

May/June 2005

Volume 14: Number 3

Language as Oppression: The English-Only Movement in the United States

by Andrew Hartman

Within the United States resides the largest population of native English-speakers of any country. Despite the huge influx of non-English-speakers from the global South and East since the 1965 Immigration Act (which relaxed earlier restrictions), the domination of English in the United States is not threatened; according to the 1990 Census, 97% of U.S. residents speak English “well” or “very well.” The 2000 Census revealed that, while there has been a growing percentage of non-English-speaking immigration, rates of English fluency are on the rise. Nonetheless, the English-only movement gained momentum in the 1990s and, according to some opinion studies, is currently supported by over 80% of the body politic in the United States.

So widely popular a movement is bound to enjoy legislative successes. Recently, Iowa became the 24th state to mandate English as its official language. Citizens in English-only states must interact with their local and state governments using only English (this includes voting) — a startling development. However, the movement has more far-reaching implications. The structure of education for non-English-speakers is being dramatically altered across the country due to the English-only movement and the resulting backlash against bilingualism and bilingual education. The pedagogical

implications of such a trend are dangerous; most serious research supports bilingual instruction as the best means to advance language skills, thus enhancing long-term English acquisition.

The Racist Roots of the English-Only Movement

The English-only movement has its roots in the historical racism and white supremacy of the United States. This does not mean, however, that it can be understood in the same way as overtly racist movements. Those who support the English-only movement, including many liberals, do not understand it to be racist. But that does not discount racism as a root of the movement; rather, it demands a more complex analysis of U.S. racism. Such an analysis should account for the racism of American liberalism, historically rooted in Enlightenment ideology, and should also take into account two other Enlightenment legacies: colonialism and capitalism and their continued roles in American society.

First, a working definition of racism is in order. Colonial theorist Albert Memmi’s study of racism and his concluding definition will serve this purpose: “Racism is the generalized and final assigning of values to real or

imaginary differences, to the accuser’s benefit and at his victim’s expense, in order to justify the former’s own privileges or aggression.”

English-only supporters claim that English-only legislation and pedagogy will empower rather than victimize non-English-speakers. If they highlight language differences, it is in a spirit of benevolence. To them, English is a “common bond” that allows people of diverse backgrounds to overcome differences and reach mutual understanding — a theory particularly seductive to liberals. Unfortunately, the English-only movement’s non-racist claims are seriously undermined by their systematic attacks on bilingual education. If English acquisition were indeed their mission, the English-only movement would not partake in these attacks.

The ideology of the English-only movement is constructed upon a well-

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS:

Language as Oppression	1
Power & Limits of Place	3
DC Non-Democracy	5
PRRAC Update	9
Resources	11

worn national mythology. In 1995, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Language of Government Act (later defeated in the Senate), intended to mandate English as the only language of the federal government. During the Senate hearings, American nationalist diatribe was prominently on display. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich decried bilingualism as a “menace to American civilization” and Senator Richard Shelby (D-Alabama) denounced opponents of English-only legislation as threatening the “sovereignty and integrity of this nation.”

In the historical formation of nations, the construction of a common language has been one of the essential tricks the elites have played on the masses to forge “commonalities.” A classic Winston Churchill quote epitomizes the myth of language and its importance in regard to nation: “The gift of a common language is a nation’s most priceless inheritance.” This myth is especially important to those who benefit from an American nation.

For many Americans, the symbolism of the English language has become a form of civic religiosity in much the same vein as the flag. Similarly, US English—the largest and oldest organization supporting the English-only movement—proclaims in its mission statement: “The eloquence [of the English language] shines in our

Declaration of Independence and Constitution. It is the living carrier of our democratic ideals.”

While proponents of the English-only movement commonly invoke the original institutions of the American nation and its surrounding mythology, opponents of the movement have fertile grounds for a historical rebuttal. The Constitution makes no mention of language. The new American elite of the revolution—distrustful of monarchical forces that regularly sought monolingual policies—did not seek a national policy on language. Jefferson viewed language as a pragmatic tool rather than an ideological symbol; the standardization of English became a

Recently, Iowa became the 24th state to mandate English as its official language.

cultural hegemonic process—comparable to the current global process—rather than a specific political agenda. The new nation welcomed hundreds of thousands of refugees from the French Revolution and did not try to force English upon them. An English-only nation was not the original nationalist goal.

The framers’ views on language, however, are less important than their doctrines of freedom. Before a citizenry comes to identify the English language with freedom, it must embrace freedom itself as something more than an abstract myth. A population sold on this myth is one of the primary achievements of the American nationalist program; freedom is assumed as self-evident in the United States. The English-only rhetoric in relation to the immigrant experience underlies these assumptions, for it is assumed that immigrants who learn English and assimilate to American mainstream culture will share in the mythical freedom enjoyed by all U.S. citizens.

There are countless instances of immigrants who discovered that freedom was an empty promise. Among the

more damning cases was the experience of the Chinese in the 19th Century. Hundreds of thousands of them, brought in to build the railroads, endured backbreaking labor at gunpoint, pitiful wages and continuous attacks, including many cases of mob violence. American history is full of horror stories such as this; the life of the immigrant was rife with dangerous conditions, restrictive of their freedom.

Underlying the message of immigrant opportunity following language acquisition is the longstanding myth of the melting pot cultivated by generations of historians who portrayed the American narrative as the saga of a single people. Although scholars who recognized the distinct, and often conflicting, experiences that constitute American immigrant history have largely discredited this absurd image, the English-only movement testifies to its continuing influence. Through the lens of this fraudulent ideology, the downside of the American melting pot (loss of language and culture) is more than made up for by the upside (social mobility). Economist Lowell Galloway, testifying before the Senate, argued for English-only legislation by citing higher poverty rates among those who don’t speak English. But his argument does not measure other factors that might account for higher poverty in these populations, including higher poverty rates for all Latinos in the U.S., regardless of what language or languages they speak. In fact, mastery of English is not an accurate predictor of social mobility among the Latino population. Surprisingly, Latinos who speak only English fare worse economically than those who speak no English. Spanish language skills offer Latinos a cultural, social and economic community. Latinos who lose the benefits of the Spanish-speaking community do not gain reciprocal rewards from the American English-speaking community.

Immigrant opportunity is an American national myth that, despite a great deal of contrary evidence, is alive and well. Integral to this myth are the assimilative qualities of the English lan-

(Please turn to page 7)

Poverty and Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 1015 15th Street NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005, 202/906-8023, fax: 202/842-2885, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2005 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

The Power and Limits of Space: New Directions for Housing Mobility and Research on Neighborhoods

by Xavier de Souza Briggs

In recent issues of *Poverty & Race* (Nov./Dec. 2004, Jan./Feb. 2005, March/Apr. 2005), some of the nation's leading practitioners and scholars have offered a compelling, well-updated case for housing mobility and related strategies, with the aim of "dismantling ghettos" and expanding housing choice and opportunity for the urban poor. They rightly understand segregation by race and income to be a linchpin of inequality in America, a problem that makes progress vastly harder on school failure, violent crime and a host of other problems that get more attention from the public and the media. Beginning with veteran civil rights attorney Alex Polikoff's proposal for a national Gautreaux program (Nov./Dec. 2004), some of the commentators made the case for targeting disadvantaged blacks, others for targeting residents of high-poverty or high-risk neighborhoods generally. In this essay, I outline some new directions for policy and research, and I review emerging evidence that takes us beyond studies of housing mobility programs old and new. What's at stake is a clearer picture of the power and limits of place—not one to dissuade the mobility advocates whose commitments I share, but a picture, I hope, to make us more effective. Here I build, in particular, on the excellent research review by Margery Turner and Dolores Acevedo-Garcia (Jan./Feb. 2005), and I present ideas from a new book, *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America* (Brookings Institution Press), a volume I edited with support from the Harvard Civil Rights Project, which includes thoughtful analyses and proposals from a range of researchers, policy analysts and advocates.

Let me outline and explore three key ideas. First, most discussions of housing mobility—and of "locational opportunity" (access to better places) generally — focus far too little on the *repeat* mobility of American families and, in particular, the high degree of "bad mobility" by poor and minority renters. In plain terms, the debate tends to center (understandably) on helping people move *out*, overlooking how they move *on* — again and again, often from poor neighborhood to poor neighborhood or from non-poor ones

***Moving frequently
makes it harder for
families to leverage the
value of a positive new
location.***

back to poor ones—in a difficult housing market, with too few formal and informal supports. I want to sharpen our exchange on the issue of where and when the minority poor move, which several of the earlier commentaries briefly mentioned.

Second, as Turner and Acevedo-Garcia note, the effort to understand which families benefit from particular locations (and why) is in its infancy. I will outline a more dynamic view of what determines the benefits and burdens of living in particular places. It is a view that respects Sudhir Venkatesh's (Jan./Feb. 2005) advice about designing policy to reflect certain realities of poor people's lives and preferences. This perspective has fairly clear implications for housing mobility, community development and other fields.

Third, there is the question of attitudes to support the sharing of neigh-

borhoods (or tax-and-spend jurisdictions), across lines of race and class, to a degree that is unprecedented in America's history. As a matter of problem-solving, one cannot empty a bathtub merely by bailing out water (i.e., moving people out) — not if something is constantly refilling the vessel. America's local communities are changing fast, thanks in particular to immigration and continued economic restructuring, and this means that no conversation about ending the ghetto as we know it can proceed very far without considering the often segregative preferences of all Americans, including the immigrant groups (Hispanic, Asian and other) that tend, like whites, to place blacks on the bottom of their totem pole of racial others. It behooves any diverse coalition, particularly one eager to broaden its tent, to understand these attitudes. They are closely tied to white prejudice and discrimination, granted, but they will exert a force all their own as immigrants become more important in the nation's housing markets as well its political life.

(Please turn to page 4)

We dedicate this issue of *Poverty & Race* to **Fred Korematsu** — heroic challenger to the World War II internment of Japanese-Americans (for which President Clinton awarded him the Medal of Freedom in 1998) — and **Kenneth Clark**, whose research on the damaging impact of racial segregation and discrimination so impressed the Supreme Court in its *Brown* decision and whose writings and activism continued throughout his life.

Moving on (and on)

Americans are famously mobile. Every five years, about half the nation's population has moved, a Census-measured rate that has not changed much in the past half-century. What has changed is who moves often. About a third of the nation's renters move each year, and low-skill minority renters move more often still, with the poorest neighborhood choices. Sociologist Claude Fischer, analyzing Census data over decades ("Ever-More Rooted Americans," in *City & Community* 1(2), 2003), found that low-skill workers are the only major demographic group for whom mobility has increased in the past few decades, and the most likely culprit is tighter housing markets and less affordable supply, alongside stagnant wages. Some moves are hugely beneficial: Non-local moves, in particular, tend to be moves to opportunity, whether low-skill or high-skill workers make them (e.g., moving out of state for more education or to take a new job). But other moves—in particular, frequent, local, "involuntary" moves—tend to reflect the conditions that are both cause and effect of persistent poverty: substandard housing units, difficult or exploitative landlords, fractured relationships, the need to isolate

kids from gang violence at school and in the neighborhood, being unable to stay on the job (or get a new one in time to pay the bills), child-rearing responsibilities, illness and other problems. Local managers of HUD's Section 8 program tell me that repeat mobility by low-income renters is a major pattern, not to mention a burdensome one, and we desperately good national and region-specific evidence on this. Clearly, moving frequently makes it harder for families to leverage the value of a positive new location. I see ample evidence of this in the ethnographic fieldwork and in-depth interviewing Susan Popkin, John Goering and I have done over the past year among very low-income, mostly minority renters in the Moving to Op-

Blacks leave poor neighborhoods often, but they fall back into such neighborhoods much more often than whites.

portunity experiment in metro Boston, Los Angeles and New York.

But the nature of the sender and receiver neighborhoods is at issue as well, and to date, there has been surprisingly little evidence on what kinds of neighborhoods families are exposed to *over time*, as they move about and neighborhoods change around them. Using a nationally representative sample of blacks and whites in the 1980s, sociologist Lincoln Quillian found that exposure to poor neighborhoods over time is more closely associated with race than with income or household type (in general, female-headed families are at greatest "locational risk"). Quillian found that most blacks, but only 10% of whites, lived in a poor neighborhood at some point in the decade and that little of the difference was accounted for by racial differences in poverty rate or family structure. For example, when blacks in female-headed households with income below the poverty line

were compared with whites in comparable households, 57% of blacks, but only 27% of whites, spent at least half of the ten-year period in a poor neighborhood. By this measure, even blacks in male-headed households with income *above* the poverty line face more risk (39%) than whites in female-headed, poor households (27%)—and far more than whites in comparable households (3%). Blacks leave poor neighborhoods often, but they fall back into such neighborhoods much more often than whites, leading Quillian to conclude, "For African-Americans, the most difficult part of escape from a poor neighborhood is not moving out but staying out." (See his 2003 article, "How long are exposures to poor neighborhoods?: The long-term dynamics of entry and exit from poor neighborhoods," in *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22:3.)

Notably, mobility patterns contributed much more than neighborhood change to increases and decreases in families' neighborhood poverty exposure. That is, it's where one moves more than what happens when one gets there that predicts exposure to neighborhood poverty, and with it associated risks, over time.

In a new study, I am checking to see whether these patterns continued into the 1990s, when the geographic concentration of poverty dropped markedly in many regions, and also analyzing patterns for Hispanics for the first time (data limitations make it hard to measure representative, long-run Hispanic patterns and, for now, make it essentially impossible to measure comparable Asian ones). I find, using a simulation model, that even dramatic changes in the 1980 patterns uncovered by Quillian — for example, doubling the rates of exiting poor places and halving the rate of re-entry ("falling back") into them — would leave many families exposed to poor neighborhoods for long periods of time. This leads to the second main idea—about rethinking the power of place, and what we really owe families, in the context of such barriers.

(Please turn to page 10)

New on PRRAC's Website:

"Submission on Racial Segregation and the Right to Housing," submitted to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, by PRRAC and the Loewenstein Human Rights Clinic at Yale Law School. www.prrac.org/projects.php

"Civil Rights Implications of the Administration's 2005 'Flexible Voucher' Proposal." www.prrac.org/policy.php

Periodically, Poverty & Race has published articles listing the many ways in which the irony of lack of democracy in the nation's capital, our home town, is played out. Complex Constitutional and historical issues are involved, as we are not a state. But DC residents pay taxes (the per capita tax burden for DC residents is greater than 48 of the 50 states); serve in the military (in the Vietnam War, DC suffered more casualties than 10 states); and in all other respects are citizens. That DC is a majority black town (whose population exceeds Wyoming's) explains a lot. Congress pays a great deal of attention to us, however – mostly the kind we can do without. Congress can overturn every rule, law or regulation passed by our City Council (and frequently does) and exerts detailed budgetary control over how we spend our tax revenues. (Examples: forbidding use of DC funds to count votes cast on a medical marijuana initiative; barring implementation of a needle exchange program; requiring the Metro system to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to change signage and maps throughout the system to read "Ronald Reagan National Airport" rather than "National Airport.")

Here's an update on efforts to bring democracy to the District of Columbia.

Bringing American Democracy to America's Capital

by Zainab Akbar

International Support

The issue of DC voting rights is gaining greater recognition and support worldwide. In February 2004, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) of the Organization of American States (OAS) released a report finding the United States government in violation of Articles II and XX of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man because of the denial of voting representation in Congress for DC residents. In response to the report, a spokesperson for the U.S. State Department said that he didn't see a connection between the OAS findings and the Bush Administration's goal of promoting a fully representative government in Baghdad and Iraq.

In October 2004, Belarus' Ambassador to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) blasted the United States government, charging that the U.S. was violating OSCE democratic election standards — which it is obligated to observe — by denying District residents the right to vote for Congressional representatives. The U.S. Mission to the OSCE responded by stating that the disenfranchisement of DC residents was imaginary — referring to DC residents' lack of equal Congressional voting rights as a "supposed disenfranchisement." The Republic of Belarus'

condemnation of the United States marks the first time that a sovereign state and a member of the 55-nation OSCE has publicly condemned the United States for its policy of disenfranchising the nearly 600,000 residents of its capital city. In November 2004, the Permanent Mission of the Republic of Belarus to the United Nations introduced a draft resolution to the UN General Assembly on the "Situ-

82% of Americans believe District citizens should have equal Congressional voting rights.

ation of Democracy and Human Rights in the United States of America," which highlights the denial of equal Congressional voting rights to the people of Washington, DC.

In April 2005, the OSCE released a report that cited the United States government's obligation to ensure "equal voter rights" for all U.S. citizens — including the people of Washington, DC. The report marks the first time that the OSCE has formally addressed this issue. While the OSCE Election Observation Mission Final Report primarily focuses on U.S. compliance with OSCE democratic elec-

tion standards during the November 2004 Presidential election, the report pointedly cites the United States government's unqualified obligation as a member of the OSCE to ensure "equal voter rights" for Washington's disenfranchised citizens.

The 1990 Copenhagen Document, which represents the human rights commitments of all OSCE member nations — including the United States — clearly states that the right "to take part in the governing of [one's] country, either directly or through representatives freely chosen," is a fundamental right, and further guarantees "universal and equal suffrage to adult citizens" in all OSCE member states. The OSCE will be holding its 14th Annual Session of the Parliamentary Assembly in Washington, July 1-5.

DC Voting Rights Summit and National Poll

At a DC Voting Rights Summit hosted by various Washington charitable foundations last January, DC Vote released the results of a new national poll showing strong bipartisan support for full Congressional voting representation for DC residents. The poll of 1,007 U.S. adults found that 82% of Americans believe District citizens should have equal Congressional

(Please turn to page 6)

(DEMOCRACY: Continued from page 5)

voting rights — in both the Senate and the House — a number 10 percentage points greater than reported in a similar poll conducted in 1999. The poll revealed that 78% of Americans have serious misunderstandings about the rights of citizens living in DC, but, when informed of DC's disenfranchisement, they support equal voting representation in Congress for DC residents. The polling data showed strong support across age groups, gender and political party affiliations. Support for DC voting rights cut across party lines, with 87% of Democrats and 77% of Republicans supporting full representation.

Baghdadis and Washingtonians

In January 2005, Iraqi citizens and expatriates around the world had the great privilege of exercising the most important democratic civil right — the right to vote for their representatives in the national parliament. The same government that facilitated voting for Iraqi expatriates in the DC metro area continues to deny voting representation for DC residents.

As keen as George W. Bush's Administration is to ensure fundamental rights to Iraqis, it has not ensured liberty and freedom in its most basic form for the residents of Washington. While the current administration has spent more than \$150 billion in Afghanistan and Iraq — and plans to spend another \$80 billion — DC residents are prohibited by Congress from spending a

single penny of collected taxes on lobbying for full Congressional voting representation.

Moreover, DC residents risked and lost their lives to ensure that elections in Iraq took place. To illustrate this point, DC Vote joined DC's non-voting Delegate to the House of Representatives, Eleanor Holmes Norton, and three Washingtonian veterans of the Iraq war at a recent Capitol Hill press conference. The veterans wrote the House Democratic and Republican leaders asking that the House begin to bring democracy to DC by giving Delegate Norton a full vote in the Committee of the Whole. (The Committee of the Whole is the entire House of Representatives meeting in the form of a committee; this allows members to follow the less formal committee rules. She had that privilege in the 1993-94 Session, but when the Republicans gained control of Congress, it was taken away.) Specialist Marcus Gray, a DC resident and a recent re-

The same government that facilitated voting for Iraqi expatriates in DC continues to deny voting representation for DC residents.

turnee from the front line in Iraq, said: "We expect equal treatment, and the Army tries hard to see that all soldiers are treated equally.... However, I want equal treatment at home as well. I want the same voting representation in the House and the Senate as other soldiers. This step would make me as proud as

I will be to see the Iraqi people go to the polls."

No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2005

In January, DC Vote's Executive Director, Ilir Zherka, joined U.S. Senator Joe Lieberman (D-CT) and Del. Norton at a press conference to introduce the "No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2005" (S. 195 and H.R. 286). The Act would give DC residents full voting representation in Congress: a voting member of the House of Representatives and two voting Senators.

At the press conference, Senator Lieberman announced his plans to build bipartisan support for the legislation. Lieberman said he was committed to recruiting Republican Senators to support the bill, and would also attempt to add the bill as an amendment to legislation considered on the Senate floor.

The District of Columbia Fairness in Representation Act

In June 2004, Representative Tom Davis (R-VA) introduced legislation to add a voting member of the U.S. House of Representatives to represent DC. Davis' Bill — H.R. 4640, "The District of Columbia Fairness in Representation Act" — would establish the District of Columbia as a Congressional district for the purposes of representation in the House. The Act would also provide for the temporary apportionment of an additional Representative in the next eligible state, which likely would be Utah — a political compromise, as Utah would elect a Republican to offset the DC Democrat. H.R. 4640 would create a temporary increase in the number of House members from 435 to 437 until the 2010 Census, when Congressional districts would be re-apportioned back to 435 according to population. Though H.R. 4640 was referred to the

The Dellums Commission

"Better Health Through Stronger Communities: Public Policy Reform to Expand Life Paths of Young Men of Color" is the title of a newly established body, headed by former California (Berkeley) Congressman Ron Dellums. The 22-member commission, whose Vice-Chair is Alvin Pouissant of the Harvard Medical School and among whose members are ex-Miss. Gov. William Winter and Rev. James Forbes of Riverside Church, was established by the Health Policy Inst. of the Jt. Ctr. for Econ. & Pol. Studies (headed by Gail Christopher) and is scheduled to issue its report and recommendations in June 2006. Contact them at mbriones-jones@jointcenter.org.

Committee on the Judiciary, the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, and the Committee on Government Reform, no further action was taken in the 108th Congress.

DC Vote has been working with Rep. Davis to expand the provisions in his bill to include representation in the Senate for DC residents. While a vote in the House is very important, it is insufficient without representation in the Senate. Davis has re-introduced "The District of Columbia Fairness in Representation Act" (now H.R. 2043), with 11 co-sponsors.

Working With the Nationals to Get Out the Message

The link between baseball and the DC voting rights movement is a natural one. The decision to name the new Washington-area major league team the "Nationals" instead of the "Senators" (the name of DC's former baseball team) stems directly from the District's more than 200-year history of being denied voting rights in Congress. (Renaming the team The Senators would have been something akin to a sick joke, given the District's disenfranchisement.)

DC Vote has been working closely with the Washington Nationals, the DC Sports and Entertainment Commission (DCSEC) and the office of Delegate Norton to build a partnership and develop creative ways to take advantage of the educational opportunities presented by having a hometown baseball team. With the help of Del. Norton and Mark Tuohey, DCSEC Chairman, a banner carrying the message "Taxation Without Representation" is hanging at RFK Stadium — the same message that appears on the official DC license plates.

Zainab Akbar (zakbar@dcvote.org) is Program Assistant for Outreach and Advocacy at DC Vote. More information on DC Vote, the history of the DC voting rights movement and current efforts to bring democracy to America's capital is available at www.dcvote.org. □

(ENGLISH: Continued from page 2)

guage. But if English acquisition and resulting assimilation do not necessarily produce social mobility, why does this mythology persist? How can it justify the English-only movement? If it is true that English is not threatened in the United States, why does the English-only movement garner huge support and continue to push for legislative change? In order to answer these important questions, it is necessary to delve beyond the rhetoric of the English-only movement and examine its racist roots. Such an examination might reveal a level of complicity most Americans are unwilling to recognize.

Unz and Co.

Ron Unz, the foremost anti-bilingual advocate, chairman of English for the Children, states that bilingual education "destroyed the lives of millions upon millions of students." In an October 2001 debate with bilingual theorist and Harvard professor Catherine Snow, Unz opportunistically continued his attack on bilingual education and bilingual educators:

A few weeks ago, Americans witnessed the enormous devastation that a small handful of fanatically committed individuals can wreak upon society. Perhaps it is now time for ordinary Americans to be willing to take a stand against those similarly tiny groups of educational terrorists in our midst, whose disastrous policies are enforced upon us not by bombs or even knives, but simply by their high-pitched voices. Americans must remain silent no longer.

Unz and his organization have been instrumental in dismantling bilingual education programs. California's 1998 Anti-Bilingual Education Initiative (Proposition 227) — passed by 61% to 39% — placed over 500,000 students lacking English proficiency in mainstream, English-only classrooms to fend for themselves. Unz and other anti-bilingual proponents claim

English skills are improving among California's Limited English Proficient (LEP) students thanks to Proposition 227, and use faulty scholarship to justify this claim. Unz argues — and a *New York Times* editorial parroted his line of argument — that the increase in state-mandated standardized test scores among LEPs is due to Proposition 227. Stanford researcher Kenji Hakuta countered Unz and the *Times* piece by attributing the increase in test scores to other factors. Hakuta reasoned that all groups of students improved their test scores due to the increased standardization of instruction. In other words, more time is spent

Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich decried bilingualism as a "menace to American civilization."

"teaching to the test." He argued that the test itself is a poor measure of English development because the test is geared to gauge native English speakers, not LEPs.

Serious pedagogical research supports bilingual education as the best means to learn English. A long-term national study has documented higher student achievement in bilingual classrooms than in transitional English as second language (ESL) classrooms or immersion (English-only) classrooms. In her debate with Unz, Prof. Snow cited research showing that "learning English faster does not equal learning English better." The level of a person's language skills will only be as advanced as the level of his or her first language. According to researcher Stephen Krashen: "The knowledge that children get through their first language helps make the English they hear and read more comprehensible. Literacy developed in the primary language transfers to the second language." Abstract thinking skills, such as those ideally practiced in social science classrooms, must first be nurtured in a student's native language. Children

(Please turn to page 8)

who are immersed and mainstreamed in English-only classrooms prior to developing abstract language skills will only learn functional English. Functional English may be all that is required to enable them, as adults, to work the monotonous semi-skilled jobs that the market demands, but it hinders these future citizens from learning how to think abstractly, which in turn limits their ability to address societal problems.

In order to understand the racism of the elite English speakers, it is helpful to understand the so-called “Ebonics” debate. In December 1996, the Oakland, California school board passed a resolution in order to, as it determined, “change the racist schooling of African-Americans.” Teachers in Oakland were being prepared to understand the linguistic differences between themselves and their students, most of whom were African-American. The measure considered African-American patterns of speech to be more than a dialect; it recognized that many African-Americans speak differently because of a long history of cultural and political segregation. A national consensus against the measure erupted, a backlash spurred by the mainstream media. The *New York Times* editorialized that Ebonics was “black slang,” the “patois of many low-income blacks,” and denounced the Oakland school board. The media dismissed Ebonics by assuming that it is nothing more than an accent and also theorizing that the Oakland school board was merely looking to acquire extra federal funding earmarked for bilingual education.

But who defines standard English? MIT linguist Noam Chomsky understands the debate to transcend linguistics: “If the distribution of power and wealth were to shift from southern Manhattan to East Oakland, ‘Ebonics’ would be the prestige variety of English and [those on Wall Street] would be denounced by the language police.” Not allowing African-American speech patterns into social discourse maintains white supremacy. The Af-

rican-American language termed Ebonics is a Creole-based language originating in American slave society, the result of Africans being intentionally separated from tribe-members with linguistic similarities, making it impossible to foster commonalities. African slaves were forced to communicate via a hybrid version of English. Like any language, Ebonics has evolved, and it now more closely resembles so-called “standard” English than during the time of slavery. But for many young African-Americans, their language is labeled a “linguistic deviance,” and these students are forced into “Educable Mentally Handicapped” (EMH) programs. A diploma from an EMH program is

The Constitution makes no mention of language.

rarely even adequate to gain entry to a community college.

This is the crux of the issue: Who is being affected by the language debates? Like the English-only movement, the Ebonics backlash sought to immobilize non-whites. And like the English-only movement, it enjoyed widespread support. Although this dynamic is controversial, and language acquisition does not guarantee upward mobility, in many cases those whose language is determined to be “standard” within their society enjoy an unfair advantage. Although race is hardly the sole determinant in the standardization of English, white Americans are much more likely than non-white Americans to read, write and speak an approximation of “standard” English. The standardization of language is an oppressive and racist agenda that limits social mobility for people of color. Whether through the belittlement of a distinct African-American dialect, or by the dismantling of bilingual education programs, the oppression of language successfully defends a society constructed according to the supremacy of whites.

US English

The English-only movement is not on the margins of American society; it is a mainstream operation. The first order in understanding the English-only movement is to understand the organization known as “US English.” US English claims it does not maintain a racist, anti-immigrant agenda. Many of its original supporters were people of color or immigrants, including former Reagan Administration official Linda Chavez, former U.S. Senator S.I. Hayakawa and California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. However, according to federal records, US English has had close ties to the anti-immigrant organization Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) and has been financed by the Pioneer Fund, a racist organization that promotes the use of eugenics and also funded Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray’s infamous racist work *The Bell Curve*. John Tanton, the founder and original chairman of US English, states that “the question of bilingualism grows out of U.S. immigration policy.” To Tanton, the huge influx of non-English-speaking immigrants overwhelms the “assimilative capacity of the country.”

Colonial U.S.A.

Jefferson, Franklin and their ilk were interested in extending their humanism to those they considered the civilized few, not those defined as “inferior in body and mind.” Manifest Destiny was the maxim of the American Enlightenment; all who stood in the way of progress were doomed to extinction. American Indians represented the savage, who by definition obstructed the path of civilization and progress. The democratic ideals of the United States, derived from the Enlightenment and further expounded by American liberalism, forced the Indians to either assimilate or die. The path of death was born out of a monopoly of force established by the white colonists. The path of assimilation required

the American colonial power to embark on a program of linguistic oppression.

In the United States, as in other imperial and colonial societies, the language of the powerful is the language sought by those wishing to ascend into “civilization.” The better one speaks “standard” English in the United States, the more likely one is to be elevated in American society. The speaker of “standard” English is then able to assume the role of a “civilized” being and is entitled the accoutrements of the civilized. The colonial model of language as oppression follows: The colonizer uses language to assimilate and control the colonized; the colonized strive to speak the language of the colonizer and develop an inferiority complex to the extent that they fall short. The English-only movement embodies the colonial model of language as oppression. Albert Memmi argues that elitism desires a seal of approval. The English-only movement offers just this for English-speakers. With English granted elite status, native speakers of other tongues are assigned both real and imaginary differences — a necessary feature of racist ideology. This is merely the beginning of the aggression that racist ideology justifies — aggression that manifests itself in a variety of ways.

The American colonial process includes the oppression of language model. An 1868 commission on Indian affairs concluded:

Now, by educating [Indian] children in the English language ... differences [will] disappear, and civilization [will] follow at once.... Through sameness of language is produced sameness of sentiment and thought... Schools should be established, which children should be required to attend; their barbarous dialects should be blotted out and the English language substituted.

The psychological inferiority of non-whites in a colonial society — the U.S. included — is reinforced by the standardization of language, as recog-

Serious pedagogical research supports bilingual education as the best means to learn English.

nized by Franz Fanon: “The Negro who wants to be white will be the whiter as he gains greater mastery of the cultural tool that language is.” For the English-only movement, representative of American civilization, Spanish is no longer a Western language but has instead become the language of the savage, of the “wetback” illegally crossing the Rio Grande hoping to steal American jobs. It is the language of brown-skinned and hungry children growing up along a militarized border — militarized in order to block the paths of these millions of

needy seeking to “sponge” off American civilization.

The Role of Capitalism

The English-only movement enjoys popular support in the U.S. because American society is constructed upon the racist ideology of colonialism. But something is missing from this analysis — the role of capitalism. The English-only movement operates within a capitalist framework; capitalism is vital to its propagation.

An important feature consistent with a capitalist economic structure is fear and insecurity. Even in times of rapid growth and perceived prosperity, capitalism subjects human beings to the whims of an impersonal market. Globalization has extended this process as never before. The successes are enormous; the failures, apocalyptic. The long and tumultuous struggle to create labor security in the United States is being overwhelmed. Jobs in manufacturing and textiles are fleeing the U.S. in search of cheaper labor. American workers no longer enjoy the economic security they have come to expect — even if this security was more perceived than real.

The statistics are startling: One in four children in America lives in poverty; workers’ average inflation-adjusted wages are 16% less than 20 years ago; even college-educated workers earn 7% less than 20 years ago. Full-time jobs are becoming a scarcity, replaced by a nation of temporary workers. Union levels are the lowest since the pre-World War II labor movement. Predictably, this social insecurity has created a surplus segment of the population engulfed by a prison-industrial complex. Over two million people are imprisoned in the U.S., the highest per capita level in the world. These developments have created a population searching for answers — and an atmosphere ripe for scapegoating. The English-only movement is one example of this process.

Targeting the Hispanic population, the English-only movement reinforces

(Please turn to page 10)

PRRAC Update

• PRRAC Board Chair **Jack Boger** received the 2005 Frank Porter Graham Award from the North Carolina Civil Liberties Union at a January banquet “for achievement in advancing and defending civil liberties in North Carolina.” Congrats!

• We thank **Alan Rabinowitz, Katharine & Eric Kravetz, Cyril**

Estrill, Jr., Florence Roisman and The Fair Housing Center of Detroit for their recent financial contributions to PRRAC.

• **PRRAC has moved!** Our new address is 1015 15th Street NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005, telephone 202/906-8023, fax 202/842-2885.

(ENGLISH: Continued from page 9)

the divisive effects of capitalist stratification, thereby diverting the resentments of those who are on the bottom rung of the ladder. For example, the English-only movement places first-generation Latino immigrants at odds with those Latinos who have been in the U.S. for more than one generation, and who are thus further along the process of assimilation and English language acquisition. The victims are diverted from the economic causes of their insecurity. The victims are then blamed and blame others who are being victimized by the economic structure.

Racial divisions were the most effective method to undermine labor solidarity. According to W.E.B. Du Bois, low-paid white workers in the U.S. “were compensated in part by a psychological wage.” White workers’ struggle with capital was made more livable through what historian David Roediger refers to as the “wages of whiteness.” White workers, while not enjoying the riches of the capitalist class, at least had the benefits of being white, which included access to most, if not all, public facilities: restaurants, theaters, hospitals, parks. This was a benefit not shared by people of color. Roediger writes:

White working class racism was underpinned by a complex series of psychological and ideological mechanisms which reinforce racial stereotypes and thus help to forge the identities of white workers in opposition to blacks.

While de jure segregation has been abolished in the U.S., de facto segregation continues through new and innovative wages of whiteness, of which one of the more important current versions is the English language.

Most white Americans can operate from an advantageous social position granted them by their “standard” English language skills. White Americans learn to enjoy this advantage and seek to maintain it. The English-only movement recognizes the disadvantages of those who do not speak “standard” English. This rift in the population

creates a fertile breeding ground for the English-only movement.

Sometimes such stratification is intentionally fostered by the powerful. Other times, it is an invisible hegemonic process arising from life in the capitalist system — a system structured to reward the few. Groups perceived to be different from one another are left to fight for scraps, thus forming harmful divisions. The English-only movement, although supported by many government officials and other representatives of American capitalism, is not an intentional stratification program. But its end result is the formation of harmful divisions. The English-only movement is, in this respect, a form of social control.

The hegemony of capitalism is increasing the standardization of American society. Sometimes this process is the result of direct decision-making, such as orders for every young person in America to be judged according to a single set of standardized tests. Sometimes the process is less the result of design and more the product of a capitalist culture that posits technocratic values as primordial. In either case (and the difference between chance and design may be difficult to determine), we must resist the English-only movement, which reflects both the visible and the invisible hegemony of capitalism. The English-only movement needs to be denounced as racist. We must recognize the purpose of this movement as the immobilization of immigrants — particularly non-white immigrants — through harmful divisions and damaging policies. A concern for social justice requires us to reject it.

Andrew Hartman (ae.Hartman@verizon.net) is a Ph.D. candidate in history at George Washington University, working on a dissertation titled “Education as Cold War Experience: The Battle for the American School, 1945-1960.” An expanded, fully footnoted version of this article originally appeared in Socialism and Democracy (Winter-Spring 2003) and is available from the author. □

(SPACE: Continued from page 4)

Leveraging the Power of Place: A More Dynamic View

Prior research has emphasized the kinds of mechanisms that *may* affect *some* families *once* they are living in particular neighborhoods. But in general, three dynamics shape the consequences of place in our lives: the *life course* (because our needs change from cradle to childhood, adolescence, young adulthood and so on); *neighborhood change* (“churning” through exits and entries, as well as in-place gains and losses by those who stay put); and *family-managed exposure and adaptation* to risks and resources. Turner and Acevedo-Garcia implicated the last-mentioned dynamic in distinguishing families that seem remarkably resilient even in the riskiest places (often because they buffer and restrict families members’ activities in order to isolate them from risks in the immediate environment) from those families that are overwhelmed regardless of where they live.

Notwithstanding the well-founded assertion that we should shrink and, in time, eliminate ghettos because of the intolerable costs they impose, it is also true that the value of wider housing choices for disadvantaged families seems *extremely* variable, so variable that we need much more attention to what the Annie E. Casey Foundation and other innovative institutions have termed “family strengthening” strategies. In this view of what it takes to enable families to *leverage the value* of a place, not merely to get there, our task is helping families cope, buffer, connect and adapt wherever they live—this *at least as much* as helping them to relocate. Yes, pre- and post-move counseling are part of the answer, but as other commentators have suggested, so are health and human service linkages, school choice counseling and transportation aid to help families “source” aid widely, across a metropolitan area (e.g., with car ownership promotion programs,

also known as “car vouchers,” linked to housing vouchers).

Choosing Neighbors in a Rainbow Nation

Accounts of segregation’s costs, and of what produces and re-produces it, rightly emphasize the impact of white attitudes and behaviors, from direct acts of discrimination in the marketplace to the perfectly legal “self-steering” through which whites avoid certain communities, at least as places to live. But with our society fast becoming the most racially and ethnically diverse in human history, our discussions of housing choice and the geography of opportunity must evolve — and soon. Not only is the white/black paradigm terribly incomplete, but the hopes for a new, majority-minority-led coalition powerful enough to change the rules of the housing game may be naïve. Simply posed, what if fast-growing immigrant groups adopt prejudice and avoidance faster than the nation can undo our long color-coded geography, which reproduces itself? This is more than an alarmist hypothetical. In our new book, sociologist Camille Charles

(“Can we live together? Racial preferences and neighborhood outcomes”) offers the best-available evidence on evolving racial attitudes and neighborhood racial preferences — i.e., whom we would prefer to share neighborhoods with and whom we’d just as soon avoid — in a multi-ethnic

What if fast-growing immigrant groups adopt prejudice and avoidance faster than the nation can undo our long color-coded geography, which reproduces itself?

America; and she reminds us that preferences, according to recent economic analyses, are not just what-if’s offered to survey researchers but actually predict residential outcomes.

The evidence is sobering: Blacks are on the bottom of every other group’s hierarchy of preferred neighbors, and immigrant Hispanics and Asians report many stereotypes of black people similar to those held by whites, albeit to a more modest degree (groups report certain stereotypes, including flattering ones, of all other groups, but

blacks suffer the most consistently negative and widely held ones). This is not a portrait cut in stone, of course, and as Paul Wachtel argued in his reply to Polikoff (Jan./Feb. 2005), shaping attitudes is a crucial part of social change. Sometimes, bold policy has to lead, not follow, a breakthrough in attitudes. But this evidence should disabuse us of the simple notion that immigration-led diversity will produce communities that are generally more inclusive. It should remind us to place well-informed discussions of desegregation, mobility and inclusionary housing in a rapidly evolving racial context that brings with it new hope, new risks and much uncharted terrain.

Xavier de Souza Briggs (xbriggs@mit.edu), a member of PRRAC’s Social Science Advisory Board, is Associate Professor of Sociology and Urban Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research at HUD, 1998-1999, and has been a community planner in the South Bronx and other inner-city communities, as well as a frequent adviser on urban strategies. □

Resources

Most Resources are available directly from the issuing organization, either on their website (if given) or via other contact information listed. Materials published by PRRAC are available through our website: www.prrac.org. Prices include the shipping/handling (s/h) charge when this information is provided to PRRAC. “No price listed” items often are free.

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (37¢ unless

otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

Race/Racism

- **Descent-Based Discrimination** (169 pp., Oct, 2004) is available (no price listed) from the Internatl. Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination & Racism - N. Amer. Office, 467 Grandview Terr., Leonia, NJ 07605, 201/592-6350,

Please drop us a line letting us know how useful our Resources Section is to you, as both a lister and requester of items. We hear good things, but only sporadically. Having a more complete sense of the effectiveness of this networking function will help us greatly in foundation fundraising work (and is awfully good for our morale). Drop us a short note, letting us know if it has been/is useful to you (how many requests you get when you list an item, how many items you send away for, etc.) Thank you.

<http://www.imadr.org/>
[9125]

- **Magazine of History**, the organ of the Organization of American Historians, devoted its

Jan. 2005 issue to “Martin Luther King, Jr.” The 72-page issue contains a series of articles by Clayborne Carson of Stanford Univ. (guest editor for the issue

with Erin Cook), lesson plans, a piece by James Horton of George Washington Univ. and other useful materials. Contact OAH for copies: 112 N. Bryan Ave., PO Box 5457, Bloomington, IN 47408-5457, 812/855-7311, <http://www.oah.org/> [9366]

- **“The Segregation of Opportunities: The Structure of Advantage & Disadvantage in the Chicago Region”** (May 2005) is available from the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, 312/341-5678, x247, <http://www.lcmoc.org/> [9378]

- **Amerasia Journal**, produced by the UCLA Asian American Studies Ctr. (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Don Nakanishi) has issued Vol. 31:1 (2005), “Orientalism and the Legacy of Edward Said.” \$19 from the Ctr., 3230 Campbell Hall, UCLA, LA, CA 90095-1546, 310/825-2974, www.sscnet.ucla.edu/aasc [9381]

Poverty/ Welfare

- **“Effects of Welfare Reform on the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Program,”** by Lucie Schmidt, is a 4-page, Oct. 2004 Policy Brief, available from the Natl. Poverty Ctr., 1015 E. Huron St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104, 734/615-5312, npcinfo@umich.edu, <http://www.npc.umich.edu/> [9155]

- **The Inst. on Assets and Social Policy** (formerly the Asset Development Inst. - Brandeis Univ. Heller School) has a new

website, <http://www.assetinstitute.org/> [9365]

- **“Participatory Approaches to Research on Poverty”** (2004?), a British study from the Joseph Rowntree Fdn., is available at www.jrf.org.uk/redirect.asp?url=findings/socialpolicy/334 [9173]

- **“Monitoring Poverty & Social Exclusion 2004”** (Dec. 2004) is available from the Joseph Rowntree Fdn., www.jrf.org.uk/redirect.asp?url=findings/socialpolicy/d14 [9197]

- **“One Hundred Years of Poverty & Policy,”** by Howard Glennerster, John Hills, David Piachaud & Jo Webb (Dec. 2004), all London School of Economics researchers, has been published by the Joseph Rowntree Fdn. Available at www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/details.asp?pubid=657 [9218]

- **“Rethinking Welfare Rules from a Marriage-Plus Perspective,”** by Paula Roberts & Mark Greenberg, is a 2005 brief, available from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman), 202/906-8000, <http://www.clasp.org/> [9390]

- **“Implementing Welfare Reform: A State Report Card,”** by Jenifer Zeigler, is a 91-page, Oct. 2004 report from The Cato Inst., 1000 Mass. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20001, 800/767-1241; \$6, <http://www.cato.org/> [9392]

Community Organizing

- **“Class Matters: Cross-Class Alliance Building for Middle-Class Activists,”** by Betsy Leondar-Wright (177 pp., 2005, \$18.95), has been published by New Society Publishers, <http://www.newsociety.com/> [9359]

- **“The Midwest Academy Training Sessions for Organizers & Leaders”** will be held in Burlingame, CA **June 20-24, 2005**; Chicago, **Oct. 17-21, 2005**; Maryland, **Nov. 14-18, 2005**. Inf. from the Academy, 28 E. Jackson Blvd., #605, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/427-2304, mwacademy1@aol.com, <http://www.midestacademy.org/> [9372]

Criminal Justice

- **“Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council: Charting the Safe & Successful Return of Prisoners to the Community”** is a 600-page 2005 report from the Council on State Governments & 10 partners. Sections viewable, or ordering inf., at <http://www.reentrypolicy.org/> [9389]

- **“Defending Justice”** is a 264-page, 2005 Resource Kit (overview articles, factsheets, Q&A’s, organizing advice), available (\$10 + s/h) from Political Research Associates, 1310 Broadway, #201, Somerville, MA 02144-1731, 617/666-5300, <http://www.defendingjustice.org/> [9393]

- **“Caught in the Net: The Impact of Drug Policies on Women and Families”** (61 pp. + notes, April 2005), a joint publication of the ACLU, Break the Chains: Communities of Color and the War on Drugs, and The Brennan Center at NYU School of Law, is available (no price listed) from Lendra Lapidus of the ACLU Women’s Rights Proj., 125 Broad St., 18th flr., NYC, NY 10004-2400, 212/549-2668, llapidus@aclu.org, <http://www.aclu.org/> [9405]

- **“Does Parole Work? Analyzing the Impact of Postprison Supervision on Re-arrest Outcomes,”** by Amy Solomon, Vera Kachnowski & Avinash Bhati (2005), is available from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200, <http://www.urban.org/> [9422]

Economic/ Community Development

- **The First Nations Development Inst.** will be held **Oct. 22, 2005** in DC. Inf. from 540/371-5615, <http://www.firstnations.org/> [9428]

Education

- **“Schooling, Statistics, and Poverty: Can We Measure School Improvement?”** by Stephen W. Raudenbush (38 pp., Sept. 2004), is available (no price listed) from Educ. Testing Service, www.ets.org/research [9368]

- **“Black Boys: The Litmus Test for Public School Education”** (23 pp., May 2004) is

available (possibly free) from The Schott Fdn., 678 Mass. Ave., #301, Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700, <http://www.schottfoundation.org/> [9373]

- **“Borrowers Who Drop Out: A Neglected Aspect of the College Student Trend,”** by Lawrence Gladieux & Laura Perna (58 pp., May 2005), is available (no price listed) from the Natl. Ctr. for Public Policy & Higher Education, 152 N. Third St., #705, San Jose, CA 95112, 408/271-2699, center@highereducation.org, <http://www.highereducation.org/> [9374]

- **“Raising and Educating Healthy Boys: A Report on the Growing Crisis in Boys’ Education”** (17 pp. + Apps., 2005) is available (no price listed) from the Academy for Educational Development, 1825 Conn. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20009-5721, 202/884-8000, <http://www.aed.org/> [9376]

- **“One-Third of a Nation: Rising Dropout Rates and Declining Opportunities”** (46 pp., Feb. 2005) is available (no price listed) from the ETS Policy Inf. Ctr., Rosedale Rd., Mail Stop 19-R, Princeton, NJ 08541-0001, 609/734-5949, pic@ets.org, downloadable at www.ets.org/research/pic [9391]

- **“Education on Lockdown: The Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track”** is a 2005 report from the Advancement Project (focusing on Denver, Chicago and Palm Beach County, FL); available from the Project, 1730 M St. NW,

#910, Wash., DC 20036, [9394]

- **“Closing Achievement Gaps,”** by Ron Haskins & Cecilia Rouse, is a 7-page, Spring 2005 Policy Brief from the Princeton-Brookings Future of Children, available at <http://www.futureofchildren.org/> [9403]

- **“Public Education and Black Male Students: A State Report Card”** (2nd ed., 47 pp., 2005) is available (possibly free) from The Schott Foundation, 678 Mass. Ave., #301, Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700, downloadable at <http://www.schottfoundation.org/> [9408]

- ***The Charter School Dust-Up: Examining the Evidence on Enrollment and Achievement***, by Martin Carnoy, Rebecca Jacobsen, Lawrence Mishel & Richard Rothstein (186 pp., 2005), has been co-published by the Econ. Policy Inst. & Teachers College Press, <http://www.epinet.org/> [9412]

- **“Prekindergarteners Left Behind”** is a May 2005 study from the Yale Child Study Center, reporting high levels of expulsion from pre-schools. Available at www.fcd-us.org/PDFs/NationalPreKExpulsionPaper03.02_new.pdf [9421]

Employment/ Jobs Policy

“Disparities in Knowledge of the EITC,” by Elaine Maag, a 2005 Urban Inst. report, is available from them at 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200; downloadable at

www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=1000752 [9399]

“Job Turnover, Wage Rates and Marital Stability: How Are They Related?,” by Avner Ahituv & Robert I. Lerman, a 2005 Urban Inst. report, is available from them, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200; downloadable at www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=411148 [9400]

Families/ Women/ Children

- **“Irreconcilable Differences? The Conflict between Marriage Promotion Initiatives for Cohabiting Couples with Children & Marriage Penalties in Tax & Transfer Programs,”** by Gregory Acs & Elaine Maag, is an 8-page, April 2005 report (likely free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5687, pubs@ui.urban.org, <http://www.urban.org/> [9377]

- **“All Together Now: State Experiences in Using Community-Based Child Care to Provide Pre-Kindergarten,”** a 2005 report from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman), is available from dewen@clasp.org [9388]

- ***At a Loss for Words: How America is Failing Our Children and What We Can Do About It***, by Betty Bardige (264 pp., 2005, \$18.95), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [9397]

- **“Child Care Assistance Policies 2001-2004: Families Struggling to Move Forward, States Going Backward,”** by Karen Schulman & Helen Blank (16 pp., Sept. 2004), is available (possibly free) from the Natl. Women’s Law Ctr. (co-directed by former PRRAC Bd. member Nancy Duff Campbell), 11 Dupont Circle, #800, Wash., DC 20036, 202/588-5180, <http://www.nwlc.org/> [9401]

- **“Black Same-Sex Households in the United States: A Report from the 2000 Census”** (40 pp., 2004), produced by the Natl. Gay & Lesbian Task Force and the Natl. Black Justice Coal., is available (no price listed) from the Task Force, 1325 Mass. Ave. NW, #600, Wash., DC 20005-4171, 202/393-5177, info@nbjcoalition.org, <http://www.nbjcoalition.org/> [9425]

- **“Power Matters: Reshaping Agendas Through Women’s Leadership,”** co-sponsored by the Natl. Council for Research on Women and the Ctr. for the Study of Women & Society of the CUNY Grad. Ctr., will be held **June 6-7, 2005** in NYC. Inf. from 212/785-7335, [9427]

Remember to send us items for our Resources section.

Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

- **Center on Hunger and Poverty.** Their newly formatted website will focus solely on hunger and food insecurity, <http://www.centeronhunger.org/> [9364]

- **“Feeding America’s Low-Income Children,”** by Sheila R. Zedlewski & Kelly Rader, is a 7-page, March 2005 Urban Inst. report, available (likely free) from them at 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5687, pubs@ui.urban.org, <http://www.urban.org/> [9407]

Health

- **“Hispanic Teen Pregnancy and Birth Rates: Looking Behind the Numbers”** (8 pp., Feb. 2005) is available (possibly free) from Child Trends, 4301 Conn. Ave. NW, #100, Wash., DC 20008, <http://www.childtrends.org/> [9362]

- **“Insured and Uninsured — A Midwest Perspective”** (11 pp., Winter 2005) is available (no price listed) from the Heartland Center, 7128 Arizona Ave., Hammond, IN 46323-2233, 219/844-7515, mail@heartlandctr.org [9380]

- **“The New Role of Health Care in Economic Development,”** by Tracey M. Orloff & Karen Doran (63 pp., 1998), is available (no price listed) from the National Governors Association, 444 North Capitol St., Wash., DC 20001-1512. [9398]

- **“Out of Breath: Childhood Asthma,**

Poverty and Housing” is an 8-page, 2005(?) publication, available (possibly free) from the Metropolitan Housing Coal., PO Box 4533, Louisville, KY 40204-4533, 502/584-6858, <http://www.metropolitanhousing.org/> [9413]

Homelessness

- **“Homeless and Hated: Bias-Motivated Violence, Degradation and Discrimination Against Maine’s Homeless”** (78 pp., Feb. 2005) is available (no price listed) from the Ctr. for the Prevention of Hate Violence, 96 Falmouth St., Masterton Hall G6, PO Box 9300, Portland, ME 04104, 207/780-4756, cphv@preventinghate.org, <http://www.preventinghate.org/> [9375]

- **“De Facto Shelters: Homeless Living in Vacant Public Housing Units”** is a 2005 report from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200; downloadable at www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411144_defacto_shelters.pdf [9382]

- **“Strategies for Reducing Chronic Street Homelessness,”** by Martha R. Burt, John Hedderson, Janine Zweig, Mary Jo Ortiz, Laudan Aron & Sabrina Johnson, a 2005 Urban Inst. report, is available from them, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200, <http://www.urban.org/> [9423]

Housing

- **“The Crisis in America’s Housing:**

Confronting Myths & Promoting a Balanced Housing Policy” (22 pp., Jan. 2005) is a joint publication of the Ctr. for Comm. Change, the Ctr. for Econ. & Policy Research, the Children’s Defense Fund, the Comm. Learning Proj. & the Natl. Low Inc. Hsng. Coal. (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley). Available at <http://www.nlihc.org/> [9367]

- **“What People Want: The Relocation Information Center Feasibility Study”** (60 pp., 2005?) is available (no price listed) from We The People Media, 4859 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60615, 312/745-2681, <http://www.wethepeoplemedia.org/> [9369]

- **“Up Against a Wall: Housing Affordability for Renters — An Analysis of the 2003 American Community Survey”** (12 pp. + Apps., Nov. 2004) is available (\$10) from the Natl. Low Inc. Housing Coal. (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley), 727 15th St. NW, 6th floor, Wash., DC 20005, 202/662-1530, info@nlihc.org, <http://www.nlihc.org/> [9370]

- **“Changing Priorities: The Federal Budget & Housing Assistance, 1976-2005,”** by Cushing Dolbeare, Irene Basloe Saraf & Sheila Crowley (13 pp. + Tables, Oct. 2004) is available (\$20) from the Natl. Low Inc. Housing Coal. (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley), 727 15th St. NW, Wash., DC, 20005, 202/662-1530, info@nlihc.org, <http://www.nlihc.org/> [9371]

- **“Moving to Better Neighborhoods with**

Mobility Counseling” is a 2005 Urban Inst. issue brief, available (likely free) from the Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-8200; downloadable at www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311146_Roof_8pdf [9383]

- **“New Study of Predatory Lending/ Subprime Borrowing,”** by Michael Stegman, Walter Davis & Roberto G. Quercia (2005), is available at <http://www.ccc.unc.edu/> [9384]

- **“Success in Affordable Housing: The Metro Denver Experience”** (14 pp., Feb. 2005) is available (possibly free) from Business & Professional People in the Public Interest, 25 E. Washington, #1515, Chicago, IL 60602, 312/641-5570, <http://www.bpichicago.org/> [9387]

- **“National Ingratitude: The Egregious Deficiencies of the United States’ Housing Programs for Veterans and the ‘Public Scandal’ of Veterans’ Homelessness,”** by (PRRAC Bd. member) Florence Roisman, appeared in Vol. 38, No. 1 (2005) of *Indiana Law Review*. Reprints of the 73-page article may be available from Prof. Roisman, 317/274-4479, <mailto:froisman@iupui.edu> and the article is downloadable at www.indylaw.indiana.edu/instructors/roisman/ [9396]

Immigration

- ***Amerasia Journal*,** from the UCLA Asian American Studies Center (headed by PRRAC Bd. member Don Nakanishi),

has published its Winter 2004/2005 issue, "Border Crossings," around questions of crossing geographical borders from Canada, Cuba & Mexico and their relation to national identity and civil rights. \$19 from the Center, 3237 Campbell Hall/Box 951546, LA, CA 90095-1546, 310/825-3415, brandy22@ucla.edu, www.sscnet.ucla.edu/aasc [9385]

- **"Federal Policy for Immigrant Children: Room for Common Ground?,"** by Ron Haskins, Mark Greenberg & Shawn Fremstad, a 2005 Policy Brief from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by former

PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman), is available at www.clasp.org/publications.php?id=2 [9424]

- **"Suburban Sweatshops: The Fight for Immigrant Rights,"** by Jennifer Gordon (2005), has been published by Harvard Univ. Press. [9429]

- **"The 5th National Low-Income Immigrant Rights Conf.,"** sponsored by the National Immigration Law Center, will be held **June 16-18, 2005** in DC. Inf. from 301/577-6940, 2005conference@nilc.org, <http://www.nilc.org/> [9395]

Rural

- **"They Paved Paradise... Gentrification in Rural Communities"** (53 pp., Feb. 2005), is available (\$5) from the Housing Assistance Council, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, hac@ruralhome.org, <http://www.ruralhome.org/> [9363]

Miscellaneous

- **"State by State Money in Politics Sourcebook: A Directory of State & National Research Organizations"**

(52 pp., 2004?) is available (no price listed) from the Ctr. for Public Integrity, 910 17th St. NW, 7th flr., Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-1300, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/> [9379]

- **"Maximizing Voter Registration Opportunities in Human Service Agencies: An Important Responsibility for Agencies and Clients"** (10 pp. + Apps., June 2004), a publication of Project Vote, Demos & ACORN, is available (possibly free) from Demos, 212/633-1405, x772 or 202/955-5869. [9386]

If You Are Not Already a *P&R* Subscriber, Please Use the Coupon Below.

☐ **Sign Me Up!** ☐ 1 year (\$25) or ☐ 2 years (\$45)

Please enclose check made out to PRRAC or a purchase order from your institution.

Name _____

Address _____

Address Line 2 _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone: _____ email: _____

Mail to: Poverty & Race Research Action Council
1015 15th Street NW • Suite 400 • Washington, DC 20005

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL
Board of Directors

CHAIR

John Charles Boger
*University of North Carolina
School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC*

VICE-CHAIR

José Padilla
*California Rural Legal
Assistance
San Francisco, CA*

SECRETARY

john powell
*Kirwin Institute for the Study
of Race & Ethnicity
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH*

TREASURER

Sheila Crowley
*National Low Income
Housing Coalition
Washington, DC*

Darrell Armstrong

*Shiloh Baptist Church
Trenton, NJ*

Maria Blanco

*Lawyers' Committee for
Civil Rights*

San Francisco, CA

Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Thomas Henderson

*Sprenger & Lang
Washington, DC*

Camille Holmes

*Center for Law & Social
Policy*

Washington, DC

Olati Johnson

*Columbia Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian

*Inclusive Communities
Project*

Dallas, TX

S.M. Miller

*The Commonwealth
Institute*

Cambridge, MA

Don Nakanishi

*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Florence Wagman

Roisman

*Indiana University
School of Law*

Indianapolis, IN

Anthony Sarmiento

*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

Theodore M. Shaw

*NAACP Legal Defense
& Educational Fund
New York, NY*

Catherine Tactaquin

*National Network for
Immigrant & Refugee
Rights*

Oakland, CA

William L. Taylor

*Citizens' Commission
on Civil Rights
Washington, DC*

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Philip D. Tegeler

President/Executive Director

Chester W. Hartman

Director of Research

Alexandra Cawthorne

*Bill Emerson
Hunger Fellow*

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

1015 15th Street NW • Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885
E-mail: info@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Address Service Requested

5-6/05

PRRAC has moved!
See page 9

Nonprofit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jefferson City, MO
Permit No. 210