

UDC 802.0-087.4(73):800.72

Original scientific paper

Accepted for publication October 3, 1996

Thomas F. Magner
The Pennsylvania State University

English as the National Language of the USA?

English is *not* the official language of the United States of America, despite wide-spread belief to the contrary. The 56 signers of the American Declaration of Independence in 1776 were all of British ancestry and for them, all native speakers of English, declaring English to be the country's national language would have seemed unnecessary. From a 1790 census of some 4 million inhabitants the country's population has soared to over 265 million in 1996, a number that includes millions of immigrants or descendants of immigrants from non-English-speaking countries. Immigration, legal and illegal, continues to bring to the USA large numbers of people whose native language is not English. The cost of providing remedial and other services for immigrants has evoked a rise in »nativism«, such that many of the country's 50 states have passed legislation mandating English as the official language and now legislation is before the U. S. Congress to declare English as the required language for all government transactions. The author supports such legislation in order to clarify ambiguous situations but he also supports bilingual education for a limited period so as to provide a transition for immigrant children from their native language to English.

English is *not* the official language of the United States of America. In fact, the USA has *no* official national language. These two statements will surprise people around the world and especially a large number of Americans who have assumed that English is their official language. To be sure, English is the *de facto* national language but it does not have *de jure* status. In recent decades there have been spirited efforts to change this situation by establishing English as the official language through legislation. Already 23 state governments have mandated English as their official language and there are similar actions pending in other states. At the national level there are at present (July 1, 1996) three bills (i. e. proposed legislation) before Congress that pursue the same goal. One bill, H. R. 123, states that »the use of a single common language in the conduct of the Government's official business will promote efficiency and fairness to all people; English should be recognized in law as the language of official business of the Government; and any monetary savings derived from

the enactment of this Act should be used for the teaching of non-English speaking immigrants the English language.«

Two questions arise from the foregoing: 1) Why *isn't* English the official language of the United States, and 2) What is the present-day status of English in the country? To answer the first question, it will help to look at the surnames of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence; an alphabetical selection of 15 surnames will indicate their Anglo-Saxon character: Adams, Bartlett, Braxton, Carroll, Chase, Clark, Clymer, Ellery, Floyd, Franklin, Gerry, Gwinett, Hall, Hancock, Harrison. Of the 56 signers one (Lewis) was born in Wales, two (Gwinett, Morris) in England, three (Smith, Taylor, Thornton) in Ireland, and two (Wilson, Witherspoon) in Scotland; the remaining 48 signers were all born in the American colonies.¹ The names of the 40 men witnessing the other great document in American history, the United States Constitution, range from Baldwin to Washington and reflect the same English-speaking background. Between July 4, 1776, when the Declaration of Independence was promulgated, and March 4, 1789, when the Constitution was adopted, the »Founding Fathers« had to cope with the Revolutionary War and the multitudinous problems of shaping 13 colonies into a nation; to these English-speakers, language legislation would have seemed a trivial concern.

The answer to the second question about the current status of English in the United States depends on data provided by the last decennial census. In the official census of 1990 the country's population numbered 248,710,000 (figures rounded to the nearest thousand).² In order to analyze language ability, census specialists subtract children under five years of age on the premise that their language skills are not yet stable; the resultant population figure is 230,446,000. Speakers (five years of age and older) of other languages total 31,845,000 which means that, in the general population, 198,601,000 are monolingual speakers of English. When queried as to their ability to speak English, 6,672,000 of the 31,845,000 replied that they either did not speak it or did not speak it very well. The result is rather extraordinary since it indicates that 97% of the U. S. population speaks English natively, fluently or effectively. If one subtracts illegal immigrants, estimated to number anywhere from two to four million, the percentage of English speakers is still very high, about 95%. Given the fact that English is also the global lingua franca, a third question would be: Does English really require legislative support in the U. S.? A brief summary of the peoples and languages in American pre-history and history will illuminate the general background of the language controversy.

1 Čapek (15) thinks that »it is more than probable that William Paca, one of the signers..., was of Čech [Czech] extraction...« and he cites as proof a Czech place name (Pacov) and family names (Paca, Pacák, Pacovsky, Pacalt) common in Bohemia. It is, of course, possible but still problematical since Paca was born in 1740 in Maryland in an established family of landowners and one would have to study the lineage of his forebears in the preceding century.

2 The U. S. Bureau of the Census estimated that, as of June 10, 1996, the population numbered 265,041,000.

America is often characterized as »a land of immigrants« and indeed the migrations of people to this region have been going on for many thousands of years. What we today call the Americas — North, Central and South — were, scholars generally agree, devoid of human inhabitants until, during periods of climatic change in the last Ice Age, 50,000 to 10,000 years ago, land bridges formed between Siberia and Alaska, enabling bands of hunters to pursue game into this empty continent.³ These migrants were the remote ancestors of American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, the Aztecs of Mexico, the Mayans of Guatemala, the Incas of Peru and other tribes throughout South America. Today the United States is still home to Indian tribes speaking some 200 distinct languages and numbering almost two million (Leap, 116).

Christopher Columbus »discovered« America or rather parts of it in 1492. The fact that he thought that he had reached the Indies still causes an ambiguity in English usage to this day, e. g., »He's an Indian«; »You mean he's an American Indian or a person from India«? A Florentine navigator, Amerigo Vespucci (in Latin Americus Vesputius), recognized in his pamphlet **Mundus Novus** in 1503 that a »New World« had been discovered and in 1507 a German map-maker, Martin Waldseemüller writing in Latin, bestowed his name on the new continents: »Now, indeed, these parts (the three »older« continents) have been broadly explored, and a fourth part has been found by Americus Vesputius... I do not see why anyone should rightfully object to calling this part for Americus (its discoverer, a man of intelligence), to wit, Amerige, that is, Land of Americus, or America — since both Europe and Asia got their names from women.« (Steward, 314–8). In the U. S. some forty places, including the seat of government in the District of Columbia, do carry the name of Columbus or its variants, Columbia and Columbiana. In succeeding centuries three colonial powers — Spain, England and France — sent explorers to the Americas, established settlements and planted their languages and cultures. The English colonies, stretched along the Atlantic seaboard, became the nucleus of the United States of America, a nation which in its first census in 1790 had a population of 3,929,000; a slave was counted as 3/5ths of a person and Indians on reservation were not counted.⁴

In 1803 President Thomas Jefferson authorized the Louisiana Purchase, paying six millions francs to Napoleon for French possessions contiguous to the United States; today Louisiana is the name of one southern state but in 1803 it designated more than a million acres, including much of the present American midwest. In the same year Jefferson dispatched two remarkable men, Captain Meriwether Lewis and Captain William Clark, to explore the new territo-

3 Anthropologists in Nevada recently announced that they had dated a well-preserved mummy, found in a Nevada cave, as being almost 10,000 years which would place it at the end of the last Ice Age (New York Times, April 27, 1996; A1)

4 Not all immigrants arrived voluntarily. Some 50,000 convicts from England, Ireland and Scotland were transported to the American colonies and sold into slavery for seven years. This practice ended in 1776 with the American Declaration of Independence at which time England was forced to find a new »dumping ground« in Australia.

ry, make contact with the Indian tribes and inform them of their new sovereign in Washington, D. C. Jefferson had an abiding interest in languages and instructed Lewis and Clark to compile vocabularies of tribal languages. An on-looker, Charles MacKenzie, described one session as follows: »The language being recorded was Hidatsa [a Sioux language]. A native speaker would say a word to Sacagawea [an Indian girl], who would pass it on in Hidatsa to Charbonneau, who would pass it on in French to Jessaume, who would translate it into English for the captains. MacKenzie thought Jessaume's English ran somewhere between inadequate and nonexistent, magnifying the chances for error.« (Ambrose, 203).

By 1850 both the territory and population of the United had again expanded; the census of that year counted 23,192,000. The Republic of Texas was annexed by Congress in 1845, an act which provoked a war with Mexico. Losing the war, Mexico ceded New Mexico and California to the United States which brought a sizeable population of Spanish-speakers into the country. The 1867 purchase of Alaska from Russia for \$7,200,000 added speakers of Indian languages along with Eskimo and Aleut tongues. Subsequently, hundreds of new languages have been brought in by immigrants but, without a native base, most of the languages have given way to English except in certain enclaves. In the 1990 census respondents claimed to speak some 328 languages but one can predict on the basis of immigration history that almost all of these imported languages, from Albanian to Tamil, will disappear within a few generations. The census-takers were not linguists and simply recorded the language names given by the respondents; thus, some of the language names are ambiguous (Chinese, Mandarin), dubious (Paleo-Siberian, Sanskrit, Luxembourgian), overlapping (Croatian, Serbian, Serbo-Croatian) or mysterious (»Other, not specified«). It would be reasonable, then, simply to assume that some 300 languages other than English were spoken in the United States as of 1990.

Who are the citizens and residents of the United States and what is their background? The 1990 census views the population through the prism of race and Hispanic origin; the races are identified by two color names: »White« and »Black«; by a term indicating indigenous peoples, »American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut«; by a geographical term, »Asian or Pacific Islander,« with 28 sub-categories ranging from Chinese to Fijian; and by the term »Hispanic,« designating an individual whose origins are in a Spanish-speaking country such as Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba or other Latin American countries. A Hispanic can also register in one of the other categories, e. g., Hispanic and White, Hispanic and Black. In sum, the U. S. population in 1990 numbered 188 million (non-Hispanic) Whites or 75.6%, 20 million (non-Hispanic) Blacks or 12%, 22 million Hispanics (of any race) or 9%, 7 million Asians or Pacific Islanders or 2.9% and 2 million Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts or 8%. The U. S. Census Bureau calculates that by the year 2050 Whites will be down to 53% of the population, Blacks will number 13.6%, Asians 8.2% while Hispanics will more than double in number to 24.5%.

Population changes have helped to fuel the debate about a national language. In 1965 changes in immigration law removed the long-standing preference

for immigrants from European countries with the result that there has been a surge in immigration from Asian and Latin American countries. The appearance of large numbers of unfamiliar ethnic groups on the American scene has revived the 19th century phenomenon of »nativism« or resentment of new immigrants. The humble potato led to the first massive wave of immigrants to America; the failure of the potato crops in Ireland in the years 1846–1849 brought over a million and a half Irish immigrants to the United States. McCaffrey (62) writes that again »in the postfamine period, from 1855 through 1870 more than a million Irish people... came to the United States. Since they constituted the first large group of people who were not Anglo-Saxon Protestants to arrive in the United States, Irish Catholics had the painful and dubious distinction of pioneering the American urban ghetto...«⁵ Weissbrodt (8–9) points out: »In the 1880's, 72% of immigrants to the U. S. came from northern and western Europe. In contrast, during the 1900–10 decade, 71% came from countries in southern or eastern Europe. These 'new immigrants' were Latins, Slavs, and Jews, who were considered 'inferior' by the predominantly Anglo-Saxon population.« A striking difference between immigration at the turn of the century and that of recent decades is that U. S. agencies now provide significant social, educational and medical support for new immigrants. Such treatment includes bilingual ballots in elections, a matter which has aroused controversy. In 1988 the United States admitted 640,000 legal immigrants (Bean, xv) and no one knows how many illegal aliens slipped over the 1,952-mile (3123 km) border with Mexico or how many were smuggled in or how many arrived by airplane claiming »asylum« for fear of persecution in their home countries.⁶

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 stipulates that no person who had completed the sixth grade in a school where the »predominant classroom language was other than English shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language...« Ten years later, in 1975, the U. S. Congress found that »voting discrimination against citizens of language minorities is pervasive and national in scope« and specified that bilingual ballots be required in any voting district where »more than 5% of the citizens of voting

5 My own ancestors were »economic refugees« in the grimmest sense of the term: they were fleeing starvation. The Irish famine of the late 1840s forced my great-grandfather, Edward Magner, to leave Ireland in 1853 with his wife and three small children to settle on a farm in Michigan. My mother, Mary Carney Magner, was the eldest in a family of ten children in the poorest part of Ireland (County Mayo) and immigrated to the United States in 1901.

6 The word »asylum« is rarely used in everyday English (its old meaning of an institution for people with mental problems has yielded to other euphemisms), but it is a well-known word in immigration cases. Thus, »An alien who is present in the United States or arrives at its border may apply for asylum if the alien qualifies as a refugee.« (Weissbrodt, 239). And a refugee is one who fears persecution in his own country on account of »race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.« The United States has welcomed refugees over the years but recent claims for asylum have stretched the meaning of the concept, e. g., some Chinese have cited China's policy of one child per family as a form of persecution.

age... are members of a single language minority...« There have been numerous complaints about the use of these bilingual ballots both for the complications they introduced into the electoral process but, more importantly, because they seem to encourage ethnic divisions in the population.

John Silber, the president of Boston University, considers that such ballots make »a change of Constitutional consequence, amending in effect the very concept of U. S. citizenship. The naturalization statutes presume that English is the language of U. S. citizens. Why else is English required for naturalization? Citizens who are not proficient in English cannot, in most cases, talk with candidates, or petition their representatives. They are citizens in name only and are unable to exercise their rights. Providing them with bilingual ballots does not enable them to exercise these rights in any meaningful way.« (Wall Street Journal, April 30, 1996; A14). George Will, a widely-read newspaper columnist, pointed out the financial costs of bilingual ballots: »New York City has had to acquire new voting machines to cope with the required Chinese characters. In the 1994 general election, Los Angeles County spent \$67,568.87 accommodating 692 voters who speak Tagalog — \$97.64 per voter.« Echoing Silber, he points out that in order to obtain U. S. citizenship, an immigrant is »required to 'demonstrate an understanding of English, including an ability to read, write and speak words in ordinary English'... If immigrants are gaining citizenship without knowing how to read English, the law (language test) is not being enforced. And if 18-year old citizens born and raised here are illiterate in English, the education system is failing.« (The Indianapolis Star, May 2, 1996; A12).

The question posed by Silber, Will and many others is: why do new citizens need bilingual ballots if they have already passed an English proficiency examination and can thus in theory cope with ballots in English? Languages other than English can also be used in taking a state examination for a driver's license. According to the organization, U. S. English, California allows the use of any of 33 languages including Eastern Armenian, Western Armenian and Hmong. Connecticut will test in 15 languages including Hebrew and Bosnian, Kentucky in 17 including Bosnian, Croatian and Vietnamese. In states which allow only one language other than English, that language will usually be Spanish. 11 of the 50 states allow only English.

In 1968 a Bilingual Act was adopted that provided instruction in the primary grades for pupils in their native (non-English) language as a method of easing them into English instruction in later grades. The intentions of this act were admirable but the execution drew wide-spread criticism: some saw it as a »jobs program« for immigrant teachers, others saw it as an obstacle to immigrant children in that it artificially delayed their entrance into an English-speaking environment. In a scathing editorial entitled »New York's Bilingual Prison,« the prestigious New York Times (Sept. 21, 1995; A21) excoriated the city's bilingual program: »Instruction in English alone may not be the perfect method of helping immigrant students into the mainstream. But neither is a system that dragoons children into bilingual programs that reinforce the students' dependency on their native language and then makes escape impossible.

A bustling bilingual bureaucracy is now hard at work, often drafting children into the programs whether or not they need them. Indeed, many of the student assigned to bilingual studies are born in this country and speak English better than any other language.« As all language teachers know, young children are remarkably adept at absorbing and mastering a new language. A personal note: I live near a primary school in a university town that has many foreign students; parents from another country will deliver a child to the first grade teacher who will address her students in this fashion: »Boys and girls, this is Juan (/Mila/Boris/Sandra/Mario/). He/she doesn't know our language. Please help him/her in learning it.« The results are always astonishing as evidenced by the sight of immigrant grandparents shopping in a supermarket with their small grandchildren serving as interpreters.

The influx of immigrants from countries other than European has stimulated a movement, particularly at universities, to celebrate concepts such as »diversity« and »multiculturalism.« This in turn has led to a rejection or, at least, a questioning of the conventional view that American culture has its roots in European history and a Judeo-Christian religious framework. In a New York Times article (May 3, 1996; A31) the noted historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., calls such claims: »History as Therapy.« He writes: »I was troubled by the implication that American history was formed equally by three cultures in convergence — European, African and Amerindian. ... But the formative American political ideas — democracy, representative government, freedom of speech and the press, due process, religious toleration, women's rights and so on — are peculiarly European in origin. They did not, at least in the form we have adopted, come from African or Amerindian cultures. Why pretend otherwise?«

The idea of legislating into law the English language as the official medium of governmental communication would have seemed as unimportant to most Americans as it did to the »Founding Fathers« of the Republic, that is, until recent decades when demands for special treatments of minorities and their languages began to be heard throughout the nation. English-speakers were confronted with the unpleasant reality that in certain sections of their cities or in a good portion of South Florida a language other than English was dominant.⁷ There are many anecdotes about the feeling of discomfort an English-speaker experiences in such situations but here I shall just quote one from John Balaban, a professor of English at the University of Florida and a first-generation American of Romanian parents. He tells of his experience in trying to renew his driver's license in Miami (letter, April 4, 1996):

»All government agencies in Miami are Cuban-run. Outside the Bureau of Motor Vehicles perhaps a hundred people were sitting in their cars or in the tree shade for about a block. Inside my 'appointment' didn't seem to mean

7 U. S. citizens are quite aware of the language tensions in neighboring Canada where the province of Quebec, a bastion of French culture and language, nearly succeeded in seceding from Canada in October 1995. The margin of victory for Quebecers who voted to remain part of the largely English-speaking country was less than one percent and it seems certain that the Québécois separatists will try again.

anything. I tried to talk to a Motor Vehicle person who either refused or could not speak English, so I just gave up. Later I drove to Stuart, Florida, a few hours north of Miami but in the still largely non-Hispanic south. I had to wait twenty minutes but they honored my appointment (which I had made only that very morning). The whole thing took forty minutes and the questions were in English.... Miami may be the only place in the United States where a shopkeeper can be upbraided by a customer for not speaking Spanish. Every now and then one sees a bumper sticker that reads: »Will the last American to leave Miami please take down the flag?«

In his book, **Hold Your Tongue** (148), James Crawford has a chapter on »Hispanophobia« in which he quotes the president of the National Council of La Raza [a Hispanic organization] as saying: »U. S. English is to Hispanics as the Ku Klux Klan is to blacks,« which essentially accuses non-Hispanic Americans who favor official English of being racists, a strongly pejorative term in the U. S. Crawford continues: »To casual observers of the Official English debate — that is, to most monolingual Americans — the label often appears irresponsible. What does race have to do with language, after all? Is it racist to suggest that immigrants need to learn English to prosper in this country? What’s wrong with encouraging them to enter the mainstream rather than remain apart?« In this regard it will be useful to consider the experience of Robert F. Lima, Jr., a professor of Spanish at The Pennsylvania State University (e-mail, June 3, 1996):

»I left Cuba, my native country, in 1944 and spent eight months in Puerto Rico prior to entering the United States in 1945. Although I had attended schools on both islands, I was not taught English and, on arriving in the U. S., I had only my Spanish language skills. After a brief stint in a parochial school in New York City where the lay teacher broke my nose with a yardstick because I couldn’t reply to her questions, my parent placed me and my younger brother in a boarding school in Tarrytown, NY. I was ten and he was seven.

My parents wanted us to be Americans and we learned both the language and the new culture in school, but we never lost our native language or heritage because my parents kept on speaking Spanish to us when they visited us and during our holiday stays at home. And my mother regaled us with the folk songs and humor of both Cuba and Spain, where she had been born.

On the basis of my own experience, I believe that a newcomer to the United States, or any country for that matter, should learn its language and culture in order to have a stake therein, feel a part of his new nation, be able to read a ballot, be capable of taking a driver’s examination, and function daily as a member of society and not be relegated to a cultural ghetto.

Learning the English language and becoming integrated into the nation’s culture should be a priority of any immigrant. But this process does not preclude maintaining one’s own cultural and linguistic heritage. I am but one

example of how one's native tradition and adopted culture can be successfully integrated.«

There are and have been various organizations operating at the state and national level to champion legislation for English as the national language. Here I shall just describe the largest such organization, U. S. English, which claims 700,000 members and is headed by Mauro E. Mujica, originally an immigrant from Chile.⁸ The organization was co-founded in 1983 by a colorful, even flamboyant, personality named Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa, a Canadian of Japanese descent who immigrated to the United States. Hayakawa (1900–1992) received his Ph. D. in English at the University of Wisconsin, taught in various American universities, wrote several books in the field of general semantics (e. g., **Language in Thought and Action** 1978), served as president of San Francisco University and later as a U. S. Senator from California from 1977 to 1983. Hayakawa once remarked (Crawford, 149–50):

»Why is it that no Filipinos, no Koreans object to making English the official language? No Japanese have done so. And certainly not the Vietnamese, who are so damn happy to be here. They're learning English as fast as they can and winning spelling bees all across the country. But the Hispanics alone have maintained there is a problem. There [has been] considerable movement to make Spanish the second official language. The Hispanic lobby said we're going to teach the kids in Spanish and we'll call it bilingual education.«

U. S. English is a very aggressive organization, constantly soliciting donations for its lobbying efforts on behalf of its goal to enshrine English as the national language. Of the three bills in the House of Representatives the organization's leaders favors H. R. 123 (in the Senate S. 356). All three bills would establish English as the official language of the government but two (H. R. 739 and H. R. 1005) are more restrictive in that they would abolish bilingual education and bilingual ballots and also require that »all naturalization ceremonies be conducted in English.« The bill favored by U. S. English, H. R. 123, is more lenient and favors exemptions for »public health and safety, foreign language instruction, judicial proceedings, and tourism.« How soon these bills will move through Congress is uncertain since the Supreme Court has agreed to consider a challenge to Arizona's English-only law and its decision could have an immediate effect on the parameters of Congressional legislation.

Since this proposed legislation is controversial, I feel it necessary to state my own position so that the comments above can be better evaluated. As a native-born American and a native speaker of American English, I do favor

8 There is a smaller organization, English First, which U. S. English derides in a press release (February 16, 1996), pointing out that Mujica, the Chairman of U. S. English, is »himself an immigrant to this country,« presumably a token of greater objectivity, while the leader of English First, named Larry Pratt, is evidently a native-born American and, by implication, less worthy of advancing the cause of English, his native language.

legislating English as the national language if only to »tidy up« a potentially ambiguous situation. I favor abolishing bilingual ballots and bilingual drivers' examinations; bilingual ballots needlessly complicate and disrupt our electoral process; as for the driver' tests, I would feel safer when driving if I knew that the other drivers had qualified in English rather than in Hmong or Cantonese. I do favor limited bilingual education for the children of immigrants, say a maximum of one year before they ease into instruction in English. And there should be »common-sense« exemptions for dealing with adult immigrants in the area of social services.⁹ It is difficult to predict when or if legislation mandating English as the national language will be turned into the law of the land; as an issue, it does not now excite a majority of Americans but increasing frustrations in coping with legal and illegal immigrants could evoke, as a side-effect, more vocal support for Official English legislation.

Bibliography

- Adams, Karen L., and Daniel T. Brink, eds. *Perspectives on Official English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990.
- Ambrose, Stephen E. *Undaunted Courage. Meriwether Lewis, Thomas Jefferson and the Opening of the American West*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Bean, Frank D., Georges Vernez and Charles B. Keely, eds. *Opening and Closing the Doors. Evaluating Immigration Reform and Control*. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1989.
- Bureau of the Census. *1990 Census of the Population*. »Race and Hispanic Origin, 1990, Table 3,« 1990 CP-1-1, Nov. 1992; »Age, Sex, Ability to Speak English, and Disability, 1990, Table 29,« 1990 CP-2-1, Nov. 1993. Washington, D. C.: US Government Printing Office.
- Crawford, James. *Hold Your Tongue. Bilingualism and the Politics of »English Only.«* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1992.
- Čapek, Thomas. *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920.
- Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, Public Law 89-110 — August 6, 1965, 439. United States Statutes at Large. 1965, volume 79. Amendment: Public Law 94-73 — Aug. 6, 1975, 403-4. United States Statutes at Large. 1975, volume 89. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Leap, William L. »American Indian Languages.« *Language in the USA*, C. Ferguson and C. Heath, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 116-44.
- Lossing, Benson J. *Biographical Sketches of the Signers of the Declaration of American Independence*. Philadelphia: G. G. Evans, 1860.
- McCaffrey, Lawrence J. *The Irish Diaspora in America*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1976.
- Sale, Randall D., and Edwin D. Karn. *American Expansion. A Book of Maps*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1962.
- Stewart, George R. *Names on the Globe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

9 The problems in providing housing and other social services to new citizens whose knowledge of English is weak to non-existent are real and demanding; in Chicago 20% of the population is now Hispanic, requiring greater use of Spanish in application forms and of Spanish-speaking personnel to process them (New York Times, April 24, 1996; A14).

The Language of Government Act of 1995: H. R. 123, introduced January 4, 1995 in 104th Congress, First Session. The text can be accessed from the Library of Congress through the Internet address <<http://thomas.loc.gov>>.

Weissbrodt, David. *Immigration Law and Procedure in a Nutshell*, 3rd ed. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co., 1992.

Engleski kao nacionalni jezik Sjedinjenih Američkih Država?

Engleski nije nacionalni jezik Sjedinjenih Američkih Država usprkos raširenoj vjeri u suprotno. 56 potpisnika američke Deklaracije o neovisnosti 1776. bilo je listom britanskoga podrijetla i njima bi se — svima izvornim govornicima engleskoga — činilo nepotrebnim proglasiti engleski službenim jezikom. Od 1790. godine kada su Sjedinjene Države imale kojih 4 milijuna stanovnika, broj pučanstva povećao se na više od 265 milijuna 1996. godine, u što su uračunani i brojni useljenici i njihovi potomci iz zemalja izvan engleskoga govornoga područja. Useljavanjem — legalnim i ilegalnim — i dalje se značajno povećava broj ljudi kojima engleski jezik nije materinski. Troškovi osiguranja pomoćnih i drugih usluga za useljenike rezultirali su određenim »nativizmom«, tako da su mnoge savezne države donijele zakone kojima se engleski proglašava službenim jezikom, a i Kongres bi uskoro trebao donijeti zakon kojim bi se engleski jezik proglasio nužnim za sve vladine poslove. Autor podržava takav zakon kojim bi se razjasnile dvoznačne situacije, no isto tako podupire dvojezičnu naobrazbu tijekom određenog razdoblja kako bi se djeci useljenika omogućio prijelaz s materinskoga jezika na engleski.