

his early college education at the Middle Tennessee State Teachers College, and his work on the Operations Staff of the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific theater during World War II as examples of his typicality; this could have been the life of any other Southern boy of his generation, he suggests. But it seems as if these experiences forged instead his singularity. He writes nonelegiacally about his working childhood on a farm and the day-to-day deprivations that did not seem to him to be deprivations; about being a day student riding into town and back to the farm in his early college days; of the precise and never-ending work of tracking location and direction of movement for the U. S. fleet in the Pacific under Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. He presents his life as if he believes it could have been anyone's and could have turned him into anyone.

He muses on the nature of fate and circumstance in the words of a country tune he composed in his youth ("My mother discouraged me from even listening to country music, but it was so much a part of Middle Tennessee that all of us variously imagined ourselves to be songwriters"): "There are too many forks in the road, / There are too many forks in the road, / And I never could learn / Not to take the wrong turn. / There are too many forks in the road."

While contemplating the way any different choice along the path of his life would have deposited him in a place miles and worlds away from the man he is now, Buchanan is lead to the conclusion that "exogenous event and chance may be far more relevant than personal choices." He may believe this. But the character forged through the choices of his rural, Southern boyhood survives today in the almost transcendent satisfaction he experiences in the "physical engagement with the earth itself" that his current life (in a home that he largely built himself from the ground up, on land where he grows his own food) provides him. And this character, forged and tested through the choices he has made, is a necessary part of the man he reveals in this homey, sensible, and delightful book.

His character also defines the economic research program that earned him his renown. His dedication to free trade is rooted in his Southern identity: "I sensed that the free trade principle was indeed central to the traditional democratic-southern-populist set of val-

ues" and that "this principle had been subverted . . . by the protectionist-monopolist interest of the East and North." His experience of discrimination against himself and his fellow Southerners by a cadet officer in the Army gave him a permanent dislike for the entrenched interests of Eastern elites who lord over and disdain the bulk of the citizenry.

His rural background, far removed from the depredations of the government whose skewed workings Buchanan has spent a career analyzing, also seems key in cementing individuals and their choices at the heart of his economic approach. Buchanan may poor-mouth himself and his economic achievements, but that is merely the pleasing modesty of the Southern boy who has worked, worked hard and worked well; and who has earned the sense of independence, security, and achievement that he seems to have taken from his life. Buchanan comes across as a delightful and intellectually powerful man; and, as like precedes from like, he has produced a delightful and intellectually powerful set of memoirs.

Brian Doherty writes from Washington, D.C.

Classic Colonialism

by Wayne Lutton

Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of "English Only"

by James Crawford

Reading, Massachusetts:

Addison-Wesley; 324 pp., \$24.95



Almost alone among the peoples of the world, the United States has largely been spared—at least until recently—the bitter conflicts that plague countries whose citizens do not share a common language. Since the early 17th century, immigrants from diverse backgrounds have settled here. In the past, it was understood that in exchange for enjoying opportunities for personal development and economic advancement and a measure of political equality unavailable elsewhere, newcomers would learn English, acquire a useful skill, and participate in community life by be-

coming citizens. That was what "Americanization" involved. This covenant between America and successive generations of immigrants worked pretty well as long as it was observed by both parties. But this unwritten compact has undergone a drastic revision since the 1960's.

In the wake of Lyndon Johnson's landslide victory in 1964 over Barry Goldwater, the Great Society Congress passed a new immigration act that departed from our previous policy of well-regulated entry. The "national origin" quotas that had been in effect since the early 1920's were eliminated. The 1965 act established a system emphasizing family ties over other considerations. Although proponents of the new law, such as its sponsor in the Senate, Ted Kennedy, claimed that the act would eliminate discrimination, what it actually accomplished—just as Senator Sam Ervin predicted it would—was discrimination against traditional immigrant groups in favor of natives of Third World countries. By exploiting provisions for family reunification, individuals with large families and many relatives were thus able to practice what has since become known as "chain migration." The entry of millions of people from Latin America and Asia coincided with a breakdown of institutional support for assimilation, exemplified by bilingual education and voting. Later, affirmative action preferences were extended to those possessing limited fluency in English.

In *Hold Your Tongue*, James Crawford, a former Washington editor of *Education Week*, discusses the rise of bilingualism and of the grass-roots opposition to it that emerged in the early 1980's. Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act in 1968; by the mid-1970's the federal government was funding an assortment of programs in 26 different languages. Although proficiency in English is supposed to be a condition for naturalization, in 1975 Congress mandated that bilingual ballots be made available.

The Supreme Court ventured into this arena with its *Lau v. Nichols* decision in 1974. In this case, the court decreed that public schools must take "affirmative steps" to compensate for a child's lack of fluency in English. In 1982, in *Plyler v. Doe*, the Supreme Court ruled five to four that states must provide public education at the elemen-

tary and secondary levels to children of illegal aliens. These two Supreme Court decisions have reinforced the drive to institutionalize bilingualism in American education.

From the outset, ambiguity surrounded the purpose and definition of bilingualism. At first, the public was led to believe that the emphasis was on the efficient transition in the short term to proficiency in English. However, proponents of bilingual education (including the National Education Association, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, the National Association for Bilingual Education, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund) have helped redirect it from concentration on the rapid acquisition of English to a confusing array of programs providing for long-term instruction in the student's native tongue—even, as in the case of the Hmong, when the language has no written form. Supported by ideologues in Jimmy Carter's new Department of Education, "bilingual education" quickly emerged as a growth industry. A demand was created for Spanish-speaking teachers; one Department of Education directive even decreed that teachers in "bilingual" programs were not required to speak English!

While Crawford warmly endorses bilingual programs, he admits that they rest on shaky pedagogical foundations.

LIBERAL ARTS

HUS ORIGINAL?

"I have kept the editing of this 1855 first edition to a minimum. Some spellings (i.e., *loafe*) have been modernized, and Whitman's language, though remarkably nonsexist for his time, has been humanized where appropriate (i.e., *human* or *person* substituted for *man* when the context clearly indicates no sexual reference is intended). Humanist personal pronouns (*hu*, *hus*, *hum*, pronounced *who*, *whose*, *whom*) have been substituted in cases where distinction of gender is ambiguous, irrelevant, or misleading."

—from A.S. Ash's preface to *The Original 1855 Edition of Leaves of Grass*, Bandanna Books, 1992.

He cites Kenji Hakuta, a bilingual educator who concedes that "an awkward tension blankets the lack of empirical demonstration of the success of bilingual education programs. Someone promised bacon, but it's not there." Indeed, a study by the Carter Administration of 38 Spanish-English projects of at least four years duration, released in 1978, discovered that most "bilingual" programs extend a student's reliance upon a minority language rather than speed his transition to English. Few of those who were deficient in English when they first enrolled in the programs acquired proficiency. The report concluded that there simply was no evidence that bilingual instruction helped Title VII students perform markedly better in either English or Spanish. The author neglects to refer to this study in his discussion of the topic.

Crawford, perhaps unintentionally, confirms what critics of bilingualism have suspected from the outset: that proponents of bilingualism have their own special agenda that is only marginally concerned with "education." The author candidly remarks, almost offhandedly, that "bilingual education was more than an issue of language; it was an issue of power. . . . Obviously, there were political motives behind these educational reforms. . . . In sum, the Federal government had thrown its weight behind a costly and far-reaching change in the way American schools were run—all with minimal discussion or scrutiny." Though the case for bilingualism presented by minority activists and NFA lobbyists is not a persuasive one, this does not discourage Crawford from devoting most of his book to attacking the critics of bilingual programs.

He chooses to dub the opposition the "English Only" movement, a mischievous misrepresentation of its position. In 1981, then California Senator S. I. Hayakawa—an internationally respected semanticist and Canadian immigrant of Japanese ancestry—introduced a constitutional amendment to designate English as "the official language of the United States." Senator Steve Symms explained the purpose of the amendment:

The English Language Amendment is intended to stop the practice of voting in foreign languages; it is intended to teach children who don't know English

through appropriate programs; it is intended to make English the only language for official proceedings of governments at all levels; it is intended to make the acceptance of English a condition of statehood incumbent upon all territories aspiring to that status.

Contrary to the impression one gets from Crawford, the amendment would *not* regulate language spoken by individuals in their private capacities; its supporters actually encourage citizens to become fluent in foreign languages.

By 1990, 17 states had adopted laws designating English as their official language. The author neglects to mention that many Hispanic-Americans have supported these laws in such states as California, Arizona, Colorado, and Florida. First- and second-generation Americans have been among the leading advocates of officializing English, which Crawford admits "makes it problematic to pin charges of nativism, ethnocentrism, or racism on those who hold such views." Yet Crawford accuses critics of bilingualism of "exploiting the politics of resentment." At the same time, he makes it clear that "*immigration is the paramount reason for linguistic diversity in the United States*" (his emphasis). He goes on to observe that supporters of bilingualism "are mistaken to assume that antibilingual fervor reflects little more than racism. Anglos' dispossession is real . . . there is no hiding the complications or the attendant shifts in power and status."

Exactly. As former Senator Eugene McCarthy points out in his trenchant new book, *A Colony of the World: The United States Today*, "If one thinks of the classic definition of colonialism—the arrival of large numbers of people who impose their cultural values and language on the preexisting society—it is hard not to define the current wave of immigration as a colonizing force on the United States. What distinguishes the United States from other colonized societies is that we have the power to prevent it, and choose not to use it." The bilingual controversy is an aspect of a larger problem. The central issue is whether the current American majority has the will to protect its interests and preserve its culture.

Wayne Lutton is the associate editor of *the Social Contract*.

Letter From Miami

by Alan R. Turin

The Unreported Story of Hurricane Andrew



On August 24, 1992, shortly after 3 A.M., Hurricane Andrew hit the coast at Miami, in South Dade County, Florida. A "Category Four" hurricane on the Saper-Simpson Hurricane Scale, Andrew struck with 145 m.p.h. winds, making it the worst hurricane to hit Miami since 1926. In fact, this was the worst hurricane to hit a major American city in recorded history. It was the fifth hurricane I've experienced.

The physical destruction caused by the storm has been well and widely documented, but it is the response of the people in the Miami area to Andrew that now bears attention. There have been acts of great decency, examples of good will, and more than a few instances of heroics. All of this is nourishment for the soul. But there have also been many acts of great indecency and ill will that have not been reported, let alone discussed.

The one thing that linked Miami to Western civilization last August 23, the day before the storm, was electricity. Electricity was a weak reed. The next day Miami wallowed in barbarity. We were suddenly in the Third World. Though legally a part of the United States, we were no longer *of* the United States.

Miami is a city of transients. It started out less than a century ago as a winter resort for Yankees. First were the retirees from New York and New Jersey. Then came the Cubans in the 1960's. Currently it is the Haitians. After Castro but before now, Miami was an amalgam of Central and South Americans. In the last decade we have had four separate sets of race riots.

Perhaps because of these quickening waves of immigrants, Miami has never provided a sense of community for any one generation. We are not a Southern town, nor a Yankee enclave. We are not

as civil as a U.N. cocktail party, but we are more than a couple of bomb blasts better than Beirut. Take away a booming economy, and things get ugly. Take away electricity, and things get vile.

The looting was a good measure of the vileness. A Jamaican food store, one block from my home, was looted the morning of the storm. It is one block from, and in direct sight of, the North Miami police station. Looters struck in South Dade while the wind was still at gale force. The police warned looters to stay away, sometimes even arresting them. Since arrest itself is hardly a deterrent in the best of times, it never stopped the looting after the storm. At my house we were without electricity for nearly seven days. A month later, 70,000 households were still without power. The neighborhoods with electricity resembled suburban America. Those without were in the Third World.

There were no shoot-to-kill orders issued by any of the authorities. In the old days, when natural disasters occurred, local governments knew that their capabilities to maintain order would be strained. Due to their preoccupation with the disaster at hand, officials would warn looters that they would be shot on sight. Since the disaster would overwhelm civil society's capacity to maintain a complete system of criminal justice, they set up an abbreviated version. This achieved simultaneously two salutary goals: first, it preserved some semblance of normalcy with reduced police; and second, dead looters would "encourage *les autres*." Friends of a free society, being suspicious of the state, don't cotton to these notions. But since such actions were tied to natural calamities, they did not become occasions for state aggrandizement.

The current thinking in Miami is that the police exist to protect lives, not property. Shooting looters, therefore, would mean placing a higher value on property than on human life. Unfortunately, when looters find the pickings easy and the restraints off, they lose other brakes on their antisocial impulses. The refusal to shoot looters only increased the disorder. Relief convoys were shot at and hijacked en route to disaster areas.

The looting decreased as neighborhoods reentered civilization—*i.e.*, got their electricity back. But what ulti-

mately stopped the looting was a *dead* looter. From the beginning, people began toting guns and putting up warning signs. ("You loot, we shoot.") Gun-control rules were widely violated, especially the state-mandated three-day waiting period. Neighborhoods prepared to protect themselves avoided the worst of the looters.

On one occasion a group of thugs in a stolen van drove up to a home whose owner was out front speaking to an insurance adjuster. The homeowner had posted a sign warning looters to stay away. Thug number one jumped out and fired at the warning sign (this is now known as his "last mistake"). The homeowner fired his .357 magnum at less than ten feet and hit thug number one in the head. Thugs number two and three drove off and abandoned the van; thug number one was dead. News of the event spread across the area as a wonderful bright spot to counter recent travails. The looting stopped. Never had so many owed so much to one shot heard 'round the town.

Within a week of the hurricane, Governor "Walkin' Lawton" Chiles had reversed his prior decision not to ask for federal help in the form of the U.S. Army. Many soldiers were sent, including the Army's 82nd Airborne. The 82nd has in the last ten years seen a lot of military action. Grenada in 1983. Panama in 1989. Most recently, in our war with Iraq. Here in Miami, one squad on a search-and-rescue mission was almost disarmed by a criminal gang. The gang knew—as did the rest of Miami, thanks to the thoughtful reporters of the *Miami Herald*—that the Army had been sent on patrols with weapons but without ammunition. A gang accosted this squad and demanded their M-16s and other sidearms. The situation was tense. The officer in charge refused to disarm and eventually talked the gang out of the hand-over. It seems this officer lied to the gang and said the squad really *did* have ammunition and would use it to defend itself. It was a bluff that worked. After the incident the press no longer advertised the ammunition status of the assigned soldiery. Rumor has it that the Army quietly issued ammunition.

My own forays into the War Zone, as we called the area of total destruction,