

Review

Reviewed Work(s):

¿Only English? Law and Language Policy in the United States

by Bill Piatt

Review by: Alicia Pousada

Source: *Language in Society*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Sep., 1992), pp. 526-530

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4168385>

Accessed: 31-10-2018 22:20 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Language in Society*

REVIEWS

besides the author's authoritative narrative were missing from the book's first two sections. Maguire insists, rightfully, that one cannot tell much about a language unless the sociopolitical context in which it is spoken is also taken into consideration. Nevertheless, her first section is heavily weighted toward the history of the language as told through public policy (which is useful but less so in isolation). The histories and sociopolitical contexts of the people who speak the language (not to mention those who show an active lack of interest in or apathy toward Irish) are left largely unaccounted for.

It is too bad that the survey was an end point. Had interview questions been followed up with a few more and one person's answer cross-checked with others, the book might have gone a bit further. Why are they speaking Irish now? Outside "quality of education," the second most common reason (71%) given by Bunscoil parents (not SR) was to provide their children with an "Irish identity," followed by "cultural awareness" (48%). Do the children agree with their parents that these are the best reasons to go to Bunscoil? Furthermore, would these children send their children to the Buscoil, and if so, why? If these questions were also put to the children, we may have had a clearer picture of both the present situation and the movement's future prospects. Nevertheless, Maguire has laid some valuable groundwork upon which we all might build.

Reviewed by SARA DELL
Department of Anthropology
Cabell Hall
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

(Received 9 March 1992)

BILL PIATT, *¿Only English? Law and language policy in the United States*.
Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990. Pp. xii + 199.

In 1986, California, noted for its multicultural population, made national news by passing a referendum declaring English the official language of the state. In 1988, Florida (another bastion of multilingualism) followed suit. To date, 18 states have statutes, constitutional amendments, or resolutions indicating English as their official language. The great majority were enacted after 1981, when S. I. Hayakawa, the senator of California, introduced a bill amending the U.S. Constitution to designate English as the official language of the country. Although unsuccessful, the proposal launched an organization known as U.S. English, which is dedicated to waging battle against bilingual ballots and bilingual education and has sensationistically brought language policy to the attention of the person in the street.

These efforts seem at first glance to be benign affirmations of the indis-

REVIEWS

putable hegemony of the English language in U.S. society; however, there is actually a great deal more at stake. Piatt's book is a carefully researched account of the many historical, legal, political, and philosophical interests involved in the official language debate. Piatt, professor of law at Texas Tech University, cuts through the vitriol and diatribes to address squarely the real issues: (a) whether we have a right to express ourselves and receive communication in the language of our choice, and (b) how we can accommodate legitimate language interests while maintaining national cohesiveness.

Piatt makes it clear from the outset that his personal and professional experiences have convinced him that multilingualism and multiculturalism are advantageous to the nation as a whole. His basic thesis is that the United States should institute limited official bilingualism in the interest of protecting the rights of all its citizens and preserving unity. Such a move would resolve the legal contradictions and ambiguities that plague present policy without endangering the ultimate supremacy of the English language.

Piatt's volume is divided into three parts. The first gives a historical overview of the recurrent language rights debate in the United States. The second painstakingly considers the evolution of the contemporary legal parameters of language rights in the domains of education, work, the legal system, social services, and the broadcast media. The final segment evaluates the inconsistencies in the law and proposes a just solution. Each of the 10 chapters is capped off by a bibliography of books, articles, and legal documents, and the book closes with a useful index of the legal cases covered.

The material is well written and accessible to the educated layperson wishing to comprehend the complex legal foundation for language rights in U.S. society. The first chapter, "Historical Perspective," should be required reading for all those involved in public policy, education, and language planning. It successfully debunks the widespread myth that the United States is and always has been an English-monolingual nation. Piatt draws on the work of Heath (1976) and others to show how American revolutionary leaders recognized the importance of multilingual communication to the struggle for independence and rejected early attempts to designate an official language as being contrary to the spirit of freedom that motivated the founding of the new republic.

Even more engrossing is Piatt's analysis of immigration laws and their conflict with the basic ideological premises of the United States. A particularly shameful incident recounted in this section is the rejection by the U.S. Congress in 1939 of a bill that would have authorized the rescue of 20,000 children from Nazi Germany on the grounds that such a move would exceed the national origin quotas set for that country. Ironically enough, when the immigration quotas were first established, it was the German immigrant who was cited as being the ideal U.S. citizen – hard working, punctual, God-fear-

ing, and so forth. However, jingoism, political expediency, and economic interests blinded the congressmen, and the children were left to perish, despite the fact that American families were prepared to sponsor them.

A telling quote from Theodore Roosevelt on immigration sums up in a nutshell the ideology of the English-only movement today. Old Teddy asserted that: "We have room for but one language here and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house" (17–18). Piatt's coverage of the clash between the "English-only" and "English-plus" movements is perhaps the strongest part of his review. By placing the debate into historical perspective, he allows the reader to see how there is relatively little new in the claims of U.S. English and similar groups, aside from improved financing and organization. He also demonstrates how English-only legislation targets Latinos (particularly the young, the old, and the poor) and responds to the fears of "mainstream" Americans as they confront the demographic boom in Latino birthrate and Spanish-language maintenance efforts. In addition, Piatt includes the text of state legislation countering English-only measures, something one rarely sees in the press. Louisiana and New Mexico's resolutions defending cultural and language rights are particularly newsworthy expressions of public sentiment that somehow did not make national headlines.

Part Two encompasses more than 100 pages and is the heart of the book. Here Piatt presents numerous legal cases in which language rights were at issue. Although the literature on bilingualism is replete with legal analyses of language rights in schools and judicial settings (see Leibowitz 1982; Ovando & Collier 1985:21–55; Pousada 1979; Schneider 1976), readers will find much that is new and revealing in the discussion of language in the workplace, social service agencies, and broadcast media. Although the evidence is quite damning (I found myself exclaiming out loud as I read), Piatt manages to maintain a calm and nonaccusatory tone throughout, which should go a long way toward convincing well-intentioned but confused advocates of English-only laws.

The volume ends with Piatt's proposal for an equitable language policy. This reader found his ideas to be quite sensible, although they have little likelihood of being approved by the current federal administration. In brief, Piatt rejects an English-only solution as overly simplistic and costly in the long run. Instead, he advocates a unified policy of accommodation that respects both minority and majority needs.

Under Piatt's plan, U.S. society would recognize *limited official bilingualism* in those situations where a non-English-speaking individual would be denied access to basic human needs (e.g., the right guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, plus the right to travel, vote, defend oneself in criminal proceedings, obtain food, shelter, education, etc.). Although potentially expensive, this

REVIEWS

policy would be no more onerous and no less desirable than the protections presently accorded indigents in our society. *Limited official English monolingualism* would be recognized in cases where ensuring the safety of persons or property calls for communication in one common language (e.g., traffic control, aviation, emergency communications, legitimate business needs, etc.). Finally, traditional *freedom of choice* would be adhered to in the remaining situations with legal remedies for infringements.

Piatt's book demands attention at this juncture. The growing economic "recession," the burgeoning language minority population, and the increasing need for effective communication with the changing world community make a reasoned approach to language policy a must. Whereas the outlook for language rights in the United States is far from bleak because federal safeguards override any state legislation, nevertheless federal protection can only be invoked by those who are informed about their rights and have the time and/or money to litigate for them. Every state that jumps onto the English-only bandwagon represents another small step toward the approval of a federal constitutional amendment and another giant step away from the minority language protection tenets of the United Nations Charter and the Helsinki Accord, which our nation ratified.

The only real flaw I find in Piatt's book is the lack of coverage of language rights in U.S. possessions such as Puerto Rico and Guam, where English was imposed as an official language. As a resident of Puerto Rico (which in 1991 reinstated Spanish as its sole official language), I am particularly concerned about the impact the English-only movement may have on the island. Any federal English-only law would run into strong (perhaps violent) resistance on the part of the Puerto Rican people who have since 1898 repeatedly insisted on their right to maintain their native language. This resistance would in turn have significant implications for the future political status of the island.

It is to be hoped that Piatt's work will serve to raise enough consciousness to divert thinking people from a narrow path that can only lead to more discrimination against minority groups, more resentment, and more divisiveness in our already polarized society. I strongly recommend this book to all those concerned with preserving and fortifying the United State's strongest asset – its cultural diversity.

REFERENCES

- Heath, S. B. (1976). A national language academy: Debate in the new nation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 112:9-44.
- Leibowitz, A. (1982). *Federal recognition of the rights of minority language groups*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Ovando, C., & Collier, V. (1985). *Bilingual and E.S.L. classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

REVIEWS

Pousada, A. (1979). Interpreting for language minorities in the courts. In J. Alatis (ed.), *Language in public life*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 186–208.

Schneider, S. (1976). *Revolution, reaction or reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act*. New York: Las Americas.

Reviewed by ALICIA POUSADA
English Department
University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, PR 00931

(Received 22 January 1992)

ALEYA ROUCHDY, *Nubians and the Nubian language in contemporary Egypt: A case of cultural and linguistic contact*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991. Pp. xiv + 84.

This is volume 15 in Brill's well-known series, *Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics*, edited by retired Semitist and archeologist, J. H. Hespers of the University of Groningen. The tome might seem a bit misplaced because Nubian is not a Semitic language; rather, it belongs to the East Sudanic branch of Nilo-Saharan, which also contains Songhai, Fur, Maban, and so forth. It is important to keep in mind, however, that Nubians have for centuries been in contact with their (Semitic-speaking) Arab neighbors. This interaction increased after the Arabs conquered Egypt in the seventh century and resulted in an Arabic-Nubian (partial or complete) bilingualism.

From an early date, the Nubians, who were originally Christians, often felt akin to their Coptic brethren in Egypt. Then, as Rouchdy notes: "Under the rule of the Fatimid Khalif Al-Thahir il Aqzaz Addin Allah (1020–1035 A.D.), who had married a Christian Nubian woman, friendly relations were established between the two regions" (7). Over the course of decades, more and more Nubians learned Arabic, and understandably converted to Shi'ite Islam. As more Nubians were born outside of Nubia proper, many continued to grow up speaking "Nubianized" Arabic. Today, Egyptian Nubians are strict Orthodox Sunnis.

With this background, one can come to appreciate the fact that there are many Arabic loanwords in both Fadicca (= Fadija, Noubi or Nubi, Maḥas-Fadidja, or Nobiin) and Motoki (= Dongolawi or Kenzi), Nubian's two major dialects, which are more properly considered separate languages. Rouchdy (1980) reported that Matoki and Fadicca speakers communicate in Arabic because their dialects are mutually unintelligible.

The reader is probably aware that there is much confusion in the nomenclature of the terms *Nubian*, *Nubi*, and the designation *Nūba*. According to many, the name Nub(i)a is first attested in Eratosthenes (c. 200 B.C.). Its etymology is probably an autochthonous word for *slave* as slavery was a common practice of many groups in this area of Egypt and the Sudan, although it is pointed out by Shinnie that he "has not been able to find any word similar to 'Nubia' with the meaning 'slave'" (fn. 1, p. 1).