

THE SUPPRESSION OF DIVERSITY

Adrian J. Lottie
Eastern Michigan University
and
Phyllis A. Clemens Noda
Eastern Michigan University

Is it a systematic strategy or a mutation of millennial fever that drives the escalating challenges to the civil rights of this nation's racial, linguistic, and national origin minorities? Increasing juridical, legislative, and popular assaults on affirmative action policies coupled with the sometimes less heralded emergence of a de facto U.S. language policy are sweeping through the states. These activities draw on a consistent repertoire of approaches from the invocation of the very language and concepts of the civil rights movement to the isolationist "buzz-words" of early twentieth century advocates of "Americanization." In an effort to legitimize their efforts this new breed of assailants has lifted the terms "equality of opportunity," "color blind," and "merit" directly from the lips of civil rights heroes of the past, retrofitting concepts that resonate from the very core of the civil rights movement into an arsenal of weapons that threaten the extinction of that movement. In that same vein opponents of bilingual education have reached further back into our history dredging up de-contextualized quotations from icons of American

history to evoke nostalgia and patriotism and to resuscitate the fear of the dissolution of national unity in the wake of the infusion of diverse languages and cultures. The introductory portion of this article treats the failure of anti-civil rights movements to acknowledge either the rich cultural legacy of people of color or the deeply engrained cultural and political limitations that this nation has imposed on their civil rights. We discuss the re-packaged language of equality and equity used by these movements and their success and attempts at success in reversing the progress of civil rights at the polls and in legislatures across the nation. We next examine the anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual movements sweeping the U.S. today, analyzing qualitative and quantitative data from multiple sources including data from the the 2000 U.S. Census to track current anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual/English only developments among the states to demonstrate the coexistence of these developments in those areas where people of color are concentrated.

Retrofitting the Language of Civil Rights

The concepts of equality and equity adopted by the Civil Rights Movement have been recrafted by anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual education groups and individuals to highlight what they term "anomalies in policy." Pointing to the inherent inequality in affirmative action policies, opponents argue that these policies have generated unfair practices and a rejection of the hallowed vision of equal opportunity. Yet interestingly when equality issues relate to immigrants, particularly immigrants whose populations are predominately people of color, many of those invoking the hallowed language of the civil rights movement are the targeted people of color and to some extent those traditionally associated with civil rights.

This exploratory effort asserts that the invocation of civil rights and "melting pot" concepts to legitimize the anti-affirmative action and English-only offensive are in actuality camouflage for an agenda which may feature the maintenance of the white majority's economic and cultural hegemony. Utterances of such

anti-affirmative action/anti bilingual education champions as former presidential candidate Patrick Buchanan's 1996 pronouncement of "cultural war," which resurrects fear-mongering threats of racial suicide and the extinction of the Nordic element due to immigration, gets closer to the core of the agendas of many of these movements. In addition we argue that in any event the proposed public policies that purport to address inequality are at best poorly designed.

One way to shed light on these apparently covert agendas and their public policy implications is to demonstrate associations between the anti-affirmative action movements and the persisting and increasingly pervasive anti-bilingual/English only movements particularly when focused on people of color. If for example geographical, demographic, socioeconomic, racial, political, or partisan associations or patterns can link these movements, they may indicate a somewhat cynical agenda that capitalizes on America's deep-seated racial and class prejudices. In investigating three decades of initiatives and popular referenda, Gamble found substantially more success among initiatives and referenda that restricted civil rights or that could be identified as anti-civil rights than among initiatives and referenda in general. It should be noted that these successes included measures targeted at policies that affected people of color (245-269).

Reflecting on the history of race relations in the U.S., we easily can become skeptical of those who assert that they want a fair and open equal opportunity system while espousing and systematically implementing anti-affirmative action and English-Only policies. This is especially so in light of U.S. race relations history and when coupled with the apparent negative impacts these policies may have on people of color. If additionally attempts to restrict cultural practices and educational access also are focused on policies that are most likely to affect people of color, concerns arise as to whether the true motives may be some form of white majoritarian hegemony. If for example these movements tend to surface in geographic areas where there are significant numbers of people of color, they may support a "white hegemony hypothesis." Certainly the crass and empty nature of the implementation of these movements lends support to a cynical interpretation of the motives behind these move-

ments and brings into question whether or not these movements are in essence just plain old-fashioned racism in disguise.

Supporting this view is the apparent dismissal of the historical backgrounds, the rich cultural and linguistic heritage and the contributions of the affected peoples. For example one element that seems to be consistently lacking in both the anti-affirmative action movements and the anti-bilingual and/or English only movements is a lack of appreciation for or inclusion of the historical backgrounds of the affected people. These policies are undertaken without the consideration and integration of that history into the proposed policy. The language of the recently passed (200-1) initiative in the state of Washington vividly demonstrates this policy approach. It reduces the civil rights of people who have suffered centuries of discrimination to a mere thirty-seven words:

The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education or public contracting (Bronner, A12).

Additionally this language appears to presuppose that the effects and practices of history no longer exist; hence the policy will result in a "homogeneous" equality for all of society. History, current practice, and current conditions surely demonstrate the folly in using this type of simplistic but disarming approach to solving civil rights problems and ensuring true equality and equity of access to the opportunities and benefits of this nation whether on the career path or in the classroom.

AFRICAN AMERICANS, EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

African Americans and N Dimensional Racism

Perhaps one way to understand the African American experience is to develop an appreciation for the term *N-dimensional racism* or racism in all knowable dimensions of life. By *N-dimensional racism* we mean a collection of historically observable phenomena that would be associated with the psychological, social, cultural, economic, and/or political dimensions of life. By social we mean having to do with group inter-

actions; by cultural we mean having to do with values, mores, norms, socialization patterns, folkways, practices, artifacts, arts, languages, and manners; by economic we mean having to do with the allocation of resources; by political we mean involving government or its policies. We argue that there are subsets associated with each of these dimensions and that racism can be identified and observed within each of these subsets. For example a Jim Crow law could be a specific instance of a type of racist action associated with a legislative body, which is a subset of government. The observation of the Jim Crow law then would be an example of racism in the government dimension. Additionally we argue that *N-dimensional racism* requires that in all observable dimensions and subsets of dimensions we can find historical observable evidence of racism associated with the African American experience. This phenomenon is perhaps best expressed in *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* in which he describes his treatment by a white family who kept him as a ward of the court during his childhood:

...They all liked my attitude...and I soon became accepted by them as a mascot...it never dawned on them that...I was a human being..." (26-27).

This dehumanization is the result of centuries of deliberate efforts to strip African Americans of all that would make them human. Every dimension of African American life was historically and deliberately restricted in order to control African Americans and use them for profit. African Americans during slavery had "no standing in courts, they could not sue etc ... could be easily killed by whites ... could not buy or sell goods... had little or no access to education ... were constantly under surveillance ... and were sexually exploited..." (Franklin, 187-202). Advocates of anti-affirmative action policies argue that African Americans would be treated equally and have the same opportunities as their European-American counterparts. Again a brief look at history belies this assumption. During the period after the Civil War African Americans suffered from the Jim Crow syndrome in the north and across-the-board social, economic, and political inequality in the south. Writing in the 1940s Gunner

Myrdal found that African Americans occupied the lowest rung of America's caste/class ladder.... He noted that African Americans were not "fully participating citizens in the political process..." that "various schema were used to control the African American vote..." and that "economically African Americans suffered an inferior existence... [that was] substandard, second class and minimally rewarding"(61-62). A half century later at the threshold of the next millennium the legacy of these problems lingers on.

Vestiges of racism remain as obstacles to the progress of African American, to national origin language minorities, and to the success of all of Americans. African Americans still carry the stigmas and indignities associated with being African American. Many dimensions of race and racism that affect African American progress have been commented on by others such as Claude Anderson and Andrew Hacker but apparently have eluded the anti affirmative action proponents. Hacker (1992) cites housing (a physical – geographical dimension), love and romance(an emotional dimension), and crime and schooling(quality of life and survival dimensions) as having a severe negative impact on and yet a constant presence in the African American community. Anderson (1994) cites culturally defined limitations affecting African American progress such as a lack of valuable social and economic linkages which deny African Americans access to important resources and are partly the result of U.S. public policy.

Another assumption by those who espouse anti-affirmative action policies is that the institutions of society will function the same for everyone especially in this Post Civil Rights Era. For example Peter Wood, an associate provost at Boston University, writing in *National Review* against affirmative action in the latest rendition of the Adarand Constructors v. Pena case, argues that "... racial stereotypes and occasional institutional disadvantages associated with race are the throwaway stuff and yard sale clutter of the past." Wood further states that "...the problem with people of color is that they do not have a culture of ambition that would foster learning." Wood continues, "The real alternative to affirmative action is to challenge the cultural traditions that excuse, foster, and perpetuate an ethic of hostility to formal

learning" (3-4). Wood, as do many anti-affirmative action advocates, presupposes that the problems of minority achievement are the result of minorities of color themselves and that the institutions of American society are more or less bereft of barriers to mobility.

Yet some scholars have found that by studying the political system from an African American perspective, new insights as to the functioning of the political system are possible. Rogers Smith found challenges to the liberal democratic paradigm by studying the status of racial minorities (549-566). He found that when studying minorities in the traditional liberal democratic paradigm scholars and policymakers often treat race as an exception to the paradigm, an anomaly that needs correcting. He argues that racism is a part of that paradigm and that we really face multiple political traditions which is why challenges to civil rights and the liberal paradigm resurface and most likely will resurface throughout U.S. history. Likewise Lucius Barker suggests that by studying the African American experience, we can uncover "the limits of the political system" (1-13). He states that traditional approaches to politics such as electoral politics may be ineffective where African Americans are concerned. These two observers confirm Lawrence Cahone's view that to understand a system one might be well informed to "focus on the margins" (16-17), again something that appears to be lost on the proponents of color blind equal opportunity policies. The observations identified by Smith, Barker, and Cahone clearly suggest that the political system may function differently when experienced by minorities. Obviously under such conditions designing policies with a broad brush that presupposes a normal functioning of the political system potentially is fraught with hazards which ultimately may result in increased inequality between the races.

Equal Opportunity and Anti-Affirmative Action

In addition to the historical burdens and failures of the political system that African Americans and other minorities face, they also are burdened and confronted with those who have power and yet make or advocate uninformed policy that necessarily negatively targets and impacts them.

The concept of equality itself is, especially in a capital-

ist free market economy, potentially quite complex and requires a great deal of analysis to understand. As discussed above, *N dimensional* racism includes the economic sphere, and in a free market context we tend to view equality in economic terms having to do with the allocation of society's resources. In fact the debate over equality usually centers on opportunities that could be construed as economic or at least opportunities that themselves could lead to economic opportunities. Job opportunities, admission to schools, and public access are typical battle grounds over issues of equality, especially where racial groups are involved.

When these conflicts occur, there is a strong tendency to view equality in simplistic terms (Lottie, 33-54 and Verba et al., 94). Viewing equality in these simplistic terms and then developing public policy initiatives based upon these views, however, constitutes an often high risk and erroneous strategy which ignores the impacts and implications associated with *N dimensional* racism. The microeconomic theoretical assumptions contained in these proposals are often ignored, and proponents often fail to take into account the richness and philosophical distinctions that are possible and relevant when examining issues of equality and in particular when dealing with people of color. They fail to consider, for example, the notions of differing means, prospects, and opportunity that are a result of *N-Dimensional* racism (Bok and Bowen, 1 and Rae et al., 64-80).

One way to begin to appreciate and understand the relevant issues when dealing with equality is to observe some basics about equality. Rae et al. offer some potential bases and typologies for examining issues associated with equality. They describe three main ways of conceiving of equality: simple subject equality that is between individuals; segmental equality in which individuals are broken into groups of two or more with equality within each group, and bloc regarding equality that is between groups. They then subdivide these into many types of equalities. Although the complexity and length of their analysis precludes a comprehensive discussion of it in this work, nevertheless some simple points in it are useful to

consider. In their discussion on equal opportunity they distinguish two types of equal opportunity: one requires that different groups have the same chances of obtaining equality; the other requires that different groups have the same means or resources to obtain equality. Although these particular distinctions clearly do not exhaust the debatable issues regarding equality, they do assist us in understanding two obvious but critical issues about equal opportunity. Different groups often do not possess the same prospects or means of obtaining equality; therefore any public policy solution addressing the problem of inequality, especially inequality between the races, that does not consider these differences runs the risk of resulting in inequality. For example prior to affirmative action the number of minorities in middle class occupations was less than one half of what it became by the late 1990s (Bok and Bowen, 10). The significance of this societal impact is not just the reality of a type of racial equality but also the "perceptions of the equality of possibilities" among racial groups (Bok and Bowen, 12). This insight alone suggests that we should not necessarily promote affirmative action as now practiced as a policy but that we should be far more careful in framing equality oriented policies and the debates surrounding them. At the very least we should consider many of the myriad components of equality and how they might inform us about actual impacts on society. The current rash of movement towards anti-affirmative action policies tends to ignore these complexities resulting in poor and uninformed public policy.

Compounding the complexity are the attitudes of Whites and African Americans about themselves, about each other, and about equality. Many Whites who are in a position to make decisions may harbor irrational ill feelings toward African Americans and other minorities. Michael Link and Robert Oldendick found that "whites who were more prejudiced had less positive views of equal opportunity or multiculturalism" than those who were less prejudiced(163-64). It goes without saying that Blacks and Whites often have differing views on the issue of equality.

When developing policies pursuant to equal opportuni-

ties and discussing the associated issues, we should not only consider equality in all of its complexity but also the views of whites and minorities about themselves and each other and about equality if the principles of informed democracy are to reign. Clearly any policy that fails to consider these attitudes, especially those of decision makers, runs the risk of falling into the traps of a multitude of moral hazards.

Bilingual Education:

Harboring the Enemy or Ensuring Equity of Access?

Bilingual education, “demonized” by the proponents of English Only and Official English, was and still is an instructional delivery approach that uses the child's home language (native language, first, or dominant language) to support content area achievement and the acquisition of English. Over the years Bilingual Education evolved out of its strictly compensatory mode (English as a second language) to offer second language leaning opportunities for all children through the dual language mode. Essentially the dual language (two-way bilingual) methodology acknowledges and leverages the language competencies of the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student to accelerate the development of foreign or second language acquisition by monolingual English-speakers, conserves first language proficiency for LEP students, while promoting second language acquisition for English monolingual students, a passport to success in the global marketplace, and ensures the full development of our children's cognitive structures and functions. In this latter regard substantive research in the US, Canada, and Europe points to the enhancement that second language learning has on the child's psycho-neurological development.

Rooted in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the *Lau v Nichols* U.S. Supreme Court decision, the 1968 National Bilingual Education Act or Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was an effort to build the capacities of school districts to serve growing numbers of LEP students, evolve research-based best practice models, and prepare teachers to better serve the needs of national origin language minority schoolchildren and youth and the general education popula-

tions: a sound pedagogy, not a subversive “plot” to overturn the unity of this nation. As Title VII implementation passed through various iterations over the next thirty-three years (as amended in 1978, 1984, 1988, 1994), research accompanying the various projects and programs evidenced the power of that pedagogy to support second language acquisition and assure academic achievement for the Limited English Proficient. Title VII-sponsored and independent research demonstrated the inherent potential that bilingual education held for accelerating and enhancing the acquisition of second languages for English monolingual students. The National Clearinghouse of Bilingual Education (re-named the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition in deference to the newly-minted No Child Left Behind legislation) amassed a bibliographic database of over 20,000 citations, collections, and abstracts of materials addressing language education issues; however, bilingual education’s progress as an effective pedagogical tool has been all but halted by the 2001 No Child Left Behind reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As James Crawford explains, the very term, “bilingual,” no longer exists in the federal lexicon.

...the word “bilingual” has been expunged from the law, except in a provision that strikes the name of the federal Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). It now becomes the Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited-English-Proficient Students (OELALEAALEPS), not even a pronounceable acronym (2002).

The systematic machinations that have resulted in the near-eradication of bilingual education are clearly evident. Beginning with the late Senator Hayakawa's assault on bilingual education (1981) conservative elements presenting themselves as advocates for the best interests of the children and the preservation of our union have successfully collaborated to create a monolingual/monocultural monolith. As the years passed a systematic state-by-state adoption of English Only and Official English exacted a toll at the national level. Under the twin banners of protecting the unity of the nation and the full empowerment of

all its people through a single language, the state-by-state dismantling of bilingual education pressed forward with the passage of the Unz Amendment in California, Arizona's persistence in securing English-only, the 1995 loss of Michigan's Bilingual Education state mandate, Public Act 294, 1974 the 2002 defeat of Massachusetts' exemplary Bilingual Education Act, culminating in the singular victory of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001. James Crawford describes the demise of bilingual education that was twenty-two years in the making.

Conservative Republicans dropped an attempt to mandate English only schooling as voters have done in California (1998) and Arizona (2000). Meanwhile liberal Democrats made little effort to block the transformation of the Bilingual Education Act into the English Language Acquisition Act. Not a single member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, once a stalwart ally of Title VII, voted against the legislation. Senate Democrats exacted a price for their agreement to repeal. The impact of the increase in cost is unclear, however, given that the money will be spread more thinly than before. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, federal funds will continue to support the education of English language learners (ELLs). But the money will be spent in new ways, supporting programs likely to be quite different from those funded under Title VII. One thing is certain: the rapid teaching of English will take precedence at every turn. "Accountability" provisions, such as judging schools by the percentage of ELLs reclassified as fluent in English each year are expected to discourage the use of native-language instruction. Annual English assessments will be mandated, "measurable achievement objectives" will be established, and failure to show academic progress in English will be punished (2002).

The 2001 NCLB Title III legislation thwarts both the nation's progress and the best interests of children whether Limited English Proficient or English monolingual destroying opportunities for all children to acquire necessary second language proficiency in the most effective modality of all, Bilingual Education.

Had the advocates of English-Only/Official English momentarily suspended their hysteria to read Title VII ESEA or the *National Bilingual Education Act* more thoroughly, they would have discovered that bilingual education is a pedagogical approach, not a subversive activity and tries to ensure the successful transition of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students from special compensatory services to the mainstream instructional setting. What does this mean? LEP children who demonstrate a mean score significantly below that of their English monolingual peers (the mean ranges from 36% in Texas to 40% in Michigan) on standardized measures of English language reading achievement are eligible to receive English language development services with support in academic content areas provided in the home or native language. Why? Nearly two decades of research have demonstrated that when the combined methodology is employed, children acquire English faster and transfer alingual cognitive skills (such as decoding in reading, math processing and scientific reasoning) with greater efficiency and likelihood of future school success.

The anti-bilingual/English-Only/Official English groups' well-orchestrated and highly-endowed victories will also earn them dubious credit for promoting this "Nation at Risk" to a Nation *Imperiled*. Lacking the skills to communicate, negotiate, interpret in multiple languages, our superpower status may well be limited to military might and agricultural production. Persisting on the path of monocultural/lingual isolationism may eventually force us to acquiesce to the well-publicized recommendation of the Japanese industrialist for the United States to give up on bids to regain industrial/technological leadership and concentrate instead on becoming the world's "bread-basket" and service industries' provider, that is to remove itself from the race for supremacy in the global "micro-chip economy" and settle for first-place ranking as a "potato-chip" economy. However bleak, this portent seems to be playing itself out in the economic sector. Various anti-bilingual and English Only/Official English state mandates have already cast a pall on US-Mexico trade relations, and the continuing flirtation with cultural-linguistic isolationism is certain to halt the progress of NAFTA implementation and further trade treaties with those Spanish-speaking nations of Latin

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 26: 2

America. It is difficult to fathom the logic, *if any*, behind *promoting* international trade and simultaneous restrictions on the use of foreign languages.

The passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a “victory” in the halls of Congress for the anti-bilingual/English Only/Official English advocates, is the culmination of a state-by-state erosion of the rights of ethnolinguistic minorities. At this writing the following twenty-five states have adopted and/or upheld policies of Official English as constitutional amendments, statutes, initiatives, or referenda with two states’ laws, Alaska and Arizona, overturned in district courts in 1998 and 1988 respectively (<http://www.englishfirst.org/efstates.htm>, English First:

Table I. Official English States (Data Source: English First, 2002)

State	Action/Year	Year
Alabama	Constitutional Amendment with 90% of the vote in referendum	1990 April 21, 2001 US Supreme Court ruling reversed lower court decision blocking enforcement of law
Alaska	Initiative with 69% of vote in referendum; Overturned in district court	1998; March 27, 2002
Arizona	Constitution: 51% of referendum; Overturned in district court; Supreme Court refused to reinstate law-upheld Official English	1988 March 3, 1997
Arkansas	Statute	1987
California	Constitution; 73% in referendum	1986
Colorado	Constitution; 61% in referendum	1988
Florida	Constitution; 84% in referendum	1988
Georgia	Statute	1988
Hawaii	Constitutional Amendment	1978
Illinois	Statute	1969
Iowa	Statute	2002
Indiana	Statute	1984
Kentucky	Statute	1984
Louisiana	Statute	1811
Mississippi	Statute	1987
Missouri	Statute	1998
Montana	Statute	1995
Nebraska	Constitution	1920
New Hampshire	Statute	1995
North Carolina	Statute	1987
North Dakota	Statute	1987
Tennessee	Statute	1984
Utah	67% of vote in referendum	2000 Official English Law Upheld
Virginia	Statute	1986
Wyoming	Statute	1996

Virginia. March 27, 2002)

Coincidence Or Conspiracy? *Examining The Relationships Between Anti-Affirmative Action Activities And The Anti-Bilingual English-Only Initiatives*

Given the parallel use of both retrofitted language and historical sources by the anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual advocacy groups, we determined to examine the field of the fifty states to discover if there was a link that had manifested itself in initiatives, legislation, referenda, or constitutional amendments.

Description of the Methodology

We originally began our research in 1998-99, with updates to cover the period 1999-2002 using multiple data sources, including the US Bureau of the Census population demographics and updated reports(latest 1999), the 50 State Survey of the Requirements for the Education of Language Minority Children (1998), and newspaper articles covering the period 1972-2002 to track anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual/English-Only developments. We then progressed through the following, preliminary five-step process to compile, relate, and analyze the data.

- Step 1: Compiled and organized data into a comparative state-by-state matrix;
- Step 2: Calculated the mean numbers of minority populations within each state;
- Step 3: Compared the mean populations of peoples of color in states with anti-affirmative action activities and anti-bilingual initiatives;
- Step 4: Established intersections of states with anti-affirmative action activities and anti-bilingual/English-only initiatives;
- Step 5: Calculated the numbers and percentages of states with both anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual/English-only initiatives;

We also calculated the proportion of anti-affirmative action states against all anti-bilingual policy fields, mean populations of African-Americans and Hispanics for every anti-bilingual/English-Only field, and the total numbers of states associated with every anti-bilingual and English-Only field across the

mean populations of minorities. The following narrative and accompanying tables describe the preliminary findings.

Table II shows that those states that have experienced anti-affirmative action activities contain a higher mean proportion of minorities than those states that have not experienced anti-affirmative action activities. This preliminary finding comports with studies that suggest that white populations often feel uncomfortable when minority populations reach a certain threshold. The states without anti-affirmative action activities are Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming). States with anti-affirmative action activities are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon,

Table II: Mean State Population Percentages of Minority Groups of Color without Anti-Affirmative Action Activities and State Population Percentages of Minority Groups With Anti-Affirmative Actions Activities

States Without Anti-Affirmative Action Activities	States With Anti- Affirmative Action Activities
19.35%	27.50%

South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Washington.(acenet.edu 2002, 1-8).

Table III demonstrates that the mean populations of peoples of color (African American, Hispanic, Native American and Asian American/Pacific Islanders) in states that have experienced both anti-affirmative action and anti-bilingual activities appear to be higher than in those states that have not experienced either anti-affirmative action or anti-bilingual activities. This may imply that anti-minority policies may be advanced as the numbers of

Table III: Mean Population Percentages of Minority Groups of Color For States with Both Anti-Affirmative Action Activities and Anti-Bilingual/English Only Policies and Without Both Anti-Affirmative Action and Anti-Bilingual/English-Only Policies

States without Anti-Affirmative Action and Anti-Bilingual Activities and/or Policies	States with Anti-Affirmative Action and Anti Bilingual Activities and/or Policies
21.39%	31.93%

minority populations begin to become more visible or pose a "threat."

Table IV shows that large majorities of states with anti-affirmative action activities have also implemented anti-

Table IV: Number and Percentage of States with Both Anti-Affirmative Action Activities and Anti-Bilingual/English Only Policies

	States with Anti-Affirmative Action Activities	States with Anti- Affirmative Action Activities and English Only Policies
Number	23	12
Percentage	100%	52%

bilingual/English Only policies.

Anti-Bilingual activities and resulting policies have occupied center stage in an on-going debate as to the value and relative threat to the nation for more than thirty-four years, while affirmative action has come under organized fire only recently. As time moves forward we may see an increase in anti-affirmative

Table V: Number of States with Anti-Minority Activities Directed at People of Color

Number of Anti-Affirmative Action States	Number of Anti-Bilingual/or English Only States
23	27

activities and, ultimately, a state-by-state capitulation of affirmative action, as suggested by Table V.

Implications/Recommendations/Future Directions for Further Study

This research team plans to refine the research design to consider the impact of partisan politics and special interest groups on what appears to be a strategic offensive against programs and policies that would support the advancement and/or entry of peoples of color into the economic mainstream of America and the global market. Additionally this research team will enlarge the scope of its study to include case studies of key states representative of the fifteen regions of the United States to discover further the tools and stratagems which may lie at the base of what may be a racist-isolationist attempt to thwart the equality and the equity of access for this nation's peoples of color.

Recommendations

Although data and findings are as yet in their preliminary stages, strong indicators point to the urgent need for the development of coalitions across racial-ethnic lines from the grassroots to the national levels. We believe that a strong coalition of peoples of color can re-capture and strengthen those threatened rights to equality and equity. We recognize that although our findings and analyses by no means exhaust the issues in the debates over equality, they may serve to enrich the debates and provide some insight that may be applied by those who seek a just society.

References and Works Consulted

American Council on Education. 2002. "Making the Case for Affirmative Action." *Acenet.edu*. 1-8.

Acufia, Rodolfo. 1972. *Occupied America: the Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. San Francisco: Canfield Press.

Anderson, Claud. 1994. *Black Labor White Wealth*. Edgewood

Lottie/Clemens Noda—Suppression

Maryland: Duncan & Duncan, Inc.

Availa, J.G. October 16, 1983. "The Case for Bilingual Ballots." *San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle*, 9-11.

Baltz, Dan. March 10, 1999. "A Difference Campaign Comes To Texas." *The Washington Post*. Section A.

Barker, Lucius J. 1994. "Limits of Political Strategy: A Systematic View of the African American Experience." *American Political Science Review*. 88:1-13.

Bowen, William G. and Derek Bok. 1998. *The Shape of the River*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bronner, Ethan. March 7, 1998. "University of Washington Will End Race Conscious Admissions." *New York Times*, Section A.

Califa, A.J. May 11, 1991. "Language Is Not The Barrier." *The Washington Post*, A1 9.

Cahone, Lawrence. Ed. 1996. *From Modernism to Postmodernism An Anthology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, Inc. EPIC Events 4 (5), 6-7.

Crawford, James. Ed. 1985. *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Crawford, James. Summer 2002. *Rethinking Schools Editorial*, Volume 16, number 4

Ferguson, Charles A. & Heath, Shirley B. 1989. *Language In The USA*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

J. Franklin, John Hope. 1967. *From Slavery to Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gamble, Barbara S. 1997. "Putting Civil Rights To A Popular Vote." *American Journal of Political Science*. 41:245-269.

Hacker, Andrew. 1992. *Two Nations Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons.

Hayakawa, Senator S.I. 1985. "The Case For Official English." In J. Crawford (ed.) *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Higham, John. 1988. *Stranger In The Land: Patterns of American*

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 26: 2

Nativism, 1860-1925, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Howe, M. January 7, 1990. "Immigrants Swell Language Classes." *The New York Times*, 26L.

Huddleston, Senator W. 1983. "The Misdirected Policy of Bilingualism." In J. Crawford (ed.) *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ingam, C. November 24, 1986. "Prop. 63 Backers Aim at Bilingual Education". *Los Angeles Times*, 3,16.

Keyser, L. October 20, 1986. "English-From Sea to Shining Sea." *Insight*, 51-53.

Kuznets, Simon and Ernest Rubin 1954. "Immigration and the Foreign Born." Occasional Paper 46, *National Bureau of Economic Research*. New York.

Link, Michael and Robert Oldendick 1996 "Social Construction and White Attitudes Toward Equal Opportunity and Multiculturalism." *Journal of Politics* 58(1): 163-164

Lottie, Adrian J. 1996. *Conflict Over Mortgage Lending in Detroit*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Malcolm X and Alex Haley. 1965. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Grove Press.

Myrdal, Gunnar. [1944] 1999. *An American Dilemma*. New York: Harper and Row.

Narne, F.J. 1916. "The Tide of Immigration." New York: Appleton-Century Crafts. In J. Crawford (ed.) *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Nickens, Tim. March 21, 1999. "Connerly May Force Florida To Choose." *St. Petersburg Times*. Section 0.

Penderod, David. January 15, 1998. "Anti Affirmative Action Advocates See '98 As Theirs." *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*. Section C.

Porter, R.P. 1990. *Forked Tongue: The Politics of Bilingual Education*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Lottie/Clemens Noda–Suppression

Rae, Douglas. 1981. *Equalities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Raynaldo F. Macias and Candace Kelly. *National Clearinhouse for Bilingual Education*: George Washington University, 1996

Rimer, S. July 6, 1992. "Words No Longer Escape Them." *The New York Times*, B1, B4

Scanlon, Bill. June 15, 1998. "Colleges Ease Policy on Affirmative Action." *Denver Rocky Mountain News*. Section A.

Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. 1992. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: W.W. Norton

Shurnway, N. 1988. "Preserve The Primacy of English." In J. Crawford (ed.) *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch 1994. *Black Americans' Views of Racial Inequality*. Cambridge University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1991. *Language, Literacy and Minorities*. London: The Minority Rights Group.

Smith, Rogers M. 1993. "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Harte: The Multiple Traditions In America". *American Political Science Review*. 87:549-566.

Sontag, D. June 29, 1993. "A Fervent "No" to Assimilation in New America". *The New York Times*, A 10.

Strelkova, Galina, 1993. "Language and Ethnic Conflicts Perspectives: The Russian Experience". *The Journal of Ethno Development* (Volume 11, 2): 20-21.

"Summary Report of the Survey of the States," *Limited English Proficient Students and Available Educational Services 1994-1995*. Tables 2.1 and 4.2.

U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 1990. *General Population Characteristics*. Washington: Department of Commerce

U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census. 2000. *General Population Characteristics*. Washington: Department of Commerce

Veltman, C. 1983, *Language Shift in The Unites States*. Berlin: Mouton Publishers

Ethnic Studies Review Volume 26: 2

_____. 1988. *The Future of the Spanish Language in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Hispanic Policy Development Project.

Wolfson, N. 1989. *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Wood, P. 2001. *National Review Online*. 3-4.