

FIDES ET HISTORIA

Michael S. Moore

AMERICA'S MONOCULTURAL HERITAGE

A Story: Once upon a time a certain high-born English duchess took her two sons on a holiday trip to France. After arriving on French soil and beginning preparations for their stay, she overheard her sons speaking to the servants—in French. Immediately she exclaimed, "Boys, now you know that you ought not to talk to those people in that way. It only encourages them!"¹ The moral: English is superior to French—even in France.

The *Weltschmerz*, a good German word which translates poorly into English as "world-view" or "basic outlook," of the woman in this story ably incarnates the problem this paper seeks to address. She is firmly embedded in her belief that English is superior to other languages, a view widely shared by many early in this century, including some who claimed to be Christians.² Should this story be told to a study-group or even informally at a party, the reaction of one's audience (laughter? anger? puzzlement?) would go a long way in revealing their own attitudes toward this kind of behavior.³

It is the thesis of this paper that the vast majority of Americans are likewise embedded in a monolingual cultural heritage which renders them basically unaware of the needs and rights of non-English-speaking peoples.⁴ Far from a Swiss-like type of linguistic pluralism within well-defined political parameters, the majority of Americans have a historical disinterest in the study of "foreign" languages.⁵ But this is to state the case passively. It is not historically inaccurate to state that the American government as well as the overwhelming majority of the American people actively participated in a passionate attempt to Anglicize all "foreigners" within the country's political borders. Social historians call this the Americanization Movement.

The Americanization Movement: An Overview

The root cause of this social movement can be stated very simply. At the turn

Mr. Moore is a clergyman in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

Official Publication of

THE CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND HISTORY

© 1982, *The Conference on Faith and History*

of the century the United States was faced with a mass of immigrating people it did not yet know how to assimilate into its predominantly Anglo-American culture. The majority of Americans spoke English, went to Protestant churches, believed in separation of Church and State, knew how to read, and were characterized by a "bouyant optimism of a people ever confident" to indoc-trinate foreigners with American values, institutions, and business ethics.⁶ The foreigners, on the other hand, were mostly illiterate, speaking languages much different from English, and belonging to all sorts of non-Protestant religious groups, including Roman Catholics, Jews, and various Asiatic sects.⁷

In the past, most social historians drew a sharp line between the "old" im-migrants and the "new" immigrants, because of the many perceived dif-ferences between the two groups.⁸ The "old" were characterized by a uniform background of political experience with self-government, were possessed of a common fund of social mores and practices, shared a high standard of living, and, except for the German and Irish Roman Catholics, were uniformly Protes-tant. These were the so-called Teutonic peoples: the Britons, Dutch, Germans, and Scandinavians who accounted for the bulk of American immigration before the Civil War.⁹

The "new" immigrants, however, were said to be different, and, because their linguistic, social, religious, cultural, political, and economic lifestyles were radically different from what was considered to be mainstream America, they were persecuted. Irish parochial schools were burned in Boston, Philadelphia, and New York.¹⁰ One writer records the gruesome lynching of twenty-two Italians and how hundreds of other Italians were prevented from attending "white" schools.¹¹ Oscar Handlin deals in detail with the similar treatment received by incoming Jews, Chinese, and Japanese.¹²

These, of course, typify the extreme reactions. In subtler ways many im-migrants were discriminated against by corrupt notaries public and thieving steamship operators. Some immigrant women even found themselves in houses of prostitution when all they wanted were directions to the nearest bathroom.¹³

Genuinely reacting to these abuses, many educators, industrialists, medical professionals, and clergy became virally interested in the problem of assimilating this rapidly expanding foreign element into mainstream American society. As immigrant groups began to huddle together behind the protective walls of (1) their religion and (2) their language-heritage to preserve their separate identities in the midst of this turbulent time, there arose in New England, where the problem was acute, select groups of people who began a crusade to awaken the general public to the growing immigration "problem."

The North American Civic League, one of the first Americanizing groups, put forth programs that were remedial in outlook. Its members attacked the in-terlectual foundations of racist arguments voiced by the proponents of anti-immigration forces.¹⁴ They emphasized the assimilative ability of "new" im-migrant children (even though these children were more or less ignored in the mad rush to Americanize their parents).¹⁵ They sensitively pointed out the psychological problems in immigrant families where fathers and mothers could speak little or no English, while the children were becoming fluent in it.¹⁶ Members of the League, and groups like them, agitated for reform in the urban

ghettos, urging the governmental adoption of their five-point program,¹⁷ and arguing that the bulk of the real immigrant problem lay in the "in-group vs. out-group" hostility of nativist groups combined with a generally apathetic at-titude on the part of the American public.

The fundamental cornerstone of Americanization activity was the teaching of English to every non-English speaker in the country (including American In-dians). Every program, every tract, every journal, every book—every aspect of Americanization activity implicitly or explicitly pointed to the universal use of English as the fundamental criterion for becoming a good American citizen. English classes were taught in labor camps, night schools, National Guard ar-mories, anywhere the immigrants could be induced to assemble. California even instituted the widespread use of English teachers who taught privately in im-migrant homes at the expense of the state.¹⁸ Henry Ford pioneered in the in-dustrial sector by making the learning of English compulsory for retaining one's job. To do this, he established Ford's English school, complete with paid in-structors whose first lesson consisted of teaching immigrant laborers the phrase, "I am a good American."¹⁹

By teaching English, civics, and the fundamentals of American ideals, as contained in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, Americanizers hoped to assimilate the Latins, Slavs, Magyars, and Orientals coming among them in ever-increasing numbers. By constant propaganda cam-paigns through the media (sponsored by wealthy industrialists who were always ready to hire cheaper foreign labor), organizations like the North American Civic League eventually won state and federal approval for their programs. There now existed a powerful force operating at the federal level which helped to shape the thinking of the citizenry of the United States toward the "foreigners" within their political borders.²⁰

Nativism: Americanization's Darker Side

At the same time more drastic measures were being discussed with regard to "the foreign question." The APA, organized early in 1887, was one of the first groups to withdraw from the Americanization mainstream to advocate outright restriction of the immigrant flow.²¹ In 1894 the *Chicago Tribune* published the APA creed which had been agreed upon at their latest Supreme Council meeting in Des Moines, Iowa. It called for the prohibition of "pauper" labor importation, the unconditional restriction of immigration, the strengthening of naturalization laws (with a provision that all American citizens be required to speak English), the exclusion of teachers from public schools who were sub-jects of an "un-American" ecclesiastical institution (aimed directly at Roman Catholics), and the prohibition of state support of parochial schools.²²

The Immigration Restriction League was founded in 1894, composed primarily of old New Englanders of Teutonic stock. Other groups included the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, and the American Legion.²³ These groups eventually worked their way into the federal bureaucracy also. Before the First World War, mainstream Americanization groups worked basically out of sympathy for the aliens, ap-pealing to democratic principles (which, however eloquently stated, often tended to remain in the abstract rather than be translated into concrete action).

Immigration restrictionists, on the other hand, operated out of a basic dread of radicalism (which was at that time perceived to be closely linked to the cheap labor flooding the labor markets), and appealed to nativistic myths, particularly the racist dogma of Anglo-Saxon supremacy over Latins, Slavs, and Magyars.²⁴

Yet, it is important to note a few specific fears of these groups. Restrictionists were quick to point out how some of the Germans and Irish had once talked of resettling whole states, as the Mormons had done, even to the adoption of German as their national language. Then, after the expected break-up of the Union in Civil War, the Germans and Irish were to set up a Teutonic Commonwealth "on an independent career."²⁵ However, Congress early refused their request, stating: "It would be unwise to concentrate alien peoples geographically."²⁶

Restrictionist forces were always alert to this kind of activity, and their influence was strong enough to permit seven bills, all designed to restrict immigration in some manner, to pass at least one house of Congress during the 1893-1903 decade, though all were eventually vetoed.²⁷ They did succeed, however, in passing the literacy test as the "most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration."²⁸ The history of the Americanization Movement, consequently, is the history of the power struggle between these two forces, a circumstance which often left the confused immigrant to shoulder the greater brunt of his problems unaided.

100% Americanism

When political events began pointing toward America's involvement in the European War—World World I—Americanizers sharply increased the pressure to Americanize all foreign elements in the United States, particularly those of German descent. To weld the nation into one people against a common enemy became the national goal. Federal, state, and municipal Americanizing groups now began to gain access to hitherto unavailable funds to "100% Americanize" the immigrant. Americanization became linked with "military preparedness, industrial mobilization, universal service... as coessential to a more vital nationalism."²⁹ In fact, Henry Ford's primary motives for establishing his English school were (1) higher productivity and (2) higher morale for the War effort.³⁰

The dissonance among the cacophonous voices within the Americanization movement—broadly, those of cosmopolitan democracy and those of nativistic fear—now began to modulate noticeably into a more nativistic key. Highnam lists a few of the reasons for this:

... the insistence on a conformist loyalty intolerant of any values not functional to it; the demand for a high sense of duty toward the nation; the faith in a drumfire of exhortation and propaganda to accomplish desired social objectives; and the ultimate reliance on coercion and punishment.³¹

In Iowa, one of the APA's strongest territories, the Governor issued a proclamation banning the use of any language besides English in all schools, churches, public places, and even telephone conversations.³² Two other states, Idaho and Utah, also yielded to the spirit of the times by requiring all non-English-speaking aliens to attend compulsory Americanization classes. In 1919

no fewer than fifteen states in the Union had declared that English was to be the sole language of instruction not only in the public schools but in the private schools as well.³³

The War effort resurrected several traditions, one being Mayo-Smith's old doctrine of nationality based on a common speech.³⁴ As early as 1890 he had insisted on the use of English as the "fundamental language of future generations," declaring that "if we are to build up in this country one nationality we must insist upon one speech."³⁵ This Anglicization philosophy, revived by threat of war with Germany, put an almost unbearable pressure on German-Americans to conform. Some nationalists were even calling for the use of the English language as an "imperative to national self-protection."³⁶

Melting Pot Or Salad Bowl?

When the inevitable post-War Depression came, businessmen and industrialists lost interest in Americanizing the immigrant because they could no longer be persuaded that their efforts in this regard brought a measurable economic return. In addition, the death of the Big Red Scare, a time when immigrant leaders and their sympathizers were deported from the United States in large numbers, served to unblock some of the tremendous social pressures which had long been brewing among immigrant (one should now begin to say "minority") groups. The combination of these factors opened the gates for a minority revolt, especially in the large Northeastern cities where the problems were most severe, most neglected.

In the vanguard of those reacting to the high pressure tactics of the 100% Americanizers were the newly educated generation of immigrant leaders who somehow survived the aforementioned deportations.³⁷ Editors of foreign-language newspapers were among the *very* first to speak out through rather bold editorials, protesting what they perceived to be an "in-group/out-group" domination by a predominantly white, Anglo-American ruling class. One such editor remarked:

You threaten to outlaw our speech and memories... and at the same time coax us to deck ourselves out like exhibits in a circus and entertain you with our quaint dialects.³⁸

Though it may not be a matter of popular knowledge, the last fifty years or so have been a slow, painful process for non-English-speaking Americans. There has been, and continues to be a strong, sustained backlash of ethnic pride to the humiliation suffered during the years of Americanization.³⁹ Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Orientals and a veritable host of other minorities are asserting themselves through legal, social, and ecclesiastical channels to make their ethnically proud voices heard.⁴⁰ Some would complain that these voices (though all would probably defend their right to be heard) are getting to be too loud. This concern is directly related to concerns about the widespread fragmentation that is taking place socially in the United States at present. This is perceived by many to be frightening, to be the root cause of a lack of an American *will* at a time when the country seems to be splitting apart along not only ethnolinguistic lines, but also along lines which reflect and emphasize differences in religion, age, education, marital status, income, race, and social position.⁴¹

After the first World War, three factors—the Depression, the death of the Big Red Scare, and the slowly mushrooming wave of ethnic consciousness set in motion a process of self-reflection by thoughtful people addressing the question of Americanization. Oscar Handlin summarizes what he perceives to be the three basic perspectives Americans gradually adopted.⁴²

First, some believed America to be a gigantic "melting pot" for all the peoples of the world. Emma Lazarus' poem, "The New Colossus," inscribed on the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor, personified this view.⁴³

Second, some believed that "adjustment should simply take the form of assimilation of the newcomers to the existing society."⁴⁴ For example, David Lipscomb⁴⁵ a powerful leader in the avowed "Movement to Restore New Testament Christianity," subscribed to this view:

It is true that interchange of peoples has its advantages; it also has its disadvantages. It is especially not desirable that people of foreign habits, feelings, manners should come among us faster than they can be assimilated into our society.⁴⁶

Third, a later view, which began to gain prominence during the first World War and afterwards, was put forth as a compromise or synthesis of the two extremes. Dubbed "cultural pluralism," this view shapes the thinking of many historians, journalists, and educators in the United States today.⁴⁷ Stated succinctly, the classical pluralist

denied that it was possible or even desirable for the immigrant groups to lose their identity and argued that our culture had much to gain by permitting each of them to develop their own particular tendencies.⁴⁸

Cultural pluralism is a synthesis in the dialectic between "melting pot" extremists on the left and "restrictionist" extremes on the right. Probably no two "salad bowl" pluralists will stand at exactly the same point on this dialectical axis; some will tend to lean to the left, others to the right. After having cautioned against simplistic usage of the term, it is nevertheless safe to say that cultural pluralism has been widely received in theological, political, and historiographical circles today as the only really defensible explanation for the social phenomena American society has experienced in this regard since World War I. Old "melting pot" and "restrictionist" extremists are usually (sometimes condescendingly) discounted as romantic idealizers of a shadowy past.

Kallen's essay was one of the most influential in establishing a rationale for this position.⁴⁹ In it he carefully balanced the positive and negative forces working for and against a homogeneous nationality, and concluded that America's future strength was to lie in a heterogeneous nationality and that the country probably ought to get used to thinking in those terms.⁵⁰ To the chagrin of Americanizers, Kallen demonstrated, perhaps conclusively, that the Angelization activity of the past several decades had failed miserably. He noted how the United States (in 1915) had become an ethnolinguistic mosaic of peoples and languages, relatively untouched by the fever of Americanization activity, even after having experienced the 100% Americanization activity of the War years. He likened the situation to that of another well-known society:

English is to us what Latin was to the Roman provinces and to the middle ages—the language of the upper and dominant class, the vehicle and symbol of culture.

For the mass of our population it is a sort of Esperanto or Ido, a lingua franca necessary less in the spiritual than in the economic contacts of daily life.⁵¹

Hanson notes how this came to be.⁵² In response to Anglo-American domination, immigrant groups clung fiercely to two institutions which worked together to preserve their respective cultures from destruction: their *language* and their *religion*. Each exerted a simultaneous influence on the other to preserve the whole from extinction, mixing together like water and powdered cement to form a protective wall around the threatened organism. The greater the attack against it, the more fiercely the minority cultural organism clung to its religio-linguistic roots. Americanization, with its corresponding emphasis on the compulsory learning of English, served only to stratify and repress, *not* eliminate the ethnolinguistic traditions of minority peoples.

Theoretical Foundations Of Bilingual/Bicultural Education

Since World War II, a new movement has been developing in the field of linguistics. Within the traditional spheres of the "social" sciences—sociology, psychology, linguistics, education, anthropology, political science—social scientists are now calling for more integration between their respective disciplines. Macro-linguistic problems, i.e. problems wherein linguistics overlaps with the theoretical and methodological constructs of other disciplines, demand more collaboration and cooperation, it is claimed, between linguists and their colleagues in the other social sciences.

Some linguists, however, have been most unwilling to submit to this trend toward more cooperation and integration, choosing rather to dichotomize the "classical" study of language from the rest of the social sciences. Although "linguistics" in its broadest sense may be used to describe all of the factors involved in the face-to-face speech act, some linguists still refuse to support this definition of the term, choosing rather to continue to divorce human utterances, in the main, from their cultural contexts. Because of this terminological confusion, newer terms have been coined which symbolize this newer movement toward integration; terms like "socio-linguistics," "psycholinguistics," and "ethno-linguistics." Hymes explains a few of the advantages of this newer terminology:

... the aim must not be so to divide the communicative event, divorcing message-form (sign-type) and context of use from one another. The aim must be to keep the multiple hierarchy of relations of messages and contexts in view.⁵³

The major shortcoming of the older anthropological approach to language of Sapir, Whorf, and Kluckhohn⁵⁴ involved their tendency to think of entire languages or entire societies as categorizable or typable in an overall way.⁵⁵ Sociolinguistics, on the other hand,

argues against any such neat classification once functional realities are brought in to consideration. Any reasonably complex speech-community contains various speech networks that vary with respect to the nature and ranges of their speech repertoires.⁵⁶

Fishman states his position flatly:

the existence of structured biculturalism is as real as the existence of structured bilingualism, and both of these phenomena counteract any neat and simple linguistic relativity of the kind that Whorf had in mind.⁵⁷

In sum then, sociolinguistics:

(1) Sands within the new stream of macro-linguistic research, represented by the voices of Fishman, Ferguson, Labov, Brown, Hymes, Bright, Gumperz, and others.⁵⁸

(2) Stands basically against the older anthropological-linguistic notions which tended to type "whole languages," "whole cultures," and "whole societies," by recognizing the existence of structured bilingualism/biculturalism in a multilingual/multicultural world, relatively unaffected by political boundaries.

(3) Attempts to describe talk contextually, via a teamwork approach to communications problems, against older methods which advocated divorcing linguistic utterances from their sociocultural contexts.

Educators building on these theoretical foundations have been acutely aware of the needs of children who come to English-speaking school systems from non-English-speaking homes. This is a continual problem that simply will not go away as long as America is perceived to be, in the minds of the immigrants who come here by the hundreds of thousands, "the land of the free." As it did during the days of the old Americanization era, this situation has given rise to serious problems within immigrant/minority families which adversely affect the learning ability as well as the actual educational progress of some of these children.⁵⁹

But unlike the days of 100% Americanization, newer court rulings, the rise of cultural pluralism and its popularity among educators, and the development of newer theoretical constructs for explaining the obvious existence of bilingualism/biculturalism have all combined to lead to the rise of a relatively new phenomenon in the United States—bilingual/bicultural education.

The unique problems confronting teachers in such ethnically diverse cities as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Miami (to name only a few) are simply compelling professional educators to experiment with new ideas and new methods if their ethnolinguistically polka-dotted classes are to be taught anything at all. They are not in a position to wait until their students learn English before being asked to educate them. Indeed,

education... is the meeting point of those cross winds which others observe in isolation, but which the educator must deal with in combination without the leisure to await the outcome of academic researches.⁶⁰

These teachers are under enormous pressure from the courts and from the parents, the governmental agencies supporting multicultural education and those which do not, and the gnawing fear that without a broad base of support a new nativism will rear its head and perhaps destroy what little progress that has been made, as was seen during the days of 100% Americanization.

In point of fact, educators themselves are becoming divided over what kind of education ought to be paid for by tax-dollars for non-English-speaking students that are often even discovered to be in the United States illegally. Some are beginning to ask: "How can this be fair to those English-speaking students in my classroom whose great potential must remain untapped because the present system dictates that they 'park' that potential until their non-English-speaking classmates somehow catch up to them? Will this not retard the nation's educational growth in the long run?"

There are signs that the controversy is beginning to come to a head. Secretary

of Education Terrell Bell, concerned to "telegraph a message of change to the American people," was quoted by *Time* in February, 1981 as supportive of a proposal

withdrawing the regulations proposed last August requiring public schools to give bilingual instruction to children deficient in English,

describing the regulations as "harsh, inflexible, burdensome, unworkable, and incredibly costly."⁶¹ The article goes on to state that their are more than 3.5 million schoolchildren in the United States today whose native language is not English, with about 10% of that number participating in federally-funded bilingual education programs at a current cost to the Treasury of \$167 million a year. Bell's proposal would seek to reduce federal involvement in the process, turning it over to the local school districts in the separate states. This does not mean that bilingual/bicultural education is in immediate danger of being scrapped throughout the nation (in fact, local control is perceived by some educators to be better than federal control), but it does signal a definite change in the posture of the federal government from the left to the right on the pluralistic axis.

Conclusion

In might be helpful now to reexamine the thesis of this paper again, (as worded above in the opening remarks), in more detail.

(1) The use of the phrase "vast majority" should in no way preclude the existence of a "sensitive minority." As noted above, not all Americans were nativistic in their attitudes toward immigrants and minorities. One should be careful, however, in assuming that, because cultural pluralism is widely accepted in historiographical, educational, and ecclesiastical circles, not to assume that somehow the attitudes of this sensitive minority have fully filtered down to change the basic psyche of the American populace at large. This is an assumption that needs to be tested empirically. What little empirical research this writer has attempted leads to the opposite conclusion;⁶² hence, the use of the phrase "vast majority."

(2) By employing the phrase "basically unaware" one should not then conclude that Americans are therefore largely ineducable or that they are somehow destined to perpetuate lifestyles that demonstrate an ignorant nativistic bias for generations to come. Some might consider these as likely prospects for the future, but surely there are other possibilities to consider. Recent increases in the overall literacy rate among underprivileged segments of the population, recent higher scores by selected schoolchildren on various standardized tests, and the newly-recognized pervasive effects of the media are some of the factors which also deserve careful consideration. Nevertheless, America's heritage—the past—leads one to conclude that at present there does exist a basic lack of historical awareness of the problem, perhaps not in Miami, Chicago, or in several other large cities, but in the populace as a whole.

(3) "Needs" and "rights" have become such common buzzwords; redefining them will prove to be a difficult task. In no other area do one's philosophical presuppositions show up more clearly than right here. One group claims that America has a "moral obligation" to accept *all* immigrants to these shores, regardless of how many, whether they were sent here to relieve

overcrowded penal systems, or whatever, simply because it is the "basic human right" of every individual on this planet to live his or her life in as free an environment as possible. Since many of these emigrant peoples perceive the United States to meet this definition of freedom, it is therefore morally reprehensible to turn them away. They have a genuine need and right not only to come here, but to participate in this society, pay taxes, educate their children, and benefit from all the social services they helped to finance. Since most of their children do not understand English yet, something must be done about this or the American penal system, already overcrowded, may prove to be their eventual home, a further burden on the country. "He who cannot read is always first to bleed." Therefore, adherents of this position vigorously defend bilingual/bicultural education as one of many basic rights which need to be safeguarded.

On the other side of the aisle another definition of "needs" and "rights" is proposed. It too betrays certain philosophical presuppositions. Adherents to this view to some degree usually sympathize with the goals and aims of their colleagues in the first group, but their primary concern is for "the country." Bilingual/bicultural education is all right for selected immigrant families, but is the goal of the program to Americanize these people or is it not? Are they going to learn English or not? At whose feet is the bill going to be laid for this very expensive program? What long-term effects will this new, untried educational methodology have on already fragmenting society? How will it affect the test scores of American children? How will it affect the nation's ability to defend itself against potential aggressors? How will the American economy, the American standard of living be affected? This group is to some degree sympathetic to the "needs" and "rights" of immigrants and minorities, but their priorities, for clearly defined reasons, lie with other "needs" and "rights" which they perceive to be more important for the country in the long run.

Cultural pluralism is an alternative to these extremes which requires a radically different understanding of such things as "rights" in a democratic society.⁶³ In an era of increasing polarization and mounting tension, perhaps a clearer understanding of America's rather monocultural heritage can open the doors a little wider for more genuine communication and less rhetorical debate. Failure to understand this heritage may close them indefinitely.

¹ Horace J. Bridges, *On Becoming an American* (Boston: Marshall Jones Co., 1919), 94.

² For example, cf. J.H. Garrison and B.W. Johnson, eds., "The Ruling Race of the World and Its Evangelization," *Christian Evangelist* 28 (June 18, 1891):386. This supremacy was frankly stated by J.J. Morgan, "California Letter," *Christian Standard* 35 (July 29, 1899):962, in direct reference to the "Indian question," in which American Indians were continuously referred to as "savage," "uncivilized," and

issues involved. Cf. M.S. Moore, "Basic Attitudes Toward 'Foreigners' Among Selected Churches of Christ," *Restoration Quarterly* 24, 4(1981):225-38.

⁴ *Ibid.* This article is a condensation of a thesis of the same name, Harding Graduate School of Religion, Memphis, Tennessee, May, 1978. Chapter titles include: "Protestant Participation in the Americanization Movement"; "Melting Pot or Salad Bowl?"; "Language and Thought: A History of Interpretation"; "Toward Christian Language in a Pluralistic Society." The final two chapters report the results of administering the BLAQ to two groups of churches who are practically identical in every respect except for one variable: success in ministering to peoples ethnolinguistically different from themselves. This was done to test the accuracy of the BLAQ; to see if it could, in fact, measure cultural distances between disparate peoples. This experiment proved that it could. There are countless applications for such an instrument as the BLAQ, not the least of which is the education of seminarians to the ethical issues involved in dealing with this problem in their future parishes.

⁵ Rep. Paul Simon (Democrat) of Illinois, Chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education and a member of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, became so alarmed at the trends uncovered by his Subcommittee that he wrote a book entitled *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis* (New York: Continuum, 1980). He writes: "One of every fifty Americans is foreign-born. We are the fourth largest Spanish-speaking country in the world, yet... at a time when the national need dictates that we should be increasing the exposure of our citizens to other languages and cultures, that exposure is declining." Some particulars: "Of 22,737 secondary schools in the nation, 4,344 do not teach any foreign language and the number of schools that do is declining... Fifty-two fewer univer-

sities today offer courses in the Russian language than offered them in 1974... The State Department no longer requires any background in a (foreign) language (for) entry into the Foreign Service." Cited in Alfred Balk, "Editor's Corner," *World Press Review* 28, 3 (March 1981):6.

⁶ George E. Hartmann, *The Movement to Americanize the Immigrant* (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1967), 273.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 7F.

⁸ Cf. Frank J. Warren, *The Immigrant Invasion* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1913); William P. Shriver, *Immigrant Forces* (New York: Missionary Education Movement of the U.S. and Canada, 1913); Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Immigrant in American History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940; reprint ed., New York: Harper and Row, 1964); Maurice R. Davis, *World Immigration* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1949); John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism* (New York: Atheneum, 1963).

⁹ U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual/Bicultural Education*, May, 1975, 5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 6, nt. 10.

¹¹ Arrigo Petacco, *Joe Petrosino* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1974.)

¹² *Immigration As A Factor in American History* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959).

¹³ These abuses were thoroughly documented by the famous Dillingham Commission set up in 1907, later published as U.S. Immigration Commission, *Report*, Washington, D.C., 41 vols. Perceived differences between "old" and "new" immigrants, though a foundational assumption upon which the work of the Commission was based, have now been challenged as "based on a completely artificial distinction. In no real sense could either the immigration from Northern and Western Europe or that from Southern and Eastern Europe be regarded

"under our care."

³ Though this paper is descriptive, not prescriptive, I have wrestled with the problem of how to educate others to an awareness of this problem, designing a Basic Language Attitude Questionnaire (BLAQ) for employment by cultural educators interested in measuring cultural distances between differing ethnolinguistic groups. Based on models used by bicultural educators, it is the only instrument of its kind, to my knowledge, that addresses itself to the *religio-ethnic*

as a collective entity possessing common attributes; on the contrary, each of the two groups of immigrants was composed of a great variety of contrasting types who deserve to be treated as such. Any other approach is not only unobjective but misleading." Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 180.

¹⁴ "Teutonic supremacy" theories were popular. Cf. Percy S. Grant, "American Ideals and Race Mixture," *North American Review* 195 (April 1912): 513-525.

¹⁵ The assertion that these children were ignored is one of the primary factors which led to the preparation and publication of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Better Chance to Learn: Bilingual/Bicultural Education*.

¹⁶ Enrico Sartorio, *Social and Religious Life of Italians in America* (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1918; reprinted in Clifton, NJ: A.M. Kelley, 1974), 126, warned that young Italian-Americans ought to be "kept in touch with the Italian language, which is the connecting link between parents and children."

¹⁷ (a) Assimilation, (b) Education, (c) Distribution, (d) Naturalization, (e) Protection. Cf. *New York/New Jersey Committee of the North American Civic League for Immigrants*, December 1909—March 1911, 5-6, cited in Hartmann, *Movement*, 76f.

¹⁸ California Commission of Immigration and Housing, *The Home Teacher, The Act, With a Working Plan and Forty Lessons in English*, c. 1915, cited in Hartmann, *Movement*, 76f.

¹⁹ Higham, *Strangers*, 244-45.

²⁰ The North American Civic League eventually Federalized, becoming the Committee for Immigrants in America in 1914. This Federal agency worked closely with the Federal Bureau of Education; it also worked with the Federal Bureau of Naturalization.

²¹ Higham, *Strangers*, p. 3, cautiously defines "nativism" as a distinctly American social posture, dating from the "first Indian resistance to white invaders," yet, in a narrower sense "the product of a specific chain of events in eastern American cities in the late 1830's and early 1840's." APA stands for American Protective Association.

²² Cited in Hartmann, *Movement*, 20.

²³ *Ibid.*, 21.

²⁴ Higham, *Strangers*, 238.

²⁵ Hansen, *The Immigrants*, 131-132.

²⁶ *Niles Weekly Register* 14 (1818):211-215, cited in Hansen, 132.

²⁷ Hartmann, *Movement*, 20.

²⁸ This was the conclusion of the Federal Immigration Commission, W.D. Owen, Chairman. Cf. U.S. Immigration Commission, *Abstracts*, 48, cited in Hartmann, *Movement*, 68. Owen, a former Disciples of Christ minister, reported that some of his colleagues had even recommended that all foreigners be required to be literate in English and their native language. "Editorial Items," *Christian Standard* 25 (June 14, 1890):385.

²⁹ Higham, *Strangers*, 244.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 245.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 247.

³² *Ibid.*, 248.

³³ *Ibid.*, 260.

³⁴ Richmond Mayo-Smith, *Emigration and Immigration* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1890). A similar view was recently voiced by Eric Sevareid, former CBS News Commentator, in a speech before the student body of Harding University in Searcy, Arkansas. Sevareid was quoted as having stated that "one of the greatest threats to national unity is English-Spanish bilingualism, and not black-white relations." Cf. Linda Hillbun, "Former CBS Commentator Calls for Renewed Trust," *Harding University Bulletin* 55, 9 (March 1980):2. (citation from Hillbun, not Sevareid)

³⁵ Mayo-Smith, *Emigration*, 75.

³⁶ Higham, *Strangers*, 259. In a request to Congress, these were the words recorded as having been uttered by Franklin J. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

³⁷ Early immigrant sympathizers had established at least one college, the American International College, whose function consisted in training immigrant leaders that they might become "capable of guiding, advising, and leading fellow members of their nationality." The institution's founders "hoped in this way to break the rule of the padrone, the political boss, and the demagogue." Hartman, *Movement*, 30.

Actually, it is misleading to say that immigrant leaders were the first to react to 100% Americanization. Liberal Protestant sympathizers had long ago been instrumental in founding the North American Civic League, and through the voices of Samuel Zane Barten ("Christian Leaders for Immigrant Peoples," *Religious Education* 7 (Dec 1912):541ff), Leroy Hodges ("The Church and the Immigrants: A Record of Failure and the Remedy," *Missionary Review* 35 (Mar 1912):169ff), and others, struggled to continue a tradition of humane concern for the immigrant. "Christian Americanization" was launched during the War years as a response to the nativistic pressure of those interested only in 100% Americanism. Many women played a vital role in this counter-movement (cf. Alice T. Anderson, "Christian Americanization," *Missions* 9 (Sept 1918):678-79; Mary C. Barnes, "New Day in Christian Americanization," *Missionary Review* 42 (Jan 1919):57-59.)

The rise of theological modernism, and its emphasis on higher education, and its demythologizing of heretofore widely accepted fundamental biblical principles had an impact on Protestants, also. Liberals, dismayed at the lack of sophistication, education, and even literacy in immigrants arriving after 1900 or so, began to lose interest in their needs,

finding themselves in a "progressive paradox" between their previously stated positions and their ethno-theological biases. Conservatives, however, who had long favored restriction, now found themselves suddenly closer to some Roman Catholics and even Jews theologically than to their liberal Protestant cousins, though the majority of conservatives remained sceptical of attempts toward "Christian Americanization," as well as other programs they perceived to be linked with the "social gospel."

In point of fact, Protestants were much more concerned with "foreign" than "home" missions, a condition that prompted Leroy Hodges to say: "Direct an equally enthusiastic interest to the solutions of the problems among the home aliens as is employed in the foreign missionary work, and a great step forward will have been taken." "The Church and the Immigrants," 171.

³⁸ Higham, *Strangers*, 254.

³⁹ Cf. the Bilingual Education Acts of 1968 and 1974, the Equal Opportunity Education Act of 1974, and the Supreme Court Decision in *Lau vs. Nichols* in January, 1974, wherein the Court affirmed "that school districts are compelled under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide children who speak little or no English with special language programs which will give them an equal opportunity to an education." U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *A Better Chance*, 2.

⁴⁰ The challenge presented to theological education at the seminary level is not new. Cf. S.Z. Barten, "Christian Leaders," 543: "We must encourage young men preparing for the Gospel ministry in the city to acquire at least one living language... In many of the Roman Catholic seminaries every candidate for the priesthood is required to attain a speaking proficiency in at least one foreign language. Some such requirement should exist in every theological seminary in the land." Though far from taking this viewpoint seriously, more and more seminaries

are beginning to take the study of Ethnology seriously. Cf. G.A. Gay, "Hispanic Ministries Education at Fuller Theological Seminary," *Theological Education* 13 (Winter 1977):83-89; G.W. Webber, "Hispanic Ministry: New York Theological Seminary," *Theological Education* 13 (Winter 1977):90-94.

⁴¹ Lyle Schaller, *The Impact of the Future* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), 160-61.

⁴² *Immigration as a Factor in American History*, Cf. chapter 7, "Conceptions of Americanization."

⁴³ *Poems* (Boston: Houghton and Mifflin, 1889).

⁴⁴ Handlin, *Immigration*, 158.

⁴⁵ Lipscomb long edited the conservative weekly, the *Gospel Advocate*.

⁴⁶ "Immigration and Emigration," *Gospel Advocate* 23 (Nov 24, 1881):742.

With all due respect, it would be a distortion of the facts to place Lipscomb in the same camp with the much more radical restrictionists mentioned above. He was much more moderate in his approach to the "immigrant question."

⁴⁷ Cf., for example, *Time* 111 (Feb 13, 1978):65.

⁴⁸ Handlin, *Immigration*, 153.

⁴⁹ Horace M. Kallen, "Democracy vs. the Melting-Pot," *The Nation* 100 (Feb 18-25, 1915):217-220.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 217f.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 217. N.B. the embryonic sociolinguistic terminology in distinguishing between the speech domains, "spiritual," and "economic."

⁵² Hansen, *The Immigrant*, 147. Cf. Joshua Fishman, *Language Loyalty in the United States* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966), for a comprehensive analysis of the vitality of multilingualism in the United States.

⁵³ Dell Hymes, "Toward Ethnographies of Communication," *American Anthropologist* 66 (Dec 1964):6. E. Biere calls for an "interdisciplinary team of

teachers, testers, psychologists, sociologists, linguists," and the like, adding "I can't think of any single discipline (let alone a single person) which can provide all of the answers we now realize we need..." in B. Spolsky, ed., *The Language Education of Minority Children* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972), 192f. On the other hand, L. Bloomfield

cautions against the tendency to overgeneralize from either a lack of data or from improper microlinguistic analysis:

"In order to describe a language one needs no historical knowledge whatsoever; in fact, the observer who allows such knowledge to affect his description, is bound to distort his data. Our descriptions must be unprejudiced, if they are to give a sound basis for comparative work." *Language* (Chicago: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1935), 20.

⁵⁴ Cf., for example, B. Whorf, "The Relation of Habitual Thought to Behavior and 'Language,'" in L. Spier, ed., *Language, Culture, and Personality* (Menasha, Wisconsin: Sapir Memorial Publication Fund, 1941), 75-93; D. Mandelbaum, *Culture, Language, and Personality: A Collection of Essays by Edward Sapir* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962); C. Kluckhohn, "Notes on Some Anthropological Aspects of Communication," *American Anthropologist* 63 (1961):895-910.

⁵⁵ Joshua Fishman, *Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1971), 94.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 94f.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 95.

⁵⁸ Cf. Fishman's sociolinguistic approach in "Language Maintenance and Language Shift: The American Immigrant Case Within a General Theoretical Perspective," *Sociologist* 16 (1965):67-88; C. Ferguson, "Diglossia," *Word* 15 (1959):325-40; W. Labov, "Phonological Correlates of Social Stratification," *American Anthropologist* 66 (1964):164-76; R. Brown, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," in T. Sebeok,

ed., *Style in Language* (Cambridge: MIT, 1960), 253-76; D. Hymes, "Models of Interaction of Language and Social Setting," *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (1967):8-28; W. Bright, ed., *Sociolinguistics* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966); J. Gumperz, "Types of Linguistic Communities," *Anthropological Linguistics* 4 (1962):28-40.

⁵⁹ Cf. J. Fishman and J. Lovas, "Bilingual Education in a Sociolinguistic Perspective," in B. Spolsky, ed., *The Language Education of Minority Children*, 83-93.

⁶⁰ John McNamara, "Bilingualism in the Modern World," *Journal of Social Issues* 23 (April 1967):4.

⁶¹ "Lau and Order," *Time* 117, 7 (Feb 16, 1981):63.

⁶² M.S. Moore, "Basic Attitudes,"

More recently, "Five Ethnic Groups in Allentown, Pennsylvania," A Critical Lecture Presented to the Faculty of Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May, 1981.

⁶³ In the past several years, Vernon Van Dyke seems to be giving judicious consideration to this problem. Cf., e.g., "Justice as Fairness: For Groups?" *American Political Science Review* 59 (June 1975):607-614; "Human Rights Without Distinction as to Language," *International Studies Quarterly* 20 (March 1976):3-38; "The Individual, The State, and Ethnic Communities in Political Theory," *World Politics* 29 (April 1977):343-69; "The Cultural Rights of Peoples," *Universal Human Rights* 2 (April-June 1980):1-21.