Foreword

Terrence G. Wiley
Professor Emeritus
Arizona State University, Tempe

In recent years, there have been several noteworthy strides in language education which have embraced the value of what used to be called 'bilingual' education (BLE). There has been widespread endorsement for 'dual language' education, pervasive interest in promoting 'heritage' languages, welcome enthusiasm for studies on the 'cognitive' benefits of becoming bilingual and pervasive excitement and support for 'translanguaging' practices. In the United States, while there is a sense of freshness to these topics, they are often discussed without reference to the legacy of prior efforts to promote BLE, particularly under the auspices of federally supported BLE. To address this omission, Sarah Moore's latest book on what San Miguel Jr (2004) termed 'contested policy', provides an important and much needed addition to the often forgotten or lesser-known history of the emergence of, and pragmatic efforts to promote, federally supported Title VII BLE.

Many important books deal with policy and the practice of federally supported BLE – too many to list here – as well as those that focus on the consequences of its demise in California and others states. In fact, Moore's (2014) own notable study on the consequences of restrictive policy in Arizona has made an important contribution in this area. What is especially valuable about her current study, however, is her focus on the political and policy climate of federal BLE's implementation as well as what was happening to develop the many elements that were needed for its successful implementation on the ground.

In dealing with the legacy of federally funded BLE, it is important to consider its rise within the context of its times. In addressing this, Moore utilizes a variety of sources, including interviews, policies, documents and legal issues, to describe its rise and development. Among the topics she addresses are BLE policy formation, as well as issues of implementation, administration and the essential problem of resource provision. She describes early programmatic efforts during the 1960s and 1970s and chronicles events and issues leading up to the 1974 authorization. She considers the degree and adequacy of appropriations and details the establishment and functions of the original Office of Bilingual Education,

which was necessary to guide implementation. Then, Moore chronicles the backlash against BLE, which had already begun when its implementation was still only in its formative years.

Moore's treatment is keen to focus on the larger sociopolitical context of BLE policymaking against the persistent undertow of antiimmigration and racially biased sentiments that were directed at the minority populations to be served. She notes how criticisms of BLE have often served as surrogates for other forms of discrimination that have more overtly focused on race and immigration. In this connection, she also digresses from her narration of the earlier history of BLE to focus on the problematic nature of the Trump Administration's ideological and policy orientations. This detour is timely, especially given the number of educational challenges that currently face language minority students, not to mention those of detainee children who have been incarcerated along the southern border.

What led to the erasure of the legacy of federally funded BLE? Moore deals with some of the early elements, including the ideological attack that labeled BLE policymaking as 'affirmative ethnicity' (see, for example, her discussion of Noel Epstein's critique). On a deep level, as Moore has noted, there were also historical and ideological antecedents. Foremost among them was the ideological legacy of Americanization, which became hegemonic during the World War I era (see below). During the Great Depression, the US government carried out a forced exodus of possibly a million or more Mexican-Americans, who were 'repatriated' to Mexico. In fact, what was labeled as a repatriation also resulted in the expulsion of American-born citizens (Balderrama & Rodríguez, 2006). As Moore notes, World War II created a labor shortage, so those of Mexican origin were again encouraged to return to labor in what Williams (1939) termed the racialized 'factories in the fields'. And what was the legacy of education for their children?

Among the most important themes in Moore's analysis is that the genesis for federally supported BLE for language minority children was embedded in the historical struggle for educational civil rights. Immigration to the United States increased dramatically after the conclusion of the Civil War in 1865. Initially, large numbers of immigrants came to the country from western Europe. Many from these groups moved into the Midwest, and as Moore notes, BLE was promoted particularly by German immigrants, and initially without opposition in places such as Cincinnati (Toth, 1990). But this migration was soon followed by immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, who became frequently targeted by nativists, who considered the new immigrants culturally and racially less assimilable. Similarly, first Chinese, and then Japanese, and later Filipinos migrated in larger numbers from Asia and faced even stronger opposition. As these groups were targeted, their children also faced discrimination in schooling (Weinberg, 1995, 1997). Legal

segregation had already become widespread against African Americans during the Jim Crow era, which was upheld by the US Supreme Court in *Plessy v Ferguson* 163 U.S. 537 (1896). Nativism and anti-immigration advocacy increased in the latter decades of the 19th century, first with a series of Chinese exclusion acts, with other Asians including the Japanese soon targeted. By the early 20th century, the US Congress, through the efforts of the Dillingham Commission (1907–1911), was increasingly fixated on the alleged negative consequences of undesirable immigrants from eastern and southern Europe.

Anti-immigrant activism exacerbated the growing xenophobia during World War I (1914–1918; the United States entered the war in 1917) and 'foreign' language education was restricted. English-only education was promoted under the auspices of the Americanization Movement (1914–1924; see Wiley, 1998). Following World War I, anti-immigration efforts continued and led to the passage of the 1924 Johnson–Reed Immigration Act, which implemented an ethno-racially based national-origins quota system that persisted, with only minimal alterations, until 1965. Former Attorney General Jeff Sessions recently hailed it as a model for contemporary immigration reform (Wiley, in press).

As Moore notes, some states, such as Texas, had had various forms of BLE during the 19th century, but during and following World War I, they became increasingly restrictive (Blanton, 2004). 'Foreign' language restrictions were compounded by separate and unequal schooling for minority children. Texas' segregation and treatment of many Mexican-American and Mexican immigrant children was particularly draconian. As Weinberg (1995: 145) notes, by about 1920, a systematic pattern of discrimination had emerged in Texas involving separate schooling in greatly inferior facilities for Mexican-American students with a 'deliberate refusal to make educational use of the child's cultural heritage, especially the Spanish language' as well as 'a shorter school year'. As early as 1925, language bias was found to be a factor in intelligence testing. Weinberg (1995: 147) notes that in San Antonio when 'Spanish-language tests were administered to Mexican-American children, nearly 70 percent scored higher than they had on an English language test'. Thus, Moore's 'prelude' focus on Texas and the work of George Sánchez (Blanton, 2014) is a fitting introduction to the origins of the struggle for federally supported BLE. As Weinberg (1995) and others have noted, the patterns of discrimination, particularly against children of Mexican heritage, were duplicated in California and throughout the Southwest. Significantly, the patterns of discrimination that began in the early 20th century persisted into the Civil Rights Era of the 1960s when BLE began to catch the attention of policymakers as Moore and others such as San Miguel Jr (2004) have noted.

After a brief period of successes in the incipient period of federal bilingual education during the late 1960s and 1970s, as Moore observes,

the policies of the Department of Education, as well as a retreat by the Office of Civil Rights during the Reagan Administration (1981–1989), worked to restrict and redefine what was permissible under Title VII. Simultaneously, this period saw the resurgence of attempts to promote English-only instruction and language restrictionism on a level that had not been seen since the period of Americanization during World War I and the 1920s. The contemporary English-only movement began in the 1970s with the backing of powerful private interests and donors who were linked to anti-immigration efforts and their influence persists with links to the current Trump administration (Wiley, in press). Thus, again, Moore's focus on the Trump administration educational policies is timely.

One of the more important contributions of Moore's history is her focus on the many elements of intellectual and professional support that were necessary for the successful launching and sustainability of bilingual programs. She describes, for example, the development of a national advisory group and the development of the national clearinghouse, which served as a broad-based vehicle for cataloguing and sharing a widely cast net of information and resources ranging from theory and policy to practice. Similarly, Moore describes the important legacy of the federally funded national network of BLE resource centers that helped to support BLE in K-12 settings, as well as the establishment of Title VII fellowship programs, which were critical for the development of professional leadership for a generation of scholars and teachers who would, in turn, go on to mentor the contemporary generation to lead the field, even in the wake of the demise of federal support.

Moore also addresses the role of the Department of Education as an initially constructive force and how, under the Reagan Administration, as well as during the current administration, it became a more reactionary institution that has inhibited BLE and, more recently, continues to fail to promote equitable education for language minority students. During the 1980s, English-only and anti-immigrant efforts were also linked in their efforts to promote a variety of official English, anti-immigrant, anti-affirmative action and anti-BLE propositions in states such as California, which allowed for voter initiatives. Legislative efforts to promote official English at the federal level have, thus far, not been successful. Nevertheless, pro-English organizations still advocate for them. Despite the legacy of resistance to BLE, Moore fittingly concludes her study by focusing on many of the positive developments that have been occurring - most notable among them the 2016 passage of Proposition 58 which paved the way for a stunning reversal of California's restrictive policies dating back to the passage of Proposition 227 in 1998 (see also Wiley, 2019).

Thus, it is important to note positive developments that have been occurring in recent years. Policymakers and professional organizations,

for example, now endorse broad-based language education. This represents an ideological shift away from the dominance of English-only practices and the possibility of a reversal of mainstream US educational policy that has been prevalent for the past century. Recall that during the xenophobic period of the World War I era and Americanization movement (1915–1925), 'foreign' language teaching was intentionally constrained in the primary grades to ensure that children would lose their native languages and acquire only English. It was widely assumed that younger children were particularly vulnerable to indoctrination in alien, un-American ideas. Once they were in the upper grades, it was assumed that it would be 'safe' for them to learn their family's native language if it were taught as a 'foreign' language (Wiley, 1998).

Within the contemporary climate of openness toward language education, there are still many reasons to revisit the formative period of federally funded BLE as well as the resistance to it, and Moore's new book provides an important resource in this regard. First, although federally funded BLE was often ridiculed by right-wing pundits at the time as a failed program that was educationally harming children and keeping them from learning English, a review of research studies generated on BLE such as the Ramírez Report (Ramírez, 1992), as well as more recent reviews by Genesee *et al.* (2005) are still relevant. Secondly, while support for dual immersion, heritage language (HL) education and translanguaging practices are all important in the contemporary context, it is essential to understand the antecedents of many of these areas and prior accomplishments of BLE, which are not always known or acknowledged in the current environment (Wiley, 2020).

Again, today it is common to see arguments for the promotion of language education couched within broad concerns for supporting language development and multilingualism. For example, a recent report by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences' Commission on Language Learning (2017: viii), which was created through a bipartisan effort of the US Congress and brought together by an interdisciplinary team of experts, endorsed promoting 'a national strategy to improve access to as many languages as possible for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background ... and that instruction should begin as early in life as possible. Its primary goal, therefore, is for every school in the nation to offer meaningful instruction in world languages as part of their standard curricula'.

Concerning the country's monolingual majority, the commission observed that the United States lags in comparison with European nations and China in helping its citizens develop knowledge and skills in second languages. The commission's recommendations noted the social, economic and cognitive benefits of bilingualism, and it endorses 'heritage' language instruction, particularly for Native Americans in accordance with the Native American Languages Act in 'English-based schools

with appropriate curricula and materials' (American Academy of Arts and Sciences' Commission on Language Learning, 2017; x). The commission first framed its arguments for the promotion of languages largely in neoliberal discursive terms. For example, it stressed that language is a resource for the United States in an increasingly globalized world. On the positive side, the commission endorsed improving linguistic access 'for people of every region, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background' (American Academy of Arts and Sciences' Commission on Language Learning, 2017: viii). Languages other than English of the home were largely depicted as 'heritage languages'. In specific reference to HLs, the commission endorsed (1) supporting the intergenerational transition of HLs; (2) encouraging HL speakers to pursue further academic instruction in their languages and more 'learning opportunities for HL speakers in classroom or school settings'; (3) expanding 'efforts to create college and university curricula designed specifically' for them as well as 'course credit for proficiency' in an HL; (4) providing 'targeted support and programming for Native American languages as defined in the Native American Languages Act'; (5) increasing 'support for Native American languages being used as primary languages of education, and for the development of curricula and education materials for such programs'; and (6) providing 'opportunities for Native Americans and others to study Native American languages in English-based schools with appropriate curricula and materials' (American Academy of Arts and Sciences' Commission on Language Learning, 2017: x).

While these recommendations can be taken as positive, especially given the ideological legacies of Americanization and the English Only movements of the prior century, as well as those still being promoted, what is missing in the commission's analysis and from other contemporary language advocacy analyses, is a sense of history on why these steps are necessary, which relates to the lapse of federal BLE, as well as earlier attempts to eradicate Native American languages during the boarding school era (especially between 1879 and 1928, see Adams, 1995).

The absence of an historical perspective also extends to research. All too often, there is a failure to acknowledge and utilize the prior research base that was focused on federally funded BLE. In this regard, although the commission references relatively recent research, for example, on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism by Bialystok (2009), as well as on the effectiveness of 'dual-language' education (Steele *et al.*, 2017), it ignores the legacy of decades of research on Title VII BLE (see Wiley [in press] for elaboration; see also Genesee *et al.* [2005] for a research summary; Ramírez [1992] for a summary of the effectiveness of transitional BLE; as well as Thomas and Collier [2002]).

Another ironic consequence of the erasure of the legacy of federal BLE is that many of those lamenting the weaknesses of current US language policy to promote heritage education seem to miss a major reason

for the consequence of its demise. A few years ago, colleagues and I (Fee et al., 2014) analyzed US American Community Survey (ACS) population data by comparing it to the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) school 'foreign' language enrollment data to get a sense of how many potential heritage learners might be reflected among foreign language learners. The data were quite telling, Based on 2007/2008 ACS data, nationally nearly 9 million school-age children lived in homes where Spanish was spoken. California had the largest single share of the population with slightly over 2.5 million students in homes where Spanish was spoken. When contrasting those numbers with California Spanish language enrollments for 2010, the nearest comparable year, only 617,000 students were enrolled in Spanish statewide, and that total would have included many students who were not living in homes where Spanish was spoken. It is important to remember that, at the time, BLE in California was still being restricted by Proposition 227, and most of the potential 'heritage' learners of Spanish would not have been able to study Spanish bilingually. Obviously, the demise of BLE in California and the lack of availability of Spanish classes in many grades and schools, not only in California, but across the country, greatly affected the opportunity of language minority students to learn through their 'heritage' languages, or have contact with them, as 'foreign' languages (see Fee et al., 2014).

The demise of federally funded BLE has had tremendous consequences for students (Arias & Wiley, 2015; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Moore, 2014; Wiley *et al.*, 2009), and the erasure of the legacy of federally funded BLE continues to have important intellectual consequences with implications for language advocacy and language minority rights in the current era. Thus, Moore's efforts to trace the early history of BLE through policy and practice at the ground level provides an important contribution and counterweight to its erasure in policy and scholarly memory. This study offers valuable information to help reconstruct its history. As we strive to promote educational opportunity for a new generation of language minority students by promoting dual language education, translanguaging and educational equity, it is vital that we not forget the legacy of federally funded BLE and utilize its history as a resource.