doubt that the belief in the decline of English is widely held and constitutes a significant element in the total set of shared beliefs about language in our society” (Ferguson 1979: 52). Ferguson identified four areas of popularly asserted decline in English: correctness of grammar, clarity and precision of expression, logic and vividness or originality. Ferguson also notes that popular attitudes of this sort give rise to prescriptions for change such as a national academy or a national language policy, but that “always such movements fail, reflecting the deeper attitude that steps of this sort are government interference endangering our personal and social freedoms” (p. 52).

Ferguson sees a continuous tradition of attitudes about deterioration in American English standards, conversely, notes that linguists consider moves to engineer language change undesirable and scarcely possible. If there is a ‘tradition’ or a lesson emerging from the early period of the Republic, from the lessons drawn from revolution and independence, it would surely not be that there was a generic libertarianism towards language (since the highly interventionist politics against Native languages and the languages of enslaved Africans contradict such a view) but rather that language policy theory on its own is an inadequate tool for analysis and understanding of such politics. To rely on the formal categories of linguistics-derived language planning would lead to conclusions of tolerance and non-intervention in matters of language; but this would be to overlook the effects of racially and imperially inspired politics that had dramatic consequences for non-European languages and their speakers in the new Republic.

Expansion
America’s linguistic demography diversified further creating regional differences and juridical complications to a nationally uniform approach. The union grew, seemingly inexorably, during the national period, adding new languages with new territory. In 1800 Spain ceded the Louisiana Territory to France who in 1803 sold it to the United States. By this purchase, Thomas Jefferson, third president, more than doubled the size of the country. Secretary of State James Madison paid Napoleon $15 million for 828,000 square miles, about 3 cents per acre, for what came to be known as the Louisiana Purchase.
The expansion brought misery and dispossession to Native Americans (Zinn 1995).

The war of 1812 against Britain secured the US boundaries but animated American ambition to take Canada and Florida. The US emerged from its successes in 1812 with enhanced confidence, having inflicted naval victories early in the war. In January 1815 Commander Andrew Jackson repulsed a post-peace treaty British attack on New Orleans, stimulating an assertive attitude about national destiny. Reflecting this confidence President James Monroe’s ‘Monroe Doctrine’ in 1823 in effect expressed a warning to European nations against establishing further colonies in North America. Apart from its importance as an early American foreign policy statement, the Monroe Doctrine is the precursor of US hegemony in the Americas.

America’s territorial expansion added vast Spanish-named and peopled territory. In 1821 Spain ceded Florida to the United States at the same time as conceding Mexico’s independence. For Mexico the early years of its post-revolution national independence were disastrous. It conceded huge areas of its territory to the United States; essentially the American Southwest. Mexico’s territorial losses followed its conflict with the Lone Star Republic in 1836 which itself had been independent for some 10 years but went on to become US territory in 1845. The progressive incorporation of Texas into the United States followed the failure of the 20,000 Americans who by 1830 had purchased cheap Texas land from the Mexican authorities on condition of converting to Catholicism and learning Spanish to keep their end of the bargain. This provoked war with Mexico. Between 1846 and 1848 the United States and Mexico fought a further war whose loss by Mexico again saw its territory shrink dramatically as it conceded large additions of its remaining Texan territory. The United States cultivated President James Knox Polk’s idea of Manifest Destiny (God’s Will that the US should extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific).

The easy victories of the US resulted in its incorporation of California, Nevada, Utah as well as parts of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming. The US paid $15 million for this Mexican Cession which five years later, in 1853, expanded again in the Gadsden Purchase which for $10 million added southern New Mexico and Arizona to US ownership. The demographic result of these progressive cessions of territory was that long-established and ‘nativised’ Spanish-speaking populations became American. Inevitably their association of language and land is qualitatively different from that of Spanish speaking immigrants who constitute the continually replenished supply of Latino language and culture in the United States. 300 years of rule from Mexico and Spain was terminated but the people continued to speak Spanish in territory more than one half of the total land size of the contiguous 48 states.
The century also saw the progressive defeat of the Native Americans and their Western resettlement as Manifest Destiny was pursued with continual Western expansion. By 1900 all Native American tribes had been relocated to reservations. During this astonishing era of massive territorial expansion (annexation and military success for the United States and subjugation and dispossession for the North American Native peoples and other European-derived settler populations) the US also fought the Civil War. The defeat of the Confederate armies of the southern states led to the abolition of slavery and the migration north of African Americans. A major stimulus to the abolitionist cause was the slave-owning status of new states which emerged in the wake of the vast territorial acquisitions of the early to middle parts of the century and the relative balance of power slave and non-slave owning states would have had in the Republic’s Senate (Zinn 1995). Of these contiguous land mass new states New Mexico was formally made a state of the union only in 1912. Through this period American imperial expansion also added Hawaii and Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam and various smaller Pacific and Caribbean flag territories (Kloss 1998).

The constitutional application in the complex arrangements of governance that resulted from expansion is such that Puerto Rico joined as a Spanish speaking territory, Hawaii as officially bilingual in English and Hawaiian, and that elaborately differing statuses apply and applied in other spheres of jurisdiction, sovereignty and influence. The question of the ‘language of government’ is more than marginally important under these complex patterns of rule and administration.

The Huddled Masses
Despite territorial expansion it was not until immigration accelerated in the 1830’s that language diversity became a salient public issue again. Most immigrants were from Europe and most were German. More than 5 million Germans arrived over the whole of the 19th century (Crawford 1992: 23, Wiley 1998b). The middle part of the century provides strong evidence of liberal toleration and pragmatic policy making in relation to both the national languages of European immigrants and to the Spanish of newly absorbed Europeanised populations. In reaction to German settlement Ohio authorised bilingual school instruction in 1839. Louisiana authorised French-English school instruction in 1847 and New Mexico authorised Spanish-English education in 1847. 12 states passed laws such as these authorising bilingual schooling. Crawford calls these measures a ‘forgotten legacy’. Those who press for official English interpret these liberal actions as sensible pragmatism easing immigrants’ inevitable shift to English monolingualism. Restrictionists also suggest that these Euro-ethnics were assimilation-oriented, contending that more recent immigrants are less inclined to join the mainstream. Some argue that such tolerant language policy was not at all foreign language promoting, and in any case if it were it would not be a warrant for permanent bilingualism.
Heinz Kloss’ vocabulary describing this mid-19th century absorption of Euro-ethnics is a recurring element in the discursive flow of the dispute about official English. Language pluralists claim that restrictive language laws violate an American ‘tradition’ of toleration. However, very problematically, Kloss’ himself and his work have come under critical scrutiny recently, especially in the research of Christopher Hutton (1999). Hutton examines the role of linguistics within National Socialist political ideology in Germany. He establishes Kloss as a significant participant in a *Linguistics of the Third Reich*. It is not clear to the present researcher from reading Hutton’s work how willing, enthusiastic or reluctant Kloss was, but Hutton’s documentation shows Kloss to have been involved in activities which provided intellectual comfort to Nazi utilisation of ‘mother tongue racism’.

The precise consequences of this reappraisal of Kloss in discussions about American *lpp* are unclear, but energetic reassessment of Kloss’ work is already underway. Some qualification to his scholarship and its import on the basis of his past associations is probable.

The mid-19th century period coincides with what Lind (1995) has called the Euro-American Culture republic as the base of the American nation. The particularity of the experience, i.e. the fact that ‘toleration’ was not characteristic of *lpp*, and indeed that the ‘tolerant tradition’ was differentially applied according to criteria of race and culture provenance would not of itself invalidate the discursive utilisation of a ‘tolerant tradition’ in present debates. It would simply require the qualification that the partisan application of otherwise laudable principles be extended rather than that their lack of past universality disqualifies toleration from characterising present-day policy.

Immigration itself was not regulated in any comprehensive manner until Congress enacted immigration laws in the late 19th Century. The first assertion of Federal regulatory power was far from tolerant: the *Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882*. It was not until 1924 that there was a shift from qualitative exclusions (i.e. the naming of particular racial and ethnic categories for exclusion or containment in immigration recruitment) and their substitution by numerical targets.

The removal of racial categories from immigrant selection processes was not completed until 1965, in a law influenced in part by a book by President J.F. Kennedy, *A Nation of Immigrants*. In this publication Kennedy criticised the ‘national origins’ basis for the selection of immigrants. Although generally tolerant in orientation, the 1965 law retained control over Western Hemisphere numbers. This move was widely interpreted as aimed against Mexicans, but, perversely, the result was a massive influx of illegal Mexican immigration; often recruited by agri-business interests. Nevertheless the law replaced the ‘national origins’ selection basis with a system of numerical targeting. Progressive liberalisation of
immigration procedures continued under *The Immigration Reform Control Act of 1986* (which penalised the hiring of illegals) and the *Immigration Act of 1990* which led to an increase of 40% in total admissions (mainly by instituting recruitment of needed high skilled labour).

At present immigration contains three categories for admission, two legal and one not: a humanitarian element (refugees principally); legal or recruited immigration (family reunion and skilled or ‘green card’ immigrants, who after 5 years can become citizens); and finally, undocumented aliens. Immigration law has oscillated between two broad orientations. The first has been favourable to immigration construing the replenishment of labour stocks as vital for economic and social development. This orientation has produced policy and practices of inclusiveness and Civil Rights for new arrivals. The counter movement in law has aimed to restrict numbers, to set national origins limits and to emphasise an exclusionary-controlling orientation.

**FIGURE FIVE: MAJOR LEGISLATIVE MILESTONES IN US IMMIGRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Exclusion Act (1882)</th>
<th>Suspends immigration of Chinese laborers for 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bars Chinese naturalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides for deportation of Chinese illegally in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Act of 1891</strong></td>
<td>First comprehensive law for national control of immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes Bureau of Immigration under Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directs deportation of aliens unlawfully in country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1924</strong></td>
<td>Imposes first permanent numerical limit on immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes the national origins quota system, which resulted in biased admissions favoring northern and western Europeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of October 3, 1965</strong></td>
<td>Repeals national origins quotas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes 7-category preference system based on family unification and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets 20,000 per country limit for Eastern Hemisphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imposes ceiling on immigration from Western Hemisphere for the first time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1976</strong></td>
<td>Extends 20,000 per country limits to Western Hemisphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee Act of 1980</strong></td>
<td>Sets up first permanent and systematic procedure for admitting refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removes refugees as a category from preference system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defines refugee according to international, versus ideological standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes process of domestic resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codifies asylum status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986</strong></td>
<td>Institutes employer sanctions for knowingly hiring illegal aliens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates legalization programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increases border enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immigration Act of 1990</strong></td>
<td>Increases legal immigration ceilings by 40 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triples employment-based immigration, emphasizing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creates diversity admissions category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes temporary protected status for those in US jeopardized by armed conflict or natural disasters in their native countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Immigration and Naturalization Services 1990-6; Clark et al 1995; Fix and Passel 1994: 11).
A source of acrimony in debates about immigration, and its flow-on into advocacy for official English, has been the presence of ‘undocumented aliens’. The large numbers of ‘undocumented aliens’ has made immigration law highly contentious. Illegal immigration is easily construed as the state (even the nation) losing control of the administration of sovereignty: territory, defence, population, and a national culture/national language. For official English advocates undocumented immigration constitutes a public demonstration of the ‘leakiness’ of the contemporary nation and serves as a warrant for action to secure enduring symbols of unity. For opponents of official English the two issues (language policy and ‘illegal immigration’) are scarcely related.

During America’s two previous eras of mass immigration ‘undocumented aliens’ constituted a far smaller issue relative to other dimensions of immigration policy. This was inevitable given the less well developed state of immigration law. At issue in the present period are disputes between the states and the Federal government about who should bear the public costs attributable to undocumented aliens. Some states with large populations of undocumented aliens have filed lawsuits seeking reimbursement from the Federal government for such costs.

The Governors of the most affected states commissioned *The Fiscal Impacts of Undocumented Aliens: Selected Estimates for Seven States* report. This report described immigration as a pivotal public issue (along with ‘race, taxes and crime’) that defines conflict over the “basic values of our society” (p1). The report links the success of immigration policies to effective immigrant policies. The latter comprise post-arrival “.. laws, regulations, and programs” for immigrants, including “the Refugee Resettlement Program and Bilingual Education” (p 16).

Since the late 1960s the US is experiencing its ‘third great wave’ of immigration (the periods 1820s-1860s and 1880s-1920s being the previous ones), comprising ‘legals’, ‘undocumented aliens’ and refugees. Although there have always been diverse source countries and although only about one third of present arrivals are from Latin America these latter are mostly Spanish-speaking.

In the landmark study of intergenerational language shift Veltman (1983) shows that Hispanics/Latinos’ use of the home language follows the broad pattern of previous large immigrant groups. Only residualised and rarely literate standard forms of Spanish remain in the third generation. While there is variation among national and social groups Veltman finds little evidence of the monolingual non-English speaking enclaves that alarm social conservatives.
A more recent study of the English of adult immigrants examines three interlocking processes that yield English proficiency: differential immigration, emigration and English language acquisition.

In spite of the lack of explicit U.S. legislation concerning the entry of potential immigrants according to their proficiency in English, the majority of new immigrants entering the US speak English. With time and education, the others learn English...the nature of the selection processes underlying who immigrates...and of the extent of the language learning that occurs after they arrive are already much more compelling declarations of the fact that English is, de facto, the nation’s official language (Stevens 1994:183).

This study found that immigrants whose first language is Spanish learn English at a greater rate than those from other language backgrounds. Reviewing his original evidence and considering new patterns of immigration and new evidence for language acquisition Veltman (1998) sustains his original conclusion of a strong pattern of Spanish-speakers’ acquisition of English. He claims that the intergenerational transfer of Hispanics to English monolingualism is faster than for comparable groups of immigrants from other source countries. This, plus the fact that the states that provide Spanish-languages services include many which have designated English the official language of the state and who have both high and low proportions of Spanish-speaking immigrants, provides evidence for the existence of relatively autonomous discourse about this issue.

Unaffected by ‘real’ costs of services, or designated official languages, the discourse of official status marking for English persists in contexts where it would not be predicted on the basis of either population numbers, electoral district voting patterns (Tatalovich 1995) or whether services are delivered in Spanish or not (Marshall 1986; Veltman 1998).

Americanisation

Bauman (1993) discusses how the nation-state, formed on symmetry between people and state, typically deals with strangers, who by their very existence, i.e. their difference, assist in defining the nation. First, strangers are identified as strangers. This insiders/outiders categorisation provokes ambivalent and fluctuating sentiments in the ‘native’ population. Bauman calls these feelings among natives towards strangers: “protephobia”. Second, the strangers are subdivided into two groups: those who are able to be absorbed (and who eventually are absorbed) and those who are not able to be absorbed (and are expelled, metaphorically or literally). The assimilated and the marginalised.

‘Protephobia’ provides the nation-state with a source of power in relation to others, the capacity to administer ‘social space’ and operate a discourse that can allocate authority to statements from ‘insiders’ about the nation while distancing those of ‘outsiders’. As a resource therefore in the management of
difference and otherness ‘protephobia’ is not eliminated once a particular group of foreigners is dealt with, rather the nation state ‘constantly replenishes its stocks’ of ‘protephobia’.

Protephobic categorisation is complex and long-standing in the US. The existence of movements that claim to represent ‘native’ interests implies that nativisation is both possible and desirable and that any movement that claims to “Americanise” also represents a claim to a secure sense of what it would mean to be “Americanised”.

Higham (1988) and McLymer (1982) document the pattern of these movements and their relationship with diversified population characteristics, and in McLymer’s case some of the educational policy effects. Presidents Reagan and Theodore Roosevelt at different times gave sanction to protephobic advocacy; to images, metaphors and ideologies that sustain its ‘on the ground’ manifestation. Presidential association with protephobic sentiment connects with Bennet’s (1995) study which shows recurring right wing politicisation of American cultural values, and with Fox’s (2001) analysis of the systematisation of political discourses within media frameworks of propaganda and persuasion.

Roosevelt’s famous admonition that America was not a ‘polyglot boarding house’ and his repudiation of Americans as ‘hyphenated’ people are valuable currency for the pro official English movement. These supply formulaic discourse additions, droplets of meaning with venerable sanction that capture deep ideas in prose chunks. Both metaphors validate the ‘assimilative tradition’ and suggest expulsion, or marginalisation for those not assimilating. Counterposed to the ‘liberal’ or tolerating tradition that multiculturalists advance, Roosevelt has supplied chunks of political discourse which are recirculated frequently in debate, often delivered by phonological patterns that ‘ring’ their claimed truth home. Reagan is a kind of spiritual continuation of Roosevelt’s on language assimilation ideology. He too has contributed discourse chunks that act as formulaic recalls of the Memory Resources of listeners (Fairclough 1989). During his Presidency Reagan declared that it is “…against American concepts” to preserve native languages in state schooling (Ricento 1998: 96).

For restrictionists a critical discourse task is to define an exclusive national interest. The many speeches of language restrictionists that constituted the source of the Q-sample (Chapter IV) are replete with instances of locating the issue of official English-bilingual education away from considerations of educational effectiveness, research evidence and specialist practitioner knowledge. The ‘exclusive national interest’ transcends questions and issues of social and population diversity, of sector-specific evidence, and of ways of knowing that are based on research. Research as a basis for generating knowledge about matters of critical national sentiment is unpopular because of its starting implication
that answers are unknown and may be discovered through scholarship. A foundational principle of the language restrictionist cause is that ultimately the issue turns on patriotism. Patriotism is a virtue and an obligation, not a science, a discipline or a scholarly endeavour. But patriotism is also a way to know, a kind of epistemology expressed by Senator Bob Dole in his campaigning for the presidency in 1996. Addressing the American Legion on September 4, 1995 (Item 19, Appendix One) Dole cast the issue as between two types of knowing: those who truly know America's nature as a land of opportunity and ‘cultural elites’ who despite their qualifications, reading and scholarship ‘fail to know’. This knowing of America's true nature is construed by Senator Dole as an act of insight (“...they know so much they have somehow missed the fact...”). This insight is not available to the 'cultural elites', the intellectuals (with their “long dissertations and endless studies”) but is available only as an act of faith and patriotism, for ‘ordinary people’. To have this interest is to love America. Perceiving this transcendent national interest is not a matter of study, reflection, science or scholarship, not for professionals to uncover evidence about, but a matter of prior commitment of the heart.

The Nativism Movement asserted itself against Jews, Catholicism and general foreignness during much of the 19th century. The Know Nothingism movement of the 1840s and 1850s attacked Germans on grounds of religion or politics mainly. In these and mirror image movements anti-Catholic feeling was directed against Italians as popist prejudice flourished in former colonies established in the name of religious freedom. The American Protective Association in its campaigns against immigrants progressively eroded the linguistic toleration that had typified some states’ responses to European immigration of an earlier era and ushered in the anti-bilingual actions of the early 20th century (Higham 1988; Baron 1990; Tatalovich 1995; Wiley 1998b; Crawford 2000).

The role of English as America’s language and as ‘American’ in a cultural sense (occasionally tending towards a deeper primordial association of language and nation) accompanies and even advances these wider developments of native-foreigner-immigrant relations. English was dubbed ‘the language of the country’ by Governor William D. Hoard of Wisconsin (Crawford 1995: 25) in an early designation of a long pattern of attempted characterisations of the relationship between English and American belonging.

Noah Webster’s Declaration of Linguistic Independence, Senator Frank Ryan’s Illinois moves to make American the State official language, bear a complex but immediate relationship with contemporary moves for English, both stressing kinds of national unity construed through linguistic means and bringing with them issues of what to do about difference, diversity and freedom. As immigration restrictionism began to gather steam, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts established the
Immigration Restriction League whose avowed aim was to institute a literacy test to be used as an immigration selection instrument. Language test criteria were powerful as an instrument of exclusionism in place of or supplementing national origins criteria. This negative use of language devices is not always recognised in lpp scholarship as an act of lpp. The first Federal language law in the United States of 1906 established an English language requirement for naturalisation.

The literacy test became law when Congress overrode President Woodrow Wilson’s veto of the Bill in 1917. Side by side with the imposition of such discriminatory measures in these decades in some places there were elaborate English-on-the-job support schemes for immigrants. But the tide was for explicit Americanisation and aggressive assimilationism. The use of language as a marker of loyalty to America was frequently invoked, and private finance and government effort energetically pursued an aggressive assimilationism in which loyalty came to be equated with English language use in public domains.

The effect of such moves in the 1920s was to enshrine an idea that pre-puberty learning of languages was undesirable. In language acquisition research a considerable degree of attention has been paid to the Critical Period Hypothesis whose more determinative variety holds that younger learners have an either psychologically predisposing, or even a neurologically determinative, pre-pubescent advantage for the acquisition of languages, after which period either or both of the ultimate proficiency attainment level or pronunciation authenticity is significantly weakened. It is probably safe to conclude that there is no serious evidence for a neurological (hemispheric lateralisation) exclusion of effective post-puberty language acquisition and only minor advantages of other kinds. It is a broadly held generalisation that attitude and motivation factors are better predictors of language acquisition success than either aptitude or neurological effect, though some effect from these sources is not to be discounted. Motivated by a sense that social cohesion, and political unity, were connected with diversity, and that precocious language acquisition seemed to imply a lasting or in-eradicable cultural, identity, attachment to the first language, the State of Nebraska and Meyer contested a very important litigation about the rights to second language mediated education. The judgment brought down in 1923 suggested that the state does have an interest in language education but that the Free Speech provisions of the Bill of Rights precluded the forced closure of German medium education. The motivating sense of the case was that early childhood is a crucial identity formation period (Macias 2000). The case also revealed how English was seen as having a distinctive World View. The implications of Meyer v Nebraska have reverberated through language policy discussion ever since.

**Emulating Old Nations**
The first official language measure in Congress was the 1923 failed proposal by Washington J. McCormick to make ‘American’ the official language of the United States. McCormick wanted to free
American thought in a ‘mental emancipation’ to accompany the political emancipation of 1776 (McCormick 1923/1992:41). In the same year Illinois state Senator Frank Ryan succeeded where McCormick had failed. Senator Ryan’s proposal to have ‘American’ declared the official language of Illinois, expressed with “virulently anti-British” sentiment (Baron 1987/1992:39) remained state law until 1969 when the official state language was changed to ‘English’. The new nation was a Republic elevating the idea of individual liberty but struggling with the England legacy.

For patriots everywhere language is more than neutral form, more than a content-free social technology for devising and transmitting messages. It has cultural and political content. Opponents of official English claim a right to be Americans in languages other than English, bilingually, in a program they call English-plus. English is acknowledged as the common tongue, but denied official standing. The First Amendment is advocated as a guarantee to the public use of other languages because language for them is more than a conduit of content. Nevertheless speech guarantees and language usage are not linearly related: “The right to free speech does not tell us what an appropriate language policy is” (Kymlicka 1995: 18).

The move to officialise English in the Federal jurisdiction commenced in 1981 with a constitutional amendment proposed by California Senator S.I. Hayakawa. Hayakawa later founded US English in conjunction with John Tanton, a controversial figure whose statements on Hispanics and their role in national culture has provided one of the watershed points in the politics of official English and a rich mine of meanings for its opponents.

Hayakawa’s manifesto begins anecdotally “…the story of one immigrant” (1985:5), and, via a surname roll-call, lists the ethnic diversity of his Congressional colleagues. His case for officialising English rests on assuring national unity in the face of perceived threats. The solution is an official language and a reinvigorated attachment to the melting pot ideology, the assimilative instrument of the American immigration experience.

What is it that has made a society out of the hodge-podge of nationalities, races and colors represented in the immigrant hordes that people our nation? It is language, of course (Hayakawa 1985: 6).

To Hayakawa a common language is for dissolving ‘distrust and fear’. But language in this instrumental role is insufficient. Crucially accompanying the common language is the melting pot which Hayakawa argued creates a “…new kind of human being” (p 7) but this new human is threatened by a vision that wishes to retain old human attachments of ethnicity, as expressed in the ‘salad bowl’
ideology which some Americans propose as a counter to the melting pot. Hayakawa names ‘Hispanic activists’ as the main culprits and particularly their advocacy of bilingualism. In the salad bowl metaphor the different ingredients of American society share geo-political space, even common nationalism, but retain distinctive identities. In salad bowls there is no melting.

For Hayakawa American language planning is concerned with the imagination. How Americans, palpably different in every conceivable way, imagine their collective existence. Often debates about bilingual education and official English hardly resemble debates about language issues at all. Finding that income criteria govern access to the claimed language rights conceded to minority groups Sonntag argues that these are not language entitlements so much as anti-poverty measures “...ameliorating the circumstances of the uneducated poor” and the moves to make English the official language are “...part of an attempt to replace the old liberal, New Deal/Great Society agenda with the right-wing, Reaganite Republican agenda” (Sonntag 1995:99).

Language planning approaches which treat political discourse as a separate domain would therefore misconstrue bilingual education-official English disputes as issues understood only within lpp parameters, interpreting these disputes as mainly about alternatives in planning language outcomes.

Six states had passed official English declarations before California’s Proposition 63 in November 1986. Nebraska’s dates from 1920. Some States and jurisdictions have adopted bilingual statements: Hawaii in 1978 designated English and Hawaiian official. New Mexico became the first of several States or jurisdictions to adopt ‘English-plus’. But ‘Prop 63’ was critical in the modern revival of official English. Voting three to one, in one of the most populous states and the one with the highest number of immigrants, California’s voters adopted an initiative to instruct public officials to ensure that “...the role of English as the common language of the State of California is preserved and enhanced” (Crawford 2000: 43).

More extreme was the November 4 1980 Dade County Florida citizen initiative Ordinance 80-128 (which repealed a decade old ‘bilingual and bicultural’ measure). The Ordinance forbade the use of County funds “...for utilizing any language other than English, or promoting any culture other than that of the United States...” (Donahue 1995:125). Although it was significantly revised and made less restrictive in 1984 its success stimulated other jurisdictions to consider similar legislation In the same year that the Education for Economic Security Act become law — an act authorising Federal funding for the improvement of foreign language education—the 1988 Bilingual Education reauthorisation increased to 25% the Title VII funds that could be used for non-native language instruction. This
pattern of association of education expenditures via defence or national security sources and the characterisation of bilingual education as a (highly contested) kind of social engineering for minorities is longstanding and repeated. Hayakawa’s initiative had inaugurated a national struggle for and against English’s officialisation, called English-only by critics, pro-English by supporters (Combs 1992).

Many successful enactments were won but there have been setbacks. District Judge Paul Rosenblatt’s February 6 1990 striking down Arizona’s official English amendment on the grounds of unconstitutionality was the most significant. The law required that state officers and employees “act in English and in no other language” (Donahue 1995: 124; Combs 1999) a requirement considered by the judge to violate First Amendment free speech guarantees (Draper and Jiminez 1990/2:93, also Miner 1998).

Global Era
Historically the idea evolved that English speaking peoples have a laissez faire attitude to language; a practical mercantile view that does not elevate language to ideological status. Unlike France where Cardinal de Richelieu marshalled French literary culture to establish linguistic order in a time of turmoil (Cooper 1989:6) and unlike Sweden where a ‘total societal attitude’ (Dahlstedt 1976) accepts authoritative intervention in language, it is often stated that British-derived attitudes reflect concern about the illiberal nature of language planning (Ferguson 1979/96) and in America’s case anti-monarchical Republicanism (Heath 1976a).

In these representations English speaking nations are the unmarked centre from which language planning activity is judged; ‘settled’ states with a secure, dominant, standardised language, literate populations at a time of instrumentally motivated global linguistic domination for English.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, however, many British commentators viewed the French academy model as a solution to what must have seemed linguistic mayhem: English spellings were widely variant and new words were encountered very frequently due to colonial exploration and scientific advances. Daniel Defoe, and after him Jonathon Swift (who wanted to ‘fix’ English and remove uncontrolled change) argued for an English language academy which would police the language, through the excellence and reputation of its literary production, and through more conventional means such as issuing spelling reforms, influencing punctuation, and controlling terminological development (Peters 1992). For Defoe there was a metaphorical relationship between monetary and linguistic currency; he imagined criminality attaching to linguistic trespass as much as it might to monetary counterfeiting. Also influential was the Enlightenment idea of preserving in some
place the exemplar of the absolute (the perfect time keeping clock, precise measures of length, weight and volume); pure standards against which all change could be calibrated and all deviation measured.

But prevailing views were against ‘embalming’ English, forcefully put by Samuel Johnson whose 1755 dictionary served, as he saw it, to stem the ‘degeneration’ of English through dictionary stabilisation, and in America Noah Webster’s dictionary of 1827. Both gave expression to a democratic ethos and impelled against ruling on language (Peters 1992). The next significant language regulating effort was William Cardell’s 1820 attempt to found an Academy in New York. His short-lived *American Academy of Language and Belle Lettres* had an explicit Americanising aim. In the 1960s commercial interests successfully developed lexicography in America. Webster’s *International* in 1961 (considered liberal for its extensive usage of colloquialisms) paved the way for a conservative reaction in the form of 1971 and 1981 editions of the *American Heritage Dictionary*.

The failure to establish an authoritative language academy is often interpreted as reflecting a liberal, free market, linguistic preference, ‘deep values’ (Ricento 1998) bolstered by the involvement of commercial interests in dictionary production (Heath 1976a; Ferguson 1979/96).

On closer scrutiny this liberalism turns out to be contingent on which social relationships are salient. When the contrasts are class ones (such as in British debate about dialects) measures that look like Academy rulings are favoured. Excluding the possibility of deliberate language engineering does not preclude consciousness of the emblematic function English. The Newbolt Report of 1921, for example, spoke of ‘..a feeling for our own native language...’ and saw this as a unifying element among the different social classes of British society (Stubbs 1986; Lo Bianco 2001).

The salient contrasts within English, the ‘diversities’ it now deals with, traditionally imagined to include only social varieties and regional dialects, is vastly greater than at any previous time. Indeed, as *Lingua Mundi* English is rapidly adding new ‘ethnic’ and national varieties; hybrids from its remarkable global expansion. These national and ‘ethnic’ varieties are intergenerationally stable expansions of the ‘older native’ Englishes (American, Australian etc) and carry new and local attachments beyond the instrumental and communicative advantages ‘international’ English offers. These ‘new native’ Englishes add an expanding circle of English users to the inner-circle of English (Kachru 1986, 1992b).

Much language planning in the world is now in the wake of the spread of languages of wider communication and the cultural and political consequences of these, especially of English (Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 1991). The recently intensified pluricentricity of English via the evolution of its stable
‘new-native’ varieties and the designation ‘world Englishes’ (Kachru 1986, 1992b) along with the growing ethnic and linguistic diversity within the ‘older-native’ English speaking nations have forced a change in any historical reluctance to plan language. Like in other English speaking nations that have a tradition of non-involvement in language matters (Britain, Australia, New Zealand), in the United States language and literacy policies are now vibrant sites of cultural expression and contest.

Language Ideology
There is an apparent conflict between the minority-language affirming ethos and provisions of the NALA and the restrictionism of Congressional to declare English official. NALA also has the effect of destabilising taxonomic classifications of ‘phases’ in American language policy, or policy orientations (Ruiz 1984). NALA is the most explicit language declaration in Congressional: "It is the policy of the United States to preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans... to use, practice and develop Native American languages”

How can these contradictions be reconciled or explained? One way is to make recourse to an underlying ideology or culture of language. Ricento (1998) devises a set of ‘deep values’ which interact with ‘important historical developments’ and ‘national problems’:
The notion that Americans have a common national experience, which has created particular values understood to be essential ‘American’ values. The Federalist papers are cited along with the overriding remark that: “being American means speaking English”.

The notion that the unity and cultural integrity of the United States cannot abide cultural, including linguistic, pluralism. Theodore Roosevelt’s message to the American Defense Society in 1919: ‘We have room for but one language here’ is seen as emblematic of this notion.

The notion that the Federal government should not intrude into matters of language or culture directly because these matters are best left to the family and communities. Ricento comments that in fact the Federal government does intrude into matters of language but that this ideological position still holds.

The notion that ethno-linguistic groups merit no special protections that might ensure their continued existence as groups (Ricento 1998: 89-90).

Several commentators seek to devise similar characterisations of an underlying, or overarching, ideology of language, or a language culture, to connect the substratum of attitudes, ideologies and values (the realm of convention) with actual policy practices (Lo Bianco 1999). Whatever ideology is constructed it must ‘handle’ contradictory evidence, at least at the surface level (see Christian 1999 for current Federal legislation on language). A pattern is attempted below in which a search for common elements that might reflect the “fragment political culture” (Hartz 1964) of Europeanised new world English speaking nations would share (i.e. the residues of British-derived language attitudes, and, of course, attitudes to English and specifically British English, and non-standard non-British national varieties) as well as even deeper civilisational Western legacies in relation to language.

At a broad level a common pattern of toleration of certain kinds of minority languages, and public concession for language rights, does co-occur in England, Australia and the United States while English has become the focus of significant governmental and institutional advocacy in all these countries (Lo Bianco 1999; 2000a; 2000b). The abstractions in the following figure attempt to incorporate the multi-directional ecology of language and dialect relations in English dominant settings with specific reference to the United States.

The discursive framework for such accommodations is subtle but suggestive. Bilingualism in foreign languages constitutes a skill (Zelasko 1991). But minority language maintenance suggests a rivalry for the sentiment of speakers, proficiency and early learning can invoke concern about foreign allegiance, proficiency superior to English or public use of the language is associated with demand for social and institutional support (Lo Bianco 2001).
HERITAGE IDEOLOGY

Public institutions accommodate to unthreatening languages & speech forms with place-territory association or to threatening ones when appropriation is more effective. Languages that have a ‘home identity’ in territory, or associations with ‘the land’, can mobilize a discourse of locality, attachment and belonging to the nation. In New Zealand, Australia and the United States there has been toleration of or even appropriation of elements from ‘native’ languages for wider national identity functions. The contrast with Quebec points out that such accommodations to minority language usage are much easier when the minority language either has weak or non-existent statehood claims, or conversely, when it is believed that such claims are strong but can, by Federalism and national policy, be contained within a united polity. More typically though, weak symbolic accommodations are offered to minority languages. ‘Mainstream’ communities may even adopt ritualised (non-communicative) touristic, or cliched use of the language. (The NALA was able to utilise a ‘heritage discourse’ (preserving what is left of the past) where immigrants have a price to pay for being admitted to the nation (Kloss 1971). These accommodations typically occur when these languages are not communicatively vibrant or are struggling for their very survival as their traditional spoken domains are ceding to a replacing language. The most common accommodation to minority speech forms comes from viewing as quaint various geographically defined but non-threatening dialects. The degree of the level of accommodation is inversely related to the perceived ethno-linguistic vitality (institutional and discursive power of the language community); the degree of hostility in relations between the mainstream linguistic community and the accommodated minority. Heritage ideology deals with place associations.

SKILLS DISCOURSE

Leads to acquisition planning in public institutions of the languages of non-proximate communities (distant others) when these can be construed as foreign languages of social and cultural esteem and prestige or languages of “economically significant others”. Prestige languages are promoted in the context either of regional economic incorporation or geo-political, strategic or economic interests. At the same time as such foreign language policies are enacted there is lukewarm or hostile reaction to extending such policy recognition to immigrant minority languages. It seems likely that the learners of the former category of languages are presumed to be unlikely to gain cultural attachment to the target language, at least not to the extent that it might challenge their dominant English. Foreign languages are perceived to be sufficiently divorced from cultural attachments and don’t require the domestic institutional support that immigrant or indigenous minority languages demand. A discourse of intellectual or economically useful bilingualism is marshalled in their cause. In 1979, the President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies described US foreign language study as “nothing short of scandalous” (Perkins 1979: 5) but it is inconceivable that minority language attrition would be described this way. Skills discourse deals with overcoming identified mainstream capability shortfalls.

AMBIVALENCE TOWARDS ENGLISHES

Mainstream attitudes towards various English varieties and dialects are influenced by their relation to prestige British standards depending on salience, regional dialects are appropriated as quaint and ‘characteristically local’ while social dialects and ‘racialised’ Englishes are typically denigrated. Ambivalent, even contradictory, attitudes persist towards British English. As national English varieties naturally occupy all spoken domains, British standard forms attract ambivalent evaluation: simultaneously a separate variety and the authoritative original (Nunberg 1992; Leith 1997; Knowles 1997; Honey 1997). Laissez faire principles govern the evolution of international English use except in restricted discourse domains, e.g. air traffic control, sea speak (Strevens and Weeks 1985). Non prestige social or racialised Englishes are denigrated (Collins 1999; Baugh 2000). During the Ebonics controversy from December 1996 into mid 1997 Congress expressed its ‘sense’ that Ebonics was not a language. Similar repudiation of indigenous Australian Englishes and variationist linguistics in English public schooling prevail (Marenbon 1987).
MARGINALISATION

Lacking associations of place[^5] and not being able to recruit associations of prestige, distance or foreignness makes immigrant languages vulnerable; having vitality & territory claims marginalises strong indigenous languages & languages of challenging proximal states.

The languages rendered most vulnerable in the kinds of policy accommodation referred to above are strong immigrant languages, territory-based indigenous languages that have vitality, and proximate languages that are associated with political issues as immigration or minority languages, or which coincide with local immigrant languages, or territory-based native languages with active domains of use. For these languages the attachment to culture is too vibrant, the speakers too numerous or too close, the supports required to retain intergenerational use of the language are institutional and therefore are perceived to challenge mainstream ones.

Nunberg (1992) has argued that in American linguistic culture there is a kind of folk-Whorfianism; the Meyer v Nebraska decision of the Supreme Court in 1923 (Macias 2000) indicating a view that key meanings in American political life and ideals (truth, justice and freedom) defy full comprehension in languages other than English, that American linguistic culture has at its root a mythological attachment to English as the language of its political genius.

Spanish Hemisphere

The proximity of 22 countries that speak Spanish, the inextricable foreign policy and geo-political connection with the region, the evolution of supra national economic and political entities (the North American Free Trade Association; the Organisation of American States) enmeshes the United States in a Spanish language inevitability and an “ordeal of hegemony” (Poitras 1990).

The ‘ordeal’ consists of an inevitable relationship of asymmetrical power, the attraction of the US economy, the power and extent of US foreign interest, the intertwined social, cultural, economic and military relationship which for reasons of the hierarchically organised relative power carry within them hegemonical consequences, and all the resentments, dependencies and needs for independency that such relationships animate. In 1995 the Organisation of American States met at the Vizcaya Palace in Florida. In his concluding remarks President Clinton urged the delegates to move from words to deeds: Let’s turn the dichos into hechos he urged. Popular American culture is already infused with Spanish music, fast-talk and reference. Latino sensibility in art, song, dance and music is pervasive.

The inextricability of forms and practices of hybrid language in popular culture are far ahead of official considerations. As the state, and its states, move to restrict language diversity the US economy services it. Miami is the largest producer of Spanish language television and movie film and music and sustains a vast industry in this production. The economics and the culture of culture sustain a particular relevance for Spanish that no other ‘minority’ language in the United States can match. Servicing the large Spanish speaking communities in the United States, especially in large metropolitan centres like Miami,
New York, Houston and Los Angeles, has become a practical matter of daily commerce and interaction, sometimes with peoples who pre-existed their English speaking co-citizens as inhabitants.

Rubin (1985a) reports an examination of the provisions for planning for Spanish in the domains of health/medicine, law, work, communications, citizenship participation and representation, and social welfare and education against a standard language planning framework (a ‘rational matrix’). First she identifies problems (called ‘language inadequacies’), then she identifies the planners who are authorised to address the problems, and subsequently she identifies the plans and/or goals that have been set out and the implementation and feedback loops that have been put in place. What Rubin reveals is an “uncoordinated, unsystematic and highly variable approach” (p 47). There is no single system, no overall guidance; and, very importantly, nothing that constitutes language rights as such. Rather the place of Spanish in the domains of public life is part of a different ideology, that of removing barriers to public participation and access to citizen benefits, overcoming the mismatch between language of community and language of service delivery; not the granting of ‘language rights’ as such.

As a living language among Americans, with both community and institutional presence, Spanish is the object of corpus planning. This signifies that US Spanish is involved in meaning-potential expansion and, as Fishman (2000) has indicated, meaning-expansion and elaboration processes usually reflect language status agendas. When languages become operationalised in testing regimes they have attained institutional and administrative salience to such a degree that public certification of proficiency is enacted. The development of materials for testing Spanish needs to accommodate the different stable varieties of spoken Spanish in the United States (Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican Spanish varieties principally). According to Troike (1981) the differences are primarily lexical, which presents problems for translation of materials. Translation necessarily entails lexical and discourse selections and operating choice involves planning and prescriptive influence. Keller (1982) observes that the choice of classroom variety is sometimes very difficult with the extreme choice being between various “ethnic” or folk varieties and forms as against what the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese calls “world standard Spanish”. Keller’s investigation found eight Spanishes in bilingual programs.

The legal head for most of the public presence of Spanish in American institutional life resides in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination on the basis of national origin. This illustrates what Rubin calls the “need for recourse to many sources of authority for language-related problems” (p. 145). “Compliance” among service delivery agencies is reluctant and partial. As part of the ‘national policy style’, the American vocabulary of rights (Primus 1999), one of the dimensions of
‘adversarial legalism’ is that legal mandates as a form of policy require monitoring, evaluation and other measures consistent with a managerialist supervisory ethic, which in turn provoke concerns about intrusive statist politics.

Servicing the large Spanish speaking communities of the United States has given rise to forms of language planning which are specific or encased within service delivery realms or the private sector. Touchstone (1996a) documents how Southern California banking practices have engaged in an unplanned language planning with many problems of commitment and understanding and Touchstone, Kaplan and Hagstrom (1996b) investigate the lpp contained within Spanish-English home loan brochures. These kinds of practices are not guided by standard procedures nor coordination (nor is there is an overt lpp goal) but rather by the interest of commerce to service a defined market. The economy services multilingualism (non-English-mediated commerce) while the polity seeks to restrict it.

The instrumental communicative medium function of language is the primary source of multilingual service provision. Examining the overall legal perspective Teitelbaum and Hiller conclude that

…non-English speaking plaintiffs must premise their language discrimination claim on the preservation of established rights, and not naked demands for bilingualism (1977: 96).

Spanish is an American language in several senses of the term. It is a language of people who became American when America became their state though war, annexation and purchase; it is a language of people who became American by migration; and it is an American language of many more American states than America.

216 Years Later
In his 1780 defence of eloquence the American patriot John Adams urged the first Congress of the new Republic to bolster ”.... liberty, prosperity, and glory” by devoting “...an early attention to the subject of eloquence and language.” Nine years later Noah Webster’s Declaration of Linguistic Independence called for Americans to ‘adorn’ English and use it well but also for the separation of ‘American’ from ‘English’, believing it to be both “necessary and inevitable” (in Crawford 1992:32-36).

‘Adorning’ English is a powerfully suggestive kind of democratically motivated corpus planning. English was to be dressed up for serving a republic that had broken away, a ‘fragment culture’ (Hartz 1964) with ‘liberalism’ (Hartz 1955) as its separating ideology. 216 years after Adams’ call for “an early attention” to language, during the 104th Congress, on 1 August 1996, the House of Representatives adopted a ‘Language of Government Act’, The Bill Emerson English Language
Empowerment Act of 1996 (104-723) by 259 votes to 169 after fifteen years of failed attempts at floor action (see Chapter VI). The Bill, however, lapsed in the Senate due to the adjournment of the 104th Congress.

In debate opponents satirised the Bill as destroying the First Amendment. This association of official English with a restriction on freedom of speech is a crucial divide. Like John Adams, many early American patriots were in no doubt that America’s Republicanism and democracy would give birth to a more eloquent form of English, worthy of being called American, not tied to the ‘Order of the Garter’ (McCormick 1923/1992) and other British cultural mores, the affectations of monarchists and tired ‘old-world’ ways.

In language it matters a great deal what the entity language is taken to be: whether tools of communication, modes and vehicles of identity or instruments of solidarity; or indicators of essentialised difference. If languages are tools of communicative exchange then apart from considerations of efficiency they would be relatively exchangeable among each other and no process of nation-establishment would concern itself with language.

If, however, identity, difference and elemental or even primordial constructs of peoplehood reside in languages, as Herder argues, languages are never and not even minimally exchangeable. Indeed they are distinguishing of the constitutional entity itself. Part of the essentialised meaning will have to do with the elemental messages of the political community. If the key ideas of the American Republic are sense-related to language, in a Whorfian way, as key political meanings best, most perfectly or perhaps, even, only realisable in English, then the language and the nation have an inextricable, even mystical connection that cannot be ruptured, or compromised, without mortal effect on the nation.

Whether this raises (and if so, how inextricably) the idea of a transcendent American ‘ethnicity’ (Lind 1995) depends on its terminological constitution. For the language may still be rendered as connected to peoplehood, without ethnicity, as it seems John Adams and Noah Webster imagined. American would differ from English to the extent of its greater ‘democratical’ nature, underscoring the political, and not ethnic, community at the base of American constitutionalism. H.L Mencken’s exposition of this problem (American or English) notes with disdain the ‘cultural timorousness’ of a class of ‘social aspirants’ which looks to England for its linguistic esteem (Mencken 1936). Mencken observes, with no small amount of triumph, that it is American English that is most carried “beyond its national borders” even making landfall in Australia and among the ‘crude dialects of Oceanica.’ Mencken’s hope was not for an Academy, but for a Chaucer or a Dante who would venture forth into the mire of
ordinary discourse and provide ‘dignity’. Dignity planning is therefore a kind of prestige attachment, a distinctive language planning, that poets and writers conduct on behalf of a code that is struggling for elevation of esteem, in Dante’s case relatively self-consciously and deliberately.

Noah Webster’s more conventional lpp (issuing reading programs and dictionaries) aimed to bring about John Adams’ ‘more democratical’ English, freed of class based dialect stratification, sycophancy and divisions of privilege. This was ideology of democratic cultural capital (Bourdieu 1991). Micro planning such as phoneticising spelling would allow persons ‘of all social ranks’ access to a common public language, common in its meaning potential and its ability to furnish and sustain the democratic and classless imagery of early national-late colonial idealism. Webster seemed to believe that community harmony and political participationism were dependent on precise and accurate use of a uniform language, uniform in being the same tongue and uniform in the universal mastery of its meaning potential (Jacoby 1995). Webster’s project was (like Adams’) language reform in the interests of both democracy and nationalism.

However, unlike Adams’ petition for the creation of ‘...a society...for refining, improving, and ascertaining the English language’ the House of Representatives of the 104th Congress passed legislation aimed at protecting it and allocating it a juridical exclusivity for a role it occupies by convention, but utterly. John Adams’ concern was for eloquence within the code: a generation of officialisers have been concerned with a protection measure for the code. By early 1996 22 states had passed legislation similarly declaring, in stronger or weaker form, the status of English. By the end of the 1990s the moves for official English had gone from ‘Boom to Bust’ (Crawford 2000) but the moves hostile to bilingual education and bilingual provisions in general had grown in power and prominence.

The 104th Congress therefore supplies a rich opportunity for studying the discursive ideology of language officialisation. Data collected to that end make up the bulk of the content of Chapters IV, V and VI.

**Changing the Past**
The past is brought into the present. It is ennobled as ‘history’ and pressed into the service of the present. In the texts that have iconic value for proponents and opponents of official English the past is called differently, named and constituted in divergent but always interested ways. In this respect the declaration of a ‘tradition’ is a representative-declarative locution seeking to effect sanction, validating from past practice present policy. The past is not silenced (Trouillot 1995) but made to speak partisanly.
Pluralists constitute the past as legitimising a pluralist or laissez faire modern language policy, language restrictionists constitute the American constitutional and Congressional past as authorising restrictionism. Those positing a tradition of liberalism constitute the disjunctures as lapses from an otherwise wise and worldly initial national disposition (by turns utilising rhetorics of liberalism, conservatism and progressivism) and attempt to infer underlying national dispositions that frame national positions now as favourable to a continuation of an essentially undisturbed underlying ethos. For the English-only lobby the past establishes a tradition of conservative pragmatism, of efficiency and national cohesion validated in language commonness. For each the past is a prologue and policy discourses derives substantial impetus from its recruitment to serve what are, after all, unique circumstances only in the most general and imprecise way inferable from the past.

The plastic past can yield a tolerant tradition (European languages) or a repressive one (black English literacy, African and Native languages). Ruiz (1990) comments that official English “disrupt(s) a 200 year history of relatively successful linguistic tolerance” (p 24); which for Crawford (1992) constitutes a ‘forgotten legacy’; whereas for official English the past gives warrant to present moves for legislation to curtail ‘multilingual governance’.

Civilisation & Culture Fragments
Even the deep and ancient past is involved. Eco (1994) discusses an ancient but continuing view that, since Babel, at the heart of language is entropy and loss. This has produced a two thousand year “Search for the Perfect Language”.

Lurking in Western civilisation’s ‘psyche’ he identifies a view that the ‘Original, True and Perfect Language’ was lost to many tongues and, within those tongues, ensued the erosion of precision, standards and loss of perfection through dialect proliferation. European language sensibilities, in the offspring polities of the New World, contain this civilisational suggestion of multilingualism and language variation as signifying God’s punishment for human arrogance. The idea of retrieving the lost unity of language from the confusion of Babel, and redeeming linguistic perfection, perfection of transcendent form and meaning, has given rise to recurring notions of degradation. Although Eco allows that similar ideas are common to all of humanity in the European strand the fear of the confusion of tongues and loss of perfection it represents has engendered a two thousand year search for a language (or language forms) postulated as mystically perfect, transcendent or mono-genetically original.

According to Eco the Western story begins with God’s act of speech, giving things their names and bringing them into being: God as Nomothete and Grand Ontologist. If such Godly linguistic perfection lies at the root of thought about creation, and if much of what followed was a search to recreate it,
language change (especially social dialects) and multilingualism have been continually marked as representing loss, compounding Babel’s imperfection, adding further deterioration. Underlying and foundational in Western linguistic culture is galloping deterioration and a resultant need to recover lost perfection.

To understand these fears, and the forlorn search, Eco advises that neither linguistics nor semiotics will help us, but that we must interrogate the ‘history of ideas’ (p 5). This substrate of belief and fear may motivate the perennial search to recover ‘declining standards’ as ‘declinist’ fears pervade American mainstream English views too (Ferguson 1979). As observed in the previous chapter ‘fears and ghosts’ play a part in English-only (Fishman 1988). Explaining official English requires recourse to wider fields of knowledge than simply to scholarly linguistics, sociology or political science.

Hartz’s (1955, 1964) suggestive ideas about New World polities being fragments of the political culture from which they split has a further resonance in ideas of liberal political culture and order. Writing in the context of the destructive English civil wars, during which time thinkers such as Bacon and Hobbes sought order (concluding often that it was elusive in language), the English philosopher John Locke wrote in his famous 1690 *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* that speech/language is ‘the great bond that holds society together’. This association of order with speech is a recurring one in social and political theory. European language academies exist to a considerable degree for related purposes and their example (and Lockean thought) motivated American concerns along similar lines. The Language Academies arose in an era before or during the colonial American period (Florence 1582, France 1634, Spain 1713) and undertook a common project of the cultivation of prestige norms of literary standards. The association with civilisation, and national culture, was always paramount (the *Accademia della Crusca* in Florence is devoted to sorting wheat from chaff (crusca)).

The most famous of the academies is the *Academie française*, founded by Cardinal de Richelieu, first Minister to Louis XIII and created in the midst of internal and external disorder for France: two rivalrous Hapsburg sovereigns, religious wars within France, an unruly nobility, agrarian revolt and a young, ill King. Richelieu and Louis battled against this disorder and, at least for Richelieu, language came to symbolise order and the common good to be elevated above selfish private interests. Language came to serve the interests of state policy, the control of writers and writing became a major project of the Academie. In the wider and slower context of the vernacularisation of Europe, replacing Latin with French, equipping French for literature, religion and state, and needing for it lexical additions and standardisation the Academie may even have influenced early American thinking, as it did English
thinking on order, standards, decadence and social policy (Cooper 1989). Thomas Jefferson’s francophile tendencies make this likely.

Consonant with Hartz’s notion of New World nations as fragments of a primary and formative political culture is an analysis by Heath (1976b) of how Castile and England bequeathed their distinctive practice of \( lpp \) making to Mexico/Peru (also Heath 1972) and to the United States respectively. What Heath calls the ‘colonial language status achievement’ in each case is an a local application of a constellation of language policy practices that are specific to the historical experience of the colonising, state-creating, power. It follows from this that some of what becomes Mexican/Peruvian \( lpp \), and some of what becomes American \( lpp \), can only be understood by reference back to the formative culture, even if that formative culture was itself rejected by the new polity as it asserted its distinctiveness.

(The) Great American Tradition (-s)
A ‘tradition’ serves to bolster discursive positions. For this reason traditions are made and re-made, the past exhibiting a plasticity that only the politics of the present could engender. In essence there are two major kinds of claim for tradition. Conservatives postulate a tradition of English while multiculturalists want to place at the centre a tradition of liberalism and toleration. However, the events and policies of history only sustain a liberal tradition at the cost of exclusion and silence, while contra conservatives there is sufficient liberal experience to unsettle the sense that that past warrants English-only. The discontinuities seem to make no pattern tenable, while the continuities in ideology seem to make patterns recur.

The most forceful claim for a liberal tradition granted to American language politics is from Kloss (1977). However, the already discussed cases of compulsory illiteracy imposed on African Americans and repression of Native American languages amply demonstrate the poverty of a \( lpp \) analysis grounded solely in applied linguistics/sociolinguistic analysis.

The claims for new kinds of English also underscore that George III’s language was not unifying for Americans, who despite being dominantly anglophone were fighting an external enemy of identical language and culture. Benjamin Franklin’s moderation of his initial hostility to Pennsylvania Germans and support of a higher education facility in German along with the continued translation of Congress documentation in German, count as evidence of a pragmatic use of minority languages in the colonial and early national periods.

The discontinuities in the language legislation history of Congress involves oscillation between a pluralising tendency and a restricting tendency. At the pluralist end there have been several legislative
extensions of Civil Rights principles to language minority groups as well as the promulgation of the 1990 Native American Languages Act. The language restriction tendency is evidenced by the repeated attempts to curtail the extension of rights and moves to officialise English, such as the August 1 1996 House of Representatives vote and the March 4 1998 defeat (by 238 to 182 votes) of an English-only amendment to the Puerto Rico Plebiscite Bill (H.R. 856). Although the founding liberalism of American political ‘fragment culture’ as described by Hartz (1955; 1964) appears to be conceded by all mainstream sides of American political life as the authoritative ideology, its specific application (and what founding liberalism would mean in any specific instance today) is often contested and the results of this contest are reminiscent of the language practices and of some of the values of the source or foundational culture of European linguistic nationalism.

According to Schiffman: "Language policy ... is not just a text, a sentence or two in the legal code, it is a belief system, a collection of ideas and decisions and attitudes about language" (1996: 59). The effect of this idea is that language policies must be "... ultimately grounded in linguistic culture" (i.e. the beliefs that a speech community has about language; especially its own (p5)). The present work seeks to go further and see language policy as practices and interactions of discourse, as performance in political rhetoric.

There is no single overarching tradition anymore than there is an overarching policy; rather a ‘panorama’ of multiple informal policies and shifting political fortunes for languages in specific historical contexts in which salience for language issues is highly variable (Christian 1999). Historical specificities make the attractiveness of synthetic summative statements a forlorn hope. Referring to the ‘foreign language profession’ Lambert (1992:1) feels that “... a substantial portion of the American foreign language community believes that foreign language planning is either an oxymoron or an odious heresy” while Foster (1982) and Marshall (1986), with their eyes towards a wider setting of community language communities, advocate explicit and comprehensive planning for languages to replace ‘covert’ and informal policy processes.

This locational problem for lpp is reflected in Kloss’ original work. After his detailed review in which he isolates language from its embeddedness in social policies he turns to see language policies as a subset of nationality laws and of the procedures for the admission of immigrants: “...the American nationality laws were extraordinarily varied and well developed.... the non-English ethnic groups....were Anglicized not because of nationality laws but in spite of nationality laws relatively favourable to them” (p283). The motivating force for this Anglicisation being the “absorbing power of the highly developed American society” (p 238) rather than coercive legislation.
Despite a concession of strong assimilationism among professionals (teachers, civil servants) usually manifested as ‘derision’ for those who ‘master English imperfectly’ Kloss proclaims an ‘American bilingual tradition’. He locates this in the ‘almost unlimited freedom’ for the retention and cultivation of non-English languages. His work only instances the private domain and self help efforts of communities but claims this “...liberal tradition has been almost uninterrupted since 1776, the one major exception being the rigorous clamping down on German during and immediately after World War I” (p. 284). For Kloss the bilingualism of ‘polities under the American flag’ is strongly supportive of this tradition, instancing Louisiana’s bilinguality from statehood until the Civil War and its formal legal encoding at various times; official bilingualism in New Mexico from its attainment of Territory status in 1852; Puerto Rico’s legally sanctioned bilingualism since 1900; and ‘continuing bilinguality’ in American Samoa. To reconcile incongruities Kloss derives two types of rule: toleration rules for immigrants and promotion rules in ruled territories.

The comprehensive toleration of the immigrant languages was in the best interests of America. More important than the quickest possible lingual assimilation of the immigrants is their spiritual and intellectual integration (Kloss 1998: 290)

This toleration is suspended when “[nationality law] intersects with racial law, as in the case of the treatment of immigrant Mexicans” (p. 292) and also in international law where the US joined other states in denying a right of language maintenance. These disjunctions produce domestic ‘tolerance’ but “reactionary, intolerant, and unjust nationality policy” in international forums (p 295-6).

For Kloss Spanish in the latter part of the twentieth century is similar to German until 1917 concluding: “…that the United States has done justice to this emancipatory movement, continuous since 1776, and is doing so now in a much more outspoken fashion constitutes a well-deserved claim to fame...an unassuming, but quite distinct, American Bilingual Tradition” (p 302).

An interesting variation on the conservative themes for language officialisation, and very different from Hayakawa’s sense of cultural fragmentation is the work of Michael Lind. Lind (1995) diverges from the standard conservative analysis and advocates official English in an original way. He sees discontinuity where ‘national myth’ wants a seamless tradition of unswerving adherence to a stable identity and ethos. Instead of either a single tradition, or a total absence of pattern Lind postulates three overarching cultural Republics within the body of United States political history. These transcend the colonial and national periods and lead Lind to take issue with fellow conservatives about the kind of ‘cultural risks’ that threaten America. In Lind’s analysis the trope of fragmentation also plays a central
role, as it does for Hayakawa and others; but it isn’t cultural ‘Balkanisation’ that concerns him but rigid and extreme stratification in the economic domain, which he calls ‘Brazilianisation’.

**Figure Eight: Lind’s American Cultural Republics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euro-America</td>
<td>The Civil War heralded a Euro-American cultural republic. Based on a northern urbanist culture. Lasted until the ‘Civil Rights revolution’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural America</td>
<td>A cultural base characterised by relativist claims to the national heritage, equalitarian logics of participation in the nation, affirmative action, and legalistically maintained equal rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lind deplores multicultural America. He claims that all states require ‘national cultures’ and that America’s is a shared one in which African Americans and Caucasians participate in a common ‘vernacular’. In Lind’s analysis a polity as an ‘imagined community’ is both impossible and undesirable. States require ‘actual communal practices’ of shared culture to function effectively. As far as ‘the tradition’ is concerned, for Lind this requires the officialisation of English not so much in legal and political terms but as a cultural statement of reinforcing the required cultural base for the American nation, which despite its pluralism of race, ethnicity and origins is both politically united and shares a common public culture.

In her detailed examination of the period Heath (1976a) concludes that the language policy of the early Republic was ‘to have no policy’ indicating either a confident sense of prevalence for English to those wishing to propose language laws today or a foundational augury of toleration to those wishing to oppose official English.

**Policy Domains**

This section discusses only three of the several domains of language policy that are contested by the official English movement; bilingual voting, bilingual education and the use of languages other than English in citizenship ceremonies. The principal focus of the thesis is the bilingual education-Official English contest but consideration of the other two domains is important. These domains highlight the struggle between English’s protectors who feel that they are engaged in a politics of reversing ‘official multilingualism’ and their opponents’ sense that official English is an aggressive attack on the social and civil rights of minorities. Citizenship swearing-in ceremonies turn out to be a very powerful symbolic marker for official English advocates. As the argument proceeds it becomes apparent that swearing in citizens in languages other than English is taken to be a deep violation, admitting to the very
Voting

This brief section discusses the origins and extent of the bilingual voting procedures. Although not as commonly cited as bilingual education, the use of bilingual election procedures is an enduring complaint of the advocates of official English. Some advocates take bilingual voting provisions very seriously indeed and construe these to mean that a key vehicle of participation in American political and social life has yielded to multilingual/multicultural policy making. Advocates of official English who attach democracy to the value systems in which English is located attach particular significance to voting procedures.

The authority for bilingual election procedures until recently derived only from section 4(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In this Act a ‘manifest injustice’ was corrected in which Spanish speaking Puerto Ricans (American citizens since 1917) were barred from voting because of the over-reach of a English literacy test not intended for them (Teitelbaum and Hiller 1977). To remove this injustice section 4(e) of the 1965 Act prohibited the application of New York’s literacy test to Puerto Ricans residing in that state. This situation prevailed until 1975.

Ruling out the use of English literacy tests which would have barred Puerto Ricans from exercising their right to vote did not still guarantee full entitlements under the Act, since registration and voting was conducted only in English, a foreign language to many of the intended beneficiaries of section 4(e). To redress this remaining inequity, a process of litigation commenced in 1973 based on charging that ‘English-only elections’ constituted the imposition of a condition on the right to vote of US citizens who were Spanish-monolingual Puerto Ricans.

The decisive case was the Puerto Rico Organisation for Political Action v. Kusper case in which the court determined that ‘the right to vote’ means the right to an ‘effective’ vote. In effect the court determined that a US citizen who has the right to vote and who is a Spanish monolingual could not cast an effective vote when the election materials on which he or she was to exercise an ‘effective’ vote were incomprehensible to that person (Teitelbaum and Hiller 1977).

This case led to widespread changes. The legal basis for what came to be ‘bilingual election provisions’ as contained in section 203 of Title II and section 301 of Title III of the 1975 Voting Rights Amendments derives from this and related cases. The Voting Rights Act of 1975 specifies that a jurisdiction is in violation of the Act if the Attorney General determines that any materials (including ballot material and
registration procedures) made available to voters are in English-only and when 5 per cent of the population of voting age within a state or political subdivision is from a single language group and the rate of illiteracy of that language group is greater than the national average of voting-age citizens.

Commenting on the 1975 Act and its evolution Rubin (1985a) notes an interesting disparity between the focus of the legal action (the inability of speakers to vote because of a lack of knowledge of English) and the provisions of the law which resulted largely from these court cases. The law rests on the figures for numbers of people belonging to a minority group rather than upon their English language proficiency.

By the 104th Congress (as the interview data in Chapter VI show) the Voting Rights provisions and especially bilingual ballots (simple directions on ballot papers about how to cast a valid vote) had become a continuous point of reference for the English officialisation movement. These provisions remain a strong source of dissent and help to animate claims that official English is rolling back ‘officialised multilingualism’ (Piatt 1990; Chavez 1991) rather than its being a ‘new policy’ movement.

The extension of bilingual ballots to all non-English speaking US citizens from the particular kind of US citizenship granted to Puerto Ricans raises the important question of whether these extensions actually constitute language rights. The evolution of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 from principles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is another instance. In both of these cases the exercise of public entitlements, i.e., facilitating substantive rights of citizenship by removing language barriers (in the first case access to voting, in the second access to education) connect with a wider issue of language rights as such. A further example would be the Court Interpreters Act of 1978 which aims to ensure access to justice.

It seems unlikely that these three provisions actually constitute a recognition of language rights as such, or that they lead inexorably to language rights. Rather the text of the laws and the various phases of their re-authorisation seem to make it clear that they constitute facilitation of generic rights of citizenship as guaranteed in the Constitution and Bill of Rights (directly or by implication) or via judicial interpretation of these. The prevailing interpretation of the First Amendment, for example, is that it is concerned with the content of discourse rather than the language form in which things may be said. Nevertheless as we have seen official English laws have been struck down for violating First Amendment free speech guarantees. In general, however, it is likely that the courts would interpret citizenship entitlements as participation and due process rights (Janoski 1998) whose exercise may from time to time be seen to be inhibited by language.
**Educating in English Plus One**

The most contentious issue in the moves to make English official, the issue most commonly featured in the spoken and written texts over the period since the modern manifestation of the movement in 1981, is bilingual education.

In the US context there are recurring debates about the Federal role in education and more fundamentally about the relations of education and state which can be traced to tensions between Jeffersonian enlightenment ideals about individuals and learning, Christian foundationalist thought about the moral and wider personal and pastoral responsibility of education, and technical schools of thought that stress education’s interface with the economy, particularly the labour market, and the international competitiveness of the American economy. During the 104th Congress the attractor of these debates was the Goals 2000 proposal (Goals 2000: Educate America Act {PL 103-227}, March 1994) issued by the Clinton Administration.

Goals 2000 specified under section 3 Student Achievement and Citizenshipship that by the year 2000, among other demonstrated competencies, ‘all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including….foreign languages…’. Minority language students are cited in several sections in relation to the aspiration to increase their general educational attainments (though never in relation to their potential bilingualism) despite clauses such as: “the percentage of students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase” (v) and affirmative statements about the “diverse cultural heritage of this Nation and about the world community” (vi).

The debates and contests about the relative weight that Goals 2000 devoted to different fields and to different kinds of knowledge and traditions of knowledge, to skills versus knowledge and to the responsibilities and relationships among parents-students-schools and school districts-the state and states and Federal government etc, were all encountered in the discursive environment of debating the status of English, the role of non-English minority languages, the relation between minority and foreign languages and the overarching context of immigration and globalisation. In this way education becomes a site for struggle and contest about basic meanings of American life and future.

The demographic and geographic complexity of the American state is one important reason why educational practice is localised. Alongside the diversity and discontinuities American education contains identifiable and overarching values and norms which constitute a ‘vernacular’ America as
nation as well as America as polity (Lind 1995; McGroarty 1997). In this stream of thought there is a consistent and stable American identity and an overarching national continuity and commonality.

It is within such a broad context that the principal motivating power of bilingual education warrants consideration. The main sanctions for bilingual education are legal cases, the famous Lau v. Nichols of 1974 for Federal engagement in bilingual education, and, for the states, a crucial case was the Aspira of New York v. New York City Board of Education. In the most general sense these and other cases have managed only to have the legal system interpret American legal obligations as requiring that children of ‘limited English proficiency’ warrant special ‘language assistance’. The planners have been a whole range of advocacy organisations (for and against native language instruction) the plans are often deeply ambiguous and the planning extraordinarily varied. Debate of official English and for bilingual education at the national level rarely allows for the nuance and detail which is inevitable in a system, or system of systems, of remarkable diversity.

Bilingual education therefore has different meanings in the “...the eye--or rather the ideology--of the beholder” (Drake 1984: 142).

FIGURE NINE: MODELS OF LINGUISTIC EDUCATION FOR MINORITY LANGUAGE CHILDREN.

| Sink or Swim. | This is characterised by neglect of the distinctive language learning needs of children from language backgrounds other than English. At best these approaches are based on the idea that children will ‘pick up’ osmotically the English required for academic work. Sometimes because basic conversational English is mastered first and with less difficulty than the learning of academic and cognitively demanding (de-contextualised) English children are mis-diagnosed as having attained the English proficiency they need and are only provided initial teaching in the language. All too often no such ‘thinking’ is involved and children are left to flounder. |
| English as a second language. | ESL methodologies vary considerably along two extreme points of a continuum. At one extreme there is full withdrawal from regular classroom activities for intensive instruction focussed on the language forms of English. At the other extreme there is full immersion in classrooms but with carefully implemented ‘language across the curriculum’ attention to their growing English language needs. In this way all teachers attend to the growing English discourse of the learner, with a careful attention paid to the language demands of the particular subject matter being taught. Some kinds of ESL in the United States are called ‘structured immersion’ which aims to ensure that children receive ESL-informed educational intervention but without withdrawal from regular classroom education. |
| Transitional bilingualism. | This involves using the first language of the learner, but only for a strictly defined time and purpose of allowing the learner to continue his or her conceptual development in the mother tongue until they have acquired sufficient English to transfer to full learning in English. The ‘bilingualism’ is a strictly transitional affair. The L1 is a ‘stepping stone’ to overcome a learning deficit. The curriculum is firmly focussed on English learning and usually culminates in monolingualism. |
| Mono-literate bilingualism. | This approach involves the use of both of the languages, English and the mother tongue, but literacy is only imparted in the societally dominant language, English. |
| Partial biliterate bilingualism. | In this approach both languages are used for all four ‘macro-skills’ of language (reading, writing, speaking and listening) but the academic subjects are divided so that the mother tongue is...
Total biliterate bilingualism. This kind of program and approach aims to develop a literate capability in both languages for learners who have a language background other than English in English language dominant settings. All areas of the curriculum and all domains of language are developed in both languages (Hampers and Blanc 1989; Lo Bianco and Freebody 1997/2001). Two-way total biliterate bilingualism would involve learners from different language backgrounds learning each others language in a total biliterate program.

The Federal mandate for bilingual education emerges from a complex series of class-action litigation in many parts of the United States basing claims of Civil Rights or other authority heads as well as Congressional efforts. It arose initially from the concern of politicians representing areas of high concentration of Mexican American children about the poor educational retention and success rates of Spanish speaking children. The 1960 census was important in stimulating this interest. It showed dramatically unequal outcomes from education for children with Spanish last names in south western states who completed many fewer years of schooling compared to both non-whites and also compared to ‘Anglo’ students in particular. In response to these figures in October 1966 the National Education Association sponsored a conference in Tucson Arizona entitled The Spanish Speaking Child in Schools in the Southwest which stimulated a consideration of the specificity of the area and its Spanish-speaking inhabitants and their educational performance in mainstream American education.

The measures taken to respond to the need highlighted in the mid 1960s have animated three and a half decades of political controversy about the social and symbolic consequences of an educational initiative. This initiative took the administrative form of the Bilingual Education Act, whose turbulent and complex history is described in what follows. It should be stressed that this measure was intended to redress group-segmented educational outcomes. The beginning point was January 17 1967. On that day Texas Democrat Senator Ralph Yarborough proposed that Federal assistance be provided to local educational authorities to assist Mexican-American and Puerto Rican children with their English language development. Critically Yarborough suggested that this assistance should incorporate use of Spanish, these children’s mother tongue, among the several modes of assistance that his Bill envisaged. Later changes modified the Bill to include all Spanish speaking children and subsequently French speaking children. Finally Congressman James Scheuer of New York rewrote the Bill to include all non-English speaking groups and defined the Federal role as supporting ‘demonstration materials, teacher training and materials development’. Committee procedures merged these various initiatives with Yarborough’s proposal and the result was the Bilingual Education Act of 1967 (Public Law 20-24).

The BEA took the form of the addition of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967 (signed into law on January 2 1968 by President Lyndon Baynes Johnson). Some intentions were
clear from the beginning. As the Bill’s passage through Congress and its hearings proceeded, Yarborough declared in the Senate on December 1 1967:

My purpose in doing this is not to keep any specific language alive. It is not the purpose of the Bill to create pockets of different languages throughout the country... not to stamp out the mother tongue, and not to try to make their mother tongue the dominant language, but just to try to make those children fully literate in English (Cong Rcd, p.34703).

The BEA was not funded until 1968 and some three and a half decades later it is still dogged by its initial anti-poverty orientation, its complex interweaving with ethnicity politics, nationalism, right and left wing attempts to theorise simple versus complex equality and ethos (Kloss 1998: 37).

Chavez (1991:12) excoriates the hearings that preceded the Bill’s adoption and shows purposive differences, and Schneider’s (1976) examination of what the various participants thought was being set up is important in revealing just how divergent were the understandings among them as to what was in fact being done. Later accretions of administrative, political and legal change made the entire enterprise so complex that among the first victims was any capacity for policy tractability via research. Later changes compounded initial differences of original understanding to such a degree that the present thesis argues what ensued was a classic instance of what Habermas has called ‘systematically corrupted discourse’ evident in the incommensurable meanings, connotations and messages of the discussions about BEA as a policy and political problem. Chapters IV, V and VI provide ample documentation of semantic gulf that has ensued and the dramatically important need for a policy conversation of a radically new order.

Anticipating what is to come in later chapters, suffice to say now that the BEA represents significant political, ideological and education points of principle. In one important respect the disputes about bilingual education go to the core of an idea in pluralist social policy that was still to make itself felt. This is the distinction between simple equality where all students learn the same things; compared to the multicultural ethos of complex equality which imposes an obligation on education systems to pursue active pluralism so that students go beyond the common store of knowledge (Walzer 1983). In effect this is an educational inflection of the French republican ideal of equality based on cultural sameness contrasted with the contemporary demand for equality within and across difference.

The Bill led to a significant growth of bilingual education initiatives in diverse languages and of diverse form across America. An important problem lurking with the legislation was the presumption that native language education involved segregation, a further question that would haunt the legislation and its effects. Title VII even within the ESEA was not the only source appropriating funds for bilingual
initiatives of various kinds (e.g. Title III of the ESEA addressing the needs of children from low income families provided funds that often supported bilingual education moves of some form or other). Alleviating Spanish-speaking children’s social disadvantage by bridging their access to English via temporary and transient use of the mother tongue was Yarborough’s unequivocal goal. At about the same time as these moves were being made civil rights advocacy was at its peak. In the wellspring of American ‘adversarial legalism’ (Kagan 1991) litigation against unequal treatment of minority language speakers drew on the principles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which banned discrimination on the basis of national origin (Piatt 1990; Baron 1990).

In 1970 the then Office of Civil Rights ordered school districts with enrolments of more than 5% of children of national origin minority background to provide appropriate educational opportunities for them which would overcome the disadvantage of their not knowing the language of the curriculum. Known as the Pottinger Memorandum this order (drawing its authority from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act which bans discrimination in Federally supported programs) required school districts to ‘…rectify…language deficiency’.

This is possibly the most critical formal involvement by the Federal government investing the entire scope of its involvement with a legalistic character and inheritance which has been significant for the discourse and ideology of American language planning ever since. School districts were not necessarily required to implement two-language education, nor specifically even to set up English teaching programs, but simply to establish some form of special provision for non-English speaking students to assist them to gain access to their school’s curriculum.

In 1974 the US Supreme Court ruled in the famous Lau v. Nichols case. The case was brought by a “poverty lawyer” (Crawford 1995:44) on behalf of some 1,789 Cantonese speaking children in the San Francisco area and was based on the previously established legal standard of “education on equal terms” from the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education. The Court upheld the Office of Civil Rights’ (OCR) interpretation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; supporting thereby the Pottinger Memorandum. It too did not mandate bilingual education, simply requiring some form of special language provision. In practice its finding was that ‘sink-or-swim’ violated the Civil Rights of non-English speaking children (Schneider 1976).

After an OCR investigation finding little compliance with the ruling the Federal government issued the ‘Lau remedies’ in August 1975. These specifically named bilingual education and ESL and specified instances when bilingual education was to be mandatory, though such bilingual education was to be
only of the transitional kind. The native language was to be used for a strictly limited period until the child’s English was sufficient to enable them to enter mainstream classes. The result of this and the accompanying active enforcement processes from Federal authorities was a proliferation of compensatory transitional bilingual education across America.

Also in 1974, during the re-authorisation processes of Title VII, the anti-poverty criterion was deleted, with the new Bill approving a bilingual pathway towards English proficiency but leaving unresolved whether the maintenance of the native language was an appropriate aim of the Bilingual Education Act. Bilingualism was intended to be a stepping stone to monolingualism (Fishman 1988). Political agitation for native language maintenance and enrichment (for developing an intellectualised and literate capacity in the first language) grew strongly but the bulk of funded programs remained steadfastly transitional. The 1974 reauthorisation proved to be only a limited reform rather than any radical reappraisal of the value of bilingualism.

Schneider’s analysis of the reauthorisation has shown that “...no one at any time” disputed the purpose of educational equalisation, pointing out that the ‘legitimacy’ of Federal support for bilingual education rested in part on its similarity to “..compensatory education for the economically disadvantaged” (1976:161).

Despite this ‘publicly authorised ethnicity’ was suspected. An early and influential critic was John Silber (1974). In his ‘Straight Shooting’ he drew a parallel between his personal transfer to standard English and his abandonment of ‘Texan’ (a process he describes as learning a ‘foreign’ language (p 11) and ‘the need’ for immigrants to abandon their home languages.

By 1977-78 began a new problem: facticity. For more than two decades disputation has been protracted and even bitter about what research evidence concludes for bilingual education. The first study of the effectiveness of bilingual education, conducted by the American Institutes for Research (Danoff, Coles, McLaughlin and Reynolds 1977-1978), concluded that there was no added advantage from short-term transitional programs over ‘sink-or-swim’ alternatives, and found furthermore that children were being retained in programs after the point they were assumed to be sufficiently proficient in English to learn in mainstream classrooms.

Since this study was issued the disputation about the effectiveness of transitional bilingual education compared with alternatives has been characterised by definitional contests, unresolved questions about appropriate goals and methods, methodological, pedagogical and measurement issues, disputed
consideration about the value to attribute to the maintenance of the first language, and disagreement about the worthwhileness of affective, social, familial, ethnic and self-esteem criteria (Baker and de Kanter 1981; Willig 1985; Chavez 1991; Ramirez, Yuen, Ramey and Pasta 1991; Cummins 1992 and 2000; Pedalino Porter 1995; Crawford 1995; Rossell and Baker 1996).

Discussing under what kinds of circumstances a disputed policy issue is ‘tractable’ (i.e. able to be treated within relatively dispassionate processes of policy analysis, with research evidence given attention), Weiss (1984) points out that every issue is part of a power configuration that contains elements of information, ideology and interests. These function to admit or exclude new information, such as research evidence. The utilisation of research knowledge depends on a particular configuration of these three i’s such that its ideologisation is balanced by claims to information or alternatively that the interests of the stakeholder groups are paralysed or relatively concealed so that informational inputs can prevail over distortions from ideological or interest-laden tendencies. The sometimes bitter contestation around bilingual education over this period of time, especially its high level of ideologisation, has relegated the question to a low policy tractability. The utilisation of research evidence within these debates has been particularly partisan (Krashen 1999b).

In public discourse by the late 1970s bilingual education came to be called ‘affirmative ethnicity’ (Epstein 1977) as the culture and language dimensions were separated intensifying mode; entrenching what was to prove to be an instance of ‘systematic corruption of discourse’ in the devastating Silber association of bilingual education with the cultural division of the American polity (Bernstein 1994) and subsequently with the cultural literacy politics and culture wars of the 1980s (Hirsch 1988). Early on a distinction between foreign language learning and language maintenance came to assume a powerful rhetorical presence separating an acceptable educational activity from one that came increasingly to assume a mantle of fostering ethnicity (Zelasko 1991).

Construed by opponents as advancing segregation for minorities, and therefore undermining the preferred ideology of either assimilation (Chavez 1991) and/or the ‘melting pot’ (Hayakawa 1985), bilingual education gained further negative baggage.

In its 1978 reauthorisation of Title VII Congress clarified the intention of the law as strictly transitional, the native language being permitted only to the ‘extent necessary’ to permit English proficiency to develop. It also permitted English speaking children to join bilingual programs so that non-English speakers could learn English from them too, but also to assuage public concern about segregation. But
these changes were insufficient to deflect the accretion of pejorative connotation that bilingual education had already come to attract.

President Jimmy Carter toughened the Lau remedies in August 1980 (calling them the Lau regulations) going so far as to actually mandate two-language teaching under certain enrolment conditions. There was a strong public rejection of Carter’s Lau regulations leading to their withdrawal. The Federal government role subsequently shrunk to operating compliance enforcement on provisions of the Civil Rights Act and Title VII funding, further stigmatising the Federal role as legalistic interference.

The association of bilingual education with wider and more negative cultural messages became deeper with the election of Ronald Reagan as President. He declared in a 1981 speech (Ricento 1998: 96) that it was “...against American concepts” to preserve native languages in state schooling. At precisely this time in Congress Senator Hayakawa from California described the 1978 Title VII changes as ‘official bilingualism’ and made a direct tie with a diminished place for English, calling for constitutional safeguards for English.

However, electoral calculations and political compromising softened the Reagan administration’s opposition to the 1984 reauthorisation of Title VII. Categories of permissible funding were added to the BEA: family English literacy, ‘special populations’. These had the effect of reducing the compensatory ethos of Title VII, but allowed up to 10% use of the funds for initiatives in which no native language was used at all.

The Office of Civil Rights retreated effectively to a new legal position requiring Federal intervention only when ‘discriminatory intent’ was in evidence, rather than the previous test of ‘discriminatory effect’, pointing out that experts were divided about pedagogy for minority language children. It considered that ‘localism’ should prevail unless ‘discriminatory intent’ was evident. The policing role of the OCR remained low under President George Bush, but whilst enforcement reviews increased under the Clinton Presidency there was no serious governmentally sanctioned attempt to investigate the issue of the most appropriate instruction for language minority children.

Such children are widely known as LEP (Limited English Proficient) defining and classifying these children not by any language competence they have but by the degree of English deficiency they exhibit, thereby making English monolingual capability the unmarked norm; the discursive habitus that biases communication towards what bilingual (potentially bilingual) children lack.
Other legislative influences such as the 1974 *Equal Educational Opportunities Act* (EEOA) have affected bilingual education’s status and reputation. The EEOA was used in a case (Castañeda v Pickard in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1981) to overrule a previous finding that overcoming ‘discriminatory intent’ was an essential pre-condition to mandate special language provisions, that educational neglect violated children’s civil rights, and that “good faith efforts” were an adequate substitute for appropriate intervention (Crawford 1995:44). With the Castañeda standard the court set out three criteria for programs for minority language children: that the intervention must be based on “sound educational theory”, that it requires “effective implementation” and that after a trial period it must be evaluated as effective in overcoming “language handicaps” (Crawford 1995 passim; 2001 passim).

For some, bilingual education is hardly ever about two-languages or even about education. Chavez calls it “the first salvo in Hispanics’ war to preserve their ethnic identity” (1991:10). Pedalino Porter (1995) considers it a self-serving, biased and politicised bureaucracy whose interests are tied to disguising its methodological failure. The main failure however has been that of the public authorities who have not steered Title VII from its compensatory, non-linguistically serious and anti-poverty orientation towards a program with wide relevance in an overarching language policy. The resultant vacuum was filled with intense litigation, pitting minority language parents against the growing power of a new organisation: *US English*.

The Office of Civil Rights issued the Lau Remedies whose purpose was to specify acceptable educational responses to the *Lau v. Nichols* judgment. The remedies specified that only bilingual education was acceptable unless the school system could prove that another ‘treatment’ was acceptable. The State of Alaska challenged these remedies on a technicality—that normal Federal procedure, requiring a hearing before regulations can be made law, had not been followed. It was further claimed that the OCR had issued new regulations which were more specific about the nature of the instruction, the certification of teachers, how students were to be admitted to such programs and how their transfer from them was to be determined and the nature of the testing adopted to facilitate the complex decision making system that the remedies gave rise to.

Public hearings were held and submissions received but the Secretary of Education rejected the resultant regulations in January 1981. In effect this meant that a Federal provision for bilingual education was cancelled. The resultant regulations provide for some forms of use of the two languages, support for teacher training, technical assistance and materials development. Some states have enacted bilingual
education laws. One of the most comprehensive was the California Law AB507 which took effect in September 1981 but was cancelled after the June 2 1998 approval of Proposition 227.

Research has a bitterly contested role in bilingual education debates (Krashen 1999a). And yet, carefully controlled and systematically defined examinations of bilingual education in many countries consistently finds evidence for an interdependence hypothesis (Cummins 2000), for positive educational and linguistic consequences of two-language teaching. Many of the BEA ‘bilingual’ education programs are simply not that. In her eight year ethnographic study of bilingual education practices in southwestern US Shannon (1999) has documented the effects on teachers in what pass for bilingual programs. In the absence of policy consistency (messages which contradict each other, continual modifications to what Federally funded bilingual education permits under the name of bilingual education). “…the absence of a language policy in bilingual education leads teachers to practice it on the basis of a dominant language ideology…” (Shannon 1999: 185).

The school district concerned serves 66,000 children, of whom 40% (24,000) have Spanish as the home language (the vast majority of Mexican origin) and has operated some kind of bilingual education for almost four decades. Shannon’s analysis highlights the extensive interplay between legal action, parent demands and participation, school policy, teacher practice and educational consequences.

It is a school district where court action has revealed that teachers are hired who have no Spanish proficiency, and where remediation moves following on from court action result in teachers still being hired who know no Spanish. The complex of ‘attitudes and behaviours’ examined leads to the observation that there is an “ideology of English monolingualism” which guides both teachers and the school district. (“Even the bilingual teacher hiring policy is based on an ideological position in which Spanish has little or no importance”) (Shannon 1999: 191). According to Shannon’s work Mexican-American ‘consumers’ of these programs have had continuing “negative experiences about the use of Spanish in bilingual education” (p. 193).

This observation is confirmed from the South-East as well as the South-West where language minority groups “typically have been perceived as people who pose language and cultural problems and difficulties for English-speaking monolinguals and for North American society” (Roca 1999: 298). In Shannon’s school district the overall result of decades of intractability of local practice in the face of legislated and judge-ordered change is that the Mexican-American community: “Within the prevailing ideology of the hegemony of English … are a silent and cooperative subordinate group” (p192). Perversely, the double standard operates even with the study of Spanish, where English speaking
children acquiring Spanish receive more praise than Spanish speaking learners’ attainments in English attract (Shannon 1999: 193). The power asymmetry between Spanish speakers and English speakers is found by researchers to permeate educational practice, even to bilingual education teachers’ ideological dependence on English monolingual norms for their daily practice of what is constituted as bilingual teaching.

Fishman’s compelling conclusion is that much of the vision of the Bilingual Education Act is, in effect, not bilingualism at all but an instrument of Anglification and a mechanism of ‘anti-bilingualism’ (1989:405) indeed “... a major effort to Anglify these last ‘unfortunates’” (Fishman 1981: 519). And yet, this same BEA constitutes the prime political justification for a politics of officialising English, based on claims that the BEA constitutes official Spanish, and official multilingualism.

Constituting the central policy and political problem as Spanish-status centred transported the question of the most effective educational means for the linguistic socialisation of immigrant children to the wider politics of cultural literacy, the celebrated culture wars of the 1980s and 1990s. The exemplary exponent of cultural literacy discourse was E.D. Hirsch whose position was that: “Linguistic pluralism enormously increases cultural fragmentation, civil antagonism, illiteracy, and economic-technological ineffectualness” (Hirsch 1988: 91). The breadth of the claim, the vast distance it tracks away from in-class educational issues of pedagogical effectiveness is an excellent indicator of the leakiness of language questions into debates about wider cultural, political and social cohesion. Bernstein’s (1994) work similarly expresses the connection between language education policy and the wider social compact, treating the idea that there might be Cherokee taught in public schools to incredulous ridicule (p 244) and seeing it as a kind of “act of rebellion against white, Anglo-cultural domination” with a “multicultural animus against European culture and its derivatives” (p245).

Foreign & Truly Foreign Languages.
The adjectival marking of language categories is an indicator of a lively distancing that proceeds in reaction to the successful discursive politics of attaching pejorative meaning to bilingual education, and to ‘community’ languages. Lambert (1992), Simon (1981/1992), a US Senator during the 104th Congress (who described the US as ‘linguistically malnourished’) and the 1979 President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies which described US foreign language study as “nothing short of scandalous” (Perkins 1979:5), among many others’ investigations into US foreign language capability, criticise American education for its ‘neglect’ of foreign languages. Among these writers there is a concerted effort to distinguish between ‘ethnic’ and ‘foreign’ language policy. This is expressed most overtly by Lambert: “Linguistic policy is hostage to ethnic politics. Foreign
language policy, in contrast...induce(s) or enable(s) citizens to master languages of other countries...trying to add to or sustain a national competency...” (1990:5).

The interview evidence reported in Chapter VI shows that this idea is very widely shared. Prominent official English advocates as if in symphonic harmony divide the ethnic from the foreign, mark the foreign national capability enhancement, skill, or creditable achievement. None extends such recognition to ethnic minority children’s bilingualism. Separating national needs of social cohesion from trade and geo-strategic external advantage is as problematical as it is strenuously pursued. Languages are not separate within the mental apparatus of learners any more than they are socially quarantined. Classrooms are not segregated; learners of ‘foreign’ languages often have a background in those languages or live in or near communities where those languages are spoken. Students of Japanese in California or Spanish in Florida have family-derived proficiency, knowledge or identity associations with the languages they study. Public policy experts attempting to deal with the ‘heat and fury’ of the bilingual education issue have recommended universal second language education as the solution (Wildavsky 1992: 310-311). Wildavsky’s assessment was that bilingualism is an ‘elemental conflict’ of American life, a ‘constant running sore’, but his solution of submerging bilingualism under universal second language education was widely dismissed as not dealing with the ‘real issues’ (Dicker 2000: 53).

Another instance of local-external connection in language policy is literacy policy for adults, which is often pursued for reasons of the ‘competitive stance of the United States in the world economy’ but in pedagogy must necessarily draw on first language literacy, the biliteracy, of workers who do not have English as their first spoken language (Spener 1994).

Despite the public education deficiencies identified by Simons, Lambert and Perkins in US foreign language capability, in fact the US has an outstanding record of foreign language planning, research and education from the end of the Second World War. At many levels of government foreign language requirements are attached to employment. “At least 33 Federal agencies have over 34, 000 positions which require foreign language proficiency” (Lay 1995:1). The designation of jobs as language-essential derives much of its discursive power and influence on public policy from appeals to geopolitical security and assessments that American strategic interests require strong investment in foreign language competence.

Extending this logic Walton (1992) has nominated a class of languages that he calls TFL’s (Truly Foreign Languages) whose presence in American education came via national defence planning; and
which he argues are of paramount importance to American military and strategic interests. Foreign language study of this kind is more readily absorbed into an economistic logic and a justificatory discourse of ‘the national interest’ than is the maintenance of minority languages spoken domestically (also Brecht and Walton 1993).\textsuperscript{29} The ideology of English monolingualism is the default mechanism however, a conclusion, though expressed in different ways, which many scholars have reached, as much for foreign language learning as for bilingual education for minorities (Lambert 1992; Roca 1999: 309).

This continuing pattern of appreciation of foreign language skills\textsuperscript{30} and ambivalence, even hostility, towards minority language maintenance constitutes a \textit{bilingual double standard} (Zelasko 1991).

\textbf{Swearing In Citizens}

In all bills for making English the official language of the US mention is made of the process whereby aliens become Americans. In the data contained in subsequent chapters it is revealed that this somewhat restricted domain of policy action is symbolically very powerful. This seems to be the case despite the fact that much of the ostensible reasoning for official English concerns the cost of multilingualism. Not only are citizenship swearing in ceremonies in which a judge or other official may use a language other than English to communicate information about duties and rights of citizenship not costly, they are also extremely rare. In fact the discourse of official English advocates makes much play of what the researcher’s enquiries were able to find as a single instance of the use of Spanish by a judge. There may be some connection between the deep cultural meaning of the swearing in ceremony and the use of languages other than English to effect the process.

Citizenship is possibly the only social role that is common to all adults in a society. As a consequence of increasing and world-wide multiculturalism citizenship is currently a field of intense scholarship among political scientists, legal scholars and sociologists. Population mobility is at unprecedentedly high levels affecting all parts of the globe and all social strata (Castles and Miller 1993) and this, combined with other world pluralising and rights-acknowledging movements, is making \textit{lpp} more prevalent across the world (Tucker 1994). With the emergence of multicultural polities everywhere ‘a fragile world’ (Dauenhauer 1996) makes substantive rather than merely formal (yes/no) notions of citizenship evolve. This is a more complex kind of citizenry; mobile and connected to diasporas as well as homelands. Trans-national economic integration and interdependence in all parts of the world and across the North American borders (US-Canada-Mexico) yields worker-mobility legalisation schemes that demand the recognition of rights across borders (Jacobson 1996) and either imply ‘the decline of citizenship’ in general or the emergence of ‘plural citizenships’ (Schuck 1998).
The ‘American community’ is often idealised as a political compact. Lind (1995) argues strenuously against the idea that there is no vernacular culture of America (against claims that there is no American identity that transcends those of the various ethnicities that comprise American society). He argues that a vernacular identity is clear and definable, transcends ethnic difference, and constitutes a set of national mores to which newcomers ought to be expected to adapt and assimilate. However, even his analysis shows that ‘belonging’ to America is quite unlike belonging to national entities in which ‘blood and ancestry’ criteria define attachment. Whatever degree of ‘vernacular culture’ is identified, American public identity is also substantially citizenship-based, and at least formally it is often argued, as Hayakawa (1985) does, that what is unique about American belonging is that it does not specify ethnic, social, religious or linguistic criteria. Nunberg (1992) points to a connection between English, the American political compact, and citizenship. Only some connection of deep spiritual attachment can reconcile the vastly disproportionate reaction that a single Spanish language swearing in ceremony has had on the issue of language status (see Chapter VI; interviews).

The analysis of discourse texts and the interviews provide evidence that political liberalism and the English tradition of individualistic political identity are assumed to be inheritances of English liberal theory and practice that have achieved both iconic status and concrete presence in the American revolution, and its founding documents. The sense that emerges from the Meyer v. Nebraska decision of 1923 about the ‘key meanings’ of American life suggests what Nunberg has called a folk-Whorfian view, and what could also be termed a Herderian spirit connection between people-hood and language, American English and American identity. If the language is the vehicle for ideologies then the meanings of the First Amendment, which is a political guarantee of free speech, can become extended to the language of expression, if speech means more than content of language, but language itself.

The rite of passage for aliens to membership of the American political community is an act of language; a speech act. The locution involves a commissive realised as a promise to uphold and obey laws along with a series of declaratives which function as public evidence of commitment, and repudiation of past loyalties. The overall speech-event of the swearing-in ceremony (with its formality and routines) formalised and institutionalised turn-taking, operationalising of status hierarchies and its core meaning of passage and transformation (becoming other by expression and display) place an expectation on participants for the use of expressives which communicate gratitude and exhibit emotion. This testifies to the transformative power of the event and its speech power. There is also an expectation that verbal representatives will issue from the participants. These will take the form of reports and assertions about the motivation and goals of the change that has been effected.
The special status of this event, its implication of deep erosion at the core of institutional meanings on how the citizenship compact may be debased into mere communicative expediency removing the magic of transformative power, is signalled in discourse of official English. The signs are organised in the talk and writing. They function to allocate depth of importance and significance to the violation and degeneration that invading the sacred speech acts of admission to the national community by ‘foreign’ languages represents. The ceremony, after all, is expressly designed to remove the foreign element and replace it with admitted new status and its core meanings are associated intimately with English.

The speech-event of a swearing-in ceremony is also information-conveying. New citizens read and are told what rights and duties are. Communicative efficiency would suggest that information transfer is most efficient in a well understood language. Advocates of legalising English do not support the separation of information transfer, and therefore ‘non-ideological’ language, from any part of the ceremony. And while few of their opponents seem to want to challenge them on this, sensing the depth of symbolism carried by the language to effect becoming other, they do argue (Chapter VI) that liberty and individualism are not synonymous with English, expressed most authentically in American English, or re-created only through English.

The citizenship swearing in ceremony is of considerable importance in the questions addressed by the present thesis about the cultural meanings of the official English movement. There is another layer to this domain of language policy however. It consists of the intersection between human rights claims to citizenship, and the ideology of national sovereignty. Human rights as they have been conceived in international law transcend national sovereignty. This tension is acute in the wake of the vast migration of peoples in all parts of the world occasioned by global economic integration, and the international role of the United States in advocating democracy and human rights in many parts of the world and making these conditions that attach to access to the US economy, or to world organisations such as the World Trade Organisation. Economic globalisation surfaces tensions of this kind repeatedly. As the philosopher Seyla Benhabib has argued: "Globalization . . . has brought to a head conflicts between human rights and the claim to self-determination of sovereign collectivities" (Benhabib 1999: 710).

Significantly, the site for the most immediate playing out of this conflict is citizenship.

*Citizenship and naturalization claims of foreigners, denizens, and residents within the borders of a polity, as well as the laws, norms, and rules governing such procedures are pivotal social practices through which the normative perplexities of human rights and sovereignty can be most acutely observed* (Benhabib 1997: 711).
THE PAST AS PROLOGUE

A prescient motif carved into public statuary at the National Archives in Washington DC is the inscription: *The Past is a Prologue*. This suggests that the present is an ongoing discourse formation whose conversational pattern remembers, recalls and continues the past. The archives store the past and it frames what can be said in the present. Bakhtin (1981) identifies an ‘authoritative discourse’ as emanating from past sanction. In Bhaktinian terms the present is a language peopled already, peopled with past meanings and representations. What has been said shapes and frames what we may, and do say, now. In the debates to officialise English, or to resist its officialisation, the past is recruited, ambivalently, because it is recalled with interest and motivation, to authorise and sanction cultural politics today. Its meanings are multiple and layered and to address these it will be productive to treat the subjectivity of the participants as a critically important realm of exploration and explanation.

The officialisation of English within this understanding is performative in both a linguistic and cultural sense; linguistically officialising language is a kind of language that makes possible the object it seeks, to attach official status and meaning to English is to make this possible in discourse first, and persuasively, so that its legal sanction may follow. To effect this linguistic performance requires a basic ideological performativity. This, in turn, involves a discursive task (of persuasion and influence) to effect the change in public meaning and attitude required to construe multilingualism as a policy problem requiring curtailment. Making multilingualism the policy problem will naturalise and inevitabilise a policy of English’s officialisation. This is the ideological work to be done.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

APPROACHING THE PROBLEM

Although *de jure* recognition and function-allocation to a linguistic code involves administrative exclusivity in the main (education, public administration, legal processes, other ‘functions of office’) it is rarely uncontroversial and almost never without symbolic meaning and consequences.

Suggesting ordinariness for officialisation US English commissioned an examination of the language provisions within the world’s constitutions (Blaustein et al 1986). 40% of the 161 surveyed contain some kind of language designation about which the text stresses the ‘normality’ and non-problematical nature of such designations and considers the absence of such a designation in the US as an indicator of a defective constitutional protection to the ordered way of things.

The most dramatic instance in the world of the consequences of language officialisation comes from the adoption of a language law in post-colonial Ceylon (Sri Lanka). The cultural and political messages conveyed by the *1956 Sinhala Language Act* compounded by other (later and reinforcing) messages contributed materially to the outbreak of civil war by provoking secessionist politics among the minority Tamil community. Historians and sociologists who have examined this case are in no doubt that the language law has been a strong contributing factor to the deterioration of communal relations (De Silva 1998). Even after, long after, the law was abrogated to accommodate minority grievances the ‘rhetoric’ (as De Silva calls the policy discourses) continued, unaffected by the ‘reality’ of change. In effect this constitutes evidence for the quasi-autonomous existence of discursive formations, or at least for the absence of any unidirectional symmetry between ‘facts’ or ‘reality’ and ideological positions. Indeed the official language law is still cited by combatants 45 years after its promulgation and about 40 years after its effective removal as constituting evidence that the majority community’s constitutional compromises offer inadequate recognition of minority grievances, and evidence of bad faith. Of course that history is particular and contingent. Most aspects of the Sri Lankan official language law experience do not apply, not even indirectly, to the United States. And in fact few make that connection, certainly not the advocates of official English. Quebec, on the other hand, is cited frequently. But Quebec too has its specificity and non-transportability. Quebec’s relevance like that of Sri Lanka is that attempts to present language officialisation in a pluralistic polity can hardly ever be reduced to routines of administrative normality and discourses of cost-efficiency. The symbolic attachments to language in Quebec are not disguised by anyone, but their prominence is a caution.
against characterisations of official language movements as being straightforwardly concerned only with matters of reducing government expense and connoting no deeper messages. Quebec is cited by officialisers as an instance of multiculturally inspired divisiness, but for the opponents of official English Quebec means the politics of aggressive intolerance and inevitable conflict.

And yet there are lessons from both Sri Lanka and Quebec about the incorporation into constitutional arrangements of status markers for selected linguistic codes. One of these lessons is that the symbolic power of language officialisation can be a far more potent message (being read and re-read for long periods of time) than the specific justifications for its being done. In both Sri Lanka and in Quebec the politics of officialisation have been motivated by a sense that an ‘embattled language’ (as sign of people-hood) warrants protection. For minorities who are not-francophone in Quebec, and non-Sinhala speakers throughout Sri Lanka, officialisation politics are read as constituting wide, deep and pervasive intentions about exclusion from the polity; well beyond what those who see officialisation as routine, unproblematic or straightforward would imagine or believe. These perspectival differences point to the need for a multi-faceted methodology in studying the multiple layers of overt versus covert policy, de facto language power and its relation to de jure formalisation, intended and perceived meanings and messages that arise in each case.

Official status also accrues to languages informally through authoritative but not legal processes. These informal processes of officialisation include dictionary ‘stabilisation’, the social emulation effects of prestige literature, elite modelling, and public education as well as a myriad of informal policing undertaken by ‘ordinary citizens’. Attaching stigma to deviant forms is a parallel mode of imposing language norms. Each of these, and stigmatising practices in particular, give rise to resistance, rejection and counter-modelling.

The talking and writing about making English official and their performative objective of achieving a hegemonical characterisation of English are key aims of the present work. This talking and writing is structured and ordered rather than random and idiosyncratic, though randomness and idiosyncracy are also found. In this manner the present study addresses moves for formal legal-juridical officialisation linked to the informal kinds of officialisation represented by acts of persuasion and rhetoric. Argument is the key modality encountered. Focussing on argument is consistent with recent work in public policy theory which moves away from seeing policy as a set of technical protocols towards a view of policy as acts of persuasion and argument (Majone 1989).
The internal organisation of talking and writing refer to, instantiate and help effect larger social frames. These forms of language organisation (organised forms of what is said) are themselves constituted into recurring discursive formations that are repeated, embellished, undermined and challenged, but which are relatively stable and recurring over time. These discursive formations are the prime material of a notion of *lpp* advanced within this work which eschews kinds of *lpp* that see language problems as necessarily given in advance of the application of formalistic *lpp* applied to ‘solve’ out-there problems. Instead the purpose here is to invest the study of *lpp* with a deeper consideration of language politics and policy in the making; by making ‘the problem’ and how it is arrived at or constituted a central focus of examination.

Elevating a single language to state code when there is little demonstrable practical requirement for doing so re-directs attention and analysis towards the symbolic organisation and re-organisation of the social community involved. It is to scrutinise this field of language politics that the methodological choices described below have been directed.

**Interdisciplinary Conceptual Map**
A comprehensive literature review and criticism of sociolinguistics and applied linguistics as they address language planning and policy making was gathered. Specifically the following fields were interrogated to uncover ideas and understandings that inform the field of *lpp*, viz, language ecology studies; critical language studies (critical linguistics, critical discourse analysis, political linguistics and other research under the general rubric of critical language studies) as well as the policy analysis literature. The principal disciplinary journals utilised were: *Language Problems and Language Planning; The International Journal of the Sociology of Language; Applied Linguistics; Language and Society; The Language Planning Newsletter, The Journal of Policy Analysis and Management and Policy Sciences. Operant Subjectivity* is the prime journal drawn on for Q-methodology.

**CORPUS & DATA SOURCES**
The thesis draws on the methodology and insights of several disciplinary areas in an attempt to theorise the complex activity of public intervention in language development. Language planning is by definition *interstitial*, combining planning and language, and their parent meta-disciplines, policy science and linguistics/applied linguistics. Planning, by definition, seeks to reduce uncertainty and insert predictiveness into human behaviour. Language, without intervention, diverges in accordance with social-psychological, geographic, identity, relative power and economic factors that differentially apply to it in its various contexts (Taylor and Moghaddam 1987). In this respect language and planning diverge fundamentally; the primary purpose of one is to constrain entropy, differentiation and change, one of the characteristics of the unconstrained nature of the other is to diverge and differentiate.
For this reason in this study a range of interlocking sources of data and methods of analysis are utilised to maximally triangulate and validate the conclusions that are drawn.

**FIGURE TEN: DATA SOURCES, CHARACTERISTICS & LOCATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q Study</td>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>*Proponents</td>
<td>One To Five</td>
<td>Chapter IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of these texts is discussed in relation to relevant literature and direct participation in the debates that report the speech events which characterised the legislative program for official English in the 104th Congress.

**Q-Methodology Study Of Activists & Aware Elites**
A Q-sort study was conducted with selected participants involved in public policy disputation and debate. The aim was to produce empirically gathered evidence of the ‘concourse’ (what has been said on the issue) from which to base an analysis of the discourses revealed within the concourse. The participants were selected to ensure three categories were represented: a general, informed but not directly engaged sub-sample, and two sub-samples of directly engaged ‘activists’ with opposing positions.

The statements which the participants respond to and rank is called a Q-sample and the scored result is called a Q-sort. The sample is representative of the concourse of statements on official English-bilingual education-multilingualism ensuring that this both validates other data sources and is ‘felt’ to be authentic by the participants. The resulting data are subjected to statistical treatment and interpretive scrutiny. The conventional mathematical operations adopted in Q-studies were applied: correlation, factor analysis and factor scores (McKeown and Thomas 1988:47). A series of interpretive analyses were undertaken to describe the narrative structure of the discourses. Interpretive scrutiny aims to
derive explanations of activity and human behaviour on the basis of what anthropological analysis (Geertz 1973) has called ‘thick description’ of contexts in which cultural mediation is prominent.

Thick descriptions are intended to be contextualised and therefore seek to go beyond cataloguing of facts, information or the enumeration of events to uncover meaning as perceived and represented by participants. Because the statistical analysis pays scant attention to the structure built into the sample, the interpretive analysis works closely with the results from the mathematics to make sense of the groupings and rankings revealed. The entire aim of these data exercises is to examine subjectivity in an empirical and systematic fashion and represents a novel departure for lpp theory and lpp scholarship.

Q-methodology provides a “systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity” (McKeown and Thomas 1986: 7) where subjectivity means “a person’s communication of his or her point of view” (p 12). In the literature Q-method is contrasted with R-techniques which are more commonly used in the social sciences (Brown 1980; Brown 1986). lpp is heavily dependent on R-techniques, especially prominent is the ‘sociolinguistic survey’ and various protocols of ‘rational choice’ decision making, exemplified by Cost-Benefit Analysis (Thorburn 1971).

While Q-researchers do not claim that survey instruments are redundant, many proponents of Q-method argue that Q-approaches are superior to R-techniques for the examination of human subjectivity and political discourse (Brown 1986; Dryzek 1990; Dryzek and Berejikian 1993). Q-methodology involves very low or non-existent researcher ‘overwriting’ of respondents’ views, opinions, orientations and attitudes. Since the reference utilised is the internal framework of opinion and belief held by respondents, this approach is well-suited to the investigation of the motives, ideologies and patterns of thinking and belief which the present study seeks to uncover. Combined with the other methods and approaches used Q offers the prospect of a rigorous and empirical scrutiny of the subjective dispositions of actors engaged in making controversial language policy.

Subjectivity does not mean “metaphysical subjectivism accessible only to introspection” (Brown 1986: 57) but refers to the ‘communicability’ of the person’s viewpoint and view of the world as they define it. Therefore within this study the words (texts) of the issue itself constitute the raw material of the discourses examined, and the ranking, order and arrangement of these texts form the overarching discourse pattern that results from the application of mathematical counting processes. Analysing the structure and patterns of thought within a concourse (the talk of politics) is the objective. This structure and form (discourse) are not provable in any empirical sense (the subjectivity which they reflect makes this impossible) nor is it possible or intended to say what proportion of the overall population adheres to
this or that structure and form of argument. Rather the aim is to examine key groups of individuals actually engaged in the politics of language planning (as advocates or resisters) to elucidate texts that are the terrain on which this discourse politics is fought.

As far as the mathematical analysis of the Q-sort is concerned it is essential to recall the operational medium through which the respondent models his or her subjective pattern of orientation on the issue being investigated. The respondent ranks or rates a series of carefully selected stimuli (a Q-sample) in response to a condition of instruction. The condition of instruction involves the researcher’s request to the respondent (Please rank these statements according to which most closely reflects your point of view).

Each of the statements is entered onto a separate card and numbered in a random fashion. The ranking adopted was a rating on a scale of $\begin{array}{cccccccc} -5 & -4 & -3 & -2 & -1 & 0 & +1 & +2 & +3 & +4 & +5 \end{array}$ from least to most congruent with the respondent’s view. The respondent reads all the statements prior to ranking, then sorts them into broad categories of agree and disagree and then ranks them according to the scale above. It is emphasised that at any point the respondent may change one, several or all of the rankings. On final submission of the Q-sort the respondent is asked to pause and consider whether the total result reflects their overall position. Differences in scatter and distribution are not particularly important in the correlation and factor analysis that Q undertakes and so a quasi-normal distribution is recognised as appropriate. According to Brown (1986: 59) even under conditions of free-choice significant deviations from normality are rare when the Q-sample is sufficiently large and representative of the concourse.

The process of selection of the respondents and the construction of the sample are important both in their own right and also as a general validation and confirmation of other observations and assessments of the issue being investigated. The analysis of the data from completed Q-sorts was undertaken with PCQ 3 program involving correlational and factor analytical techniques (factor analysis and factor scores). These processes involve a highly restricted mathematical focus allowing the major attention to be devoted to the ordering of the textual stimuli by respondents. The mathematics consists simply of intercorrelating the N Q-sorts and factor analysis of the matrix of correlation of N x N; what patterns of agreement and disagreement are revealed. Factor analysis reveals the number and kind of attitudinal groupings in the correlations of rank scores. When there are strong oppositions significantly negative correlations may occur, i.e. bipolar factors.

A third and final process is the determination of factor scores for each of the statements in all of the factors. “The result is a Q-sort (factor array) for each factor, with each factor array being a composite
of those individual Q-sorts constituting the factor” (Brown 1986: 60). These differences were in the original concourse, since the separate views, disagreements, arguments, positions or discourses were present and indeed gave rise to the political conversation in the first place.

The first procedure correlates persons and the second produces factors on which the respondents’ loading on that factor constitutes the magnitude of their adherence to it. Finally each stimulus item is scored for each factor and the factors are interpreted with an eye to patterns of convergence and divergence.

A recurring and important notion within Q-methodology is the idea of concourse. Discourses are seen to constitute a ‘communication concourse’, i.e. the population of statements uttered on an issue. A concourse can be seen to constitute the total discoursal setting within which discourses become salient, all that is said, or has been said, about the issue. All that is said also implies to a significant degree all that can be said or all that is likely to be said since so many of the views and positions expressed cohere or are structured in systematic ways.

Q-method was invented in the 1930s by the British psychologist William Stephenson (Stephenson 1953; Brown 1996). McKeown and Thomas (1988) describe Q-methodology as a way of ‘objectively’ studying subjectivity given that it is communicable and self-referring but that methods used to study subjectivity do not alter or destroy its self-referent character. Dryzek (1990) includes a discussion of Q-method in his book Discursive Democracy especially in relation to its potential to displace the more positivistic and technocratic alternatives to the conduct of research into political dispositions in democratic societies. Chapter IV reports the Q-study findings.

Radio & Advocatory Texts
The second major methodology is discourse analysis. Recent scholarly discussions of the role of formal analysis of discourse balance consideration of text-oriented purposes and socially-critical purposes for conducting such study. Fairclough (1991; 1992) distinguishes between two types of discourse analysis: Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis and Critically Oriented Discourse Analysis. The former is undertaken for to gain understandings of textual structure as revealed by the level of discourse organisation and features of a text. Critically oriented discourse analysis is premised on a view that to illuminate society-language relationships is to understand the socially patterned nature of language texts, and, further, that these social patterns in turn reveal ideological characteristics.

Pennycook (1994b) identifies three broad approaches in discourse analysis. A descriptive textual one (identified with conversation analysis, called by Pennycook Suprasentential Language Use); a critical
ideological one (identified with critical theorists, which Pennycook calls Critical Discourse Analysis) and Discourse as Power/Knowledge (primarily derived from the work of Foucault which “allows for critical analysis while avoiding the reductions and totalisations of more Marxist-based analyses” (p. 126)).

While the main aim of the discourse analysis is to reveal the patterns of performativity in relation to lpp, (for which task critically oriented analysis is appropriate) some dimensions and features of both Fairclough approaches and all three Pennycook approaches is also adopted. This is not intended to be eclecticism. Rather it derives from a sense that explicit foregrounding of a political position within discourse analysis is excessively optimistic about the state of sophistication of the field and indeed of the extent to which correlations between language and social life can be attributed confidently to ideological categories, especially pre-existing ones. Critically oriented studies are too ready to dismiss as a-political discourse analysis methods that analyse texts in the expectation that correlations with larger social frames may emerge in analysis without having to be pre-supposed.

One of the key goals of discourse analysis of politically or persuasively oriented texts is to identify ‘themes’. These can be understood as propositions (Toulmin 1958; Agar 1983) whose recurrence through discourse on an issue holds the promise of revealing a central, and perhaps concealed, underlying proposition which renders the argument available for clearer interpretation. Since themes recur they are different from devices of rhetoric or persuasive effects and moves in discourse whose presence may only have a local coherence or relevance. In addition metaphorical reference is identified. The texts are subjected to analysis specific to each individual text. The three radio texts differ: the first features a single participant (and contains an extended talk-back session); the second is a debate between two participants (with a brief talk-back component); the third involves four participants and no talk back. The final text is a written chapter of a book and therefore materially different from the immediacy of the audience-shaping context of talk-back radio.

In addition to functioning as a validating data set for the Q-study the analysis of these texts explores whether inter-relations of power, knowledge, ideology and underlying structures to undirected flows of discussion and argument contribute to explaining aspects of the politics of official English that may not emerge in direct interview or via respondent sorting of stimuli as in Q. Chapter V reports the discourse analysis findings.
Fred Fiske interviews George Tryfiatis, Executive Director, English First. The program notes title the program “Interview with George Tryfiates, Executive Director of English First about problematic national bilingual program”. The broadcast features 12 live callers and comprises 198 distinct speaker turns. The program was broadcast live on 23 September 1994.

The Dianne Rehm Show. Dianne Rehm interviews Congressman Bill Emerson, (R-Missouri) and Mr Jim Lyons, Director of the National Association for Bilingual Education and featuring 3 live callers. The segment comprises 80 distinct speaker turns. The official English segment of the Dianne Rehm Show was broadcast live on 9 September 1995.

“English: Making It Official” features Dr Richard Lesher, President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Representative Toby Roth (R-Wisconsin); Representative Esteban Torres (D-California); Representative Ed Pastor (D-Arizona) and Meryl Comer, Moderator U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and contains an inserted tape segment from reporter Dan Kush and an unnamed Announcer. There are 158 distinct speaker turns including announcer turns.

“English as the American Language” is chapter 15 of a 1995 book by 104th Congress Speaker Newt Gingrich, To Renew America.

Proponents, Opponents & Observers

During the months of September, October and November 1995 interviews were conducted with Congress representatives and other proponents, opponents and observers. The material that is used in the thesis is drawn from several interviewees: a Senator who was a principal sponsor of one Bill and another Senator who was a strong opponent of the Bills; four Representatives (three of whom were proponents of the most significant Bills and one of whom was an opponent and Chair of the Caucus committee most hostile to the Bills); the key staffer attached to the office of the Hearings Committee chair and the senior political adviser attached to the office of a prominent proponent of one of the contesting Bills; the key staffer attached to the office of a Senator who was opposed to the Bills but who was associated with a view that foreign language competence was a key strategic issue for US national policy. The Senator was perceived by opponents of the official English Bills as either uninterested in or opposed to minority language issues dominating national languages policy discussions.

Eight interviews were also conducted with lobby organisations: the Executive Director of English First; the Executive Director of the Center for Equal Opportunity and former Director US English and President Reagan’s Civil Rights Commissioner, the present Executive Director of US English; the Education and Languages officer of the National Council of La Raza, the Executive Director of the National Council of La Raza, the President of the Joint National Councils of Languages Associations, and extended discussions over a three month period with two ‘ordinary members’ of the lobby organisation US English. Three interviews were held with education officials in the Department of Education, with the Acting Director and with a researcher of at the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.
Eleven interviews were conducted with research organisations and academics studying the issue, and four with independent consultants providing commercially based policy advice to various organisations, including school districts, banks, commercial businesses, media agencies, foreign trading firms and lobby groups on bilingual education, official English, voting rights and drivers’ licence regulations.

Professional organisations and community-based groups were also interviewed, such as Washington area Chinese community schools, the National Association for Bilingual Education, adult literacy and adult ESL teacher associations as well as providers of community education services to new immigrants. State education and State legislature representatives and school district governors from nine separate jurisdictions (in California, Florida, Puerto Rico, Wisconsin, New York, Virginia, Arizona, New Mexico and Hawaii) were engaged in discussions about the effects of the Bills. Finally interviews were conducted with indigenous and immigrant language organisations who were in Washington either to appear before Hearings, to lobby, or to obtain information about the impending legislation.

The interviews were conducted with the researcher describing the purpose and nature of the present study and the process of recording and transcribing interviews as part of dissertation research. Common questions were asked of all interviewees regarding their personal motivation-interest, their identification of key problems, issues and meanings. Specific questions were asked about Spanish and other languages, about bilingual education, foreign policy, trade and geo-political issues. Most interviewees were asked to comment on the extent to which the issue was ‘symbolic or practical’ politics and on foreign language learning in relation to bilingual education.

All interviewees were asked to characterise their opponents’ views and to indicate the level of ‘tractability’ and to assess the prospects of compromise. In many cases the interviews took their own direction. This was true of all the interviews with politicians. While all interviewees were asked all questions, few needed prompting of any kind and unless their replies were not at all pertinent to the issue they were not discouraged from pursuing their own pathway through the issue. For these reasons the interviews are described as only partially structured.

Although 44 interviews were conducted the thesis reports information from a smaller number. In one case the tape recording proved unreliable, in another the interviewee later requested that her evidence be eliminated from consideration, in many cases the material was repetitive of others’ comments and claims (evidence of the discursive organisation that patterns views).

Some of the interviewees also participated in the Q-sorts and several had statements of their own included in the sample. This ‘reticulation’ was a useful guide to the currency of the discourse data that
was obtained. Chapter VI reports the interview evidence. The next section describes the researcher’s methodological understanding of some critical terms and notions.

**Thoughts about Arguments**

Argument is one of the ways in which talk is ordinarily structured and arranged in social interaction. Tannen (1998) has pointed out that routinely framing debate as conflict produces an ‘argument culture’ and that relentless argument is corrosive to the spirit. In Tannen’s view we need to move debate towards dialogue as the talk-organising principle for public policy and decision-making since argument is based on and creates polarisation and extreme position-taking, which, in turn, makes agreement difficult.

The kind of argument Tannen is opposing is *agonism*, ritualised opposition (“*programmed contentiousness*”, p 8) which she claims typifies contemporary adversarial US public culture. She contrasts relentless argumentativeness and adversarialism to the view of pragmatic philosopher John Dewey that ‘*democracy begins in conversation*’ and expresses a fear that [democracy] gets “*derailed in polarized debate*” (p 25). In polarised debate an ‘ethic of aggression’ takes hold and constituents, and the media, punish compromise. This is a call to cooperation, a principle well established in analysis of conversation and the related field of study the ethnography of communication.

Some cooperation is necessary if any communication is to proceed at all. Grice (1975) summed up this cooperation in the form of a cooperative principle and four associated maxims of conversation. Conversationalists, argues Grice, generally expect each other to obey the principle. The principle embodies four maxims: **Quantity** (Say only what is required, no more, no less); **Quality** (Be non-spurious, be sincere, speak the truth); **Relevance** (Be relevant, to the point); **Manner** (Be perspicuous, avoid ambiguity and obscurity).

While conversation may appear to facilitate democratic possibility and conflict-framed argument may threaten to descend inexorably into domination and polarisation can democracy function (and can policy realistically depend on) conversationally-organised talk alone? And is argument *necessarily* disruptive?

Goodwin and Goodwin (1990) hold that argument is not ‘disruptive behaviour’ and analyse kinds of conflict talk that show argument is “accomplished through a process of very intricate coordination between the parties who are opposing each other” (p 85). Their analysis of argument-talk shows how its rules and practices constitute the social identities of participants such that participants attend to both what they are opposing and to “proposals in prior talk about how those present are being positioned vis-à-vis each other” (p85). Similarly, Halliday (1987) points out that “*talk constructs microcosms (little universes of doing and happening) and that these in turn construe two macrocosmic orders of*
which talk participants are a part (the social order and the natural order)’. Both the larger frame and the instantiation draw on what Halliday calls ‘ordinary, everyday, spontaneous, natural spoken language’ (p 135).

For the purposes of the present research we will be working with what is a rather broad and undifferentiated notion of the distinctions that discourse analysis, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis make. These fields of scholarship evolve from the work and insights of scholars such as Dell Hymes (1974), Emanuel Schegloff (1992), Ragnar Rommetviet (1984) and the fundamental role of Harvey Sacks (1992). The present analysis proceeds along the lines of a perspectival selection, preferring an analysis of language as discourse, practice (praxis), communication over an analysis of language as system/structure (Linell 1998: 3) and preferring to analyse the former within thematic and broad categories rather than the units and categories of a linguistics-oriented approach.

This present approach looks at structure and language forms only to the extent that these elucidate points of meaning, dispute or ideology in language. The approach to language as system allows research to comment on “what can be said by a particular linguistic system” (Linell 1998: 3) as distinct from the present approach of focussing on “what is made known and reciprocally made understood by what is said” (p 3). Formalistic linguistics deals with S-units (phonemes, nouns, sentences, lexical meaning, propositions, noun phrases) which constitute the tree structures of formal linguistic characterisations and the rules or ‘transformations’ to which these units are subjected. The resulting discourse is of secondary importance being the product of processes of S-unit interaction. Language serves to ‘represent’ the world which is independent of the linguistic-system itself an ‘underlying’ order of neutral and transparent media. Saussure’s langue and Chomsky’s competence are located in contra-distinction to parole and performance respectively, and both scholars effectively do not consider the latter phenomena.

On the other hand D-aspects (categories such as: utterance, implication, act, genre, perspective, position and context) of language focus attention on what is regarded as primary over S-units which are seen to be abstractions from formal models of linguistic analysis or for standardisation, teaching or translation purposes but not in themselves actual constituents in meaning-making human interactions. This dialogistic preference is not the only one however. There is a more integrated possibility which sees S-units and D-aspects as interdependent in that S-units are differentially operationalised in given contexts and relations among interactants. This way to look at matters raises the possibility of seeing structure and discourse as potential versus actual. The structure is an inheritance from past usage and a validation available ongoingly to users whose actual realisation (in discourse via texts) either confirms or challenges the inherited pattern. Meaning potentials are a resource available that is then activated in specific settings that constitute relations and results but which also re-play past patterns (Linell 1998: 5).
In turn the D-units as argumentative organisation is played out in what Bourdieu calls ‘fields’. One of the characteristics of arguments is collusion (disguised as struggle) to retain adherence to shared or common ground between interactants. This insight supports the approaches to argument that see it as intricately patterned social behaviour.

*It is one of the generic properties of fields that the struggle for specific stakes masks the objective collusion concerning the principles underlying the game….the struggle tends constantly to produce and reproduce the game and its stakes by reproducing…. the practical commitment to the game and its stakes which defines the recognition of legitimacy (Bourdieu 1991: 58).*

From these scholars we derive some generalisations to utilise in the analysis of debate-argument genre in the texts which follow. Texts of argument on official English are examined to identify programmed contentiousness, to elucidate and identify cooperation/collusion that frames participation in an overarching pattern and also in micro-analysis to explore the social identities of the participants. These aims of the analysis appear in the subsequent chapters. It is worth anticipating at this point that language as talk (formalised and structured in the debate-argument-conflict matrix and which in some discursive formations attains authoritative status that defines or helps to define social institutions) is a departure from the formalities of descriptive ‘autonomous linguistics’ which depend on idealisations of language. Taking into consideration Linnell’s and Bourdieu’s views we can see *lpp* as having dimensions of performance. Performatively language is deployed with particular policy related aims. The analysis of performatively-oriented *lpp* is most readily available to us within its ‘thick contexts’, where there is also always contest. To understand *lpp* as performance will therefore require sensitivity to the prevailing, but always local, contingencies of purpose, identity and power. The question remains though, is the talk-as-conflict debate genre conducive to a ‘democratic’ *lpp* about official English? Public policy theorists grapple with this and, like Habermas, have often commented on and theorised about language and communication within more or less politicised contexts.35

Finally it is important to keep in mind that the audiences for public discourse are technologically enhanced and media mediated. In his analysis of the structure of American public discourse Fox (2001) identifies three kinds of American voices: Doublespeak, Salespeak and Sensationspeak which are ‘media messages’ that invade private and public life alike structuring and influencing individuals, ideology and culture. These mediate among language policy activists and heighten the sense of adversarial contest and polarisation that the general public perceives to be inevitable in politics.

**Acting Language**

It was anticipated in Chapter I that the elaboration of British Speech Act theory into a policy-oriented context by Habermas promises to contribute some conceptual armoury for the present study.
Performativity involves seeing language as a kind of activity. Habermas’ *Theory of Communicative Action* co-locates communicative action alongside other actions that seek to redeem claims of validity, truthfulness, strategy and instrumental goals. Argumentative procedures for ‘redeeming claims to propositional truth and normative rightness’ form a critical assumption of the Theory and locate the Habermasian project in the kind of understanding that has stimulated the data gathering processes of the present work. The three pragmatic functions that the *Theory of Communicative Action* is grounded on are that speech acts represent facts, establish legitimate interpersonal relations, and express subjectivity. The present consideration of Habermas’ theory relates directly to whether generically organised conflict-in-talk performs lpp functions.

**FIGURE TWELVE: COMMUNICATIVE ACTION & OTHER TYPES OF ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION ORIENTATION</th>
<th>ORIENTED TO SUCCESS</th>
<th>ORIENTED TO REACHING UNDERSTANDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION SITUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SOCIAL</td>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>STRATEGIC ACTION</td>
<td>COMMUNICATIVE ACTION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Habermas 1984:160)

Communicative action as argument can be oriented to either success or to reaching inter-subjective understanding. Success involves prevailing, inter-subjective understanding need not. In policy oriented contexts inter-subjective understanding is a pre-requisite of inter-subjective agreement. Converting a dispute about the status of English into a policy-tractable ‘problem’ would involve communicative actions oriented towards reaching understanding, not success. If the orientation of argument activity is towards success (prevailing) then depending on the depth of social context what follows is either instrumental or strategic action; both of which leave little room for understanding and agreement.

Figure Eleven below contains an adapted version of the social action and purposive activity model of Habermas’ work on Communicative Action. In this elaboration Habermas connects activity types that comprise both communicative practice and strategic, expressive or regulating action alongside characteristic speech acts, speech functions. These are associated in turn with a success/understanding dichotomisation of action orientations, attitudinal formats and claims to validation and external relations.
This modulated flow of formal pragmatic features, orientations and effects of systematically organised and structured communication is utilised as a stimulus to data discussion and analysis categories, though it is not applied rigidly to each data set.

**Description**

The underlying rationale for ethnography derives from the qualitative-phenomenological and the naturalistic-ecological hypotheses which claim to understand behaviour in as unobtrusive and contextually rich a way as possible (Wilson 1983). According to Wilson, customary deductive research techniques of framing hypotheses and defining categories *a priori* may obscure or shape the findings rather than uncover the meanings of the observed phenomena. Ethnography seeks to approach a reality with few preconceptions and aims to allow hypotheses and theory to emerge from observation. For Wilson this approach involves ‘disciplined subjectivity’ which ultimately produces ‘more reliable knowledge’.

Ethnography is a multimodal technique in which the data are collected in ways appropriate to the setting. The general approach taken in the thesis is broadly inspired by these principles and adopts a kind of ‘disciplined and systematic subjectivity”; one incorporating a variety of methods for particular subsets of evidence that test the field of *lpp* around official English.

Accompanying this broad orientation the research is also influenced by a specific belief in relation to the examination and gathering of data. This belief is influenced in a general way by some views of philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein who in *Philosophical Investigations* (1967) argues against the ‘contemptuous attitude’ towards the particular case and against what he calls the ‘craving for generality’. Wittgenstein abjures excessive concern with the ‘method of science’ and offers an
alternative route to the understanding of general terms: not by theoretical activity (interpreting and applying general theory in specified instances) but by the practical activity of being able to use, or operate with, general terms (and concepts) in given circumstances.

**Following rules**

Wittgenstein’s idea involves not interpretation so much as simply following rules (or violating them in special circumstances, which indicates knowing rules well enough to violate their requirements). This is a kind of practice and customary mastery rather than abstract science. From this principle Wittgenstein advocates the understanding of language as game and shows that shared properties and relationships among very different games have ‘no one thing in common’. This means that participating in games and understanding them (language understood here as the preeminent game) involves not the recovery of some implied comprehensive rule but perception of similarities. Even these similarities are not always uniformly perceived as such.

Wittgenstein likens language to an ancient city, alternating planned and unplanned space in a continuous overall presence without particular attention to planning, or even to coherence. Although rules can be made up in participation this does not mean that participants have no understanding of rules. The way to understand general terms is not to seek order, underlying and invariate rules, but rather to engage in the practice of the game and to acquire proficiency in its performance; proceeding through analogy, example and practice. Intermediate examples point to wider connections and, like urban sprawl, and occasional town planning, the overall is put together. New instances are not necessary instantiations of an underlying pattern, but can in fact alter the way of looking at the originally formulated game or general term. The assembling of knowledge, mastery of general terms, involves dialogical encounter with the field under examination.

The dialogical commitment of the present study involves gaining an understanding of policy making as discursive politics, sometimes structured as contestation or argument that is either directed at success or at understanding and representing some potential for policy-traction. Sometimes the dialogue utilises or becomes narrative, at other times it is dialogic and at other times it performs speech acts. Because this is an examination of a policy *in the process of formulation* and the resistance it encounters (with clear and less-clear movements) the politics of talk in its various performatively organised patterns is the prime focus of attention. The long period of time over which this issue has been discussed gives a special character to the analysis as well. In effect the officialisation of English becomes a chain of interconnected acts of language, which occur in events whose main content is speech and writing, about the authoritative claims of a speech code. This then is a sort of elaborated speech action with multiple participants over an extended period.
Observation
Much of the interpretive analysis derives from participation in some key events in Washington DC during the 104th Congress’ consideration of the official English legislation. The general approach to the observation of policy-making events in which the issue of official English-Bilingual Education was being discussed was informed by a ‘sensibility’ about principles of description and following rules as described above and a view to interpretation that makes use of Wittgenstein’s encouragement towards appreciating diversity in epistemology. Some insights and techniques of ethnography were utilised and adopted but it is not claimed that the present work constitutes an ethnography.

The insights and approaches from the above considerations were selected in an attempt to implement practices of deriving the ‘general’ without collapsing the particular into the general, an approach faithful to the thinking of Wittgenstein. As conclusions, interpretations, or overarching and general statements and terms evolved these were checked with participants, both opponents and proponents of official English, and the language form that they gave to these was utilised as the basis for subsequent discussion, problematising connotations, meanings and ideological content where this was apparent.

Elicitation
It was considered important to gather texts under different elicitation conditions to guard against any possible bias that might derive from favouring one or other method of elicitation. Since texts are critically important in the present study design, the conditions of elicitation are intended to gather a rich, multiple and ‘credible’ concourse of texts. The credibility criterion was tested by the recognition of respondents that the statements (texts) to which they were asked to respond did indeed reflect a fair and accurate depiction of the kinds of dispute points contained in the political contest about official English. In effect this criterion was amply met. The other important criterion was that the participants in the study (interviewees, Q-sorters, observed activists and ‘aware but not active elites’) should comprise those engaged in making the discourses, re-circulating past and iconically important texts, or making new and original arguments. This criterion was also met. The interviewees comprise legislators, and legislators’ assistants, lobbyists, academics, and others who all see themselves and identify as ‘activists’ or informed ‘close up’ observers. The texts that they encountered in the Q-analysis, that they produced at interview and which they produced in the selected discourse-analysed debates are their own words and position statements, recognised and commented on by them regularly.

Since all texts are produced in open or private dialogue (Bakhtin 1981) there is always a social presence in language. The three elicitation conditions refer therefore to the role of the researcher. Unelicited texts refers to a population of texts analysed in the following three chapters that are naturally-occurring in the sense that they were generated independently of the researcher’s involvement in the issue. The
semi-elicited texts are samples of unelicited texts that have been ‘manipulated’ by the researcher to produce structured samples of statements that respondents later ranked, rather than the result of the application of discourse-analytical techniques. Finally the elicited texts are those generated by practitioners in direct response to researcher stimulus. Several of the texts are hybrids though there are also more or less ‘pure’ forms. A text, spoken or written, is understood here as the realised form of discourse (see Chapter IV).

**FIGURE FOURTEEN: TEXT ELICITATION PATTERN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNELECTED</th>
<th>SEMI-ELICITED</th>
<th>ELICITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>RADIO TRANSCRIPTS</em></td>
<td><em>DISCOURSE ANALYSIS</em></td>
<td>*DISCUSSIONS WITH PARTICIPANTS IN RADIO DEBATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CONGRESSIONAL SPEECHES</em></td>
<td><em>OBSERVATIONS OF SENATE &amp; HOUSE HEARINGS</em></td>
<td>*INTERVIEWS <em>GROUP DISCUSSIONS</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NEWSPAPER ARTICLES</em></td>
<td><em>NOTES OF SEMINARS ATTENDED</em></td>
<td><em>DISCUSSIONS WITH RESPONDENTS ON INTERPRETATION OF SEMINAR NOTES</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADVOCATORY-PROPAGANDA MATERIAL</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ORIGINAL Q-sample</td>
<td><em>CULLED Q-sample</em></td>
<td>*Q-SORTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some texts are recurring and recursive. Those who favour official English and those who oppose it talk mostly to each other, and mostly about officialisation. What has already been said becomes part of the texture and predicts, shapes, makes possible what may be said next. Each conversation grazes in the same pastures. This is *lpp* in the doing. And *being*, since the encounters are also a series of acts of *lpp* participation as identity since the roles and functions of the participants are invoked by them in the data that is collected as representing orders of political identity. The texts play back to some individuals their own and others’ words and ask them to rate and rank these as a story of that individual’s operant subjectivity, i.e. that person’s predisposition to act politically in a given way. Acting politically of course involves more talk, and all talk adopts generic structures like dialogue, argument, formal debate and lecturing.

**THE DATA CHAPTERS**

We have discussed the improbability of official English and why in its ‘strangeness’ it promises to reveal information that will help us to theorise more robustly the field and practice of *lpp*. We have also set the American *lpp* experience as manifested in the official English movement against a backdrop of the wider treatment in philosophy and sociological scholarship of a more semiotically complex world in which communication and language, as discourse, are held to constitute central importance in human sociality, identity and power relations among groups. The specific and remarkably diverse complexity of American language policy practice in both the colonial and national periods requires that we approach the field with new techniques of analysis that triangulate evidence gathering. The relatively
autonomous existence of discursive politics from ‘reality’ makes official English-bilingual education an issue not readily amenable to policy analysis having a low policy tractability. In the present chapter we have put forward a methodology for the collection of texts under different levels of researcher elicitation. Chapter IV reports the data from Q methodology which aims to analyse the subjectivity of activists engaged in the actual politics of lpp.
CHAPTER IV

ACTIVIST SUBJECTIVITY

This chapter reports the results from the analysis of subjectivity. An analysis of participant subjectivity is unusual in LPP and the use of Q-methodology to undertake a scrutiny of participant and key observer subjectivity in relation to a language policy in the course of its being made introduces a methodological technique not so far encountered in applied linguistics and LPP literature.

ATTITUDES, BELIEFS & IDEOLOGIES

Q-methodology differs from attitude assessment in the important respect that it seeks to canvas a propensity to act, or to hold an active view or position about a subject. To make this distinction clear the terms attitudes, beliefs and ideologies, and their relationship with the integrated focus of Q-methodology require separate specification. The focus of Q is subjectivity, and a credible approach to analysing subjective predispositions is aided by an integration of attitudes, beliefs and ideologies.

The approach adopted to attitudes, beliefs and ideologies is that put forward by Rokeach (1968, 1979) in which a belief is a ‘simple proposition’ which can be inferred from behaviour or utterances. Beliefs come in three types: evaluative, descriptive-existential and prescriptive-exhortatory. Evaluative beliefs are characterised by true/false or correct/incorrect oppositions in relation to the world, descriptive-existential beliefs concern the relative merits of particular things, while the prescriptive-exhortatory belief category takes a position and advances certain courses of action over alternatives.

Attitudes are an organisational effect of various beliefs around predetermined objects or situations. Since beliefs are behavioural predispositions aggregated around a given ‘common object’ (Rokeach 1968: 116) they become ‘agendas for action’. A higher order grouping produces an ideology which is “an organization of beliefs and attitudes-religious, political, or philosophical in nature” (p. 123). These tend toward institutionalisation and are characteristically “shared with others, deriving from external authority” (p. 123).

Attitudes however are only latent action and in applied linguistics have long been considered a poor predictor of action (Fasold 1984:147-180). Attitudes, beliefs and ideologies are accessed through behaviour comprising most often textualisation.
TEXTS AND DISCOURSE

Although often used interchangeably with discourse the term text requires separate specification. Texts are located within discourses but after the production of discourses texts often remain as the evidence of discourse which has occurred (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Beaugrande and Dressler 1981).

For Gee, a text is “any stretch of oral or written language” (1996:103). Language is located within interacting motivations of its users and in networks of status and solidarity among interactants which tend to give certain kinds of language ideological character. The discourse analysis of a text aims to understand the properties of language (beyond grammar) which are revealed by the working together of various sub-discoursal systems which give ‘sensefulness’ to the text. However a distinction between a narrower sense of discourse and a wider one is needed to make operational the notion of discourse. Crystal (1985:116-119) discusses the relations between text and discourse in linguistic analysis, the latter typically seeing discourse as supra-sentential language, i.e., identifying discourse as continuous stretches of language in use that are larger than the sentence structure. Gee is among those scholars who sees in discourse elements of activity, or identity, when he comments:

\[
A \text{ Discourse is a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’, or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role’} \quad (1996:143).
\]

The most systematic theorisation of text-discourse relations is in Fairclough’s work (1989; 1991; 1992). The following figure is Fairclough’s re-working of the Foucauldian notion of discourse with its more pronounced linguistic orientation.

**Figure Fifteen: Fairclough’s Text->Discursive Practice->Social Practice Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCURSIVE PRACTICE (production, distribution, consumption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure Fifteen is an adaptation of Fairclough’s representation (1992: 73). The central location of the text (a text realised in any channel of communication, viz, writing, speech, sign or visual-gestural or iconic)
connects it in a shaping and ‘imbricating’ way with how it is manifested as discursive practice. Discursive practice is understood by Fairclough to be a kind of economy with elements of interconnected production, distribution and consumption. Social Context refers to the overarching cultural and political situation and relationships whose impact is that of supplying contextual framing of meaning, purpose and design to the discursive and textual layers.

The relation between Social Context and Discursive Practice is how Fairclough’s ‘orders of discourse’ operationalises Foucault’s ‘discursive formations’. Foucault’s work sees discourse not in any strict linguistic sense as connected stretches of speech (the ‘supra-sentential’ field of language) but, rather, as “power-saturated ideology” (Woolard 1998). Fairclough’s orders of discourse often constitute or help to constitute entire institutional domains.

These domains have become more discursive as a consequence of the diffusion of political power throughout societies as the state changes from central to diffuse structure and modes of operating. No longer, if it ever was the case, is the state the King (Louis XIV’s declaration 340 years ago equating his person with the state: L'état c'est moi!) but the state operates, or better, is diffused, among multiple institutional practices and locations and involves less ruling and more hegemony, compliance, and, in Foucault’s understanding: governmentality. This term (combining government and mentality) seeks to evidence the consensual, self-governing (governing of the self) that post-Enlightenment discipline-warranted practices have engendered, making the locus of power no longer singular, and the mode of its deployment no longer coercive.

The centrality of the lingual-discursive modality of compliance (and resistance, influence and rejection) produces a vastly more diffuse and complex set of relations in which texts are the critical ultimate condensations of the social order. Performativity is central to the possibility of governmentality operations since discourse carries more than content information which a message recipient unpacks and comprehends as a separate part of the message. Rather, discourse performs work, of ideology as well as of communication. In this model the ultimate form of the discourse is the text.

Q-methodology utilises indicators of the subjective dispositions of participants in political projects. In the present study texts (understood as comprising the complex of patterns identified by Gee and Fairclough) are the raw material for an empirical examination of how the textual organisation of a political issue is sub-divided into discourse patterns which attract the allegiance of participants in political contest.
The Q-sample is the body of statements that constitute the stimulus that respondents organise and order to represent their own view of the issue being examined. The statements are not regarded as having some a-priori meaning, or as being valid in themselves as measures of a discourse presumed to exist in a particular field. Rather the statements and their selection are provisional with the overriding aim that the totality and spread of statements should reflect the breadth of issues, questions and arguments canvassed in the overall concourse of debate and argument that constitutes the issue being examined. This was the criterion that the selection process attended to in the main.

The approach adopted to constructing the Q-sample is the sampling technique and methodology proposed by Dryzek and Berejikian (1993:50-52). Brown (1986:73) comments that “any suitably comprehensive sample is adequate for purposes of experimentation”. McKeown and Thomas (1988:25) point out that Q-samples can be ready-made or naturalistic or that they can be structured or unstructured, or that there are hybrids of these alternatives. While some of the options offered would have been faster and simpler than the one eventually adopted (reducing the number of components and their effects) Dryzek and Berejikian’s sample construction method was most suited to the aim of the present work to connect an empirical examination of subjectivity with discourse analysis examination of debates on the issue and the subsequent interviews with key activists.

The aim has been to produce a more confident and mutually reflective series of approaches to the study given the fact that activists and participants in debates often dispute their antagonists’ motives, ‘real purposes’, agendas and aims. Studying the subjective orientations of key activists can be a highly elusive aim and therefore adopting a mutually supporting array of techniques and methods offers a stronger basis for confidence in the results obtained.

Accordingly, the present study sampled a very large and representative range of statements that could be taken to constitute the historical, philosophical, ideological and political dimensions of the status of English in the US in the immediate context of the attempts to enshrine constitutional recognition and authority for the language. This selection of statements was in accordance with a matrix of political discourse (Seidel 1985; Dryzek 1990:159-169) especially as set out in Dryzek and Berejikian (1993). These were cross-referenced with the heuristic categories of argument identified by Toulmin (1958). This procedure aims to ensure that a sample of representative statements is assembled for rating by respondents.
Construction of Q-sample

The statements are characterised by their fit with the definition of political discourse and their character as representative of the claims about the world which argument embodies. The language of the statements is mostly unchanged from its original form as the bulk are authentically-occurring in the conourse.

The principal aim was to ensure that respondents can identify the statements as representative of the contest for the officialisation of English in the 104th Congress, and the associated question of the role of Federal bilingual programs, in particular bilingual education. Bilingual education serves as the ever present ‘other’ of the official English movement, and although the two could conceivably be treated as discrete they co-exist in virtually all arguments for official English.

The wide range of sources from which the statements were drawn also reflects a generic diversity. This means therefore that the statements are anecdotal, rhetorical-political, scientific-evidentiary, factive, descriptive and programmatic, and constitute both the remembered and retained presuppositions of participants in the issue as well as more immediate questions that participants are addressing.

Material was collected from key participants in these debates, specifically from key organisations. Among these were the National Association for Bilingual Education, the National Council of La Raza, the Joint National Committee for Languages and the National Council for Languages and International Education, U.S. English, English First. The kinds of material collected included what is typically given to an enquirer interested in the mission and policy of the organisation: brochures, position statements, research reports, letters to the editor from several newspapers, articles of various kinds, promotional and advertising material intended for the general public, kits and folders that contain information about the organisation. Other sources included political speeches and statements from Senators and Congressmen who have expressed views on bilingual education-official English. An extensive search of newspaper clippings and speeches printed in the 1990-95 volumes of Vital Speeches of the Day period was conducted. Books and promotional booklets from the above-mentioned organisations were included as well as statements made by Congressmen, their staff, and representatives of lobby and advocate groups during preliminary discussions with the researcher. Finally, statements were collected from two seminars devoted to opposite sides of official English held on September 1995 (see Chapter VI). The sources for the statements is set out in Appendix II.

Statements that appear didactic, or even ‘scientific’ in nature, (e.g. statements trying to establish in some ‘objective’ way the ‘best’ program or methodological intervention for children’s education) were
included if they were found to be located in the overall concourse of discussion about policy. In this respect such statements constitute an orientation to policy and therefore are part of a political discourse understood here to intend practical consequences concerning the dispersal of resources and their justification against competing claims.

More than 250 ‘statements’ were collected via these processes. These statements constituted the total initial gathering of a potential Q-sample. Reducing these to a manageable number involved eliminating statements that substantially repeated the key ideas, positions, points, claims or ideologies expressed in other statements, after which process 160 statements remained.

Each of the 160 statements was checked against the cells of a matrix (Figure Seventeen) formed by the intersection of four elements of political discourse (ontology, agency, motives and naturalised relationships) and four argument claims (defining, designating, evaluating or advocating). Sixteen cells result from this process with 4 statements selected for each cell. This results in a final total of 64 statements meaning that four statements characterise each of the political discourse features. The resulting final list reflects a broadly balanced representation of views both within cells and overall, but these are not necessarily mirror images of each other.

The cells therefore are the intersection between the verb statement on the left hand (the rows, defining, designating, evaluating, advocating) and the discourse features (the columns, ontology, agency, motivation, naturalness).

**Figure Sixteen: Verb Expressions by Political Discourse Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell 1</th>
<th>Defining Ontology</th>
<th>Cell 5</th>
<th>Designating Ontology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell 2</td>
<td>Defining Agency</td>
<td>Cell 6</td>
<td>Designating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 3</td>
<td>Defining Motivation</td>
<td>Cell 7</td>
<td>Designating Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 4</td>
<td>Defining Naturalness</td>
<td>Cell 8</td>
<td>Designating Naturalness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 9</td>
<td>Evaluating Ontology</td>
<td>Cell 13</td>
<td>Advocating Ontology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 10</td>
<td>Evaluating Agency</td>
<td>Cell 14</td>
<td>Advocating Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 11</td>
<td>Evaluating Motivation</td>
<td>Cell 15</td>
<td>Advocating Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell 12</td>
<td>Evaluating Naturalness</td>
<td>Cell 16</td>
<td>Advocating Naturalness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an aid to understanding the meaning of each cells 1-4 are described. Cell one is the intersection of Defining (an argument claim) with Ontology. Cell one therefore concerns arguments that define
ontology, that is arguments that define which set of entities are recognised as existing (ethnicities, nationalities, languages, social classes, genetic inheritances, incompatible interests etc). Cell two is made up of arguments that define the degrees of agency (autonomous or constrained) that these entities are seen to have (Marxists might argue that social classes have agentive power; liberals might see that individuals do). Cell three comprises arguments which define the kinds of motives that these entities will have (such as material self-interest, or civic virtue). Cell four defines the relations among these entities (are different ethnic groups in the same social space inevitably involved in conflict; are different languages essentialised properties of cultures?).

**FIGURE SEVENTEEN: POLITICAL DISCOURSE MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Naturalness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining</strong></td>
<td>11 52</td>
<td>36 46</td>
<td>32 50</td>
<td>5 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 27</td>
<td>56 58</td>
<td>54 57</td>
<td>9 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designating</strong></td>
<td>8 45</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 51</td>
<td>38 55</td>
<td>7 19</td>
<td>33 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating</strong></td>
<td>26 28</td>
<td>14 47</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td>12 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 44</td>
<td>61 62</td>
<td>25 49</td>
<td>41 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocating</strong></td>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>53 59</td>
<td>30 29</td>
<td>34 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 18</td>
<td>63 64</td>
<td>60 31</td>
<td>39 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This categorisation promises to uncover the kinds of argument types that characterise the discourse positions in the field.

Given that statements are contextualised (retained within their surrounding texts) the meanings of several are complex and some contain ambiguity. Political argumentation contains ambiguity as a strategic device. It follows that some of this is represented in the statements which are a direct sample of the concourse having these very same features. A highly charged political contest over resources, ideology and interests is the subject of examination, and political actors seek to appeal to multiple audiences and sometimes embrace ambiguous or even contradictory positions. There is also some overlap in the categories and labels. The matrix is a heuristic-organising device to ensure that a
representative sample of the concourse is tapped. There is no rigid or formulaic application of an outsider-determined template for selecting statements.

**Q-Research Process**

The main reason for preferring Q and political discourse analysis over the next likely alternative (attitude testing) is that the present study is seeking to access the kinds of political positions that are complexly woven into debates about the issue of official English. Yes/No or other binary or limited choice characterisations of political alternatives dichotomise what are invariably more richly contextualised positions of political actors. The present study is more concerned to examine what political actors do (or potentially would do) and what they actually say (to a considerable degree saying is acting in politics). In other words, attitude studies leave to chance the likelihood of action following from an expression of opinion or attitude whereas Q seeks to go further and identify the actual predisposition to act in relation to the issue being studied of the participant. Some latency may remain but the method is more sophisticated in tapping predisposition to act.

Figure Eighteen sets out what a completed Q-sort looked like. Each respondent placed each card under the selected rank to display an overall position in response to the researcher’s instruction. Each sort was scored, the total aggregated and factor analysis undertaken.

**FIGURE EIGHTEEN: QUASI-NORMAL DISTRIBUTION OF Q-SORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKE</th>
<th>INDIFFERENT</th>
<th>MOST LIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOUR VIEW</td>
<td>OR NEUTRAL</td>
<td>YOUR VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q-Sorts**

The results are set out in Figure Nineteen below. On the left there are two numbers for each statement: the first is the individual statement in serial form (1-64), the second is the number of the cell to which each statement belongs (1-16) and for which it expresses one fourth of the statements that characterise the verb-discourse feature quality of that cell. The text of the statement then appears (this is abbreviated in some cases in Figure Nineteen but all respondents were shown unabbreviated statements on separate cards). The final two numbers are the scores that each factor allocates to each statement. The rank order that each factor allocates is the relative importance of that statement for each factor (discourse).
To illustrate this further, statement 1 comes from Cell 13 in which the categories of entities that are seen as existing are: nations, languages, common languages and (though only by implication) languages that are not common to all, the text is ‘One nation, one common language’. These entities of nations and languages are advocatory in that this cell is the intersection of the verb Advocate with the discourse feature Ontology, therefore the statement advocates a position about the relations of nations and languages; in this case that united nations must have a single common language.

Because this particular statement occurs frequently in the literature of the main organisations moving to make English official (it is a slogan used in many publications and speeches by US English and English First, and appears in Congressional speeches and debates) virtually every respondent recognised the specificity of meaning (that it is necessary to declare English the common language of the United States for the country to remain united). The statement seeks to effect perlocutionary force via declarative expression and is understood by its opponents as being more than a description.

In post interview commentary one respondent who agreed with the politics of this statement commented that it was an “exemplary statement”; another commented “That is what I truly believe”. One who disagreed said the statement represented a political program “To make people feel unwelcome”. This particular statement was very powerful in dividing the two discourses; official English advocates voted Statement One **PLUS 3** (out of five); their opponents disagreed even more strongly allocating Statement One **MINUS 4** (out of five).

Proceeding through all the statements reveals that although there is much variation there are also two main groupings, and these constitute the two discourses that the participants adopt. These discourses are constituted by the mathematical factor scores; i.e. those statements that predictably form a unity so that a single respondent who ranks one statement high will also rank a predictable set of other statements high, and vice versa.

Examining the surface level of the statements provides evidence of what the respondent thinks about the issue of official English-multilingualism-bilingual education etc, while examining the underlying political discourse via the cell content tells us about the kind of argumentation and framing that the individual and those with similar views engage in.

In addition to the two main discourses there is also a ‘hidden’ factor, in that factor two (official English advocates) is consistently bipolar. This represents an alienation from the extreme form of official English by people who otherwise support its goals. Bipolar factors are indicative of highly contested
issues. The positive and negative poles of factor two and factor one are discussed below. Below then are the results of the Q-analysis.

**FIGURE NINETEEN: STATEMENT SCORES AND FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors 1</th>
<th>Factors 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>‘One nation, one common language’</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘Fear of foreign speakers is older than the nation, rising in times of war, economic stress and increased migration’</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘Language minorities don’t need lectures about the importance of English, as shown by the numbers competing for scarce seats in ESL classes’</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘America’s success and prosperity have always turned on the determination of immigrants to assimilate into a common culture with common values and, yes, a common language.’</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘America is fast becoming a society divided by language, and with it we will inherit all the problems that stem from this development—ethnic strife, more discrimination and entrenched poverty.’</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>‘Bilingual government services all share a fundamental problem; they remove a strong incentive to learn English and be a productive citizen of our democracy.’</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘The formation of US English should be viewed within the wider context of the more general Reagan renaissance; that is the widespread mobilization of the right wing in the early 1980’s …’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘My children learn Spanish in school so they can grow up to be busboys and waiters. I teach them English at home so they can grow up to be doctors and lawyers.’</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘As with other official English bills (this one) is chauvinistic, xenophobic divisive and discriminatory.’</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>‘It is to the economic and cultural advantage of the nation as a whole that its citizens be proficient in more than one language.’</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘..many US citizens have native languages of other than English... and many members of our society have not had an equal opportunity to learn English.’</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>‘Our assumed common language, English, has helped make the United States the lone superpower in the world today.’</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘The tie of language is perhaps the strongest and the most durable that can unite mankind.’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Word Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Last year our government spent nearly $8 billion abusing children…it’s called bilingual education.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The aggressive movement on the part of Hispanics to reject assimilation and to seek to maintain—and give official status to—a foreign language within our borders is an unhealthy development.</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>We have room for but one language here and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns out people as American… no more hyphenated Americans.</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>'Democracy or Babel!'</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Bilingual Education Act is a cash-cow for a vast well-funded national bureaucracy.</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>'...keys to unity under attack…intellectual elites who seem embarrassed by America. What we see as opportunity they see as oppression.'</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>'…salsa has replaced Ketchup…it won't be too long before someone moves a Bill to make Ketchup the official condiment of the nation.'</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>'An English language amendment is not just a symbolic bolster of the English language. It will disenfranchise voters. It will endanger public safety. It will put up barriers…'</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>'..the United States might as well face the fact that the future of the country will be multilingual--whether it is English and Spanish in Florida or English and Japanese in California.'</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>'Less initial instruction in English produces greater eventual proficiency in English. What is learned in the native language transfers to English.'</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>'The Spanish language is totally different from English. If you concentrate on teaching a kid in just one language he can learn better. English…the sooner kids learn it well the better off they will be.'</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>'I come before you to accuse advocates of native-language-based bilingual education of fraud… I tell you their primary purpose is to perpetuate a seriously flawed teaching method.'</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>'It is time to see bilingual Americans as role models rather than communicative lepers.'</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>'…all of us who…worry about the status of the English language, who worry lest the country be left once more without adequate defense…these are not separate worries…they add up to…Reagan's prayer..'</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>'Some black and Chicano radicals also claim they are not part of America and demand multiculturalism and bilingualism. Some want to establish an empire, Azatlan, in the former Spanish Southwest.'</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'...I can only hypothesize that bilingualism and bilingual education have become another scapegoat, another casualty of truth in the growing anti-Hispanic, anti-immigrant climate we are experiencing.'

30. 15  +3  -4

'According to experts in education and psychology, the English-only movement uses arguments which promote interethnic group tension and prejudice.'

31. 15  -3  +3

'The other side gets most of its money from the government. The anti-English lobby gets millions of dollars from these programs...they've risen out of nothing; but its very well paying work.'

32. 3  0  -3

'X blamed the Bill on xenophobia, and 'blind conservatism' which, he says, are driving the nation's culture wars. There's a supremacist tinge to it.'

33. 8  +1  0

'Languages are like mother's milk.'

34. 16  +3  -1

'The first day of school... a little boy... His world seemed dark and alone except when his teacher spoke to him in the language he understood. Then a smile came to his face...'

35. 12  -2  +1

'I have a problem with my kids.... Trying to teach everything in two languages has slowed down their learning. Their minds are confused.'

36. 2  -1  +4

'In order to achieve political gains as a minority, Hispanic activists have had to fight the erosive forces of assimilation which endanger the size of their core constituency...'

37. 8  -2  -3

'We should erect a sign at each port of entry into the US: Welcome to the US-We cannot speak your language.'

38. 6  -1  +4

'(Hispanic) leaders seem more intent on vying with blacks for permanent victim status than on seeking recognition for genuine progress by Hispanics over the last three decades.'

39. 16  -5  -4

'We cannot assimilate--and we won't!'

40. 16  -3  0

'A group speaking the same language is known as a nation and a nation ought to constitute a state.'

41. 12  +4  -1

'Bilingualism is beautiful.'

42. 12  +3  -5

'In a civilized state, there should be no need to debate the right to maintain one's mother tongue... It is a self-evident, fundamental, human right. [the USA] is guilty of linguistic genocide.'

43. 9  +4  +5

'The menace to America today is the emphasis on what separates us rather than what brings us together.'

44. 9  +2  +5

'Let us not confuse the private freedom to use any language or keep any cultural traditions with the responsibilities of public education.'

45. 5  +4  -2

153
'For students in the U.S. ...the elementary school program with the most success as measured by standardized tests across all subject areas, is two-way developmental bilingual education.'

46. 2 +5 -2
'Of course English is the language of the United States. Of course it is. The issue is whether children who come here, while they are learning English, should also be able to learn other things.'

47. 10 +3 -5
'In the name of 'enhancing the role of English as the official language' we may again see a rebirth of hatred and bigotry towards limited English proficient persons.'

48. 5 -5 +1
'America is a melting pot. America is not a salad bowl. America is 'one people'. That's why English must be our official language.'

49. 11 +1 -2
'...the issue [of official English] is more a product of GOP presidential politics than good policy...an arbitrary debate that, frankly, has more to do with the agenda of the extreme right.'

50. 3 +2 -4
'So it's a manufactured problem and it's a manufactured issue designed to appeal to the prejudices and the resentments of a group of conservatives in this country.'

51. 5 +3 -3
'Furthermore, any legislation that mandates English-only instruction is in fact unconstitutional. It violates the 1923 Supreme Court decision, Meyer v. Nebraska...'

52. 1 +1 +3
'Foreigners are always aliens in England. No one becomes English. It's a very tribal society...No one becomes Japanese. No one becomes Nigerian. But Nigerians, Japanese and English become Americans.'

53. 14 0 +2
'Our symbol is the statue of liberty torch, capturing the spirit of immigrants who learned English and became full members of the American society.'

54. 3 0 -2
'In the United States, official-English advocates firmly subscribe to the language-nation connection, though frequently on a rather superficial and occasionally pernicious level.'

55. 6 -2 +3
'It is these communities [...]poor non-white recent immigrants] that have been most isolated, culturally and economically, by multilingualism and have the most to gain from a common language.'

56. 2 0 -4
'It's straight out racist because first there was affirmative action now there's English-only. So now you have African Americans and Hispanics scraping the bottom of the barrel for crumbs....'

57. 3 0 +2
'.the problem is the self-appointed protectors of the minorities.'

58. 2 +4 -1
'If anything, Congress should consider funding efforts to teach English as a second language, instead of punitive bills that would in effect bar non-English speakers from receiving services...'

59. 14 +1 -3
'Bilingual educators must continue to be advocates for those people who are not able to defend themselves.'
I remember one day trying to communicate to the teacher my need to use the restroom. She could not understand me. Tears rolled down my face...I will never forget these experiences...

The sight of striking Latino students brandishing the Mexican flag and calls by Latino leaders for 'Azatlan' (a return of California to Mexico) stir deep resentment.

While there is no conclusive research that demonstrates the educational superiority of bilingual education over ESL advocates of bilingualism continue to make such claims.

The President must hear from constituencies that bilingual education is important to them...

Sadly, there are some ethnic leaders who prefer bilingualism because it keeps their voters and supporters isolated from the rest of America... more easily manipulated for political purposes...

(There are no consensus items and 56 items distinguish factor A from B being at least 1 pile apart).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliabilities 98 98

DISCOURSES

The two discourses, Pluribus and Unum that are represented as Factor One and Factor Two are now discussed in narrative form.

Pluribus: Civil Rights, Multilingualism & A Diverse America

The first of these discourses is called the discourse of language pluralism. Linking the statements together we can form an idealised narrative, the story that the advocates of this position tell about the official English issue. Chaining the statements together, using only the very high and very low scores, it runs as follows. The numbers in brackets refer to the statements. Only some respondents’ scores equate exactly to the narrative (it is an idealisation). These are respondents whose scores allocate +5 and –5 rankings with a perfect fit to the idealised discourse scores. The majority of respondents are located along a continuum more or less closely allied with the two discourse ideals.

Bilingualism is an achievement of individuals, it should be valued and the individuals seen as national role models (26), the idea that English is not the main language of America is absurd, of course it is (46) but that is not the issue, the issue is whether children will be educated in a way that will advance their general intellectual growth while they acquire English (46), then as bilinguals they can contribute positively to the economic and cultural growth of America (10) and so we don’t need to be lectured about the need for English (3), when there are huge waiting lists of immigrants wanting to learn English but insufficient funding for the teaching and services they require (3); that’s what Congress should be
doing, funding efforts to teach English as a second language (58); we don’t like this talk of the lone superpower (12), or the assimilative melting pot (48); language maintenance is a right in a civilised state (42)

We are totally opposed to the idea that there is room for only one language in America (13) or that having more than one language makes one less American (16). The idea that having many languages is a threat to democracy is wrong (17); as is the notion of the melting pot in which we have to disregard our past to become American; this is unacceptable (48). However, we are strongly embarrassed by immigrant claims to refuse assimilation (39), but we are especially appalled that the official English advocates have described our professional work in bilingual education as child abuse in public advertisements (14) and that they characterise the issue of the bilingual education as a ’cash cow’ (18) or that our motives are self-serving and about keeping well paid jobs (31).

Consistent with our view that this issue is really about making the most of the resource of bilingualism (10) within the American community we feel that the evidence is clear that two way bilingual education is the most successful education of minority children (45), and that is the real issue here, what is the best education for minority language children (46); we should aim to produce bilingualism which is beautiful (41), therefore if anything the Congress should be legislating funding for ESL (58), instead of pandering to fear of foreign speakers which is always heightened at times of war or economic difficulty (2), and this is the real menace, these created divisions where there really are none (43). We really should see bilingual Americans as role models rather than communicative lepers (26), and this kind of argument from the other side that promotes prejudice and inter-ethnic group tension (30) really should be exposed for what it is.

The issue is essentially an educational one. It is clear that our opponents see this as an issue of nationalism. We do not agree that one united nation requires that we only have one language (1), we might as well face up to the fact that the future of the nation is multilingual (22). As professionals we are appalled that we are accused of deceiving parents and the wider community and really only looking after our own selfish interests (25)

The exemplary or ideal Q-sort for the discourse of pluralism is shown in the figure below.
These 16 respondents are the exemplar holders and advocates of the position of Pluribus: Civil Rights, Multilingualism & A Diverse America. Theirs is the ideal factor load.

Respondent 2 is a young man who lives in Louisiana and is a student teacher. He votes for neither of the main political parties and identifies himself as someone concerned with “social opportunity and ongoing discrimination in America”. He is white in identified ethnic origin and has English as his first language. His intention is to teach in a Spanish-English bilingual program and believes that children “should keep their first language alive”.

Respondent 3 is a young professional female, white, English mother tongue but a speaker of Spanish. She is an academic and very hostile to the official English movement which she regards as an “immense attack on fellow Americans”. For Respondent 3 past immigrants lost their languages but “surely we don’t have to keep making the same mistakes”.

Respondent 43 is a middle aged female Democrat voter who is active in “some groups” that are “defending people from racism” however she is concerned about the “weak defense we have had on this issue” feeling that the Democratic leadership perceives popular “anti-immigrant sentiment” and does not wish to alienate potential voters in a presidential election period. She feels that official English is about “turning the clock back” to a time when America was “white and Protestant”. The world is a “global village now” and languages are “useful”.

Respondent 29 is a male Hispanic of African origin who speaks “a few languages”. He is reluctant to vote believing “the rich run America” and that official English is a consequence of economic difficulties and the need to curtail immigration and that “well, money talks.” He argues that political parties are “undemocratic” and party machines are corrupt. He is active in “special education” and believes that bilingual education is often necessary and that the research is “very clear that bilingual education is the best method” for “LEP students”. Teachers “should decide” what education children receive.
Unum: Protecting English & Uniting America

*Unum* is the counter discourse to *Pluribus* and declares itself as opposing multilingual excess and stemming national disunity. The counter discourse construes the overall issue and “the problem” in radically different ways. This is a discourse not primarily concerned with education, or professional service delivery, or with the evidence from research. It is concerned with constructions of nation, identity, unity and world role; what has made America prosperous and successful.

Linking the statements together we can form the idealised narrative. As with the previous discourse chaining together the very high and very low scores the discourse is as follows.

This issue is about what has made America prosperous and successful. America’s success has come from the willingness of past immigrants to give up their traditions and to assimilate (4), now we have this menace to our unity which comes from divisions of immigrants wanting to stay separate from being American (43), this means that the keys to the unity of the country are under attack from within (19), of course people can speak what they like at home (this is a private freedom) but in public education there is a responsibility to teach English (44).

Assimilation into the America economic and political nation is the desire of individuals who have made the United States their home (4). This process is inevitable but an array of legislative extensions of Civil Rights thinking to language has interrupted this process so that minorities have become absorbed into a stultifying collectivism under the management of ethnicity-controlling institutions (6), among these bilingual education is an especially egregious exemplar (31). Hispanic activists have had to combat the desire of ordinary immigrants who want to assimilate (36) and become American, and who know that English is the language of opportunity (8).

Some extremists refuse to assimilate (39) and have joined a common cause with Blacks on becoming ‘victims’ (38) and erect an elaborate structure of institutional support to separate them from mainstream America and retain their cultural and linguistic distinctiveness. In this they have had the support of self-serving professionals (18).

This alliance of ethnic bosses and elite self-serving intellectuals does not recognise America’s true nature, its power in the world, and the central and unifying role of English (12); we will reap some strife from all this (5); the effects are to insult the American nation (37), to see oppression where really there is opportunity and achievement (19); the United States will not inevitably be multilingual (22) and the menace to our nation is all this emphasis on difference (43).

These groups have invented a vocabulary of ‘rights claims’ with which they make false accusations against the US (42); and make this an issue of racism and bigotry (47; 9); there is more at stake in this issue than some technical question of the educational effectiveness of alternative pedagogies, or prejudice (30), or endangering public safety (21) what is at stake is the unity of the America (19).
The exemplary or ideal Q-sort for the discourse of anti-pluralism is shown in the figure below.

**Figure Twenty-Two: Ideal Q-sort for Factor Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+4</th>
<th>+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure Twenty-Three: Respondents with Significant Loading; Factor Two**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>+45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>+81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+79</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 14 respondents are the exemplar holders and advocates of the position that Affirming English is an act of national unification. Theirs is the ideal factor load.

Respondent 11 is a middle aged male who lives in Virginia. He has a small company that does engineering consultancy work. He votes Republican and is a former marine. He describes himself as an “ordinary member” of US English an organisation whose aims he “backs to the hilt”. He is concerned about illegal immigration, the “fraying” of America and the sense that as the “lone superpower” Americans need to be united and strong because so many will be wanting to “bring America down.” He is white in identified ethnic origin and has English as his first language. English is the “language of opportunity” and America is the “land of opportunity”. “People come here” but then they want to change the way things “have always been”.

Respondent 12 is a retired female para-legal, white, with English as her mother tongue but who has “studied language”. She has recently voted Democrat but is unsure about “next time” because “Clinton has let us down”. She feels that “patriotism” demands “protecting English” because too many employers will “hire anybody” but this is not good for the nation. Official English will send a “clear message” to “keep America united”
Respondent 13 is a middle aged female Republican voter. She is a member of US English who feels that “bilingual education just doesn’t work” and “too many people are living off of it.” Immigrants should assimilate like earlier generations did “we are all of immigrant stock” but new ones “want it all on a platter” commenting “Who is going to pay for all this?”

Respondent 47 is a male of German origin who speaks “good English”. America is a “great force for good” in the world, taxpayers should not have to pay for “what people speak at home” and “Canada and Belgium” prove that “too many languages split countries”. America is “where it’s all at” and if you want to keep your other language “there is another country for you”.

Injury
The extended analysis of these data, supplemented by the interviews and discourse data seeks to answer this critical question: What is to be taken to be the core problem that policy on language will address?

According to the restrictionist discourse multilingual excess is the problem; multilingualism costs too much, divides the nation, stresses difference, keeps immigrants poor. Language is construed as a basically economic and commodified entity, and much of the discourse makes America into an economic entity, but there is also a suggestion of “a nation injured” by the wish of people to “keep other languages”. Language is essentialised in many cases as belonging to America, being indissolubly part of America’s world standing, and other languages are a price that immigrants allowed into the country should willingly give up. It being “disrespectful” not to.

The contesting pluralist ideology focusses on the kinds of professional intervention that are appropriate in “the reality” of American diversity. This gives rise to a discourse of evidence, research, globalisation and even a sociolinguistically oriented view of languages, rather than an essentialised view of languages. For pluralists too there is “injury”, but the injured are poor immigrants, children who don’t speak English and minorities in general.

The voices of recent immigrants in the restrictionist camp stress the economics dimension most strongly and comment that with other languages “you can’t go as far as with English”. ‘Mainstream’ Americans in the official English movement on the other hand more readily push the nation-language link. These people often present themselves as patriots who are “worried about America”. Within the pluralist camp many participants present themselves, i.e. introduce the basis of their claims to express a view as coming from research, from professionalism, from personal experience of disadvantage and struggle or from reflection on the new world of global interdependence. These self-legitimations sustain the basic divisions between the discourses as an educator-derived pluralist matrix contending a nation-
affirming matrix that legitimates its claims on the basis of “insightful knowledge and patriotism”. The exemplar speaking positions provide little basis for inter-subjective understanding.

**Always Already**

There are no consensus items in the sorts and (a very large) 56 items distinguish Factor A from B, being at least 1 pile apart. This is evidence of the high level of polarisation and ‘agonism’ involved. However, there are several statements that produce a ‘near consensus’; rather like shared strong opposition. These are statements 39, 20 and 37 that are given congruently negative votes by both sides.

| 39. 16 | ‘We cannot assimilate--and we won't!’ | -5 -4 |

The unanimous deploring of this sentiment indicates a space, slim in the overall context of the divisions, of common ground. Essentially this statement vocalises rejection of the assimilative pressure of wider society. It contains two semantic elements. The first is a descriptive claim that assimilation is not possible, the second (contradicting the first) assumes that it is indeed possible but it is repudiated. A common description by respondents in response to Statement 39 was “real aggressive”. This ‘aggressive’ stance, and the meaning of the statement as interpreted by most respondents, appears to tap into a protephobic common ground, a kind of shared disposition from all language strategists, activists against and for official English.

The statement appeared to embarrass the pluralists as much as it enraged the restrictionists. It also surfaces a common ground, a kind of citizenship platform. This suggests that the only legitimate activists in the politics of official English are those who somehow have “made a move towards America” (as one respondent described it) as the platform from which the dispute is to be conducted. The right of passage to be able to engage is suggestive of the interest the antagonists have in the ‘common stakes’. Bourdieu’s contention is that arguments involve collusion disguised as struggle to retain adherence to aspects of common ground (1991: 58). Here there is an insider/outsider divide (Americans who can disagree about official English; and non-assimilators who aggressively reject America and are therefore not permitted even to disagree). The category ‘American’ is the necessary pre-condition of participating in the argument; or perhaps the category ‘non-aggressive’.

Less strongly, there is also convergent disagreement on ‘the salsa remark’.

| 20. 11 | ‘..salsa has replaced Ketchup...it won't be too long before someone moves a Bill to make Ketchup the official condiment of the nation.’ | -1 -2 |
This statement was repudiated by both sides as frivolous in a way that is damaging to an underlying sense shared by Unum and Pluribus adherents that “this issue is serious”. Pluralists commented that they considered engaging in ridicule of their opponents as “bad form”, they would be accused of _ad hominen_ tactics from their opponents and already had to sustain so many suggestions of being against the common-sense interests of the nation that anything which challenged their patriotism was undesirable. Further they felt that ‘the salsa remark’ although supportive of their cause would render them frivolous in the judgment of ‘ordinary people’.

_Unum_ adherents described the statement as either “silly” or “insulting”. One respondent who considered it insulting described it as an “anti-American jibe” and attributed it to “some minority” (in fact it was a statement made by a Congressman). Those who considered it “silly” saw in this evidence that pluralists were “cavalier” about the kind of “damage” that was being done to the “fabric and unity of America”. The rankings are only –1 and –2 and so the ‘mutuality’ is not great.

There is also shared negative reaction to the “We cannot speak your language” remark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37.</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'We should erect a sign at each port of entry into the US: Welcome to the US-We cannot speak your language.'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although both restrictionists and pluralists alike considered the statement to be “silly”, “trivial”, and “not real” several respondents, from both primary discourse positions, remarked that the statement was “insulting to America”; one stating that it “demeans America”. Several questioned the source (drawn from an influential book by a US Senator making a case for enhanced foreign language competence).

The general feeling among most respondents was that “_Americans can disagree about this issue_” but that this particular comment is an “indignity” to America, humbling the nation before others. The common ground here is interestingly reflective of the previous two statements, which seem to call for no overt aggression in the debate, for its conduct being seen to be ‘among Americans’ and that it eschew invidious national comparisons or practices. These are legitimising agreements, and although not strong they show that the only recurring basis of consensus is about who is allowed to fight out the issue.

This section has been entitled Always Already (Immer Schon) to capture this sense that past legitimating procedures (being admitted as an authorised participant in debates by declaring out of bounds denigration of America, overt aggression and trivialisation) have pre-structured a meaning-scape that constitutes the main source of (fragile) consensus between the Unum and the Pluribus discourse patterns.
in what has been said and re-said about official English (and what legitimations there are for being permitted a voice).

E Pluribus Unum and Other Problems
Politically (and grammatically) much hangs on whether the many become one, or the many are one. These are the two discourses around which opinion and action gravitate. The ontology, agency ascription, attribution of matters to ‘nature’ and the motivations (self and other) are considered below. It is clear that the *Unum* is predominantly a discourse of nation and language and arrayed against it is *Pluribus*, a discourse principally concerned with education and service delivery. As we shall see this difference is marked in the transcriptions of the radio and television debates and, although somewhat attenuated, it is also encountered in the interview data. It is of considerable importance for the kind of politics and *lpp* represented by official English that there is so deep a difference in the underlying construction of the issue, or more problematically, that there are so few grounds for achieving intersubjective agreement. A theory of communicative action applied to such a situation would emphasise that the performance of divergent discourses, since they talk about language, invest this issue with a high degree of ideological materiality. Since the informational conveyance function of language is relatively low the shared presuppositions of the interactants become correspondingly more important in predicting the direction of arguments and debates. And here too, it is clear, that the two discursive orders diverge strongly.

The language concourse divides into the two sharply drawn pairings, the discourses. As the analysis proceeds a more elaborated structure to the discursive arrangements is revealed. Several attempts were made to locate a possible third discourse but the degree of polarisation was such that no reliable third grouping was located, although a considerable number of statements are bipolar indicating that within the two main discourses we can identify further affinity groupings. In particular within *Unum*, or attached to it closely, is a dissenting discourse, one which attenuates the nationalist and patriotic intensity of the *Unum* discourse. Figure Twenty-Four dramatically stakes out the ideological territory of the two discourses revealing that beneath the propositional level of the ranked 64 statements is a structured pattern of ideology which diverges sharply between the educator-derived pluralism-accepting *Pluribus* and the nation-protecting *Unum*. 

163
The following information deals with the pure or ideal sorts and analyzes them according to the similarities and differences in the verb kinds that they each select and according to the political discourse features that they each focus on. The intention is to see if the content level analysis revealed above is sustained by underlying features of argumentation and ideology.

**Pluribus on positive verbs (+3 +4 +5) and negative verbs (-3 –4 -5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE:</th>
<th>Defining: 3</th>
<th>Designating: 4</th>
<th>Evaluating: 5</th>
<th>Advocating: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE:</td>
<td>Defining: 3</td>
<td>Designating: 2</td>
<td>Evaluating: 4</td>
<td>Advocating: 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unum on positive verbs: (+3 +4+5) and negative verbs (-3 –4-5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE:</th>
<th>Defining: 3</th>
<th>Designating: 7</th>
<th>Evaluating: 2</th>
<th>Advocating: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE:</td>
<td>Defining: 5</td>
<td>Designating: 3</td>
<td>Evaluating: 2</td>
<td>Advocating: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from these data that the pluralist discourse evaluates more, indicating a possible sense of defensiveness and “weighing up of things” The restrictionist discourse does significantly more designating possibly a suggestion of a greater confidence about responsibility, essential qualities and natural relations.
Pluribus on positive (+3+4+5) and negative (-3-4-5) Political Discourse Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ontology: 6</th>
<th>Agency: 3</th>
<th>Motivation: 3</th>
<th>Naturalness: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unum on positive (+3+4+5) and negative (-3-4-5) Political Discourse Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ontology: 6</th>
<th>Agency: 5</th>
<th>Motivation: 2</th>
<th>Naturalness: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pluralist discourse appears to be rejecting more essentialisms (about nation and language) than the restrictionist discourse but the other differences are small. The following table aggregates the discourse features for both of the discourses for all votes over 3 on both the negative or the positive scales.

FIGURE TWENTY-FIVE: UNDERLYING POLITICAL DISCOURSE FEATURES FOR FACTORS ONE AND TWO

When we examine the major plus votes (+4 +5) and the major rejections (−4 −5) some consistent and interesting differences emerge. The restrictionist discourse scores down naturalness (evaluative, advocative and defining) assertions very preponderantly (3 out of 4 for −5 and 4 out of 9 for −4 and −5 aggregated) while the pluralist discourse scores down ontological assertions (advocative and designative) markedly (4 out of 9 for the aggregate and 2 out of 4 for −5).

It would appear from this that the educator orientation of the plural view is responding very negatively to the fixity and inevitability and essentialist content in the restrictionist World View contained in statements located in those cells. The restrictionists on the other hand react very strongly against the
idea that pluralism is an inevitable consequence of globalisation, that the loss of national distinctiveness is a consequence of global trade, and of immigration.

The positive rank ends are equally stark, but more for their congruence. Both discourses rank highest Ontology, Motivation and Agency features of discourse (+5 identical spread, though different verbal markers) while at +4 the restrictionist cause is very strongly assertive of a fixed and formed World View of ontological categories that are in human nature, whereas for the educator and professional slant of the pluralist discourse the world is more malleable and a sociolinguistically oriented pattern is evident in the ranks.

Narrating
The ideals of American nationhood are available to both causes. These recruit from instances of historical political formation to authorise positions in the present. For restrictionists, individualistic and freedom-idealisations of the American political compact contrast with collectivisms of all kinds. Combating freedom’s denial is America’s historical mission. A contemporary manifestation of freedom’s denial (individuals enclosed in stifling collectivist ethnicity) creates a seamless connection with a timeless national purpose. An ideological tie is established between ethnic bosses ostensibly containing minorities within enclaves of dependency and past American struggles against other freedom-denying autarchies.

For language pluralists the founding documents, the national founders themselves, the events of the independence struggles sustain a narrative linked with the Civil War and Civil Rights. In this discourse is patterned a sequence of national legitimations for official English. The ideological tie is with other kinds of freedom, of representation, of culture, of expression.

Language restrictionists also depict minorities as victims of sophisticated but no less dependency-creating, self-serving overlords among intellectuals (including teachers). Academics, educators and other intellectuals whose careers involve interaction with minorities, are represented as self-serving and exploiting minorities. English (opportunity-language) denied to minorities by what Speaker Gingrich called “linguistic welfare”, will empower minorities to independently, as individuals, join mainstream society without the mediation of ‘cultural elites’.

By contrast to this intellectual “bossiness” of cultural elites official English advocates parade the "authentic voice". Epitomising these is the Hispanic Father role model story, the multiple repetitions of the words of Ernesto Ortiz an ordinary man who famously said: "My children learn Spanish in school
so they can grow up to be busboys and waiters. I teach them English at home so they can grow up to be doctors and lawyers”. 

The Q-analysis has revealed evidence of a different view of the nature of languages between pluralists and restrictionists. Languages are essentialised entities and English is not tradeable with any other language. Essentialism can be of two types. One regards language as autonomous and bounded, a system closed within itself and its history, that speaks for particular cultural configurations, which in turn it forms. More extreme than this is an essentialism that merges with primordialism where language is linked to biology. Pluralism typically adheres to a more sociolinguistic view which, in the words of (Jaffe 1999: 216): “Proscribes purism, accepts and validates social and linguistic diversity, and makes political or social agendas the basis for language judgments and practices.” The plural reaction to official English also advances and accepts hybridising practices of nations, cultures and languages. These too are bounded for the extreme version of the restrictionist cause.

The discourses differ also in relation to the linguistic ideologies they advance as much as to underlying differences of language and its connection to collective identities. Nations devise and circulate narratives that work to solidify citizens around shared stories of attachment, and interpretation of the past (Bhabha 1990). The past is pressed into service in the present, displayed and made to do work in the here and now. But nation-narration, the deployment of narratives advanced and validated by institutional practices and endless reiteration, is rarely smooth. There are often conflicting narratives that vie for prominence. Dissenting narratives, or the repudiation of dominant narratives, constitutes one kind of contest for the symbolic capital of a nation. In one of the American narratives accommodating to diversity, exemplifying diversity, is constituted as a tradition. In the other the American nation is a distinctive entity, not an aggregation of differences, but an entity founded on English liberalism, political values, a political community, in which difference is set aside for unambiguous attachment to a common story.

Pluribus and Unum are in reality meta-narratives, orders of narration that organise overarching ideologies of state, nation, culture and language. These carry companion narratives with policy-making aims, to perform acts of language planning by engaging in ‘discursive politics’ (Yeatman 1990), by organising popular communication and by surfacing authorised problems around which state agency is called to action.
FROM SUBJECTIVITY TO POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

The next chapter extends the understanding that is emerging of the subjective dispositions of activists engaged in making and resisting language policy. In an analysis of taped radio debates, a monologue, a dialogue and a multilogue, as well as a critically important written text the central characters involved in the official English politics during the 104th Congress confront each other directly before audiences of the general public.
CHAPTER V

RADIO TEXTS & WRITING ANALYSIS

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In this chapter we use unelicited texts of politicians, lobbyists and journalists in their talk in interaction, and in one case a written text. According to Tannen (1998), politicians, lobbyists and journalists have “a habit of --and a stake in-- manufacturing polarization and the appearance of conflict” (p 276) and in modalities like radio and popular writing this has the effect of broadcasting and technologically-enhancing aggression.

The transcripts of the full texts appear in the appendices, only the analysis is included here. It extracts the main and recurring themes and connects these with themes and ideological patterns already discussed in the previous chapter.

TRANSCRIPT ONE: FRED FISKE SATURDAY

Transcript One (Appendix Six) consists of an extended encounter with a single proponent of official English. English First broke away from US English after a clamorous embarrassment for US English, the infamous ‘Tanton Memo’ (Crawford 2000) exposed an extreme anti-Hispanic bias and as a result of the bitter bickering this provoked. English First is more radical but much smaller than US English; a policy and tone difference which the transcript evidence with Mr George Tryfiatis (hereafter GT) sustains. The transcript contains collusive work between moderator (hereafter FF or MOD) and GT and reactions to perceived sympathetic, hostile, accusatory and irrelevant commentary from callers.

This transcript represents an extended (long turn) display and elaborated discourse from a key proponent of the official English movement, highlighting ethnic subjectivity, ‘interest’ and motivation, themes and metaphorical-metonymic reference, as well as critical evidence of the social criteria for assessment of bilingual education.

Analysis Of Text
The text comprises a long interaction of 107 turns exchanged between FF and GT. This is followed by 12 callers comprising a further 91 turns. Each of the callers engages in an interactive encounter with GT. The Moderator-Guest part of the text (up to turn 106) is discussed first, then the Callers’ turns (107-199) are presented and discussed.

Framing The Issue
From the first turn the debate is framed as the irreconcilability of ‘bilingual education’ and ‘official English’, the latter constructed in opposition to and as a reaction against the presumed excesses of the former. In turns 1-3 FF frames the issue as the departure of bilingual education from its original
legislative mandate of providing assistance to immigrant children to continue general learning until they acquire sufficient English to transfer to learning in English. By turn 4 GT has gathered the sense of this by his ‘Of course, we’re the only country in the world that’s based on that theory.’ By turn 10 Spanish immersion education and bilingual education are conflated and confused. Bilingual education is named co-terminously with Spanish education. In the next sequence, turns 10 to 28 GT develops the ideas of problem and cause. The problem is the self-interests of teachers, bureaucrats and ethnic leaders aided and abetted by ‘the Federal government’. At turn 10 both GT and Moderator ridicule the complexity of the bilingual education programs (‘…their native Urdu and their native Greek…’), the hiring of foreign teachers, less well trained and less English proficient than American teachers. FF leads GT and occasionally indicates sympathy with his view (turn 22) while at turn 24 GT seems to revel in the leads (“Yeah, Yeah.”) and goes on to propose ‘linguistic welfare’ in relation to the issue. When GT’s cynical interpretation of his opponents’ motives is called to explanation GT invokes the ‘snout in trough’ claim in turn 28 as well as ‘ethnic bossism’ and ‘manipulative ethnicity brokerage’.

**The Taxpayer**

“The question is - do the tax payers really need to support this kind of thing? If you want to go out and do that - go for it! But don't ask me to pay for it. Don't ask the tax payers to pay for it!” (50)

“…it's not up to our fellow tax payers, to pay for my children to speak Greek and learn about the glories of the Greek culture. The public schools have a job to teach people the English language, to teach people American culture.” (34)

**Molly-coddled Spanish speakers**

“…In fact, who really needs those ten-forty forms in their native language more? The people who speak Spanish who have a huge safety net in terms of their own community or the one or two Lithuanians who happen to be in a community. Well, if anybody really needs language services, you'd think it would be the smallest minority.” (56).

**What about the Greeks and Russians?**

..and others not ‘favoured’ as indicated in turn 52: (…”instead of wasting tax money, again on one language group, which could be used to teach against everybody else whose language is not served.”)

**Sneak attacks**

“…Right now it's not part of the civil rights laws - language discrimination - but there are all sorts of sneak attacks to put that particular word in the list of things against which you cannot discriminate”. (60)

“In other words, what they want is that if somebody applies for a job and is not able to speak English and the employer says, ‘Well, I'm sorry, I can't use you, I need somebody who can speak English’ the employer could be liable.” (61)

“…If they're successful. If they're successful in getting that sort of thing in the law. The most recent place that they tried to do that is - believe this or not - in the health care legislation….”(62)

**Splitting at the seams**

“And after many years of seeking to integrate, our populations - our racial, our ethnic groups - now there's this splitting at the seams.”(51) FF

**Getting somebody a job**

GT: “I think we have. In fact, if you look back just a couple of years ago, during the more unpleasant disturbances, you had Hispanic leaders come up and say ‘Well, the cure for the Mount Pleasant situation was to train policemen to speak Spanish’. Well, that is not going to get anybody a job. On the one hand you had Hispanic leaders saying ‘Well, the people don't have jobs’ and the answer to this is that we train the police to speak Spanish? It's completely turned on its head. The answer is to teach people to speak English. You just don't do that by insisting on Spanish all day long in a classroom. “(70).
Segregation
Many references are made by official English proponents to the social organisation of bilingual education caricaturing it as ‘segregation’. This attempts to connect with a memory resource of repudiated practice.

Evil and Racist
GT: “… The only place you see division on this issue is when our opponents start raising a ruckus about how its evil and racist somehow. You look anywhere where there's an official English Bill on the books, it's just not happening. Racists are just not crawling out of the woodwork in these places. And one last thing, let me just point out, where these things are on the books, official English is still supported, even by Hispanic and Chinese. Every ethnic group supports it. “(88)

At each others’ throats
Quebec “…at each others’ throats and have been for hundreds of years..”

Things are separating
The move to “separate things” and the leading role of the moderator in turns 43-50 (“…a movement afoot now to have bilingual education of American Indian Reservations” (46); GT: “Well, it’s everywhere” (47); “…even a movement afoot to establish Black English as a separate language.” (49); “…In Hawaii there's an effort to push Pidgin English as a matter of ethnic pride and you can just imagine every imaginable thing.” (50). And later GT emphasises the separation in 52, aware however that his calling them Spanish-only bilingual is not descriptively accurate: (“You'll notice that these Spanish-only bilingual classes, as I like to call them, are literally segregated - we're separate but equal. You've got every class, every subject, every grade, all completely separate with their own teachers and their own languages.”)

Ridicule
Advocates of official English often ridicule multilingualism. A favoured technique through naming a rare language and asking rhetorically whether this rare language is to receive public support. Another technique is by intonational marking of the names of rare languages with an appeal to listeners/readers to perceive the ridicule. Opponents of official English also engage in ridicule. Two favoured items of ridicule are to ask, rhetorically of course, whether the Congress should make official a particular dialect of English. This is the slippery slope rhetorical question: Sometimes this is applied to religion as in: Why don’t we officialise religion while we are at it? A popular point of ridicule also concerns the scope and limits of official English laws focusing on the Dade County Ordinance which, it is claimed, would have banned Latin botanical and animal terms at the County Zoo.

Framing the public
Hutchby’s (1996) analysis of power in arguments on British talk radio shows indicates that the organisation of activities within calls highlights “the asymmetrical distribution of argument resources” (p 494). The ‘power in calls’ is located between interactional activities and organisational structures. The discourse that flows brings into prominence relations of power, in the relationships between turns (as actions) and sequences. The basis on which calls are invited and introduced, the order of stating position and claim to knowledge, and the commentary space available to hosts, make the relationship very uneven.
What the public said
The twelve calls represent an important series of complications and resolutions to the discourse of the text. They challenge GT to elaborate and defend statements and provide a live and moving text of policy status attribution, what it is possible to be accused of and what surfaces in conflict and challenge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Self-Framing</th>
<th>Principal Argument</th>
<th>Basis of Argument</th>
<th>Moderator Role</th>
<th>Guest Speaker Response (GT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Self-effacement “not very good at arguing”. “Feel strongly”</td>
<td>2 way bilingual programs succeed</td>
<td>Professional experience &amp; research evidence. Educator &amp; therefore discursive insider.</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Distancing &amp; Dismissal, ‘bilingual folk’; ‘keep saying’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Insider knowledge. Empathy claims.</td>
<td>Social &amp; psychological needs of minority children</td>
<td>Anecdotes, individualisation, personalisation</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Empathy, personalisation &amp; anecdotisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Direct immigrant experience, knowledge through personal experience</td>
<td>‘German Imperialism’ in Baltics; ‘…fantasy language called Lithuanian’, ‘historical case for Polish’. Support for bilingual education</td>
<td>Personal experience &amp; ‘Study of History’</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Exploits caller claims for ‘validity’ in language &amp; community nomenclature. Manipulates caller confusion to assert callers’ opposition to bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Direct experience is implied</td>
<td>Bilingual ballots complicated &amp; expensive, but understandable. Swiss model more relevant than Canadian model</td>
<td>“Something I know about.”</td>
<td>Colludes with GT to distance relevance of Swiss model by ‘othering’ the Swiss.</td>
<td>Personalises Greece as nation with clear expectations about foreigner language use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Awareness of power of ‘immigrants as taxpayers’</td>
<td>GT ‘fanning flames of division’. Immigrants also pay taxes.</td>
<td>Fathers’ experiences of immigration and limited opportunity</td>
<td>Calls on GT to exhibit a compromising attitude.</td>
<td>Intransigence. Personalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>“…a few comments.”</td>
<td>Dutch first European language of America. Netherlands has two languages (implies success). Past 2 centuries immigrants organised ethnic language schools which “…didn’t harm us.”</td>
<td>Implies personal knowledge &amp; family experience</td>
<td>Moderation</td>
<td>Strong reaction. Officialisation of English merely the de jure recognition of the de facto status. ‘Concedes’ no moral superiority for English. Implies superiority attaches to Greek. Implies sacrificing own ethnic advocacy in national interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Regular listener. Concerned with objectivity.</td>
<td>Over 6 years Moderator has shown bias in selecting speakers favoring those opposed to bilingual education</td>
<td>Listening over 6 years. Implies considerable expertise in relation to bilingual education.</td>
<td>Rejects allegation of bias</td>
<td>Attempt at humorous self-characterisation. Allows moderator to deal with substantive issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille</td>
<td>Hispanic. Offended at bias of program. Offended by GT bias.</td>
<td>Hispanics also pay taxes. GT shows religious and ethnic bias. Claims perverse effect of program is to stiffen resolve to support bilingual education.</td>
<td>Parents had a “tough time”. Intimate knowledge of local community. Distances moderator and GT from such knowledge.</td>
<td>Moderation.</td>
<td>Defensiveness and counterattack; Hispanics well-served and pursuing a self-serving agenda; relatively more powerful than other ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Hispanic. Angered by program’s ‘bias’</td>
<td>Official English campaign “…sounds a little bit like xenophobia”. Supports government financed language training.</td>
<td>Implies professional knowledge</td>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td>Elaborates new position: uptoers government financed language training but only in English. Rejects xenophobia allegation. Defends views as producing social harmony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Implies direct experience, accent suggests speaker of a</td>
<td>Language ‘enslaves’ people</td>
<td>(Untrustworthy) ‘liberal academics’. Have uncovered in</td>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td>Concurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ellen
C1: This comprises 10 turns and is a microcosm of the overall issue and the nature of the debate. At turn 108 the interviewer turns moderator and introduces the caller. At 110 Ellen frames herself in self-effacing mode, an inability and inexperience with radio debate and contested argument. This is counterbalanced with claims about insider knowledge as an educator and ‘feeling strongly’ about ‘the issue’. Essentially the rejection of GT’s view concerns his over-generalisation of bilingual education programs, and the need to distinguish among the kinds of programs that exist, the aims that they each have and the results as indicated by testing. Ellen introduces a new kind of program type: the two-way bilingual program for consideration. At turn 111 the moderator passes the reply to the guest, who at turn 112 seems distinctly ill at ease and even concedes that the two-way programs may in fact work well but dismisses them as a “fad”. This is totally different from any criterial judgment so far engaged in. At turn 113, possibly sensing some advantage, Ellen requests recognition of the success of these programs, only to encounter at 114 the dismissal of research conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics as biased and a more general repudiation of ‘expertise’ and the collapsing of specific program types into general categories. This pattern is reproduced in the genuinely interactive turns 115 and 116 in which Ellen’s frame of insider knowledge and disaggregation of program type and evidentiary material are foregrounded but dismissed as the views of “bilingual folk”, implying an interestedness that cannot be trusted, and the views of people who “keep saying” these things. The “keep saying” characterisation is a powerful device that GT uses to diminish the sense of being on the defensive occasioned by Ellen’s introduction of the new program type. At turn 117 the moderator intercedes to terminate the exchange.

Patricia
C2: This exchange also comprises 10 turns and it too is characterised by insider knowledge claims from the caller. The evidence and knowledge claims for the argument fall heavily on personalisation buttressed by anecdote. The call is framed in psychological commentary and challenges bilingual education for its removal of language minority children from contact with English-speaking peers, however this is attentuated by Patricia’s call for ‘sensitivity’ and appropriate ‘transition’ in turn 128, and her slight distancing from FF suggests she opposes bilingual education. In 124 the evidentiary personalisation becomes complete by Patricia’s basing her argument on the experiences of “a little girl who is Vietnamese…she’s a darling girl”. The anecdote induces GT to construct a similar case as he relates personal language learning experiences (countering bilingual methodology) in turn 125. FF appears affected by these exchanges and in 127 asks a leading question which implies partisanship.

John
C3: This exchange lasts 7 turns. C3 refers instantly to GT and frames his claims in terms of direct immigrant experience (“I must qualify myself”). John’s claim to support GT’s position is largely undermined when he transfers the discussion totally away from bilingual education to the history of the Baltic nations, “German Imperialism”, the “fancy or fantasy language called Lithuanian” and the historical claims for Polish. This challenge to the direction and content of the debate is refuted by the Moderator at turn 131 who calls for relevance. However in response C3 compounds the ambivalence of the case he has made by claiming to support bilingual education “100%” and yet argues that individual language communities ought to support their own languages if these languages and communities are
valid”. In turn 134 GT exploits the confusion when he claims that C3’s statements in fact constitute opposition towards bilingual education.

**Gail**

C4: This comprises six turns of which the caller has only one. Gail’s comments in 136 are referred to the moderator, she frames her comment as being based on “something I know about”; seems to both oppose multilingual ballots but recognise some merit in the practice. However Gail introduces a theme which animates a series of exchanges without any reference to her. Gail introduces the case of Switzerland and questions why the Canadian model is used in preference to the Swiss model. Swiss exceptionalism is an occasional trope in official English debates and in the present instance represents a strong, if strictly irrelevant, challenge to GT’s position on bilingual education, being essentially about a multilingual polity divided into monolingual cantons, however its relevance comprises the fact that it is a cooperative multilingualism whereas in the discourse of official English Canada constitutes a conflict model. Turns 137 and 141 constitute a collusive pattern of progressive removal of the Swiss model from consideration based on the partisanship of the moderator. In turn 137 GT acknowledges the “interesting” nature of the Swiss case but declares it an “anomaly”, a “very rare” instance. This distancing is continued by the moderator in 138 who claims that the Swiss people are “unusual” demonstrated by their managing to “stay out of war”. GT extends this theme by normalising multilingualism and conflict “Normally you have people at war over which language they’re going to use” and how an unnamed force (impliedly bilingual education) is introducing this conflict into American society. The Moderator further distances the Swiss case in turn 140 by claiming that the Swiss are “basically the same stock” and implying that American language differences are a problem because Americans are racially diverse and that America therefore needs “unifying elements” that Switzerland does not need. GT elaborates this differences thesis in turn 141 and makes a nominal return to C3’s original point about voting by foregrounding his own country of origin (Greece) and its naturalised expectation that an immigrant would know to vote only in Greek.

**Sue**

C5: This segment of the debate comprises 12 turns for which the Caller is only involved directly in three. Sue’s claims that immigrants are also taxpayers and therefore immigrants also pay for bilingual education (“this”) and that her German father would have attained more opportunity had his education been more successful (implies had there been language support), and that GT is “fanning the flames” of division among ethnic groups, exemplified by Yugoslavia. The response is carried by GT who dismisses the claim about divisiveness by asserting popular support for measures to officialise English. The moderator calls on GT to identify a possible compromise in his position. This is refuted with reference to the “Federal government” and its spending, justifying a position of apparent intransigence. This appeal to middle class tax sensitivity is bolstered by the exaggerated claim that this spending is on mandating minority languages: “force on people a Spanish-only or native language-only method.” This method in itself is not able to lower school drop out rates for disadvantaged groups. FF attempts in turn 151 to normalise immigrant settlement patterns by confounding this with bilingual education and conceding settlement difficulties (people seek psychological support) but refuting the consequence that might arise from the concession (providing support removes people from the main game: to leave the past behind and assimilate). GT’s intransigence against such compromising tendencies in 152 is repeated and anecdotalised: while this is a “natural thing” there is “no going back.” The decisive break with the past cannot accommodate continuing attachments and total assimilation is warranted, his own French learning experience is cited in support. A further call from FF for “room for compromise” is rejected on the basis of the manning of New York City telephone exchanges, an example of numbers of ‘costly services’ in many languages.

**Catherine**

C6: This very brief exchange is important in several ways in that it raises claims about the specificity of language in American identity. The caller makes three claims (“…a few comments”). That Dutch was the first European language spoken in America, that the Netherlands “has two
languages” and that during the first two centuries of American settlement by Europeans immigrants operated ethnic language schools and that these “...didn’t harm us” nor did such schools stop people learning English. The response from GT is an interesting reading of a concealed purpose in the question. The claims for the officialisation of English have nothing to do with the “moral superiority of English” for if such a discussion were entered into GT would claim that status for Greek, however officialising English is justified on the basis simply of its de facto official status, the claimed ‘common sense’ of designating it thus, and the justification of such a designation deriving from “government bilingual policies”. Official English therefore is a kind of people’s movement for status planning as a reaction against government mandated multilingualism. Perhaps as ridicule for special status for Dutch GT offers other possible language statuses: Cherokee as indigenous, Spanish as regional and majority-minority. He turns to seriousness as he allocates English status recognition only because of pragmatic realities and implies that if affect were involved superiority would be accorded to Greek.

**Charles**  
*C7:* This intervention is a challenge to the objectivity of the very program. Charles claims that over six years the Moderator has favoured guest speakers who oppose bilingual education, the moderator rejects this.

**Denuda**  
*C8:* This exchange is constituted by 7 turns. The caller is well-versed in names and titles. Denuda foregrounds her own ethnicity and family experience as the basis to argue that family responsibility prevails in language maintenance, her family’s past practices warrant the present policy response. She argues that bilingual education is “very divisive” and points out that C6 is incorrect in designating the Netherlands as a bilingual nation, in fact it is Belgium. This example is recruited to support the bilingualism is divisive thesis by the claim that “...Flemish speakers and French speakers are at each others throats, interestingly enough.” The “interestingly enough” seems to function as an after thought, the first part correcting factual errors in C6’s intervention, the “interestingly enough” functioning as a kind of observational afterthought that even the previous speaker’s claimed support is an argument for official English. GT quickly supports by exaggeration and obfuscation C8’s Belgian observation (“They have been [at each other’s throats] for centuries”). C8 continues her participation, easily the most prominent caller so far, by dismissing the lingering presence of the Swiss exceptionalism (“..an anomaly”) and then anecdotalising children’s language learning skills (“...it’s amazing how children pick up languages”) in defence of the need for no special programs of language intervention in schooling. The Moderator places a particular and wide ranging reference to the comments contrasting traditional practice (“…doing things for ourselves”) with the desire to depend on government. At turn 175 C8 dismisses possible characterisations of her politics as right wing, and associates herself with voluntarist and family-responsibility based pluralism. This cues GT into a strong defence of a new theme at turn 176 (“...the R word, responsibility”). In this way consideration of bilingual education is taken utterly away from educational methodological practices to questions of ethics, appropriate personal conduct and role of government.

**Camille**  
*C9:* This intervention represents a challenge to GT from an Hispanic viewpoint. Camille supports “some bilingual education” and points to a growing tax-paying power of Spanish-speakers in an implied threat. Her position grows strident when at turn 179 GT appears to manipulate her tax-payer based argument in the opposite direction to her intention, as a support for official English. Camille expresses offence at several of GT’s arguments (softened by the use of ‘your program’ rather than ‘you’): his negative characterisation of Hispanics compared to Greeks and his negative contrasting of the multiple ethnicity of Catholicism as a possible community support institution for Hispanics to the ethno-specific nature of Greek Orthodoxy. This produces a sharp reaction in 181 from GT who refers to the large number of Hispanic organisations and the vibrant community they sustain: (“You’ve got LULAC and MALDEF and all these others and they’re having all these meetings”). Here GT seems to regret the apparent passivity of the more established Greek community and introduces competitive ethnicity
implied in previous parts of his talk; his ‘Hispanics are favoured and molly-coddled’ thesis. All this merely strengthens Camille’s resolve to support bilingual education, instancing her parents’ “...tough time” as justification and the bias of “your program.”

Edward
C10: Edward’s call sustains the view that GT had exhibited an anti-Hispanic bias. For Edward the official English movement “[...sounds a little bit like xenophobia.” This leads GT to declare (turn 187) incomprehension at the claim and to respond that “...what we’re saying is that everyone should get along...”. With such a retreat from specificity into generality bolstered by claims that everyone should be welcomed and be able “...to communicate” the Caller can only agree and call for more financing for non-specific language training (turn 189) at which point GT again feigns agreement only to assert the “colossal failure” of bilingual education (“$12 billion dollars a year and we're just totally washing it down the drain”).

Joe
C11: This intervention involves two turns from Joe (191 and 193) with a supportive divider from GT (192). Essentially the Caller’s position is to claim support from liberal academics on the divisiveness on multicultural policy, and to bolster this claim with the fighting in Bosnia-Hercegovina. An essentialist assumption about language and ethnicity underscores Joe’s view: “It enslaves them.”

Mary
C12: Mary announces herself as a 12-year old who has decided that “...we should stick to English”. The caller’s teacher is “pressuring” her to “take a language” but Mary feels that English is adequate and further that the language is in need of her support. In turn 196 GT deals with this ‘left field’ challenge by characterising foreign language study as worthwhile (“helps you with your English”) and calls for support for English to be accompanied by the learning of ‘foreign languages’.

GT’s response is significant. It enshrines a staple reference of the official English movement. Two-language capability is preferred if the sequence involves English (First and Pre-eminent) + Foreign Language (Second and Dependent); in this way English is sequentially and ideologically first, and, probably, superior in proficiency.

This kind of two-language competence is enveloped in a discourse of addition, skill, benefit to the nation; an indicator of the talent and dedication-discipline of the learner. This kind of bilingualism involves a pattern of relative mastery, a sequence of acquisition and an indicator of allegiance all of which connote value and commendable reward for effort. The counter to this kind of two-language capability is problematical on all counts. Non-English first language based learning of English is not a kind of two-language capability that attracts positive commentary. The sequence is wrong. The non-English language is temporally prior to English. The probable proficiency levels are suspect. It is likely that English will be known in terms of the characteristics (grammatical and ideological) of the first language. And finally, it is also likely that community languages, as distinct from foreign languages, require and posit the existence of a vibrant, intergenerationally transmitting community of local speakers.

The Mary-GT encounter is an exemplary instance of performative language-officialising talk in the way it displays the framework for official English by attaching positive values and ideological buttressing to what is its political position but disguising this buttressing as natural.

TRANSCRIPT TWO: THE DIANNE REHM SHOW

Transcript Two (Appendix Seven) differs from Transcript One in that it is a moderated debate between a key proponent and a key opponent of Official English. The transcript contains no evidence of collusive collaboration between the moderator and the program participants and considerable evidence of the
cruces (Fairclough 1989) which result in contest and argumentation when shifts in argumentation are required. The transcript highlights many key elements of the appeal that both sides make to a bench of imaginary judges.

**Framing The Issue**

Turns 1-3 are taken up with context-setting and framing of the debate that follows. The parameters of the issue are presented as the following frame:

*Efforts to restrict the public use of languages other than English (exemplified by bilingual education) via the designation of English as the official language of the United States are growing. Wider context has been established for this issue, and higher authority attached to it, by reference to the involvement of ‘Senate majority leader and presidential hopeful Bob Dole’.*

**Framing The Debate**

The debate is cast as an interaction between prominent pro and anti factions and as a display before the eavesdropping public who will later have the chance to have their say. The debate is not framed as ‘conflict’ *per se* but the overall cast of the program is to deal with controversial issues which impacts on the expectations of the participants.

**Framing The Participants**

The participants are framed ambiguously and have claims attributed to them that influence the course of the interviews. Jim Lyons (JL) is introduced as a studio guest to “talk about English-only proposals” while Bill Emerson (BE) is presented as the “lead US House sponsor of the legislation to make English the official language of the Federal government”. The presentation of the guests bends their positions according to claims of interest and purpose that are considerably at variance from each other

**CLAIM A (JL):** The problem being debated is *English-only proposals.*

**CLAIM B (BE):** The problem being debated is *making English the official language of the Federal government.*

**Framing The Claims**

The ambiguity contained in the initial framing by DR recurs several times in utterances of the participants. At turn 9 BE asserts that his purposes are more limited than what CLAIM A implies, at turn 36 JL conflates CLAIMS A and B. This produces a challenge from BE who, at turn 39 contests this conflation as representing his position. However, at turn 40 JL reiterates explicitly the conflation of English-only with official English, denying that there is a difference between them. BE wishes to minimise claims made for his legislation (Turn 9: “simply”). At turn 18 JL uses BE’s preferred designation but seems to attach pejorative connotation to it.

At turn 37 BE appears to contest (the intervention is only partly audible) the conflation of CLAIM A with CLAIM B, in turn 39 he explicitly asserts a difference between CLAIMS A and B. At turn 40 JL rejects the distinction but then, as though to label it insignificant (while allocating it to Memory Resources) states: “*but let me finish my point*”, as though to discuss the incommensurate nature of the claims is to deal with less important matters. In turns 50-52 both speakers use CLAIM B, though clearly they attach different meanings to it. In turn 59 a caller adopts CLAIM A, but in response BE adds an additional layer of meaning to the claim by considering: “*proficiency in English*”. In turns 65-
67 JL interacts with a caller and recruits other meanings (English as primary language, official language, non-native language, and then English-only). The unresolved nature of the primary point influences the range of discursive strategies that the participants, callers and the moderator utilise throughout the text.

**Overall Organisation**

**FIGURE TWENTY-SEVEN: POSITION DECLARATIONS; EMERSON & LYONS**

I Position declarations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Emerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turns 4, 6, 8, 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 7-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jim Lyons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turns 17, 19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 18, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE TWENTY-EIGHT: INTERACTIVE COMMENTARY; DIANNE REHM SHOW**

These turns are broadly separate, each establishing premises for subsequent argument.

II Interactive commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turns 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 33</th>
<th>Debate management (DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41, 49, 51, 53, 55, 58</td>
<td>Problem reclaim (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 23, 25</td>
<td>Recovery (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 27, 29, 31</td>
<td>Undermining (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 32</td>
<td>Position diversification (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 35-40, 42-48</td>
<td>Jab and counter jab (JL and BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 50</td>
<td>Jurisdiction (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 52</td>
<td>Jurisdiction (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 54</td>
<td>Jurisdiction, deflection to ‘Not Xenophobic’ (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 56-57</td>
<td>Xenophobia (JL, BE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE TWENTY-NINE: CALLER INTERACTION; RONALD, CHARLES & DENNIS**

III Public interaction, with callers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, 80</th>
<th>Debate management (DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn 59</td>
<td>Racist agenda allegation (Caller 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 61</td>
<td>Rebuttal (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 63, 65</td>
<td>Sovereign nation claim (Caller 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 67</td>
<td>Rebuttal (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turns 69, 71, 73</td>
<td>Canadian precedent claim (Caller 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 75</td>
<td>Claiming speaking turn (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 77</td>
<td>Rebuttal Canadian precedent claim (JL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 79</td>
<td>Position restatement (BE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE THIRTY: THEME ORGANISATION; DIANNE REHM SHOW

Position declamation: Fracturing versus Menacing Motives (Turns 5-22, 48)
Attribution and counter attribution of motives undeclared, and dangerous consequences (Turns 23-32, 36, 40,42, 44, 45, 46, 47,54, 56, 57 )
Factive disputation (Turns 34-36, 38, 39,40, 42, 44, 50, 52, 54)
Calls (Turns 58-80)

**Turns 4-22**

DR’s intonation pattern at turn 4 invites a temporal justification for BE’s claim. At turn 5 BE expounds the idea that social “fracturing...along the lines of language” is occurring. The Bill is described as a “gentle prod” about the socially cohesive role of English. The stress on “citizens in particular” is a trace of a later reference to the symbolic nature of English as constituting Americanness. English is three things: “the language of opportunity”, a “door opener” and “the binding language in the United States”. Collectively these dichotomise Other Languages as entrenching marginality, encouraging division and closing doors. The “binding” function of English is recirculated and exemplified in relation to “our friends in Canada” where “very serious fracturing” is encountered. The turn concludes with two characteristics of the official English claim: that it is “nipping” an incipient problem in the bud, a wise move whose metaphoric associations with garden commonsense is intended to forestall alarm, but also the universalistic claim about the association of English with economic opportunity.

In turn 7 BE documents the intended effects of his legislative proposal; a declaration of English’s status (official language of the Federal government); a consequent “affirmative obligation” that this role be “enhanced” (what this means is not specified anywhere in the text, and constitutes a significant point of ambiguity, signalling danger to opponents, but revealing both symbolic and practical intentions from supporters); a declaration that “every person in the United States” is “entitled to communicate with the Federal government in English” (the use of the term “entitled” borrows from the discourse of rights (entitlements are secured through legal mandate) however the clause offers an entitlement which is ade facto reality, and, is taken by opponents to mean that it is an invitation to litigation by the creation of presumed grievance; a disallowance of Federal financial subvention of “publications and forms and ceremonies” on languages other than English. The enumeration of the Bill’s effects concludes with the claim that “all monetary savings” which result from the Bill’s enactment be put towards programs to teach English to immigrants.

DR invites comment from BE about the effect of the Bill, unmentioned, on Bilingual Education.

In turn 9 BE distances his Bill from others intended to “reform the bilingual situation” and reiterates that his Bill “simply” has the declarative function of the status of English in US government. In
response DR seeks clarification that in “official action” of the US government English would be the
language used. BE in turn 12 concurs but extends the meaning to include government-citizen
“communication”. For DR this seems to beg the question about existing practice, however, in turn 14
BE justifies on the basis of “exceptions”, citing citizenship ceremonies and “trials” in the printing of
Spanish language IRS forms. In response to DR’s query, whose stress pattern seems to convey doubt
about the merits of the case for terminating such measures, BE confirms and then “hasten(s) to add”
symbolic argumentation to what it is presumed he has come to see as a weak case in practical terms
(raising the point about unity through English) the wider presence of this issue (presumably to secure
himself from criticisms of eccentricity), and then a sequence of caveats (“not seeking to interfere with
anyone’s culture, speaking language in the home”). These exemptions, at least rhetorically, are
repeated by BE and challenged by JL, since they imply that the use of languages other than English is
permitted simply as a private activity. BE then offers the principal rationale, that there are “ballpark
figure” 150 languages and to provide services in all of these would be costly. He continues to explain
that the issue is emergent, because Spanish speakers (qualified, after an initial broad sweep inclusion, to
“some elements of the Spanish speaking community”) have been pressing to make citizen to
government communication possible in Spanish. BE labels this as a problem, progressing to be as wide
as it is in “some other countries”, the lack of specificity creating an invitation to listeners to adduce their
own worst case scenario, and the reasonableness claimed to address such a problem in its “incipient
stages”.

DR calls in JL inviting his enumeration of the “principal arguments against” measures proposed by BE.

In turn 18 JL moves rapidly into argument, indicating rehearsal, citing the authority of USA Today and
its characterisation of official English as a “phony solution in search of an imaginary problem”. This
characterisation is initially regarded as “exactly” what BE’s proposal entails but immediately after BE’s
proposal is described as “a good deal worse”. JL then embark on a series of patriotic characterisations
(“219 years as a nation”, surviving a civil war, two world wars (victory stressed) claiming first that
victory in the Second World War, then mitigated to reduced deaths and casualties, resulting from multi-
lingualism. There is a flow of patriotic associations: interned Japanese Americans in “camps” were
recruited (“we recruited them”). National service is adduced to languages other than English, servicing
a non-lingually defined nation. The next move is to assert the overwhelming proportion of US census
respondents (95%) who speak English, its international status (“the language of choice for people
throughout the world”). JL then returns to the USA Today dyptich (phony solution, imaginary problem)
inverting it to make strong points against its being perceived as innocently symbolic, claiming it will be
“very dangerous and disastrous”. He emotively then describes official English as dishonouring
“millions of Americans, Americans who have died to preserve this country”. The associative power, the
connotative argument, is highly charged with values of patriotic service, intended presumably to remove
this association from a natural collocation with English and America, or an association between multilingualism and national disloyalty. He extends the symbiosis between people and nation to people and government by stating that official English would “cut millions of other Americans from, from, from, their government”. This proprietorially associates non-English speakers with American governance.

DR seeks to direct JL towards an evidentiary response to the demand for English from recent immigrants compared to past immigrants. In turn 20 JL claims that present immigrants are more anxious than past generations of immigrants to acquire English. This solicits a DR question as to the source and reason for the official English movement, since his claim is that immigrant behaviour towards English cannot be the cause.

In turn 22 JL “quite honestly” as though a difficult truth is about to be revealed, indicates that “a couple of organisations” entirely devoted to this cause are motivated by fear, hostility to large scale immigration. Anxious, it seems, to widen the effects and multiply the victims, JL names several categories of non-immigrants, non-immigrant Americans (Native Americans, Alaskans, Puerto Ricans (“US citizens since 1917”) as people who would be “disconnected from government”. JL repeatedly distances immigrants, or widens, to include groups unarguably associated with America, unchallengibly local, as also being languages other than English-using Americans and victims of official English. The significance seems to be that to oppose official English from an immigrant rights basis appears weak.

Turns 22-80
After the position-declaration phase the debate moves to a struggle over connotations, each seeking to make presuppositions stick to labels, and to make claims appear as settled facts. As background associations the speakers aim that these connotations would be activated as Memory Resources when the lexical item, category or other discourse element is encountered in debate.

In turn 22 DR initiates a process of inviting JL and BE to scrutinise each other’s previously established claims. BE is invited to assess the claim that official English constitutes “a backlash against immigration”. BE describes the claim as “rhetorical”, and not “founded in fact”. The allegation of rhetorical intent seeks to position BE above or beyond rhetoric, in the realm of commonsense: i.e. one language, English, in the public sphere, is simple commonsense. He states that there is a “problem”, a claim which recurs through this section. This is a debate about what the problem is. This form of discursive politics, planning and policy and discourse is a struggle to name ‘the problem’ or have one’s name for the problem prevail and constitute it as subject to public intervention (Yeatman 1990). In turn 23 BE seeks to claim a commonsensical evaluation of his case, he seeks to make JL appear “rhetorical”, overblown, his use of the expressions “needs to be corrected” and “dampened a little bit” operate as softeners suggesting that his claims are calm and measured, while JL’s are exaggerated. The homespun
language reinforces this desired effect. He wishes to claim that multiple languages are costly, that this claim stands to reason, and is transparent to those not governed by “rhetoric.” He distances the claim that there is an attack on other languages implied in his proposal, keeping the racism charge at bay. This is further elaborated by his claim that “many, particularly second generation Americans” are “strong in this movement”. Here he appropriates a popular theme for the official English movement, that the actual experience of immigration and learning a new language has made former immigrants the most authentic and eloquent advocates. Ontologically this creates their other, those who do not have such an experience and yet who wish to advocate costly and unwanted multilingualism. These are implied to have suspect motivations, and are described as elites, though not here by BE. English is named the economic language, attributing to it an association closest to the motivation for immigration itself, and the requirement that parents “insist” that their children “learn” English. This point, discussed below, is a further ambiguity, since he may really mean that they ‘use’ English rather than that they learn it.

Getting ahead also reinforces the disassociation of ‘ordinary immigrants’ wishing to make the most of America’s opportunities and not be held back by an industry of dependency. The juxtaposition of “bicultural and multilingual” reveals a jargon unfamiliarity on his part… “get at” is also powerful since it appeals to the slight that he claims from JL’s inference of bad motivations, penalisation of immigrants. For BE the issue of cost, simple commonsense matters of cost, the private realm of languages use and knowledge is not addressed by his legislation, he is concerned with cost in the public realm. He stresses economic issues and opportunity to keep xenophobic allegations at bay. His conclusion is important. He also wishes to claim no opposition to LANGUAGES as a category or entity, and specifically names Spanish as the language (community) presumed most attacked by the legislation. This is reinforced emotionally by foregrounding “my own children” who are “strongly encourage(d)” to learn other languages “most especially Spanish”. Communication “in that language” is important. Foreign language acquisition of Spanish is important but there is an implication that retention of and public, (American) use of Spanish may not be. After the interruption he concludes with a locational positioning, Spanish is for “this hemisphere”, with an implication that the place for English is the US and the place for Spanish is other places “in this hemisphere”.

At turn 27 BE confronts a challenge directly against the allegation that he has made about cost. The GAO report of 1995 indicated that only 265 of 400 000 documents had been translated into languages other than English between 1990 and 1995 (Associated Press 1995) and this may have been behind the question. BE’s device for responding is to make use of his (rhetorical) device of appropriating the descriptor of commonsense, non-ideological, non-rhetorical position to characterise himself. His narrative is that there is an “incipient” problem that he is trying to nip “in the bud”. BE’s ordinary person talk supports and bolsters an entire representation of official English as common sense; acting
prudently in the here and now to forestall a future problem. This also suggests an impending threat. Stress patterns indicate his possible perception of vulnerability however: "The IRS has printed...tax forms in Spanish" (the stress on tax is to emphasise its inappropriateness, tax collection is a compact between government and citizens and ought to be in English), and then goes on to make a remarkable claim: a judge (unnamed, undated, far away) "did hold a citizenship" (stressed, as though this ritual of becoming American is inconceivable in a language other than English) "swearing in ceremony in Spanish". The rest of the turn is remarkable for its contradiction of, or lack of support for, the claims in turn 23. There is no mention of cost, of commonsense or of immigrants’ economic valuation of English. Here are symbolic, not practical and economic, questions: citizenship IN SPANISH, tax forms IN SPANISH as emotional and symbolic bolsters. The stress patterns indicate awareness of the effect of counterclaims: “did” (that is to assert that there is in fact substance to the claims, and not the ‘phoniness’ JL (and USA Today) claim against the case for official English. These matters (taxation and citizenship) are an interesting combination of preeminently practical and deeply symbolic, both intimately associated with government functioning, one a statist activity, the other an activity on behalf of the nation. BE further emphasises a language and nation coupling by concluding with a rhetorical question: “Shouldn’t people who are, are becoming new citizens here (place and language, the essential Englishness of America)...speak the language of the country that they have adopted?"

Although the claim in 23 was about cost and pragmatism, BE becomes primarily concerned in turn 27 about largely cost free or minimally costly matters, and concedes that the actual cost of “official business” in languages other than English is: “very minimal”. In turn 27 official English starts to look like symbolic status planning and concerned with symbolic positioning of languages.

In turn 29 BE restates the centrality of the category Spanish in the universe that he imagines warranting the legislation he is proposing, but only two items are mentioned, IRS forms and citizenship swearing-in ceremonies.

Turn 32 represents the first opportunity that JL has to rebut BE’s position. His move is to name an alternative problem, to attach nefarious motivation to BE’s claims. The underlying tone is to interrupt the claim of commonsense, of transparency of official English ("...well there’s more than that..."). He nominates the private right of action of the official English bill as an invitation to litigation ("a lawyer’s welfare act"). He continues his theme of ‘phoniness’ by arguing that there is an attempt to fabricate and manufacture grievance amongst English speakers, so that they will construe multilingual services as both threatening English, and as denying them the right to communicate in English as a potential cause of grievance. However, his principal discursive move is to impute menace and bad intention by citing the intrusion of the Bill into the private realm of parent-child relations. JL has a counter legal case, a celebrated August 1995 instance when Texas State Judge Sam Kiser ordered a Spanish-speaking woman
involved in a divorce case to cease bringing up her daughter in Spanish commenting that it would: “make her a maid for the rest of her life”.

Turns 35-36 involve a struggle about the jurisdictional extent of the proposed legislation. especially concerning Puerto Rico, often cited as ‘the ‘thorn in English-only’s side’ (Zentella 1998), and Hawaii. JL seems to wish to emphasise the balanced bilingualism of the Puerto Rico instance, whereas for BE’s case Puerto Rico’s Spanish domination works better. However Puerto Rico is left undebat ed. JL identifies Hawaii as a further instance but this is not pursued either. In turn 36 however, after the factive jurisdictional interlude is put aside, JL attacks. He calls it a simple example (implying that there are more complex ones as well, in his discrediting move). He calls the legislative proposal this “English-only mandate” and as though to forestall possible BE claims that commonsense areas are exempted JL proffers examples which are anything but simple: religion and veterans affairs. In this move he seeks to widen massively the implicative reach of the Bill and bolster his claim of a menace underlying it. These are emotive choices. Religion is sanctioned in the US political compact as a realm of clear liberty of choice in which governmental involvement is constitutionally abjured, and veterans affairs claims a realm of national patriotic service.

BE’s attempt to arrest this direction the debate is inaudible but his move is clear, claiming that things are “mixed up” in JL’s conflation.

In 39 BE is rejecting the assignation of his position as English-only; he prefers to be named as the “language of government sponsor.” For BE this represents as less problematical and smaller target. JL repudiates the distinction immediately and then dismisses BE’s attempt as interruptive (“Official English is English-only”). This is a struggle for the Memory Resources, the cognitive hinterland, those associations that will be habitually ascribed to one or other position by listeners. Perhaps sensing an advantage, JL elaborates that funeral services in other languages are precluded by there not being a religious exemption to the proposed legislation. This is the man introduced at turn 1 as the Executive Director of the National Association for Bilingual Education. Both the instances are about emotive national and patriotic service, about ‘ordinary people’. Sensing advantage he claims that there is no exception for Native Americans. The stress is heavily on Americans: claiming local belonging and place to their languages, distancing BE’s point of turn 27 where English is associated with place, America. He names private realms where the background assumptions of American culture are that government has no place, his device is to transfer such assumptions to language.

Turn 42 is an invited turn. BE struggles with the import of the wider ramifications and background associations made by JL. BE responds ultimately by conceding that he would contemplate such an
exception because “the government per se does not get involved in religion..” and then underscores his surprise at the turn of the debate: “…if you want to talk about…”

JL’s interruption clarifies the association of government, religion and war veterans with languages by the suggestion that the government “pays” military chaplains.

This provides sufficient traction for a much more fluent reply from BE who recovers ground in turn 44. He specifies the patriotic services, enumerating them, revealing more lexical range, and therefore more control of this field (“soldiers and sailors trained by the armed services of the United States”) and then reverts to irritation, signalled by the use of formal politeness (“You tell the taxpayers Mr Lyons!”) that the issue is costly multilingualism, and the implication of JL’s points that taxpayers have to foot the bill for incalculable amounts: (“all of its services …in 150 different languages”). BE retrieves lost ground by reverting to the cost/efficiency/taxpayers/commonsense conflation.

As if in recognition that he had provided BE unintended assistance, JL struggles to remove himself from the allegations of reckless spending, from the jury of ‘the taxpayer’ in turns 45, and especially in turn 47, where JL appears seriously concerned about the possible impact of the BE claim. However in turn 48 BE shifts theme again to ‘English as victim’, that English is the language of unity, the binding element in American life and both the language and therefore this essential function are being “attacked”. He stresses attacked to mark the seriousness and irresponsibility of attacking the binding element of American life, America’s language, and attempts by this device to elicit a ‘pro English’ emotion.

The intervention by DR adds a new jurisdictional and factive element, concerning the number of states which have legislated on official English, and offers this turn to JL, perhaps to restore his position from the previous battering. In turn 50 JL begins straightforwardly describing the state situation but soon identifies a possibility of associating historical instances of official English with nativism and xenophobia to return to his earlier turns, however he rapidly turns from this to question the constitutionality of the bill. He seeks here to name a new problem, one dealing with constitutionality, intrusion into private life and to suggest the possibility of litigation. It is like religion again, government should stay out of officialising.

In turn 52, invited to comment on constitutionality as an issue, BE struggles initially but then draws a distinction between the earlier vintage of official English and the more recent spate of state legislation in this area. He abjures all the associations with the past, war and constitutional ambiguity. However, in turn 54, perhaps conscious of the residue impact of JL’s references to xenophobia, he effects a move away from an invited reply to issues of legality to the status and ethnicity of the modern proponents.
The modern movement (unlike anything that might have been the case “back in the teens”) is led by a “person, a professor, a University president, a United States Senator of Japanese extraction” and “led by a Hispanic speaking bilingual...of Chilean descent”. The stress and authority claims pattern here reveal an attempt to de-problematise the recurring concern of BE that associations of nativism, anti-immigrant minority or other such claims will be attached to the proposal. In elevating the credibility of the leaders and founders of the movement he changes tack and seeks to reinforce his earlier Memory Resources claim, that it is a commonsense, widely shared initiative. BE returns to the position declaration. His acute awareness of this potential problem is emphasised at turn 56: “…so this is not xenophobic”. This claim rests on the culturally diverse origins of some of the prominent figures associated with it; forestalling the charge BE fears most. In 57 JL attempts to make it stick but DR moves to taking calls.

**Ronald: It’s Straight out Racism**

However, in turn 59, the first caller makes this precise charge and forthrightly. Ronald names racism as the motivation, the entities as African Americans and Hispanics (construed as victims). The issue is nominalised as “English-only” and associated with attacks on affirmative action. The statement: “It’s a fake solution to a non-existing problem” is an excellent instance of intertextuality (a Bakhtinian notion of ‘ventriloquising’) as it replays the USA Today headline, and suggests nefarious, undeclared motives. For Ronald it is “straight out racism”.

DR invites BE to reply. BE reconstitutes the claim that English is uniting, stressing “in this country”, again distancing other languages from place and patriotism. The reply reveals a major struggle with the role of African Americans “and their languages” in this issue. BE expresses concern about “conflict on account of language” emphasising English and place: “…in this country”. Perhaps this was elicited by Ronald’s African American phonology.

**Charles: America is a Sovereign Place**

The second caller presents a parallel problem, this time to JL. Charles claims that others’ languages implies others’ places, that nations and languages are inextricably connected. For Charles the central issue is sovereignty and relations between nations are symbolised by domination (“annex”). Interestingly Charles’ words of place are often stressed: “there”, “come here”, “got here”. This is an exemplary instance of the irretrievable association of place and language marked with meaning and reinforced with intonation.

This struggle to name different problems and frame the interpretation of the solution by attaching languages to wider, deeper, associative maps is continued in the remaining part of the text.
JL’s reaction, turn 67, is to repudiate the notion that contesting official English, or acknowledging Spanish, implies a reduction in American sovereignty, and rebuts the association of languages and place by referring to “millions” of Americans whose native language is not English being relegated to second class status. JL aims to separate the association of language and national identification. Fearing perhaps that the argument may not be strong enough he reverts to a common theme that there is a nefarious edge to this, referring (rhetorically) for only the second time to DR as though she were an arbiter and that official English is bad for the future and implies a regulatory urge from government which will gallop into dialect officialisation, an aspect of culture officialisation. He adds the so far unuttered point that global communications may be hampered (other than BE’s turn 23 and 25 about Hemispheric Spanish) and then tries the Internet, utilising a contemporary issue of regulation and censorship to associate the move to official English with restrictions of private liberty. JL is attempting to widen the target, BE to narrow it.

**Dennis: The Canada Card**

Caller 3 raises the Canada card. Here the separatist association of language and place is strongest. The caller names the issue as English-only but supports it claiming that the fears of opponents of official English are “not founded”. Again the caller identifies the learning of other languages by children as desirable.

JL in turn 77 astutely turns the potential problem posed by this call around, by claiming that the Canada problem actually supports the case against official English rather than being evidence for social disunity in multilingualism. He injects both ridicule and alarm (language police, bureaucrats interfering with people’s privacy, measuring signs to ascertain whether English is written larger than French) and provoking a business “exodus”.

In reply BE 79 seeks public sanction for his position in opinion polls and state precendents. He returns to his principal association, English equals jobs. He distances JL’s position by claiming a clear correlation of English and employability in the US labour market.

**Who ‘we’ is**

BE names ‘his group’ widely: 20 states, taxpayers, person, Professor, United States senator, Hispanic-speaking bilingual, Americans. The collective effect is to represent himself as a kind of ‘Voice of America’ encompassing a wide and heterogenous grouping. He assumes speakership responsibility for “taxpayers” and in doing this animates the political-economic compact. BE assumes speakership responsibility for citizenship, reinforcing the nation-citizen link.

For JL there appear to be concentric circles of American authenticity, in his attempt to scramble automatic associations of Americanness with Anglo-Saxon Anglophones. The central circles are
Americans whose dignity would be injured by official English, named as people of place: native peoples (especially those who have “fought for America”), others who have fought for America, citizens and then (but only by implication) all other Americans. Again immigrants are not directly included.

Who ‘you’ is
From both speakers there is infrequent use of the generic ‘you’ because the debated issues are personal and highly personalised. This means there is a high proportion of personalised ‘yous’. Turn 61 is richly peopled in person pronouns. Some instances however are stark; in turn (59) ‘you’ is government, but ‘we’ is African Americans and Hispanics. On other occasions the ‘we’ governing ‘you’ is clearly elastic so that ambiguous connections are suggested and dangerous or undesirable/unstrategic ones are scrambled when a wide claim is being made.

Transcript two extends the performativity of Transcript One. A critical question involves ontological characterisation (place, language, peoplehood) and agency (who is doing what, and why) and the ideological struggle to persuade listeners of what the ‘real problem’ will be constituted to be as a prelude to state intervention.

TRANSCRIPT THREE: IT IS YOUR BUSINESS
Transcript Three (Appendix Eight) differs from Transcripts One and Two in that it is a moderated multi-participant debate between key proponents, key opponents of official English and presumed ‘neutrals’. The framing orientation (business and commercial interests) is a vital one for the characterisation of official English as connected to opportunity and progress for minorities within the American mainstream.

The transcript contains no evidence of collusive collaboration between moderator and guests, though in most cases the moderator and the announcers operate with a ‘common-sense’ notion that multilingualism is excessively expensive. There is considerable evidence of the cruces (Fairclough 1989) which result in challenges to the flow of argumentation when shifts required. These are particularly strong in relation to the kind of democratic participation that bilingual ballots bring about, the economic effect, especially in relation to the income earned and unemployment rates experienced by non-English speakers. Very importantly cruces abound in relation to how agreed facts are interpreted. One surrounds the de facto status of English and the desire of new immigrants to learn English. For supporters of officialisation this means that official English is unproblematical, all should support it and to oppose official English is to make ideology where there is common sense. For opponents of official English the demand for English among new arrivals and its de facto domination of American life mean that the official English movement is ideological. According to this line the redundancy of any practical
need for legislation on English means that its move is a hostile act, a symbolic domination move against minorities and associated with bigotry. There are three others that are distinctive in the present transcript and that arise probably from the pressures of a multi-participant debate and the inclusion of the discourse of business specific to the particular debate context.

**What costs**
The economy-income-opportunity associations with English and other languages gains new content as the cost of servicing a multilingual population with a monolingual policy is introduced.

**In five years time**
Two diametrically opposed prognostications are made: “The whole world is going to be speaking English in the next five years” (77) from an opponent of official English and “One in Seven Americans is not going to be speaking English in just five years” (72) from a proponent of official English.

**Metonymic reference**
Places refer to whole sets of arguments and positions. Quebec makes its inevitable presence felt, “many little Quebecs” in America; Arizona as a sign of the legal problems for official English; California as trope for citizens-initiated referenda that support language restriction; Puerto Rico as sign that since 1917 Americans have been American without necessarily being English speaking; Native American Reservations as places where ‘natural’ circumstances apply and appeal is made to these as unambiguously American locations where some kind of foreign allegiance cannot be easily imputed; different but local.

**What binds**
Political ideals; “Democracy, Freedom, Tolerance”; are arrayed against essentialist associations: “One Nation, One People, One Common Language”. What binds (and how social characteristics serve processes of ‘binding’, and specifically how a common language functions to this end are left undisussed; but the connection seems to be seen by pro and anti-official English advocates to be considerably deeper than any issue of a common language making communication more efficient.

**Kinds of Equality**
The economy-opportunity discourse formula (English=Opportunity) is sometimes disrupted by the case of language loss among enslaved Africans and the persistence among African Americans of economic inequality and social disadvantage. Two further instantiations of the difference-sameness/equality-inequality correlation surface. These are Puerto Ricans American identity and various Native American populations. Puerto Ricans are represented as American and ‘equal but Spanish speaking’ while a similar rationale is suggested for indigenous minorities. Immigrants and potentially irredentist minorities (the Azatlan trope) trouble and unsettle the logical extension of this suggestion that equality need not mean sameness. If the idea of equality within and across difference were extended to a wider notion that diverse societies need to aim for complex notions of citizenship equality (equality across difference, rather than equality as sameness; Walzer (1983)) the ready application of the discourse formula English=Opportunity is made vulnerable.

**FIGURE THIRTY-ONE: ARGUMENT STRUCTURE ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>YES/NO</th>
<th>WHY</th>
<th>ELABORATION</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>COMPLICATION</th>
<th>SUMMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODERATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>No (2)</td>
<td>*Already the language of US *Everybody speaks English</td>
<td>*Ludicrous issue *Waste of taxpayers’ money *Nonsense</td>
<td>GAO research</td>
<td>*World will speak English in 5 years *America united already</td>
<td>*Official English “dumbing” America *Monolingualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Transcript Three consolidates the thesis claims of recurrence of discursive organisation of argument about official English (repeated inflections of essentially unvarying content) and the illuminating contribution that micro-textual analysis can make to lpp methodology.

**TRANSCRIPT FOUR: SAVING AMERICAN CIVILISATION**

**NEWT GINGRICH**

Transcript Four differs from Transcripts One, Two and Three in that the text is written. It consists of a chapter in the best-selling book *To Renew America* produced as a kind of political manifesto by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 104th Congress, Newt Gingrich. As such it is of considerable importance in establishing presumed audience, indexical referencing modes, and the temporal separation that written text operates with in relation to presumed time, place and circumstances of readers.

These qualities provide a contrast with the three recorded radio texts, but as the analysis shows the performance of a lpp oriented officialisation of English is shared. Gingrich had made it an objective of his period as the most senior Republican in Washington DC to effect a change in the way the social and
political world was named and constituted. He deliberately substituted words like workfare for welfare (connoting the difference between independently oriented dispositions against dependency on taxpayer-provided benefits; deploying a responsibility-irresponsibility dichotomy) attempted to attach pejorative meaning to the word welfare and called bilingual education linguistic welfare. In what follows the term ‘bilingualism’ seems to mean a reduction, lessening or diminution of English rather than English plus one other language (para 13).

The analysis which follows is premised on the idea that the literal and propositional content of the text is enveloped (caked) in this kind of performance of a political plan for language, a claim on the memory resources and (future) cognitive presuppositions of readers. The argument therefore is that not only is the Gingrich text attempting to persuade readers of its cause, it attempts to effect officialising English, standard literary English, by associative marking. Officialising is both a juridical practice that Congress may or may not bring about, and a claim on the order of discursive play so that when the language name English and American public policy (or government) are used in talk connections of status may be made by habitus.

While re-lexification is a standard practice of political language, what was exceptional about Gingrich was the self-conscious and avowed or explicit way in which he sought to re-name what he believed was a Democratic named political discourse into one in which conservative values would be more readily associated with the currency of political talk. Bolinger (1980) identifies three characteristic processes of the semantics of power:

**Euphemism** (in which one’s own aggression is downplayed, but the term is understood here to also mean a general strategic softening of responsibility, indication of vulnerable agents)

**Dysphemism** (exaggerating the bad qualities of one’s opponents, or intensifying their acts/responsibilities)

**Mystification** (jargon or other linguistic devices intended to, or having the effect of, concealing important activities or responsibilities, obscuring or obliterating important information).

Bolinger’s terms are used in the following analysis because they were found to provide a well-attested set of common devices that written politicalised language exhibit. In addition to an analysis that addresses the ‘loaded weapons’ being set off in the text, an attempt is made to indicate something of the vocal structure. The framing orientation of the text (a political program that aims for wide appeal) is important in highlighting what the ‘American democratic mainstream’ is taken to be. In Gingrich’s text this mainstream is personalised, and constitutes a kind of adjudicating subject to which reference is made. This judge is often a kind of: Ordinary Person with Common Sense and so this subject is used in the analysis as the name of the judge. The judge appears as a ‘voice’ and his/her presence is indicated in the analysis with the designation: OPwCS.
The analysis consists of interspersing the text with the following signs (which succeed the phrase or sentence they refer to):

(Δ1) indicates missing or obscured overt agents, elided transitive verb and object sequences

(Δ2) politically-ideologically oriented mystification

(Δ3) politically-ideologically oriented euphemism

(Δ4) politically-ideologically oriented dysphemism

(OPwCS) indicates the adjudicating subject to which reference is made.

Rewritings are made in some cases to emphasise the obscured sense of a paragraph. These sections appear in boxes in italicised capital type. Pronominal reference is analysed in a later section.

“Sometime in the 1960s, (Δ2) we were told (Δ1) that since all people and cultures were equal, (Δ2) it was inappropriate for middle-class American (sic) (Δ3) to impose (Δ4) the English language (Δ3) on poor people (Δ3) and people from other cultures (Δ3). The imposition (Δ4) of this racist, (Δ4) colonial (Δ4) way of speaking (Δ3) on young people of other ethnic groups (Δ3) would deprive (Δ4) them of their cultural roots (Δ4).

There are two problems, (Δ3) with this argument. First, at a personal level, it is difficult (Δ2) for a poor person or an immigrant to get anywhere (OPwCS) in this country without learning English. There are nearly two hundred different languages spoken in America (Δ4) (sixty alone in one school in my congressional district (Δ4)). Yet nearly all our business, politics, education, and commerce is conducted in English (OPwCS). It’s just plain easier (OPwCS) to have one standard language (Δ3) than a dozen (Δ4). Even (OPwCS) a country like India, which has hundreds of languages and local dialects, has adopted English as the language of commerce and education. It is liberating (Δ2) when people can understand one another (Δ2). (p 159)

A generation ago, (Δ2) African Americans were being held back by racial segregation, much of it officially sanctioned by the government (Δ4). Then the moment of liberation came (Δ1). Tragically (Δ2), it was at that very moment (Δ1) that the educational establishment (Δ4) decided (Δ2) that standard English (Δ3) was no longer necessary (Δ4) and that grammar and spelling skills (Δ2) could be ignored (Δ4). While this has had a gradual corrosive effect (Δ4) on middle-class students (Δ3) (virtually every employer (OPwCS), including Congress (OPwCS), can tell horror stories (Δ4) about trying to find college graduates who can write effectively (Δ4)), it has been devastating (Δ4) to poor African Americans (Δ3) and their ability (Δ4) to get good jobs.

Learning a language is hard work. Being able to write clearly, converse fluently, and read with comprehension--these are difficult skills (Δ2) that virtually every student, (including me) would have liked to avoid (OPwCS). But if they are not learned in childhood (Δ4), it becomes much more difficult to do so when you are an adult (OPwCS).

When poor children (Δ3) are told (Δ1) that practising basketball (Δ4) is better than practicing English (Δ3 +Δ4), they are more than willing (Δ4) to take this advice (Δ2). Only in later years will they discover (Δ1), that they
have literally dribbled away (\(\Delta 4\)) their opportunities for happiness (\(\Delta 4\)) and a good job (OPwCS). If they belong to a gang (\(\Delta 4\)) that ridicules (\(\Delta 2\)) standard English (\(\Delta 4\)), they may be marked (\(\Delta 1\)) as strange or uppy (\(\Delta 4\)) for speaking well (\(\Delta 2\)). If no one at home (OPwCS) can spell or use grammar correctly, the difficulties are much worse.

The final result is (\(\Delta 1\)) an angry young man (\(\Delta 4\)) who feels that violence (\(\Delta 4\)) is the only way he can express himself (\(\Delta 4\)), or a young girl (\(\Delta 3\)) who thinks that the only great accomplishment (\(\Delta 4\)) she can achieve in life is to have a baby(\(\Delta 4\)). Many of the twelve-and thirteen-year olds now filling our maternity wards cannot read their own children’s birth certificates (\(\Delta 1+\Delta 4\)).

The problem is even more acute (\(\Delta 4\)) among first-generation immigrants and their children. Historically, emigrating to America was an exhausting but exhilarating experience (\(\Delta 2\)). The millions of immigrants who came through Ellis Island (\(\Delta 3\)) hoped to find happiness and give their children a better life, but it was (p 160) hard work (OPwCS). The new land was a school of hard knocks (\(\Delta 2\)) that compelled (\(\Delta 4\)) every immigrant family to immerse itself (\(\Delta 2\)) in the process (\(\Delta 2\)) of becoming American (\(\Delta 2\)).

According to the theory of the melting pot (OPwCS), if people had wanted (\(\Delta 1\)) remain in their old culture(\(\Delta 2\)) they could have done so (\(\Delta 1\)) without coming to America. Immigrating itself was a reaching out for a new and better future (OPwCS). It expressed a willingness to learn, grow, and change in the pursuit of a better life (\(\Delta 3\)). It was not uncommon for people to take two or three jobs to make ends meet (\(\Delta 1+\Delta 2\)). People often lived in crowded and unhealthy circumstances (\(\Delta 3\)). Yet people kept coming to America because the sense of opportunity outweighed the hardship (\(\Delta 3\)).

Today the counterculture left and its allies (\(\Delta 1+\Delta 2\)) profess to smooth the path (\(\Delta 1\)) for immigrants by setting up bilingual education programs (\(\Delta 4\)), making it possible for children to continue (\(\Delta 2\)) in their own language. In fact, they have actually made it more difficult (OPwCS). Bilingual education slows down (\(\Delta 4\)) and confuses (\(\Delta 4\)) people in their pursuit of new ways of thinking (\(\Delta 2\)). It fosters the expectation (\(\Delta 1\)) of a duality (\(\Delta 4\)) that is simply not an accurate portrayal of America (\(\Delta 2\)).

Immigrants need to make (\(\Delta 1\)) a sharp (\(\Delta 4\)) psychological break with the past (\(\Delta 4\)), immersing themselves (\(\Delta 3\)) in the culture and economic system that is going to be (\(\Delta 1\)) their home (\(\Delta 3\)). Every time students are told (\(\Delta 1\)) they can avoid learning their new native language (\(\Delta 2\)) (which will be the language of their children and grandchildren (\(\Delta 3\))), they are risking their future (\(\Delta 1\)) by clinging to the past (\(\Delta 2\)).

There are also practical problems (OPwCS). With over two hundred languages spoken in the United States (\(\Delta 4\)), it is physically impossible to set up bilingual education for each one (\(\Delta 4+\Delta 2\)). No school system could possibly afford it (\(\Delta 2\)). In addition, educators and professionals (\(\Delta 2\)) who make their living running these programs (\(\Delta 4\)) often become the biggest opponents (\(\Delta 4\)) for letting (\(\Delta 1\)) these people move into the mainstream (\(\Delta 3\)). Sadly (OPwCS), there are some ethnic leaders who prefer bilingualism because it keeps their voters (\(\Delta 2\)) and supporters (\(\Delta 2\)) isolated from the rest of America (\(\Delta 3\)), ghettoized (\(\Delta 4\)) into groups more easily manipulated (\(\Delta 1\)) for political purposes (\(\Delta 4\)) often by self-appointed (\(\Delta 2\)) leaders. (p 161)

By time-honored tradition (\(\Delta 1\)), new American immigrants have joined various friendship societies and fraternal organizations that help maintain the holidays, customs, and cuisines of their ancestral homes (\(\Delta 2\)). The more immigrants assimilate to America (\(\Delta 3\)), the more they often want to renew social and fraternal ties (\(\Delta 3\)) with “the old country”. We (OPwCS) all remember and celebrate our (OPwCS) past (\(\Delta 1\))--but we (OPwCS) remain aware (\(\Delta 1\)) that it is the past (\(\Delta 2\)). We (OPwCS) can all (OPwCS) honor our (OPwCS) racial or cultural identities without assuming (\(\Delta 4\)) this fact alone (\(\Delta 4\)) will inevitably (\(\Delta 4\)) determine all (\(\Delta 2\)) our (OPwCS) ideas and our (OPwCS) politics (\(\Delta 4\)). Maintaining one’s special (\(\Delta 2\)) identity is perfectly compatible with assimilation into American civilization (\(\Delta 3\))--indeed is a characteristic of it.

| THERE ARE ASPECTS OF THE OLD CULTURE THAT CAN BE MAINTAINED. THESE ARE UNTHREATENING AND COLOURFUL PARTS OF CULTURE, FOOD, CUSTOMS AND  |
FOLKWAYS. IT IS “NATURAL” TO WANT TO KEEP A CONNECTION WITH THE OLD WAYS, AS LONG AS THIS IS FRATERNAL AND DOES NOT IMPLY A POLITICAL LOYALTY TO THE OLD COUNTRY. WE ALL DO THIS. ALL AMERICANS KNOW THIS. BUT IT IS JUST A COLOURFUL ADDITION TO LIFE, A SAFE AND UNTHREATENING NOSTALGIA. OUR LOYALTIES ARE FIRMLY WITH AMERICA. WE DO NOT ALLOW OUR IDEAS, MUCH LESS OUR POLITICS, TO BE DETERMINED BY OUR OLD COUNTRIES. THERE IS A HIGHER ORDER IDENTITY, AMERICAN CIVILISATION, IN WHICH ALL OF US ARE IMMIGRANTS AND IN WHICH WE PURSUE OUR PAST TRADITIONS AS TOTALLY DE-POLITICISED PRACTICES OF SOFT CULTURE. AMERICAN CIVILISATION IS COMPRISED OF THIS KIND OF DIVERSITY.

The new multiculturalism (Δ4) takes (Δ1) a much more radical (Δ4) approach. Bilingualism (Δ4) keeps people actively tied (Δ4) to their old (Δ4) language and habits (Δ4) and maximizes the cost of the transition (Δ2) to becoming American (Δ2+Δ3). As a result, poor Americans (Δ1) and first-generation immigrant children have suffered pain and confusion (Δ3).

Yet the personal problems (Δ4) caused by bilingualism (Δ4) are overshadowed by the ultimate challenge they pose (Δ1) to American society. America can absorb an amazing number of people from an astonishing range of backgrounds if our goal is assimilation (OPwCS). If people are being encouraged (Δ1) to resist assimilation, the very fabric of American society will eventually break down (Δ4).

Every generation has two waves of immigrants (Δ2). One is geographic--we call them “immigrants”. The other is temporal--we call them “children” (Δ2). A civilization is only one generation deep and can be lost in a very short time (Δ4). Insisting that each new generation be assimilated (Δ1) is the sine qua non of our survival (Δ4).

IMMIGRANTS COME FROM OVERSEAS. ADULTS COME FROM CHILDREN. IMMIGRANTS ARE LIKE CHILDREN. (IN THE SENSE OF THIS ARGUMENT WE CAN THINK OF IMMIGRANTS AS CHILDREN). WHAT IS AT STAKE IS AN ENTIRE CIVILIZATION. IN ONE GENERATION, WHETHER IT IS AN AGE GENERATION, OR ONE OF NEWLY ARRIVED IMMIGRANTS, WE WOULD LOSE OUR CIVILIZATION. EDUCATING CHILDREN AND ASSIMILATING IMMIGRANTS INVOLVES THE SAME CHALLENGE OF INSISTING THAT THERE IS ASSIMILATION TO WHAT WE (NON-RECENT IMMIGRANT ADULTS) SPECIFY. IF WE DON’T DO THIS WE WILL NOT SURVIVE. IT IS THIS SERIOUS.

The (Δ4) only viable alternative (Δ2) for the American underclass (Δ4) is American civilization (Δ3).

ALL THESE GROUPS (THE POOR, AFRICAN AMERICANS, IMMIGRANTS) CONSTITUTE AN UNDERCLASS WHICH IS AMERICAN. (WE MUST IMPOSE AMERICAN CIVILISATION ON THIS UNDERCLASS).

Without English as the common (Δ1) language (Δ1), there is no such civilization “ (Δ4). (p 162)

AMERICAN CIVILISATION CAN ONLY EXIST IF WE HAVE ENGLISH AS THE COMMON LANGUAGE. (SUB-TEXT: THEREFORE MAKING ENGLISH OFFICIAL IS ESSENTIAL TO THE SURVIVAL OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION AND BILINGUAL EDUCATION-BILINGUALISM ARE THREATS TO AMERICAN CIVILISATION).

The Argument

“Sometime in the 1960s”…..this nominates an ambiguous date, invoking associations with counterculture, anti-establishment politics, youth rebellion, drugs, rock and roll etc; an indulgent time in the past.
“We were told that…” is ambiguous as to who is doing the telling and to whom (we); the phrase implies common cause with readers against unnamed subverters.

“Poor people”...is a phrase which is distanced from English, people on whom English may not be “imposed”.

“The imposition of this racist, colonial way of speaking on young people of other ethnic groups would deprive them of their cultural roots”...caricatures opposition position, however framed like a fair, scholarly initial premise whose analysis will follow; perfectly complemented by following sentence (“There are two problems with this argument”) invoking scholarly and dispassionate response and tone.

The Problem
The problem animated in the text is made both overtly and sub-textually.

Overtly there is a connection between practices of attachment to languages and cultures deemed to be of foreign others, of poverty, of racialised difference and of sub-literacy and threats to American democracy, economic progress and, most dramatically, civilisation. A governing dichotomy is only half named: Civilisation. Its other half is suggested: Absence of Civilisation (with the likely effect of an extension to barbarism).

There are also processes of: aggregation of suggested and overt meanings and hardening of lexical associations and sub-textual indication (especially bilingualism and bilingual education as though these do not involve English, and as states which effect a brake on connection with both mainstream society and “American civilisation”); and strategic and ‘loaded’ conflations (poor people, immigrants, African Americans) as categories of people who are textually associated with children (temporal and geographic immigrants) who can be manipulated and therefore need to be protected.

The effect of these aggregations function via a series of associations with impersonal agentive capacities: unnamed persons or things bring about the states of threat to American values and civilisation via processes of unreasonable levels of attachment to ‘old’ ways and to bilingualism (not to the old language as such but to this language sharing any role with English).

“The new multiculturalism”: the former one is suggested to have been bad enough but the new one is sinister. Bilingualism is co-located with this ‘new multiculturalism’ but, again, does not equate with the literal and propositional Bi-lingualism because IT keeps people ‘tied to their old language and habits’. In this and the next sentence it is clear that Bi-lingualism seems to not include English, or to down play it, so bilingualism really means other languages and the ‘transition to becoming American’ means becoming mono-lingual. Having two languages means suffering: ‘pain and confusion’ for ‘poor Americans and first generation immigrant children’. Essentially this means that ‘we’, or Middle Class Americans are English monolinguals, but it implies that if ‘we’ learn a foreign language it does not result in ‘pain and confusion’.

Neglect of grammar: grammar is associated strongly with a disciplined subject, one able to govern his or her behaviour. Such a disciplined subject would not be angry, unemployable-unemployable, a pregnant adolescent of such limited horizons that she considered it her greatest accomplishment to give birth to a child. One effect of sequencing the problems in the text from inner urban African American poverty and blight to language issues with immigrants is to claim for the official English that is the overall aim of the chapter a way of linking to poverty and inner urban violence. This functions in the text as a dysphemising strategem.

The Solution
The overt and declared solution is for ordinary people to share the writer’s advocacy of monolingualism in standard literate English. All references to the ‘other language’ are either deprecatory or associated
with poverty. The cognitive presupposition that is advanced therefore is of English, standard literate English, as a dimension of American capitalism, democracy and civilisation.

*We’s & You’s*

The figure below examines the way in which the pronoun referencing pattern in the text sustains the ideology of anti-languages other than English, except when the adjudicating subject of the text, and the author, can share anecdotes about how difficult it was to attain such skill.

**Figure Thirty-Two: Pronominal Reference Pattern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE/OUR/US</th>
<th>THEY/THEM/OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>we were told…</td>
<td>poor people and people from other cultures 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle class American</td>
<td>young people of other ethnic groups 1:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their business, politics, education and commerce 2: 4</td>
<td>a poor person or an immigrant 2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people 2:7</td>
<td>people 2: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans 3:1</td>
<td>African Americans 3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government 3:1</td>
<td>The government 3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational establishment 3: 3</td>
<td>Educational establishment 3: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class students 3:5</td>
<td>Middle class students 3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Poor African Americans 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress 3: 4</td>
<td>Poor African Americans 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtually every student (including me) 4:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you are an adult 4:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor children</td>
<td>their own children’s birth certificates (illiterate young mothers) 6:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They 5: 1</td>
<td>first-generation immigrants and their children 7:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poor children)…they…they…their 5:2</td>
<td>millions of Americans who came through Ellis island…their children 7:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poor children), they…they…gang…they 5:3</td>
<td>Becoming American 7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry young man…he…himself…6.1</td>
<td>every immigrant family 7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young girl (aiming to become pregnant) 6:1</td>
<td>people…old culture 8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve and thirteen year olds (girls) 6:2</td>
<td>the counterculture left and its allies 9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor maternity wards 6:2</td>
<td>immigrants…they 9:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own children’s birth certificates (illiterate young mothers) 6:2</td>
<td>America…no duality 9:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own children’s birth certificates (illiterate young mothers) 6:2</td>
<td>Immigrants…themselves…their 10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first-generation immigrants and their children 7:1</td>
<td>Students…they…their 10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millions of Americans who came through Ellis island…their children 7:2</td>
<td>Educators and professionals who make their living running (bilingual) programs 11:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming American 7:3</td>
<td>Some ethnic leaders (who isolate and manipulate) their voters and supporters…self-appointed leaders 11:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people…take two or three jobs 8:2</td>
<td>The rest of America 11:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people often lived in crowded 8:3</td>
<td>New American immigrants 12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people kept coming 8:4</td>
<td>Immigrants 12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the counterculture left and its allies 9:1</td>
<td>We (who remember our past…but remain aware that it is the past) 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants…they 9:2</td>
<td>We (who honor our past but who don’t let it dictate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Agentless Passives**

Preceding sections have dealt with this issue. The purpose here is to isolate only three instances to exemplify the role the obscuring of agency has on the ideological character of the text.

**The moment of liberation came**

The liberation of African Americans is rendered as if it emerged without struggle or contest, by no process which is even implied, as though by magic and not political struggle.

**Sometime in the 1960s, (Δ2) we were told (Δ1) that since all people and cultures were equal…**

The effectiveness of this sequence is to seek the connection between a presumed audience of commonsensical adjudicating subjects and a ‘culture’ of responsibility. In this way bilingual education is able to be tied to a history of Great Society-Civil Rights innovations whose overall rejection the judge is expected to share.

...if people had wanted (Δ1) to remain in their old culture(Δ2) they could have done so (Δ1) without coming... The function of this sequence is to tie immigration to a contract which involves the surrender of certain characteristics (language and culture) in exchange for the right of entry.

**Hard Work**

Several references to work and effort tie English to the economy and therefore create the effect that language is like economic effort of other kinds (an appeal perhaps to presumed “ordinary readers’ values”) and an association of America in general with opportunity, gained through effort, and the repudiation of kinds of welfare (including linguistic welfare; bilingual education). This further associates effort with the need for sacrifice in becoming American.

**Dates Without Time**

**Sometime in the 1960s**

These homily-like appeals to shared experience among like-aged, like-opinioned readers reveal a great deal of the logic of the issue from Gingrich’s point of view. Essentially he imagines that wiser, older people who have endured ‘the sixties’ will have a cognitive presupposition activated by the expression: The civil rights movement and the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, the Great Society philosophy of President Lyndon Baines Johnson; social rebellion; the anti-Vietnam war era.

The overall design effect of the vagueness is to maximise the number of potential reader negative associations and to diffuse any responsibility for specifying the issue in its own terms. It also abjures any attempt to understand the specificity of the logic of language interdependence hypotheses and
pedagogies which are based on it. It divides professional considerations and knowledge from ‘common sense’ ascriptions of motives, agency and ontological categories.

*We were told*

This expression serves to create a unity of audience between the author and his presumed readers. These are co-located in a group of people ‘spoken down to’ by unnamed others. Having to endure these ‘tellings’, attempts to identify a community of interests and implies that present vague rumblings of things having gone wrong emerge from what they were told: *that since all people are equal…*” *We*” is later specified as “*middle class American (s)*” associated with class categorisation as presumably people who pay taxes, work hard, are the back-bone of the nation, look after the poor but are not the privileged rich. Clearly those who did the telling were not “*middle-class American (s)*” but the ambiguity creates the powerful possibility that each reader may attribute separate and aggregating responsibility and therefore co-author the text with Gingrich in a common writing of responsibility.

*A generation ago*

This expression also functions to locate the policy claims of the present in a vaguely defined anti-nationalist and vaguely irresponsible self-indulgent time. It may have the effect of removing both the author and most readers from being accessaries. It locates the age of the claim to ‘linguistic welfare’ within a wider political program and removes from it any specificity as a matter which linguistic scholarship might resolve. The time and ideology thereby associatively connect a deprecated social era with a present policy discussion.

*At that very moment*

This expression carries the suggestion of a nefarious connection between a moment of possible opening and a thwarted opportunity. The ‘education establishment’ is mythologised as a monolithic and one-thinking behemoth capable of perverting the best interests of the poor, of African Americans, of new immigrants. This seeks to locate responsibility with ‘elites’ and makes immigrants and the poor objects of sympathy: potential Americans whose manipulation by ethnic bossism and professional elites who are self-serving requires overcoming. This may also have the effect of minimising ‘ethnic’ hostility to the author since the immigrants are construed as ‘victims’ who actually do want to assimilate and become American.

**Hard Verbs & Metaphors**

These verbs reveal a great deal about the expected or targeted audience of the chapter. Gingrich is appealing to and conversing *inter nos* as it were, to assumed supporters and therefore adopts a language of assumed agreement and common experience. The tone is one of “We all know that” English is so important and yet “THEY” call the need for English *imposition*. Immigrant language discourse is tied to anti-democratic practice, ingratitude and rudeness. Public policy behaviour is connected with common logics of interpersonal politeness.

Some parts of the text use anecdotes of personal experience (“*Being able to write clearly, converse fluently, and read with comprehension-- these are difficult skills (Δ2) that virtually every student, (including me)...*” adopts a tone of chatting among the like-minded, who share deep values and experiences and are not convinced, indeed they are untrusting, of the motivations of academics and of minorities who insist on construing ‘ordinary knowledge of ‘hard knocks’ as being either about rights or scientific knowledge from research. The references to the school of hard knocks completes this sequence of ordinary appeal and the use of the verb “compelled” within an overall setting of ‘*we are all immigrants*’ aims to divide ‘*old immigrants*’ from the new or recent ones, those who seek (or have thrust upon them) support that their predecessors did without and yet who succeeded in their new land.

**Infantilisation**

Paragraph 15 has the effect of equating the immigrant experience to the experience of children growing to maturity. Since immigrant adults separately experience that process the effect is one of paternalism and double-infantilisation; immigrant adults are infants requiring protection and former infants as well.
This manoeuvre operates with other suggestions in the text that a two part strategy is required of the ordinary reader, the adjudicating subject, and the author.

The first part involves vigilance. There are ethnic bosses, and cultural-professional elites, who operate out of self-serving interest and against whose self-serving ways vigilance is required. (Immigrants are named as “voters and supporters” though there is no indication of what electorate is involved).

The second part requires protection. This is a kind of duty incumbent on “Americans” (sometimes rendered as “middle-class Americans” or those with American civilisation) meaning however those who have completed the process of relegating the past to surface level attachments and transferring all loyalty (importantly suggested as “political” allegiance) to their ‘new home’.

The cost (or price) that new immigrants must render for the benefits received through immigration are a kind of ideological logic that is inapplicable to indigenous groups and that is greatly attentuated in relation to the formerly enslaved minorities. It is powerfully part of public discourse logic in relation to immigrants who are seen to have entered into a cultural contract with the authorised cultural and linguistic practices of the new home. This symbolic order of torts therefore deploys both protection and support for those who comply, and ‘sticks’ for those that defy.

Denigrated Neutrals
‘The English language’ is one of the few objects in the text that is named explicitly. It is thus foregrounded in the text for a particular kind of treatment. The verb that operates on the nominal phrase ‘The English language’ is ‘impose’, and ‘The English language’ is later suggested to have been impugned as “this racist, colonial way of speaking”. The denigration of this neutral and naturalised aspect of American life is realised both by its nominal clarity, the use of a “heavy” verb. The English language is therefore brought into the discourse as a kind of subject, one with possible feelings, whose impugning its speakers are invited to repudiate: for English is “the language of opportunity”.

Trivialisation
In the sentence “There are nearly two hundred different languages spoken in America (sixty alone in one school in my congressional district). …It’s just plain easier to have one standard language than a dozen’ trivialises and mocks the claims for language maintenance. No individual or group seeks to maintain more than one (possibly two) language/s other than English and always in conjunction with English. The addition of ‘one standard language’ implies that advocacy is for sub-standard languages or for non-standard forms of English. In addition the commonsense appeal of “It’s just plain easier” functions again to evade any serious consideration of multilingual policy claims; and to appeal to the Judge of Common Sense. The analogy with India further develops this idea given the associations of India with poverty and lack of development, and the continual associations of America with opportunity, work and progress.

**WHAT IS THE PROBLEM HERE?**

The analysis of radio and written texts has extended the Q-methodology examination of the subjective dispositions of actors engaged in lpp. The textual evidence provided in the present chapter represents the views, ideas, strategies and arguments of the central characters engaged in the politics of language in the 104th Congress, in debate with each other. From this evidence we can clearly observe the performance of officialisation routines as an integral part of making language policy. The talk which gives effect to this officialising language is in unelicited texts of the main actors.
The interview evidence which follows differs from the kind of evidence contained in the present chapter in which Transcript One provided a series of long turns from a single advocate. Transcripts Two and Three required advocates of official English to engage with opponents, with one other in Transcript Two and with several, including some presumed neutrals, in Transcript Three. Transcript Four did not have the quality of ‘eavesdropping’ that radio texts contain. The written text therefore is another kind of long turn constrained by audience (as all texts are) but an audience removed temporally, unlike listeners to radio broadcasts, who are in time and place connection with the speakers. These constraints are modality influences since they can affect what is said and how. The textual analysis reveals not only discoursal and ideological structuring but how democratic persuasion makes language performance an integral part of policy formulation. If official English were legislated that textualisation of policy would only be the culmination of the immense preceding textualisation as discourse that made the policy-focus of the law acceptable for executive government. The judiciary, executive and legislature are not the only divisions of government, these merge discoursally with the self-and-other government of citizens in democratic argument.

While these texts have not been totally unelicited they differ very much from the texts which follow since the latter are entirely and directly elicited. This factor introduces an additional textual constraint, the expectation of interviewees about the purposes and interests of a foreign researcher. Again, however, the interviews surface the recurring conflict to name the problem of language as a prelude to constructing a policy response. In Chapter VI, as in Chapter V, what is revealed is the contest over what constitutes the problem for official language policy in the United States and the performative activity of discursive contest.
CHAPTER VI

THE INTERVIEW EVIDENCE

...supporters of official English (no matter how moderate) have come to be routinely labelled ‘racist’, and immigrants wishing to use their own language (no matter how cultured) are castigated by such names as ‘welfare hogs’...(Crystal 1997: 129-130).

The headings under which the material in this chapter is organised is taken from an analysis of recurrence, meaning that issues that interviewees continually made recourse to were deemed to be a ‘theme’ (Agar 1983). Under each theme a sample of the diverse comments of the interviewees is included. Each theme is introduced with a brief commentary specifically relevant to that theme, or the question which elicited the theme, or some overarching explanatory detail. The interviews were semi-structured in the sense that researcher framing was kept to a minimum. Since the interviews were mostly with prominent politicians or public figures who are well used to advocating their views, little researcher prodding or focusing of themes was needed.

What Is The Problem?

Respondents were asked about their personal motivation for engagement with the issue of official English. In response some mention their view of the issue rather than describe their personal histories. Ten excerpts are included. These highlight a range of nation-language associations closely consistent with how the Q sorts uncovered evidence about this core theme of the official English issue. How America is called varies in an interesting way, from simple descriptive place naming, to deeper connotation and association. What is taken to be “The Problem” consistently widens according to the Pluribus interest but narrows in the hands of Unum advocates.

EXCERPT 1:1
R2:  ... the last 25 years with the growth of bilingual language in New York, especially ... it gave me reason to doubt over the years ... the effect of it...because it struck me that it was not encouraging people to learn (it was reducing the) interest to break into the mainstream, it was giving them a false security, a mirage...

EXCERPT 1:2
L5:  ... we saw it from the very beginning as clearly an anti-Hispanic, anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic agenda by a very mean-spirited group of individuals.

EXCERPT 1:3

---

1 This chapter presents extracts from some of the 44 interviews conducted. The number allocated to the excerpts refers to the full text, located at Appendix Ten. Since not all excerpts under each theme are included here the number sequence is not always intact, however the excerpt numbers have been retained so that the reader may refer to the corresponding full extract located in the Appendix. The excerpts are listed by recurring general themes (Agar 1983) not by individual interviewee. The coding transcriptions and the names, locations and dates of interviews are described in Appendices 3, 10 and 11. The bolding indicates the speakers’ emphasis.
S1: I thought it was English. I never dreamed ten years ago that English was not the official language somewhere. But it is just by custom. What we want to do is to make it by law. It is a statement. First, it would be symbolic in that it is in a statement; but if it were the law of the land then it was also be more than symbolic.

EXCERPT 1:5
S1: //no, no, no, but you’re missing the point-
JLB: //No, no, I’m-
S1: //yes, you are. Let me tell you, let me just argue. You’re trying to equate the speaking of language to not designating English as the official language of the United States. It would be wonderful if you have five children and they could speak four languages. What would they be? Spanish? Chinese? Japanese? German, maybe? And English. But what we’re saying is that it’s great to do that. But let’s put English first as the official language in the United States.

EXCERPT 1:6
L1: ….see, and that’s what this is really all about. It isn’t about bilingualism (although I have my problems with official bilingual policies; I think they are ultimately divisive) but it isn’t about bilingualism of individuals, that isn’t the problem. The problem, in my view, is monolingualism. [It is] Monolingualism in non-English languages that I worry about … …

EXCERPT 1:7
L3: ….but it is not a problem, we’re not talking about a problem, we’re talking about a concept, we’re talking about an idea.

EXCERPT 1:10
R1: …what I am saying, is that this concept of a melting pot has served America very well. In the new concept of America is the one of the salad bowl where you have groups living adhering to groups and as Woodrow Wilson said way back in 1915, that as long as you look at yourself as a part of a group you are not really assimilated into America because America is a nation of individuals, not a nation of groups.

EXCERPT 1:12
L4: … if it (English) were somehow being threatened we would look at it differently; but as we say, 95% of the American population speak English and the other 5% are, by and large, trying to learn English and doing it better than previous groups.

EXCERPT 1:13
L5: … they need a problem to solve by this proposition and they don’t have one so they try to create one. They’re trying to paint a picture that isn’t there … there is no evidence for, and it is totally an artificial creation. There is no evidence to support what they’re talking about.

EXCERPT 1:14
L4: Mean-spirited. Cultural Imperialism. Wrong-headed. Stupid. Those are the words that come to my mind.

The Importance Of Being Ernesto
Participants seek to authorise their interventions by appeal to authentic views of silent people, non-participants. This democratic impulse to render legitimate views by claiming the sanction of ordinary people involves a binary logic; on the one hand, the authentic-ordinary, and its counter, the elite-manipulated. This at least is the Unum’s dichotomy. The educator base of the Pluribus position on official English makes it have to work hard to counter this; however it often appears to be speaking with a vocabulary of science, research and evidence, making it vulnerable to the voice of Ernesto. Because the overall discursive arrangements (as we saw in the previous chapter radio moderators, listeners and
others acknowledge the commonsense claims of the ordinary person characterisation of truth) it becomes possible to legitimise views on the basis of their symmetry with the former and distance from the latter. Ernesto Ortiz has assumed a remarkable fame, and notoriety, as the exemplar of the authentic voice stifled by elite manipulation. He appears and re-appears, and on investigation has been found to be playing this role for at least two decades. He is press-ganged into lending his voice, his text, to the officialisers of English who find his 32 words very powerful.

The ubiquity and duration of Señor Ortiz’ commentary suggests a hierarchy of knowledge and representation in which the democratic evidence of lived encounter is seen to furnish what is an otherwise repetitious incantation with virtue and deep truth. In several sections of the present work this kind of knowing is called ‘insightful’ because this term expresses the sense that the knowledge is invested with a capacity to ‘see through’ the ‘corrupted’ discourses of interest and motivation that ‘elites’, bosses and critics of America put out. Patriotism is not just a sensibility but also a way to know.

The power of Ernesto’s voice can be seen to intensify the efforts made by interactants to distance much of what they say from ‘science’ which is invoked only when it supports what authentic-ordinary knowledge can already legitimise through ‘experience’ and insight. Indeed insightfulness, beyond the suspicious manipulations of academics, is a recurring theme of the debate (Dole 1995). Democratic principles validate such invocations. Excerpts 2.2 and 2.3 are interesting attempts to remove some of the power from the story.

EXCERPT 2:1
R1: … here is a man with real insight …

EXCERPT 2:2
L4: And they are using anecdotes. I mean, you know, the Ernesto Ortiz story by Toby Roth I have heard (it) so many different times … you know, that is like a pet story.

EXCERPT 2:3
L5: Oh, well we have heard that any number of times. I think…it is a little bit of defensiveness because Toby Roth isn’t Latino, you know, he doesn’t have that kind of a background to be able to say “I know what’s best”…

EXCERPT 2:4
L1: … Readers Digest … apparently had been trying for years to get somebody to write something on bilingual education and they kept getting these manuscripts that were filled with data that nobody could understand…

EXCERPT 2:6
L2: …I think that Ernesto Ortiz, the Mexican farm worker, put it so well in John Silver’s book Straight Shooting. He said “They teach my children in Spanish at school so that they can be bus boys and waiters. I teach them in English at home so that they can be doctors and lawyers”. … Ernesto Ortiz – he’s the fellow I mention in People magazine this week.
A Double Standard?
Official English advocates highlight their support of ‘foreign’ language education. In Transcript One, Chapter V we see GT correct a 12 year old who thinks “we should protect English” assuring her studying a foreign language will ‘help’ her English. This theme is encountered in the interview evidence.

Zelasko (1991) calls the differential support for foreign language education contrasted with opposition to bilingual education as the bilingual double standard. This raises questions such as: Is there a ‘fear’ of prior cultural or ideological attachment behind opposition to bilingual education for young children? Are languages invested with essentialist national connection and intergenerational retention of minority languages feared to continue intra-cultural minority language exclusive domains and institutions, which foreign language competence would not imply?

There is some kind of historical validity to such questions in decision of Meyer v. Nebraska 1923 in which the idea of basing bilingual capacity on the retention of a minority languages was seen to threaten attachment to and full understanding of key American political concepts. The first language maintenance pathway to bilingualism is coded and expressed in different ways. In extract 3.1 it is as an ‘ethnic marker’, in 3.2 instrumentalism, in 3.6 commonality, in 3.7 efficiency.

EXCERPT 3:1
L1: … the idea of maintaining Spanish as a part of the whole concept of a foreign language instruction++ is fine. I don’t think that Hispanics should be forced to maintain Spanish. If they choose to learn Japanese instead ++ let them learn Japanese. I don’t want it to become an ethnic marker.

EXCERPT 3:2
R1: …There are people who are opposed to this but who don’t want to take me on frontally so they’re jabbing on the sides or whatever. The truth of the matter is that I want people to be proficient in other languages too - but - first and foremost, people in this country, I want them to be able to vote in the English language, be able to do government in the English language and so on.

EXCERPT 3:6
L3: Well, they could study any language they like as a second language. My kids study Spanish. I’m sending my thirteen-year old son to Spain this year in summer to study Spanish. We’re actually for studying foreign languages, but they first must acquire the language that they need in this country and that’s English.

EXCERPT 3:7
L3: .. So we absolutely support the learning of foreign languages. That has nothing to do with the fact that an immigrant comes to this country and they need to assimilate, they need to become a part of the country, and to do that they need to learn English. Of course it would be wonderful if after they learned English they could learn some other languages.
Two-Language Education

Bilingual education is the main source of unhappiness for the advocates of official English. The interview evidence bolsters and reinforces the kinds of extra-educational associations that constitute the principal problem for bilingual education, and indeed which characterise one of the key divides between the *Pluribus* people and their *Unum* antagonists. A key dividing line revealed in the Q-analysis is that *Pluribus* subjectivity is an educator-technician-professional discursive formation, while *Unum* is founded around a nationalist-economist aggregation of meanings. These underlying frames largely preclude effective dialogue since each makes of the same evidence different things and gathers evidence that bolsters their fundamentally incommensurate values and ideals. Schneider (1976) finds that something of this divide has been present since the inception of the BEA; but the accumulation of conflict over time has produced further conflations, argument culture (Tannen 1998), incompatible cognitive presuppositions and have rendered it a major and seemingly irreconcilable dichotomisation. The seven excerpts powerfully demonstrate this; 4.7 and 4.9 are classically in the educator mode, while the remainder demonstrate the wide range of meanings, denotations and connotations, that two-language education has when it is called ‘bilingual education.’

**EXCERPT 4:1**

L1: .... They need to learn English and yet the program became a Spanish maintenance program.

**EXCERPT 4:4**

S1: //I’m not for bilingual education. I push for English. Let people coming to this country learn English, not learn another language unless they want to do it on their own as a second language for business reasons or for educational reasons but I don’t believe we should push or equate another language to English.....That’s fine but that’s a personal thing. Whatever they want to do - that is fine. And not just Spanish. Let’s just say it was Japanese or Chinese or German or French or Arabic. It doesn’t matter what it is. We were using Spanish; but I believe that we should emphasise and promote the English language and only the English.

**EXCERPT 4:5**

R1: What I am saying is that when the youngsters come to school they should be taught in the English language. Now, if they want to teach another language later on then I think that is great, we want to do that. But the primary focus has to be on teaching English in the lower grades.

**EXCERPT 4:6**

L2: Instead we say that the way to learn English is to hear Spanish for six classes a day with one class of English, and wonder why the kids don’t pick it up.

**EXCERPT 4:7**

O1: ... I think the truth will come out. I think ‘Let them engage the debate!’ But it must be a fair debate. It must not come up with the perception to say that the bilingual program is not worth it and that the only way is to shut it down. The only way they listen - swim or sink type of theory.

**EXCERPT 4:9**

O1: .... They feel shame, they feel embarrassed; when they sit in the classroom and know nothing of what is going on. So they drop out. Later on they come back to school and the parents say ‘Can you put my kids back
into the bilingual program?’. And then a few months later, or maybe a year later, maybe two years later, they depend on their English ability at that point and they will be mainstreamed to the regular classes.

EXCERPT 4:10
L1: The Los Angeles school system is much more interested in maintaining their Spanish than it is in teaching them English.

The Meanings Of Things
The following two excerpts also powerfully illustrate the difference, epitomised by callers in Transcripts One and Two (Chapter V) between professional meanings that Pluribus operates with and which are the base of their political stance and the rival ‘nationalist and anti-educator’ principles and meanings that prevail for Unum, or opponents of bilingual education. This underlying meaning divide was highlighted by the Q-analysis.

Politicians and advocates who seek to align themselves to popular legitimations have available to them the vocabulary of common naming. In debates this is often used by anti-bilingual education and pro-official English advocates seeking to attract popular legitimacy to their case by appropriating a claim to commonsense. This alignment of meanings via in-group vocabularies establishes a divide between the professionals’ representation of the problem and that of ‘ordinary people’- or of ‘taxpayers’.

EXCERPT 5:1A
JLB: Do you have a particular concern with bilingual education?
R3: Not at all, I strongly support bilingual education.
JLB: So your legislation, unlike Toby Roth’s, wouldn’t support the dismantling of bilingual education?
R3: No.

(SOME MINUTES LATER)

EXCERPT 5:1B
R3: … in the public education programs that we have around the country there is some notion that people should be taught in their native language. I don’t agree with that.
JLB: So, teaching in another language you would disagree with but the teaching of that language you would support?
R3: Exactly.

EXCERPT 5:2
L2: ….. They won’t affect the language in the home, they don’t affect the language spoken on the street, they won’t make the Korean market down the street start speaking English. What they do …say ‘The language of the country is English. Let’s eliminate some of these multi-lingual programs..”

Quebec, Salad Bowls & Melting Pots
Quebec is iconic. In the Dianne Rehm show we find JL construing the Quebec trope as evidence against the official English Bill. Its more common meaning is to invoke support for Official English. Salad Bowls and Melting Pots are part of the metaphorical paraphernalia that activate the cognitive presuppositions of listeners and readers. Those who advocate smaller and ‘less intrusive’ government perversely seek to involve government in administering language legislation (while lauding the
American state as essentially liberal); professionals who would normally support national language policymaking oppose it. These inversions of expected tendencies lend the issue some of its ‘craziness’.

EXCERPT 6:1
L1: Right! No, I mean that is part of the craziness of Quebec. I don’t have any problem with the private sector using whatever language they want….that’s their problem, it’s not the government’s problem. So you see, I don’t want the government intruding on the activities of the private sector in respect to language in any way.

EXCERPT 6:2
R1: … they had a call-in show. People would call in and say ‘You know, here in Canada we have one Quebec but you have many little Quebeks all over the United States’.

EXCERPT 6:3
L5: … the Canadian government is busy telling the French speaker ‘Your language is making you separate and this is part of your identity’ and if you keep hearing that from the government for a while you believe it.

EXCERPT 6:4
O2: … Where we have to be careful is in reviewing the experience of Canada where an official bilingualism has nearly wrecked the country apart…

Being Smart
A discussion about the associations of language with national capability, human assets and strategic investments for facilitating international communication revealed a shared commitment among most participants that such learning is the direction national economies need to take. These extracts indicate that new naming for disputed territory can indeed achieve some (albeit limited) kind of advancement, and also serve to underscore the primary argument of the thesis that much of the public display of language in contest is performing the work of officialisation.

EXCERPT 7:1
L1: … I think that smart businessmen do in fact invest in employees who speak the language of their customers. That would argue for a more aggressive approach on speaking languages where the biggest markets are, and that would be China, the Chinese, the Japanese, it would probably not be Spanish as the first language. I do find it interesting; Chinese is still not widely taught in the United States. Japanese is being taught.

EXCERPT 7:4
R1: … The more global you become, the more people in a local area are going to hang onto their traditions and their languages.

EXCERPT 7:5
R1: … the truth of the matter is that the United States has not been a diverse country. We’ve had diverse cultures, all diverse cultures, here. But we have been every bit as united as Japan….

EXCERPT 7:6
R1: …Yes, we are becoming more diverse now because our languages are breaking up; but if we could keep this unifying force, this common glue; there is no country that is more unified than the United States.

EXCERPT 7:7
I think that the promotion of foreign language education is an important educational goal. … I think that every American high school student should graduate with four years of foreign language instruction. I think that ought to be a requirement for graduation from high school in the United States - just as I think those students should have four years of math, four years of English, and four years of social studies, and four years of science. I mean, I think that knowing other languages helps make us educated persons.

EXCERPT 7:8
L5: ... this question of setting up an official language .. contributed ... to that separation that you have there [in Canada-Quebec]... I think that begins to beget separatism when you get into more of a Canadian/Quebec-style kinds of fights. I think that we misunderstand the Canadian experience in this country very, very much.

The American Century or The Great Society
The role of English in America’s success is an important trope. The idea has global scope. Conquest (1999) has argued that the idea of a European Union is ‘artificial and unconvincing’ and that a ‘more natural association’ is one of ‘like-minded peoples who share a common language and heritage’. The re-circulation of folk ideologies which make use of essentialised constructions of English is powerfully sustained here. The sense among some interviewees that the 21st century will not be the ‘Asian century’ but the ‘American century’ has a codicil requiring the overcoming of the ‘stultifying backwardness of bilingualism’; a legacy of the Great Society thinking of Lyndon Baines Johnson’s presidency (equating bilingualism with welfare).

There is also a sense that learning others’ languages signals weakness in international relations. Who adapts to whom linguistically is a kind of victory spoil. Hegemony and prevailing, dominance, implies that others do the accommodating, a kind of price the dominated must pay. Seeking to penetrate markets by using foreign languages has a different sense to the extent that supplication is not really invoked since sales (the profitable exchange of goods or services) supports national interests.

EXCERPT 8:1
R1: ... I feel that the 21st Century is going to be the American century....

EXCERPT 8:2
R1: ...it was in 1968 when the Great Society phenomenon of the liberals took over and we are going to reshape man, and we’re going to have the new Soviet man, the new Stalin, and Hitler had, you know, the master race. Whenever you have the liberals and, you know, these people come in and they are going to re-do human nature - they always fall flat on their face....

EXCERPT 8:3
R1: I said ‘American Century’, what I am talking about is the American Idea. The societies of the individual (are) going to be successful in the 21st Century (and these are) made of ... three parts. One – (those who) understand technology, education, and everything that goes along with it. Secondly - entrepreneurship. Thirdly ...traditional values. These are going to be the three great pillars for success for the individual or society in the 21st Century.

Scope & Limits
The reach and limits of official English law is a constant source of difference in debates.
R3: … the proceedings in the court would be conducted in **English**. The non-English speaking person is, under the law, provided with an interpreter.

EXCERPT 9:4
R3: … I would apply the same rule to Native Americans, i.e. that the **official** business of the government should be conducted **only** in English. But **no-one** would be prohibited from speaking in or communicating in whatever they wish, another language. But if they are going to become **involved in the official government process** then that will be conducted in English.

EXCERPT 9:5
R3: There have been allegations that because of the **concentration** in some places of non-English speaking individuals that people seeking services or **seeking information** in English have been denied this. …

EXCERPT 9:7
L1: … certainly don’t want, you know, **language police**. I certainly don’t want the government **telling** businesses what language they can operate in. ..

Citizenship & Sacredness
The term sacred appears odd in secular political debate, but animates views of the American polity as a ‘secular religion’. Citizenship (the admission or initiation ritual for aliens) is an activity of the state on behalf of the nation. This activity yields almost mystical and transcendent associations, and is a rich ore in official English discourse. It stands out of all proportion to the small (tiny) number of cases of non-English swearing in ceremonies, and in complete contradiction of claims that multilingualism is to be opposed because of its ‘cost’. The heat goes up most where the cost is least.

EXCERPT 10:1
L1: …my recollection is that the ceremony was for the elderly ++ you know, you can become a US citizen if you are older than fifty or fifty-five **without** learning English. I understand that it is much more difficult to acquire English as you get older. And if it was elderly people or if there were some translations so that the families could understand and participate in it, I **don’t** have a problem with that. I remember that at the time there was all a hullabaloo about it. … if the government is now giving **official sanction** in the most important symbolic ceremony, in terms of an immigrant’s life, the **naturalisation** ceremony, then I think that people would think that there was a problem.

EXCERPT 10:3
R3: …. It should **all** be done in English. It is the **official** language. The **act** of becoming a **citizen of the United States** is an **official governmental** function. Being such, in my view it should be conducted in English and English **only**.

EXCERPT 10:4
S1: … I think **that is** wrong. I think that we should **promote** that it should be done in English, that people who come to this country should **learn** English and should **speak** English as their **primary** language-

EXCERPT 10:5
L5: Yeah, we have only ever been able to document **one** that has ever existed. Somehow it has become the **most famous** swearing in ceremony … an unexamined linkage, between if you are an American therefore you
must be Americanised, and that means you’ve got to be English-speaking, that means you’ve got to love baseball, that means you’ve got to love hot dogs, that means you are washed away. I’m not making these up. These are phrases and words that have been used. ‘Washed away’: your ethnicity, your other ethnicity, that you have brought to this country as though they were unclean and that therefore they could contaminate.

EXCERPT 10:6

R4: … there is no connection between American citizenship and language per se, in the sense that if we are going to enthrone American citizenship to have an almost supernatural reality rather than just being an artifice of human institutions, that somehow or another we are going to have to enthrone English in the way that the Nazis enthroned the origins of German and the Teutonic languages - it’s ridiculous! It’s absurd! English is the language of the country - clear. English will be the language of government for almost all purposes - clear. Beyond that you don’t need to make it sound as though English is coming ++ that it has been hand-delivered from the gods, that there is some unique genius to the essence of using English words in the sense of the unique genius of American in coming up with the Constitutional form of government that we have.

JLB: But do you think that some of the official English advocates actually see it that way?

R4: Actually, they do! They are trying to make that connection.

What The Founding Fathers (Would Have) Said

The silence of the founding documents on language speaks loudly in present debates. Seeking sanction for present action in founding documents is a common quest of Unum and Pluribus people. It is a quest for legitimisation from the founders of the state. The first three informants represent advocates and supporters of official English. Their search leads them to conclude that the silence means support for declaring English as the language of American life and culture. Supporters of pluralism find not redundancy but openness and toleration in what was not said more than two hundred and twenty years ago.

EXCERPT 11:1

O2: Nor did the founding fathers establish a wide range of Federally mandated social benefits and Federal education programs and Federal mandates on individuals and citizens. The reach of the Federal government at the time of the founding of the country was much less than it is today.

EXCERPT 11:2

L1: … what they were trying to create was a more perfect England….

EXCERPT 11:3

R3: … implicit in what they were doing was acknowledging that, as far as they were concerned, English was the official language.

EXCERPT 11:4

L3: …We were breaking from an English speaking country and they all spoke English and they never figured it would ever be any problem. …

EXCERPT 11:5

L5: …Our founding fathers discussed this and they very wisely agreed that, given our pluralism, and at a time when thirteen colonies and oh they were largely English speaking, they felt that given the vision of America it would not be appropriate to have an official language…. 
Lingua Mundi
As English attains global status what is its affective function for ‘old’ English speakers? The ‘natives’ for whom English would be the marker of language identity need to evolve differentiated attachments to English, perhaps to ‘correct’ English, or to ‘British English’. Nevertheless the global power of English represents an additional dimension for the struggle about its status in the United States. For Unum global English means that pragmatism is added to the mix. Interestingly, as stated in Chapter I, US English commissioned the UK linguist Professor David Crystal to assess the global significance of English, and whether this global presence will be maintained in the forthcoming decades.

EXCERPT 12:1
R2: ...the airport industry around the world uses English as the common language. In every airport that you go around the world, if they are qualified as an international airport then the instructions to the pilots are provided in English...  

What’s “Behind” It?
Opponents of officialising English suspect nativism and reject the face value claims of the official English organisations. The face value issue is a particular challenge to ‘old style’ lpp. What tools will lpp use to make decisions about whether given language policies are what they claim to be. In the case of Official English, where accusations fly about what the real motives of either side are, a linguistics-based lpp will be unable to offer convincing answers from within its disciplinary base.

EXCERPT 13:1
L4: ...We also believe that it would be discriminatory and most definitely divisive. ... reactions to growing waves of immigration or even certainly even just the growing prominence of certain groups, such as Hispanics - we really feel that is behind this latest rise in official English popularity

EXCERPT 13:2
L4: I think that they have been very, very good, very successful at presenting themselves as a very moderate, ... Things that used to be radical are not, and things that are extreme are viewed as more moderate. To us US English is still an extremist, radical organisation… we know what their roots are, we know where they’re coming from.

EXCERPT 13:3
O1: Well, I think it has a lot to do with politics... a lot of debate lately coming out from what they call the American Agenda, Contract with America, you know, with a lot of Christian Coalition movements, their agenda …the true story will be revealed and we will prove once again that our children deserve better.

EXCERPT 13:4
R4: ... the United States as a whole is having difficulty, dealing with this new-found diversity and there are certain quarters of the country that feel threatened by it; and one of the most symbolic ... one of the things that is easiest to symbolise, as an example of diversity gone crazy, as diversity becoming a disunifying force, is language.

EXCERPT 13:7
S1: We are basically a land of immigrants, of immigrant stock, but the English language has been the glue ...But what has happened in recent years is we have had a massive influx of immigrants through regular immigration, through refugee status...

EXCERPT 13:8
O1: The image I looked to America when I was in Vietnam is completely different to the image now of America. I can tell you this much. Why? Because based on those debates! So, I sometimes ask myself - where are we? What are we doing? This is the thing. … This is a very confusing time. And a very sad time.

If Language Isn’t The Glue?
Opposing official English laws places pressure on Pluribus advocates to specify what does unify America? What is the nation? What are its bonds? The three excerpts which follow are from Pluribus advocates. These extracts supply a rich array of understandings of both the primary meaning of the attack from Unum (that a nation-unifying issue is central to whether English attains Official Status, rather than anything to do with educational effectiveness for minority language children).

EXCERPT 14:1
L4: … … frankly, if English is the only unifying factor then we’re in trouble. We feel that there are far more important shared values and shared principles that keep us unified as a country.

EXCERPT 14:2
R4: … You know, the genius of the United States is that it defines membership on a political and civic basis. It didn’t attribute it to some kind of sacred origins, it didn’t attribute it to ethnicity…

EXCERPT 14:3
L4: Latinos have a very strong belief in the family, in traditional values of the family and of unity in that sense; certainly the shared belief in democracy and individual liberty, and the belief that if you work hard then you can get ahead. … I think the Latinos are very committed to that, that ideal, as well. But primarily the issue of individual liberty, of freedom, of democracy, those are all, we believe, all far more important shared values than the fact that we all speak English.

If It’s Symbolic What Does It Symbolise?
The reaction to claims that official English is symbolic are ambivalent. Supporters sometimes agree feeling that the ‘right kind’ of symbolic message is being communicated. At other times they perceive symbolic to mean ‘impractical’ (as in merely symbolic) and reject the idea that official English is symbolic, stating either that official English is a first-step towards fully practical measures, or that symbolic change must accompany practical change or by rejecting the symbolic tag altogether.

The symbolic claim is also a problem for opponents of official English, though, inevitably, in inverse pattern. They react negatively to claims that official English is ‘harmless symbolism’ and point out that a range of ‘very concrete’ measures accompanies the ‘symbolism’. Some claim that symbolism is important in its own right, since the symbolism is of domination by established Anglo-Americans over new arrivals rejecting their presence in American life.

The interview evidence is rich with contradictions of claims and meanings and these change. Excerpt 15:1 from a central figure in the process of making English official indicates a staged process from symbolic meaning with concrete purpose of facilitating actual reform; excerpt 15:2 involves a
speculation about the kinds of purposes of symbolism and the outcomes from these; while 15:3 is a very rich exposition of the concerns of Hispanic American organisations about the proximity, or rather inseparability, of symbolic and ‘practical’ action and its, for them, wholly negative character. The remaining excerpts elaborate a related theme; that symbolic action is a ‘kind of action’ and that practical action follows from symbolism.

These excerpts provide nuance to the question of whether, and how, official English would ever be ‘policy-tractable’.

**EXCERPT 15:1**
L3: … in the beginning, yes. Making English the official language is a symbolic act ++ in the beginning. The end result of that, because it is the official language, we will begin reform in multi-lingual government, bilingual education reform, ballot reforms, and all the other reforms.

**EXCERPT 15:2**
L5: Precisely! And that is precisely the question. If it is symbolic, what is it that you're trying to get across? And it is almost beginning to sound like a cultural chauvinism, a reaction, rather than trying to accomplish anything meaningful. ..

**EXCERPT 15:3**
L5: I think it is 99% symbolic. …..Very anti-Hispanic document that was talking about how, something about how this will be the first time in history that those with their pants up are caught by those with their pants down, just very sordid, obviously blatantly racist and blatantly anti-Hispanic sentiment. He talked about ‘brown hordes’ of people and people who reproduce like rabbits, and just very ugly stuff…

**EXCERPT 15:5**
S1: I think it is more than symbolic. Once you pass the law there will be other things that will follow. There will be a greater emphasis, more attention, to how important English is to America.

**EXCERPT 15:6**
R4: …those laws are not policies designed to solve problems. They are designed to send a certain symbolic message to everybody, and once that symbolic message is sent you don’t know where it is going to lead……. Now they have the law on their side. Well, they have nothing on their side! But it symbolises that intolerance of other languages is OK.

**Linguistic Civil Rights & Linguistic Welfare**
A driving polemic between Civil Rights based support for bilingual education and its repudiation as ‘linguistic welfare’ is one consequence of the incommensurate ideologies that underlie the Unum and Pluribus discourses. The educator-professional base of Pluribus finds an extension of Civil Rights to languages a logical outcome of construing language in connection with nation-transcending human rights. For Unum advocates it is precisely the connection between language and nation that makes bilingualism politically problematic. In bilingual education they see a rival nation being formed, financed by US taxpayers.

**EXCERPT 16:1**
L5: … to repeal bilingual education, to repeal the foreign language, the assistance provisions of the Civil Rights Act, that does speak louder than words.
EXCERPT 16:2
L5: Yeah. I think often the perception has been that certain Federal programs are designed for certain groups. …I’m, frankly, at a loss to understand how people portray it as a program that prevents children from assimilating when its very purpose is and always has been to teach students English.

EXCERPT 16:3
L3: Sink or swim was the situation.
JLB: Do you favour ‘sink or swim’?
L3: It worked. The whole country is English-speaking right now because of the ‘sink or swim’. Stop anybody in the street and ask them where their grandparents were born.
JLB: But a lot of those grandparents would have functioned in German or French or whatever, and then their children would have learned English.
L3: No, their parents also learned. To a lesser degree of course.

Tractability
In the policy sciences some issues are known to have a high tractability and others a low tractability. Tractability refers to the whether formal techniques of policy science can ‘get a grip’ on the question at hand and produce evidence that will assist in resolving or lessening tension, argument and contest. The findings of the Q-study reveal that official English-bilingual education has a very low tractability. There is a high degree of polarisation and ‘agonism’. Everybody cites studies that ‘prove’ that bilingual education does or does not work. The following excerpts are illuminating of the interested character of such ‘science’. 17:1 reveals a sophisticated understanding of the lines and relationships between knowledge-generation procedures and policy/politics and programming. However in excerpt 17:2 it is clear that practitioners (bilingual education experts) consider that research evidence is important to their case.43 17.4 dissolves any possibility of tractability.

EXCERPT 17:1
R4: Well, science should never be used to solve a policy problem. … ultimately it is not going to be resolved by science and it is not going to be resolved by research…

EXCERPT 17:2
O1: The point is, and I hate to say this … politics is involved in the issue, not purely educational. I think that issue should be decided by the educators who know at least the techniques or appropriate approach and research it. Do the research into how to improve the learning and teaching environment in the classroom.

EXCERPT 17:4
L2: One program out of three hundred shows that their program works and if they find one person who, for the wrong reason, supports my cause, that proves that the entire thing is racist. It is becoming an interesting method of working from one small example to the entire universe. No-one is interested if I recite chapter and verse of failed program after failed program - they call that ‘anecdotal evidence’.

Snouts In Public Troughs
An acrimonious part of the issue concerns allegations made by official English advocates that bilingual educators are ‘in it for the money’. Participants in Transcripts One and Two in Chapter V make this claim repeatedly.

EXCERPT 20:1
L2: My favourite is this huge amount of money, about $200,000, to a group that said it would teach people to speak English. They taught 5 people….we could have sent them all to Berlitz nineteen thousand times.
EXCERPT: 20:2
L2: Well, the people in charge of the programs make **darn good money**.

EXCERPT 20:3
L2: The assistant co-ordinator of bilingual education in New York makes $104,000 a year! Who gets the blame for that? The poor **immigrant** for something he **never asked for** and **doesn’t want**.

**National, Official, Convenient Or Common?**
What to call English is a vexed problem. What to call those who support and those who oppose official English is also vexed. This battle is an indicator of the performativity of official English debates. The interview data contain some merciless dichotomisation: “We are Pro-English”, “They are Anti-English”; “We support English-plus they want English-only” are mild simplifications. The verbs ‘resisted’ and ‘opposed’ express the balance of forces during the 104th Congress when the initiative was with the **Unum** cause.

EXCERPT 21:1
R4: … and that’s **not** to discount the role of **English** in providing the language. It is the language of **common** communication. It is the language of political discourse.

EXCERPT 21:2
L3: I like calling it **common** language. Frankly, I have never like the word **official language**

EXCERPT 21:3
L5: English is the **de facto** common language of this country…. that is **very** different from having that language be **official** and it **violates** something we’re very comfortable with… **very different** from having an official language and it is **particularly** different from having an official language with a lot of **coercive** measures

EXCERPT 21:4
L2: … people get confused on terminology and when someone says there is a course called English as a **Second** Language one Congressman stood up and said ‘**English is the first language in this country!**’. … the other side had a good laugh, people do make mistakes.

EXCERPT 21:5
L2: Where now English is the **national** language of the United States, about 95% of the American people **speak** English; however it is **not** the official language

EXCERPT 21:7
L3: this is the **welfare** State, they think that language for them has become sort of a **welfare situation**, or an **equal rights** kind of situation…

**Being & Becoming**
Political citizenship, rather than ancestry, blood and kinship ties are what constitute participation in the American polity. There is consensus on this but not on whether culture (vernacular culture) and language is or ought to be involved. In this regard the politics of official English surfaces important issues of American democratic theory and practice.

Language pluralists construe the absence of ancestry, or consanguinity, based citizenship as evidence for the inappropriateness of official English. Supporters of official English cite citizenship by political
adherence as proof of the need for English as unifying glue in the absence of shared vernacular culture. Both sides elicit present day political messages from the ‘silence of the founders’, circulate outdated visions of the reality of citizenship in European nations and cite de Tocqueville to uphold opposing conclusions.

EXCERPT 22:1
R4: … You have proved in a sense the **enduring viability** of American institutions and **certainly** their attraction to the rest of the world. ‘**What else do you have to prove?**’… I guess we’re all supposed to live like *Leave It To Beaver* ...

EXCERPT 22:2
L2: They **did one**… even though **everyone** spoke English, they said ‘*Let’s have this one in Spanish*’, only the first one in **200 years**! Now you have seen in the movies; America is good at pulling out in the movies like in Short Circuit II (?) all of the people from various ++ obviously of different **colour, cultures, and countries, and languages**, all **taking that oath in English**, saying that ‘*I’m proud of what I was before but I’m also proud of what I have become - American - and we now have something in common.*’ Well, the **anti-English** lobby goes after that commonality

EXCERPT 22:5
L3: Immigrants come here mainly because of **money**, this **green** value [holding up a dollar note]. That is why immigrants come to this country.

EXCERPT 22:6
R4: … **what is a community** in this country? And that is the **source** of the problem. You can **invent** communities in this country in ways that you can’t...

EXCERPT 22:7
R4: For this nation it is the **only** way. I remember one of the teachers unions said this is the **only** country where you seriously ask the question ‘**What is an American?**’

Milking Cash Cows
The *Unum* discourse reserves its most vitriolic arrows for professional ‘beneficiaries’ of bilingual education. In this respect the cash-cow allegations polarise the sides, as evidenced in the Q sorts. Pluralists resent the allegation deeply.

EXCERPT 23:1
L2: The **biggest advocates** of …*[bilingual education]* were … America’s largest teachers union… labour unions like to have … **more** people doing the **same** job…

EXCERPT 23:2
L1: … **bilingual** teachers…. Get…anywhere from $500-$5000 **more**…you have a **self-interested** lobby….**much more interested** in maintaining their jobs than they are in ensuring that their kids succeed ….we’re **rewarding** bilingual educators for **failing**. If you are a **Spanish language bilingual** teacher, it is in your interest to **keep Jose in your class** for as **long** as you can..

EXCERPT 23:3
L2: …local school districts **hate** to turn down **any** money. So, if they get a notice from the investigator saying ‘*We hear you’re not doing this*’ their reaction is generally **not** what happened in Allentown which is **prove** it, it is ‘*Oh no, we’re not doing anything and please keep the money coming*’.

EXCERPT 23:4
L3: …because it is a **cash cow**. Bilingual education teachers **get more money**, the school **gets more money**…. The NEA, which is full of **lefties** there…they want to **keep it that way**.
Azatlan & All That
Backstage in much official English talk is the suggestion of nation-splitting. Azatlan is a word for it. The way Azatlan is used in the discourse of official English suggests that even its users don’t really believe that splitism is a serious desire of any group. Nevertheless, in the manner of dogwhistling, the mere suggestion that there might be nation-splitting adherents among the ‘bilingual and multicultural lobby, can activate the cognitive presuppositions of listeners and readers of texts where it is suggested. Although kept backstage most of the time Azatlan is occasionally dusted off to do its ideological work for official English.

EXCERPT 24:1
R4: …there are some kinds of romantic notions about Azatlan and the role of Spanish and the Mexican culture in the South West….But the only legitimate claims to a special role for non-English languages in this country belongs to the indigenous people and in that instance nobody begrudges them that.…

EXCERPT 24:3
L3: …some people who are completely nuts! They think that the way to gain back what Mexico lost ….is to reproduce very quickly and to have as many Mexicans in this country as possible…

EXCERPT 24:4
L1: …there is a very small but nonetheless significant, among the intellectual class, irredentist community…

EXCERPT 24:5
L3: …the so-called self-appointed protectors of the minorities on the Spanish side see that as a human rights issue…. the blacks got their equal rights and all of their protections. And now the Hispanics…

Difference & The American Dream
As revealed in the Q-analysis a major discursive dividing line is the nature of human nature. Unum advocates often make reference to a stable human nature: ‘different cultural groups can’t live together without conflict’; ‘supporting more than one language in a given society leads to conflict.’ For Pluribus advocates a state comprised of multiple ethnic groups will be stable if there is affirmative action or riven with conflict if there is inequality. The dividing line is between the a priori attribution of conflict to the existence of stable, intergenerational, differences of language and culture versus the idea that those differences only lead to conflict when they correlate with socio-economic, political and other inequalities.

EXCERPT 25:1
JLB: So, that original idea of America as the land of opportunity is one of the key things in your mind about this issue?
L2: Human nature will always look at difference and find ways to argue about them. …kids are mean, as any parent could tell you. They’ll say something mean and then the parent will turn around and say ‘Well, you can’t say that. You can’t say ‘Why is that man so fat, Mommy?’’, and there is a natural division of children and we need to, rather than encourage them by saying ‘Well, this is different’, be concentrating more on unity.
The Nature Of Things
The excerpts presented here extend the views above about ‘difference equals conflict’ and issues of what things can be considered the ‘natural’ state of affairs for a harmonious and successful society. For pluralists language, like society, is constructed and social, and therefore the present order is the result of past construction and is amenable to future change. For restrictionists this is a naiveté since the natural order of the world dictates that the powerful always prevail, and therefore if English is predominant this both means that it is better in some way, and that to stick with differences is to court the danger of division.

Unum people consider the view that multiculturalism can work as dangerously illusory. The discourse of unum sees assimilation as essential to forestall social instability and would argue that any ‘palliative’ thinking in bilingual education, or related multicultural policy, merely delays the acceptance of ‘reality’ by immigrants. The following excerpt, expressed by a prominent minority culture and language background lobbyist, expresses succinctly the pluralists struggle with the dominating force of attributing inevitable conflict to differences.

EXCERPT 26:2
L4: … it is not necessarily true that because you speak more than one language somehow you’re going to be falling apart. What binds a country and binds a nation is a set of political values, a set of values around democracy and equality and Civil Rights; that’s our belief. That’s why I fought for my country, that’s why I served my country in the military, that’s what my brother went to Vietnam to defend.

Child Abuse
Two clamorous instances connect Spanish and bilingual education to ‘child abuse’ allegations. The first was an advertisement placed by US English in Time Magazine which openly described bilingual education as Federally funded child abuse. The second involved remarks by a judge describing Spanish language child-rearing as a kind of child abuse (Chapter V, Transcript II). For bilingual educators such comments are immensely provocative, and outrageous; but their extreme nature also embarrasses many official English supporters. Just as the excerpts above represented a challenge to the pluralists, the child abuse allegations represent a major challenge to moderates who advocate official English. The following excerpt is an instance of creative appropriation of the allegations, via the home-public education system dichotomy.

EXCERPT 27:1
L3: You see, there is this case in San Antonio I think it is, where a judge said it is child abuse to speak Spanish at home. And that is wrong. None of our laws affect what is taught in the home. But the mother is wrong in thinking that her child is going to be taught English at school. If the poor child comes in with the Hispanic name and speaks no English, they won’t be given English. They’ll be given all Spanish with one class a day in English. …
The England Legacy
National public culture and identity is connected to the idea of the “fragment culture” that the American polity represents (Hartz 1964). In Chapter II we set out the long and arduous battles waged, during both the colonial and national eras of American history, to distance American English from Britishisms of various kinds. The England legacy also represents an ideological challenge, since much of what is defended in the interests of overarching American freedoms are a legacy of the political philosophical traditions of the evolution of British kinds of representational democracy. The England legacy is therefore problematically cultural, as well as historically antecedent.

EXCERPT 29:1
JLB: [Official English advocates claim] that English is the language of government and opportunity. [Is English] … America’s language in a cultural sense?
L1: I think it is…our political and social institutions + we trace them ++ there is a lineal descent from England that isn’t even European, that it is English in character, that our culture is English, its roots are English.

Hemispheric Spanish
There are 22 regional countries whose dominant language is Spanish. Is the fact that in terms of politically sovereign units there is no other part of the world with such a uniform linguistic pattern, (at least at the level of national-official languages) as the Western Hemisphere, a claim for a special status for Spanish? Can there be a ‘special’ role for Spanish in the US? The excerpts indicate that the Pluribus advocates shy away from such possibilities; for Unum adherents it is unthinkable if ‘special’ implies governmentally sanctioned.

EXCERPT 30:1
L1: I don’t see the government playing a role in that. …I think the market place takes care of itself.

EXCERPT 30:3
R4: … it makes no sense to encourage bilingualism at one end and to value bilingualism at one end and then at the other end to squash out the potential for developing large scale bilingual resources that just come by natural inclination and natural behaviour.

EXCERPT 30:4
L5: I think that begins to beget separatism when you get into more of a Canadian/Quebec-style kinds of fights.

EXCERPT 30:5
L4: Spanish is the language of the Western Hemisphere and there is no question about that and everybody who is in this country ought to be multi-lingual….we are just simply saying - let the government be neutral in that. Let the market place decide that.

Protecting English
Many of the legislative proposals before the 104th Congress contained a clause giving English speakers who considered they had been discriminated against because of multilingually provided public services a private right of action for redress. This clause in the Bills occasioned extensive debate and contest; for Unum adherents it is a self-justifying clause, for Pluribus the private right of action clause is sometimes
taken to suggest that legal action is being prepared to create the illusion that US laws discriminate against Anglophones.

**EXCERPT 31:1**
L4: I suppose you might find somebody in Miami, Florida, who might assert that - but the real problem, the real issue - is that millions and millions of people are being discriminated against because they don’t speak English

**Do They Really Want To Learn English?**
Just as pluralists ask what is really behind official English, advocates of official English sometimes ask whether immigrants really do want to learn English? Are they allowed to? Will ethnic bosses let them? These suggestions are bolstered by the statements reported in Chapter II made by Presidential candidate Bob Dole and by House Speaker Newt Gingrich in Chapter V.

**EXCERPT 32:1**
JLB: So, if there were evidence … of year-long waiting lists, you would see that as a problem?
R3: Not as a justification to conduct our official business in a foreign language but as a deficiency on the part of our government in providing the necessary support to allow people to become proficient in English.

**EXCERPT 32:2**
L4: As I told Toby Roth on the television, if his interest is that a greater number of Americans learn English and he were willing to talk about a public program that would allow that, that would compensate that, and would make that available, we would immediately join with him in doing that because we would have exactly the same goal. But that is not what’s being proposed. …

**EXCERPT 32:3**
R4: The great anxiety in the Hispanic community is how to get to English as soon as possible! And there is no subtext for them to try to impose Spanish on others or to carve out a special role in the government for Spanish….but, even though Hispanics is the major part of it….other languages groups are automatically included; anybody with an accent. People become fair game for stereotyping, for humour, it’s insulting.

**EXCERPT 32:4**
L4: …this week’s *US News and World Report* (has) a cover story and it does refer to some places in San Francisco where they have waiting lists of thousands of people. I know that there are centres in Los Angeles that are virtually running twenty-four hour ESL programs to keep up with the demand.

**Patriotism**
The Q-analysis revealed that one of the few areas of agreement between the sides is that antagonists not devalue or criticise the American nation. This results in regular patriotic affirmation by both sides. In effect this upholds the notion cited in Chapter II that antagonists retain a commitment to the overall activity, in this case an argument, sometimes a debate, even as they conduct a vigorous dispute.

**EXCERPT 33:1**
L4: … The US English folks have been very good at making this sound like a symbolic effort, almost a patriotic effort, to enshrine, and of having no impact other than as a sort of patriotic gesture. And as long as they frame it that way, as long as it is framed as ‘Are you patriotic or not?’ the response is going to be an overwhelming ‘Yes! I want to be a patriot, that’s who I am!’ and if we can frame it as something else, if we can frame it as just the opposite, then in a real way what we’re talking about is not being patriotic, not being true, if you define patriotism as being true to the ideals of a nation…. It is dangerous. .. it is divisive and puerile.
EXCERPT 33:2
O1: The immigrant environment is very, very concerning because every one of us are immigrants. We come from somewhere else. The only truly natives of this land in America are the Indians. So everyone of us have come from somewhere else. So it is very sad that the previous groups, well settled, is too many already, we’ve got to put them English-only, we’ve got to do this, do that. I think it is a shame, I think it is very sad. I can speak from my experience as a former refugee and now as an American citizen. And I am working my heart out to serve this country because I paid a big debt to this country who opened her arms to welcome refugees and immigrants to her shores of America. This is what it is all about. This is it. I’ve got to do my job - well - because that is the way we pay the debt back to the Americans who so generously opened their arms and welcomed immigrants and refugees to their shores.

La Raza
Feeding into ideas that retaining community languages intergenerationally is essentially about ethnicity and anti-individualistic, and that it concerns specifically the retention of Mexican identities in the US is La Raza.

EXCERPT 34:2
L3: //Well, you know, ‘La Raza’ means ‘The Race’ - which race do you think he is worrying about? The Mexican race! That’s what it is. He’s protecting Mexicans and Mexican interests. What he is talking about and what I am talking about are not two different stories. I am talking about the United States. I’m talking about Mexico or Chile or any other country. I’m only talking about the United States, what’s best for the United States.

EXCERPT 34:3
R4: And I think that is their [Hispanics’] function; their function is to be referred to as the ‘other’ and it is not so much what they have in common, what they bring in common, but how they are treated in common.

How To Do It
The question of the methods for actually constituting a language as official, or, even, for bringing about a constitutional bolster for English, raises important considerations of what official status would actually mean. While some regulated functions for English, raises important considerations of what official status would actually mean. While some regulated functions for English, and exclusions for other languages, would be one evident result, the issue also concerns whether official English requires a performance of discursive roles and activities for languages.

EXCERPT 35:1
JLB: How can legislation establish English as the common language?
O2: It would be fairly simple. It would be a Bill whose title and whose text would be “This legislation establishes English as the common language of the people of the United States”. It could be that simple. It could add a few additional provisos as Roth’s legislation does. It could add a large number of additional provisos, legal ramifications…But it could be fairly simple. The question is whether that type of Bill would have the effect of sending a strong message to individuals coming into this country and individuals in this country already, that to come to the United States, in order to have a chance at the American Dream, and America is that land of opportunity, and if you want to have a chance at the American Dream then English is a part of that.

EXCERPT 35:2
JLB: So, it is not as though those regions could conceivably be bilingual in any sense.
O2: Establishing an official bilingualism in any sense is something that Representative Cunningham would probably be leery of; owing to the Canadian experience and owing to his belief that among the things that Americans share, we share a Constitution, we share a flag, we share this country, and we share our common language and that is English.
The Mandate
The role of the Federal government and its long association with the Democratic party is associated with this question of mandate. The 104th was the first Republican dominated Congress in 40 years. The notion of mandate in this context surfaces a concern about legitimation. The extract is from a public official managing a large program for supporting bilingual education. The notion of mandate is deeply problematical for a Federal department in an area of dominantly non-Federal jurisdiction.

EXCERPT 36:1
O1: The Federal level does not mandate anything. The total bilingual education budget (that) comes from Washington that Congress authorised to us only makes up about 6-7% compared to the whole class of education (for) limited English proficient students, the 93-4% that constitutes the rest - where is it coming from? State and local school budgets! So you are telling me that we mandate? How come we can mandate, we’re only 6-7%! And they are 93-4%.

There’s Always Someone Dumping On A Good Idea
Performativity in lpp implies that the discourses that characterise a field of dispute are not random, or idiosyncratic. While they may introduce new content, change and shift over time, and engage new meanings there remains a constituting or overarching pattern, the orders of discourse. These orders of discourse were identified by the Q analysis as corresponding to underlying meaning patterns, the nation-protecting imperative for Unum, and the Service Providing, Educator influenced patterns of Pluribus. What each will predictably say about its claims can be demonstrated by the collection of statements over the 15 year period of our sample for Q, indicating a relatively stable pattern of underlying ideas and commitments. However, what each will predictably say about the claims of its opponents may be more dynamic. Opposition is part of pressure group democracies and, as the excerpt notes, “anybody can say whatever they want”.

EXCERPT 37:1
JLB: I say that because it was characterised in the Hearing two days ago as an anti-immigrant and racist venture. People were saying you were racist.
L3: That is what the opposition will say. The beauty of this country is that anybody can say whatever they want; regardless of what you want to do, you will have people against it. …we would find 20-30% of the people against it. Regardless of what you want to do in this country…

CHAPTER OVERVIEW
During 1995 there was a palpable sense of anticipation and expectation of prevailing among official English advocates. The two main protagonist organisations (US English and English First) are not on the best of terms but, being ‘for English’, they both exuded a confident air. They experienced more progress in 1995 than at any time in the previous 15 years. The Bills before Congress collected large numbers of sponsors and co-sponsors, the media was providing extensive coverage to the issue, and the prospects of serious legislative attention were good. House and Senate Committees called Hearings making it extremely likely that floor action would follow. Senator Bob Dole hitched his presidential
campaign hopes to the official English wagon. Speaker Gingrich commanded a considerable majority in the Congress and was backing official English. There was a mood of ‘possibilism’ among proponents; anxiety among opponents. September to December was a hectic time. 15 years of talk and writing structured to effect a change to how the English language was itself talked and written about in America were reaching the pinnacle of attainment.

September 18 proved to be a crucial day. During the morning the Asian and Hispanic Congressional Caucus conducted a conference entitled *Bilingual Education: Separating Fact from Fiction* at the Rayburn House Office Building in support of bilingual education and against official English. During the afternoon the Center for Equal Opportunity conducted a conference entitled *The Future of Bilingual Education* at the US Capitol Building in support of official English and against bilingual education. Crucial moments for the display of verbal politics, the rolling out of the rival discursive formulations. The morning mood was anxious, the afternoon mood triumphal.

Congressional Hearings took place on 18 October, 1 November and 5 December 1995. The eventual, and so far only, floor action occurred in the House of Representatives on 1 August 1996; the culmination of 15 years of verbal language planning. The Hearings were elaborately structured and formalised speech events arranged to display pre-ordered speech acts and display. There was little dialogue, and no Habermasian ‘success’, no Habermasian ‘inter-subjective understanding’ and certainly no Habermasian ‘inter-subjective agreement’. Lapel badges proclaimed either: STOP ENGLISH-ONLY or DEFEND ENGLISH. Everyone spoke in English to Congressmen about why a law was good or bad for English.

On 1 August 1996 the *Bill Emerson English Language Empowerment Act of 1996* (104-723) was passed by 259 votes to 169 in the House of Representatives. The Act contained two chapters: *Title I: English Language Empowerment* and *Title II: Repeal of Bilingual Voting Requirements*. The Act declared an official status for English, making English the language of state, or at least of the Federal government. The specific provisions were: the repeal of bilingual voting provisions; the banning of citizenship swearing-in ceremonies not conducted in English; the declaration that Federal ‘government business’ would take place only in English and the granting of a private right of action to citizens to sue if any government service were denied them because they spoke English.

In the House debate Speaker Gingrich commented that public schools’ instruction in many languages would eventually lead “...to the decay of the core parts of our civilization”, earlier stating that “...becoming American involves English.” Opponents satirised the Bill, Thomas Foglietta saying:
“...since we’re legislating an official language, how about an official religion to go along with it?” concluding “…why don’t we just get rid of the First Amendment altogether?” (Lo Bianco 2001: 46).

The Bill Emerson English Language Empowerment Act of 1996 is a text of language policy and planning. The lpp discourse which carried and made this text possible, but then wilted and faded, is a myriad of texts, a concourse of all the said and written; an intense, already-peopled, historicised, remembered and non-rational, but ordered, arranged and predictable concourse of texts.

Official English moves were unsuccessful in the subsequent Congresses but have (re-)emerged in 2001. These Bills still aim to effect a declaration speech act for English, saying similar things as were said in 1980, aiming to perform an inscription, i.e. to inscribe official English as part of a national ideology, so as to facilitate its legal officialisation. This textual archive is a palimpsest, written over and over on the same slate, erased but revealing the past inscription, with grooves that make each new inscription follow the same lines. These grooves are the discourses, they don’t make it inevitable that people say the same things, just likely. There is a realm of the imagined and the imaginary which is a space of intense but ordered activity of conflict but this conflict plays by agreed rules and on a common playing field.

An entirely new discursive arrangement would be needed to break new ground.

The data chapters of the thesis have described and analysed evidence from texts drawn from the concourse of what has been said about official English. The uncountable number of things that have been uttered are not random or eccentric, disorganised or idiosyncratic. Instead they are systematically arranged, ordered and relational. The following diagram depicts these in a single graphic representation. It aims to show that in lpp theory there is a productive role for analysing the language performance of the participants, in addition to corpus, status, usage and prestige planning (the conventional lpp categories) there is also discourse planning. In discourse planning the objective is to pattern what is sayable and preferred through reiterations of performatively successful speech. Discourse planning justifies being included in language planning theory because it uses language to plan language, but its purpose is not linguistic. Discourse planning aims to influence what is expressible. These new theoretical possibilities are explored in Chapter VII.
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CHAPTER VII

Language planning as a social scientific enterprise.... arose as an extension of sociolinguistics into the domain of social planning, and the job of describing and tracing patterns of language change thereby was tied to the normative task of prescribing such change. The enabling historical conditions which led to the formalisation of language planning had their bases in postwar concerns with the systematic “scientific” engineering of social and education policy. As a result, many language planners embrace the discursive strategies of what Habermas ....has called “technicist rationality”: the presupposition that the linear application of positivist social science could transform problematic, value-laden cultural questions into simple matters of technical efficiency (Luke, McHoul and Mey 1990:25).

...language planning specialists must realise that although much of the post-structuralist and neo-Marxist criticism directed at them has been and continues to be fully rectified, that most of the issues raised by this criticism cannot be fully rectified, even were society to be entirely overturned and rebuilt. Authorities will continue to be motivated by self-interest. New structural inequalities will inevitably arise to replace the old ones. More powerful segments of society will be less inclined to want to change themselves than to change others. Westernization and modernization will continue to foster both problems and satisfactions for the bulk of humanity. Ultimately language planning will be utilised by both those who favour and those who oppose whatever the socio-political climate may be. This is a truth that neo-Marxist and post-structuralist critics of language planning never seem to grasp (Fishman 1994:98)

THEORISING IN A POST-POSITIVIST TIME

The analysis of the political subjectivity of policy activists reported in Chapter IV provides evidence of a systematic structuring of the discourses that characterise the official English dispute. The semi-elicited texts which comprise the culled Q-sample and the ratings that constitute the elicited Q-sort reveal the contours of the overall debate on official English and support the case made in the present thesis that including the discursive domain within language policy analyses is a productive addition to the explanatory power of lpp theory.

As we have seen the concourse describes all that has been said and written about the fraught politics of official English. This totality of statements is structured not only at the level of revealing an order of discourses (a Pluribus order and an Unum which organise a predictable constellation of statements) but also in the underlying ideological grammar of these discourses. Although new and original statements are possible and encountered mostly we see recurring statements, repetition, rehearsal and re-cycling. It is clear that a great deal of the communication does not aim to achieve inter-subjective understanding, much less agreement, and hardly at all to achieve conciliation. The debate is often but not always agonistic, involving displays of ‘programmed contentiousness’ (Tannen 1998). Statements are organised around a substantive repetition of the available designs of meaning supporting a view that these
statements are symbolic display, with an aspiration of prevailing discursively (Habermas 1984), a search for symbolic domination. In Chapter III we introduced the distinction between D-aspects of language (categories such as: utterance, implication, act, genre, perspective, position and context) which are the main the subject of the discourse-oriented lpp being advanced here, and S-units (phonemes, nouns, sentences, lexical meaning, propositions, noun phrases) which constitute the tree structures of formal linguistic characterisations and the rules or ‘transformations’ to which these units are subjected. The approach favoured here is the integration of S-unit analysis and D-aspects, so that their interdependence is stressed, however the bulk of our analysis concerns the D-aspects of language.

Inherent in this politics of language about language is an underlying structure which our analysis has revealed to be ideological not only in its overt content, but also in the verbal and grammatical selections that are distinctive of its two dominant discourses. The Q-analysis was supplemented by the examination of texts taken from radio debates and Speaker Gingrich’s exposition of the official English cause as set out in Chapter V.

These naturally occurring, un-elicited, texts strengthen the claim that there are recurring designs of speakership, that provide a relatively stable field of debating and speaking positions for participants. Whether in one person elaboration of the official English cause (Transcript One), or two-person and formally structured debate (Transcript Two) or in multiple-participant organised debate (Transcript Three) it is clear that the available positions for participants are a structured package of ideas, arguments, metaphors, narratives and facts which although they are variable in their sequence of deployment and what is executed in any one encounter are also structured and ordered. Finally in Chapter VI we saw how the direct interviews with the same key participants provide corroborating evidence of these discursive designs.

Figure Thirty-Three suggests that a policy conversation is only likely to be productive among middle-order antagonists between the Pluribus and Unum extremes (where education and economy are foregrounded and society and nation backgrounded) and where individual bilingualism with English as a shared goal is given prominence and where language is considered neither problem nor right, but resource.

In the present chapter we draw these threads together against the information provided in Chapters One and Two and the methodological considerations set out in Chapter Three to offer pointers towards new theoretical, methodological and practical orientations in the field of language policy and planning.
Specifically this chapter is organised around the following two themes. The first theme addresses the relation between different kinds of ‘language theory’ and real-world problems. This theme is discussed in three sections: the aspirations that theorists have held for a disciplinary ‘unity of purpose’ that would stand above specific circumstances; the contributions of four major thinkers (Haugen, Kloss, Neustupny and Fishman) and finally kinds of lpp theory that would flow from different theorisations of linguistics as a ‘master-discipline’ (autonomous linguistics, grounded semiotics and language as acts of identity).

The second theme framing this chapter concerns what intellectual disciplines a re-invigorated lpp would need to engage to develop more robust explanatory power. This theme is discussed in relation to language as the object of investigation (minimising the inheritance-effect of autonomous linguistics and its categories); and also the inclusion of knowledge and concepts from policy studies, political science and a recent tendency in scholarship that challenges linguistics to become partisan (critical and political). Essentially this theme looks at two kinds of possible applied linguistics. The first sees itself as the application of linguistics (linguistics-applied); and reifies language. The other reifies social context, and makes its central focus of attention society and social issues/problems in which language is prominent (Brumfit 1997; Davies 1999).

New theorisation of lpp will need to account for the post-positivist sensibility that characterises public policy discourse and the human sciences in general. ‘Traditional’ or ‘classical’ language policy and theory need to incorporate the discursive and symbolic realm of political contestation to explain phenomena such as the official English movement. This challenge has long been recognised. In “Language Planning and Social Change” Cooper finishes with the question: Is a theory of language planning possible? concluding that: “To plan language is to plan society. A satisfactory theory of language planning, therefore, awaits a satisfactory theory of social change”(1989:182). Cooper’s pessimism (believing such a theory to be beyond present capability) represents a check against excessive optimism here, and so what follows is not a new theory (and certainly not an all-embracing theory of social change; much less a ‘theory of society’) but the addition of new methods and ideas to current understandings of lpp.

Intellectual Mapping of LPP
Ricento (2000) attempts to produce a comprehensive post World War II intellectual history of lpp. His analysis identifies three factors that have shaped the research questions, methodologies and goals of the discipline. These factors are macro-sociopolitical, epistemological and strategic and are in turn arrayed along a developmental sequence. According to Ricento the first phase of postwar language planning is characterised by predominantly technocratic approaches and beliefs. In this ‘early work’ specialist language planning professionals promulgated solutions to clients in newly emerging decolonising nation
states following a generic approach that indicated little awareness of the problematic and biased assumptions of their research methodology. These researchers’ ‘developed country’ assumptions also concealed the personal interests of language planners.

Ricento’s second phase was made necessary by the failure of the expected economic ‘take off’ according to a ‘stages of development’ ideology that had shaped first-phase thinking (p 14). This failure of expectations led to new scholarship based around investigation of issues of ‘hierarchisation and stratification’ as well as an awareness of the inadequacy of operational models, the beginning and then the full flowering of concern that lpp was/is not ‘philosophically neutral’. In turn this realisation coincided with intellectual challenges to ‘autonomous linguistics’ studying real-world problems and issues in which language and communication are central and itself led to the problematisation of some cherished concepts of linguistics: native speaker, mother tongue, diglossia, national languages, bounded literacy, finite grammars, languages as discrete and bounded entities. These notions were subjected to critical appraisal and found to be products of a disciplinary idealism, a ‘will to community’. The second-phase therefore involves a de-reification of linguists’ categories (from ‘languages’ to ‘speech communities’) and a move away from code-centred lpp theorisation to social and political issues of languages in use.

Ricento’s third phase is characterised by professional alarm at the phenomenon of ‘linguistic imperialism’, language extinction, and a pluralistic conception of language, literacy and culture as contingent, variable, and hybridising social practices. In this representation language ecologies, critical theory and post-modern theorisations are part of the new intellectual, third-phase, ferment within lpp along with a methodological priority to link micro-studies on language use with wider social analysis. Baldauf (1994) too has identified a sequence of lpp activity from a ‘developing societies’ focus’, to an ‘all-societies focus’ to a ‘self-critical’ view of itself (p. 82).

**FIGURE THIRTY-FOUR: RICENTO’S INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF LPP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY WORK (1950S TO LATE 1960S)</td>
<td>MACRO-SOCIO POLITICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DECOLONISATION &amp; STATE FORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND PHASE (EARLY 1970S TO LATE 1980S)</td>
<td>FAILURE OF MODERNISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD STAGE (MID-1980S TO PRESENT)</td>
<td>NEW WORLD ORDER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as accuracy is concerned it is likely that the criticisms are too strong, the recent picture too comforting and self-assured and the characterisation of the work in each phase too sweeping. Nevertheless, the Ricento analysis is a bold and helpful attempt to bring together contextual factors, intra-discipline epistemological change and periodisation. Inevitably these kinds of schemas say both too much and too little; and at best can be only suggestive since rarely does the real world invite tight taxonomisation.

What is missing from the schema is the critical dimension of the constitution of language problems, how language problems come to be constituted as territory for the deployment of state resources, professional activity and symbolic prominence, in other words the politics of language policy and planning. Adding this focus would foreground the subjectivity of the actors, and give us a chance to assess whether the claimed partisanship of their tools is in fact a justified claim. However, unlike the consequences of the serious allegations of lpp made by Luke et al (1990) and others our present aim is to strengthen lpp rather than to have it abandoned, to assist it to become a more important scholarly and social practice, rather than one which would wither away after being subjected to critical scrutiny.

**HISTORY, DEFINITIONS AND PROBLEMS**

Perhaps the most frequently cited definition of *lpp* is:

> deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes (Cooper 1989:45).

Other definitions of the field incorporate public practices, what actually happens and what people think and believe.

> ... the combination of official decisions and prevailing public practices related to language education and use. It includes ... ‘deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of language codes’ ... and language practices related to language learning and use which, though unofficial and occasionally inadvertent, are widespread (McGroarty 1997:1).

There is in fact a definitional panorama, itself indicative of the unstable territory which is marked out for the field (Weinstein 1983: 37). Probably first invoked by the linguist Uriel Weinreich in the early 1950s in the context of his work on Yiddish and on languages in contact (Weinreich 1953) the first systematic use of the term *language planning* was largely concerned then with issues connected to what *lpp* these days terms status planning. Einar Haugen (1966) made the term an overarching category encompassing all societal intervention in language and several Scandinavian researchers followed Haugen’s interest in the Norwegian practice of distancing national language norm-setting from Danish sources. Also decisive was Weinreich’s work on language contact, writing originally in journals devoted
to anthropological and theoretical linguistics, from the mid-1950s to the early 1960s. The emerging discipline of sociolinguistics, under the tutelage of Joshua A. Fishman and Charles A. Ferguson was also decisive. In a later phase *lpp* theorisation was stimulated by the activities of the *East West Center* at the University of Hawaii at Honolulu and later the *Central Indian Institute of Languages* in Mysore. The work of Bjorn H. Jernudd, Joan M. Rubin, J. V. Neustupny was important as was the emergence into prominence of Indian, Indonesian and Filipino language planning theoreticians such as Jyotirindra Das Gupta, Takdir S. Alisjahbana and Bonifacio Sibayan.

Haugen’s still popular systematisation of the field distinguishes: *selection* of form, *codification* of the selected form, *implementation* of new norms, and their *elaboration* into various public domains. Elaboration comprises institutional and cultural *cultivation*.

Fishman (1971) and some early commentary of Rubin and Jernudd comes closest to matching *lpp* with the policy sciences field especially its interest in drawing analogies to rational choice matrices, cost-benefit analyses (Thorburn 1971) etc to generate costed alternatives for action.

In Rubin’s work this orientation is prominent, seeing *lpp* as: “...solutions to language problems through decisions about alternative goals, means, and outcomes to solve these problems” (Rubin 1971: 477) and the formulation of alternatives for solving language problems... the task of *lpp* is in fact “the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems... the task of *lpp* is inherently a normative one involving a *theory of public intervention*” (1983: 352) (emphasis in original). Similarly Jernudd (1973: 11-23) specifies orderly and systematic requirements for *lpp*: establishment of goals; selection of means and prediction of outcomes. In reality, however, only a small minority of actual *lpp* practice. The majority of encountered *lpp* are highly immersed in contexts of power and ideology for rational tractability.

There is therefore broad consensus as to what areas constitute *lpp* but there is also movement. Although in 1985 Rubin (p 137) could point out that the “…field of language planning has grown both in theoretical base and in adherents over the years since the publication of *Can language be planned?* (Rubin and Jernudd 1971)” contrasting with 10 years earlier the existence of summer institutes, a quarterly journal (*Language Problems and Language Planning*) and a regular newsletter (*Language Planning Newsletter*) as well as ‘a developing paradigm’ (Neustupny’s work) along with reported demand for courses and training in *lpp* around the world. For Rubin these developments, crowned by the 1977 Summer Linguistic Institute at the University of Hawaii, “amply demonstrated that language
planning is rapidly becoming a discipline” with over 40 countries sending visiting scholars, language planning agency directors and staff and students all of which called for an introductory textbook.

An indicator of the debt of lpp to the paradigm of descriptive linguistics is the fact that ‘acquisition planning’ refers only to the learning of additional languages. A different origin, one more sensitive to social stratification and its linguistic correlates would also include the acquisition of the literary, stylistic and high order discourse norms and practices of a given language. These, and how ‘eloquence’ is gained and used (Joseph 1987), are not easily incorporated in the early models of lpp. The omission of social re-production and tools of the enactment of social relations and how ‘eloquence’ is gained and used (Joseph 1987) are social reproduction devices not easily incorporated in the examination of others’ social relations.

A recurring theme in definitions and characterisations of language planning has been grappling with the degree of deliberateness needed to qualify activities as language planning. The deliberateness (consciousness) required to classify an activity as language planning, what the object of the planning must be and what the superordinate categories of the definition are, are all matters located on a cline from scholarship to practice; from studying instances of lpp to direct engagement in language politics.

Language Problems
Much lpp scholarship views the start of lpp as a response to the identification of language problems. In this approach the specification of protocols of study and intervention that succeed problem definition.

Dua (1985; 1986) is the most elaborate typologisation of language problems, reflecting the complex inter-dialectal and religious, script and post colonial context of India. He claims that the “characterization and systematic account of language problems of a speech community is a prerequisite to an adequate theory of policy formulation, language planning and language treatment” (p 3). The characterisation of problems and the participants in their definition and propagation gives rise to an almost infinite number of possibilities. In Dua’s scheme definers of language problems can be insiders/outsiders, politicians/bureaucrats, researchers/professionals and ‘the people’. This ‘population of definers’ gives rise to a variety of perspectives arrayed against social need defined in four ways.

As extensive as Nahir’s and Dua’s schemes are they only generally touch on the kinds of intra-societal processes of intellectualisation (what in functional grammar linguistics (Halliday 1993) might be termed expanding the meaning resources of a population) and not at all to what is later here called ‘discourse planning’ and the ‘problems’ that might occasion ‘discourse planning’.

The typologisation process so far reported deals with problems that language planning with a problem-orientation seeks to redress, but when such problems are taken to be ‘non-linguistic’ in nature (social, political, religious, ideological or economic) as in Christian’s (1988) analysis we can see the limitations to a code-focussed characterisation of problems. Christian’s work requires lpp to reach beyond the frames of formal-theoretical-descriptive linguistics and locate its work within social, religious and economic spheres of action. In noting the symbolic dimension of language Christian also requires attention to the political weight of the symbolisation of relations among a polity’s constituent groups.

This theory limitation is implied in Cooper (1989) who holds that lpp is mostly not concerned with language or communication problems at all, but with essentially non-linguistic issues and goals. It follows that it is misleading to speak of problems of language as the basis for lpp. And yet, the bulk of what counts as language planning theory makes continual recourse to assumptions about the ‘givenness’ of problems. Turi (1994) argues that the main goal of all legislation on language is to resolve problems that result from language inequality and language conflict.

In Dua’s and other scholars’ work a triptych of language problems as ‘pseudo’, ‘received’ or ‘real’ is mentioned. The addition of ‘received’ problems (and a politicised understanding of ‘pseudo’) would be
a useful heuristic as they introduce the possibility of a politicised origin to problems and the interests of the definers.

The relentless belief that a prerequisite to an adequate theory of language planning is an ‘objective’ typologisation of language problems (along with a policy/planning and treatment system) has given rise to a vast number of competing characterisations. Perhaps the proliferation of these schemes reflects the absence of a disciplinary order for the field or a deeper problem with problems. This is especially raised to prominence in attempts to place American language planning efforts within a problems framework. Rubin (1978/79) uses the Neustupny term ‘linguistic inadequacies’ and correlates this with problems of form and problems of ‘socio-economic or political considerations’.

In the first category she notes three areas: need for standardisation of all aspects of language; need to use English well and correctly; need to know foreign languages and reports efforts undertaken by the US Board of Geographic Names, scientific nomenclature standardisation in chemistry, zoology, deaf signs, and transliterations (Library of Congress); in the second she comments on Americans’ ‘insecurity’ in relation to English usage; and in the third she reiterates concern about foreign language mastery.

The ‘inadequacies’ of a socio-economic and political nature are listed as: the correlation between ‘limited English and poverty’, barriers to public access to professional/technical information because of its complexity; image/identity unacceptability in relation to certain labels or names; basic skills inadequacies and their relation with limited employment, ‘poor citizenship’ and ‘participation in democracy’; retarding of national leadership through lack of foreign language skills; translation needs in foreign science material; negative effects of language based group stereotypes; and the need to maintain home language ‘to promote cultural identity retention’.

Rubin concludes that the responses or attention paid to these problems “falls far short of any planning model” (1979:5) and notes that communication problems are costly and that the required approach is “regular, rational, consistent, coordinated and well motivated” (p 5).

It will be clear that lpp theorists have sought to take a comprehensive approach to the characterisation of problems but have struggled to produce comprehensive taxonomies for the vast complexity that is encompassed by the term lpp. The critical issue for our present purposes is to ask what actually constitutes a language problem and to suggest that this question may be embedded in contestation about interests and can be retrieved by a study of the process of the constitution of problems for state agency.
The contention of the present work is that language problems are constituted discursively and that lpp scholarship would be enhanced as an incisive scholarly field if it turns its attention to this discursive realm. Relatedly, Stubbs has argued:

*The ‘face-value’ nature of language planning analysis fails to recognise that in political discourse concessions may be made to certain socially claimed and demanded principles...but these may in fact be denied in practice* (Stubbs 1986: 194).

Language planning which treats political discourse as a separate domain would therefore misconstrue the bilingual education-official English disputes in the United States as being only about alternative modes of planning language. Scholars of lpp have been alert to these dimensions. Rubin for example (1986) refers to a distinction between ‘tame’ and ‘wicked’ problems in which language problems are invariably wicked and therefore not easily tractable within a formalistic policy analysis framework of steps, stages and management protocols. In fact any ‘social problem’ is wicked and unique and defies ready formulation with few transparently evident solutions nor tests for their solution, while the present suggestion is that lpp theory incorporate a discursive domain focussed around problem constitution politics.

### Problems With Problems

Edelman (1988) sees problems as ideological constructions particular to certain times and events and characterised by the interests of those engaged in contest over their meaning and the role of state intervention in their resolution. “*Problems come into discourse and into existence as reinforcements of ideologies*” (p 12).

What is not made into a problem is naturalised as being in the ineluctable nature of things. Policy discourse and political argument aim to legitimise already selected courses of action, to define the field and the roles of those in it, to evidence a side or argument, to rebut alternatives. Legal protection of English reads as "*Hispanophobia*" (Crawford 1992), the “*Reagan renaissance*” (Tarver 1989) or a fundamental choice of civilisation; *Democracy or Babel!* (de la Pena 1991).

The language of creation of a problem is a critical factor in its analysis (Drey 1984; Hogwood and Gunn 1984). Political moves through discourse revolve around the creation of meaning. Political discourse differs materially from most discursive genres due to the high degree of motivation it contains. It is purposive and loaded (Bolinger 1980) in its original design. Discursive devices are used to immobilise opposition or to gather support by dichotomous associations which reveal the unacceptable, imply the unsayable and legitimise the action made inevitable through the original construction of the problem. The mutually creating relationship between discourse and public policy...
action ("Words that succeed and policies that fail" (Edelman 1977)) suggests that the language of the officialisation of English ought to be data and content for critical analysis of the phenomenon itself and in turn that lpp theory move back a step to interrogate the how and why of problems as well as the what (Brett 1994).

Calvet (1998) poses the problem problem in a very forthright way about 'complicity' of linguists in 'language wars'. His definition of the field foregrounds the politics of language planning, which he sees as in vitro manipulation of language away from the in vivo context within which languages compete for space and power:

All planning presupposes a policy, the policy of those in power....by intervening in languages, [the linguist] becomes part of the power game...usually the linguist is to be found on ...the side of power, even if he only considers himself as a technician or adviser (Calvet 1998: 203).

Calvet goes on to locate the 'social responsibility' of the linguist as language planner in the obligations of common citizenship and not in any professional or scholarly inheritance.

For others the issue is also clear cut and the term political linguistics (Blommaert and Bulcaen 1997) accommodates the inevitability. "Taking sides is unavoidable: it comes with doing a particular type of questioning of linguistic reality....So be it" (Blommaert 1999b: 437). Hagege’s view is similar: "All language policies play the game of power by strengthening this power with one of its most loyal supports". This kind of partisan linguistics troubles some scholars who operate within notions of autonomous linguistics but presents no problems to others.

Whereas Eastman (1983:126) sees an overall unity of purpose, perhaps unconsciously, residing in lpp "...language planning is becoming a field that seeks to foster ethnic interaction, world communication, and national identity by means of the policies proposed", Rubin strongly disagrees finding this "...clearly untrue....The field of language planning doesn’t have goals, planners do" (1985b:140), describing these planners as "persons with authority to make or influence language-related decision"(p 137).

For Fishman an overarching unity of purpose is unlikely since "ethnicisers, nativisers and traditionalisers also engage in language planning for their own purposes" (1994: 96) but like other scholars he argues that lpp "must be re-centred on contributing to the empowerment (rather than merely to the re-ethnification, re-linguification and assimilation) of the disadvantaged " (1994: 98). Significantly, he comments that "..very little language planning practice has actually been informed by
language planning theory” (1994: 97) thus circumscribing powerfully the criticism of the ‘science pretensions’ of scholarly lpp securely within the in vitro cabinet of the academy and inviting work on the political domain of real-world politics, problem-making and their interaction with reflection and systematic enquiry.

KEY APPROACHES

Haugen-Kloss
The work of Einar Haugen has attracted a continuous group of adherents influenced by its assumptions and approaches and who use the primary categories of status and corpus planning which Haugen borrowed from Kloss. As one of the formative models in the field Haugen’s approach is of ongoing interest in its conscious effort to represent typologically and graphically a wide array of settings and parameters for language planning.

The Haugen-Kloss approach is an important descriptive typological schema. According to Djite (1994 and 1995) who works in this framework but has extended and modified it language policy is generally defined as the deliberate choice(s) made by governments or any other authority with regard to the relationships between language and social life. At the societal level, such choices involve the identification of a language (or communication) problem, the formulation of the various alternatives available for the resolution of this identified problem and the making of decisions with regard to the norm (a language or a dialect) to be made the standard or national language or to be introduced in the education system.

At the level of the code, language policy provides an explicit, usually written (graphisation) form to the selected norm. This involves the linguistic corpus and general standardisation procedures such as the writing of grammars and the selection of an appropriate lexicon.

In this formulation language planning usually comes about as a result of language policy which is itself activated by the identification of a problem. At the societal level, it involves carrying out or enforcing decisions made about the selected norm(s) and propagating these norms within government, education or the media. At the language level, lpp undertakes stylistic and terminological modernisation of the norm to meet the functions of a ‘modern’ world.

Djite’s formula also draws on the work of Kloss (1969) and his term status planning. Status planning deals with the allocation of languages or language varieties to given functions (medium of instruction, official language). Familiar instances include the shift from Latin to modern European languages for literary and scholarly purposes, the shift from Anglo Saxon to Latin, then to Norman French and finally
to English in England, the shift from Dutch to Bahasa Indonesia as the language of government administration in Indonesia, the shift from English to Swahili in Tanzania, and the shift from French to Arabic as the sole official language of Algeria.

The deficiencies with the model are that it overly stresses the code at the expense of socio-political concerns and issues. Its rather firm separation of policy making from implementation creates an unfortunate gulf between domains that the policy sciences literature increasingly regards as rather forced and overly dichotomous. Finally, and as a consequence of the two preceding concerns, the Haugen-Kloss approach is internal to a linguistics/applied-linguistics framework and can offer little to the more elusive processes of language politics.

Kloss’s primary typological distinction of status planning and corpus planning reflects the internal standpoint of linguistics whose distinctive approach of language reification is given focussed treatment. This has the effect of ‘externalising’ context; attention to language as system, or code, is construed as “internal” i.e. internal to the discipline. Some theoretical positions (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985; LePage 1988; Mühlhäusler 1995; Hanks 1996) challenge the very existence of ‘language’ and therefore present the most basic challenge to the possibility of itself, indeed of anything that might stand in for the individual and his/her use of language. To the extent that status planning is a societal process corpus planning by contrast is a primarily linguistic process having as its object terminological extension various aspects of graphisation and formulating rules for prescriptive grammars. Although status planning appears as a pre-eminently public and political activity and corpus planning more technical in nature and more securely within the domain of the linguist as scientist the relation between these two is in fact ambiguous and characterised by tension.

**Neustupny**

It is not really possible to speak of a unitary Neustupny model, rather an evolution of a distinctive approach (Neustupny 1978, 1983, Jernudd and Neustupny 1986)

The Neustupny approach has evolved a coherent characterisation of the field and has attempted to conjoin in a single vocabulary the societal treatment of language issues with the linguistic behaviour of individuals. In a 1968 paper Neustupny (1978, 1983) posited the existence of verbal and non-verbal communication problems and subdivided the former into problems of the language code and speech problems. In a 1970 elaboration he distinguished between a policy and cultivation approach to based on perceived communication inadequacies at these individual and systemic levels. He claimed that such language treatment is a universal and therefore, presumably, not contingent on political setting, culture or time.
In 1978 Neustupny extended his early thinking with the introduction of the ‘correction’ model. Communication ‘inadequacies’ exist in both the communicative acts of individuals and in the communicative system in general. Inadequacies of this sort lead to hyper-correction and an increase in the consciousness of the speaker. Problems in the communicative system lead to a meta-linguistic correction system of two basic kinds: the teaching and the treatment systems.

Neustupny says little about teaching but an elaborate set of conditions and systems is enumerated for the treatment system. Treatment is activated to correct perceived inadequacies in the communicative system, which in turn operates three subsystems: policy, cultivation (preserving the earlier formulation) and the newly introduced, planning sub-system. Each of these corresponds to three stages in socio-economic development, respectively, Policy>Early Modern; Cultivation>Modern and Planning>Contemporary.

A further elaboration in a 1986 paper (with Jernudd) introduced the idea of the interests (cultural, economic and social) that interact with the system while in more recent work the term ‘language management’ has been substituted for ‘language correction’.

Whilst the Neustupny approach suffers from definitions which are often too broad, a conflation of stages of societal development with phases of language policy which coexist rather than succeed or delimit each other and a rather forced distinction between planning versus policy it does contain important ideas and formulations. Essentially Neustupny’s work posits the notion of ‘language correction’ (or management) as crucial in the understanding of lpp. Speakers note discrepancies in the system or form of language they are using, find a design for its removal and decide whether to implement the identified change. Language planning in this schema is a societal and conscious analogue of this personal language correction process.

The appeal of Neustupny’s suggestion is to locate the individual and the societal along a related dimension (as Foucault does for technologies of the self within his superordinate notion of governmentality). ‘Language treatment’ describes all organised forms of societal attention to language problems (Rubin 1985b: 139) whereas in the Neustupny schema the term lpp would be reserved only for the subset of language treatments which draws on explicit lpp theory and is therefore characterised by systematicity, theory, rigour, and future orientation (Neustupny 1983: 2). These actions are both organised and managed by agencies of government or by cultural institutions such as language academies. In the Neustupny approach the sequence of noting, evaluation and implementation can only
take place in actually-occurring discourse. This is an important theoretical sequence from analogue to actual, to societal action (though the latter is far less well developed). Neustupny’s ideas are particularly interesting for the ambitious attempt to see through, initially by analogy and later by more systematic structuring, the connection between individual and societal (or systemic) treatment of language problems and processes.

Nevertheless these ideas do not grapple with the legacy of the post-structuralist challenge to the sciences as expressions of modernity, a challenge which, ironically, traverses some territory that the Neustupny model one is of the few within classical lpp to acknowledge.

**Fishman**
The longest lasting and most influential source of work in lpp scholarship has been that of Joshua A. Fishman. Fishman’s 1968 work concerns developing nations principally and offers two ‘clusters’ of problems that are progressively developed in later formulations. In this work Fishman divides the tasks and activities of lpp around goals of national authentification of languages chosen on the basis that some unifying national symbol may be created for post-colonial new nations.

The second cluster of problems is aimed at socio-cultural nation-making involving strategies for enhancing communicative efficiency. This more programmatic instrumentalism is activated by ‘nationism’ in contrast to ‘nationalism’. These initial ideas about state and nation couplings have resonance in developed nation politics in the light of new nationalism arising in the context of immigration and the former term has considerable potential in relation to the US English experience.

Fishman has also been decisive in grounding lpp in social context as well as nation-setting, and especially contexts for studies and policies of intervention in language ecology (maintenance and shift). In a 1974 work he builds on the evolving field of lpp theorisation to conjoin in a single framework modernisation and development models with models of language policy and planning. Four language problems are characterised: selection, stability, expansion and differentiation, each corresponding to a lpp process, respectively: policy-decisions, codification, elaboration and cultivation. These result in one or other of the outcomes identified by Charles A. Ferguson, another of the pioneers of lpp (Paulston and Tucker 1997) as graphisation, standardisation and modernisation.

Fishman’s is an important attempt to devise a coherent set of relationships between the societal and the linguistic planning processes; though results are described in mostly language terms (the societal which is identified as the base problem stimulating the activity in the first place receives less attention). The
correlation of problem with a given language policy process comes up against the leaky nature of language questions in general and their discursive manifestation in particular.

Fishman’s (1991; 1994) has continued to explore new areas of relevance for the field and to connect it in ground-breaking ways to practices of ethnicity consciousness in plural societies as well as to language regeneration efforts of indigenous and new minority communities. The *Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale* (Fishman 1991; 2001) offers planners a theoretical construct for locating a language at a particular point on a scale, descending from 8 to 1 as a heuristic for the construction of intervention strategies to regenerate or revitalise languages in various states of attrition. In language reconstruction efforts GIDS is a critical tool for language re-generation that combines community effort with expertise.

With a pithy recent definition of *lpp* (“*authoritative allocation of resources to language*” (1994: 92) Fishman has been the only ‘parent’ of the *lpp* field to respond to ‘neo-Marxist and post-structuralist’ criticism of *lpp* (cited above). While Fishman concedes that “*much of lpp is motivated by a desire to render a particular language capable, or more capable, of expressing the realia, the relationships and the ideals that stem from the modernised West*” he rejects the charge that *lpp* is a “*linear....espousal of Westernisation and modernisation*” (1994: 95) removing the untenable idea that there can be an overarching ‘unity of purpose’ within the discipline of *lpp* that is separate from the interests, ideologies and values of its practitioners.

**PARENT DISCIPLINES**

**Language Science**

This section discusses autonomous linguistics (language science) and two alternative theorisations of language, to consider what kind of *lpp* emerges from these options as the base-core theorisation source of *lpp*. The first alternative is to view language as a social semiotic, associated most clearly with the Systemic Functional Linguistics of MAK Halliday. The second is the radically original conception of language used by Le Page and Tabouret-Keller. These two approaches invert the reification bias between language and context found within autonomous linguistics.

In *The Politics of Linguistics* (1986) Frederick J. Newmeyer discusses the contrast between autonomous linguistics and those approaches to the study of language which conceive ‘language’ as not disconnected to external non-language realities, viz, socio-linguistics, Marxist-oriented linguistics and ‘humanistic’ approaches that examine aesthetics.
For Newmeyer ‘autonomous linguistics’ means generative linguistics, alongside the structuralist varieties that were its forerunner together seen as a modernist language science. Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990) argue that the ‘discovery’ that language has ‘context’ as well as ‘calculus’ is the critical difference between autonomous and contingent approaches to its study. For these scholars the sense that language has context radically changes how it is to be seen, as a characteristic of ideological, purposive, and situational factors, not understandable outside of such contexts.

At a broad level it is possible to identify an oscillation between approaches to language study, which more greatly separate it from context, and those that more strongly ground language within context. This oscillation is inflected in each historical phase in the research questions which occupy language scholarship. The inflections mean that similarly underlying questions recur in more specific and grounded ways for those who work under the rubric of linguistics and applied linguistics. In turn this reflects a more general intellectual history of alternating between periods of stressing universality and periods stressing relativism.

Pragmatics, Semantics, Stylistics and Discourse Analysis and several aspects of Sociolinguistics have all arisen to answer questions of language in use, *D-aspects* of language, and have more or less comfortable-uncomfortable relations with linguistics. Applied linguistics is also preoccupied by this challenge and contemporary theorists locate the dilemma precisely as the point of preference in relation to the context-versus-language reification options it contains (Brumfit 1997; Davies 1999).

**Grounded Semiotics**

Halliday’s (1993) systemic functional linguistics (grammars; social semiotics) distinguishes between institutional (the larger component) and systemic language planning. The latter is more innovative and follows from sema-history notions, i.e. stages of history and the relations between language and materialism, language and classism, sexism and racism, language as ideologising, the relation between evolution and design or intervention, the limits posed by grammar’s base, the relation between social structure and language and phases of history as well as its disjunctions.

Halliday also deals with the role of experts and of the anti-democratic tendencies of technical language and technologisation of language. Although not normally a language planner Halliday’s 1993 (a and b) papers demonstrate the power of his coherent theory of language and semiosis with explicit interconnections between it and the material realm and effortlessly sidesteps contestation about taxonomical categories. Application of Systemic Functional Grammar categories to the problems of *lpp* as a scholarly field results in a cogent and internally consistent discourse and its extension to public agitation for the distribution of public and discursive meaning resources.
For Halliday there are three likely positions on language and semantic structures. The first of these is a universalist one which holds that ‘early on in human history’ (1993: 6) grammars evolved to represent a pre-existing reality. The second, the Soviet-Marxist one, locates language within the superstructure in relation to the material base. This tied relationship means that language evolves through predictable phases (primitive communism, slave, feudal, and capitalist modes of production) each of which engenders the language with a semantics particular to the underlying economic base structure. The third is the Whorfian position (p 7) which holds (depending on its hard or soft form) that languages determine or influence thought.

The base language theory from which one derives a position about \textit{lpp} shapes the parameters and features of the language policy and planning theory and action-description that is realised.

\textbf{Acts Of Identity}

LePage and Tabouret-Keller (1985) and LePage (1988, 1993) propound a unique view of language and therefore of linguistics and of the sorts of intervention that are made and possible into ‘language’ which are of immediate importance to any possibility of serious theorisation of the intersection of the domains of language and planning. A key premise of the theorisation of language for these scholars is a highly dynamic inseparability of language (“\textit{a repertoire of socially marked systems}” 1985:116) from the practices and instances of its use.

Questioning the ontological status of the categories assumed by conventional linguistics LePage and Tabouret-Keller also challenge the fixity of these categories (ethnic groups, languages, dialects, different languages). This challenge derives from the locus of language; which they find residing in individuals whose creative and massive variations in use reflect constant negotiation and change. LePage and Tabouret-Keller claim a universality for their idea of variation and the individual as locus of language; their studies draw evidence from contemporary Britain and France as well as on creole and pidgin situations in the Caribbean.

The Acts of Identity thesis gravitates around two critical processes: \textit{projection} and \textit{focussing}. Every speech act involves the projection of the ‘inner universe’ of the speaker “implicitly with the invitation to others to share it” (p181). This projection produces adjustments (focussing) based on the feedback from the interlocutors’ response to the language projected, in some measure reinforcing the original or producing its modification as the original speaker accommodates to the feedback received. Projection involves a creative and constitutive set of operations and functions whereas focussing involves progression from simple feedback to the incorporation of institutionalisation and education. It is in the
latter senses that the theory gains relevance for the purposes of this study as a societal form of ‘focussing’ in which some norms are selected and policed or mandated in the public domain.

LePage (1988, 1993) argues that variationist studies and orientations answer the question of what language is and how it comes about. He works from the notion of stereotypes about language (“internal models about the nature of things which the processes of socialization in our own culture induce in us” p 26). Stereotypes represent both data in LePage’s work and a source for probing the relationships with linguistic universals.

Dante Alighieri’s efforts to produce a dignified, poetic, standard vernacular in *De vulgari eloquentia* represents a process of comparative eloquence. The poet is seeking a language medium to elevate to literary cultivated status to dislodge Latin. He seeks this medium by a process of contrasting the respective claims of the existing spoken contenders in medieval Italy’s repertoire. The ancient practice of a language strategist is compared with the current state of West Indian Creole English. Like Dante’s search LePage argues that the English dialectologists (both those who seek form and meaning in African influences and those who see themselves primarily as ‘theoretical linguists’, or ‘scientists’ simply describing what they find) in effect give valence to different data sets. Both are acting as rationalisers of pre-existing constructs and views, reflecting the divergent stereotypes animated by their search.

The ideologies that drive these searches and others: illustrious standard vernaculars, correct grammars, religious purpose and legitimation in the case of Q’uranic Arabic, political unification or power’s entrenchment, authorising an educated elite often combine and sometimes collide and conflict but are always deeply embedded even in scholarly purpose and activity.

Individuals inhabit and create a “*multidimensional symbolic universe*” (p32) surrounding us with a multitude of possible linguistic choices and sets of selections based on the complex interplay of projection and focussing. Focussing involves standards-setting and their prescription. This becomes relevant to *lpp* as an explicit practice and is analogous with Neustupny’s language management notion.

LePage makes a distinction between standards as norms and standards as prescription. The former come about through focussing, the dialogical process of fit between projection and feedback. This is a largely unconscious process and is intensely present in social life varying according to its multifarious domains and settings. This process of standards as norms can account for language change and development and even for rigidities (e.g., monastic scriptoria) and any centripetal forces that groups encounter that stimulate norm generation as acts of identity. Prescriptive norms on the other hand derive from the
awareness of stereotypes based on norms. In this latter respect, LePage argues that Received Pronunciation originated in the ‘close interaction’ between public schools, Oxford and Cambridge and the ‘Mandarin ranks of the civil service’ in the latter part of the 19th century and early part of the 20th. A descriptive examination of these norms by H.C. Wyld later was utilised prescriptively by Lloyd in framing advice to BBC announcers. This progression from focused and socially marked norms to their description and later prescriptive advocacy LePage terms “progressive reification, totemization, and institutionalization” (p33) and despite the diachronic pattern could, and often do, co-exist, even with alternate and contesting processes.

This analytic perspective promises links social processes of how language standards are constituted, to the linguists’ description of those standards and any utilisation of such descriptions in prescriptive patterns, therefore between informal and implicit processes and their eventual (possible) societally approbated form. The maximal point of this linked process is deliberate planning and explicit policymaking. In the approach put forward by these scholars we can identify a connection between the views of language as usage (parole, language as having contexts that produce variation) and approaches that describe, analyse and study the S-Units and standards of language. Because therefore language has context the reification of formal autonomous linguistics becomes theoretically impermissible or at least problematical.

**PRESSURES IMPACTING ON lpp THEORY**

**De-Reification Of Language**

We can see how linguistics involves the reification of language. However, the removal of any social act from its deep embeddedness in human interactional purposes for the object of studying that act is reifying. Therefore we can agree with Brumfit (1997) who points out that applied linguistics and sociolinguistics also reifies. According to this sequence of thinking applied linguistics/sociolinguistics reifies real-world problems that involve language. This is a positive development in consideration of these questions because it permits, as Le Page and Tabouret Keller’s work does, to retain an interest in linguistics within an lpp framework, without having to be conduct lpp within the terms and categories of autonomous linguistics.

Scholars who argue for locating language within context are also commonly concerned to do down linguistics as the principal disciplinary field understanding language phenomena. We can identify one key motivation in the work of Pratt (1987). Pratt has argued that linguistics assumes and works off a series of utopias. These utopias are located at the heart of the field which autonomous linguistics studies visions of the human community which can be traced to the idealisations of Chomsky (1965) of the ideal speaker-hearer dyad as the core
problematic that language science examines. In sympathy with Pratt’s view, Calvet (1998) points out that in many ‘real world’ settings language is in fact a kind of war (not a community at all, or at least not a community getting along very well with itself). Calvet also calls linguistics politics. It plays a part in language as war. For Pratt, and by implication for Calvet, language and linguistics are better understood as being principally about interpersonal contact rather than community. This seeks to move away from telling only utopian stories about language. In language scholarship of this kind conflict as well as collaboration; difference, dispute and miscommunication as much as cooperation, collaboration and community are made objects of attention.

Even sociolinguistics, which was a reaction to Chomskyan idealisations of ‘ideal speaker-hearers’ in ideal speech communities, and which aimed to dismantle such abstractions, created several of its own. According to Pratt the ‘shared patrimony’ posited at the centre of theoretical linguistics gets a re-run in socio-linguistics, even in discourse studies, in a sort of “impulse to unify and harmonise the social world” (p 56). A new lpp will need to accommodate to these critiques of linguistic science.

De-Fenestration Of Linguistics

Much of the effort of locating lpp within intellectual disciplines such as sociology or politics is a kind of throwing linguistics out the window. The merit or otherwise of linguistics is not strictly relevant to present purposes, however the sense that a different kind of lpp analysis and practice emerges from locating it with alternative parent-disciplines is important. A more attractive possibility is that of conceptualising language policy and planning theory as applied practice of its own (Davies 1999) ‘dialoguing’ actively with sociological theories, economics, policy sciences and political science, and critical studies schools.

Weinstein (1979, 1983) makes the important point that among those who influence and make language policy are many individuals, ‘language strategists’, and ‘cultural elites’. “Writers, translators, poets, missionaries, publishers and dictionary makers can shape language for political and economic purposes; their effectiveness may be greater than (that of) government”. It is clear that the instances cited already in Chapter I, and here of Dante Alighieri (also Eco 1994 and 1998) sustain this point. The main mechanism identified by Weinstein is that of positive value (presumably the inverse operates with stigma-attaching performance) which has the effect of transforming it into a “form of capital useful for gaining entry into a community or for economic benefits”. Joseph (1987) has demonstrated how the emergence of ‘eloquence’ as capital in European national languages symbolises the transfer to discourse of the distribution of social authority. These kinds of capital are performative, the ‘policy’ is a kind of praxis. This is similar to the claim made in the thesis. We are arguing that the performance of routines by powerful speech actors in expressly constructed speech event-venues such as Congress seek to make
particular kinds of associations between languages and statuses. Powerful among the associations are those of identity-infused language practices and the kinds of human subjects who make particular language choices. The performance of lpp of this kind invokes naturalisation of these statuses, that is, to have them accepted as natural, taken for granted, or ontological. To accept that language is performative in this way is to ascribe to it capital (Bourdieu 1991), some degree of discursive autonomy (Foucault 1977), and some capability to shape mental states. The following discussion addresses these three ascriptions.

New Signs
In ‘theorising the sign’ Burke, Crowley and Girvin (2000: 13-39) locate a trichotomy of core options: Ferdinand de Sassure whose linguistics finds meaning in langue (the abstract system of language) and therefore in its structure, rejecting parole (what is actually said) as unsystematic and unanalysable; Benedetto Croce who collapses the linguistic under the idealist construction of aesthetic, where language is part of the human subject unconstrained by structure; active and creative; and V.N. Voloshinov for whom systematicity resides in the dialogic practice of communication and its inextricable embeddedness in contexts of society, economy and power.

What the sign is able to carry (information alone, or ideology, World View, identity and more) is fundamental to achieving the purpose of the thesis at this point, to indicate new theoretical possibilities for a ‘science’ of language planning that makes discourse planning possible and indeed central. Kress (1988) identifies W.v. Humboldt as one “modern source for the notion that the structurings of language, at every level, code a Weltanschaung, a world view, an ideology” (p.163). A materialist version of this notion that language is not simply a neutral or transparent code for the transmission of meanings is traced to the Marxist philosopher and literary critic Voloshinov and an idealist version to the North American linguistic anthropologists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf in their famous formulation known popularly as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (Chapter I). Coulmas (1997) points to the same history but unlike Kress who stresses such ‘language structuring’ as important work in explaining language in society Coulmas wants to stress that language is not a ‘prison house’; that Homo Loquens is capable of deciding even what will be called the mother tongue and therefore seeing that every language is a social construct, mother tongues are ‘claims’ rather than actualities, a political statement rather than ‘destiny’ and tends to disparage efforts to preserve intergenerational retention of endangered languages.

As we have seen the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis is a theory of linguistic relativism focused mostly at the lexical level. It was generated from studies on native American languages whose lexical categories suggested to the Sapir and Whorf that reality is an undifferentiated rush of experience and sense, which different languages, according to cultural conventions (history) ‘slice up’ in different ways.
The attractiveness of relativity theory has been revitalised in recent work that goes beyond grammar or lexicon into discourse and socio-cultural practice (Niemeier and Dirven 2000; Pütz and Verspoor 2000; Hawkins 2000; Bickel 2000). By making connections between elements of language and its socio-cultural practices of semiosis many scholars claim to demonstrate Whorfian effects of language on thought. Hawkins’ empirical examination of interpretive grounding in criminal law allocates to ideology a function like spatial, temporal and discoursal variables; a role in the meaning-making process of deixis. Bickel’s conclusion that “language and non-linguistic practice together construct a relativised cognitive ground” (p 185) reinforces this ‘embedded’ approach to how communicative practices can constitute habituated patterns.

Revitalised interest in Whorfian effects gravitates around this habituating capacity of streams of language (discoursal patterns) as constituting a habitus which pre-disposes towards particular kinds of meanings. Locating Whorfian effects not strictly in grammatical categories, or lexemes, separated from discourse and socio-cultural practice, deixis, or referential practice can be seen to rely on “a socio-culturally loaded environment and discursive context” (Bickel 2000: 186).

For Bakhtin, however, it is discourse itself that is ideological in that it arises in given social contexts among interlocutors who are ‘socially organised’. Since discourse is engendered in social contexts it evades understanding that does not consider it a phenomenon of culturally constructed intercourse. However the ideologically laden character of discourse is most evident in ‘authoritative’ contexts, where: “It is indissolubly fused with its authority- with political power, an institution, a person- and it stands and falls together with that authority” (Bakhtin 1981:343).

The incorporation of supra-sentential practices into meaning-centred linguistics is a longstanding procedure of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday 1985, 1993a, 1993b). This counterposes Chomsky’s (1965) Transformational Generative Grammar, later Universal Grammar, whose preoccupation has been with determining the rules of langue as innate universals. SFL addresses instead the social construction and reproduction of language as a dynamic system of meanings. Hallidayan theory makes possible an interrelation of linguistic and ideological structuring in a systematic analysis of actually occurring texts and therefore sees in parole its domain of examination.

Fairclough (1989, 1995) argues that language is prime locus of ideology, that this insight of critical and social theory (especially Bourdieu, Foucault and Habermas) is evidenced by the ‘linguistic turn’ in contemporary social theory, a critical linguistics, critical language study, is critical precisely because it
reveals connections of power and ideology with language that are otherwise concealed through ‘linguistics proper’. This work too distances itself from the Saussarian a-social focus on language-as-form and not language-in-use, with its stress on synchronic analysis and its abstract character. Furthermore, for Fairclough, sociolinguistics establishes only correlative relations between social structures and aspects of language (and, he claims, runs the risk of legitimising such correlated forms by a-critically describing their contextual appropriateness) whereas critical linguistics seeks to problematise such relationships as much as to uncover them. Beyond this Fairclough also wants a sociolinguistic practice that seeks to uncover how language is constitutive of social structures and ideologies as much as or more than the mere correlative relations that can be statistically and otherwise demonstrated.

Although pragmatics as a branch of linguistics addresses language in use and is close to the concerns of critical language study, with its focus on language as a form of action deriving from the notions of ‘speech acts’ and its use of naturally occurring texts; for critical language theorists pragmatics overly focuses on atomised individuals and insufficiently connects its micro-level analyses with social structure. It also suffers, according to Fairclough (1989), from an inability to theorise the relation between individually creative behaviour and the conventionalised, and therefore, ideologically laden, patterns that are socially constructed and inherited by language users. Exemplifying this view is Gee’s claim that:

Since language situates speakers and hearers within fields of status and solidarity, and since these are inherent social goods to humans, all language is always and everywhere ideological

This view of critical scholars holds that in addition to conventional correlational socio-linguistics, pragmatics share the same ‘deficiency’ of those schools of discourse analysis and conversation analysis (Pennycook 1994b) developed by ethno-methodologists although the latter have the advantage of preferring extended samples of naturally occurring texts for their data.

For critical linguistics a theory of social practice that does not reduce or overly elevate individual agency and creativity nor overly represent the determinative power of convention and structure is the defining parameter of the field. Critical linguistics can be defined as the operationalisation of theories of the social that elevate ideology and discourse to a constitutive as well as a correlative force.

Critical linguists however, invariably on the left in conventional political terms, seem not to acknowledge that if they are right that language is constitutive of the ideological formations that
underlie extant social and political arrangements there is logically no reason to assume that the
directionality of ideology critique will necessarily favour a leftist social agenda or project.

This could only be conceivable if we assumed that power relations were always and everywhere skewed
to reflect the interests and structuring of the right. Even in capitalist societies there can be little
justification for such a monolithic notion of power’s concentration. Rather power is always and
everywhere dispersed, contested and refracted so that its manifestation is far from predictably ordered to
favour particular interests.

**Homo Economicus**
The final consideration of the new intellectual forming sources for a re-invigorated *lpp* is not the
discipline of economics, nor political economy, but rather the construction of a kind of human subject
within sociological discourse that makes central the ideology of economy. Human capital theory has a
four-decade history within economics, being resurrected recently in the light of the post-industrial

Bourdieu (1991) has produced an analogue of the economic man within a symbolic market. In
Bourdieu’s scheme there are four kinds of capital available to interacting humans. *Economic Capital*
refers to the various kinds of material wealth and assets; *Cultural Capital* consists of forms of
knowledge, skill and levels of educational attainment; *Symbolic Capital* comprises accumulated prestige
or honour and finally *Social Capital* revolves around connections and individuals’ membership of
certain social groups. Individuals are distributed according to the configurations and quanta of capital
that they possess and how the capital stocks can be transformed in social life into advantage. Power is
taken to be the capacity of individuals to mobilise the authority accumulated in a market by deploying
their capital stocks. This kind of power is a symbolic transmutation of coercive force.

Starting off with the premise that ‘buying and selling’ economies are located within a communication
economy in which linguistic interchange is a critical social practice Bourdieu questions what kinds of
markets exist for linguistic interchange, how profit and advantage are gained or exercised, what
investments are made and how these unfold in actual communication. This is both a metaphorical
rendering of marketplace terms and practices of language and a real analysis of the actual interplay of
communicative exchange. Within these communication economies symbolic domination is effected by
asymmetrical capital endowments. These take the form of a *habitus* in which the social person operates
not just within linguistic dimensions but with consequences in material capital. There is a proliferation
of markets for the interchange of various kinds of capital stocks but symbolic mediation is common to
them. Bourdieu’s analysis of the historical unification of the French linguistic market from pre-
revolutionary to Republican times shows the operation of symbolic domination processes so that state linguistic unification and formal officialisation accompanied each other.

The constitutional enshrinement of French was bolstered and made possible by the realisation of the project of officialisation of the Parisian dialect in the symbolic dimension of the marketplace. It was not just that the state required standardised forms of literate language to operate its technical mechanisms of nationing and administration, but that there was a “struggle for symbolic power in which what was at stake was the formation and re-formation of mental structures” (1991: 48). The legitimation and realisation of the language of state, with its content shifts towards new terms of address enshrining new social relationships, new metaphors and euphemisms was a political struggle for the kind of language that a new social order needed and demanded. This was centralising, hierarchical and universalising (removing or marginalising local differences in the interests of an ideology of Republican citizenship). The value of the Bourdieu approach for the present work is its clear connection between micro-linguistic performativity of the macro-socio-political change of authority for French. The analogue in the present analysis of official English is of the local ‘doing’ of lpp in discursive renderings as a vitally necessary instantiation of a wider language policy at the more formal level of constitutional and legislative change.

In the system of habits, the habitus, that is desired from the politics of the status of English in the United States is a recurring association between English and qualities of opportunity, individualism, advancement, progress, democracy, modernity, capitalism and American culture; with a counter for other languages but pre-eminently for Spanish of collectivism, familism and poverty. Targeted additional exploration would be required to see if this habitus design extends to Catholicism-Protestantism but there is considerable suggestion of this possibility in the interview evidence, the Tanton memorandum and the commentary and analysis of other scholars.

There is a further and important connection. Bourdieu points out that symbolic domination utilises and indeed ends up being a practice of euphemisation; in effect a kind of self-censoring (governmentality in Foucault’s language). The market results in euphemisation because of a process of anticipation (Thompson 1991). As individuals anticipate and adapt to the pre-eminence of certain kinds of dominant linguistic capital in their personal habitus they effect a confirmation of extant, language mediated, power relations. This process gives effect at the inter-personal linguistic exchange of a wider societal project of language officialisation. Persuasive powers are ‘obeyed’ in anticipation of their deployment.
**DIRECTIONS IN NEW THEORY**

Lemke (1995) dislodges theory from its “traditional status as the goal of inquiry to that of just a tool in social activity” (p 156). This is a useful point for lpp theorisation, lpp being a preeminently ‘social’ activity.

It was pointed out in Chapter I that official English has not been well accounted for within the conceptual apparatus and theorisation of lpp. The heavy infusion of overt and naturalised ideology, and the deep symbolism of the politics of contest over official English, promise to project lpp into new theoretical directions. Two further questions are relatively not well considered within lpp literature and theory. The first is the expansion of literacy in industrialised economies. The second are issues of development and modernisation nationalism that follow non-Western trajectories.

Since the time of the Industrial Revolution a binary notion of literacy has operated in the industrialised West, a functional utilitarian literacy for masses and cultural literacy for elites (Luke 1992). Now, infused with explicit government policies of economic rationalism and human capital economic theory (OECD 1996) mass literacy campaigns are fostered in both advanced and poor economies. New theory work on lpp needs to explain the appropriation of language/literacy in these ways to address cultural politics in developed states such as the practical and symbolic function of the US English movement.

Non-Western (endogamous) economies, that is, forms of national economic development, both distinctive pathways, and unique capital and wealth accumulation practices, proto-typically those of north Asia, challenge and do not reproduce the model of nation typical of European economic modernisation. Parts of the overarching paradigm of classical language planning need to be set aside. For example Romanised writing can no longer be considered an essential precondition of economic and social modernisation (DeFrancis 1977; Gottlieb and Chen 2001). The role of language in modernisation, much of which has assumed that multilingualism necessarily correlates with poverty and underdevelopment is under challenge. One of language planning’s founding thinkers, Charles Ferguson, had long ago been alert to this deficiency in lpp theorisation in his appeal to researchers to examine the role of language in development without continual recourse to Westernising assumptions (1988/1996). As a demographic fact virtually everywhere nation-building policies are urged to acknowledge the inevitability of diversity rather than hypothesise unilingual solutions which merely serve to distance policy making from social reality (Mansour 1993). Emerging scholarship that problematises modernist assumptions in lpp (Gottlieb and Chen 2001) promises an internal remediation of the theoretical constraints on lpp from its conceptual inheritance in linguistics-based sciences and westernising notions of nation and state but new theory work is required to explain the appropriation of
language and literacy practices in intra-national single language planning (similar to the issues discussed above under Grounded Semiotics) and to address symbolic, representational and cultural politics with high degrees of performativity in developed states such as official English in America.

Politics, policy and planning are located on a cline. Planning is a continuation of politics and policy-making into the domain of administration with the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of plans constantly recirculating both politics and policy. Discourse is the linking element across the continuum and performance of practices of intended policy is the new horizon onto which theoretical scholarship needs to be exerted.

Bellhops, Busboys & Maids-Forever

The *Unum* discourse combines strong economic, moral and political associations for English. Two sets of meanings and connotations are organised under discursive formulae, the first is the *English and Economy* connection and the second is the *English and America* connection.

As the language of economy and opportunity English is associated with capitalist individualism as a system through which economy and opportunity operate. A series of values is connected to this association such as self-reliance, independence and thrift. This belief system about the superiority of English in delivering economic associations and connections is given exquisite expression by the Ernesto Ortiz narrative.

A second cluster of meanings and associations is organised under the *English and America* connection. *English and Economy* concerns the economic ideology to which new arrivals must adapt. *English and America* makes demands in relation to place and nation ideology as well. This surfaces a sense of American nationhood as individualistic and democratic, a continuation, or the culmination of English political liberalism, an ideology in which Whorfian connections are implied and sometimes made explicit.

Other languages are discursively tied to the immigrant compact ideology: Thou shalt forego your culture in return for entering here. This is a moral overlay to what the relentless operations of social and cultural forces bring about in language shift (Veltman 1983, 1998; Fishman 1991/2001). Specifically for Spanish there are recurring elements that associate it with the counter messages of place and opportunity: otherness and poverty. Spanish is tied to poverty (sometimes inevitable poverty), menial occupations, atavism and the barrio (imagined as ‘ghetto’, apart from the mainstream, isolated and isolating) or operationalised as central American imagery of sleepy towns.
This is found within the nationalist-inspired discourse that in the Q-analysis has been called *Unum*. The politics emerges from views that natural processes of immigrant absorption are being interrupted by imposed collectivism. This sometimes takes the view that Spanish mono-lingualism is being entrenched by nation-undermining bilingual policies. This sense is bolstered by the view that intergenerational language shift towards English is desired by immigrants and believed to be inevitable because English is too powerfully associated with dominant norms and social and economic forces. For strategists of the unitary role of English, of its projection of an economic human subject defined not by ethnos, background, or nationality, but by citizenship-grounded American values to implement multicultural policies is mere palliative care for dying community languages and therefore a politics imposed on ethnic minorities by self-serving intellectual elites.

A further (and less compromising) inflection of this is also encountered, though infrequently in the present evidence. This is based on a presumed connection between English and Protestantism. The American Dream, the Statue of Liberty (with its torch shining, symbolising various kinds of illumination, held high above huddled masses) and the Melting Pot ideology are the three tropes that are re-circulated, and anecdotalised as ‘ordinary person’s’ insightful knowledge about the connections between English and nation, English and economy. Insightful patriotism ‘knows’ that there is material reward for hard work, individualism, self-reliance and personal responsibility. By such discursive manoeuvres Spanish gets connected to collectivism, Catholicism and Familism. These are essential pre-requisites for formal officialisation, but they seek to enact a popular incorporation of this ideology as a kind of officialisation by anticipatory belief.

The locutions that deliver such associations and loaded connections are only performative in intention. The ‘take up’ depends on the degree of consciousness in anticipation of such ‘systematically corrupted discourse’ that treats bilingual capability as ‘problem’ if it is associated with community institutions, especially if these attract public subsidy. The perlocutive effect however is constrained by the extent to which the ideological materiality (the density of the effects that the ideology wishes to deliver) is recognised, contested and repudiated. This too, of course, is a discursive phenomenon.

Like Wittgenstein’s (1967) view that dialogical encounters with general terms allow a practical understanding of them rather than the search for invariate and ‘theoretical’ or underlying meaning language planning and policy is a conversation with multi-vocality, this is inevitably both diachronic, because the past-said recurs, and shapes and influences what will be again-said, and also because new and multiple interests and meanings are attached to language action, language as ideological work. Discursive language planning is therefore recursive, multi-vocal and memorised, it repeats itself and
both accompanies practical language planning as well as making the latter possible by defining its problems and necessary social alignments.

**Policy Performance As An Extended Speech Act**

“Final conclusions, like final solutions, are for dogmatists” (Edelman 1988:5). The implications that suggest themselves from the present study have been discussed throughout the present chapter and are now considered as the performance of an extended speech act.

**Officialising** language is a kind of speech act that is dispersed among large numbers of people and takes place over a long period of time. It is both discourse planning and discursive planning. It requires extensive textual instantiation. It depends on and utilises continual reiteration. A myriad of minor conventionalised speech acts recur to progressively convert the aim of the policy (to perform a symbolic hierarchisation of English in American public culture) into a cultural assumption. Its execution requires endless re-playing of its tropes, metaphors, themes and arguments. Its endless repetition interpellates ideological structuring so that it is progressively archived as a memory resource, available for triggering via ‘dog-whistling’ political language. This is a kind of language in which deep recall of messages stored as memory is solicited by saying that which is in overt saying impermissible (either by convention or law) but which the politics of majority dominion desires.

*Representatives* performed by authoritative persons (or sanctioned by what the founding fathers would have said) mean to recruit to political purposes associations about English and the American political compact, by sanctioning believable statements, or validating politicians’ utterances (distancing content uttered by politicians from their low credibility), statements that at a critical level would be discounted. The affirming, reporting, concluding that representative speech exemplifies when located to narratives of patriotism, lived-belief rather than reflection, inculcate a mode of knowing that is beyond critical challenge. By contrast representative speech, affirming, reporting and concluding acts of language, when undertaken by scholarly discourse whose truth-claims depend on disciplinary association have become mired in immense contestation in relation to bilingual education. Here representatives are made to struggle against common sense, ordinary experience, ‘history’ as experience rather than scholarship. Ideological representatives therefore have succeeded in disabling the talk of *Pluribus* by forcing on it a need to justify itself. So, officialising language recruits to its task representative performance that deploys scholarship-based knowing against insightful knowing that emerges from a prior commitment of the heart. The specific character of these representational acts are determined by the available resources of esteem, expectation and culture within the American political compact, and, ultimately, by a politics of relative credibility.
**Directives** perform a smaller role in language as officialisation routines since the interactants are disputing the allocation of that status to English. Nevertheless the entire performance of the discursive policy making of official English is directed at a single act of textualised direction for English; a single textual admission to the ‘sacred writings’ of American politics, the Constitution. However, that directive would have the force of stating the obvious. It is then a directive that can only be understood symbolically, though no doubt its collateral damage would be extensive.

**Commissives** appear throughout the concourse of statements in the micro-interactions among the advocates and opponents. Commissives are operationalised as the rules of engagement between *Unum* and *Pluribus*, technologised on radio and TV and the Internet, allocating relations an exaggerated adversarialism and reducing prospects for inter-subjective conciliation. **Expressives** function to navigate the arguments between the participants though it may be the case that a special class of expressives is also deployed. This category of expressive speech act seems to make English itself into a kind of abstract interlocutor (people speak to and about English as though it were a participant in debate, more than an object of attention). English becomes a kind of object of interlocution since it gains the capability to be injured, to be slighted, to be denigrated, and therefore to have its dignity acknowledged as a participant in the process of debate. Expressive acts are declared for and to English.

**Declaratives** are a large part of the play of language acts that seek to effect officialisation in memory, action and attitude. Since declaratives aim to alter the real world in some way, to effect a word-world correspondence, and since English is the de facto official and national language of America to declare it thus is to enter a realm not only redundant but also reverential. Since to all intents and purposes English has the statuses a vast national movement seeks to allocate it formally the acts of doing so exaggerate the value and function of English to the point where it attains cultural status. Officialisation therefore, where it is not pragmatically needed, comes close perform acts of cultural validation.

An examination of language ideologies that take discursive form and seek to effect policy performatively involves performing both policy and ideological work. This is a recursive activity since it is language deployed manifestly to effect material changes in relation to language, but silencing its purposes all along. The resistance and contest that ideological language performance undertakes is itself ideological and performative. When there is a high degree of redundancy in the discursive goal (i.e. there are few or no material changes to make) the play of language for and against English and its *de jure* status develops an enclosed and circular politics understandable largely as the struggle for icons of hegemony. If English had been declared the official language of the United States two hundred years ago it is likely that all of the provisions that official English advocates seek to have abolished today (removal of bilingual voting provisions, curtailment of bilingual education etc) would still exist. The absence of official English constitutional declarations would not have prevented the educational
imperatives for first language literacy, the pragmatic urgency of voting provisions in other languages, the pressure on a single judge to spell out citizen rights to Spanish-dominant new Americans, or the local convenience of ensuring that new drivers well understand the rules of the road. These provisions would all still exist since they constitute neither official multilingualism nor anti-English. Further, the populations whom they serve would still be there needing these services since American population recruitment, and its leaky immigration screening, service the burgeoning demand for labour that the American economy generates.

We have seen that the same meanings are made, and made possible, by the re-circulation of precise texts over time. We have seen how individuals who espouse a restrictionist or a pluralist discourse allocate more value to some and correspondingly less value to other recurring texts. The discourse analysis we have undertaken reveals that recurring production of meaning can be predicted, as did the Q-data, reinforced by the interview data. The discursive landscape therefore is emblematic of a series of political discourse elements that are also expository (revelatory, iconic and legitimatory) and contrastive (oppositional-argumentative and foundational).

The texts which are expository have three principal functions: to reveal ‘hidden agendas’ within opponents’ positions (revelatory); to stand excellently for the idealised advocated position, that is to display virtuous positionality (iconic); and to legitimate and authorise the speakers’ intervention by recourse to a truth and legitimising higher order source (legitimatory).

The contrastive texts have two principal functions: to define a bounded position distinctive from the counter-argument (foundational) and to maximise the distance between them (oppositional-argumentative). In the latter respect claims seek to widen or extend the distance from the opposition while the foundational forms of contrast seek not to prevail, not to establish a basis for collaboration, inter-subjective agreement, or understanding, but rather to perform what Habermas has called dramaturgical action. These appeal to audiences beyond the protagonists be they moderators, listeners, viewers or distant observers and establish the position of the speaker in relation to supporters.

Texts are arrayed in this manner and represent a dense web of possibilising potentials, a meaning potential. The materiality in the official English world is largely ideological and symbolic. Political interests claim huge support for the project of official English, an investment in its support by others in the communication economy of modern American society. The asymmetrical capital endowments between English and non-English are so great that all antagonists are defined in relation to English (pro-English, anti-English, English-only, English-plus). Evidence for this also comes from the few areas of agreement between Unum and Pluribus (Chapter IV) which are mostly about the rules of the game: No
Frivolity, Do Not Demean America, Act As Though This Is A Very Serious Issue. Official English does not appear to be intimately connected to any historical unification of English in the US, finding a distinctly non-British national English voice. Rather it is a project of settlement of intra-national linguistic iconography, one whose purpose is to domesticate local difference (banishing from state to home), to ascribe to the state a cultural hierarchy, to add weight to a vernacular nation (adding a language-nationality element to citizenship in the political compact) and to effect the interests of an ideology of Republican democratic capitalist-individualism, making central the American subject as an economic entity within a context of atomistic individualism. It is the nationing principle mopping-up after destabilising new population influences. Education is the means to socialise the young into this imagery, citizenship (swearing-in and ‘legislative messages’ alike) is the means for socialising the new.

Our examination of micro-linguistic performativity has connected with these macro-socio-political changes for the symbolic authority of English. In our present analysis of official English we have seen language policy and planning in action, always contested, sometimes succeeding, sometimes failing. Each public act (in Congress, on Radio, in interviews) is an instantiation of the wider language policy, this is Tully’s constitutional multi-logue, not just a preamble to formal acts of constitutional and legislative change, but an essential companion activity.

The shift from a central to a liberal state is central to Foucault’s claim that the state can only effectively function in semiotically complex dispersed practices of governance through ‘collaborative’ relationships. This therefore is not a discursive democracy so much but a guided discursive democracy by incorporating family, civil society and specialised knowledge. The linguistic markets, discursive formations, or orders of discourse co-perform the officialisation of English by inscribing it into the communicative understandings of citizens.

Two levels of performance of the language policy are required, the de jure adjustment to language status via legislative action and the performance of a governmentality shift which sees people self-govern, monitor and check their distribution and use of English and other codes in public domains. This use is not only what they do with which language but how they speak of it. The regulation of the code practices of Americans performs the language policy and realises its objectives but also inscribes itself into each American who then ‘says the right thing’. The right thing to say is that ‘English is official’. Official English is therefore a continuation of an Americanising ideology and a practice of nationing America’s people. The kind of language and nationalism that is invoked is a recuperation of national legitimation after a time of disruption through immigration. English is emblematic of this function and guided discursive public policy making is the mechanism.
In the end, it comes down to this. But, of course, it is never the end…
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Factors Resulting from Varimax Rotation

The following table shows the factors that result from the method of Varimax Rotation utilised by the PCQ 3 Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>FACTORS:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>H2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>-54*</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>72*</td>
<td>-54*</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-51*</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>-50*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>87*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>-35*</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>-45*</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>56*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>-52*</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>-35*</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-42*</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>-47*</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>71*</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>-46*</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>77*</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>82*</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>-49*</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>-56*</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>-36*</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>-49*</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>76*</td>
<td>-39*</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>60*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>-43*</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>68*</td>
<td>-48*</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-33*</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-37*</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>83*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>-46*</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>66*</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes a loading significant at .32

**Factors: 1 2 Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigens</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

denotes a loading significant at .32
Appendix 2: Sources of Q-statements

1. Chavez, L., Readers’ Digest, August 1995
2. National Association of Bilingual Education, Newsletter, vol 18, no 6 pp 1 and 8, 1 May 1995
3. EPIC (English-plus Information clearinghouse) Newsletter vol 1, no 1 p 4 March-April 1988
5. Roth, T. Congressman “Speech before the American Forum”-Miami, Florida March 14 1994 p 1;
   Milwaukee Sentinel 4 May 1995: p 12 A
6. ibid. page 8
   June 1989 p. 227
9. Edwards, D.J. English as the Language of Government Act: Not a Rose by any other Name TESOL
   Matters February-March 1992
10. A statement of opposition to the English as the Language of Government Act of 1991 by the National
    Council for Languages and International Studies
11. English-plus Information Clearinghouse, Statement of Purpose p 2 EPIC Events May-June 1988
12. Mujica, M.E. Chairman of the Board (Dear Fellow Americans) Towards a United America U.S.   English
    brochure (undated)
13. Alexis de Tocqueville 1805-1859 quoted in ibid
15. Hayakawa, S.I. p 16 The English Language Amendment, One Nation...Indivisible? The Washington
    Institute for Values in Public Policy 1985
16. Roosevelt, T. President of the United States, cited in Hayakawa, ibid, p 18
17. de la Pena, F. The Case for Official English, Democracy or Babel 1991 U.S. English
18. Roth, T Congressman, Congressional Record (103rd Congress), Washington Tuesday May 4 1993 vol
    139 no. 60 Declaration of Official Language Act
20. Underwood, R Congressman, closing remarks at seminar Bilingual Education: Separating Fact or
    Fiction 18 September 1995
    Statement: English as the Official Language of the United States
22. Bergholz, E. ‘Bad language over official U.S. tongue, Anti Hispanic bias being charged’; Insight, The
    Pittsburgh Post, November 5 1988
23. light paraphrase of Cummins, J 1981 “The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting
    Educational Success for Language Minority Students.” In Schooling and Language Minority Students: A
    Theoretical Framework, edited by California State Department of Education, Los Angeles: Evaluation,
    Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University 1981 (permission granted by
    Cummins, personal communication)
24. Alvarado, M.T. Regarding Teaching Elementary School in a Second Language Remarks made at the the
    Seminar The Future of Bilingual Education, Center for Equal Opportunity September 18 1995
    Washington DC
25. Peterson, S. Breaking the Bilingual Lobby’s Stranglehold, paper delivered to the seminar The Future of
    Bilingual Education Center for Equal Opportunity September 18 1995 Washington DC
27. Dector, M. 1995 A Return to Our Heritage (It is Up to You) Speech Delivered at the Heritage
    Foundation’s Annual Board Meeting and Public Policy Seminar; San Diego CA., (August 1) pp. 630-
    632, Vital Speeches of the Day, vol., LXI no. 20
28. Duignan, P., (Senior Fellow Director of African and Middle East Programs and Western European
    Studies at the Hoover Institute) Speech entitled: The Dangers of Multiculturalism (The American
    Experience), delivered before the Rotary Club of San Jose, San Jose, CA., (March 22 1995), pp. 492-493,
    Vital Speeches of the Day vol., LXI no., 16
29. Yzaguirre, R., President, National Council of La Raza, Statement Regarding Bilingual Education,
    September 18 1995 News Release
30. Language Acquisition and Ability Fact Sheet, National Council of La Raza, undated typescript
31. Boulet Jr., J. Executive Director English First, interview with researcher 22 September 1995
33. ibid
34. Garcia, S., Statement of a parent of a bilingual education student, employee of Mile High United Way, and parent representative of the NABE(National Association of Bilingual Education) Executive Board, Denver, Colorado Seminar on Bilingual Education: Separating Fact or Fiction 18 September 1995
35. Alvardo, M.T. op cit
36. A Brief History of the Modern Language Rights Movement, undated and unauthored, distributed by U.S. English
Chavez, L. 1991 Out of the Barrio Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation Basic Books p.6
38. ibid p. 1
40. Slogan of several modern and foreign language teacher associations as appears on bumper stickers
42. Boorstin, D.J. cited in CEO Center for Equal Opportunity brochure
43. Porter, R.P. 1994 Goals 2000 & the Bilingual Student, Commentary, Education Week, May 18, p. 44
44. Thomas, W.P. and Collier, V.P. Language-Minority Student Achievement and Program Effectiveness Studies Support Native Language Development NABE (National Association of Bilingual Education) News, August 1, 1995 p. 5
45. President Bill Clinton. September 27 1995, Remarks by the President to Hispanic Caucus Institute Board and Members Washington Hilton Hotel Washington, D.C., The White House Office of the Press Secretary, typescript
46. Torres, R., September 18 1995, Statement, Director of Public Policy, ASPIRA: An Investment in Latino Youth.
47. Roth, T., “U.S. Needs One Language” p 12 USA Today September 7 1995
49. Yzaguirre, R., Hispanic-Rights Groups Disagree with Dole’s Stance on English, San Antonio Express-News September 6 1995
51. Theroux, P. cited in Hayakawa, S.I. op cit p 6
52. Motto of English First (Adams and Brink 1988: 3), confirmed by English First 23/10/95.
53. Baron, D., 1990 The English-only Question Yale University Press p 7
57. Murphy, L.W., Nojeim, G.T., and Chen, E.M., ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union, Washington National and N. California offices) open letter to Representatives October 17 1995
Appendix 2: Characteristics of Q-study Participants

The total number of respondents in the Q-study was 54 with the following distribution of characteristics.

Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>25&gt;40</th>
<th>Over 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25&gt;40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voting Preferences</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>TX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Language</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Child Bilingual</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic or ‘Racial’ Categorisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic or ‘Racial’ Categorisation</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian-Pacific Islander</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Latino-Hispanic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Interviewees and Dates/Locations of Interviews

CONGRESS MEMBERS

Senator Richard C. Shelby, R-Alabama
(Elected 1986)
Interview conducted: 28 September 1995
509 Hart Senate Office Building
(CQ 1995: 47)

Representative Robert A. Underwood, D-Guam
(Elected 1992)
Interview conducted: 29 September 1995
507 Cannon House Office Building
(CQ 1995: 274)

Representative Peter T. King, R-New York
(Elected 1992)
Interview conducted: 17 October 1995
118 Cannon House Office Building
(CQ 1995: 162)

Representative Toby Roth, R-Wisconsin
(Elected 1978)
Interview conducted: 22 November 1995
2234 Rayburn House Office Building
(CQ 1995: 224)

Representative Owen B. Pickett, D-Virginia
(Elected 1986)
Interview conducted: 17 October 1995
2430 Rayburn House Office Building
(CQ 1995:211)

Mr Ian Valaskakis, Staffer Congressman Toby Roth,
Mr Charles Barone, Office of Senator Paul Simon, 17 November 1995
Mr Frank Purcell, Staffer Congressman Randy ‘Duke’ Cunningham, 13 November 1995
Senator Patsy Mink, Senator for Hawaii, November 16 1995
Interview data discarded at request of interviewee.

LOBBY ORGANISATIONS

Jim Boulet Jr, Executive Director English First, 22 September
Linda Chavez, Executive Director Center for Equal Opportunity, former Director US English and Civil Rights Commissioner, 2 October 1995
Mauro Mujica, Executive Director US English, 20 October
Karen Hansen, National Council of La Raza, 20 September 1995
Dr Raul Yzaguirre, National Council of La Raza, 25 October 1995
Dr. Dave Edwards, Joint National Council of Languages, 7 September 1995
William Sinnott, ordinary member US English, 16 November 1995
Jorge Amselle, Center for Equal Opportunity, 7 November 1995

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Dang Pham, Acting Director Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, 19 October 1995
Three officers of OBEMLA, 15 September 1995

RESEARCH ORGANISATIONS AND ACADEMICS

Dr Donna Christian, President Center for Applied Linguistics, 14 September 1995
Dr Shelley Wong, University of Maryland, 24 October 1995
Dr William De Lorenzo, University of Maryland, 24 October 1995
Dr Bernard Spolsky, National Foreign Language Center, 16 August 1995
Dr Elana Shohamy, National Foreign Language Center, 5 September 1995
Dr Jodi Crandall, University of Maryland, TESOL, 22 September 1995
Dr Richard Ruiz, University of Arizona, 15 September 1995
Dr James Alatis, Georgetown University, 13 September 1995
Professor J V Neustupny, Osaka University, 14 November
Dr Kathryn Davis, University of Hawaii, 18 November 1995
Dr Thom Huebner, San Jose University, CA, 8 and 27 September 1995

INDEPENDENT CONSULTANTS
Dr Joan Rubin, 5 October and 14 November 1995
Dr Ellen Touchstone, 16 August 1995
Dr Charles Stansfield, 15 November 1995
James Crawford, 11 September 1995

PROFESSIONAL ORGANISATIONS
Jim Lyons, Executive Director National Association for Bilingual Education, 20 and 31 October 1995, and staff of NABE
Dr Nancy Zelasko, National Association for Bilingual Education, 5 October 1995
Dr AR Walton, National Foreign Language Center, Asian Minority Languages 4 October 1995 and 1 November 1995
Dr Xueying Wang, Chinese Heritage School Associations, 19 September 1995 and 1 November 1995
Rick Lopez, National Association for Bilingual Education, 2 November 1995
Dr David Maxwell, National Foreign Language Center Director, 30 August 1995

COMMUNITY EDUCATION ORGANISATIONS
Inaam Mansour, Adult English and Literacy Education, Arlington VA, 1 November 1995
No'eau Warner, Laiana and Kahu, Hawaiian Language Activists 18 November 1995

SEMINARS AND HEARINGS
18 September 1995
Asian and Hispanic Congressional Caucus Conference,
Bilingual Education: Separating Fact from Fiction,
Rayburn House Office Building

18 September 1995
Center for Equal Opportunity,
Bilingual Education Seminar, U.S. Capitol

18 October 1995
Congressional Hearing,
Rayburn House Office Building

20 October 1995
Quality Education Network for Minorities,
‘Brown Bag on Official English’

1 November 1995
Congressional Hearing,
Rayburn House Office Building
Appendix 4: Q Respondents Questionnaire

NAME: 

PROFESSION: 

A1:
SEX
FEMALE
( )1
MALE
( )2

A3:
AGE
BELOW 25
( )1
BETWEEN 25-40
( )2
BETWEEN 40-55
( )3
OVER 55
( )4

A4:
VOTING
PREFERENCES:
DEMOCRATIC
( )1
REPUBLICAN
( )2
OTHER
( )3

A5:
USUAL STATE
OF RESIDENCE:

A6:
FIRST
LANGUAGE:
ENGLISH
( )1
SPANISH
( )2
CHINESE
( )3
MT/BILINGUAL
( )4
OTHER
( )5

A7:
RACE/
ETHNICITY:
WHITE
( )1
ASIAN-
PACIFIC
( )2
AFRICAN-
AMERICAN
( )3
HISPANIC-
LATINO
( )4
## Appendix 5: Quasi-Normal Distribution of Q-Sorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAST LIKE YOUR VIEW</th>
<th>INDIFFERENT OR NEUTRAL</th>
<th>MOST LIKE YOUR VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+5</td>
<td>CARD</td>
<td>CARD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: TRANSCRIPT ONE: FRED FISKE SATURDAY

Part One: Fiske & Guest

TURN SPEAKER UTTERANCE
1. FF: Good morning everybody, this is Fred Fiske and welcome to 'Fred Fiske Saturday'. In 1974, Congress mandated bilingual education nationally. The intention was to instruct immigrant children or the children of immigrants in their native tongues while they learned to speak English. Many in the Congress today feel that the program, which has been greatly expanded, has been a failure, while leader of some ethnic and immigrant groups seek to expand it. George Tryfstates is Executive Director of English First, a lobby group which seeks to develop congressional and public support to make English the official language of the United States. And I'm delighted to welcome you to 'Fred Fiske Saturday', George.
2. GT: Thanks for having me, it's a pleasure to be here.
3. FF: How many children are in the program?
4. GT: The thinking 20 years ago was that children who couldn't speak English would be at a great disadvantage, that they would not be able to learn the other subject matter and so on and so forth; and that after they learned English that the instruction of their native language would end.
5. FF: The thinking 20 years ago was that children who couldn't speak English would be at a great disadvantage, that they would not be able to learn the other subject matter and so on and so forth; and that after they learned English that the instruction of their native language would end.
10. GT: That's right. The idea was that what you need to do is to teach the child in his native language, he can make a transition to English over time and then he'll be able to fit into the all-English classes. Of course, we're the only country in the world that's based on that theory. Any other country that's got some sort of bilingual program, trying to teach kids a foreign language, immersed the child in that other language. And of course there are ways to help kids do that which help in their native language.
6. GT: Thanks for having me, it's a pleasure to be here.
7. FF: Children learn language very easily.
8. GT: They do.
9. FF: Much more easily than adults.
10. GT: That's exactly right. As time goes by, as you're waiting for this transition to take place, of course the theory is that it's getting more and more difficult for kids to learn. But at a young age, they're at the prime of their learning ability. They're just little sponges soaking up everything, and I have serious qualms about instructing children in Spanish-only, for example, and then making that transition. And here's why.
11. FF: You don't have any trouble with the original thinking that when the kids were new to this country and had no ability to speak or understand English that they were being left out.
12. GT: I don't have any trouble with the idea of teaching kids to speak English and doing the best we can for them. If they need a little help in their native language, I'm willing to tinker with the programs and let people experiment. Unfortunately what we've got, quite literally, is Spanish-only bilingual education program. The teachers in the bilingual programs in many cases can't even speak English, so the question for me is "Well, how are you going to teach it if you can't even speak English?". I'm proud to say that this past August an amendment was successfully passed, sponsored by Senator Larry Pressler, that requires at least some of the teachers in the bilingual education programs to be able to speak English. That shows you there is a serious problem. The other thing is just last week, the Washington Post reported that the dropout rate for Hispanics is twenty-seven and one half percent. I mean, that is just outrageous. And this is after twenty - twenty five - years of bilingual education.
13. FF: How many children are in the program?
14. GT: There are hundreds of thousands I would assume. I don't know the exact number.
15. FF: Did I see a figure of 2 million some place?
16. GT: It could be.
17. FF: Spanish is the primary language.
18. GT: The primary language.
19. FF: What other languages are involved.
20. GT: Oh, every language under the sun. Every other language under the sun. In New York I think it is something like 13 different languages, where kids are being taught in the native Urdu and their native Greek and their native Turkish in order to make a supposed transition. The transition just is never happening. There are more and more kids stuck in the programs or put in there on the basis of their last name. The programs just haven't worked, frankly, and this last week, the American Legislative Exchange Council came out with a report that shows we're spending some 12 billion dollars a year on bilingual education; and what do we have to show for it? Literally nothing!
19. FF: What are some of the problems that have resulted? I suspect that recruiting teachers has been an enormous problem - where to find teachers, for example who speak Urdu or Spanish and so on, who are also expert in the field they're supposed to teach.

20. GT: This is one of the, I think, outrages of the whole program. For instance, in order to fill the need for Spanish-speaking teachers, Los Angeles can't hire Americans. They're just not enough Americans who can speak enough Spanish to teach them the bilingual programs and so Los Angeles has now a deal with the government of Mexico to import teachers and in fact this whole Pressler amendment that requires that bilingual teachers be able to speak English, that whole thing came about originally because Houston this past year went through this major scandal where teacher credentials were being falsified and the whole reason was, of course, is that Houston is searching all over Latin America for people who can speak Spanish or enough, and they're so desperate for fluent Spanish speakers, they're not hiring American teachers in their own back yard. Instead they're going abroad.

21. FF: What troubles me is not so much that they're going abroad or that they're hiring a Spanish speaker, but that in searching for these Spanish speakers they neglect the competence of the teachers in the subject field so that the kids then, even though they're being instructed in Spanish, are not being well instructed.

22. GT: That's exactly right. I do have a problem with the fact that the teachers can't speak English. I think that gets right to the root of the problem. But the other aspect is indeed that you've got teachers who are on emergency credentials. In California, teachers with 30 years of experience or 25 years of experience, they're let go, reshifted around throughout the school system in order to make way for a teacher on emergency credentials to come into the school. Why? Because that teacher happens to speak fluent Spanish whereas the experienced teacher doesn't.

23. FF: I understand that the parents of these children, most of the parents, are anxious for them to learn to speak English.

24. GT: Yeah. Yeah. This is a point that I bring up all the time - who knows better the need to learn to speak English than the one who can't? I'm sorry to say that we've got government agents, politicians, ethnic lobbyists who are sending out the message "Hey, don't bother! We'll take care of you. We'll provide every imaginable sort of bilingual service". But what it comes right down to is that there's not enough money to teach people to speak English, because we're squandering all out resources, all our tax dollars on bilingual programs of every imaginable sort.

25. FF: If the parents, and I understand that 80-85% of the parents are concerned that their children learn to speak English, how is it that these programs grow and proliferate? How is it that they're learning less English?

26. GT: The answer to that is - follow the money! You've got the Federal Government offering millions of dollars to local schools, requiring local schools. Of course, the schools want to teach people to speak English. The way they get their money is that the Federal Government says "You have to use this particular method and no other", basically. The vast majority of funds available for instructing limited English proficient children on the Federal level is dedicated to programs that emphasise the use of the native language. Every other alternative program that experiments with English immersion, Sheltered English and all these other programs, they're left to fend for themselves.

27. FF: Who's supporting this?

28. GT: Well, you've got, of course, the people whose jobs depend upon it. You've also got the ethnic politicians who thrive upon it. If they, frankly, can keep people from learning to speak English, then they're the only source of information, people have to depend upon for that information.

29. FF: Do you think it's that crass?

30. GT: I do. These people depend upon them and it enhances their political stature.

31. FF: They become spokespeople? Go-betweens?

32. GG: Yeah. For instance, you've got people that the League of United Latin American Citizens say 'You've got to have these programs and it just so happens I administer those programs and I need those monies flowing in for my programs'. It's pathetically cynical.

33. FF: Isn't there a question of ethnic pride there as well?

34. GT: Well, in some sense I suppose there it. I think the ethnic politicians traffic in it. Here at English First our belief is that, yes, you should be proud of your ethnic heritage as such but its not up to the public sector, it's not up to our fellow tax payers, to pay for my children to speak Greek and learn about the glories of the Greek culture. The public schools have a job to teach people the English language, to teach people American culture.

35. FF: Traditionally, immigrants have come to this country and while their children learned to speak English they spoke the native language at home, in communicating with their parents and their relatives. There was no problem about that.
36. GT: Sure. The measure that we support in Congress to make English the official language of government, they all apply to the public sector because that's where all the priorities are whacked out of shape. The private sector is the best capable of promoting the native language and culture. In fact, I think the Greek community is a good example. You go to your local Greek church and there are Greek language classes, culture classes, Greek Independence Day celebrations. None of that is funded by the government. Another great example is right here in this area, the Potomac Chinese weekends. Chinese parents are not allowing their children in many cases to go to these Chinese-only bilingual classes. They're saying 'No, you're going to the English classes and we'll teach you Chinese on the weekend'.

37. FF: One of the things that troubles me about all of this, George, is that English in the past, and we have a wonderful immigrant history in this country or a nation of immigrants, has served as a unifying force. When people learned to speak English they felt more a part of the community they had joined and were more readily accepted. What we're achieving through the program that you mentioned is that we're separating into enclaves, into groups, and that's not what it's all about.

38. GT: Well, you're exactly right. You know, the current fad of multi-lingualism and multi-culturalism kind of goes back to the late 60's as such and it is, frankly, a divisive fad. You look at a country where there's one language, where people agree to unify around like this country used to be, at least de facto, and you see a basic kind of unity where people can at least communicate. You look at other countries which are officially bilingual - take out friends to the north in Canada - and you see--.

39. FF: There's enough trouble up there.

40. GT: Exactly. I mean, I don't even have to go through it. Even last week, why the province of Quebec elected a majority of separatists in the provincial legislature. I mean, they're at each other's throats and have been for hundreds of years, frankly, but bilingualism did nothing to unify them. They're more divided today than ever.

41. FF: There are other examples of that, I suspect, too.

42. GT: Oh, all over the world.

43. FF: Is this part of a worldwide movement to separate things? There was, for many years, for generations, the tendency was to amalgamate. Now it seems that worldwide, ethnic groups of various sorts, professional groups of various sorts, are seeking to separate, are seeking to establish their own identity. Is this part of that?

44. GT: Well, that's a good question and I've looked at some of these issues myself. For instance, in Lithuania and Latvia and Estonia, one of the first things they did to protest the Soviet colonialism is what it amounted to and communist Soviet colonialism, was to make their native languages the official language of the Republic, the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania at that time. That was their first message to the Soviets – 'Look, we're not going to stand for that'. Now in this country we have sort of on the other hand we've got a divisive effort to push Spanish and even in places like Miami where, interestingly enough if you ride the Metro in Miami as I did this past Spring, you find that the 'Emergency Exit' signs are in Spanish only. Well, that sends a message to me that there is something seriously wrong. Whether or not it is separatism on the basis of Spanish speakers, I don't know that I'd go that far.

45. FF: Spanish is that language that is most used in bilingual education but you have many, many others as well and increasingly, as time goes along, people are coming to this country from areas of the world where in the past there wasn't great immigration. So the problem is likely to become even more confusing.

46. GT: Oh, even worse. You see, what the whole issue here is that if government is going to provide a bilingual service in Spanish, a Greek American has every right to that service in Greek. My Chinese neighbour has the right to that service in Chinese and it goes on and on and on. Where are you going to stop? Right there is the whole issue of discrimination.

47. FF: I read in some of your literature that there are movements afoot now to have bilingual education on American Indian Reservations.

48. GT: Well, it is everywhere. In fact, we've got all sorts of different services, not only in bilingual education but in bilingual ballots. Voting materials have to be in multiple languages, at least the four chosen language groups. Everyone else is discriminated against. The Greeks and the Russians, we all have to pay for. The Spanish ballots and the American Indian ballots are another of the favourite language groups. Sad to say, that kind of thing is not uniting people. It really is dividing people. And actually, if you take a look at the voting and how voting patterns go on the language issues here in this country, overwhelming numbers of people support official English, not only at the polls, not only when they're polled over the phone, but also when they go to the polls and vote where it really counts.

49. FF: What's interesting to me is that there is even a movement afoot to establish Black English as a separate language.
50. GT: Yes. Yeah, there are those who say we need to be pushing Black English as a matter of ethnic pride. It goes even beyond that. In Hawaii there's an effort to push Pidgin English as a matter of ethnic pride and you can just imagine every imaginable thing. The question is - do the tax payers really need to support this kind of thing? If you want to go out and do that - go for it! But don't ask me to pay for it. Don't ask the tax payers to pay for it?

51. FF: And after many years of seeking to integrate, our populations - our racial, our ethnic groups - now there's this splitting at the seams.

52. GT: And bilingual education works exactly upon those lines. You'll notice that these Spanish-only bilingual classes, as I like to call them, are literally segregated - we're separate but equal. You've got every class, every subject, every grade, all completely separate with their own teachers and their own languages. Well, that is separate but equal, if I've ever heard of it, and yet we're going right back to that for Hispanic children. This is not something I think Americans are voting for.

53. FF: At a time when I think we're desperately seeking to shave the costs of government, this would increase it greatly. Not only the hiring of the teachers but all forms would have to be present, presumably fifteen, or twenty or thirty languages.

54. GT: In fact it would be if you were planning to be fair about it.

55. FF: The IRS is doing that now?

56. GT: The IRS is doing that now! They've got Spanish language ten-forties. They're looking at Vietnamese ten-forties. And of course you get right back to this issue of 'Well, they're doing it for two but they're not doing it for Lithuanian Americans'. In fact, who really needs those ten-forty forms in their native language more? The people who speak Spanish who have a huge safety net in terms of their own community or the one or two Lithuanians who happen to be in a community. Well, if anybody really needs language services, you'd think it would be the smallest minority.

57. FF: In addition to printing the forms in different language, you'd presumably have to have advisers or counsellors, or in the case of IRS, examiners who could speak the various languages.

58. GT: I like to point out that a few years ago the IRS was raked over the coals because if you called them up you had a 50/50 chance of getting the right answer if you had a question. Well, that was in English. Can you imagine if you'd called in Spanish or Vietnamese, what your answers would be? It's probably not as good as 50/50 and I'm sorry to say that what we need to be doing is teaching IRS agents really to give the right answer, at least maybe 75% of the time instead of wasting tax money, again on one language group, which could be used to teach against everybody else whose language is not served.

59. FF: These people obviously have some difficulty in attaining employment. They can't speak English and there are laws now or rules that provide compensation for those who are language discriminated.

60. GT: Well, actually, that is an issue which is getting bigger and bigger all the time. Right now it's not part of the civil rights laws - language discrimination - but there are all sorts of sneak attacks to put that particular word in the list of things against which you cannot discriminate.

61. FF: In other words, what they want is that if somebody applies for a job and is not able to speak English and the employer says, 'Well, I'm sorry, I can't use you, I need somebody who can speak English' the employer could be liable.

62. GT: If they're successful. If they're successful in getting that sort of thing in the law. The most recent place that they tried to do that is - believe this or not - in the health care legislation. They stuck that work in there. 'You shall not discriminate on the basis of...' and then there was the whole regular list and then they added a few things and language was one of them.

63. FF: You mean in hospitals for example.

64. GT: In hospitals, for example, if you walked in and you spoke only Greek to the doctor and the doctor said, 'I'm sorry, I just don't speak Greek', well then you would have a right to sue him for language discrimination.

65. FF: Or to demand a Greek speaking doctor.

66. GT: Oh yeah. You could go in and whether or not the doctor was a Greek-speaking doctor, you could go in and demand 'I demand Greek service right now!' And if he fails for whatever reason or can't get an interpreter or whatever, you have a basis for suing him, if these health care bills had passed.

67. FF: I understand that's included in some of the legislation?

68. GT: Oh, in much of the legislation. The Clinton administration proposed that legislation and Senator Mitchell ran with it and several of the other proposals, Kennedy's the Monahan's, they all contained it. Senator Mitchell's went to far as to say that you've got to provide multiple translations for all of the materials that you provide, related to health care. And not only do you have to provide those translations in the native languages, you have to provide them at the appropriate reading level.
69. FF: What's the situation in this listening area? Large numbers of varying ethnic communities in Virginia, for example - Asian, European, African, have we encountered serious problems?
70. GT: I think we have. In fact, if you look back just a couple of years ago, during the more unpleasant disturbances, you had Hispanic leaders come up and say 'Well, the cure for the Mount Pleasant situation was to train policemen to speak Spanish'. Well, that is not going to get anybody a job. On the one hand you had Hispanic leaders saying 'Well, the people don't have jobs' and the answer to this is that we train the police to speak Spanish? It's completely turned on its head. The answer is to teach people to speak English. You just don't do that by insisting on Spanish all day long in a classroom.
71. FF: Are we teaching them to speak Spanish? Or are we teaching them other subjects in Spanish?
72. GT: That's exactly right. Actually, we have read many reports where kids come out of these programs unable to speak English or Spanish because they're getting all Spanish all day long and yet they're making this transition to English. And some of the programs have been seriously criticised because some of the kids come out and they don't know either. They don't know their grammar, they don't know-.
73. FF: But presumably they come speaking Spanish or whatever language.
74. GT: That's right. We're teaching them other subjects in Spanish.
75. FF: But presumably they come speaking Spanish or whatever language.
76. GT: No, there aren't! And that's something I'd like to work on and have been for quite some time. The fact is that the rules keep changing. The so-called experts say that the transitional program isn't working. OK, I admit that what we need to do is make a longer transition. So, when they're originally trying to sell this idea, they're saying, "Well, the kids will probably only be in the program two, maybe three, years. They'll make their transition and then they'll be out in the mainstream". Well, now they're saying that it's got to take six or seven years, or it'll take seven or eight years. Well, there are programs in Houston and New York that go K through 12, all Spanish, making a supposed transition. And you've got senators on Capital Hill who say 'Well, there are kids who go through our public school system and they never learn to speak enough English to vote and therefore the cure is bilingual ballots'. Of course the cure is not bilingual ballots! It's to teach the kids to speak English.
77. FF: States and localities in various states have attempted to deal with this, have they not?
78. GT: Yes, they have.
79. FF: In Florida, for example.
80. GT: Yes, yes.
81. FF: What's the experience there?
82. GT: The experience is pretty sad. You've got a very strong push from the ethnic politicians for bilingualism and that, sadly, hampers the efforts of people to speak English. It hampers the allocation of funds for English language classes for adults. In fact, I was going to mention earlier the perfect example that is Los Angeles. Congress forced Los Angeles to switch over to a multi-lingual system. At the time, in 1992, our opponents were saying 'Los Angeles has 30,000 people on waiting lists for English language classes' and so the cure, they said, for that was bilingual ballots. Well, the bilingual rules passed in Los Angeles and today there are over 40,000 people on the waiting lists for English language classes and Los Angeles is printing ballots in six different languages. Six. Well, that's got to cost money, I'm sorry to say, and it's money that could be better spent and is not.
83. FF: What's happened in Florida?
84. GT: The same kind of thing. Of course, the bilingual rules for ballots are nationwide rules. In Florida the most interesting things have been happening in Dade County. They originally passed a measure by referendum. A majority of the people in Dade County voted to make English the official language of the county and that was great. That was in response to the masses of funds the county was spending on bilingualism. Just recently the Dade County commission repealed the law and of course it was a completely political move on their part. I hate to be too cynical about these things but that's really what was happening whereas it passed by referendum originally and in fact there was a statewide official English referendum in 1988 after official English was on the books at the county level. Do you know, the county a second time in 1988 voted an overwhelming majority for official English for the statewide measure and yet you've got the county commission come by a few years later and say 'OK, it's all over, this is a horrible measure. It's discriminatory'. They're going on and on. 'Tourists are getting killed here so we need to have the rest of our commission meetings in Spanish', they're saying. And they repealed the law.
85. FF: The governor of Maryland, Governor Schaeffer, vetoed some measure to deal with this. Tell us about that.
86. GT: Yes, yes he did. That was an interesting situation. The measure, frankly, was a symbolic measure. It wouldn't really have changed much. In many ways people were debating 'Well, should we be merely...
fighting for some symbolic measure when after all, if we're going to fight a fight, we should get something for it'.
But in the final analysis the Bill did pass. It was up to Governor Schaeffer and he just vetoed it.
87. FF: Can you explain why he vetoed it?
88. GT: From what I remember of it, not really. I think his main concern was that this was divisive even though the vast majority of the people supported it. The only place you see division on this issue is when our opponents start raising a ruckus about how its evil and racist somehow. You look anywhere where there's an official English Bill on the books, it's just no happening. Racists are just not crawling out of the woodwork in these places. And one last thing, let me just point out, where these things are on the books, official English is still supported, even by Hispanic and Chinese. Every ethnic group supports it.
89. FF: I was looking over a vote on the Bill that was proposed by Representative Toby Roth of Wisconsin which was defeated. But, interestingly, every single vote for his Bill was Republican. Now, why has it become such a partisan political measure here in the United States.
90. GT: OK, let me clear up a couple of things. First of all, his bill, HR7-39, makes English the official language and it gets rid of some of the worst Federal bilingual programs. The Bill itself has never been voted on. The only vote that took place was taken on an amendment that he offered to the education reauthorisation and his amendment said it was time to repeal Federal bilingual education and it was pretty controversial. I was pleased to see the number of people who spoke for it that did. It would have been nice to have a lot more but sadly we were divided on that particular issue.
91. FF: How many voters voted for it?
92. GT: Fifty-eight people voted for it.
93. FF: Fifty-eight? Well, why the political separation?
94. GT: That in fact is something I want to explain a little bit. There is no political separation on this issue. Official English crosses both sides of the isle. In fact on his Bill there are sponsors from both democrat and Republican parties. Everyone recognises this. You look, for instance, the vote in Florida where 84% of the people voted for it. Those aren't all Republicans. Those are Democrats, Republicans, I don't know - Marxists.
95. FF: But everybody who voted for his amendment was a Republican.
96. GT: On that particular amendment was everybody was a Republican and there really is no explanation for it. What can I say? It's sad to see that there were no democrats willing to stand up and say 'Look, twenty five years is long enough to screw around with a program that's a colossal failure, like bilingual education'. I think, and as I said before, another reason for it may be that the official English movement was divided. There were those who supported us who said 'We can't go for that'.
97. FF: Now, let's assume that your Bill to establish English as the official language in the United States passes, what would happen? What would result?
98. GT: Well, if the Roth Bill were to pass, what would happen is that the government would finally have its priorities in place. It would produce information in the English language. It would be free then to free up its funds either to actually teach people to speak English or to return those funds to the states or to the people who pay the taxes in the first place and that's what I'd like to see. You've got Federal programs like the ten-forty forms in Spanish. You've got programs like, for example the immigration service had the first Spanish only swearing in ceremony for new citizens last year on the 4th of July. All that kind of stuff would stop.
99. FF: It would all stop suddenly?
100. GT: It ought to.
101. FF: But what happens to all these millions of people, for example, suddenly cut off, suddenly out of communication?
102. GT: Look, they're not going to be cut off and without communication. The fact is what's going to happen is that those monies will actually be used to teach English and they should be. I'm sorry to say.
103. FF: Is there a gradual approach to it?
104. GT: I don't see that there is a reason for a gradual approach at this point. Bilingual education has been on the books for 25 years and we're spending $12 billion dollars a year for it. We have nothing to show for it. Frankly, what would be the impact of repealing it? The dropout rate is going to go up? I don't think so. It's still twenty-seven and one half per cent.
105. FF: But you've been telling me that there are millions of foreign speaking students in this country who really don't understand English. Now, if we say we phase this out over a period of three of four years, then would they have to learn to speak English? It might serve some purpose. But if we cut them off suddenly, they're floundering.
106. GT: I just don't see that happening because there are programs in place right now. We've got alternative methods of teaching people to speak English. For instance, if we just concentrate on bilingual education. There are programs right now in place where alternative methods are being used, they emphasise the
use of English and some of those programs are tremendously successful. Well, what is the program that is going to be cut off? The program that will be cut off is the program that emphasises the use of Spanish. Those funds can either go to the other programs and then that transition can be made overnight. And you can actually be using an English basis for teaching people to speak English rather than a Spanish basis.

Part Two: Guest, Moderator & Callers

TURN SPEAKER UTTERANCE

107. FF: Well, George, all of our telephone lines have been lit up for a long time now. People are anxious to talk about this, so let's go to the phones. Our telephone number is 202-8858850. I'm Fred Fiske, my guest is George Tryfiates who is Executive Director of English First. Support for programming on WAMU is provided by contributing listeners like David and Anita Anderson and Christina Robinson. Thank you very much for your support of WAMU. OK, to the phones and our first caller is Ellen in Takoma Park. Good morning, Ellen. Ellen, are you there? Hello, Ellen.

108. C#1: Hello?

109. FF: You're on the air.

110. C#1: Hi. I just want to warn you first of all that I'm not very good at arguing but this is something I feel pretty strongly about. What really upsets me is that you're really throwing all bilingual programs together. I've taught in three different school systems in different states. Bilingual programs are very different, one from the other and usually they're not independent from an ESL program or a program to teach English. It's usually complimentary. And the Centre of Applied Linguistics in Washington DC recently did a study across the country analysing the effectiveness of different programs. And the students that achieved the most were one in two-way bilingual programs where the student's language is validated and used and also English is used. And other students, mainstream students, English-speaking students, are also learning those languages. So both languages are being validated, both languages are being used. The worst achievement in that study was programs of complete English immersion where the student was thrown into an English-speaking classroom and then only pulled out for a half hour to an hour a day for intensive English remediation. And those students could not achieve as much. Also the study came up with showing that it takes between three and... [end of tape, unknown amount of bridging text lost] ...who seems to be fluent in English, cannot be thrown into, say, a mainstream social studies class and expected to achieve at the same rate.

111. FF: Alright, George, do you want to enter into this?

112. GT: I sure would. Ellen, I appreciate your call on some of the concerns that you point out but let me just say this - first of all you mentioned that many of the bilingual programs are complimentary to ESL - English as a Second Language programs. Well, the reason they're complimentary is because in my view they're not teaching people to speak English. Secondly, on the two-way bilingual education, this is a new fad I think that the bilingual experts have come up with; frankly, because their programs are just producing the same high drop-out rates that they have for the last almost thirty years, twenty-five years. And so now the new theory is 'Well, what we need to do is put English-speaking children in with the Spanish-speaking children and let everybody learn the other language.' Well, that's a fad that's going to go the same way as the transitional program is going.

113. C#1: But have you seen the results from the studies? It shows higher achievement, significantly.

114. GT: It does, I suppose, but one thing I'll say is that I don't consider the Centre for Applied Linguistics an objective observer on these issues. There are just as many experts out there who will tell you that bilingual programs that are emphasising a transition are colossal failures and in fact we have the objective looks, the objective results of that. In fact, you pointed out the fact that originally they're saying 3-5 years is the amount of time needed for the transition. Now there's the need for a 5-7 years transition.

115. C#1: We're talking about two different kinds of language where the 3-5 years is social functioning so when you meet a student, you'll think that they're fluent in English but in reality they need more in order to handle the academic side of things.

116. GT: Well, this is something that the bilingual folks have been saying. They've had 25 years to tinker with their program and now they say 'Well, we need a longer transition'.

117. FF: Ellen, we have a lot of people waiting. We're going to have to move along. Thank you so much for your call. Patricia in Rockville.

118. C#2: Good morning Mr Fiske

119. FF: Good morning.

120. C#2: I teach at Montgomery County Public School and I can certainly testify to the fact that if kids are kept amongst people of the same language if it's a foreign language all day, they simply never learn English at
121. FF: What subject do you teach?
122. C#2: I teach Special Education in High School and we have a lot of ESL kids at the school where I teach and when they end up in my classrooms and many of them do because I teach Math and Science so it’s the same concepts but they’re done on a lower level. The kids simply never ever speak English except when they’re in my class and I just make the rule that they cannot do anything but speak English.

123. FF: How does it affect their performance, their success, in your class?
124. C#2: Well, we have a little girl who is Vietnamese and it’s amazing - when we got her she barely spoke and we put her in the program. This is the third semester for her to be in the program and her English usage and her social skills have gone way up. And before that she just simply was mute all the time. She didn’t talk and she’s a darling girl.

125. GT: You know, it almost goes without saying that the time you spend on the task of learning English is going to reflect in how well you learn to speak it. I have to say that that’s how, when I was studying French and when I had a half hour a day of French when I was in High School and in College, I learned a decent amount but when I really learned it was when I went to France and had no choice.

126. C#2: Exactly. And I think that that’s exactly what, if I were to learn another language, I would need to do. I don’t think being in a class a couple of hours a day or even five hours a day would help me unless I were totally unable to speak the language that I knew.

127. FF: Can we gather then that as a High School teacher you think that the bilingual education program has been a failure?
128. C#2: Well, I think that it does help kids and that there does need to be some kind of a transition and they at least need to be around people who are sympathetic to their inability to understand English and I think they get that; but I don’t think that they should be totally in that setting and maybe teachers need to be sensitised more just in the regular classes to those types of things. I think too that if you check the literature from the 20’s when all the people were coming over here. The papers basically say the same thing but when you talk to the people who went through it, they will say that the only way you learn English is by going to school and having to learn it; that their mothers told them ‘You learn English and I don’t want to hear anything about not learning it’.

129. FF: Patricia, thank you so much. John, you’re on the air.

130. C#3: Mr Tryfiates, first of all I must qualify myself. I am from an immigrant group. I do have my own other majority language and I also do have my own other minority language and therefore I think I know the difference and I must say that with your support of majority language first is not truly world-wide and I think you support your cause about 90%. I say therefore that I must support your cause 110% just to make up for what you’re saying. You constantly have references to this false or fantasy language called Lithuanian. The historic language of the region known as Lithuania was Polish; the historic, government, administration language was Polish. The Lithuanian language was invented in 1860 by German Imperialism.

131. FF: John, we really don’t have the time to discuss that history. We’re concerned with the problem of bilingual education. Do you have any view on that?
132. C#3: Yeah, I support it 100%. If another language group is truly valid then they can support their own language by their own resources. It is not necessary for all of the American people through taxation to support a different language other than English. Any immigrant group in the United States which has a valid language with a valid tradition but support it themselves and we don’t need any more than we needed German Imperialism to support Lithuanian. We need a support of minority languages.

133. FF: That’s an interesting point of view, isn’t it?
134. GT: Yes, it is. I take it then, he basically opposes bilingual education since it is working that way.
135. FF: OK, thank you, John, let’s move along. 8858850. Gail, in North West Washington.
136. C#4: Hi, Fred. I just want to speak specifically about something I know about and that’s voting in California and they have the most incredible ballot propositions; (text lost)… very speak in basic English which is bad enough but if it’s going to help someone who was born in this country and speaks Chinese or Spanish and is going to help them to understand the process a little bit more then I don’t have a problem with it. But my question is - why do people use the Canadian model when we could very easily use the Swiss model. They have at least three national language there.

137. GT: The Swiss model is interesting because they have somehow managed to cooperate with those three different languages. Frankly, the Swiss model, to my way of thinking is an anomaly. It is very rare that multiple language groups can get together and agree to use three different languages - Italian and French and German.

138. FF: The Swiss are unusual people. They’ve also managed to stay out of war.
GT: They’ve managed to stay out of all these wars and maintained their neutrality. Normally you have people at war with each other over which languages they’re going to use and we’ve never had that problem here in this country before and now we’re getting into it.

FF: What’s interesting is that while they have different language groups in Switzerland, they’re basically the same stock so they don’t have that to overcome. In our other differences to overcome and we need unifying forces.

GT: And we are from every country in the world and that’s what gets into the whole issue of, well, if you’re going to give a pamphlet to someone in Spanish, why not all the other different languages? And we’re from everywhere and when we came, frankly, everyone knew that it was basically an English-speaking country so they knew they were going to have to learn to speak English. If you or I were to go to Greece today, we’d expect to have to learn Greek in order to vote.

FF: Let’s go to Tacoma Park - Sue, you’re on the air.

C#: Right, you’ve guessed that the tax payers have to pay for this. Who does he think the tax payers are? The people here from other countries - the immigrants - they pay income taxes, social security taxes, sales taxes; and probably most of them don’t know the loopholes of how to get those taxes back either the way the Anglo Saxons do.

GT: That’s exactly my point!

C#: And I also want to say that my own grandfather was a German immigrant many years ago. He had no bilingual program. He dropped out of school in the 3rd Grade which was a great tragedy because of the language. Of course, he learned English in time and he became a productive citizen, but never to the degree that he could have if he’d had more opportunities at school. So, I am sorry but I see this movement as being a xenophobic and dangerous movement and I really protest these kinds of fanning of the flames of ethnic division that I think this is doing.

GT: Well, I appreciate your views, Sue. I can understand perhaps your concerns. The fact is, when we talk about fanning the flames, 84% of Floridians voted for it and there you would think if it were going to be divisive and inflammatory then it would be there.

C#: It’s very easy to get people to want to turn on each other. Look at the Yugoslavians.

GT: 84% - who were they turning on? And 84% of votes, I mean realistically, that is virtually unanimity.

FF: Let me ask you this question, George - is it possible to take this measure to meet the concerns that led to the establishment of bilingual education initially and to eliminate the abuses, the things that it has become? For example, to place a limitation on the amount of time that a child is in bilingual education and to expect, say, after two years or three years that he ought to be able to speak English.

GT: No, I don’t think anyone should misunderstand. We support teaching people to speak English and that’s what we ought to really be doing. The question is - what methodology are you going to use and sadly the methodology of the Federal Government has decided, frankly, to force on people a Spanish-only or a native-language-only methodology. If we just got rid of that, we’d be a long way towards making some progress and that’s why I say if you repeal that overnight, you’re not going to notice the difference because the drop-out rate can’t get any worse. I mean, it’s just not helping.

FF: It’s interesting to reflect on the psychology that leads to this. People come to this country from other nations because they feel that life will be better for them here and they want to become part of the group; but they come here and they feel strange and naturally drawn to people of their own stock and their own language groups. They feel more comfortable with them while they’re getting established and it’s easy to fall into that trap and, as a result, actually not accomplish their purpose for coming here.

GT: I mean, that’s true and that’s a natural thing. I mean, I experienced that myself when I was studying in France. It was a lot easier to hang out with the American students and speak English with my buddies than it was to go out there and try to speak French with college kids of my age at that time who were speaking French a mile a minute and using slang I had no idea about and that sort of thing. It is a difficult thing but when your whole life is changing, there is no going back. At least I could come home.

GT: Don’t you think that there’s room for some sort of compromise in this?

FF: In terms of government policy, in terms of government providing the various services, really I don’t see how you can compromise. Frankly, if government is going to give out pamphlets in one language, if it’s going to be providing services in one language for one language group, it should do it for everybody and there are hundreds of different languages. The government’s priority has got to be teaching people to speak English. It can’t providing a pamphlet to, say, one, two or three. You know, New York is a great example. It has a hotline phone number in the city. It is staffed by operators in 140 different languages and I’m telling you, they’re still missing
somebody. They could serve a lot more people if they served them in English and saved the money on the 140 operators.

155. FF: You’re listening to Fred Fiske Saturday. My guest is George Tryfiates who is Executive Director of English First. OK, back to the phones and we go to Catherine in Silver Spring. Go ahead, you’re on the air.

156. C#6: I guess I had a few comments. Good morning to you both. First, I wanted to comment that language was the first European language was the first language spoken in this country for perhaps 100 years before the first English-speakers arrived. Also in addition to Switzerland, the Netherlands uses two languages. And I also want to comment that throughout the 1800s and early 1900s, other immigrant groups had their own language schools; notably German and Italian and French and I don’t think it harmed us. Those people succeeded. They were immersed in their own languages, they spoke them at home but they learned English.

157. GT: Well, Catherine, let me just make one point clear and that is that I hope you’re not getting the idea that I’m somehow suggesting we need English as the official language of government because it’s morally superior to every other language. I think what it comes down to is, right now English is the language de facto of daily life in the United States. It’s being harmed because of government bilingual policies. I mean, we could begin to debate that maybe we should have it Spanish, maybe Cherokee, or one of the other Indian languages. I think what it comes down to is that what we need a language and the vast majority of people do speak English and we need to encourage other people to do that, particularly our newcomers who, after all, want to learn English. If we were going to discuss which language was morally superior, of course I’d say Greek but we’re not going to do that. It’s just a question of common sense. So, who was here first and what language was spoken first is not really relevant.

158. FF: Catherine, thank you so much for your call. Charles in Bethesda?

159. C#7: Fred, really this question is, in a sense, for you. This is the third program of this nature that I have heard of in the past six years on Fred Fiske Saturday. In the two previous programs, Larry Pratt has spoken, from the same organisation, against bilingual education. There’s a movement today amongst the mainstream press to put balance, to insist that talk shows be balanced, and I was wondering if we could ever expect that you would have someone on your program who would be speaking in favour of bilingual education programs.

160. FF: As a matter of fact, I have in the past had people from LULAC and others. I haven’t kept count but I don’t think I’ve done three, I think I’ve done two in the past six years and I don’t think that’s kind of overbalancing it. As I say, I have had people support the other view. You probably just weren’t listening.

161. C#7: Well, I don’t listen every Saturday but when I have listened I’ve never heard one of your invited speakers talk in favour of bilingual education.

162. FF: Well, you’re talking about a period of six years, aren’t you?

163. C#7: Right. Yes

164. FF: Well, I guess it’s easy to miss.

165. GT: I’m ready to criticise him for only having me on twice!

166. FF: Well, I think I’ve achieved balance on it and of course we open the phones for people to oppose the point of view presented, to speak up.

167. C#7: I realise that but it does represent the power of a talk show host to select the guests that you have and those guests present a particular point of view; and it would be nice if we could have another point of view represented.

168. FF: Well, we’re going in circles, aren’t we, because I’ve said I have done the other point of view.

169. C#7: I guess I haven’t heard them.

170. FF: OK, thank you for your call. Denuda in Arlington, you’re on the air.

171. C#8: Yes, hi, thank you. I’d like to express support for English First. I’m second generation Polish-American and I’ve been using my language and my career in my personal life and the language was given me by my family, not by a government program or anything of that sort. And indeed, when my family first came here in the 1940s, my older sister did attend a parochial school where some of the classes were held in Polish and some in English and that waned into the 1950s as the population became more and more English-speaking. But the point is that this was done privately. This was not done with any government program and it’s up to the family to maintain the language program or to maintain the cultural identity of a family; and I agree with your guest that this is very divisive in society. And the lady who spoke a little while ago saying that the Netherlands has two languages, well, it’s actually Belgium. But Belgium right now is actually in a very fractured state with the Flemish speakers and the French speakers at each other’s throats, interestingly enough.

172. GT: And have been for centuries.

173. C#8: Exactly, so it is in a way apparent that Switzerland is an anomaly. I have a friend who is Russian Jewish and who is married to a Hong Kong Chinese lady. He’s a professional translator. Their child is now an
amazing English-speaker, understands Russian, a smattering of Chinese, and he speaks Polish to her as well. I mean, it’s amazing how children pick up languages.

174. FF: Incredible. What you’re saying and what a couple of other callers have said is that we traditionally have done things for ourselves that we now think the government ought to do for us.

175. C#8: And just to clarify, I tend to vote liberal-democratic, so I’m not a hard-core, hard-right Republican who is going to be saying that this should be English-first or something like that. I think basically it is the family’s responsibility to maintain cultural identity.

176. GT: Denuda used the ‘R’ word and that is ‘responsibility’. Our policies are lulling people into the idea that we don’t have a responsibility.

177. FF: Thank you very much, Denuda. Camille in Elicut City, you’re on the air.

178. C#9: Hi, I would just like to say that I support some bilingual education and I would like to point out the fact that the Spanish-speaking people are tax-payers and they are a growing tax-paying population; a very important point to remember.

179. GT: That is a good point. I mean, the fact is, when it comes down to asking tax payers if they support these services, the overwhelming majority say no, including Hispanics.

180. C#9: Well, I’m actually Hispanic and I’m also very offended to tell the truth about the comparison between Greeks and Spanish-speaking people on your program. First of all, the comparison of the Greek Orthodox Church as a safety net for people who are Greek-speaking; people who are Spanish-speaking, I just want you to understand something, are mostly Catholic, and Catholics have many different cultures in the Church. Greek Orthodox are mainly Greek people and their Church. I just thought that was an incredibly ignorant comment when you came on the air.

181. GT: Well, let me just say this: the fact is that when it comes to the Greek community, about the only thing we have is the Greek Church to promote the culture but in the Hispanic community the fact is that there are all kinds of programs in the private sector. You’ve got LULAC and MALDEF and all these others and they’re having all these meetings. Sadly, LULAC has lost its moorings. Originally it made English the official language of the organisation and tried to teach people to speak English. And now many of the Hispanic ethnic groups are not helping people to learn to speak English or are so intent on providing a native language basis and I'm sad to say they're trying to do it through the public sector rather than the private.

182. C#9: I'm from Maryland and we have a big population growing in Baltimore and right now I have my degree in accounting and I'm actually thinking about going over there and trying to help out; and you know, I think some bilingual education I would support. My parents both were from Mexico and they had a real tough time and I would definitely support it and just listening to your program just makes me want to support, to get more involved again, with Spanish-speaking people.

183. FF: OK, Camille, thank you so much. Edward?

184. C#10: I wanted to say something. I'm Hispanic and one of the things that really rankles most Hispanic people about this official English issue is that is sounds a little bit like xenophobia.

185. GT: I have never been able to understand how people can accuse other people of xenophobia when we're saying that everybody should get along, that we should welcome people, that we should all be able to communicate.

186. C#10: I agree with you. I think we should all communicate, we should all get along and the way to do that is to, there's a different strategy you can use. If you want people to learn to speak English and to be able to communicate and talk to each other, to use it as the language of commerce, then the way to do this is to help people; to use your money, to use your resources, to use your influence to get people to have more language training programs and make that available instead of using the tack that you are.

187. GT: That is exactly our goal, to use those funds to help people to speak English. I keep saying that we've had bilingual education, and this transitional method in particular, for over 25 years and the drop-out rate for Hispanics is just as high as ever. I just don't see how anyone can defend a colossal failure like this. $12 billion dollars a year and we're just totally washing it down the drain. I mean, if people were really interested in helping people to speak English, they would be opposed to bilingual education. And in fact, the vast majority of Hispanics are opposed to bilingual education and they support official English.

188. C#11: How are you doing today. Listen, your host is right. Multiculturalism is extremely divisive. Arthur Schlessinger's big liberal group has even come out with a book saying that multiculturalism, multilingual society is divisive. It causes confusion. If somebody were to go to Italy and tell them that they (didn’t) want (ed) their child taught in Italian, they'd boot them out of the country. They'd boot them right out of the country! Our
language is English, our constitution is written in English, our common law is English. We are Anglo-Saxon, whether people like it or not. And one other point - there is more to being Greek than just Greek Catholics. There's Lebanese being Greek Catholics, there's Romanians being Greek Catholics. The Orthodox Church does not discriminate as to who can be a member.

192. GT: I hope that goes without saying.
193. C#11: It's the most divisive issue in the world. People with the same genetic background, different religions in Bosnia Herzegovina can't get along or speak the same language. It enslaves people. It enslaves them and keeps them from progress.
194. FF: Thank you very much. Mary? Mary, we have a short time remaining.
195. C#12: I wanted to say that I'm twelve years old and I was thinking that it was very good that we should stick to English instead of learning another language. My teacher is pressuring me to learn and instead of choosing another language I think that I should stick to my own.
196. GT: I appreciate your point. I think it's a good idea for us to know English and to stick together with English but it is also a good idea if you speak English to learn a foreign language. That's the other side of the coin. It's a good idea for you to pick one and to study it hard. It helps you with your English.
197. FF: Thank you very much. I hope you do well in school. I guess our time has run out. It's een interesting, George. Thank you for coming.
198. GT: It's been my pleasure. Thank you, Fred.
199. FF: George Tryfiates, Executive Director of English First. This is Fred Fiske. We'll do it all again next Saturday morning at eleven o'clock.
APPENDIX 7: TRANSCRIPT TWO: THE DIANNE REHM SHOW

Part One: Moderator, Proponent & Opponent

1. DR: Welcome back I’m Diane Rehm ++ efforts to restrict the use of languages other than English in the public realm seem to be gathering momentum. In a speech last week Senate majority leader and Presidential hopeful Bob Dole called for an end to most bilingual education programs and legislation has been proposed in both the House and Senate which would designate English as this country’s official language. Joining me in the studio to talk about English-only proposals Jim Lyons, he’s Executive Director of the National Association for Bilingual Education. On the phone is Republican Congressman Bill Emerson of Missouri the lead U.S. House sponsor of the legislation to make English the official language of the Federal government. Between now and the top of the hour join us 202 885 8850 or 800 433 8850. Congressman Emerson and Mr Lyons thanks for joining us.

2. JL: Thank you, Diane.

3. CE: Good to be with you this morning.

4. DR: Mr Emerson, if I may, why do you believe that Federal legislation on this issue is necessary at this point?

5. CE: Well we’re beginning to see fracturing in our society along the lines of language and my Bill, which is the Language of Government Act is, in my view, a gentle prod indicating that everyone in this country, citizens in particular, need to know English, because it’s the language of opportunity, it’s the door opener, it’s the binding language in the United States. And I think that’s a good reason, we have only to look to the north, our friends in Canada, and we see some very serious fracturing occurring up there, their dispute, their argument about this subject, has been going a lot longer than ours but this is an attempt to nip a potential problem in the bud and to open the economic doors better to everyone.

6. DR: Give me an idea of the specifics of the legislation you’re sponsoring.

7. BE: Declares English to be the official language of the Federal government, creates an affirmative obligation on the part of the government to enhance the role of English as that language, declares that every person in the United States is entitled to communicate with the Federal government in English, disallows Federal taxpayer funding of publications and forms and ceremonies, sponsored by the government, in languages other than English, provides that all monetary savings derived from enactment of the legislation would go toward teaching non English speaking immigrants the English language.

8. DR: So what does that mean for public education and the use of bilingual (inaudible).

9. BE: This is not the measure that is designed to reform the bilingual situation, there are other pieces of legislation tending to do that. Congressman Toby Roth of Wisconsin is the principal proponent in the movement to reform bilingual. I support his move to reform bilingual as it exists in this country, although I think he and I do have some different ideas about it. My Bill simply says that English will be the language of government.

10. DR: And when you say English will be the language of government that means in any official action on the part of the US government English would be the language used.

11. BE: It would be the language, that is correct, it would be the language used, by which citizens communicate with their government and their government communicates with them.

12. DR: But now isn’t that the case even now?

13. BE: That, there are exceptions now. There are, there are, certainly instances in which citizenship ceremonies have been held in English (sic), the IRS, at least on a trial basis, has been printing internal revenue forms in Spanish, and ah[...].

14. DR: [...]And that would come to an end?

15. BE: [...]that would come to an end. But let me hasten to add here that one of the reasons for that when you stop to think about it, once again the fundamental premise here, is that English is the language of unity in this country, this issue has been around a long time in many countries, we’re not seeking to interfere with anyone’s culture, speaking language in the home, none of that is part of our objective, but stop and think that there are, ballpark figure, 150 different languages spoken in this country, are we to make the services of government available in 150 different languages, there ultimately gets to be a cost involved. This, this, hasn’t been much of an issue until now but it has been exerting itself, the Spanish speaking, some elements of the Spanish speaking community, have been pressing to have the opportunity to communicate
with government in languages other than English, and as I say this, this, problem, as I see it, is in its incipient stages here in the United States, hasn’t progressed as far as it has in some other countries as a problem.

17. DR: Jim Lyons is the Executive Director of the National Association for Bilingual Education. What do you see as some of the principal arguments against Federal legislation establishing English as this country’s official language.

18. JL: Diane last week USA Today carried an editorial branding official English a phony solution in search of an imaginary problem. And that’s exactly what it is, I’m afraid it is a good deal worse but, we’ve existed for 219 years as a nation, we have survived a civil war that had nothing to do with language, we were victor, victorious in two world wars, the second world war was largely won in many respects, at least, the amount of deaths that, and casualties that were took were minimised because we were a multi-lingual country, we had native American code-talkers from the Navajo nation, Mohawk, we used bilingual Japanese-English speaking Americans even, even those that were interned in camps, we recruited them to help us win the war effort, bilingualism has made us strong, 95% of the American people speak English according to the US Census, it’s the language of choice for people throughout the world, it’s in no way threatened, so it is an imaginary problem but I am afraid it’s worse than a phony solution, it’s a very dangerous and disastrous solution, because official English effectively dishonours millions of Americans, Americans who have died to preserve this country, and it would cut millions of other Americans off from, from, from, their government...

19. DR: You talk about this country’s past history, is there any indication that immigrants coming to this country in the last, say, two or three decades, are less inclined to learn English than perhaps their predecessors?

20. JL: To the contrary, all of the data, both anecdotal and research based data, shows that immigrants coming to this country are more anxious to learn English than they’ve ever been before.

21. DR: What do you think is behind this push and certainly it’s not just Congressman Emerson, there are a great many, not only legislators but people throughout the country, who think this is a good idea. Where do you think the momentum is coming from?

22. JL: Well quite honestly the momentum is coming from a couple of organisations that would have as their entire purpose lobbying for this legislation; U.S. English and English First. Both of the organisations, I think, are attempting to, to, pander, to the fears that people in this country, because of large scale immigration, but in the process they’re harming Americans of, of, not just, who are immigrants, but Native Americans, you know this is a very big country, people in Alaska speak many languages other than English, we have 7 million Puerto Ricans, US citizens since 1917, whose first language is Spanish, many of these people would be effectively disconnected from government.

23. DR: Congressman Emerson, a backlash against immigration?

24. BE: Well, no I would say Jim Lyons there is making a rhetorical statement that isn’t founded in fact. You know calling us phonies because we believe there ‘s a problem here that needs to be corrected, I think that rhetoric needs to be dampened a little bit. There’s nothing in this proposal whatever that would interfere with anyone else’s culture or their use of another language. What we’re saying is that the official language of government shall be English. There are many people, many, particularly second generation Americans, who are strong in this movement to make English official, recalling how when their parents came here one of their first objects was to learn English and to insist that their children to learn English, because they saw it as the economic door-opener, the way to get ahead. So Mr Lyons apparently isn’t familiar with our legislation when he says its phony and that we’re going to hurt people who are bicultural, or multilingual, that, that isn’t true, we are going to get at, we’re not opposing the teaching of other languages. I strongly encourage my own children, who are of school age, to learn other languages, most especially Spanish, because I do believe it’s important that we be able to communicate in that language[ ...]

25. DR: Congressmen...

26. DR: Congressmen Emerson what percentage of our government’s official business is now, would you estimate, conducted in languages other than English?

27. BE: Very minimal. But as I indicated this is an attempt to nip a problem in its incipient stages. The IRS has printed internal revenue tax forms in Spanish, a judge in Arizona did hold a citizenship swearing in ceremony in Spanish, shouldn’t people who are, are becoming new citizens here, shouldn’t, shouldn’t they be spec., able to speak, shouldn’t they speak, the language of the country that they have adopted?

28. DR: If the legislation were to become law how would it be enforced?
29. BE: Well, that would, the government, the Federal government, would not communicate officially in languages other than English. The IRS wouldn’t be printing forms in Spanish and Federal judges wouldn’t be holding citizenship swearing in ceremonies [..]

30. DR: [...] Mr Lyons? [...] in languages other than English[..

31. JL: [...] well there’s more than that, the legislation has a private right of action, it’s sort of a lawyers welfare act allowing any American who feels that they are aggrieved by the government’s failure to enforce the new rights in the chapter including being entitled to communicate with government in English, which in no way seems threatened, we don’t have any instance in which somebody who because they speak English, have been denied facilities or services provided by the government. But more than that, it will impact people. We saw just two weeks ago where a judge in Texas, in a child custody matter, attempted to restrain a bilingual mother from speaking Spanish to her child [..]

32. DR: [...] What would happen in Puerto Rico for example, Mr Lyons?

33. JL: Well, Puerto Rico has two official languages, the dominant language however is Spanish. I think it would effectively...

34. BE: [...] They have official Spanish

35. JL: [...] they have an official Spanish and English, they’re bilingual, such as the State of Hawaii. Let me give you a very simple example. There are a number of exceptions to this English-only mandate [...] but there are none in the area of religion.

36. BE: [...] (inaudible) mixed up

37. JL: [...] there are none in the area of religion, there are none with respect to veterans [...affairs..

38. JL: [...] I’m not the English-only person. I’m the language of government sponsor

39. BE: Official English is English-only, but let me finish my point. Very simply, we have chaplains who conduct religious services for American military personnel and their families, in languages other than English. There is no exception in here for religion. Neither is there an exception in here for Native Americans[.....

40. DR: [...] Congressman Emerson?

41. BE: I would have no difficulty, no difficulty whatever, I think, I think there’s no exception in here for religion because basically the government per se does not get involved in religion[...if you want to talk about

42. JL: [...] the government pays military chaplains

43. BE: If you’re talking, talk about military chaplains it’s highly unlikely it seems to me that soldiers and sailors trained by the armed services of the United States would not be proficient in English and you know, I, once again, you know tell the taxpayers Mr Lyons that you think that the Federal government should make all of its services available in 150 different languages[...

44. JL: [...] I would never tell that Mr [...

45. BE: [...] it is very well established Mr Lyons that English [...

46. JL: [...] Representative Emerson I wouldn’t.

47. BE: [...] is the language of unity, it is a common, binding fact in this country but there are people attacking it as such [...

48. DR: [...] Let me ask what’s happening at the State level, Mr Lyons

49. JL: We’ve seen a number of States that have declared English their official language, the first one was Nebraska in 1920, this whole thing got started quite ironically in the First World War, with, with nativism, xenophobia, we were fighting Germany, it’s interesting because the Bill is probably unconstitutional as written, Nebraska in, in, at the same time that it made English its official language made it a crime for teachers to teach in a language other than English any child who hadn’t yet completed the 8th grade in Nebraska and that criminal law applied to teachers in both public and private schools. That law, that portion of the law was overturned by the Supreme Court in 1923.

50. DR: What about its Constitutionality, Congressman Emerson?

51. BE: Diane, I would like to say first of all that I, I, don’t think it’s unconstitutional I, as a matter of fact there are 20 States, Mr Lyons cites Nebraska and a law they passed back in the teens, fact of the matter is
there are now about 20 States that have official English and they’re coming along more rapidly, these I mean, in the decades of the 80s and 90s, of the twenty states that have official English most of them have passed it within that timeframe and not some previous timeframe in some other set of circumstances [...]

53. DR: [...]Congressman Bill E...
54. BE: [...]the Nebraska, Nebraska bill’s been on the books for a long time, but in the 80s and 90s, this measure has got increased support and momentum, let me also say that the leader, the founder of the modern movement, a person, a professor, a University president, a United States Senator, Sam Hayakawa, of Japanese extraction is the person who founded this U.S. English movement, and it is currently led by a Hispanic speaking bilingual, Mauro Mujica, of Chilean descent [...]

55. DR: [...]all right, Congressman Bi.
56. BE: [...]so this is not the xenophobic[..].
57. JL: [...]Diane it’s been...oravis..go ahead..

Part Two: Moderator, Guests & Callers

TURN SPEAKER UTTERANCE

58. DR: [...]Congressman Bill Emerson Republican of Missouri, your listening to the Diane Rehm Show. We’ve got a lot of callers waiting I want to get to the phones and you can join us 202 885 8850 or 800 433 8850. Let’s first go to Ronald your on the air.
59. CALL 1: OK yes. I am an African-American and I feel that English-only is dividing African-Americans and Hispanics. It’s a fake solution to a non-existing problem. Its straight out racist because first there was affirmative action now there’s English-only. So now you have African-Americans and Hispanics scraping the bottom of the barrel for crumbs where we should be getting together for a seat at the table.
60. DR: Allright. Thanks for your call. Congressman Emerson?
61. BE: That’s a point of view I don’t exactly understand how African Americans and Hispanics are being divided I think they should be uniting in this country under the umbrella of English. How African Americans and their languages and Hispanics are in conflict on account of language I don’t know I think they’d both be better served if, in this country, they became proficient in English.
62. DR: All right and let’s go to Oakdon, Virginia, Charles your on the air.
63. CALL 2: Hello. I wanted to just make one comment... can you hear me?
64. DR: Sure.
65. CALL 2: I just wanted make one comment. The United States is a sovereign nation and I know that Puerto Rico is a kind of an annex of the United States and Spanish is their primary language there. But the United States is a sovereign nation we are not an annex to any of the nations of the world, we welcome the nations of the world to come here, you know, most of us come from immigrant backgrounds, and our ancestors or forfathers learned English, if they didn’t speak it when they got here. And that’s the comment I wanted to make, you know, we’re not an annex and English is the primary language and should remain so.
66. DR: Mr Lyons.
67. JL: Of course, we’re not an annex. However, by having an official language we would be saying to many, many, many, and millions of Americans, that somehow or another you're second class, because your native language is not the official language of the United States. This is bad for the future as well, you know where does this lead, Diane, language today, will it be dialect tomorrow, is it an aspect of culture we want to regulate by the government? How does this relate to our need to communicate with the world? How does it relate to matters even like the internet? Will it be English-only on the internet?
68. DR: Well, and now its that much more likely to become part of the public debate with Senator Bob Dole declaring that he was interested in seeing English become the official language of the US. Let’s go to Berian Spring Michigan. Dennis your on the air.
69. CALL 3: Hello.
70. DR: Hi.
71. CALL 3: I’ve been following this comment with real interest for the simple reason that when we moved to Michigan we actually moved here from Montreal, Quebec. And it was there for example during the 1970s that we were right in the middle of the French-English situation, which has transpired, and which still is a very definite issue, in fact I believe today they’re announcing, the the separatist government, their election for separation, and so it is a very definite issue, but my point that I want to make is that I think that those that are concerned about English-only really have fears that are not founded. I am a supporter of English-only
because I have seen the difficulties that have transpired when you do not have anything and I believe that part of the problem which brought this to a head by the former Senator Hayakawa was what he was seeing happening in Canada and such [...]

72. DR: [allright]
73. CALL 3: [... and I think that it is very important that we promote other languages, and I have done with my own two daughters who were born there, they’re fluent in French[...]
74. DR: [...Dennis I am afraid that we are almost out of time and I do want to let our guests respond and I appreciate your call[......]
75. JL: [..yes Dianne]
76. DR: [...Mr Lyons]
77. JL: [... Quebec is perfect example of what happens when you do have an official language, the official language of Quebec is French. There is now a bureaucracy in the French Quebec government to ensure that English is no way a threat, measuring the signs to whether French words are larger than English words. Massive exodus of business out of Quebec because of it as well.
78. DR: Congressman Emerson, how important do you expect this issue to be in the ‘96 elections?
79. BE: I think it will be an important elect., an important issue, polling data going back over a long period of time shows that overwhelming majority of Americans believe that this is a correct approach, as I said approximately 20 legislatures, somewhere 18, 19, 20, I’m not sure what all the results are from this year’s activity in legislatures but about 20 states have official English. Bottom line here we’re all concerned about jobs and job opportunities and economic prosperity. English is the economic door opener here, Mr Lyons’ comments to the contrary notwithstanding there is reams, there are reams, of data available that show that people who are not proficient in English have far less chance to succeed economically than those who do.
80. DR: Congressman Bill Emerson, Republican of Missouri and Jim Lyons Executive Director of the National Association for Bilingual Education. Thank you both so much for joining me.
APPENDIX 8: TRANSCRIPT THREE: IT IS YOUR BUSINESS

Moderator, Republicans, Democrats, Chamber Of Commerce

TURN | SPEAKER | UTTERANCE

1. **ANN.** "It's Your Business" the national debate on issues affecting you. Today, English: making it official. Should English be made the official language? In today's debate, Representative Esteban Torres, Democrat-California, member, House Appropriations Committee.

2. **ET:** I think not. English is already the language of the United States. Everybody speaks English. Some people coming to this country don't, but they want to learn it.

3. **ANN:** Representative Toby Roth, Republican-Wisconsin, Chairman., Congressional English Language Task Force.

4. **TR:** Yes. We Americans are people from every corner of the globe, but we are one nation, one people. Why? Because we have a wonderful commonality called the English language. We're losing that today. It's hurting us economically and hurting us as a nation.

5. **ANN:** Representative Ed Pastor, Democrat Arizona, chairman, Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

6. **EP:** Because the Federal government and state and local governments conduct their business in English, English is the official language. And if it's not broke, don't fix it.

7. **ANN:** Dr. Richard Lesher, President, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

8. **RL:** English is the common thread that bonds us together. We should do whatever we can to make that bond stronger.

9. **ANN:** And now your moderator, Meryl Comer.

10. **MOD.** Welcome. America as the melting pot for generations of immigrants looking to improve their quality of life is getting a bit tongue-tied. With close to 325 different languages spoken here, there is concern in some quarters that English is not getting the respect it deserves. Correspondent Dan Kush reports on immigration trends and the move to make English the official language.

11. Mr Kush (Via Tape): 1.2 million new immigrants enter the United States every year. Over 300,000 are illegal immigrants. The vast majority of immigrants come from Mexico. Other top countries of origin for immigrants include Haiti, the Philippines, Vietnam, and the countries that make up the former Soviet Union. Roughly 9 percent of Americans were born in other countries. Approximately 32 million people within our borders speak a language other than English.

The campaign to make English our official language is gaining public support and picking up support in Congress. A recent U.S. News & World Report poll indicates that 73 percent of Americans believe English should be the official language. Bills to achieve this goal have the support of over one-third of Congress, including House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole.

Reporting for "It's Your Business," I'm Dan Kush.

12. **MOD.** Congressman Roth, the GOP agenda is less government regulation. Why the need to make English official?

13. **TR:** The reason we have to make English our official language is because America today is splitting up into groups, and if we want to keep a united nation, then we have to have one language, one commonality, one common language. I think the lesson of Quebec is--can be demonstrated here. I was on a talk show in Canada where one of the people called in and said, you know, here in Canada we have one Quebec, but in the United States you have many little Quebecks. And we do have 190 different languages here in this country, and I think it's great for people to keep their culture and their native language. But we have to have one commonality, one thread that binds us all together, and I think the English language gives us that. this issue?

14. **MOD.** Congressman Torres, how do you see

15. **ET:** I think it's a rather ludicrous issue. It's a waste of taxpayers' money. Certainly we are all for English. We speak English; it is the language of our nation. It is used for every matter of business, education, the courts. As you have heard, 94 percent of the populace of the United States speaks English. Why do we need to engage in this nonsense endeavour to make something official that already is?

16. **RL:** Let me answer that.

17. **ET:** Yes.

18. **RL:** You talk about a waste of money. It's a waste of money when the IRS sends out forms, 500,000 of them, in two languages, and they come back in English. It's a waste of time. That's what we're talking about.
We're requiring the government at all levels to print these forms in other languages other than English. I would argue that the immigrant ought to learn English even before he comes here.

19. MOD. Congressman Torres?

20. ET: Let me answer that. I think that the statistic is something like 0.06 of 1 percent of all the documents that this nation prints in another language-0.06 of 1 percent. Now, that is not a lot of money. In fact, if it's for taxpayers, I think that’s money well spent

21. RL: Well, if you don't want forms--

22. MOD. Congressman Torres--I'm sorry,

23. EP: You know, it's interesting because you have to consider, first of all, that you have countries or Commonwealths like Puerto Rico who speak Spanish, yet they're Americans. And in many cases, it's the paperwork that has to go to some of these Commonwealths who not only speak English but also other languages that you make it easier for them to deliver—to get a service delivered.

Out of 400,000 publications that we publish in this country by the Federal government, 260 are in another language. And so you say waste of money? Well, I mean, it's so small that it doesn't make a difference.

24. RL: Well, if it's 80 small, why don’t we just eliminate it? You're making my argument for//

25. EP: Well, I'm making an argument. There are Americans in this country who need to get a service from this government, and it's easier-to deliver that service in many cases because of Social Security//

26. RL: The point I'm making is that the forms go out in Spanish, they're not used by the Hispanic speaking community because/

27. EP: How can you verify that?

28. RL: The IRS tells you that.

29. MOD. Congressman Roth, let me ask you a question. Let's push the implication rather than just government forms. Let’s move to part of your Bill which would impact on ballots.

30. TR: Yes.

31. MOD. What are the implications if you don't add a number of languages on the ballot?

32. TR: Well, first of all, I think for people to cast an informed ballot, I think they have to be able to take part in the debate and so on and see what the issues are. And I do feel that it's not too much to ask people in this country to vote in the English language.

As far as money is concerned, in L.A. we spent almost a million dollars for multi-ballots. You have seven different ballots in L.A. I think that's bad for the country. I think that, for example, in bilingual education where you take youngsters, you do not teach them in the English language but in another language, they're never going to be able to climb the ladder of opportunity because English is the language of opportunity. This goes deeper than just money. I'm interested in this because--not because of money. It costs us billions of dollars, $12 billion for bilingual education. But I am doing this because I feel I want to keep this one nation, one people, and for that we need a common language.

33. MOD. Congressman Pastor, stick with the ballot issue, if you will, please.

34. EP: Sure, I'll stick with the ballot issue. We have, in the area I represent, Native Americans, the first Americans--Navajos, Hopis, Apaches, et cetera--and under the circumstances that we have them under, they have to go to school on a reservation, and sometimes they don't have the opportunity to learn English well. And in many cases, in order that these citizens will be able to participate in this democracy and they can contribute to this democracy in determining who they're going to vote for, it's easier for them to have the ballot in another language. And in many cases, you have older immigrants who are now in this country who speak English, but it's comfortable for them to speak in Spanish.

So, you know, there are circumstances in which you have Americans--Americans--we want them to participate, that it's easier for them to participate if we have a ballot in the language that they feel comfortable with.

35. MOD. All right. When we continue we'll look at if getting a good job is dependent on reading and writing English, what's happening in our schools? Stay with us.

36. ANN: "It's Your Business n is being brought to you by Charles Schwab, helping investors help themselves. We'll be right back with more on making English official.

(Commercial break)

37. MOD. By current statistics, one-third of the children in urban public schools today speak a foreign language instead of English to communicate. Congressman Torres, the '68 Bilingual Education Act was to ensure minority-language-speaking children be schooled in English as a first step toward educational and economic opportunity.

38. ET: That's correct.
39. MOD. Now, is it working?
40. ET: It's a tool that's being designed to transition foreign-speaking students into English as the primary language.
41. MOD. That's its goal, but is it working?
42. ET: It is working, yes. I know it's working. I come from an area where I see it working. This is not an issue of disuniting. This is--this country is united. I take issue with Quebec. Mr Roth, it's not language that drives us apart. We need the ideals of democracy and tolerance and freedom. These are the ideals that keep us together. We are united.
43. TR: It's language that's driving the Quebec and the Canadian system--country apart.
44. ET: But we're not Quebec.
45. TR: And as far as bilingual education, it is not working. That's why the largest dropout America is in bilingual education, because as these kids get older, they become very self-conscious. They do not have the skills in English that they should have been taught-
46. ET: //I beg to differ with you, Mr. Roth.
47. TR: -and that's why my strongest supporters-
48. ET: //This is the only tool in which you can get-
49. TR: //are the new Americans.
50. ET: //children who have not had the opportunity to transition into the language. It's going to make them competitive in this country and abroad. And English is the language.
51. MOD. Congressman Pastor?
52. EP: Well, I think some of the problems that English--bilingualism is a teaching method in which you take a child from the point they're at and the objective is to teach English, as you mentioned. But the problem has been in many cases that in school districts that have attempted it, they don't have the resources. First of all, they don't have the teachers who are bilingual, and then they don't have the resources. But where you do have the resources, you do have the teachers, and the administration and the board supports that, it's successful.
53. MOD. Congressman Roth, the real debate is whether or not you have a $10 billion bureaucracy in place perpetuating a system that may or may not work and get these young people assimilated so that they can enjoy economic opportunity.
54. TR: The money is important, but not nearly as important as what's happening to these young people. You want these young people to come in and to be able to climb the ladder of opportunity like every American. And that's why the new Americans are my strongest backers, because these parents come to me, like Jose Fabula and others, who say, yes, the language of opportunity in America is English and we want our youngsters to have a good foundation of the English language.
55. EP: Nobody denies that. We all want to learn English. In fact, if you look at statistics today, they'll show that every immigrant that comes in knows how important it is to learn English. And so to say that they don't want to learn English is wrong. What happens to this child who is in this country, cannot speak English, and is not afforded the opportunity by a bilingual education to go in the language that he or she speaks well and learns English, what happens to that child, the self-worth of that child, when basically they're isolated from the other classmates?
56. RL: Ed, you know it's not the kids.
57. EP: Oh, it's not the kids?
The kids learn languages much easier than older people, as you said a moment ago when you were talking about the Indian example.

"If you teach them science and other subjects in their native language, they are not going to learn English as fast. So the debate is immersion in English, which has always been our tradition. We're getting away from that. And so you allow them to continue to learn in their native language, they don't get English, and they are handicapped because of it.

How can you say immersion is successful?

Let me just ask you, Congressman, can schools promote English to students and still respect cultural diversity?

Well, they do so now. I mean, I don't know where this notion comes that we're not speaking English and that somehow we're off into another language. We are speaking English in schools. As I said, again, this detracts from this whole issue. Why do we need to make English official when it's already the language of this nation?

How can you say immersion is successful?

We have to do that because one out of seven Americans, according to our statistics, is not going to be speaking English in just five years. And we/

I don't believe that, Mr. Roth.

And all over the world, experience has been that you can--we are people from every corner of the globe, every religious, every cultural, every ethnic background, but we are one nation because we've had this wonderful commonality until 1968, until the liberals brought on/

That is not true.

/\bilingual education. We had immersion until that time.

The whole World Net is designed-- the World Net, the Internet, is designed to be in accordance with the 26-letter alphabet of this nation. The whole world is going to be speaking English in the next five years/

(Simultaneous conversation)

We are going to take a break and continue our discussion in just a moment. Stay with us.

"It's Your Business" will be back after these messages.

In a U.S. News and World Report poll of 1,000 registered voters, 73 percent of Americans felt English should be the official language. But that's not all. As a reaction to growing illegal immigration, there is support for tighter limits on legal immigration. The Senate passed bill cuts legal immigration by one-third and reduces slots for skilled workers. Congressman Pastor, is there a sense that there's something else going on besides the debate of whether English should be the official language?

Well, I think so. If you look at what happened in California when English-only--that's where it started, and then the evolution from English-only to Proposition 187, and now the latest proposition deals with--dealing with affirmative action, I think that in California you basically were--where you probably have the largest number of immigration, the people now resent people who they consider aren't American because they're of different colour or of different language.

Well, let's be very candid. Is there concern, as the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus/

//We are concerned//

//that the target is Hispanics and Orientals? What?\n
It's racism.

We would argue that immersion and facility with English will tend to minimise that discrimination. We would urge that fast tracking people to learn the English language is the best for all people.

Well, that's an interesting comment, because here you've had--here you've had Black Americans who've learned English and probably is the only language they speak, and yet they feel in great numbers the predominance of prejudice.

I'm not saying/

And so I don't think English-- because we speak another language other than English/

I think we're getting off the/

//You missed the point entirely. Let me just make a point, Toby. Okay.

The fact is learning English will not eliminate discrimination. That's not what I said. But if you look at the discrimination against Hispanics today that can't get a job because they can't speak English, that's the
kind of discrimination you can end. So I would argue that it's there in black and white, the dollars earned by people. And if you look at people who don't speak English, they don't make any money.

(Simultaneous conversation)

96. MOD. Let me give you some numbers, Congressman Torres. A refugee speaking no English may make about $750 a year as opposed to someone fluent who will bring in about $27,400.
97. ET: Yes.
98. RL: That's the point.
99. ET: The point is that you need English to be competitive in this society.
100. RL: We're all saying the same thing.
101. ET: And there's no question we need English. But oftentimes the jobs that are available in this country to people that are non-English-speaking are the $700 jobs, the menial labor jobs, and people take them because they don't have the language proficiency. So we want to teach them/
102. TR: //I must insist
103. MOD. /Congressman Roth?
104. TR: I must insist on putting in a word here edgewise. You know, Ernesto Ortiz, a foreman in South Texas, put it best. He said, 'They teach my kids Spanish in school so they can become busboys and bellhops. I try to teach them English at home so they can become doctors and lawyers.' You see, he understands better than all of us in Congress that the language of opportunity/
105. EP: //No, that's not true//
106. TR: //The language of opportunity//
107. EP: //We all//
108. ET: //I don't know where Mr. Ortiz//
109. TR: //And the other thing that's//
110. MOD. /Just a moment. One at a time. Let Mr. Roth finish.
111. TR: ... important, I want to unite people. What divides people all too often is language. We want to keep one United States of America. We don't want to go through what Canada's going through. And for that we need the common language/
112. ET: It's not analogous to Canada. It's not analogous to the Balkans/
113. MOD. //Congressman Pastor?
114. ET: //as you've often argued.
115. EP: We all agree in that all of us want to learn English. Any immigrant who comes over in this country, including Mr. Sanchez, realises that in order to get ahead, you have to learn English. And, I mean/
116. MOD. All right. But on/
117. EP: //right now we don't have enough//
118. MOD. //why not support English as an official language?
119. EP: //Well, you don't need--because it's not broke. Everybody knows English. Now, once you make it an official language, that means that government officials in providing a service cannot use a language other than English. And what happens, as the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has found in the Arizona English-only, that this is against the Constitution.
120. MOD. All right. Let me give you-- Congressman Roth? the Constitution.
121. TR: It doesn't say that at all.
122. EP: Yes, it does.
123. TR: No, it doesn't say that at all.
124. EP: The Ninth Circuit said it's against
125. TR: Basically what it says is that when you vote and when you work with government forms/
126. EP: //No, no. We're talking about//
127. TR: //Please, just let me finish. You do it in the English language. Why don't we take the//
128. EP: //You have law enforcement--you have law enforcement//
129. TR: //Why don't we take the $12 billion, Ed, that we spend on bilingual education, which keeps kids back, why don't we take that and increase that in English, teaching//
130. EP: In your bill, in your Bill you say that English will be the official language/
131. TR: //Yes//
EP: to conduct business.
TR: That's right.
EP: And that's the same language that Arizona has in its English-only. It's gone to the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit says it's unconstitutional.
MOD: Let me//
EP: //It says it's unconstitutional because a public service cannot--a public servant cannot provide a service because, due to enforcement, it will chill providing that service in a language other than English. And so it causes problems because then people will not get a service. I as an elected official who wants to provide a service to someone who is non-English-speaking won't be able to do it because then somebody can bring a suit against me.
TR: That's incorrect.
ET: That's in your bill, Mr. Roth.
TR: No, it's not.
EP: That is in your bill.
TR: No, it's not. That's a misrepresentation of the bill. All my bill says is when you vote, when you work with government forms, you do it in the English language. It doesn't say that you can't speak another language. I speak other//
EP: //Your Bill says//
TR: I speak other than the English language. My kids do. That's a//
EP: //Your bill//
TR: //That's a//
EP: //Your Bill is the same as the Arizona//
MOD: All right. Unfortunately, we're out of time. I'll be back with a summary question. Stay with us.

(Commercial break)

MOD: Just to demonstrate how far accommodation goes, California offers driver's license exams in 35 different languages; New York, 23; Rhode Island, 19. Right now 21 states already have English-only laws on the books. So, by way of summary, what would happen if English is declared the official language? Congressman Torres.
ET: I think it would make it costly because we'd have citizens not being able to read safety signs and we'd have health problems. It would make the U.S. a less competitive nation. We'd be contributing to the dumbing of America, really. Already we're a country that needs--we speak English already. Why do we need this law?
MOD: Thank you. Dr Lesher.
RL: Just the opposite. We all agree that people would be better off the sooner they speak English, and this Bill would move us in that direction.
MOD: Congressman Pastor?
EP: It's unconstitutional because it says that governments can transact their business only in English, and what will happen is that it will stifle public employees.
MOD: Congressman Roth.
TR: When we make English our official language, we're going to keep the United States of America the United States of America. America is breaking up into groups, and we can't allow that to continue.
MOD: Thank you so much. That's the last word. Join us next week when we confront the issues that are your business. I'm Meryl Comer. Hope you'll join us then.
ANN: "It's Your Business" has been sponsored in part by Charles Schwab, helping investors help themselves. This program comes to you from Washington, D.C. If you would like to comment on today's program, write to "It's Your Business," 1615 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20062. For a transcript of today's debate, send $3 to the same address and ask for the official English program. For a videotape of the program, send a cheque or money order for $19.95. "It's Your Business" is a production of BizNet, the American Business Network.
Sometime in the 1960s, we were told that since all people and cultures were equal, it was inappropriate for middle-class American to impose the English language on poor people and people from other cultures. The imposition of this racist, colonial way of speaking on young people of other ethnic groups would deprive them of their cultural roots.

There are two problems with this argument. First, at a personal level, it is difficult for a poor person or an immigrant to get anywhere in this country without learning English. There are nearly two hundred different languages spoken in America (sixty alone in one school in my congressional district). Yet nearly all our business, politics, education, and commerce is conducted in English. It’s just plain easier to have one standard language than a dozen. Even a country like India, which has hundreds of languages and local dialects, has adopted English as the language of commerce and education. It is liberating when people can understand one another. (p 159)

A generation ago, African Americans were being held back by racial segregation, much of it officially sanctioned by the government. Then the moment of liberation came. Tragically, it was at that very moment that the educational establishment decided that standard English was no longer necessary and that grammar and spelling skills could be ignored. While this has had a gradual corrosive effect on middle-class students (virtually every employer, including Congress, can tell horror stories about trying to find college graduates who can write effectively), it has been devastating to poor African Americans and their ability to get good jobs.

Learning a language is hard work. Being able to write clearly, converse fluently, and read with comprehension—these are difficult skills that virtually every student (including me) would have liked to avoid. But if they are not learned in childhood, it becomes much more difficult to do so when you are an adult.

When poor children are told that practicing basketball is better than practicing English, they are more than willing to take this advice. Only in later years will they discover that they have literally dribbled away their opportunities for happiness and a good job. If they belong to a gang that ridicules standard English, they may be marked as strange or uppity for speaking well. If no one at home can spell or use grammar correctly, the difficulties are much worse.

The final result is an angry young man who feels that violence is the only way he can express himself, or a young girl who thinks that the only great accomplishment she can achieve in life is to have a baby. Many of the twelve- and thirteen-year olds now filling our maternity wards cannot read their own children’s birth certificates.

The problem is even more acute among first-generation immigrants and their children. Historically, emigrating to America was an exhausting but exhilarating experience. The millions of immigrants who came through Ellis Island hoped to find happiness and give their children a better life, but it was (p 160) hard work. The new land was a school of hard knocks that compelled every immigrant family to immerse itself in the process of becoming American.

According to the theory of the melting pot, if people had wanted to remain in their old culture, they could have done so without coming to America. Immigrating itself was a reaching out for a new and better future. It expressed a willingness to learn, grow, and change in the pursuit of a better life. It was not uncommon for people to take two or three jobs to make ends meet. People often lived in crowded and unhealthy circumstances. Yet people kept coming to America because the sense of opportunity outweighed the hardship.

Today the counterculture left and its allies profess to smooth the path for immigrants by setting up bilingual education programs, making it possible for children to continue in their own language. In fact, they have actually made it more difficult. Bilingual education slows down and confuses people in their pursuit of new ways of thinking. It fosters the expectation of a duality that is simply not an accurate portrayal of America.

Immigrants need to make a sharp psychological break with the past, immersing themselves in the culture and economic system that is going to be their home. Every time students are told they can avoid learning their new native language (which will be the language of their children and grandchildren), they are risking their future by clinging to the past.
There are also practical problems. With over two hundred languages spoken in the United States, it is physically impossible to set up bilingual education for each one. No school system could possibly afford it. In addition, educators and professionals who make their living running these programs often become the biggest opponents for letting these people move into the mainstream. Sadly, there are some ethnic leaders who prefer bilingualism because it keeps their voters and supporters isolated from the rest of America, ghettoized into groups more easily manipulated for political purposes often by self-appointed leaders. (p 161)

By time-honored tradition, new American immigrants have joined various friendship societies and fraternal organizations that help maintain the holidays, customs, and cuisines of their ancestral homes. The more immigrants assimilate to America, the more they often want to renew social and fraternal ties with “the old country”. We all remember and celebrate our past—but we remain aware that it is the past. We can all honor our racial or cultural identities without assuming this fact alone will inevitably determine all our ideas and our politics. Maintaining one’s special identity is perfectly compatible with assimilation into American civilization—indeed is a characteristic of it.

The new multiculturalism takes a much more radical approach. Bilingualism keeps people actively tied to their old language and habits and maximizes the cost of the transition to becoming American. As a result, poor Americans and first-generation immigrant children have suffered pain and confusion.

Yet the personal problems caused by bilingualism are overshadowed by the ultimate challenge they pose to American society. America can absorb an amazing number of people from an astonishing range of backgrounds if our goal is assimilation. If people are being encouraged to resist assimilation, the very fabric of American society will eventually break down.

Every generation has two waves of immigrants. One is geographic—we call them “immigrants” The other is temporal—we call them “children”. A civilization is only one generation deep and can be lost in a very short time. Insisting that each new generation be assimilated is the sine qua non of our survival.

The only viable alternative for the American underclass is American civilization. Without English as the common language, there is no such civilization. (p 162)

Gingrich, N. 1995 English as the American Language (Chapter 15 pp159-162)
To Renew America. New York: Harper Collins
Appendix 10: The Interview Data Organised By Theme

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

EXCERPT 1:1
JLB: ……How did you, personally, become interested in this question? What was it that motivated or stimulated you to be interested in legislation on English?
R2: Probably, coming from New York was one. Even though my grandparents were Irish they didn’t have any language problems. We grew up in New York City where a lot of kids were Italian, Jewish, Polish. And I remember them going through the process of their parents learning English and their grandparents learning English. And I am 51 years old so there was no bilingual education when I was growing up and then in the last 25 years with the growth of bilingual language in New York, especially … it gave me reason to doubt over the years … the effect of it…because it struck me that it was not encouraging people to learn, (it was reducing the) interest to break into the mainstream, it was giving them a false security, a mirage, and it was keeping them in their own physical ghetto and intellectual ghetto.
JLB: The personal observation of the-
R2: …that’s how I started and then obviously from that I started reading more. And then interestingly I went to Israel in 1993 and I went to an absorption centre where they have Jews coming from all over the world - Russia, the former Yugoslavia, black Jews from Ethiopia - and they all have to learn Hebrew. They go through the absorption school in the absorption centre and it obviously works there. But also, from talking to people, (bilingual education) just struck me as an experiment that has not worked and there are also different surveys that have come out. There are always different surveys for each side of the issue. There is one in New York City which indicated that kids who got no bilingual help at all did better than those who had bilingual education. It also just struck me that there comes a time when common sense has to apply and in this country for the first 180 years we didn’t have bilingual education, and for the most part the system worked, people learned to speak English. People were able to break into the American mainstream and were maintaining their own cultures and national identity, the glue that bound us together was the common language…

EXCERPT 1:2
L5: Well, (this issue) came to us mainly because of my position but it also drew our attention because it was exactly the same people, the same organisation, that was moving towards very restrictive immigration policy who would then just turn around and show another face to the public and also had another organisation that promoted official language. So we saw it from the very beginning as clearly an anti-Hispanic, anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic agenda by a very mean-spirited group of individuals.
JLB: How does it become anti-Catholic?
L5: The individuals behind this had written an internal memorandum citing the close correlation between being Hispanic and being Catholic and therefore having a propensity to have more children and therefore having a greater and different birth rate and therefore threatening the culture and the ethnic make-up of this country.
L4: And threatening the separation between the church and state.

EXCERPT 1:3
JLB: What has been the incident or the issue or the information that has stimulated you personally to become committed to this?
S1: I thought it was English. I never dreamed ten years ago that English was not the official language somewhere. But it is just by custom. What we want to do is to make it by law. It is a statement. First, it would be symbolic in that it is in a statement; but if it were the law of the land then it was also be more than symbolic. It would mean that if people would come to America to do well, to assimilate, whatever their ethnic stock, and for their children to do well, they’re going to have to learn English. And that has been the message before, and I think that should be a stronger message in the future.
JLB: Do you think that message has been somewhat attenuated or lost in recent years?
S1: Well, there hasn’t been any need for it until probably the last twenty years. We have never had, not in modern times, such a massive influx of immigrants and some of us see a time - not now, but twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years from now - where America could fracture along the lines of language. It happens everywhere in the world and we want to prohibit that from happening, we want to prevent a problem from happening.

EXCERPT 1:4
JLB: Do you think that in America’s economic dealing with China, Japan, and so on, that there ought to be an explicit national policy to develop a population of people who are proficient in languages of economic significance?
S1: Oh, absolutely! We’re going to have that anyway. That has nothing to do with what we’re talking about. There are two different things here and I think you ought to recognise that. Maybe you don’t. Maybe you don’t want to. What I am saying, and this is the movement, and a lot of the immigrants, and the head of American English - have you talked to him?
JLB: I’m going to next week.
S1: You ought to talk to him. He comes from Chile! He’s an architect. His language is Spanish. I think he speaks several languages but he’ll tell you in his own words why he believes that English, as the official language of the United States, is important not only to his children and to the new immigrants but to the ones who will come down the road. He’s been there. He came here. He can say it better than I can.
JLB: The research evidence is that 95% of the population (of the US) speaks English and the overwhelming majority of immigrants want their children, as a high priority, to be proficient in standard English; very quickly. So, where has this problem emerged from? If the immigrants themselves are committed to English, if you and the education system are generally committed to English - why is there a concern?
S1: I told you earlier. I told you ... you remember, about ten minutes ago I told you about how many millions of newly arrived immigrants, not from England, from all over the world had come to the US in the last twenty years and people are concerned about the erosion of English as the spoken language here.
JLB: But the overwhelming majority of those people moved to English.
S1: That’s good, so they should be for my Bill.
JLB: I see.
S1: See, if they’re not for my Bill, you wonder why. Why aren’t they for it?

EXCERPT 1:5
S1: What are you? Are you English descent?
JLB: I’m an Australian but I’m of Italian descent.
S1: We have a lot of Italian Americans in this country and most of them speak English and a lot of them - we haven’t had a lot of Italian immigrants in recent years - made it a point for their children to learn English. They don’t teach in Italian.
JLB: In the past the economy was such that you didn’t need a high level of schooling to-
S1: //that has nothing to do with what we’re talking about. What I told you earlier when you asked the question about would it be good ... or something to that effect ... about the international trade and everything ... a lot of my people speak many languages, and the answer is absolutely yes - but that has nothing to do with whether or not English is the official language of the United States of America. I think we should promote foreign languages but the first language we should promote is English, not anything secondary, not anything on a third basis, but English.
JLB: You’re from Alabama. Does Alabama have an official English-
S1: //yes, they passed one. They passed a law or whatever it is recently. So yeah ... a lot of States have.
JLB: I imagine that given the Olympic Games are in-
S1: //Georgia.
JLB: //in Georgia-
S1: //no, no, no. but you’re missing the point-
JLB: //No, no, I’m-
S1: //yes, you are. Let me tell you, let me just argue. You’re trying to equate the speaking of language to not designating English as the official language of the United States. It would be wonderful if you have five children and they could speak four languages. What would they be? Spanish? Chinese? Japanese? German, maybe? And English. But what we’re saying is that it’s great to do that. But let’s put English first as the official language in the United States.
JLB: I understand that point and I have accepted that. I was just trying to see whether, in actual practice ... in schools and in the community...the fact that many immigrants themselves move very quickly to English, they interpret...the message...from the official English Bill is a punitive one, one that is indicating that they don’t belong to the society. Because they are already making efforts to learn English and so they are asking - why is this being done? So, that is the question that I was asking.
S1: That’s why we’re doing it - to make sure that English remains the paramount language of America. Always. And because that is the glue that has held us all together although we come from different immigrant stock.

EXCERPT 1:6
JLB: Does that then mean that it is possible in your view to be a bilingual American (speaking English and any other language) ++ that it is possible to conceptualise Americanness in this way but not Americanness as monolingual, non-English speaking-
L1: // (inaudible) see, and that’s what this is really all about. It isn’t about bilingualism (although I have my problems with official bilingual policies; I think they are ultimately divisive) but it isn’t about bilingualism of individuals, that isn’t the problem. The problem, in my view, is monolingualism. [It is] Monolingualism in non-English languages that I worry about … ++ I don’t worry at all about the Spanish bilingual who speaks English as well. What I worry about is the Spanish speakers, and other speakers, but it is mostly Spanish speakers, who are being deprived of becoming bilingual, of learning English.

EXCERPT 1:7
L3: The great majority of the people in this country want to learn English. It is not a problem. That is not the problem. The problem is that we’re slowing down their learning and their assimilation by trying to do things for them that they do not need.
JLB: Why is it necessary? … the people who disagree with the campaign that your organisation is putting forward say-
L3: //we have 86% approval. There aren’t many people that disagree.
JLB: Yes, but the people who do disagree say, and they quote…USA Today which said that official English is a “phony solution to a non-existent problem” and-
L3: //but it is not a problem, we’re not talking about a problem, we’re talking about a concept, we’re talking about an idea.

EXCERPT 1:8
JLB: Do you agree that the overwhelming majority of immigrants-
L3: //the great majority of immigrants are in agreement that this is an English speaking country and that they need to learn the language and 81% of the immigrants agreed with us that English should be the official language. The problem is the self-appointed protectors of the minorities, with [prominent legislative opponent of official English] who thinks there is a problem with that.
JLB: What do you think? Why is he doing that?
L3: Because he wants to be elected by his so-called people that he is trying to protect. There is nothing to protect. We’re not hurting, in any way, the minorities. On the other hand we want to help the minorities. We want to save all the money that the government, about $25 million dollars a year, is using by functioning in many languages. We want that money to be channelled towards teaching English to immigrants. You know, if you immigrate to Israel, one of the first things you have to do is go to a school that will teach you Hebrew otherwise you can’t work anywhere.

EXCERPT 1:9
R1: Ah, well I feel that language is a great unifying force. It can also be a tremendous impediment to … unification, and set people against people and population in the world. We have people from every corner of the globe; every religious, every linguistic, every cultural background. But we are one nation, one people. Why? Because we have this wonderful commonality called the English language [inaudible] become part of what we call out ‘melting pot’. We’re all Americans and we have this wonderful commonality, this common bond - the English language. And ever since 1620 when our pilgrim fathers landed here it has served us very well but in recent times, especially since 1968, with this Great Society program where we started this multiculturalism approach, things have been completely different. America is breaking up into linguistic groups and I think that is very bad for our country. So I have introduced this legislation which basically is this: when you are naturalised ++ it is done in the English language, when you vote ++ it is done with an English ballot, when you work in the government ++ it is done in the English language. Now, if people want to keep their culture or their church group or whatever it might be. God love ‘em. ‘Go ahead and do it’. I’ve got three youngsters, they all take
foreign languages. We want our youngsters and our people to be proficient in other than just the English language but the key issue is that all Americans should be proficient in the English language so that they can climb the ladder of opportunity. Also, and even more importantly, or just as importantly, so that we can remain one nation, one people, and for that we need one common language.

EXCERPT 1:10
R1: I think basically what we’re saying is that, or what I am saying, is that this concept of a melting pot has served America very well. In the new concept of America is the one of the salad bowl where you have groups living adhering to groups and as Woodrow Wilson said way back in 1915, that as long as you look at yourself as a part of a group you are not really assimilated into America because America is a nation of individuals, not a nation of groups. And I think this is the key.

EXCERPT 1:11
JLB: What is the main issue that motivated you, or stimulated you, to become interested in the question of legislation on the behalf of English?
R2: I believe strongly that it is vitally important for countries as large as the United States to have a common language to communicate the essential requirements of government. For example … relating to various transactions, the official statutes of States and the Federal government. Things of this kind I believe very strongly must be maintained uniformly in English for the nation in the long run to be successful. While there is not an immediate onslaught of a threat, there is a creeping deference to allowing some of these activities to be carried on in languages other than English. …I think it is timely to deal with the issue and I think it is important to our country to clearly state that official public documentation will be conducted in English and English only.
JLB: So, does your legislation deal then essentially with governmental work and not really with the private and public use of languages?
R2: No, that’s ++ the point that you’re making is correct. There is no effort or intention or thought to restrict or prohibit anyone using whatever language they wish. We’re only talking about official activities of a society, and the recording of official records, the recording of official information, promulgating official information, that this be done in English.

EXCERPT 1:12
L4: … if it (English) were somehow being threatened we would look at it differently; but as we say, 95% of the American population speak English and the other 5% are, by and large, trying to learn English and doing it better than previous groups.

EXCERPT 1:13
L5: It is just simply untrue. The facts are very clear. We have one of the greatest percentages of people speaking English than we have ever had in our entire history. Immigrants are assimilating quicker into this society and learning English quicker than any other group; so part of what they do is provide a rationality, they need a problem to solve by this proposition and they don’t have one so they try to create one. They’re trying to paint a picture that isn’t there … there is no evidence for, and it is totally an artificial creation. There is no evidence to support what they’re talking about.

EXCERPT 1:14
L4: Mean-spirited. Cultural Imperialism. Wrong-headed. Stupid. Those are the words that come to my mind. And I use those words hopefully in a thoughtful way. I think if your goal is to promote English, the stupid way to do it is to make it the official language and to try and be coercive. I grew up in that system. I grew up in a de facto English-only place where we were punished if we spoke Spanish in the playground.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING ERNESTO
EXCERPT 2:1
R1: What appealed to me about that statement is here is a man>>because it is a metaphor for what is happening in America today>>I receive thousands of thousands of letters from every State in the nation and foreign countries>>I am continuously on Canadian radio, or have been, and on TV<<and basically what Ernesto Ortiz said, he put it so well as a new American, when he said that “My children are taught in school in Spanish
so they can become bus boys and bell hops. I am trying to teach them English at home so they can become doctors and lawyers” and I always said here is a man with real insight because if you want to climb the ladder of opportunity in America, and quite frankly if you want to climb the ladder of opportunity world-wide today, the English language is the ladder to that opportunity. And, for example, even in a country like India where they have fourteen languages, who knows how many dialects, but they have taken English as their official language. Why? Because they realise that to have a nation they have to have a commonality….but here in our own country we are spending between $8 - $12 billion dollars a year to teach youngsters and other than the English language. It just doesn’t make sense.

EXCERPT 2:2

L4: And they are using anecdotes. I mean, you know, the Ernesto Ortiz story by Toby Roth I have heard (it) so many different times ... you know, that is like a pet story.

EXCERPT 2:3

L5: Oh, well we have heard that any number of times. I think...it is a little bit of defensiveness because Toby Roth isn’t Latino, you know, he doesn’t have that kind of a background to be able to say “I know what’s best”; he doesn’t have one or two case studies that he can point to, at least in public, perhaps (he’s) somebody who ... you know is ++ a snobbish kind of ... maybe he would be portrayed as the elitist. He is trying to tell the Latino culture what is best for them. I think that ++ we have almost two hundred affiliates throughout the country who do the actual teaching of literacy, they have alternative high schools, they have legal services, they do social services.

EXCERPT 2:4

L1: … With respect to my own writings it is very mixed as you can see. I deal a lot with the research in my book. When you're writing for the Readers Digest you deal in stories because that's what the Readers Digest readers want to hear. They apparently had been trying for years to get somebody to write something on bilingual education and they kept getting these manuscripts that were filled with data that nobody could understand, education jargon that is so popular, and I put it in terms of stories, of actually going out and talking to people and I think it does sort of personalise it and bring it down. But there are clearly, in my view the opponents of bilingual education win hands down the theoretical and empirical debate. There simply isn’t the empirical evidence to show that this method works with kids so we’re not relying on stories because we don’t have the data, it’s just, I think, in terms of communicating with people on what has become a political issue. Stories are a more effective means of communication. They need to be buttressed by empirical evidence and research but people understand the story better than they understand Christine Rossel’s analysis of all the scientifically balanced studies of bilingual education.

EXCERPT 2:5

L2: If you look at the history of this issue there is a fellow by the name of Horace Kallen who, in 1924, somewhere about that time, said ‘We don’t need to assimilate immigrants, we should be celebrating diversity”. Well, he perhaps was a voice in the wilderness. The United Nations in the 1950’s started saying ‘We need bilingual education’ but the UN is not all that listened to in this country. It was when the National Education Association took a real problem. This is what elites tend to do. They tend to take a real problem - dropout rates of Hispanic young people in Texas- and the important thing to their solution is not that it solves the problem but that it advances their own agenda. In the United States and Canada we are going down parallel tracks in the 60’s and 70’s. Canada’s official bilingualism came out right about the same time with the United States’ mandate of bilingual education. In 1974 in neither the House nor the Senate hearings, also really interesting reading, it was in 1973-74 in that session of Congress it was made mandatory. And there is a book by [omitted] in which she had access to all of the pro-bilingual education records and was a friend of Ted Kennedy. Fascinating reading! Because it talks about just they were with language how much more concerned preservation but the new Congress would never buy that. And one of the speakers in a hearing said that while it was too early to consider an Official Languages Act like Canada had, this would be a good first step.

EXCERPT 2:6
L2: And I think that Ernesto Ortiz, the Mexican farm worker, put it so well in John Silver’s book Straight Shooting. He said “They teach my children in Spanish at school so that they can be bus boys and waiters. I teach them in English at home so that they can be doctors and lawyers”. … Ernesto Ortiz - he’s the fellow I mention in People magazine this week.

A DOUBLE STANDARD?

EXCERPT 3:1

JLB: But would you be happy if Jose were learning English by an ESL program and studying Spanish.
L1: I’d have no problem with that and I have always said I will have no problem with that. And the idea of maintaining Spanish as a part of the whole concept of a foreign language instruction ++ is fine. I don’t think that Hispanics should be forced to maintain Spanish. If they choose to learn Japanese instead ++ let them learn Japanese. I don’t want it to become an ethnic marker.

EXCERPT 3:2

JLB: Criticism of your position that there is a double standard. On the one hand you want people to learn a foreign language and become bilingual but you’re not so happy for people to maintain Spanish and then learn English and become bilinguals that way. You think they should become English speakers and then learn a foreign language. What do you say to that criticism?
R1: Quite frankly I haven’t heard that criticism. Let me see if I can restate what you as you understand the question, correctly. What you’re saying is that I want people to study English and to be proficient in English, is that right?
JLB: Then you are happy for them to learn a foreign language like Japanese-
R1: //Exactly. Yes, that states my point-
JLB: //they would become a bilingual via that process.
R1: Yes.
JLB: However, the criticism mentioned to me was that if someone becomes a bilingual by keeping the Spanish they speak at home and learning English as school, you’re not happy with that.
R1: Oh, that’s not so. I am very happy with that. That would be misrepresenting what I say.
JLB: Oh, I see b-

EXCERPT 3:3

R1: You know, we do have actual translations….but basically the translations into English are so good that I think one of the reasons we don’t study foreign languages as much as we could +++ =>we’re getting off the topic, the question, now … is because we know the translations are so good today that we’re not really forced to study other languages because everything can be translated into English<<….But we can’t go around and study every language otherwise we’d never get anything done commercially and so I think we have to be somewhat pragmatic about this but it is important for people to know other languages. But that is not the issue.
JLB: Yeah-
R1: //the issue is, first and foremost, to have Americans - I’m talking about my Bill now, I want to get back to that so we don’t lose focus of that - my goal is that I want Americans to vote in the English language, when they become citizens that it is done in the English language, work in the government is done in English; so that all Americans, wherever I meet another American, whether it is in Australia, Britain, or China or whatever, when we get together we talk in English, we have that commonality.

EXCERPT 3:4
R2: So many opponents interpret the legislation … as trying to discourage the use of foreign languages. Nothing could be further from the truth. This has nothing to do with the desirability or the many advantages of speaking languages other than English and I would sign on to encourage that kind of activity. The point that I am trying to establish is that, for our nation, being as large and as diverse and as spread out as it is, if we get into the quagmire of having public records being in different languages then I think we will be taking a decided step back in our social and cultural practice. I don’t want to see this happen.

EXCERPT 3:5
JLB: And then, if in Dade county or Montgomery county, the parents and the teachers and whoever the authorities are, decided that English is the language of instruction and they want their kids to learn another language, you’ve got no problems with any of that?
L2: No.
JLB: But what if they were then to say ‘However, we think the most effective method for teaching is to do what the Canadians do and to immerse these kids in, say, Spanish, and to teach these children via the use of Spanish as the language of instruction, then they would be teaching in Spanish’.
L2: I know, it’s interesting. We’re not moving to that in this country because transitional bilingual education supporters ++ keep in mind their real goal is the maintenance of the ancestral language of the third and fourth generation. The immigrant is usually too busy working to learn the language while his children are bilingual and the third generation speaks English. They (language pluralists) want to interrupt that process and make sure that the ancestral language is maintained. And it is interesting. They want to use immersion for the English-speaking children to learn that second language but they don’t want to use immersion to learn English. And it is interesting. Canada has found that when you deal with this so-called two-way that in fact what happens is that the English speakers pick up French really well but the French speakers don’t pick up English.

EXCERPT 3:6
JLB: So if the system were reformed in such a way that-
L3: //we would force them to do what they were supposed to do - assist them and that would last no more than three years, where students would go and learn English and then graduate, if you will, and then go into the normal class.
JLB: … Let’s just take an example of some Spanish-speaking children; would you and the organisation be supportive of the fact that those children might go into English medium education but could also continue to study Spanish as a foreign language or a second language?
L3: Well, they could study any language they like as a second language. My kids study Spanish. I’m sending my thirteen-year old son to Spain this year in summer to study Spanish. We’re actually for studying foreign languages, but they first must acquire the language that they need in this country and that’s English. I hope that if you move to this country then there is no question that you need to learn English.

EXCERPT 3:7
L3: There is not enough emphasis on the learning of foreign languages and my wife is a professor of foreign languages. She teaches Spanish to students. So we absolutely support the learning of foreign languages. That has nothing to do with the fact that an immigrant comes to this country and they need to assimilate, they need to become a part of the country, and to do that they need to learn English. Of course it would be wonderful if after they learned English they could learn some other languages.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION
EXCERPT 4:1
L1: … Two things happened. When the program started, it was a program aimed at American citizens, it was a program aimed at Mexican Americans primarily and a little bit at Puerto Ricans and in the North East, but mainly Mexican Americans who’d lived here many generations, some of them for hundreds of years but they had lived in isolated circumstances, in poor educational settings, and facing a lot of discrimination. And they came into school with a lot of impediments. One of those impediments was that they didn’t speak English very well and the purpose of the program was to try to help them to learn English and to have let them learn some of their other subjects and keep up with the language they were more familiar [with] sounded like a great idea. I think, if it had been a short term program, I think if it had only been aimed at the population that it had been aimed at initially, if (inaudible) had ten years of a bilingual education program that could have probably helped solve some of the problems of that particular population. Meanwhile the population has changed, meanwhile we have
all these newcomers coming in. Most of the Mexican American kids who went into school were totally ignorant of English. They would go in speaking no English at all. Even at the time the Bill was passed in 1968, you still had (inaudible) television out there, you still had people living in areas where they could at least hear English, but now we have these huge enclaves of new immigrants coming from Latin America who really have very little familiarity and whose kids are being sent to school and it seems that the program that was designed for this one group is now being imposed on this new group in a very unsatisfactory way. The problem with that new group is not we don’t have to make them bilingual in the sense of maintaining their Spanish. Most of them already know Spanish pretty darn well depending on the age at which they come. Their desperate need is to learn English. They need to learn English and yet the program became a Spanish maintenance program rather than a program to help newcomers learn English. So there is a real mish-mash here.

EXCERPT 4:2

L3: We’re opposed to (bilingual education) also. But we’re not saying ‘Abolish it’; we’re saying ‘Reform it’.
JLB: What would that mean? What would you do?
L3: We would [make it do] what it was supposed to do, a transitory system. You go there for three years, let’s say, and in those three years they must teach English to the children. Right now they’re keeping them.
JLB: So, they could use Spanish or Japanese or whatever.
L3: //I don’t care what they use as long as they are teaching them English. The difference right now is that kids in bilingual education come to class and they get all of their subjects in as many as eighty-six different languages in California. And then they get twenty minutes of English. I got more English in [country of origin] than children in this country would per day. The difference is, we want the kids to go to school to learn English and if you have to talk to them in whatever language to teach them English then that is fine but the purpose should be teaching them English, not math in Chinese, or whatever. They’ll catch up later on. A child will learn in no time if they’re exposed to the language, but you tell me, a kid that comes out of a Chinese family, speaks Chinese at home, goes to school and is spoken to in Chinese all day, he is not exposed even to the other kids to play with, he goes back home in the afternoon to more spoken and written Chinese - when does he learn English? They are slowing down the assimilation; they are slowing down that kid.

EXCERPT 4:3

L1: … what I object to, and I guess it was the point of my Readers Digest [article] and this is that we have two groups of immigrants coming into the United States and the Spanish speakers are deprived of ESL-kinds of programs that allow them to learn English which, after all, is the key to their economic success in the United States. I mean, Ernesto Ortiz, whoever he is, is right about that. If you don’t learn English in the US you will be consigned to a life in which you are relegated to manual labour. That is all that will be available to you.

EXCERPT 4:4

S1: //I’m not for bilingual education. I push for English. Let people coming to this country learn English, not learn another language unless they want to do it on their own as a second language for business reasons or for educational reasons but I don’t believe we should push or equate another language to English.
JLB: Do you think that Spanish, (rather than any other language given its hemispheric role and the large number of citizens in this country both now and in the future who are and will be of Spanish language background) - do you think that it might have some sort of status in this country?
S1: No, I don’t think so. We don’t think that it should have any status - no more than German or French or Chinese or anything. It is good to speak many languages. I wish everybody could speak five but I think we should emphasise that English is the language of America.
JLB: In schools would you promote the teaching of foreign languages?
S1: Oh yes, absolutely! I took Spanish.
JLB: So, the distinction that you are drawing, if I understand it correctly, is the use of Spanish as a language of instruction and the teaching of it as a second language?
S1: That’s right, and equating it with English as the language of business and commerce in America, the official language.
JLB: Do you feel that it would be appropriate to say that one of the desirable educational outcomes for all American students would be bilingualism? That they should know English and another language?

S1: Or two or three. That would be desirable. But that is highly unlikely in America.

JLB: But logically it would make sense to build on the languages that are known by the population and spoken?

S1: That’s fine but that’s a personal thing. Whatever they want to do - that is fine. And not just Spanish. Let’s just say it was Japanese or Chinese or German or French or Arabic. It doesn’t matter what it is. We were using Spanish; but I believe that we should emphasise and promote the English language and only the English.

EXCERPT 4:5

R1: We have had bilingual education since 1968. We started off on a small scale and it has mushroomed like cancer all over the country, so if you have 19 kids, you have 20 kids with a certain language background, whether it is Swahili or whatever it is that youngsters are being taught in that language. In New York they are being taught 12 different languages. In Chicago and so on, different languages. All I can say is that when youngsters go to school I want them being taught English but after they have a good foundation in the English language then if they want to study a foreign language - go ahead, that’s great!

JLB: But this is precisely where people say that this double standard that they accuse you of comes in. They say ‘Wouldn’t it in fact be better’ (and this is the philosophical basis which you don’t agree with-

R1: //I know, but they are being very disingenuous. OK, let’s take these young kids in the kindergarten - first, and second, and third grade - let’s teach them in some other language, not the English language, and then we’ll teach English later on. But you see what happens. If you do not teach with the English language they never become proficient in the English language, and they become very self-conscious. That’s why in bilingual education you have big drop-out rates later on. These poor kids are not being allowed to compete when they get into fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth grade and then into high school. Why? Because they don’t have the language skills developed and so on that they should have developed when they were in the lower grades.

JLB: So, has bilingual education been badly implemented or is it-

R1: //not only has it been badly implemented, I think that bilingual education is not a smart idea, let’s put it in a kind way of saying it.

JLB: //right. But-

R1: //It’s not been an intelligent approach.

JLB: And by this you mean the use of two languages as media of instruction, as the means of teaching?

R1: What I am saying is that when the youngsters come to school they should be taught in the English language. Now, if they want to teach another language later on then I think that is great, we want to do that. But the primary focus has to be on teaching English in the lower grades.

EXCERPT 4:6

L2: And in fact in school in Los Angeles we have a picture of it. There is a sign on the wall which says ‘SPEAK ENGLISH’, that you have to be immersed in a language to speak it well. Well, it turns out that is the best way to learn a second language but that is not something that we do in the United States for something that we call bilingual education. Instead we say that the way to learn English is to hear Spanish for six classes a day with one class of English, and wonder why the kids don’t pick it up. Dr Christine Russell of Boston - if you haven’t talked to her you should.

JLB: I heard a paper she gave on Monday.

L2: Good. Remember when she was talking about the 300 studies and she was really onto something there because you can pick up English on the street corner but you really can’t pick up grammar and algebra. And what is interesting is that the Boston Globe had an article about official English and they said ‘Everybody is learning English so why do we bother learning it in school?’ which is the first time that I have heard anyone say ‘Why should we bother doing this in the schools? Let’s have them learn it on the street corner’.

EXCERPT 4:7

O1: I’m very optimistic. I think the truth will come out. I think ‘Let them engage the debate!’ But it must be a fair debate. It must not come up with the perception to say that the bilingual program is not worth it and that the only way is to shut it down. The only way they listen - swim or sink type of theory. Either they like it or for us it is doomsday. That is not the way to approach the issue or the problems. As a bilingual education teacher
myself….Most of my kids, about 99% of my kids at that time stayed within the Vietnamese bilingual classes only for two years. But that doesn’t mean that every kid is two years. The way children learn is different. One kid, very different-
JLB: //exited into mainstream English? Is-
O1: //late exit or early exit ++ depend upon teacher, principal, parents decide; not in Washington - not in Washington! Let the school teacher (inaudible) with these kids every day make the decision!

EXCERPT 4:8
L1: … [name of Bill] is the one that deals I think most comprehensively with the issue I care most about which is bilingual education. Quite frankly, I think if we would deal with bilingual education >> that I think is the bigger problem than the English language debate which is the big picture<<I am most concerned about the newcomers ++ I am most concerned having them be able to repeat the pattern of previous groups which is to be able to, within a generation or so, to move into the middle class.

EXCERPT 4:9
O1: … And I can tell you I am from Boston. In Boston some parents ++ misunderstood our program. They said ‘Oh, our kids want to learn English.’ They put them in an English class. In the first two months they are all flunking and dropping out of school, they hate to come into the classroom because they do not understand what is going on in the classroom. They feel shame, they feel embarrassed; when they sit in the classroom and know nothing of what is going on. So they drop out. Later on they come back to school and the parents say ‘Can you put my kids back into the bilingual program?’ And then a few months later, or maybe a year later, maybe two years later, they depend on their English ability at that point and they will be mainstreamed to the regular classes. That is the whole purpose, to go back once again…

EXCERPT 4:10
L1: The Los Angeles school system is much more interested in maintaining their Spanish than it is in teaching them English.

BUT WHAT DO THESE THINGS MEAN?

EXCERPT 5:1A
JLB: Do you have a particular concern with bilingual education?
R3: Not at all, I strongly support bilingual education.
JLB: So your legislation, unlike Toby Roth’s wouldn’t support the dismantling of bilingual education?
R3: No.

(SOME MINUTES LATER)

EXCERPT 5:1B
R3: There may be one area here that I suppose we should talk about and that is, in the public education programs that we have around the country there is some notion that people should be taught in their native language. I don’t agree with that. I think that any citizen, to be successful in our society, has got to have a working knowledge of English, and if you perpetuate that dependency on some tongue other than English then you are doing them a huge disservice and condemning them to second-class citizenship. Now, I think that is wrong. I have met with some groups in my own District particularly Spanish -speaking groups, who are very proud of their Spanish heritage. I tell them this exact same thing. ‘Yes, Spanish is important, please continue to speak it but remember that to be successful in this country you have got to learn and be able to understand English. And if you tell your children and your young people otherwise then you are condemning them to a second class citizenship, one in which they will never be able to compete in effectively if they don’t speak English’.
JLB: So, teaching in another language you would disagree with but the teaching of that language you would support?
R3: Exactly.

EXCERPT 5:2
L2: ...Let’s be clear what English laws don’t do. They won’t affect the language in the home, they don’t affect the language spoken on the street, they won’t make the Korean market down the street start speaking English. What they do - Bills like HR739 … and HR1005 … say ‘The language of the country is English. Let’s eliminate some of these multi-lingual programs. Government should encourage people to learn English’; not force them, encourage them, just as the government encourages people not to smoke but we don’t shoot smokers on the street. People, if they don’t want to learn English - that is their right in this country but they need to be given every opportunity.

QUEBEC, SALAD BOWL & GOVERNMENT

EXCERPT 6:1

L1: Right! No, I mean that is part of the craziness of Quebec. I don’t have any problem with the private sector using whatever language they want. If a business is going to be trying to sell things to new immigrants, that business would be smart to speak to them in the language that the business is sure that they already (have) which is Spanish, if you’re talking about the South West. I don’t have any problems with Korean grocers putting up their signs in Korean. I don’t think they should have to be required to put them in English at all. If they want to tell customers who don’t speak Korean that they don’t want them to shop there then they’re going to lose some customers. But that’s their problem, it’s not the government’s problem. So you see, I don’t want the government intruding on the activities of the private sector in respect to language in any way.

EXCERPT 6:2

JLB: Do you think there is any part of the United States, which runs some risk of becoming ‘a Quebec’?
R1: It is interesting that you ask that question because when I was on Canadian television, they had a call-in show. People would call in and say ‘You know, here in Canada we have one Quebec but you have many little Quebeks all over the United States’.
JLB: And which ones do you think those are? Where is it like that?
R1: Wherever you have a language, wherever you have people in this salad bowl concept, where they live in these large groups and so on and do not use English as the language.
JLB: So, you don’t necessarily mean a former Mexican or Spanish speaking- //I’m talking about anywhere in the country.
R1: //we have tribes in our own State of Wisconsin. They can keep their language. We encourage that. In fact, back in Wisconsin, tourism is our biggest industry and we encourage our native people, the natives, I am talking about the American Indians, for example, to keep their culture.
JLB: Yeah-
R1: //and we find that it is very enriching but we have no problem in Wisconsin because our people are very bright and they realise that in order to be successful in America, or anywhere in the world, the English language is very important. There is no impediment to teaching English. In fact, while the Native Americans teach their language, they are teaching English at all of the schools.
JLB: ... isn’t it inevitable that all parts of the world are going to become pluralistic or diverse or multilingual or whatever? Like the United States is.
R1: You know what’s going to happen? You’re asking me what’s going to happen? What’s going to happen is people are going to add here more and more of their particular language. Why? Because it gives them an identity. That’s why.

EXCERPT 6:3

L5: ... the Canadian government is busy telling the French speaker ‘Your language is making you separate and this is part of your identity’ and if you keep hearing that from the government for a while you believe it.

EXCERPT 6:4

O2: Representative Cunningham strongly favours individuals learning as many languages as they can do. … Where we have to be careful is in reviewing the experience of Canada where an official bilingualism has nearly wrenched the country apart; that Quebec and the French-dominated culture and the remaining English-dominated
culture, in some parts of Quebec and in the rest of the country, is worth studying for the purpose of saying this is something we may not want to do. But Mr Cunningham strongly favours individuals learning other languages for the purposes of expanding their horizons as they wish, but establishing a Federal government program, establishing a Federal direction for people to do so, he may argue that the Federal government’s strong arm need not reach into that part of individuals’ lives.

**BEING UNITED & SMART**

**EXCERPT 7:1**

L1: … I think that smart businessmen do in fact invest in employees who speak the language of their customers. That would argue for a more aggressive approach on speaking languages where the biggest markets are, and that would be China, the Chinese, the Japanese, it would probably not be Spanish as the first language. I do find it interesting; Chinese is still not widely taught in the United States. Japanese is being taught.

**EXCERPT 7:2**

JLB: What is your prediction about the place of English in the world?
S1: The place of English? I think that English is going to be pre-eminent in the business world, in the commercial world. But there are other languages in the world. Chinese is spoken by more than anybody else and what else - I don’t know. Many languages.

**EXCERPT 7:3**

JLB: So, you believe that the Federal government’s role in education would be-
S1: //the Federal government’s role in education is very small in America. It funds very little in educational outlays in America. It always has. As a matter of fact, until twenty-five, thirty, years ago, there was no Federal aid to education in America. It was always a State and local matter.

**EXCERPT 7:4**

R1: I’m talking about the world over. The more global you become, the more people in a local area are going to hang onto their traditions and their languages.

**EXCERPT 7:5**

R1: //the truth of the matter is that the United States has not been a diverse country. We’ve had diverse cultures, all diverse cultures, here. But we have been every bit as united as Japan. Why do I say that? Well, when you go to a ball-game in the United States, a soccer game or a baseball game or a football game, all the people get up and they sing. What? The American National Anthem. We are all Americans. When you go - I don’t care what background you are or what background I am - but when we talk we all have this commonality of the English language. America has been a uniquely unified country. Oh yes, we have all these cultures, but I don’t know of any country that has been more patriotic. Just stop and think about it, isn’t that true?

**EXCERPT 7:6**

R1: …Yes, we are becoming more diverse now because our languages are breaking up; but if we could keep this unifying force, this common glue, there is no country that is more unified than the United States.

**EXCERPT 7:7**

L1: I think that the promotion of foreign language education is an important educational goal. … I think that every American high school student should graduate with four years of foreign language instruction. I think that ought to be a requirement for graduation from high school in the United States - just as I think those students should have four years of math, four years of English, and four years of social studies, and four years of science. I mean, I think that knowing other languages helps make us educated persons and that as a matter of language policy I think the learning of second languages is critical and it is something in which the United States has fallen
woefully behind. One of the reasons that English is the common language in the market-place is that whether you’re in Germany or Japan, or Mexico for that matter, you study English. We do not enforce the studying of other languages in our schools to anything like the degree to which they do in other parts of the world; and I think that ought to be part of our education policy.

EXCERPT 7:8
L5: ... this question of setting up an official language .. contributed ... to that separation that you have there [in Canada-Quebec]... I think that begins to beget separatism when you get into more of a Canadian/Quebec-style kinds of fights. I think that we misunderstand the Canadian experience in this country very, very much.

THE AMERICAN CENTURY & THE GREAT SOCIETY
EXCERPT 8:1
R1: ... I feel that the 21st Century is going to be the American century. Again, I am going to tell you why I say that. When you take a look at China, for example, the Chinese are very successful in all parts of the world except, it seems, for many years in China. You’re going to see that I think that the way that the world is evolving is that what America has given the world, and so I focus on the English language, is how people of all these diverse characters, backgrounds, cultures, religions, can come and live peacefully like we have in the United States, in harmony. That is the great lesson we can teach the world, how we have done that. Basically, one of the reasons this language issue - so we get back to your question-is language going to divide people or unite people? I think if it is done properly it is going to unite people. And that is going to be the big issue in the 21st Century - uniting people, not segregating people.

EXCERPT 8:2
R1: I think that bilingual education is not going to be a government mandate. I think we’re going to teach other language as set course as we have done in the past but I think the idea of taking youngsters and teaching them in other than the English language when they start school, I don’t think that is going to be around for much longer. We never had it before until 1968, it was in 1968 when the Great Society phenomenon of the liberals took over and we are going to reshape man, and we’re going to have the new Soviet man, the new Stalin, and Hitler had, you know, the master race. Whenever you have the liberals and, you know, these people come in and they are going to re-do human nature - they always fall flat on their face. And I think it is something that has to be remembered.

EXCERPT 8:3
R1: I said ‘American Century’, what I am talking about is the American Idea. The societies of the individual (are) going to be successful in the 21st Century (and these are) made of ... three parts. One – (those who) understand technology, education, and everything that goes along with it. Secondly - entrepreneurship. Thirdly ... traditional values. These are going to be the three great pillars for success for the individual or society in the 21st Century.

SCOPE & LIMITS
EXCERPT 9:1
JLB: ... Aren’t there some areas where this becomes a difficult line to draw? What would happen if there were a defendant in a legal case who only spoke Spanish? Does your proposed legislation make it difficult for that person to obtain an interpreter in Spanish?
R3: No, it does not. But the proceedings in the court would be conducted in English. The non-English speaking person is, under the law, provided with an interpreter.

EXCERPT 9:2
JLB: Why do you think Federal legislation is involved in this? Because it seems to me that many of those (are) issues that Congress now wishes to devolve back to States and have smaller government. Don’t you see this as working against the current of the present Republican Congress?
R3: The **only** way to have uniformity throughout the country is to promulgate it through Federal channels. If you attempt to achieve an objective of this kind on a State by State basis you will **never** achieve nation-wide uniformity. And this is one area, the area of **communication**, the **written** word, where I think there **absolutely must** be uniformity throughout the nation.

**EXCERPT 9:3**

JLB: Would you go so far as to propose a Constitutional amendment on behalf the official status of English or do you think that the legislation, if it were to pass, would be sufficient?
R3: I think at this stage that (what) is required is legislation. I don’t see the reason for a Constitutional amendment.

**EXCERPT 9:4**

JLB: What about Puerto Rico and Hawaii or Alaskan native tribes? Do you make exceptions in particular instances where there might be different from the contiguous States operating?
R3: No, and I would apply the same rule to Native Americans, i.e. that the **official** business of the government should be conducted **only** in English. But **no-one** would be prohibited from speaking in or communicating in whatever they wish, another language. But if they are going to become **involved in the official government process** then that will be conducted in English.

**EXCERPT 9:5**

JLB: I found one clause in your legislation (proposal) very puzzling and it’s the one that says-
R3: **/no-one can be perfect!**
JLB: **//it is the one that says that no-one should be discriminated against** because they speak **English**. Why is that? Has **anyone** been discriminated against **because** they speak English? Or denied government services because they speak English?
R3: There have been allegations that because of the **concentration** in some places of non-English speaking individuals that people seeking services or seeking information in English have been denied this. There is no provision in law for that to take place and this would simply **put into** the statute that no-one should be denied (inaudible) for making an inquiry in English.

**EXCERPT 9:6**

L2: We have more lawyers per capita than any other place in the world and that is where a lot of this rises up - **lawyers have to eat too!**. Let me just play off ... because the argument you just made is one the other side makes in this country: ‘**Well, even with all this other stuff everyone knows that English is the common language?**’ So then why are we so busy legislating all these other multi-lingual provisions and language? ... there is a principle of physics that applies to legislation which is that **nature abhors a vacuum** and in fact what we have seen in this country is, under the Clinton administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, without a hint of legal authority, say to downtown Pennsylvania that if your **volunteer official English law** **offends us** and we would like you to repeal it, we would feel better, and we wouldn’t want you to lose all of your housing money…. Are you familiar with The Godfather?
JLB: **Yeah.**
L2: OK, this is called ‘**an offer you can’t refuse**’. But a couple of guys on the city council said ‘Well, before we give in, what’s your authority? Do you mind if we invite the press to attack?’. Well, that cancelled the meeting and this became an issue in Congress. It’s always funny - 24 members of Congress signed the letter to (Secretary of Department of Housing and Urban Development) saying ‘**This is the dumbest thing I have ever heard of, what are you doing?**’ and immediately they said ‘**We weren’t doing anything!**’ But had no-one asked - then what would have **happened**? There is a whole mechanism there.

**EXCERPT 9:7**

L1: …There can be a sort of double backlash. I think the whole movement to declare English as the official language is part of a backlash; when I wrote about it in my book I put it in a chapter in which I used the word backlash. But I also think that if the proponents of English as the official language **go too far** they too could ++ there could be another backlash. I mean, the **wonderful** thing about the United States, and we never really go
terribly far in extremes, is that we are like a pendulum. If something shifts a little too far to the left there is a natural correction and comes back towards the right.

JLB: The democratic process.

L1: That’s right, and it sort of, you know, centres in that way. I certainly don’t want, you know, language police. I certainly don’t want the government telling businesses what language they can operate in. I have no objection whatsoever to the Spanish language.

CITIZENSHIP & SACREDNESS

EXCERPT 10:1

JLB: … the citizenship ceremony… it seems to have deeply offended some people, that people could actually become American citizens … in Spanish. Do you feel the same?

L1: Well, actually we did a little bit checking on that and unless I’m mistaken it has been a while since that incident but my recollection is that the ceremony was for the elderly ++ you know, you can become a US citizen if you are older than fifty or fifty-five without learning English. I understand that it is much more difficult to acquire English as you get older. And if it was elderly people or if there were some translations so that the families could understand and participate in it, I don’t have a problem with that. I remember that at the time there was all a hullabaloo about it. We looked into it and it turned out not to be quite as egregious.

JLB: But why would it be egregious if it had in fact happened? I mean, it seemed to tap a particular-

L1: //I think it would be because there was this particular idea that there is no connection, that English doesn’t have a special place, that it isn’t the language of government, that we don’t expect people to learn English as part of becoming American. That is exactly what is worrying people; and so if the government is now giving official sanction in the most important symbolic ceremony, in terms of an immigrant’s life, the naturalisation ceremony, then I think that people would think that there was a problem.

EXCERPT 10:2

O2: I don’t think [Representative] has spoken directly to that issue, but those members would hold that because English is an important common bond of the people of the United States and it is important to an individual achieving economic hope and prosperity in the United States, that having the immigration ceremonies in other languages other than the common language of the United States, which is English, regardless of whether it is established or not, sends an undesirable message to recent immigrants to the United States that English is not necessary or a major part of American life when in fact it is.

EXCERPT 10:3

JLB: … it has been suggested that there have been citizenship ceremonies conducted in Spanish, swearing-in ceremonies-

R3: //non-English-

JLB: //and that this is unacceptable. Do you agree that particular ceremony should only be done in English?

R3: Yes. It should all be done in English. It is the official language. The act of becoming a citizen of the United States is an official governmental function. Being such, in my view it should be conducted in English and English only.

JLB: Does that also have a symbolic or extra-functional meaning, i.e. becoming an American, becoming an English speaker, and using English in the process of becoming an American, as an English speaker? Do you think that citizenship has some special sort of effect …?

R3: I don’t know that I attribute any unique or unusual significance to the ceremony of becoming a US citizen ++ other than the fact that it is an official Federal government function conducted in the United States Federal District Court and as such it should be conducted in the English language.

EXCERPT 10:4

JLB: Some people have said that citizenship ceremonies conducted in Spanish, one that has been mentioned, in Texas-
R4: ballots, and they want to make the language of the ballot approximate the sacred status to which we ascribe to voting? It can’t be! And there is right, that language is approximate to the sacred status to which we ascribe to voting? It can’t be! And there is 

JLB: But do you think that some of the official English advocates actually see it that way? 

R4: Actually, they do! They are trying to make that connection. But I don’t think the connection is there. I think they’re trying to do that, so it is interesting that, for example, bilingual ballots actually show up the falsity of that connection. The reason that we have bilingual ballots is not because of America’s belief that (citizens) have a right to choose the language in which they vote, but the reason that we have bilingual votes is that we value voting above language. That shows you that voting is more important than language and that if language were a barrier to voting then you must eliminate that barrier! So it is not the same sense as in other countries where you have multi-lingual policies where you have a right to vote in any language. In the United States you don’t have a right to vote in Spanish, you don’t have a right to vote in English, you don’t have a right to vote in French - what you do is you have a right to vote! And if you can prove that somehow or other that is the sacred right, that language is an impediment to the exercise of that right, that’s why you have bilingual ballots! ...Now they want to make the language of the ballot approximate the sacred status to which we ascribe to voting? It can’t be! And there is no special status assigned to language per se, it is the exercise of voting that we hold sacred, not the language in which we vote.

EXCERPT 10:5

JLB: …I’ll be interested to hear if you think I am over-reading it or misreading it. I get the strong impression that there is something kind of sacred about the citizenship swearing in ceremony, that it symbolises the becoming of an American and that has to be done in English and that if it is not done in English then it has some undermining quality undermining the nation. I have asked some of the members of Congress and I feel from their reactions that there is something to that…They can quantify bilingual education but just the suggestion of a single swearing-in ceremony conducted in Spanish seems to have really set them off. Am I over-reading that? 

L5: I think you’re very, very perceptive. I think first of all that it is single swearing-in ceremony, out of hundreds of thousands of these that have happened in our history. There is an interesting linkage, almost an unexamined linkage, between if you are an American therefore you must become of an American and that has to be done in English and that if it is not done in English then it has some undermining quality undermining the nation. I have asked some of the members of Congress and I feel from their reactions that there is something to that…They can quantify bilingual education but just the suggestion of a single swearing-in ceremony conducted in Spanish seems to have really set them off. Am I over-reading that? 

L5: Yeah, we have only ever been able to document one that has ever existed. Somehow it has become the most famous swearing in ceremony, out of hundreds of thousands of these that have happened in our history. There is an interesting linkage, almost an unexamined linkage, between if you are an American therefore you must be Americanised, and that means you’ve got to be English-speaking, that means you’ve got to love baseball, that means you’ve got to love hot dogs, that means you are Americanised and that if it is not like it was a widespread practice; if it has happened at all we are talking about a handful of cases. 

JLB: I’ve heard of one. 

EXCERPT 10:6

JLB: The recurring reasons that are cited by the official English legislators are bilingual education, bilingual ballots, and citizenship ceremonies in Spanish. But it is citizenship that seems to be strongest concern for those wanting to officialise English. And the words that Congressman [Bill Sponsor] used in relation to this were ‘the sacredness of the citizenship ceremony.’ The language used to talk about the citizenship ceremony almost becomes religious - do you find that too? 

R4: In order to adopt that point of view you would have to say that the use of other languages approximates sacrilege and it seems kind of ++ there is no connection between American citizenship and language per se, in the sense that if we are going to enthrone American citizenship to have an almost supernatural reality rather than just being an artifice of human institutions, that somehow or another we are going to have to enthrone English in the way that the Nazis enthroned the origins of German and the Teutonic languages - it’s ridiculous! It’s absurd! English is the language of the country - clear. English will be the language of government for almost all purposes - clear. Beyond that you don’t need to make it sound as though English is coming ++ that it has been hand-delivered from the gods, that there is some unique genius to the essence of using English words in the sense of the unique genius of American in coming up with the Constitutional form of government that we have. 

JLB: But do you think that some of the official English advocates actually see it that way? 

R4: Actually, they do! They are trying to make that connection. But I don’t think the connection is there. I think they’re trying to do that, so it is interesting that, for example, bilingual ballots actually show up the falsity of that connection. The reason that we have bilingual ballots is not because of America’s belief that (citizens) have a right to choose the language in which they vote, but the reason that we have bilingual votes is that we value voting above language. That shows you that voting is more important than language and that if language were a barrier to voting then you must eliminate that barrier! So it is not the same sense as in other countries where you have multi-lingual policies where you have a right to vote in any language. In the United States you don’t have a right to vote in Spanish, you don’t have a right to vote in English, you don’t have a right to vote in French - what you do is you have a right to vote! And if you can prove that somehow or other that is the sacred right, that language is an impediment to the exercise of that right, that’s why you have bilingual ballots! ...Now they want to make the language of the ballot approximate the sacred status to which we ascribe to voting? It can’t be! And there is no special status assigned to language per se, it is the exercise of voting that we hold sacred, not the language in which we vote.
WHAT THE FOUNDING FATHERS WOULD HAVE SAID

EXCERPT 11:1

O2: Nor did the founding fathers establish a wide range of Federally mandated social benefits and Federal education programs and Federal mandates on individuals and citizens. The reach of the Federal government at the time of the founding of the country was much less than it is today. And the question of establishing English as the common language of the United States is at least a question worth considering. The common language of the United States and the Constitution is not put on a par with the exalted position of religious faith; religious faith is in fact mentioned in the Constitution in the First Amendment. Furthermore, the Constitution is written in English but the founding fathers were in fact silent on the question of language, whereas they spoke rather clearly on the issue of religion. The rise of the welfare state, the rise of an expansive Federal government that reaches into individuals’ lives and business and livelihood and education, and nearly every day calls for this particular question at least to be raised and debated for possible Congress to consider for legislation.

EXCERPT 11:2

JLB: ..the interpretations of the intentions of the founding fathers and the German language question and whether Benjamin Franklin said what he said or meant it, i.e. what kind of state was envisaged? Was it to be an ethnically and linguistically neutral state in which belonging to America was a political contractual (kind of) citizenship and therefore breaking with the European tradition of clothing the state in ethnicity? Do you think that the state, in its original conception or how it has become was ever neutral or was ever intended to be ethnically or linguistically neutral?

L1: No. I think that if you’re talking about the colonies that were the basis for the United States, where the founding took place then no, I do think the early Americans understood themselves prior to the revolution as Englishmen. And I think they understood their tradition as an English tradition (but that doesn’t mean that each and every colony…there’s obviously Pennsylvania and other exceptions) that they were modelling and what they were trying to create was a more perfect England. I don’t think that there was this notion that there was going to be this very laisser-faire … and that it would be simply a conglomeration of different groups that would sort of go off on their own. Now, maybe it would have turned out differently if in the revolution, the revolutionary forces, had been able to take parts of Canada that they were going after and had ended up with some French speakers ... it’s, it’s-

JLB: //speculation.

L1: Yeah. It’s hard to know. But I think the founding fathers understood this country to be a country whose roots were basically English.

EXCERPT 11:3

JLB: A lot of comment …that America has always been a multilingual society and that the founding fathers actively chose not to make English the official language. Either that or they preferred to be silent about language believing that was entirely a private matter, and that it was just natural that people would … use English because it was the dominant language…According to this reasoning what you’re doing is to work against the tradition of the founding fathers,…this sort of libertarian sort of ideal. What do you say about that?

R3: I don’t recall any of the founding fathers who either on their own - and some of them are very proficient in languages like Jefferson, who was very proficient in French - I never heard one of them ever suggest that any business of this country should be conducted in a foreign language. So, implicit in what they were doing was acknowledging that, as far as they were concerned, English was the official language.

EXCERPT 11:4

L3: This country, when it began, was an English speaking country, it broke off from an English speaking country. The founders of the Constitution that they made so much noise about the other day, that they (did not) put English in their Constitution - there was no need. We were breaking from an English speaking country and they all spoke English and they never figured it would ever be any problem. So why put it in the Constitution?

EXCERPT 11:5
So, it is particularly difficult to accept the **official** language proposition when you have got all of these **very explicit negative** repercussions: if somehow you **don’t** comply with somebody’s notion of what **ought** to be an official language. But even if there were a sort of **innocuous** situation, or **so-called** innocuous situation, as we’ve had it at the **State** level, they simply **declare** something the official language - I think even then we would find it difficult **because of who we are** as a country and what our **tradition** has been. Our founding fathers **discussed** this and they **very wisely** agreed that, given our pluralism, and at a time when **thirteen** colonies and oh they were largely English speaking, they felt that given the **vision** of America it would **not** be appropriate to have an official language. And in a way, to make a **modest** concession, a **minimal** concession, to the reality that this country has enjoyed the presence of **many** of the world’s languages in some way or another, and that would be a recognition.

**LINGUA MUNDI**

**EXCERPT 12:1**

R2: ...the airport industry around the world uses English as the common language. In **every** airport that you go around the world, if they are qualified as an international airport then the instructions to the pilots are provided in **English** and it is that sort of a concept that in a **huge country** like the US where you have the distances so great, and the differences among the people are so great, that it is **important** to maintain a uniformity and consistency that we record and manage communications.

**EXCERPT 12:2**

L3: //I study languages, I have **at least** twelve languages, right now I just finished a course studying **Slovak** because I am very involved in the Slovak Republic. US English is going to bring American teachers, to take **English to Slovaks**.
JLB: **In Slovakia**?
L3: Yeah.
JLB: So it’ll be a sort of English foreign language **commercial** activity-
L3: //**yes**, they’re **dying** to learn English over there, **all over Eastern Europe**. We’re going to **facilitate** the foundation. We have two groups. US English Inc. is the lobbying group trying to make English the **official** language and US English **Foundation** is the education foundation promoting the **learning** of English. We give money around here to people who are teaching English in neighbourhoods or in border states or whatever, and we want to expand it to give money to El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, or in Eastern European countries where they want to learn English.

**WHAT’S REALLY BEHIND THIS WHOLE THING?**

**EXCERPT 13:1**

L4: We believed that English was already our common language so therefore our perception is that a proposal to **make** English the official language would be unnecessary first of all because English is in **no** danger of disappearing. We also believe that it would be **discriminatory** and **most definitely** divisive. And **frankly**, what you said earlier about the reactions to growing waves of immigration or even certainly even just the growing prominence of certain groups, such as Hispanics - we **really** feel that is behind this latest rise in **official English popularity**. There are so **many** reasons that we oppose these, but **frankly** we hear a lot from the community that this would be **dangerous and divisive** and really an **insult** to the culture of Hispanics in this country, because for Hispanics language is a **very important** part of the culture. So it is **not only** from a public policy standpoint that we would find it **dangerous** but a **cultural** standpoint as far as maintaining ties to culture. We certainly **don’t** believe that we need to have Spanish as the official language....

**EXCERPT 13:2**

L4: I think that they have been **very, very good, very** successful at presenting themselves as a **very** moderate, **very** reasonable organisation and in comparison to all of these other groups they **look** more moderate. I think that they know **exactly** what they are doing. I think that it is **no** accident that there are groups spawned in the much more extreme. It is a curious phenomenon in this country that they happened over the last **fifteen to twenty**
years. Things that used to be radical are not, and things that are extreme are viewed as more moderate. To us US English is still an extremist, radical organisation but has been able to position itself, as has their counter-part, F.A.I.R. (Federation for American Immigration Reform), because again we know what their roots are, we know where they're coming from.

EXCERPT 13:3

O1: Well, I think it has a lot to do with politics... a lot of debate lately coming out from what they call the American Agenda, Contract with America, you know, with a lot of Christian Coalition movements, their agenda... the true story will be revealed and we will prove once again that our children deserve better.

EXCERPT 13:4

R4: ... it would take some interpretation to interpret the underlying motivation and you hate to impugn peoples’ motives. But clearly the country is having difficulty, the United States as a whole is having difficulty, dealing with this new-found diversity and there are certain quarters of the country that feel threatened by it; and one of the most symbolic... one of the things that is easiest to symbolise, as an example of diversity gone crazy, as diversity becoming a disunifying force, is language. And so language is used as the symbol around which to rally the forces of assimilation, the forces of acculturation, the forces against alleged political correctness, the forces against immigration and the forces against all kinds of changes with which many people feel uncomfortable with; and in a sense... the immediate basis for that is the demographic changes that are in the United States today (although this always had been a part of American history) there has always been this sentiment... it surfaces from time to time and it reaches where you can get a majority of people behind it at certain critical points in American history... certainly the last time would have been some time in the '20s when it was linked to the kinds of changes in immigration policy and the English-only laws that were passed back then.

EXCERPT 13:5

L4: Yes we do (speak English), but we also speak Spanish and many other different languages and, frankly, if you look at this debate you see that the fact that there are Russian immigrants speaking Russian is never a concern, you know, the fact that you're a Yiddish speaker in New York, that's really not a problem. The problem is that there are Spanish speakers-
JLB: //why is that particularly a problem? Because of geographic proximity, because of those peoples or because of the size (of those communities)? What is the particularity there that makes it problematic?
L4: I think that, for example, Miami is the ++ out see a city, you know, that prior to the immigration of a lot of people from Latin America, particularly Cuba... the city was really in trouble. And it has had economic benefit, it has added economic benefit to that city to have the influx of Cubans. So Miami is a good example where there is a more visible Latino population that is perceived to not want to assimilate... but again I think that ah... you're question was why is it a problem-
JLB: //you said that it doesn’t seem to bother the legislators that Russians or white northern Europeans speak their languages but it does bother them that so many Latinos speak Spanish, and I was just wondering what-
L4: //it may be the sheer numbers of perceived ++ I guess my point was that there was a perceived cost economically because of the fact that jobs are lost perhaps in Miami, for example. The counter argument there is that it is the very influx of tourists that are attracted to-
JLB: //what, jobs go to Spanish-English speakers; to bilinguals?
L4: Right
JLB: It is an advantage for bilingualism, though, it is not an advantage for Spanish only.
L4: True. But I think there were some studies that I have seen that Florida is, like, a number one tourist destination for a number of Latin American countries. Florida itself. And that is largely due to the fact that there are a lot of Spanish speakers and certainly they feel more welcome. But actually it goes the same for German tourists. I have read studies that German tourists find the fact that Miami is an international and, really, a bilingual city to be attractive, even though German isn’t spoken nearly as much as Spanish; so it is the perceived internationalism of the city that is attractive.
EXCERPT 13:6
R4: … people are saying that the number of Hispanics in the country are growing in leaps and bounds and so sometimes the same statistic is used as an argument to continue to support bilingual education and on the flip side it is used as an argument to scare people! - “Wow, they’re taking over! What are we going to do?” And so the statistic itself tells you nothing other than how you reacted. And the problem, at base level, for American society today is that there is a great deal of anxiety about that and the way to deal with it is to relieve the anxiety, to make diversity non-threatening, not to say that the cure for diversity is assimilation but to say that diversity itself is not threatening and that’s really the point. …to say that diversity exists and it is not threatening.

EXCERPT 13:7
S1: I believe that the United States needs to designate English as the official language of this country. Most people in America support that idea. I have seen polls up to the high 80% of the American people supporting that. The polling of the new immigrants - you’ve got some of that down - overwhelmingly, even the ones that have come into this country over the last few years, support English as the official language. That doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t encourage people to speak more than one language but America is different from a lot of these countries. Not altogether different but some different. We are basically a land of immigrants, of immigrant stock, but the English language has been the glue that has held this country together over the years because we come from so many lands and came with many tongues. But what has happened in recent years is we have had a massive influx of immigrants through regular immigration, through refugee status, and so forth; and I think it is healthy that America does have diversity. But we need one language because I can see America fractured in the future, along language lines. The Spanish language is probably the second highest spoken language in the US. There has been a massive influx of Spanish speaking people in the last twenty years; a lot legally, a lot illegally into this country.

EXCERPT 13:8
O1: … The image I looked to America when I was in Vietnam is completely different to the image now of America. I can tell you this much. Why? Because based on those debates! So, I sometimes ask myself - where are we? What are we doing? This is the thing. … This is a very confusing time. And a very sad time.

EXCERPT 13:9
L3: There wasn’t an issue! It was greatly exaggerated …In one of his groups there was a Think Tank that had to do with population growth and how population moved from one place to another. He had written a memo with questions. These were philosophical questions – ‘What would happen if the Mexicans were reproducing a lot faster and were to become the greatest majority?’ Or whatever. I have a copy of it somewhere here also; the famous Tanton Memo. It was blown way out of proportion. It had nothing to do with US English, it had to do with philosophical questions.
JLB: He was the Director at the time?
L3: He was the Director, yes. It is the same as me telling you – ‘What would have happened if during the Million-Man-March a group of terrorists had thrown a few grenades into the crowd?
JLB: So it was speculation of some sort?
L3: That’s what it was. Speculation. And I think it would have been a horrendous mess if some terrorist had attacked the crowd. For the country it would have been a horrendous mess. That’s what it was, it was speculation. The man got very surprised by the reaction to all this and he resigned and he has never been around anymore.

EXCERPT 13:10
L1: Well, I don’t oppose an English language amendment and I think there might even be some marginal benefit that would accrue by having an English language provision either in the Constitution or by law because I think it would serve important symbolic significance. It would in fact settle the question that the government is not neutral about the issue and that there is a language that is common to the public and in which we are going to operate in the civic sphere, that this is the language that the government will use to communicate with the people, will be the language that the people will be expected to use in communicating with the government. I guess my own take on why this has become an issue is sort of two-fold….One thing is we built up a whole rights mentality with respect to language as well as to other factors and characteristics of American life. There is now, I think, a very strong movement to try and enshrine in law, basically by using the courts, the notion that it is a Civil Right in the United States to be able to function in one’s language of origin, one’s native language, one’s
mother-tongue; and that it is the government’s responsibility to communicate with people in their ‘own language’ so now that you have demands that certain kinds of documents be printed in languages other than English, that services be provided to people by the government in (languages other than) English, and that any failure to do so is viewed in the legal context as a violation of one’s Civil Rights. Now, within reason, there is something to this. I mean, the idea that you’re going to be tried in a court of law and not understand the language in which the proceedings are taking place obviously does impinge on your right to a fair trial….So, there seems to be some reasonable accommodations where in fact the right to speak in your own language is part of your Civil Rights. But, to try and take those limited examples and then take that whole notion of rights and interpret it much more broadly so that you have a right to function in all circumstances, in all places, in the language which you choose as somehow your Civil Right is somehow part of your Civil Right to engage in free speech seems to be taking that notion just too far. So you have got a little bit of a backlash in that context. The other thing which is quite clearly driving this is that suddenly, in the 1980’s and 1990’s we are beginning to get many more non-English-speaking immigrants, just as we did in the early part of this century when we had so many people coming in from southern and eastern Europe. So the numbers are also driving it, you have lots of newcomers. Those newcomers are also empowered in a way that they were not in the earlier part of this century. They have institutions that speak for them; that mobilise them, that can use them as a political wedge to demand services in their native language. And that’s why we don’t hear a lot of clamour for bilingual policy with Korean as our second language, or Chinese or Japanese. But we do hear a lot with respect to Spanish because even though Asians make up an equal number of immigrants to the US as Latin Americans they do all speak different languages whereas the Latin Americans speak one. So you have a critical mass of newcomers who can be used politically. They demand equal attention to their language.

**IF LANGUAGE ISN’T THE GLUE WHAT UNITES AMERICA?**

**EXCERPT 14:1**

L4: … also there is this perception somehow that English is the only unifying factor, we disagree with (this). In fact, frankly, if English is the only unifying factor then we’re in trouble. We feel that there are far more important shared values and shared principles that keep us unified as a country.

**EXCERPT 14:2**

R4: … you know, the genius of the United States is that it defines membership on a political and civic basis. It didn’t attribute it to some kind of sacred origins, it didn’t attribute it to ethnicity; the genius of that, yeah ++ because of that unique history there is always some feeling of dissatisfaction about your own origins as a country and some feeling that you need to reinforce it, reinforce that core, and so you latch onto certain symbols and you make them more powerful than they really are.

**EXCERPT 14:3**

L4: Latinos have a very strong belief in the family, in traditional values of the family and of unity in that sense; certainly the shared belief in democracy and individual liberty, and the belief that if you work hard then you can get ahead. That is something that the mentality of the States is supposedly famous for. I think the Latinos are very committed to that, that ideal, as well. But primarily the issue of individual liberty, of freedom, of democracy, those are all, we believe, all far more important shared values than the fact that we all speak English.

**IF IT’S SYMBOLIC WHAT DOES IT SYMBOLISE?**

**EXCERPT 15:1**

L3: //in the beginning, yes. Making English the official language is a symbolic act ++ in the beginning. The end result of that, because it is the official language, we will begin reform in multi-lingual government, bilingual education reform, ballot reforms, and all the other reforms.

**EXCERPT 15:2**

JLB: If it were just a symbolic measure, what would it symbolise? What would the symbol be?

L5: Precisely! And that is precisely the question. If it is symbolic, what is it that you’re trying to get across? And it is almost beginning to sound like a cultural chauvinism, a reaction, rather than trying to accomplish anything meaningful. So, that is the dilemma. Why do you want to do it? Either it is symbolic and it has a lot of baggage to it and very little upside or it is coercive and it has got a lot of baggage and you’re trying to induce a
certain kind of behaviour by using the punitive powers of the government. And then it is clearly very objectionable.

EXCERPT 15:3
JLB: So, to what extent do you see the official English movement is about symbolic relations within the country - who belongs, who doesn’t, and what the messages are? And to what extent is it a really practical thing to actually save money on translations and so on?
L5: I think it is 99% symbolic. If you look at the origins of some of the groups that are pushing for official language laws, they have very direct ties to some of the same groups that are pushing an anti-immigrant agenda…US English was founded with help from F.A.I.R which is one of the most anti-immigrant groups around that has been very supportive of things like Proposition 187 and you have some intermingling also between the boards of those two groups and I don’t think that is just coincidental. So I think that even though groups like US English try and portray themselves as representing the best interests of the recent immigrants and (as) part of a very altruistic motivation, when you see who started them, who funds them. For example, John Tanton kind of came out of English, there was a memo that surfaced in the late 80′s, I don’t know if you have heard of it, when Shelby and Mauro Mujica were saying “Don’t you feel…” and afterwards I said “Oh, when I saw that I was upset I had it pull immediately. Where did you get that copy?”. He was very upset about it. But it showed me that this guy doesn’t even know what kind of advertisements his organisation is producing. And then I asked him something like “Don’t you feel…” … or rather he said something like “When I was first approached to be the head of this, I spent three months trying to make up my mind whether or not I should do it. But I feared that it was better that I be there than not”. So I said “Don’t you know that there are many people who are in the movement who have very strong anti-Hispanic and very strong anti-immigrant biases?” and he agreed with me; he said “Yes, I do know that” but somehow he is hoping that by his being there he can turn this around whereas, you know, I think it is a cover.

EXCERPT 15:4
JLB: Do you think that is primarily a practical job…? To designate English as the official language? Or is it a symbolic question about the nature of the society and cohesion in the way you’re saying?
S1: But we have always accepted it (that English is the official language) here but the political debate has intensified in the last five, six, seven years regarding English and that is why it is in the political arena today here in Washington.

EXCERPT 15:5
JLB: If it is not going to make any practical effect tomorrow then clearly the move, to a very significant degree, is a fairly symbolic statement.
S1: I think it is more than symbolic. Once you pass the law there will be other things that will follow. There will be a greater emphasis, more attention, to how important English is to America.
**EXCERPT 15:6**

R4: … I don’t know where [name of Congressman] leads on that but the problem is because they are not ++ those laws are not policies designed to solve problems. They are designed to send a certain symbolic message to everybody, and once that symbolic message is sent you don’t know where it is going to lead. That’s the problem. The problem is not whether the … legislation says that English is the official language ++ what are the practical effects of that? The practical effects may be limited in the beginning but what message does that send to people when the Navahos say ‘Well, we want to do this and that’ and are met with an ‘Oh no! You can’t do that now’ and then it sets a dynamic for a whole series of arguments that don’t need to exist, consternation, like the example of the person trying to get Feliz Cumpleaños on a cake and Baskin Robbins or thirty-one flavours. You know? How does the public interpret a law like that? Does that mean I don’t have to ++ if somebody comes in ++ the classic example of this is on Guam ++ my wife, who is a Spanish speaker … the newspaper and wanted to buy and advertisement that said ‘Happy Birthday’ to me in English - well, they had said ‘absurdity’! So that led to a series of demonstrations and eventually the newspaper changed its policy. Now, the reasons for policies like that is not because of the law, but law symbolised an attitude, and sent a signal to American at large that you can do this!

JLB: So it authorises behaviour among ordinary people who police the law as they sometimes might be very negative and other times might be indifferent?

R4: Well, certainly it unleashes the forces of empowerment and that is bad, and that is know, I can even imagine some cable operators saying ‘Now I don’t have to carry the Spanish-language network’ so that the decision is no longer a business-based decision. Now they have the law on the side! But it symbolises that intolerance of other languages is OK.

**LINGUISTIC CIVIL RIGHTS & LINGUISTIC WELFARE**

**EXCERPT 16:1**

L5: We believe that developing our resources should include developing our multi-lingual resources and that it is silly to squander them which is essentially what you’re doing if you’re saying that English is the sole official language because you’re symbolically lessening the importance of the other languages we have in this country. So that is definitely one of my points, one of the points that we make; that, you know, as far as rapidly becoming a global society and global economy, English is definitely the language of communication. It is the common language but it is equally important to develop our own resources.

JLB: Do you think the arguments in Mr Roth’s speeches about how he supports foreign language learning, he thinks it is a good idea for people to know, say, French or German or Japanese? What impression does it give you to hear him say those sorts of comments and to construe all that as a plus and then

L5: I personally think it is just disingenuous. I think that your actions speak louder than words and to sponsor the kind of Bill that he has sponsored, that flies in the face of … that perhaps some of the Representatives have been tagged with a little bit of “you’re immigrant bashing” so they are starting to feel a little bit defensive. But certainly to repeal bilingual education, to repeal the foreign language, the assistance provisions of the Civil Rights Act, that does speak louder than words.

**EXCERPT 16:2**

L5: Yeah. I think often the perception has been that certain Federal programs are designed for certain groups. You heard often last year during the Reauthorisation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that in previous years the Charter One program which a $7 billion dollar program for disadvantaged students was for African Americans and that Title 7, which is less than a $200 million dollar program, was for Hispanics. We tried to change that perception because obviously a $7 billion dollar program can reach far more students than can a $200 million dollar program…. I’m, frankly, at a loss to understand how people portray it as a program that prevents children from assimilating when its very purpose is and always has been to teach students English.

**EXCERPT 16:3**

L3: Sink or swim was the situation.

JLB: Do you favour ‘sink or swim’?

L3: It worked. The whole country is English-speaking right now because of the ‘sink or swim’. So anybody in the street and ask them where their grandparents were born.
JLB: But a lot of those grandparents would have functioned in German or French or whatever, and then their children would have learned English.

L3: No, their parents also learned. To a lesser degree of course.

**IS IT TRACTABLE?**

**EXCERPT 17:1**

R4: Well, science should never be used to solve a policy problem. It should only be used to illuminate. …ultimately we’re talking about value-laden decisions. And, to be sure, in this instance I am a bilingual educator so I feel very comfortable with the research on bilingual education because almost all the research on bilingual education that is done by educators and linguists sustains the point. The other guys have all this research done by people who are not linguists and are not educators, they come from some other field and so that is the problem with their research work. It is like allowing a dentist to make commentary on medical procedures… ultimately it is not going to be resolved by science and it is not going to be resolved by research…

**EXCERPT 17:2**

O1: The point is, and I hate to say this … politics is involved in the issue, not purely educational. I think that issue should be decided by the educators who know at least the techniques or appropriate approach and research it. Do the research into how to improve the learning and teaching environment in the classroom. The education/learning process should not be taking place in the Congress, not taking place in the Governor’s mansion, not taking place in the Mayor’s office, or School Board Office, but taking place in the classroom, in schools, so that in the classroom the teacher and the student really interact - that’s when teaching and learning take place. So in every effort to improve and reform our education, we should focus on the classroom. That is why Secretary Riley and President Clinton are always saying that if there are cuts, the big impact is felt in the classroom and the President will then consider vetoing those measures. Why? Because the President and the Secretary are very concerned about the classroom activities. Always…classroom activities top priority for guiding us in any type of program and anything like that.. I hope the real and strong answer to this type of challenge is to prove that our kids are going well, our program is working well, (that) we are not wasting any tax-payers dollars at a Federal level, government level, local level, State level. We try to improve ourselves, our school, our classrooms, we help our teachers to be better, better able to cope with all situations that arise at school and in the classroom nowadays. Not talking about twenty years ago - at that time the school setting was completely different.

**EXCERPT 17:3**

L1: I think policy will play a very important role in resolving the problem. I think getting the various people who are a part of this disagreement to sit down at the table and to accept the same sort of facts probably will not be likely. I think what will happen, and I think part of the reason that we have the problems we have today, is that for much of the time that this constituency for Spanish native language instruction in the United States the majority population basically didn’t pay attention, they didn’t much care if their children were not being affected. Money may have been spent and wasted creating these Spanish bilingual classes but by and large it didn’t affect middle-class non-Hispanic children and therefore nobody much cared. It was sort of a pot of money being given to this one group because the group said they needed it and it wasn’t a very big issue because …it was a tiny part of the population. It is becoming more critical now because the group that is making these demands is itself becoming much larger and whether or not these particular immigrant youngsters learn English well, and are able to move into the mainstream in this country, is critical in terms of the future of this country. We’re now talking about a part of the population that is going to over 10% of the population in the next census, we’re talking about a population that is very regionalised so that it is over 10% nationally but it is well over a quarter in some places in the country, and in some cities it is the majority of the population.

**EXCERPT 17:4**

L2: But it is interesting. One program out of three hundred shows that their program works and if they find one person who, for the wrong reason, supports my cause, that proves that the entire thing is racist. It is becoming an interesting method of working from one small example to the entire universe. No-one is interested if I recite chapter and verse of failed program after failed program - they call that ‘anecdotal evidence’.

**SMALL OR INTRUSIVE GOVERNMENT?**
EXCERPT 19:1
L5: But then again the political party has a strong interest in the abortion issue which is, again, intrusive government, really, based on larger symbolic values. But it’s hard to say. But that is what I think is a big (inaudible) for Bob Dole. We wrote him a letter before he made his speeches in becoming involved in this issue, (it) runs counter to the traditional tenants of the Republican Party – ‘Why are you doing this’?

EXCERPT 19:2
L2: There were student riots in Cambodia, over the students wanting to be taught English at University instead of French, because English is the language of world-wide opportunity. In the United States all the government has to do is get out of the way and immigrants will learn English. Immigrants in this country have not changed. Immigrants want to learn English, they want their children to learn English. And unfortunately a mandatory multi-lingualism tends to create needless resentment against immigrants because these are programs they never asked for.

EXCERPT 19:3
L2: As I understand Australia, you all have set up a policy in which you have a language preservation for the indigenous peoples.
JLB: Yeah, something like that.
L2: And there is some of that in this country. We passed a similar law in 1990. The alarming thing about that sort of thing is that I think you would agree that there is a very big difference between a family deciding ‘Yes, we will preserve our language and our culture’ and a government saying ‘Your child will have his language and culture preserved whether you like it or not’ as if they are not children but so many linguistic refugees.

EXCERPT 19:4
L2: What we’re concerned about is in the schools should be taught the national language and every child should be given the opportunity to learn the national language. If they don’t want to, that’s their choice. The United States also has a tradition of private schools and there is a program run on Saturdays in Silver Spring, Maryland, for Chinese-speaking parents who have set up at their own expense, a Chinese school. So, during the week the children learn in English in a regular school but on Saturdays they learn Chinese language and culture and customs at a Chinese school. There seems to be a thinking on the other side that if the government doesn’t pay for it then it is not worth doing; and our thinking is that it is wonderful when immigrant families choose to preserve their culture. It is quite another thing when the government says we’re going to preserve your culture whether you like it or not.

EXCERPT 19:5
O2: [the Representative] would hold that the Federal government should not mandate upon States and local communities that ballots be printed in every tongue. If the local community in its local election, and most election laws are in fact local and State laws, that they ought to have the ability to determine that themselves ++ without the Federal government mandating that they print the ballot in nearly every conceivable tongue.

SNOUTS IN PUBLIC TROUGHS
EXCERPT 20:1
L2: //I was saying that there is a lot more to this issue than simply passing an official language law because what we have seen is that the government bureaucracy tend not to enforce the language laws, and they’re trying to create new demands for multi-lingual services. …. North Carolina, for example, passed an official English law in ’88 and decided to translate its drivers’ manual into Spanish in 1989! … so, what we’re looking at again on the Federal level is we have a very unusual custom in this country which in the United States gives grants to groups which lobby the Congress for more money. You can see how this seems to have a bit of a conflict of interest and under the new Congress there is an attempt to say that if you lobby the government you can’t get government grants, if you get government grants you can’t lobby the government.
JLB: Alright.
L2: And this is so the anti-English lobbyist advantage because they are almost entirely dependent on it. So we’re voting on that on Tuesday and that’s what we’re working on.
JLB: They’re voting on whether or not you can lobby if you receive a grant?
L2: Also the National Service Plan... turns out ‘National Service’ doesn’t mean what most people thought it meant, either. It also grants to organisations. My favourite is this huge amount of money, about $200,000, to a group that said it would teach people to speak English. They taught 5 people. On a dollar per person value, we could have sent them all to Burlitz nineteen thousand times.

EXCERPT: 20:2
L2: That’s interesting and one hates to say this but Speaker Gingrich said it and unfortunately we have start looking at the motives of people who seem to be utterly indifferent to the fact that immigrant parents hate the programs that are not working for the children and who are denying the children of immigrants their rightful place in society by not giving them a chance to learn English while they are young. And you see, why would anyone do that? Well, the people in charge of the programs make darn good money. And Canada proved that when they passed their official languages act, wages were held constant for monolingual English and monolingual French but people who spoke both English and French had their wages go up by about a 5th. So, there is a certain self-interest and in fact we see this in certain of their writings, on the other side. The National Association for Bilingual Education, I believe this is from their issue brief, but this isn’t a quote like some of the other stuff I have given you. I was reading this somewhere. They said ‘Our teachers should have to learn Spanish. How can you expect the children to learn English if the teachers won’t learn another language?’ Well, let’s step back for a moment and see what kind of an agenda does that reveal? Not again, bringing us all together in a commonality. And of course if we say, well, if the Spanish speaking kids learn English then the teachers must learn Spanish - what does that do to the Vietnamese speaker?

EXCERPT 20:3
JLB: …some of them (opponents of official English) say that the official English movement is xenophobic. How do you respond to those comments?
L2: Let me respond to that on two levels. First of all, on [name omitted], the founder of English First. His wife was Panamanian! He speaks Spanish at home! His son grew up speaking Spanish before he spoke English! But in the broader question, immigrants haven’t changed … but in these costly bilingual and multi-lingual services… bilingual education, a process that hasn’t worked in over 27 years, costs States and localities $8 billion dollars. New York City is laying off Art teachers and Gym teachers and then they are advertising for more multi-linguals who must be able to speak this language, ‘We need a guidance counsellor who speaks Spanish’. The assistant co-ordinator of bilingual education in New York makes $104, 000 a year! Who gets the blame for that? The poor immigrant for something he never asked for and doesn’t want.

IS ENGLISH NATIONAL, OFFICIAL, CONVENIENT OR COMMON?
EXCERPT 21:1
R4: … and that’s not to discount the role of English in providing the language. It is the language of common communication. It is the language of political discourse. Anybody who argues that you should have a bilingual ballot because that is the only way that they are going to participate, as long as it has Spanish - for that person, they are cutting off their own level of participation in national dialogue. … approximate the standards of voting. It does not even approximate the sacred standard of voting. It does not approximate the sacred standard of being a citizen! In Guam there was some discussion about when we play the Guam Hymn and then we play the Guam Hymn. And people sing the Guam Hymn real loud, they sing the Guam Hymn as loudly. And there was one clever man who resolved this problem in Chamorro, translated! Why would anybody object to that? What’s the Spangled Banner into Chamorro and singing it? Does that not do more honour to the flag? Are we going to arrest him? Are we going to say that he’s committed sacrilege.
JLB: So what is needed in this debate is a resolution that doesn’t require delivery plusses ++ to find a new language to describe the role of English which would not be about common convenient historical power. Something that can be moderately objective. Do you agree with that?
R4: I think they are almost open and shut cases in American society. I mean, you know, it is the language of communication, it is the world language in the sense of business, in the sense of telecommunications. So, you know, on the basis of that it makes sense to continue the primary role that English has, not to make it sound as though it was delivered from the gods.
EXCEPRT 21:2

JLB: The here in Washington D.C. and I have file in (Babel) God wanted to punish His people who were building this tower by each other. I like to define it as a reverse tower of Babylon (Babel) situation. In the story of the tower of Babylon way it couldn’t understand each other and so they abandoned building this tower to the sky, to the Heavens. I call it the reverse tower of Babylon (Babel) places, speaking different languages, and different races, and we were able to talk to each other. But I don’t think that a common language, a language that we could all understand and be understood in, so as a matter of communication, that is the key word here, being able to communicate, this is not a country like England or France where there was a commonality, where the race and the language was the same so they were able to function more or less well.

EXCERPT 21:3

L3: I like calling it common language. Frankly, I have never like the word official language but that is the way it has to be called in order to pass a Bill in Congress that will make some changes hopefully. The way I see the common language situation is that it is the language that allows all of us immigrants to communicate with each other in this country. ….. So it is an issue of us immigrants being able to talk to each other and understand each other. I like to define it as a reverse tower of Babylon (Babel) situation. In the story of the tower of Babylon (Babel) God wanted to punish His people who were building this tower by forcing them to speak different languages so that they couldn’t understand each other and so they abandoned building this tower to the sky, to the Heavens. I call it the reverse tower of Babylon (Babel) places, speaking different languages, and different races, and we were able to talk to each other. But I don’t think that a common language, a language that we could all understand and be understood in, so as a matter of communication, that is the key word here, being able to communicate, this is not a country like England or France where there was a commonality, where the race and the language was the same so they were able to function more or less well.

EXCERPT 21:4

L2: Every now and then people get confused on terminology and when someone says there is a course call English as a Second Language one Congressman stood up and said ‘English is the first language in this country!’ And the other side had a good laugh, people do make mistakes. De Tocqueville when he wrote about the United States talked about how we had this vast continent united by this one language and he was forgetting about the Native American Indians. But we, the United States, is vastly larger than Europe, miles and miles and (we are) really able to function in one language, and this is why immigrants and people even thinking of coming to America are studying English because it is not only the language of the United States, it is increasingly the international language of commerce. Now the other side will say and they do in debate how the Japanese will tell you that the most important language is the language of the customer so therefore Americans need to study more foreign languages. That’s agreed. That is also a separate issue from official language and it also ignores the fact that the Japanese, the Germans, are studying English in much the same way as the language of international air traffic control is English. You can be a pilot from anywhere but if you want to fly internationally out have to speak English.

EXCERPT 21:5

L2: … it is in the details … that there is a lot of confusion. Let me work down your list if I may. A national language may be something that is spoken across the country but is not official. In other words it is not enshrined in law. Where now English is the national language of the United States, about 95% of the American people speak English; however it is not the official language which means that if you have a government document in two different languages and there is a difference in the meaning of one because there is a translation error, there is no way to say ’No, this is the official version’. If you file for a patent in the United States you are allowed to file in any language but you have to provide an English translation and that is considered the official application. JLB: The translation?

L2: Right. The English translation….Then a cultural language, and we’re not very far from Chinatown here in Washington D.C., and I have been down there, gone to the shops, the newspapers are all in Chinese,
everything is in Chinese - that’s part of our culture. And an official English law wouldn’t affect that. It doesn’t affect people. The difference between a foreign language and a second language; when I studied a second language in school it was a foreign language because I was raised an English speaker. But a technical term, call English as a Second Language which means if a child’s first language is not English…we actually have a real interesting way of determining what a child’s language is in this country. Under Federal law, if any other language is spoken in the home - let’s say you have an extended family and the grandmother speaks no English, and her children speak to grandma in French? - and if the child is fluent in English and then they have a bad day in a test or something- well ..(break in tape)…

EXCERPT 21:6
L2: We’re supported by individuals. We have an American custom called Direct Mail and we tell people about what we’re doing and if they like, what we’re doing, then they send us money. We have got 250,000 on our mailing list. We have 100,000 strongly active members right now, and we’re growing quite well. The other side gets most of its money from the government and this is why the Istook Amendment that is going to be voted on in some conference committee and the vote on Tuesday in the Senate are so important because the anti-English lobby gets millions of dollars from these programs. And you see, immigrants don’t support them, most Americans don’t support them, they have risen out of nothing, but it is very well-paying work.

EXCERPT 21:7
L3: /*this is the welfare State, they think that language for them has become sort of a welfare situation, or an equal rights kind of situation, and if we take it away then they’re going to lose something. I think they’re wrong. Nobody loses anything by learning English ++ anywhere in world.

BEING & BECOMING
EXCERPT 22:1
R4: … You have proved in a sense the enduring viability of American institutions and certainly their attraction to the rest of the world. ‘What else do you have to prove?’… And now, when they get to that, and then they define it as a War of Culture, as Speaker Gingrich does, then he inevitably has to raise those issues because what he is talking about as this a cultural war. Well, what culture is he talking about? Well, he harks back to 1955. I guess we’re all supposed to live like Leave It To Beaver and if we don’t kind of adopt that kind of life or we don’t find that the core of our collective memory then we are somehow not members of the cultural group that continues to sustain this society.

EXCERPT 22:2
L2: … some people in this country >>there is something that Australia has too<<we’re unique nations in that we’re nations of immigrants and the United States is almost unique in that almost anyone can become an American.. My last name is [name omitted]. It’s French. I couldn’t go to France and become a Frenchman, even if I became fluent. I mean, it’s just not possible. But when someone takes that citizenship oath in this country they are as good an American as the people who came over on the Mayflower. Under Bill Clinton we decided to start segregating citizenship ceremonies on the basis of language. Instead of emphasising what brings us together-
JLB: /*what does that mean? That citizenship ceremonies can be conducted in, say, Spanish?
L2: They did one… in Tucson Arizona, even though everyone spoke English, they said ‘Let’s have this one in Spanish’, only the first one in 200 years! Now you have seen in the movies; America is good at pulling out in the movies like in Short Circuit II (?) all of the people from various ++ obviously of different colour, cultures, and countries, and languages, all taking that oath in English, saying that ‘I’m proud of what I was before but I’m also proud of what I have become - American - and we now have something in common.’ Well, the anti-English lobby goes after that commonality and they want to be more concerned with what divides us as if the most important thing is not where we are or what we are doing but the language our ancestors may have spoken.

EXCERPT 22:3
L1: … Look, I am aggressively pro-immigrant. Virtually no-one in Washington D.C. involved in public policy is more pro-immigrant than I am. We have been very up-front on the immigration issue. In order to be able to maintain the high orders of immigration which I think are very good for this country; I don’t think we’re getting too many immigrants and I don’t even think that when you count the illegal aliens that we’ve got a
problem...I wish that we would come up with a guest-worker program where the people that are crossing the border illegally here because they have no way of getting in legally would be able to come here and be able to work for five or ten or fifteen or twenty years and have it be regulated and have it be something that the government authorised so that we could automatically get rid of our illegal alien problem if we had a guest-worker program and simply converted all of those people illegally coming here into guest-workers. And that’s the way of solving that problem. I don’t think that the economy is hurting because of these people, it is helping them. This city and every other major city in America would grind to a halt if all of these people disappeared overnight. They do very vital and important jobs that other people aren’t going to do and they do them well. So I’m very pro-immigrant. But in order to be able to maintain that position I have to be able to say that it is my ultimate aim, for those that we do let in as immigrants, that they be able to integrate into this society and literally do become American. I don’t think that you can become an American without learning English. I think English is integral. I think there is an American culture and that primary to that culture is the English language. And I think it is silly to suggest otherwise.

**EXCERPT 22:4**
JLB: … Are you saying the American nation does not have an ethnicity but it must have a common language?
L3: It has to have a common something.
JLB: It cannot have a common ethnicity, can it?
L3: It has the common territory, the common flag, and a common language. If you don’t want that, there is nothing more common about it.
JLB: … So you see, therefore, the language in instrumental terms, functional terms.
L3: To keep us together... because the people in this case came from all over the place. In fact, what I like to always say is that the founder of US English was a Japanese American, an immigrant. I am now the fellow who runs US English and it has nothing to do with being an immigrant. It has to do with being an American. And by living here I have to be able to communicate with the people of Polish ancestry and Russian and Jewish and everybody else. And that’s what we use to communicate - this common language.

**EXCERPT 22:5**
L3: Immigrants come here mainly because of money, this green value [holding up a dollar note]. That is why immigrants come to this country. They don’t come here because the landscape is better or the weather is better, they come here because there is plenty of opportunity. It is the opportunity of country. Anybody can be anybody in this country. Class is not important as it is in a lot of countries, including my own country. Education is not even important. You can be a high school dropout, like there are many high school dropouts that are multi-millionaires in this country. A lot of things are not important except your brains and what you can do with them. Taking that into consideration again, you can only function within the system if you know the language of the country. You can be as bright as anybody but if you don’t speak English you’re not going to get very far.

**EXCERPT 22:6**
R4: …, what is a community in this country? And that is the source of the problem. You can invent communities in this country in ways that you can’t invent communities in other communities. And somebody will come out front and say ‘Well, I’m representative of this community council meeting and you think ‘What the hell is a tennis community?’ And there are sixty other representatives of the tennis community says ‘Well, the anxiety of the tennis community is going to impede playing on our court time’; and so the tennis community contributes to the lack of participation and ethnos if you will, really contributes to it and so this anxiety is then exacerbated by the anxiety of people wanting to play tennis. Consequently this may be full of Hispanics, to have such strong communal roots, so that they are as a people, who speak to themselves as a people, and they are able to have a very short-hand way that Americans find ++ on the one hand they want to go to that, they wish they could have it, but they know they’re really kind of ++ above it and it is a struggle.

**EXCERPT 22:7**
R4: For this nation it is the only way. I remember this vein of debate where they said this is the only country where you seriously ask the question “What is an American?”… you don’t do that in France, you don’t do it in China. You don’t ask - what is a Chinese? We have a history of being a country of all the world and therefore
that question takes on a particular dimension to it. So if we can’t be a nation based upon ethnicity or blood, we are in the reality a multi-cultural, multi-lingual nation and therefore what’s got to unite us has got to be something else. And that something else has got to be political values.

**MILKING CASH COWS**

**EXCERPT 23:1**

L2: It is interesting. The biggest advocates of the program [bilingual education] were the National Education Association, America’s largest teachers union. One thing that labour unions like to have is more people doing the same job with sort of-

JLB: //it’s membership-

L2: //yeah, it’s membership. It’s a way to make the load a little lighter. What they came up with, and this is in 1966, was that dropout rates for Hispanic children were high - unacceptably high. They still are and they were unacceptable then. So, let’s have two teachers in the classroom, one to speak English, and the other to speak Spanish - and then the children will learn English. Well, they have studied that and it turns out that children don’t pick up a language that is not native to them in the same way that you and I couldn’t go to a movie in Swedish - we’re not listening for the Swedish, we’re waiting for the subtitles. And that is what the students do - they wait to hear the language they understand. So, then when Congress said ‘Let’s have bilingual education’: this makes sense. There is no data for it. They got some people. One of the people testified for it on the Spanish language radio station in Texas-

JLB: //this is back in 19-

L2: //back in 1967. You can look this up in the Congressional Hearing records. It is very illuminating. It is the Hearings on the bilingual education, Senate side, before Senator Ralph Yarborough -

JLB: //is he retired now?

//nah, he’s long gone, he’s dead. But these programs go on. The closest thing to eternal life in this world is a government program. We’re still trying to repeal the tea-tasters that we started in 1890! And in those hearings, you see, there was this one fellow and he owned a Spanish language radio station in Texas, and he said ‘We need bilingual education because everyone is learning English and I’m not going to have any listeners and I’m going to go to Spain to get radio announcers’. Keep in mind that this was for a program that Congress was later told would teach English but when they are discussing it here the people were saying that ‘Yeah, this will preserve Spanish and keep my job’. Another person to testify for it was a text book publisher. Well, this makes sense - the more languages that are required in school the more text books you need. Now, let’s say that these people were all doing it not for base motives but for the most pure of intentions - 27 years later the program hasn’t worked and their response is ‘We’re not doing enough of it! Let’s spend more! And we can show you an example of a program that works’. Yeah, one out of a hundred!

**EXCERPT 23:2**

JLB: Do you agree with the construction of this issue by some people that essentially the cause for this is the interests of bureaucrats and teachers?

L1: That’s absolutely right. The National Association for Bilingual Education is made up of bilingual teachers, teacher who get, depending on the school district anywhere from $500-$5000 more in their teaching jobs, teaching the bilingual classrooms, who are in a situation now where teaching is facing a lot of cutbacks that they have this ever-growing constituency of people who need their services so they are the ones who are going to be cut. We’re going to cut Art education and Music education and History and lots of other things before we cut services to these immigrant kids because everybody understands that these kids need help. So you have a lobby, you have a self-interested lobby, who are much more interested in maintaining their jobs than they are in ensuring that their kids that succeed and to the degree that you can keep those kids forever in their programs, they maintain their jobs that much longer. In other words, we’re rewarding bilingual educators for failing. If you are a Spanish language bilingual teacher, it is in your interest to keep Jose in your class for as long as you can. The fact that he might learn English and go on to Miss Jones’ class that is taught in English is going to undercut your job security.

**EXCERPT 23:3**

L2: There is a lot of autonomy but the next thing you know the government is suing you. That’s what’s happening in Colorado.

JLB: Well, what does that mean?
L2: Well, that means, in other words, you see under Federal law if you violate Civil Rights then you can’t get any money from any government program and we have a lot of money that is spent on Federal aid to education. Most of the money comes from States and localities but local school districts hate to turn down any money. So, if they get a notice from the investigator saying ‘We hear you’re not doing this’ their reaction is generally not what happened in Allentown which is prove it, it is ‘Oh no, we’re not doing anything and please keep the money coming’. And what is interesting is last year the Senate for the first time passed a requirement that some bilingual education teachers had to speak English. The Department of Education hadn’t gotten around to issuing any regulations or doing any investigations about that but they’re busy complaining to the State of Colorado that the State of bilingual education in the schools there don’t use enough native language.

EXCERPT 23:4
JLB: In the bilingual programs, though, isn’t it required that they … like, is it possible to have a bilingual program that doesn’t teach English? Isn’t the definition of a bilingual program-
L3: …… that’s exactly what is going on. … It doesn’t work!
JLB: Why? Isn’t it being implemented in the-
L3: …… because it is a cash cow. Bilingual education teachers get more money, the school gets more money, I think it is about $450 per student. The NEA, which is full of lefties there, what they want to do is they want to keep it that way. They have no incentive in taking them out of school, in graduating them, the incentive is to keep them.

ELIMINATING FEDERAL MANDATES
EXCERPT 24:1
JLB: If this succeeds, if Mr [Bill Sponsor]’s proposal succeeds, and the bilingual mandate is terminated, and it could be anyway through the cuts to the education-
L2: …… /I want to correct that and I do have one sheet of paper that will help you. You see, it turns out that the Federal government spends $240 million even before the budget cuts and it will probably be less when all is said and done but States and localities, that’s $8 billion from 1991-92 data, and as long as there is a mandate-
JLB: …… /so this is $8 billion unfunded bilingual education mandate? .. So you’re saying that even if the Federal government program were wound down there would still be these additional contributions? B-
L2: …… /as long as the Federal government mandates this approach. And what they do … is they say you have to use a method that is effective. It then defines bilingual education as effective and so if you want to do anything else then prove it works. Well … were bilingual education forced to meet that standard, it couldn’t. And let’s remember what bilingual education is. Bilingual, in your dictionary and mine, means ‘two languages’. Bilingual education in the United States means all day in Chinese or Spanish or whatever with one class a day, or as little as two classes a week in English. In New York City they take Haitian and they teach them in Haitian Creole. Of course in Haiti the school children are taught in French. So a child coming out of the Haitian school system comes to New York and says ‘What’s this?’..
JLB: So, they teach the language of the community but not the language of education in Haiti?
L2: Right.
JLB: Let’s just assume that the mandate is abolished and leave aside for the moment what the States would do... What would your preferred policy be then in terms of foreign languages … I am thinking about Spanish? Would it be taught as a second language in schools? Do you think it would be an important language for Americans to learn formally? What would the language policy be if there were one?
L2: Many colleges and universities in this country have, for many generations, required a foreign language to get into. Our laws don’t affect that. It’s interesting. In Washington it seems in order to get rid of a bad program you have to explain how you’ll mandate a good one. And our thinking is that would be up to the community. And in fact, let’s say that El Paso, Texas, decided as a matter of policy that every student should learn Spanish. Well, El Paso’s paying the Bill! But El Paso shouldn’t have the right to make that decision for Amarillo or Dallas or Los Angeles.
JLB: So, what I am hearing from you here is that it is the Federal government that is a large part of your problem. Is that your concern? Is that right?
The United States has always been a country that believes in the Fifth Amendment and that the States have certain powers and that government should best be a local matter because the local people are closer to it. And in order to eliminate Federal mandates what we are talking about is simply trying to legislate common sense. And what happens, and you have talked to the other side and they’ll tell horror stories about why if this happens they won’t be allowed to have Latin names and the animal cages. I’m not going to say that we don’t have supporters who are a little more aggressive they should be. But it is interesting. The other side says we should make Spanish the official language of the country and no-one says ‘Boo!’ about that! So, if we had our way then the Federal government would get out of the language business, other than encouraging people to learn English, issuing documents in English, and maybe taking some of this money that is saved and providing more English classes for adults.

JLB: But getting out of the language business means passing a language law, is that what you’re saying?

L2: Yeah.

TACTICS
EXCERPT 25:1

L3: But Congressman John Doolittle is doing an Amendment to the Constitution. But the feeling I get from the Members on the Hill is that they would like to have it and if it gets thrown out in court then we will talk about Amending the Constitution. And on what basis would people challenge? Which of the Amendments to the Constitution would they have mounted on?

JLB: Do you think that is possible? To challenge one of the Amendments to the Constitution?

L3: They would find a friendly judge. As you know, anyone can go to court in this country. If you pick the right judge in Arizona, a strong self-executing Bill in Arizona is the only one that allows citizen and unconstitutional, blah, blah, blah’. It just heard it this summer or prior before the Court of Appeals and they found in Arizona that the language used has been good in language issues. The other side would like to say that under American law you cannot discriminate on the basis of national origin - or should you? And they want to say that language is intrinsically part of national origin. Language has never been part of that, it has been rejected in the seventies and [name omitted], senator from Illinois who hates everything I stand for, tried to amend this commission on Civil Rights law to give him the right to investigate language. People always have the power to investigate national origin discrimination which tells me that even the other side admits that like, [name omitted] is Hispanic and speaks no Spanish. That doesn’t make her any less a proud Hispanic.

JLB: I just want to be clear on this. So, if the law were to be passed and there were to be a clear understanding that the language of government was English, that there would be no translations of materials unless there were some urgent need to do something overseas or something like that-

L3: //so you could just put in a translation and it would just have a warning label on it that says ‘This is provided as a courtesy while the official version is in English’.

EXCERPT 25:2

JLB: So you’re supporting the HR123 legislation?

L3: We created … legislation HR123. We don’t believe that you can get it done in a Bill. We support everything that [Bill Sponsor] and [Bill Sponsor] are saying. Yes, it needs reform; but that is not the way to pass a Bill.


L3: We don’t want to abolish it, we want to reform it. As a practical matter we have divided the Bill, if you will. I am an architect, I want to build the foundation of the building first. The foundation should be that we have an official language. Later on we will worry about bilingual education, bilingual ballots, drivers licenses, etc.

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGES
EXCERPT 26:1

L2: Let’s come back to one of your earlier questions. I am standing with immigrants who want to learn English and want their children to learn English. The Dade County Florida poll stays with me. 98% of the Hispanic parents want their children to read and write English perfectly whereas it’s just 94% of the Anglos. I think of the little Korean boy who was written up in the … at T.C. William’s High School ++ one of the teachers
there writes for the Washington Post and he wrote a book. This little boy said that he had to learn 40 new English words a night because he wanted to learn them. Meanwhile his English speaking class-mates complained about learning 10 a week. Immigrants are eager to take their place here and that’s why they leave family and all of that and they want to learn English and now the government says to them ‘Don’t bother’.

JLB: So, a large part of this is about the messages the legislation is sending?

L2: I think there is a cultural message to even the weakest law that says English is important in this country. In a nation as diverse as this one we have to be able to talk to one another. But laws have to be for a lot more than just sending messages. I mean, we have a post office for sending messages. And that is why we need a specific self-executing legislation.

EXCERPT 26:2

L2: ... And, as usual, our president is not known as the most steadfast on any particular issue. So, we’ve got the Speaker of the House endorsing this concept and the Majority Leader in the Senate. Now the key is to get the strongest Bill possible and for us a Bill, in order to succeed, has to do two things. It has to be self-executing. In other words, it has to be very specific about what it repeals so the bureaucracy can’t say ‘What are they getting at?’ and it also has to have a means of citizen enforcement. And in both the [Bill Sponsor] and the [Bill Sponsor] Bills, individuals can sue; if they are successful not only win but receive their attorney’s fees. So that will create a very quick resolution to the problem.

AZATLAN & ALL THAT

EXCERPT 27:1

R4: That’s true. That’s true; I mean, it doesn’t exist. To some extent there are some kinds of Romantic notions about Azatlan and the role of Spanish and the Mexican culture in the South West which, you know, is obviously quite large. But the only legitimate claims to a special role for non-English languages in this country belongs to the indigenous people and in that instance nobody begrudges them that. I mean, I don’t know of any politician that is going to stand up and say ‘We should get the Navahos to stop speaking Navaho’.

EXCERPT 27:2

JLB: Do you think it is seriously the case that American national unity is in jeopardy in some way? Do you feel that the country is less united now than it was twenty years ago and, if so, is there a contribution that immigration and multi-lingualism has played in that?

L2: I’d like to separate those issues. Immigrants aren’t the problem. I would say that, and I don’t know if you saw this when they, right before the Prop 87 vote in California, they have students in Los Angeles....come out and protest it. And they were waving Mexican flags and they are denouncing Prop 87 in signs in Spanish. Those people were the perfect flower of bilingual education programs in the United States. They don’t speak English and they don’t identify with the country in which they were born but with the country of their ancestors. We can only imagine how a program like this ++ where we concentrate ++ we see how in Northern Ireland would have separate programs where each group was taught in their native language and they are taught only about the outrages of the other group against them. ‘What that would do for future unity?’ ‘Is the country going to come apart tomorrow?’ No. But interestingly enough, Canada went through a dual languages law in the 70’s to prevent a break-up. ‘Well, what’s Quebec voting on again?’ Because once you say that we must have a multi-lingual policy, you can never satisfy people because there are 200-300 languages spoken and the ones who are even protected then feel a sense of grievance. We’re certainly an experiment - us and Australia. We all have all the convicts and we have everybody, and we’re saying that the most important thing is not where you’re from or what you did or who your ancestors were but what you do now. And being a part of that. And [in the ] the Old-World? It was who you were was the most important thing ... ‘Were you a Fleming? ‘Or were you a Walloon?’ ‘And what language?’ And blah, blah, blah...

EXCERPT 27:3

JLB: [prominent opponent of bilingual education] mentions ‘Azatlan’.

L3: //Yeah, as the concept that “La Raza” would like to expand on in this imaginary country that takes half of the United States back to Mexico.

JLB: Is that a serious idea?

L3: There are all sorts of things written about it. I wish I knew where my copy is but there is an actual book about ‘Azatlan’ and what they want to do.

JLB: So there might be some people whose motives are really that?
L3: Oh, there are some people who are completely nuts! They think that the way to gain back what Mexico lost, from the United States, is to reproduce very quickly and to have as many Mexicans in this country as possible and that then eventually they will have it back.

EXCERPT 27:4
JLB: Do you think that parallels that are drawn by some commentators with Canada are far-fetched?
L1: No, I don’t, in the sense that two things: there is a very small but nonetheless significant, among the intellectual class, irredentist community ++ as I always say to people, it would be most happy … if the Mexican immigrants who just crossed the borders, sometimes risking life and limb to do so, suddenly find themselves back in Mexico. I think they would probably be very unhappy. But there is that small element among the ++ the sort of UCLA, UC San Diego, UC Riverside, some of the schools in the South West, among the intellectuals there, there is this irredentist movement. But more importantly there is the sort of ethnic power-brokers that also benefit by this and again I wrote about that in my book with respect to the voting rights because creating these safe Hispanic voting blocks and Districts is one way of maintaining the power-brokers and giving them a constituency. It is not in their interests for Hispanics to move into the middle class and for their ethnic identification to diminish. If all you have to appeal to somebody upon is skin colour and ethnic identification then you want to maintain those identities in a very strong way.

EXCERPT 27:5
L3: //yes, and the so-called self-appointed protectors of the minorities on the Spanish side see that as a human rights issue which someone explained to me; the ex-Minister of Education of Puerto Rico once told me that I was stunned because I had never seen it like that. You see, the blacks got their equal rights and all of their protections. And now the Hispanics, the only thing they have is this bilingual education programs which they see as an equal rights kind of issue. It’s theirs. You take it away and you’re taking away a part of their life.
JLB: You don’t see it like that at all, obviously.
L3: I don’t see it like that but it is a reality that the Hispanic leaders think that we’re trying to take something away instead of looking at it the other way where we’re trying to make it easier for them to integrate.

DIFFERENCE & THE AMERICAN DREAM
EXCERPT 28:1
JLB: So, that original idea of America as the land of opportunity is one of the key things in your mind about this issue?
L2: Human nature will always look at difference and find ways to argue about them. And bilingual education, one of the things that they have come back to, there are very few arguments for it but they say it increases the self-esteem of the child and says that their language is important in their culture, and this way they don’t feel inferior. And what they are forgetting is that school is hard for everybody and that kids are mean, as any parent could tell you. They’ll say something mean and then the parent will turn around and say ‘Well, you can’t say that. You can’t say ‘Why is that man so fat, Mommy?’’, and there is a natural division of children and we need to, rather than encourage them by saying ‘Well, this is different’, be concentrating more on unity. And that is the only way that you can have a diverse country. We don’t have an official religion in this country, nor should we. We’re from everywhere and we need to emphasise that or the American experiment will end up like a lot of other countries where linguistic divisions lead to other divisions. Switzerland is kind of unique.

DON’T MESS WITH NATURE
EXCERPT 29:1
L2: You have to keep in mind that any official English law, to be truly effective, has to eliminate bilingual education because bilingual education guarantees that the natural process where the children of immigrants learn English and take their rightful place in society is interfered with. As you know, studies show that by the age of 12 or 13 or even below that, it is easier to learn a second language, above that it is difficult. Bilingual education has the student in an almost all-Chinese or all-Spanish program for 6-7 years, they start school at the age of six, so that takes them to 13 years of age, and then they are put into an all-English program. Well, it is going to be much harder for them and they are less likely to learn English but are much more likely to be in need of bilingual services for the rest of their lives. When Massachusetts tried to repeal this program they brought in a group of students from the bilingual education program to protest it and someone stands up and gives a speech about the
program as terrible and then all the kids start applauding and then it is translated into Spanish and they start booing.

**EXCERPT 29:2**

L4: … it is not necessarily true that because you speak more than one language somehow you’re going to be falling apart. What binds a country and binds a nation is a set of political values, a set of values around democracy and equality and Civil Rights, that’s our belief. That’s why I fought for my country, that’s why I served my country in the military, that’s what my brother went to Vietnam to defend.

**CHILD ABUSE**

**EXCERPT 30:1**

L3: You see, there is this case in San Antonio I think it is, where a judge said it is child abuse to speak Spanish at home. And that is wrong. None of our laws affect what is taught in the home. But the mother is wrong in thinking that her child is going to be taught English at school. If the poor child comes in with the Hispanic name and speaks no English, they won’t be given English. They’ll be given all Spanish with one class a day in English. The other thing about that case is it is an American divorce case and what we know from American divorce cases it turns out that he’s sued her, she’s sued him, claiming that he has sexually abused the child as the age of 6 months, and I am not making light of it but many of these accusations are made back and forth in divorce cases but are basically for purposes of war.

**CONFLICT**

**EXCERPT 31:1**

JLB: Do you think language diversity would necessarily produce a conflict?

S1: Yes, I think it has been the root of a lot of conflict. There is nothing wrong with language diversity but we have built this country from a lot of diversity, but the English language is very important in this country. It is the business language of commerce now in the world for the most part. It would be another step in a positive direction that we’re going on record in a Congress to name English as our official language. Is it going to change anybody’s everyday life? No. But it will be a step, I think, in the right direction.

**EXCERPT 31:2**

L1: I think the whole genesis for much of what is being asserted on behalf of the Hispanics in the United States is really an outgrowth of the Civil Rights Movement. All of the tactics and strategies of the Civil Rights Movement were adopted wholesale in terms of advocating on behalf of the Hispanics in the United States. Now, language is one of the ways in which you can characterise Hispanics, by and large, although even that is increasingly non-accurate. Most Hispanics born in the United States speak only one language and that one language is English. I grew up speaking English not just as my first language but really my only language. I heard Spanish in my household but it was not the language I first learned. It was my grandparents’ language but it was not my parents’ language.

JLB: This was in New Mexico?

L1: In New Mexico, and it was certainly not mine. And that was very common in my generation of Hispanics of at least the third generation or more. And I guess what I see having happened to Hispanics is Blacks, in terms of asserting their uniqueness and specialness in terms of the legal system, had the whole context of slavery had the aftermath of the Jim Crow laws to react against as a way of defining what was owed by the state to this group that had been disenfranchised and terms of their experience in the United States is far more akin to that which many immigrants, the Japanese who after all had Chinese exclusion and a much more mixed history in discrimination Hispanics experienced you’re talking about the Chinese or the Japanese or the groups who were discriminated against in various ways, even the Irish. Hispanics wanting to benefit from the new protections they themselves and their specialism latched on to the Voting Rights Act. Blacks had been excluded by literacy tests which were very ++ there and the application of the tests weren’t equal or fair. It is not that the same literacy tests applied to Blacks and Whites, they were very arbitrarily applied. Hispanics didn’t have a history of literacy tests but they tried to define language as in and of itself a
literacy impediment. And ...since the ballot was printed in English that was akin to having a literacy test that asked you how many soap bubbles there were in a bar of soap and if you couldn’t answer that then you couldn’t answer. ‘Well, they said having a literacy test is not different to having an election ballot printed in a language that you cannot understand!’. So they latched onto this as a sort of a symbol of their identification, as a symbol of what it was that made them unique. And, in asserting that began to assert the same protections for that language as Blacks did based on a history of slavery, based on laws that had been used to exclude them. So that they began to define language and the English language as exclusionary, as somehow excluding by definition everybody who was Hispanic. Obviously it doesn’t. Obviously a language is an acquired characteristic. You’re not born bilingual. You learn language. And I have actually found people who have debated this subject, including some who are proponents of the English language, who somehow think that I ought to have a better facility for learning Spanish than you or somebody whose name is Jones because I’m Hispanic. That’s nonsense.

THE ENGLAND LEGACY
EXCERPT 32:1
JLB: [Official English advocates claim] that English is the language of government and opportunity .... [Is English] ... America’s language in a cultural sense?
L1: I think it is. And I mean, you know, I don’t find any discomfort with that anymore. I mean, I’ve been debating the issue of multi-culturalism for years now and I don’t have any hesitance to say that our political and social institutions we trace them there is a lineal descent from England that isn’t even European, that it is English in character, that our culture is English, its roots are English. I don’t have a problem with that. I guess obviously some people do and there is still this hesitance on some Americans’ part to acknowledge the contribution that England made in terms of the United States.

EXCERPT 32:2
L5: You see, it gets back to the melting pot myth. And the image that we have tried to portray is that it sounds wonderful to have a melting pot - that everybody comes in and contributes their own flavour to the stew and that the stew gets different every time. Well, that metaphor doesn’t work because the thirteen colonies spoke English and they had the common law system of England, and we still in fact in our judicial system can argue a case based on English common law, not on world law.
JLB: They didn’t start from zero.
L5: Right. They can’t say that ‘Hey, you can’t use that argument, that’s inadmissible’ and that you go way back to England and then that becomes a basis. And the way that the so-called special relationship with England that we supposedly have, there’s still a mother-country mentality that is very operative that most people don’t examine. And by the way here’s a country that we went to war with twice and whom we’ve saved twice in our history. But that doesn’t get examined. There is just a feeling that this is the appropriate metaphor when what in fact really happens is that it really is more a pressure-cooker. If you really want to become an American you can keep your foods but that’s about all you can keep. You’ve got to change your name, you’ve got to change your language, you’ve got to change you’re religion. You have to change almost all there is about you in order to be really “an American”. And people will deny that, but I believe that at the core of their belief system that is really what’s happening.

HEMISPHERIC SPANISH
EXCERPT 33:1
L1: I don’t see the government playing a role in that. First of all, I think the market place takes care of itself. I think that if you are a businessman and you want to sell to customers in Latin America then chances are you’re going to learn to speak Spanish or Spanish is going to become a part of the capital that you’re trying to build in order for you to win your customers. That is very different from having the government get involved in the act and giving some sort of status to Spanish. I think also, not to put too fine a point on it, English is the language of the market place throughout the world and that while it may be important to understand your Spanish speaking customers, the chances are, in terms of the people you are going to be dealing with - the intermediaries, the likelihood is that they’re going to speak English. English is the lingua franca now of the world. It is the language that the educated classes speak. And that is true whether you are talking about Latin Americans or whether you are talking about Asians. So the idea that unless the government does this, as a matter of self-interest we’re going to miss out because we’re not going to have enough people speaking another language I think is not accurate. And to the degree that it is accurate, to the degree that it is important to speak other languages, I think the market place itself pushes people to learn those languages.
EXCERPT 33:2
JLB: Do you think that Spanish might have a status in this country that might be different from other languages, being an original language as well, that it might be if not official then it might be the preferred foreign language or something like that?
R3: You are suggesting that of all the foreign languages being spoken in the US the most predominant is perhaps Spanish? And you're probably correct. And we have some television channels who conduct their programs in Spanish. I have no quarrel with that to ++ some extent but, again, as long as we recognise that for official purposes we use the English language.

EXCERPT 33:3
JLB: Do you think that the United States in involved in …a developing … regional identity with the Americas, through NAFTA and the Organisation of American States’ meeting last year in Florida? And if it were developing, would not Spanish come to be regarded as a substantial economic resource?
R4: Absolutely - it makes no sense to encourage bilingualism at one end and to value bilingualism at one end and then at the other end to squash out the potential for developing large skill bilingual resources that just come by natural inclination and natural behaviour. It is always a great mystery to me why there are some members of this institution [Congress] who are highly involved in international trade and tourism and who are almost xenophobic in their behaviour when it comes to language policies and don’t make that connection; and then the connection is so obvious I don’t know why you would need to repeat it. Now, for the United States to develop a regional identity, that’s, that’s ++ I don’t know how much of that is happening. Because the United States is obviously trying to be ++ obviously NAFTA but … also a part of APEC and the meaning of economic participation may not be tied to regional identity but certainly it is tied to your economic interests and in your economic interests, language resources, economic resource capacity to operate in as many settings as possible, gives you the advantages.

EXCERPT 33:4
L5: The problem you have there is the same problem you would have with English as the official language. If you start down that road, by giving any language a special status then you start deciding that English ought to be an official language and then we start a movement that Spanish should be the second official language of the United States and that’s not where we want to go. I think that begins to beget separatism when you get into more of a Canadian/Quebec-style kinds of fights.

EXCERPT 33:5
L4: Spanish is the language of the Western Hemisphere and there is no question about that and everybody who is in this country ought to be multi-lingual. We ought to have multi-lingual education for everybody in this country. And as a practical matter, that second language ought to be Spanish. There hopefully will be a third and maybe a fourth. But to give it a special status would mean that you would also have to give English a special status and that begins to get you into legal and all kinds of other problems that. And we are just simply saying - let the government be neutral in that. Let the market place decide that.
JLB: So, Spanish would acquire any status on the basis of hemispheric and domestic demand?
L4: Yeah.

PROTECTING ENGLISH
EXCERPT 34:1
L4: … It is ludicrous. If you have Hearings or you have a study, if you are in any way trying to get at the truth and you’d figured out how many people in this country had been discriminated against ++ because they spoke English - I suppose you might find somebody in Miami, Florida, who might assert that - but the real problem, the real issue - is that millions and millions of people are being discriminated against because they don’t speak English well or do not speak it at all, or are being denied services or opportunities despite the fact that they’re well equipped to do a job. So the real issue and what’s happening in the real world is that people are being discriminated against because they do not speak English and yet it is turned out on its head because, you know, for that one person, that one in a million chance that you might have that you will be discriminated against because you spoke English - you have a right of private action. We live in very interesting times where we have
turned logic on its head … It is an invitation for mischief. They can tie you up in our legal system … such that the furore of the suit just drives you crazy, it has a very chilling impact on you.

**DO THEY REALLY WANT TO LEARN ENGLISH?**

**EXCERPT 34:1**

JLB:  I have read … that there are long waiting lists for classes for English … since there isn’t the money to provide the teachers, etc. Some people say that it is hypocritical to not actually making available resources to provide for English teaching. That you are just wanting to legislate it.

R3:  I question the accuracy of that. I don’t know conditions for every locality and under every circumstance throughout the country. I can speak for the conditions in my District, but there are special outreach programs maintained in conjunction with the public school system to assist people who are non-English speaking to become proficient in English. And these courses are offered without cost.

JLB:  So, if there were evidence … of year-long waiting lists, you would see that as a problem?

R3:  Not as a justification to conduct our official business in a foreign language but as a deficiency on the part of our government in providing the necessary support to allow people to become proficient in English.

**EXCERPT 34:2**

L4:  As I told Toby Roth on the television, if his interest is that a greater number of Americans learn English and he were willing to talk about a public program that would allow that, that would compensate that, and would make that available, we would immediately join with him in doing that because we would have exactly the same goal. But that is not what’s being proposed. We’re not asserting necessarily a right of immigrants to have the right for the government to pay for their English acquisition. We think it makes good sense. As a practical matter we think that the public will reap enormous benefits out of it; we would have more productive citizens who would pay more taxes and we would get that money back, two and three and four times the amount of money that we invested in. And we would have a country that would be able to communicate better and hopefully people would be less scared about folks who could speak less English. We’re not asserting a right of immigrants. What we are saying is that they are obviously distorting their opponents on this legislation or obviously distorting the truth.

**EXCERPT 34:3**

JLB:  What is the evidence for the concern about English?

R4:  Well, there is no evidence for it, simply. That’s why … whenever you try to derive legislation from people’s fears or anxieties, it must be based on weak policy analysis. The only way that an English-only policy makes sense, or that an official English policy makes sense, is as if they were counter-veiling attempts, as though there were people attempting to expand the role of Spanish as an official language. It makes no sense at all. It is formed on the basis of your immediate experience; and if you’ve lived in the United States as an adult for the past thirty years, and you’re channel surfing, you’re now finding out that there are full networks in Spanish. There are even programs in Armenian. There are programs in (inaudible). ‘My God! What is going on here? The place is changing right before our eyes! Under my nose. And how do I bring that all into line?’ And in this case it is largely symbolic because it is largely symbolic; and yet for most Americans the only experience they have of people using other languages is running into people on the subway or watching it by accident on TV and that’s about it. They have no real experience with it. And that’s the motivation. It does no good to point out to people, as you pointed out: “The vast majority of Spanish immigrants who … or Hispanics today+++ who are maybe the products of immigrants two or three generations ago are really not good Spanish speakers today. They are all stronger in English” All of them know English well enough to function and to be educated in this country in English and I would think the greater fear would be - how did we come to squander a potential resource? Rather than - how do we get these people to speak English? There’s no problem with that. If you watch the programs of the two major Spanish networks, I would say invariably 30% of the commercials are for how to learn English, how to learn English faster, and all this kind of stuff and this is what people are seeing. The great anxiety in the Hispanic community is how to get to English as soon as possible! And there is no subtext for them to try to impose Spanish on others or to carve out a special role in the government for Spanish.

JLB:  But do you find that-

R4:  /but, but even though Hispanics is the major part of it, you know, other languages groups are automatically included; anybody with an accent. People become fair game for stereotyping, for humour, it’s insulting.

**EXCERPT 34:4**
L4: There is a group called ESL and The American Dream. It is hard to document (unmet demand) because ESL programs are documented in many different ways - you have private sources, public sources…. there is adult basic education which allows for funding of ESL programs but according to the study which based their estimate on… the number who are served every year, it appears that about 12% are served. Many organisations that run ESL programs … stopped keeping waiting lists because they are just unmanageable, they are thousands of people long. .. this week’s US News and World Report (has) a cover story and it does refer to some places in San Francisco where they have waiting lists of thousands of people. I know that there are centres in Los Angeles that are virtually running twenty-four hour ESL programs to keep up with the demand.

EXCERPT 34:5
L4: Within fifteen years, I think, of their arrival, most of the time Hispanics are speaking English. So, I mean, yeah, definitely the fact that there aren’t studies that show that some 80-90%, depending on the survey, people think that English needs to be the official language, I think it is … a demonstration of the importance people place on the English language more than an understanding of what an actual official language amendment or act or Constitutional amendment would actually do or what it would be.

EXCERPT 34:6
O2: In other legislation moved through the House this year, something called the Careers Act, there was a consolidation of job training and adult education programs. The majority, I think some 60%, of individuals involved in the adult education programs in this country are involved in English as a Second Language courses among adults. The English as a Second Language course is necessary for those adults to that they acquire sufficient fluency in English so that they can obtain some job skill usable in the United States. ...Secondly, though, there must be a fair examination of those Federal programs which do purport to help aid individuals in learning and speaking English. The General Accounting Office and other non-partisan research organisations have indicated that the bilingual education program in the past has run up against some difficulty, that it is not as successful as it should be, and it deserves some fairly close review.

EXCERPT 34:7
O1: Well, you know, with us I feel personally that the more languages you speak, the better you are. This is benefit. I mean, absolutely! I have the top advantage - I can speak Vietnamese, I can speak a little bit of French. And meanwhile some others cannot. And I will still be able to speak with you in English. I will never question at any time in my mind what the language of the United States is. Obviously English is the language of the United States as certainly as Chinese is the language of China. Japanese is the language of Japan. Everyone knows that! You don’t have to declare it. Everyone is lined up, immigrants coming into this country are usually looking for the State of Massachusetts to provide ESL services for the immigrants and newcomers to the States. The line for the ESL classes is so long and meanwhile the funding becomes smaller and smaller. Do you know what happens? The line becomes longer and it takes a couple of years at least to clean up those waiting lists for ESL classes for adult illiteracy. So, you’re telling me they are avoiding learning English? That is not true! They know that English is a way of life and that if you want to make it in America you’ve got to be able to get English language education, except in the case of an 85 year old man or woman who comes here, like my dad - 85 - they try to learn English but it is absolutely not easy for them compared to a 14 year old boy or girl. You’ve got to understand that. And now with global markets opening up, free trade, I don’t see why we limit ourselves. If we want to sell cars in Japan, we want to sell cars in Vietnam, we want to sell cars in Thailand, we’d better speak the language of the customer. Meanwhile the Japanese selling cars in America speak English! They have no problem with it. And they don’t need to declare that Japanese is the language of Japan!

EXCERPT 34:8
JLB: I have read (that) there are very significant waiting lists for learning English.
L3: There are not enough schools and there are not enough teachers and we want to provide the funds for that.
JLB: Who should fund those?
L3: The government - either the State or Federal government.
JLB: So fundamentally there is a notion of the ++ what the appropriate role (of) the Federal government, or any government, ought to be in this. Is this the point?
L3: Right. We believe that the government should not try to function in many languages. They should fund the teaching of English to new immigrants. So, for instance, in California you don’t take the driver’s exam in
thirty-five different languages. I think it is **insane** that you can take it in **thirty-five** different languages. We’re not against giving drivers licenses to people who don’t speak English, but we would give them a **temporary** license. We would give them a license for, say, **three** or **four** years and we would say ‘**When you come back you must take it in English if you want a permanent license**’. That would given them the **incentive**. We have **taken away** the incentive for people to learn English in this country. It **used** to be, **fifty** years ago, **eighty** years ago, that if people came to this country they **had** to learn.

**Patriotism**

**Excerpt 36:1**

L4: … The US English folks have been very good at making this sound like a symbolic effort, **almost a patriotic** effort, to **enshrine**, and of having **no** impact other than as a sort of **patriotic** gesture. And as long as they frame it that way, as long as it is framed as ‘**Are you patriotic or not?**’ the response is going to be an overwhelming ‘**Yes! I want to be a patriot, that’s who I am!**’ and if we can frame it as **something else**, if we can frame it as just the opposite, then in a **real** way what we’re talking about is **not** being patriotic, **not being true**, if you define patriotism as being true to the ideals of a nation…. It is dangerous. And I think it is **divisive** and **puerile** and that is exactly what we are saying.

**Excerpt 36:2**

O1: The immigrant environment is **very**, **very** concerning because every **one of us** are immigrants. We come from **somewhere** else. The only **truly** natives of this land in America are the **Indians**. So **everyone** of us have come from **somewhere** else. So it is very sad that the previous groups, **well settled**, [inaudible], is **too many already**. We’ve got to put them **English-only**, we’ve got to [do] **this**, do that. I think it is a **shame**. I think it is very sad. I can speak from my experience as a former **refugee** and now as an **American** citizen. And I am working my heart out to **serve this country** because I paid a **big debt** to this country who **opened** her arms to **welcome** refugees and immigrants to her shores of America. This is what it is all about. This is it. I’ve got to do my job - **well** - because that is the way we pay the debt back to the Americans who so generously opened their arms and **welcomed** immigrants and refugees to their **shores**.

**La Raza**

**Excerpt 37:1**

JLB: … could you tell me about the concept of “La Raza” and how it **arose**, what it means to **you**, and how you respond to those people who **don’t** support your work? Other people say that “La Raza” is a ++ **problematical** concept.

L4: There are a lot of questions in your question so I’m going to try to sort them out. We are a **Civil Rights** organisation in the business of trying to protect the interests of a group that has been traditionally discriminated against…. So that’s who we are. The concept “La Raza” expands to **all** Hispanic groups? We think it **does**. We think it doesn’t distinguish between **native-born** Mexican Americans and New Dominicans and Puerto Ricans and so forth; we think that there is a **common** language and a **common** culture and, yes, there are **nuances**, yes, there are differences and we **recognise** that. But the **main** thing is that we have the same **experience** in this nation about the **wrong** education, the **wrong** employment, **around all** these issues that affect our daily lives and it makes sense to us to work collectively towards the same goals. The **concept** of “La Raza” comes from La **Raza Cosmica**, the Cosmic Race, which is the concept of the Hispanic people and the **New World** that represent the race of the all the races, that being Hispanic in the **New World** is an amalgamation of a lot of cultures, a lot of races - that we’re **African-American**, that we’re **Asian** because the Native Americans were **originally** Asian, that we are **Native** American, and that we are **also Caucasian**, and that we’re all in this New World and so there is this **cosmic sense** of coming together. It is what “La Raza” **means** to us. And we say it on our **stationery** – “**La Raza, the Hispanic People of the New World**”. It is a concept that has been around for over a hundred years and it is a term that we have used to describe ourselves…. We are **both** the victims and the victimisers; that part of our history is that we are the **victimisers**, i.e. the **Spanish**, and we are the **victims**, i.e. the Africans or native peoples - we are a **fusion** of all that and that is a part of our history.

**Excerpt 37:2**

L3: //Well, you know, ‘La Raza’ means ‘The Race’ - which race do you think he is worrying about? The **Mexican** race! That’s what it is. He’s **protecting** Mexicans and Mexican
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EXCERPT 40:1

O1: The word ‘mandate’ does not really truly reflect the situation at this point. The Federal level does not mandate anything. That is completely local and States decisions. Let me put it this way, the total bilingual education budget (that) comes from Washington that Congress authorised to us only makes up about 6-7% compared to the whole class of education (for) limited English proficient students, the 93-4% that constitutes the rest - where is it coming from? State and local school budgets! So you are telling me that we mandate? How come we can mandate, we’re only 6-7%! And they are 93-4% so you see a lot of States think that bilingual
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EXCERPT 40:1

O1: . The word ‘mandate’ does not really truly reflect the situation at this point. The Federal level does not mandate anything. That is completely local and States decisions. Let me put it this way, the total bilingual education budget (that) comes from Washington that Congress authorised to us only makes up about 6-7% compared to the whole class of education (for) limited English proficient students, the 93-4% that constitutes the rest - where is it coming from? State and local school budgets! So you are telling me that we mandate? How come we can mandate, we’re only 6-7%! And they are 93-4% so you see a lot of States think that bilingual
education is a good way and the best way of serving these kids who recently arrived in America whether entering as refugees or as immigrants. I can speak very adequately and very clearly about that because I am a former refugee. I came here. I flunked a couple of subjects in first semester ++ big time. I almost dropped out or intended to drop out of school. It is very struggling. Learning a language skill is not easy. You learn only to speak? No. You have to learn writing. You have to communicate well and be able to function within the classroom in all of the subjects. That is important. So what that translates into is that lately a lot of the refugees and immigrants coming from South East Asia, from South American, now even from eastern Europe, even Russia - so we've got to teach these kids and it is a shame on us if we waste tons of mind and potential resources by these kids. We believe that we've got to have some program helping these kids. What type of program? It is up to the local schools and the State (to) decide.

**THERE'S ALWAYS SOMEONE DUMPING ON A GOOD IDEA**

**EXCERPT 41:1**

JLB: I say that because it was characterised in the Hearing two days ago as an anti-immigrant and racist venture. People were saying you were racist.

L3: That is what the opposition will say. The beauty of this country is that anybody can say whatever they want; regardless of what you want to do, you will have people against it. If we have to declare the American flag the American flag right now, and I hate it, if I have an organisation, trying to make that the official flag, I would have a lot of people against it. They wouldn't like the stripes, the colours, the stars. There would be people saying it is racist because the stars mean whatever, you know, and the three colours mean whatever - we would find 20-30% of the people against it. Regardless of what you want to do in this country, but if on the other hand you look at the positive numbers, 86% per cent of the people support making English the official language, and including 81% of the immigrants.
Appendix 11: Transcription Conventions and Australian English Style

The conventions for the transcription of the data of the interviews and other spoken language texts rendered into written form is dictated by the purposes of the analysis. It has not been the goal of the present analysis to conduct micro linguistic textual analysis but rather analyses of the recurring themes, meaning patterns, identities of participants, ideological structurings and underlying orientations of the political and policy-related messages contained in or ordered by the text. These patterns are in turn related to the propositional level of the text.

Accordingly textual detail of interest to some forms of analysis is removed, the text ‘cleaned up’ and only relevant features retained. The transcript of interviews has therefore been edited for inclusion in the thesis. Punctuation has been added, repetition and pauses have been removed and grammatical errors have been corrected. However, where such spoken language features have been retained it is because these were deemed to be significant to the meanings of particular passages or arguments.

Criticisms and ad hominen attacks made by speakers that were deemed to be spiteful, personally motivated or otherwise indecorous have not been reported. Naturally criticism of ideas, issues and even of persons when these were deemed relevant to the focus of the thesis have of course been retained. In most cases the questions asked of respondents have been removed unless some framing comment in the question is relevant to the interpretation of the answer. For reasons of space and length however questions have been removed from the parts of the interview excerpts that are placed within the body of the thesis. Such changes are warranted because the spoken language transcription produced here is not intended for fine-grained linguistically oriented analysis. Instead the focus has been on the respondents’ own meaning content, and therefore extracts from the overall continuous spoken transcript have been converted from the spoken language forms in which they were uttered and rendered into forms more consistent with standard grammatical conventions of written English.

The conventions used are:


++ pauses
… deletions
[ ] inserted text, usually to explain unclear or deleted references, or added grammar
(inaudible) indicates tape recording difficulties
// interrupting speakers’ utterance

**BOLD** emphasis by speaker

>>> digression by speaker
<< end of digression

`*italics*` these indicate vicarious or impersonated quotes by the speaker

“*italics*” citations that are more or less accurately reproduced by the speaker
These extracts utilise the following speaker codes

R: Representative (R1, R2, R3 & R4)
S: Senator (S1 & S2)
O: Official (O1, O2 & O3)
L: Lobbyist (L1, L2, L3 & L4)

**Appendix 12: Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEA</td>
<td>Bilingual Education Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Community Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>Federation for American Immigration Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accounting Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>Inland Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lpp</td>
<td>Language Policy and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NABE</td>
<td>National Association for Bilingual Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFTA</td>
<td>North American Free Trade Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALA</td>
<td>Native American Languages Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>National Education Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBEMLA</td>
<td>Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
END NOTES

1 During the 104th United States Congress from November 1994 to November 1996 (the first Republican dominated Congress in 40 years) there were seven separate proposals seeking to declare English the official language of the United States and two counter proposals seeking to declare that while English is the de facto national language, of the United States was to be regarded as a 'multilingual community'.

2 Nevertheless for Senator Shelby this constituted "overwhelming...government waste" (Associated Press 1995).

3 “In the absence of any legal protection for the English language, policies such as bilingual education and bilingual elections have come under critical review....recent inroads of rival languages and the perceived erosion of English are signals that the time has come to grant English more formal recognition....It should be noted that in poring over the language problems and constitutional provisions of other nations, we find none that quite parallel the situation in the United States today. None of the other countries seek to avoid the possibility of breaking up a society with an established common language into separate language communities" (Birkales 1986)


5 Fishman 2000 shows however that much of this kind of lpp also reflects and pursues a status agenda.

6 The history of sociolinguistics in the American setting and the decisive contributions of CE Ferguson and JA Fishman among others is presented Paulston and Tucker (1997).

7 The rational choice model of lpp was set out as an analogue of management decision making formalism with a sequence such as: 1) Identification of Problem (fact-finding); 2) Specification of Goals (development of policy); 3) Cost-Benefit Analysis (of alternatives with rational choice selection of preferred one) 4) Implementation 5) Evaluation (comparing predicted to actual outcomes).

8 The language, not the state, which is called Bosnia-Hercegovina, though of course it too has re-emerged.

9 Herder (and J. Fichte) as well as other thinkers were reacting in part against Enlightenment comparative linguistics that was uncovering evidence of lexical, grammatical and other similarities among north Indian languages and European languages and was postulating genetic connections. Humboldt was an anthropologically oriented linguist who in the 1820s postulated a language-thought connection similar to that which emerged in the middle of the 20th century from Canadian Edward Sapir and American Benjamin Lee Whorf.

10 Even increasingly in the private psychological realm, insofar as this is discoursally constructed through the dialogue (Harre and Gillett 1994).

11 “The struggle for Bengali continued, eventually turned into a liberation war and resulted in the establishment of Bangladesh in 1971” (Moniruzzaman 1979).

12 The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has ancient antecedents in both European and Asian thought. There is a sequence from the anti-Enlightenment Romantic philosophy of J.G.Herder (1744-1803) who animated a view of nationality as “Gemeinschaft” or comradeship in a relativist view of nations and who was influential in his view that difference in the peoples’ ‘spirit’ is based on and derives from distinctive languages; through W. von Humboldt’s language writings in the 1820s; to the anthropological theories of Franz Boas and from thence to Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf’s anthropological linguistics (Grillo 1989).

13 There has always been within linguistics (‘explicit systematically gained knowledge about language’) an attachment to relativist positions for descriptivism, whether the “loaded weapons” of Bollinger, the systemic-functional linguistics that follows the work of Halliday, British speech act theorists and of course anthropologically inspired linguistics (Mühlhäusler 1995) and finally new emerging scholarship in ‘language ideologies’ (Schieffelin et al 1998)

14 Woolard 1998 is an excellent introduction

15 Many languages have this feature. Both English and Japanese contain a lexical choice level that connotes status, prestige and power. In the case of English this involves the alternative lexicalisations from Latin or Anglo Saxon origin (parodied several times by Shakespeare especially in Measure for Measure). Japanese distinguishes between words of ‘native’ origin and the more prestige Chinese-derived equivalents. Japanese takes this kind of ‘language power’ towards its own version of Herderian spirit: kotodama the ancient view about the innate spirit which resides in pure Japanese (Carroll 2001: 37)

16 The Federalist Papers are unique in that they alone of the ‘founding documents’ contain mention of language. In Rossiter’s edited version he claims that these are the “most important work in political science ever written” in the United States and the “one product of the American mind that is rightly counted among the classics of political theory”. Rossiter considers the Federalist Papers “third only to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself among the sacred writings of American political history” (pvii)

17 In Public Good 1781 Thomas Paine justifies this largely on the grounds of the conflicting claims between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States to the ‘vacant western territory’.

will be in serious jeopardy of falling apart if the immigrant’s native tongue becomes the first language of any community or—God forbid—a state, the American experiment is subject to tremendous insecurity. This means that language is always already a fragile consensus about the rules of communication. This means that language is always already a feature of the language policy (the “Sinhala Only” Act of 1956) was to perpetuate a monolingual Sri Lankan populace, within a heterogeneous society. Sinhalese and Tamils grew up living side by side but unable to communicate and the majority is their opponents who are making what is a straightforward and routine matter into a question of controversy and bitterness. Their opponents disagree.

Immigrant minority language rights should be surrendered as a kind of payment to the host society for being admitted into the receiving nation.

Immigrants prosper in a new country more than they would have in their country of origin and this constitutes a contract in exchange for which they should waive any language claims.

The maintenance intergenerationally of minority languages and cultures is a kind of self-imposed social isolation and therefore it imposes a lag on the ineluctable eventual assimilation. This is undesirable.

Languages are potentially divisive and in its self-interest the host nation has a right to require linguistic assimilation.

An exemplar of this is the Foreword contributed by Alister Cooke to de la Pena 1991 in which he writes: (“But the day that the immigrant’s native tongue becomes the first language of any community or—God forbid—a state, the American experiment will be in serious jeopardy of falling apart” (p 10).

H.R 856 was a Bill governing the future political status of Puerto Rico. The House rejected an English language amendment to this Bill (submitted by Representative G. Solomon (R, NY) but supported a replacing measure submitted by Rep. D. Burton (R-Ind). The Solomon proposal would have made official English a condition of any future request by Puerto Rico for full statehood, while the Burton amendment would encourage the island’s schools to ‘foster English’ but would not impose language requirements on eventual statehood.

Puerto Rico has been called the “thorn in the side of official English” (Zentella 1999).

The term Bilingual Education here refers only to the typically authorised programs funded under Title VII of ESEA of 1968. There are many programs in US education that are far more rigorous than the typical BEA program, and some of these also receive BEA funding. In recent years the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington DC has documented and studied a considerable number of ‘two-way’ bilingual programs along with immersion programs, language enrichment and traditional foreign language programs and some language maintenance programs which are serious and successful and some of which also receive support from Title VII funding. However it is the case that much of what is called bilingual education typically consists only of short-duration use of the mother tongue as a transitional arrangement to full teaching in English.

With the exception noted by Dr Richard Brecht of the National Foreign Language Center in 2001 (personal communication) that the language-essential positions has greatly expanded since the figures for the 104th Congress but with the realisation that school-acquired second language proficiency is simply too low for the requirements of these positions.

“Sometimes our failure to understand languages is a security threat in the most immediate sense. Language is essential to security in this multilingual world.” (Simon 1980: 41)

Peiris, H. (1999) Language, Barriers that can crumble, p 6, (Sri Lanka) Daily News, Saturday May 1: “A very negative feature of the language policy (the ‘Sinhala Only’ Act of 1956) was to perpetuate a monolingual Sri Lankan populace, within a heterogeneous society. Sinhalese and Tamils grew up living side by side but unable to communicate and the majority community attempting to force the minority to assimilate” (p 6).

It should be pointed out that language officialisation can indeed be routine, unproblematic and even mundane. And so it would be in the United States if there were not other meanings attached to it, and a politics of pragmatic and symbolic struggle associated with it. Advocates of official English in the Chapters which follow, and among the families of the two self-described “ordinary members” of US English with whom the present researcher spent time discussing the matter, claim that it is their opponents who are making what is a straightforward and routine matter into a question of controversy and bitterness. Their opponents disagree.

Fred Fiske Saturday and The Dianne Rehm Show are broadcast on WAMU Public Radio (The American University, 4400 Massachusetts AVE NW, Washington DC 20016).

“English: Making It Official” is program #848 of the “It’s Your Business” series produced by BizNet, The American Business Network of 1615 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20062. This program was recorded on November 30, 1995 and broadcast on December 2 and 3 1995.

Etzioni (1996) formulates “rules of engagement” for the conduct of discussion about disputed topics in public policy which stress that interactants belong to the “same community” despite disagreements.

Small changes have been made and these are noted in the list Source of Statements, Appendix II.

The German expression Immer Schon (Always Already) is taken from Karl-Otto Apel, cited in Habermas (1981) and refers to the sense that all communication presupposes a state of communicative possibility that can serve as the premise of intersubjective agreement: a fragile consensus about the rules of communication. This means that language is always already predisposed towards at least the possibility of agreement.
38 “Sadly, there are some ethnic leaders who prefer bilingualism because it keeps their voters and supporters isolated from the rest of America, ghettoised into groups more easily manipulated for political purposes often by self-appointed leaders” Gingrich, N., “English Literacy is the Coin of the Realm,” Opinion Editorial, Los Angeles Times, August 4 1995.

39 “But these keys to unity are under attack from our government and from intellectual elites who seem embarrassed by America. What we see as opportunity they see as oppression. Where we see a proud past, they see a legacy of shame. What we hold as moral truth, they call intolerance. They have false theories, long dissertations and endless studies to back them up. But they know so much they have somehow missed the fact that the United States of America is the greatest force for good in the world has ever known.” (Dole 1995).


41 In August 1995 Texas State Judge Sam Kiser during a Spanish-speaking woman involved in a divorce case to cease bringing up her daughter in Spanish commenting that to continue raising her in Spanish would “make her a maid for the rest of her life” (Ricento 1998: 102 footnote 15). These associations of Spanish with inevitable poverty, or with ‘menial’ occupations while English is associated with ‘doctors and lawyers’ realises a strong ideological pattern of cognitive presuppositions and systematically distorts BI-lingualism, i.e. TWO languages, one being English so that it is taken to mean ANTI-English or NO-English.

42 In fact the evidence for any connection between ‘degree of diversity’ and conflict is very mixed. Mono-cultural, mono-lingual and mono-religious Cambodia has experienced vast conflict in the 20th century, proportionately greater than vastly more diverse India. Belgium, Canada, Norway are nations where language -nation conflicts are persistent but these are societies that are broadly homogenous by contrast with Papua New Guinea or Vanuatu whose language diversity is immense.

43 In this regard Krashen (1999a and 1999b) evaluates the appropriation to political ends of research evidence in relation to the outcomes from this kind of bilingual education; specifically in relation to learning in a second language in transitional bilingual education (initial first language instruction followed by a rapid transfer to English-only instruction).

44 The Bill was named in honour of Bill Emerson who had passed away.

45 The Bill subsequently lapsed in the Senate due to the adjournment of Congress.

46 A seminal text in the field; Rubin, J., and Jermudd, B.H. (eds.) 1971, Can Language be Planned? (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), was subtitled: “Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations”.

47 Status-planning research has been required to locate its analysis of ‘language problems’ within contexts sensitive to politics especially in the post-colonial processes of national individuation while corpus planning work has (less politically) resided in anthropology schools generating much of its new knowledge and ideas for more limited audiences of primarily fieldwork specialists and the communities with whom they worked.

48 Language Planning Comes of Age, no author named, Language Planning Newsletter, 3, (3), p1. (The courses that were run comprised language planning theory, implementation, sociolinguistics for language planners, the role of ethnicity in lpp, sociolinguistic methodology, and workshops on language planning for mass media, terminology, lexicography).


50 The following maxim is a case in point: “...a country that is linguistically highly heterogeneous is always undeveloped, and a country that is developed always has considerable language uniformity” (Poole 1972:213). Fasold (1984:4) states: “It is obvious that multilingual states have problems that more nearly monolingual ones do not...difficulties in communication within a country can act as an impediment to commerce and industry and be socially disruptive” and “there is a definite relationship between linguistic uniformity and economic development” (p7); although he does instance some positive benefits of multilingualism he argues that linguistic “...diversity is inversely related to development” conceding however that the relationship may not be causal and may have to do with the arbitrary nature of post-colonial boundary settings which aggregated linguistically different groups. (p 134). Pattanayak (1987) shows that a range of modern scholars have discussed multilingualism, and more generally language diversity, negatively, as causing backwardness and economic underdevelopment.

51 “A crude version of Whorfian thinking that treats English as the sine qua non of democratic thought runs through the tradition of American language policy and at times has enabled attacks on the rights of minority language citizens” (Woollard 1998: 19).

52 ‘Dog whistling’ is an expression that refers to suggesting in political discourse things that may not be overtly said, therefore these are signalled just above, or beyond, the ‘hearing range’ of political acceptability. This term is a rich symbol, a kind of semantic onomatopoeia.

53 Ernesto Ortiz seems to have acquired iconic status for the official English movement and functions to focalise an underlying idea that the authentic voice of ordinary Hispanics is smothered by “cultural elites”. Ortiz’s two sentences are mentioned by Roth many times including1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995 and Boulet 1995 and appear to originate in Silber (1974:25).

54 This statement has been amended very slightly from the original form in which it appeared which is precisely as follows: “Mr. McCurry added that the issue was more a product of GOP presidential politics than good policy. He said Mr. Clinton wants to promote reforming education, and not be caught in arbitrary debates that, frankly, are more to do with the agenda of the extreme right.”

55 Proposition 187, which seeks to cut off a range of welfare, educational and other benefits to illegal immigrants was passed by Californian voters.

At time of interview a Congressman