

Montclair State University

Montclair State University Digital Commons

Department of Educational Foundations
Scholarship and Creative Works

Department of Educational Foundations

12-2000

The Constitution of Bilingual/ESL Education as a Disciplinary Practice: Genealogical Explorations

Jaime Grinberg

Elizabeth R. Saavedra

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/educ-fdns-facpubs>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#)

The Constitution of Bilingual/ESL Education as a Disciplinary Practice: Genealogical Explorations

Jaime Grinberg and Elizabeth R. Saavedra
University of New Mexico

This article provides a cultural and political critique of the constitution of bilingual/English-as-a-second-language (ESL) education as a disciplinary practice in the case of New Mexico. Using genealogy and postcolonial, post-structural, and critical frameworks, this article claims that the directions advanced by the Chicano/Chicana movement were lost. Instead, what emerged was a field that nurtured a mix of symbolic colonization and docilization through the construction of a settlement that controls thought and behavior, perpetuating misrecognition in a Bourdieuan sense. Illusion, collusion, and delusion have enabled the dominance of psycholinguistic approaches. Problematizing the constitution of bilingual/ESL education within a cultural and political sphere could foster an emancipatory education for marginalized students.

Within the current U.S. system of education, bilingual/English-as-a-second-language (ESL) education has been reduced to a conventional program focusing on helping students move from their native language to English as their second and major language. In this context, students begin to learn the necessary and required “real” content in the only legitimate “real” language, English. Even though it was established as and is still considered a progressive practice, we argue that bilingual/ESL education is a disciplinary practice (Foucault, 1972, 1979) involving both control of the mind through structuring meaning within a field of study and control of the body in space and time through structuring practices (G. L. Anderson & Grinberg, 1998). As a disciplinary practice, contemporary bilingual/ESL education has not advanced a cultural and political critique in a democratic and emancipatory way; instead, it prepares the students it serves to take their places on the lower rungs of the U.S. social hierarchy.

We argue that bilingual/ESL education, while appearing to be a specialized and equalizing service for linguistic and ethnic minority students, has in reality merely created an illusion. This illusion is constructed through the collusion of “experts” in the field who appropriate and/or control expository or oppositional critical discourses. Many of the experts, who are themselves members of marginalized groups,

The authors are listed in alphabetical order; they contributed equally to the article. We wish to thank Gary Anderson, Kathryn Herr, Katia Goldfarb, Tee McDougal, Linda Ware, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and encouragement.

have ultimately deluded themselves into believing that they have reached equality for themselves and the students they serve.

Bilingual/ESL education has not fulfilled the sought-after transformation of the criticized system; instead, in Bourdieu and Passeron's terms (1977), it has maintained its own misrecognized existence. Misrecognition denotes a denial of the economic and political interests present in a set of practices and embodies the claim that self-interest underlies all practices, particularly in the cultural domain. Swartz (1997) elaborated on Bourdieu's concept of misrecognition:

Symbolic practices deflect attention from the interested character of practices and thereby contribute to their enactment as disinterested pursuits. This misperception legitimizes these practices and thereby contributes to the reproduction of the social order in which they are embedded. Activities and resources gain in symbolic power, or legitimacy, to the extent that they become separated from underlying material interests and hence go misrecognized as representing disinterested forms of activities and resources. (p. 90)

By shifting the focus from the cultural and political critique into mostly technocratic linguistic domains, bilingual/ESL education has furthered misrecognition, thus limiting its postcolonial discourse-practice and facilitating the formation of settlements. Through its pursuit as a legitimate academic field, bilingual/ESL education has served as a "settlement" where "minority and marginalized groups are able to make incursions into the mainstream of the political process and open up space in the state for progressive change, even though they are not part of the power bloc that exercises leadership in the state" (Carlson, 1997, p. 61). More important, according to Carlson (1997), settlements "serve to incorporate discontent within parameters that do not seriously threaten the privilege of dominant groups" (p. 61).

We locate bilingual/ESL education as a settlement within U.S. educational institutions' larger historical agenda of (a) "Americanizing" (Spring, 1994, 1997), (b) reproducing a social and cultural system that ultimately perpetuates the interests of the powerful and privileged (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), and (c) "docilizing" and disciplining the body and the mind (Foucault, 1979). The legitimization of bilingual/ESL education as an academic field has had disabling consequences because it has controlled resistance against the historical role of deculturalization within U.S. schools (Spring, 1994). Therefore, we contend that it is necessary to keep asking, as urged by Freire (1970a, 1970b, 1985, 1989, 1994), "In favor of whom are we educating?"

We used an array of sources for this study: theoretical literature, empirical studies, and archival data and interviews. First, we briefly explain genealogy as a method and present genealogical explorations reflecting the constitution of bilingual/ESL education vis-à-vis the struggles of Americanization in the U.S. context. Most of this genealogy focuses on the U.S. Southwest, particularly New Mexico, since we (in agreement with Foucault, 1979, 1980) believe that analysis must be localized, contained, and then contextualized. Therefore, we focus on Hispanic, Chicano/Chicana, and Mexican American ethnic groups. We then examine how bilingual/ESL education operates as a disciplinary practice in the context of schooling. We analyze how, as a settlement, illusion, collusion, and delusion are enacted to discipline, docilize, and control. We conclude with a discussion challenging current scholars to act as public intellectuals who are constantly alert, provocative, and

engaged. We turn now to a genealogy of bilingual/ESL education as a way to unpack an array of connections that shaped its constitution.

Genealogical Explorations

As a result of the current political and ideological attack on bilingual/ESL education from conservative opponents and the current crisis of school failure for multitudes of linguistic and ethnic minority students, there is an urgent need to understand the genealogical elements that have constituted this field so that we may develop an understanding and an ability to respond to contemporary educational policies. As stated in the introduction, we have localized most of our discussion in New Mexico and the Southwest. We have done so because we want to highlight that not all bilingual education “genes” in the United States come from an encounter with immigration. On the contrary, and similar to what Lewis (1980) suggested in his analysis of the role of bilingual education in conquered territories (e.g., the former Soviet Union), we present a complex dynamic between colonizer and colonized.

Genealogy

Genealogy, a method advanced by Foucault, is not history, or at least not history in any traditional sense. Foucault (1980) argued that genealogy needs to be explored “in terms of tactics and strategies of power . . . tactics and strategies deployed through implantations, distributions, demarcations, control of territories and organizations of domains” (p. 77). Marshall’s (1990) explanation of the concept of descent in Foucault’s genealogy is useful in demonstrating that history is fragmented and that what have been constituted as historical events rest “upon complex, contingent, and fragile ground” (p. 19). As clarified by Donnelly (1986), the type of history that Foucault called genealogy involves an array of techniques: (a) making the past unfamiliar using a narrative that interrupts by breaking with continuity and coherence, (b) breaking with chronological accounts and flows of events and showing preference for a complex and contingent account that is seemingly disconnected, and (c) problematizing given concepts and categories because what seem to be obvious universal experiences are objectivized categories contingently constructed for the purposes of study.

Furthermore, different from traditional historical methods, genealogy is organized around themes rather than chronological sequences. This demands from the reader certain flexibility, because the narrative moves back and forth through time in order to provide a thematic analysis. Nevertheless, in some sections of this genealogy, we try to facilitate chronological order to create a better understanding of how certain themes unfold and connect with each other.

In what follows, we provide a brief genealogy. Our explorations explain that the constitution of bilingual/ESL education is not free of conflicts, tensions, and contradictions and has been shaped by the political and social environment it sought to transform. We first analyze the genealogical background of the teaching of languages in the southwestern United States and New Mexico vis-à-vis colonizing projects, opposition, accommodation, and tensions. We then explore the role of Chicano activism during the civil rights movement and after passage of the Bilingual Education Act. Finally, we briefly unpack other tensions and contradictions such as the cultivation of monolithic identity formation within the colonized,

resource allocation for policy implementation, and the influence of a scientific base in the academic constitution of bilingual/ESL education.

Background in the Southwest and New Mexico

The available literature suggests that when bilingual/ESL education was initially established as an academic field, its purpose was to serve as a form of resistance and rebellion against deculturalization, economic oppression, and educational marginalization (Donato, 1997; Faltis & Hudelson, 1997; Lewis, 1980; Spring, 1994). The movement was founded and propelled by minority radical activists who clustered around the Chicano movement. However, bilingual education in the United States, in general, and the Southwest, in particular, has also historically served to accommodate and cope with the cultural, political, ideological, and economic changes that resulted from the expansion of the American territory.

The southwestern portion of the United States has had a constant history of colonization that began with the Spanish conquistadors and continues through the present in what we term “symbolic colonization,” which occurs through our contemporary institutions. Symbolic colonization draws from postcolonial theory and refers to how certain practices maintain an unequal and hierarchical distribution of power and access to knowledge through educational and social relations. Given the legitimate and/or informal rules in place, minorities are continually held at the bottom of the stratified social and economic system without institutional possibilities for advancement or change. *Postcolonial* refers to a discourse that moves beyond, denounces and challenges, and proposes alternative practices to the ways by which the curriculum, pedagogies, and dominant/dominating views of schooling have historically constructed and marginalized the “other.”

For example, the dominant language of schooling has referred to minorities, the working and poor classes, and immigrants using labels that indicate inferiority, savagery, deprivation, and difference. This is a common way of constructing the “other,” that is, as different from what is established as normal, desired, and dominant, something that challenges homogeneity. Thus, by pathologizing students, their families, and ethnic and social groups, the project of schooling becomes one of domestication, “civilizing,” Westernizing, Americanizing, and normalizing students according to the values, culture, language, and traditions of the dominant classes: in other words, a colonizing project. For us, symbolic colonization is an encompassing and helpful term to describe these practices. The discourse of “English only” is an example of symbolic colonization, since language has been central to imperialistic cultural imposition throughout history.

In Southwest Spanish colonial times, Zamora (1978) argued that teaching Spanish was a major tool for colonizing the indigenous populations when Columbus arrived on the American continent. During Spanish and Mexican Territorial times, the Catholic Church owned and controlled schools and used the Spanish language to dominate, convert, and acculturate the indigenous populations: “Since a cardinal objective of Hispanic imperial policy was the acculturation of the Indians, it should not be surprising that toward the end of the colonial epoch the friars preferred the use of Spanish as the dominant language” (Almaraz, 1978, pp. 348–349).

In late territorial times during the Anglo expansion, introduction of the common school movement provided a challenge to the hegemonic dominance of the church in several ways. At the onset of this territorial period, there were several attempts to introduce the common school movement and a public school system modeled

after the New England experience. This was resisted and/or accommodated by the locals, who perceived these attempts as a cultural, political, and religious threat to the system in place (Walter, 1927). One interesting form of resistance was for Catholic priests to occupy positions in the public school district or as members of local school boards.

In addition, the onset of the separation of church and state affected state support for schools in the Southwest. Unlike the Spanish regime, the Mexican government did not provide support: "The achievement of Mexican independence in 1821 deprived the Franciscans in New Mexico of regular government assistance" (Almaraz, 1978, p. 349). Similar to the Mexicans, U.S. territorial administrations were interested in supporting the birth of a public school system, not a church system (Walter, 1927). In this context, the language of instruction became a symbolic arena of contestation within Spanish Catholicism and English Protestantism.

According to Almaraz (1978), when the United States acquired the Southwest as part of its territories and after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, tensions with local Spanish-speaking clergy were exacerbated when Jean Baptiste Lamy was appointed as bishop of Santa Fe. These clergy opposed his racist views about the nature of "Mexicans." Upon a closer analysis of this situation, we stipulate that the policy of the Catholic Church was one of accommodation to the new political constellation. We agree that, "in a spiritual sense, Lamy was a visible symbol of the Roman Catholic Church; in a pragmatic sense he was a non-military extension of the Anglo-American conquest of the Southwest" (Almaraz, 1978, p. 350). The placement of Lamy by the Catholic Church was not easily accepted by local leaders, as in the case of Father Martinez of Taos, a major leader in the active resistance against cultural colonization and author of Spanish language textbooks for instruction. In spite of resistance, Lamy created several schools and two colleges and segregated Indian schools where instruction was conducted in English.

Another major influence during this time was the large internal migration of English-speaking populations into the Southwest during the 1870s. This migration shaped the creation of public school systems where English was the language of instruction. In spite of this new direction taken by the church, Italian Jesuits continued to create Spanish-speaking educational programs.

The points just detailed are relevant in the genealogy of bilingual/ESL education since they reveal that the ongoing struggle over the language of instruction is not necessarily a theme connected only with immigration into the United States. The historical struggle in the Southwest was different from the case of German immigrants upon entry into the Indianapolis or Cincinnati schools. In these Midwest public schools, competition with parochial schools over student enrollment was the major reason for teaching immigrant languages and offering intense curriculums in these languages at a time in which the public school system was not yet well established (Perlman, 1990; Zamora, 1978).² In spite of such events, the underlying interest in strengthening public schools had to do with the construct of Americanization, as pointed out by Perlman (1990):

In the formulation of William Torrey Harris, first the superintendent of schools in St. Louis and later the U.S. commissioner of education, "If we do not 'Americanize' our immigrants by luring them to participate in our best civilization. . .they will contribute to the degeneration of our political body and thus de-Americanize and destroy our national life." (p. 31)

However, even though there are similarities to the Midwest, where instruction in public schools was conducted in German and other languages and the ultimate goal was Americanization, the struggle for the ownership of schools, curriculums, and language in the Southwest represented a different conflict: the struggle between the old colonizing power structure, which was now being colonized and was thus losing its power base, and the new colonizing forces. The fear of Americanization for many was rooted in the tension emerging from a curriculum that not only was culturally imperialistic but was formulating new class differentiations based on racist practices (Pascual, 1978; Spring, 1994, 1998; Tyack, 1993). The discourse of “Americanization” is problematic because it advances notions of equality of opportunity while simultaneously assuming the inferiority of certain ethnic and racial groups and ultimately uses education as a socializing agency to stratify class levels, to dominate, control, and subjugate these “others” (the colonized). This can be explained by the historical role that education played in maintaining social reproduction (Bowles & Gintis, 1976) and internalization of oppression by the colonized (Fanon, 1968; Memmi, 1965) as well as controlling resistance. As one Texas superintendent put it, “Most of our Mexicans are of the lower class. They transplant onions, harvest them, etc. The less they know about everything else, the better contented they are” (cited in Tyack, 1993, p. 20).

Some local, mostly rural, populations have resisted public education not only because of the cultural and class struggle involved but also because of fear of taxation in the construction and support of schools (Walter, 1927). Certainly, internal migration from other areas of the United States intensified these tensions because it altered the ethnic-linguistic balance of the local population.³ However, it is important to note that several remote rural areas in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado were never absorbed by the Americanizing public school system; within these areas, instruction in Spanish continued throughout the 1950s until issues of national security forced a more tightly controlled curriculum.

While at the beginning of the 20th century the U.S. colonizer in New Mexico was establishing its social, political, and ideological agenda, the colonized were negotiating their own positionality and identity within this overarching agenda. For the middle classes, the teaching of English in schools, instead of Spanish, became an issue of Union loyalty and an economic commodity with a strong exchange value in a market where only Spanish and/or Mexican elites had, in the past, enjoyed the privilege of a bilingual education. Many Hispanics saw in bilingualism (English and Spanish) a chance for prosperity. They realized that, since they had the ability to move at ease from one language to another, they could serve as business brokers with the South (Mexico and Latin America) or as functionaries in multinational enterprises, U.S. diplomatic posts, and other forms of economic exchange:

Our government needs youngsters qualified for positions of profit in its relations . . . with Latin America. Central America, as the South, [invites] our professors who are fluent in Spanish and [invites] our companies. Acquiring honor and wealth is only a matter of our desire to prepare the road for progress in education so that those who can take advantage of the opportunity profit from it. (Baca, 1915/1992, pp. 107–108, our translation)

The proliferation of the English language in schools was also an important symbolic property for Hispanics in terms of cultural capital. It enabled them to have access to the power structure, allowed the possibility of physical mobility beyond

the boundaries of the territories, and served as an element of justification for claims of statehood, as in the case of New Mexico. Thus, for the middle classes, schools provided access to an important commodity. Unfortunately, similar to many schools in the Midwest where German, Dutch, Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish were popular languages of instruction, schools in the U.S. Southwest were faced with the context of the First World War. Incited by a nationalist general political climate, bilingual programs were perceived as “non-American” and were closed down. This important historical event signifies the erosion of the advantage sought by many Hispanics, because neither the language nor the culture was part of the school experience. Furthermore, the marginalization of Hispanics was exacerbated by these nationalistic discourses that evolved from the prevalent manifest destiny ideology. Hispanics not only spoke a different language but held on to their cultural, ethnic, and religious traditions and were perceived as inferior and foreign (Gallegos, 1998; Samora & Simon, 1977; Spring, 1994).

Americanization in this context meant more than socialization; it meant deculturalization. Herein resided a paradoxical problem for the new colonizers: The “Americanization” of these Hispanics was emerging as a threat. The new settlers began to recognize that these bilingual and bicultural Hispanics could have, in their language and their traditions, a commodity that the colonizers could not easily possess. Coupled with an ideology of superiority and entitlement, “manifest destiny,” the new colonizers believed that Hispanics needed only a minimal education to survive within the new economic structures (Getz, 1997; Samora & Simon, 1977; Sanchez, 1940). For the colonized Hispanics, schools became sites where economic and cultural divisions were crafted. In short, they were designed to educate some groups to their advantage and others to their disadvantage (Landavazo, 2000; Sanchez, 1940; Spring, 1994, 1997). This pattern of schooling, which was either inclusive or exclusive depending on race, class, and ethnicity, led to the turmoil that erupted in the 1960s (Gallegos, 1998; Spring, 1994, 1997, 1998; Tyack, 1993).

The Civil Rights Movement/Chicano Activism

The civil rights era of the 1960s and 1970s brought dramatic reform to American schools and society (Spring, 1994, 1997). In the 1960s, Chicano activists, in particular, called for Chicano-oriented curriculums and schoolbooks that more realistically depicted the historical and economic contributions of Mexicans and Mexican Americans to U.S. society (Samora & Simon, 1977). Many activists also believed strongly in the value of teaching children in the language they understood and related to best, their native language. More important, these political activists not only saw a moral, ethical, and educational need for teaching children in a language they understood but believed that minority students had the right to receive an equitable education. These beliefs compelled Chicano activists to engage in political struggle, activism in changing schools, and active resistance to the social sorting, segregation, and deculturalization occurring in schools. This pattern of resistance created a different political balance in the struggle for access to knowledge and education because, unlike in the past, it emerged from the same oppressed populations (Tyack, 1993). The claims and initiatives for change were being proposed and demanded by groups within the civil rights movement (e.g., the Chicano movement) that had never played a leading role in claiming their own civil and educational rights.

According to Donato (1997), some Latino groups (e.g., the League of United Latin American Citizens) advanced educational proposals in several ways. Some began lobbying for specific kinds of instructional programs for Spanish-speaking children, including bilingual education and the teaching of Chicano-Mexican culture in schools. Others worked more locally and were involved in school sit-ins to demand Chicano studies programs on their campuses. Simultaneously, Chicano educators called for increasing the number of ethnic minority teachers and teacher education faculty at universities. In California, Mexican American educators such as Ernesto Galarza set up curriculum laboratories to develop culturally appropriate school materials and to provide workshops for schools with large bilingual populations (Faltis & Hudelson, 1997).

The Bilingual Education Act

In 1967, after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was signed, an amendment was introduced as a bill. Its purpose was to provide federal assistance to local education agencies to set up bilingual programs for poor, native Spanish-speaking children for whom English was a foreign language. This bill established native language instruction along with teaching of English as a second language. According to Faltis and Hudelson (1997), bilingual education was gaining recognition as a potential solution to poverty, miseducation, and undereducation, and thus Chicano and other minority activists and political leaders supported such education. The bill was expanded to include other low-income, non-English-speaking groups. A portion of the funding was to be used to establish, maintain, and implement special programs for children who were adding English as a second language (T. Anderson & Boyer, 1978).

In spite of this gain, many school districts with large numbers of non-English-proficient students did little, if anything, to provide special programs for these students. In 1970, a group of Chinese parents in San Francisco filed a class action suit against the school district and the superintendent, *Lau v. Nichols*. The suit was based on the claim that Chinese children who did not speak English were not receiving an equal education. Simultaneously, in Portales, New Mexico, a group of Mexican American parents sued their school district. In this case, *Serna v. Portales Municipal Schools*, the court found that non-English-speaking children were being treated differently when they received the same curriculum and instruction as their native English-speaking peers and were therefore being discriminated against (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990). The school district appealed, and, in 1974, the court ruled in favor of the parents. Interestingly enough, that same year the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Chinese parents in *Lau v. Nichols*. After the *Lau* decision, Congress legislated the Supreme Court ruling in the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974.

Bilingual/ESL education, as it currently exists, maintains a traditional view in which students' bilingualism is eradicated under the guise of helping them learn English. As a result of the overemphasis on second-language acquisition (the strict focus on language), bilingual/ESL education mainly persists as English "immersion" programs in which students are placed in almost exclusive English classes or "transitional" programs in which students are provided Spanish instruction in the primary grades and then rapidly phased into English immersion classes. Late-exit bilingual programs exist but are few and far between, and once again the focus is solely on language. Therefore, the continual negation of constructing knowledge,

identity, and political emancipation for marginalized students that Chicano activists fought for in the 1960s has not been a primary goal of bilingual/ESL education.

Tensions and Contradictions in the Constitution of Bilingual/ESL Education

It is important to understand that part of the genealogical constitution of bilingual/ESL education incorporated elements that are in tension and at times in clear contradiction with each other. These elements manifest in discursive forms, in policy forms, and in practice forms. In what follows, we pay particular attention to three domains of tension and contradiction by exploring their elements. The first domain is the cultivation of "Spanish heritage," which at its core is a colonial discourse. This genealogical element coexists with the postcolonial Chicano cultural and political critique. The second domain is the tension that prevails between the symbolic policies and discourses that supposedly support bilingual/ESL education and the exploitation of such discourses for political advantage. The third domain refers to the tensions and contradictions that result from, on the one hand, appropriating cultural and political critiques and, on the other hand, institutionalizing a scientific discourse in order to constitute an academic field that ultimately serves the illusion, collusion, and delusion of bilingual/ESL education.

Cultivating "Spanish heritage." Homogenizing the concept of "Hispanidad" is problematic. Chicanos, who also emphasize their indigenous heritage, do not consider themselves "Hispanic." On the other hand, many northern New Mexicans think of themselves as "Spaniards" (Grinberg & Goldfarb, 1998). Gallegos (1998) cautioned that embracing discourses of Mexicanismo (or *Atzlan*) and/or Spanish as ethnic identities tends to ignore the complexities of local ethnic politics, different types of class and gender struggles, and the subjugation of indigenous populations who mixed by force with the colonizers. Thus, as suggested by postcolonial theory (Carlson, 1997; Gallegos, 1998), attempts to reclaim a monolithic and essentialist national-ethnic-racial category as Hispanic could be equivalent to replacing one oppressive discourse with another, not necessarily less oppressive discourse. Within these discourses, *Mezticismo* (Anzaldúa, 1987) tends to be ignored, and 400 years of interaction are neglected in educational programs.

A contemporary example of these identity conflicts is the one that occurred in Vaughn, New Mexico, in 1997. The local school board, a majority of whose members were of Hispanic descent in a community where the Spanish dialect of northern New Mexico is well maintained, fired two teachers who were implementing a Chicano studies curriculum in their classes, a curriculum designed by active civic groups in cooperation with teachers and university faculty. The official reason for the school board decision was that the curriculum was divisive. Although the teachers won monetary restitution in the courts, they have not returned to teaching in that community, and, of course, the Chicano studies curriculum is no longer taught. We argue that recognition of Chicano/Chicana as a social category threatens the homogeneous construction of the Hispanic as pure Spanish.

The situation just described suggests the importance of understanding that there are cases in which Hispanics discriminate against Hispanics (Gallegos, 1992). We contend that the main interest of some colonized minority groups in having bilingual/ESL education is that of legitimization and status building vis-à-vis a system that has constructed them as inferior (as described earlier). This helps to

explain the interest in locating Hispanidad and Spanish as part of the Western heritage, divorced from any allusion to indigenous people (as implied by Chicanismo). In his analysis of the university preparation of bilingual teachers, Pascual (1978), who was in charge of the Office of Bilingual Education in the New Mexico State Department of Education for almost 20 years, asserted that

Hispanics are heirs to one of the greatest monumental cultures of Western civilization. The achievement of Hispanics in art, music, literature, architecture, jurisprudence, religion, and philosophy since before Christianity and undiminished until the present, are testimony to our intellectual vitality. These achievements and vitality must be represented in the curriculum that educates our children, regardless of the language to be used. (p. 15)

Furthermore, evidence from archival work suggests that New Mexico's programs and curriculums in bilingual education center on Spanish culture going back to medieval times, ignoring any art, literature, creativity, music, and so on that may imply a Chicano heritage. For example, an undated document from the New Mexico Department of Education, *Cultural Values Through Music and Literature*, suggests that instruction in literature should include "the repository of the best thinking of the human race . . . Hispanic heritage—Seneca, Quintillan, Alfonso El Sabio, San Isidoro, Maimonides; . . . the beginning and flowering of the "Golden Age"—Calderon, Lope de Vega, Garcilazo, San Juan de la Cruz, Valdez, Santa Teresa de Avila, Feijoo, Carrasco" (p. 2, our translation). Although it is not clear whether this suggestion is intended for all literature classes or only for bilingual classes, it is clear that the agenda is consistent in terms of the Spanish identity. The selection of readings suggested is narrow. There is a bias in favor of a Spanish canon, and there is nothing that reflects 400 years of interaction, the mix of cultural traditions, or any creations by Chicanos or other Latin American populations.

These genealogical elements suggest that the struggle over the curriculum in public schools goes beyond cultural heritage or linguistic conflicts. It also involves status, class, and the cultural capital of the old colonized power structure attempting to regain a position of privilege. The following section addresses the politics of resources.

Resource allocation and the symbolic uses of bilingualism. In the last 25 years, federal resources have been allocated to support several inclusionary programs such as bilingual/ESL education; however, this has not always been the case at the state level. Hence, another aspect of this genealogy is that state legislatures often have engaged in the rhetoric of advocating bilingualism while passing bills without real provisions. In spite of public declarations of commitment to creating or supporting certain programs, the programs have not been implemented because resources have not been allocated. For example, in New Mexico, a goal was that all students become bilingual by the year 2000. Yet, as 2000 approached, New Mexico was experiencing the greatest loss of non-English languages in its history (Guerrero, 1997; Hernandez-Chavez, 1996).

Nor is this a recent phenomenon. In 1943, the New Mexico legislature passed a bill (SB-129) demanding the hiring of supervisors of Spanish for rural schools that would be designated as fully bilingual. Although the intention was noble in terms of hiring functionaries who knew and understood content in the two languages and who could communicate at ease with teachers, community members, and students, insufficient funds were allocated. These individuals needed to be highly qualified,

and the demand for them was great, yet money was rarely properly allocated to prepare personnel from within districts to fulfill the necessary tasks.

Similar conflicts emerged in New Mexico during the 1970s in regard to funding allocations for the preparation and development of bilingual/ESL teachers. As the following quotation from a New Mexico State Department of Education official indicates, universities resisted investing in the preparation of these teachers if money was not specifically allocated; meanwhile, the Department of Education determined that money from the regular allocation of funds for teacher training should be used so that every teacher could be trained in bilingual/ESL skills.

The question which I [raised] of the various colleges of education was "Why cannot the universities assume this responsibility with funds appropriated for that purpose by the New Mexico Legislature?" In reviewing the appropriations for higher education, it appears to an "outsider" that the legislature has been very generous. We can only come to one of two conclusions: The State Legislature is not funding teacher education programs adequately or we are utilizing our funding for training in inappropriate teaching areas.

On several occasions, I have met with university officials to discuss this problem. . . . Generally, it is felt by university officials that special funding should be provided if the universities are expected to train teachers in areas other than . . . general professional preparation. However, this does little to satisfy the needs of our students in specialized areas. The staff members of the New Mexico State Department of Education have asked universities to supply us with "X" number of teachers for some new program and we are told to provide the funds and they will be happy to provide the training. The question . . . is whether or not training to meet these specific needs is thought to have been provided by the legislature, or should funds be provided, separate and part [sic] to meet these needs. (untitled report, New Mexico State Department of Education, 1972, pp. 1-2)

Nonetheless, skills needed by educators to serve the needs of bilingual students were to be grounded in what was considered the relevant knowledge base contributed by a community of scholars through systematic, valid, and legitimate research but not necessarily grounded in a political and cultural critique. Therefore, types of questions asked, research designs, and funding of studies were shaped by the dominant conceptions in educational research at large. Furthermore, the already established disciplines moved portions of their research agendas into this emergent field, while the models that were fostered by the bilingual/ESL educators were dominated by the academic hierarchies of knowledge construction, which were not free of power struggles.

The scientific base of the discipline. In *The Name of the Rose*, Eco (1983) raised questions related to contested power and who controls the production, access, and distribution of knowledge; the origins of knowledge; and whose and which knowledge is deemed legitimate. This top-down filtering of knowledge legitimizes and privileges expertise. In turn, there is an emergence of a new bureaucracy of experts whose purpose is to establish and administer an institutional system of diagnosis and classification of students' deficits. These practices perpetuate the pathologization of clients by using "valid" instruments to ratify and justify diagnosis of needs. In turn, because of the existence of need, there is a demand for more resources. This process of diagnosis and classification/pathologization supports an arrangement of self-perpetuation and does little more than create a segregated space for

the pathologized, keeping them away from and sheltering the interests of those regarded as “normal” (Ware, 1994).

The classification function of schooling is buttressed by its legitimization function. Schools consecrate social distinctions by constituting them as academic distinctions (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Because institutional agents believe these classifications to be academic, they use them as legitimate labels without full awareness of their social and ideological consequences. Through socialization, these labels and classifications have been incorporated as a practice of instruments that agents employ practically without conscious reflection. However, these academic judgments are also social judgments that ratify and reproduce social class distinctions.

So, then, what is the origin of the validated expertise? Our archival research suggests that when bilingual/ESL education was formalized after the civil rights movement, the only “expertise” available was that of members of the field of linguistics and language acquisition. Furthermore, even though at the university level some courses were offered in arts and sciences regarding historical or cultural elements of different populations, the focus of both research and training was shaped by the prevalence of scientific positivist study of methods of instruction. Within such discourse, the process-product research paradigm of the 1970s and 1980s had an extraordinary influence in the quest for a validated knowledge base that could define the discipline as such. Thus, many teacher development programs focused either on teaching methods or on problems of acculturation and self-esteem within a discourse of cultural disadvantage.

Although we do not dispute the necessity for teachers to be skillful in the areas of child and youth development, as in teaching approaches, we want to highlight that the political and social contexts were neglected. We also argue that the constitution of the field was immersed in discourses that contradicted the emancipatory intention of bilingual education because of the hierarchical nature implied in the construct of cultural disadvantage.

Furthermore, as discussed previously, schools were immersed in the discourse that “real” learning and the development of knowledge, skill, and potential do not occur until students can begin to function and produce in English. While we agree that English should be a language mastered by all students, the implication has been that English became the core of bilingual/ESL education in order to justify its existence as legitimate in a political climate reluctant to support diversity, multiculturalism, and different points of view. In short, the field gains legitimacy within a system that attempts to maintain construction of the “other” as second class in order to privilege an inherent colonizing agenda (Carlson, 1997). A genealogy of bilingual/ESL education suggests that its constitution emerged within the context of schooling and was not divorced from it. In the next section, which considers these competing discourses, we unpack how bilingual/ESL education operates as a disciplinary practice.

Bilingual/ESL Education as a Disciplinary Practice

Foucault’s work on genealogy (1979) and archeology (1972) of knowledge helps provide an understanding of the constitution of academic fields as disciplinary practices immersed in power struggles. As stated at the beginning of this article, in Foucault’s terms, disciplining refers to both control of the mind through structur-

ing meaning within a field of study and control of the body in space and time through structuring practices. Drawing on Foucault, G. L. Anderson and Grinberg (1998) defined disciplinary practice as

a set of discourses, norms, and routines that shape the ways in which a field of study constitutes itself . . . [that connect] with historical, political, cultural, and economic contexts but are enacted within specific, local, and contingent institutional arrangements, and . . . [that entail] the establishment of conventions, agreements, and rules that regulate and legitimize current ways of distinguishing among “best practices,” desired outcomes, academic rigor, and valid knowledge claims. (p. 330)

Thus, an academic field such as bilingual/ESL education (or any other field such as psychology, administration, special education, or even history and sociology) functions as a regime of truth in which even so-called paradigmatic shifts are controlled by routines, demarcations, behaviors, and the like. As posited by Foucault (1988), the most insightful way to understand society is to consider it from the perspective of the professions that have emerged to contain its failures.

We argue that, in order to legitimately exist within the broader institution of education, bilingual/ESL education constituted itself as a specialized area of expertise. More important, this location undermined any potential for bilingual/ESL education to serve as a transformative and emancipatory force within and against dominant educational practices. In its effort to construct itself as a specialized area of expertise, it has been diverted from its originally intended objective and has neutralized any possibility of providing a countervailing force against the oppressive educational structure.

In what follows, we discuss how bilingual/ESL education serves as a disciplinary practice of social reproduction in education. We frame this practice by revealing a pattern of interrelated phenomena. First, we use “illusion” as a construct to explain how bilingual/ESL education operates under the guise of emancipatory possibility. Then, by analyzing a pattern of “collusion,” we explain how colonization needs the “confused colonized person” (Cordova, 1997) in order to create a cycle of oppression whereby the colonized collude with the colonizer and oppression is reproduced. Finally, we discuss how “delusion” allows a sense of accomplishment that, in reality, is a misrecognition of what has been achieved.

Bilingual/ESL Education and Social Reproduction

We turn now to educational practices as docilizing and normalizing entities. Since the early part of the 20th century, the goal of public schools has been to Americanize and socialize Mexican American children to take their place in the lower stratum of the social hierarchy and enter the workforce as a source of cheap labor within the larger political economy in order to serve the needs of the upper class (Donato, 1997; Gonzalez, 1990). Therefore, schooling for linguistic and ethnic minority Mexican Americans has served as a means of assimilation and of providing only basic knowledge and skills for low-status jobs. Furthermore, according to Donato (1997), schooling became a vehicle to advance the dominant Anglo culture, including law-abiding values, while discouraging Mexican Americans from participating in the democratic process. Gonzalez (1990) maintained that the educational isolation of Mexican American children corresponded with the economic interests of local White communities throughout the Southwest and became

a means of domination and control, the antithesis of equality and freedom; and it was intrinsically racist both in that it was based on racial social theories, and in that it led to educational practices that reinforced a pattern of social inequality based on nationality and race. (p. 141)

Gonzalez (1990) also looked at the nature and impact of several educational reforms on Mexican American children during the early 20th century, among them the use of IQ testing, curricular differentiation, and vocational education. Each of these reforms became entrenched schooling practices and had a profound influence on the education of Mexican American students. Many are still in effect in schools today. Both San Miguel (1978) and Gonzalez (1990) found that school segregation practices limited the opportunities for Mexican Americans in U.S. society.

Bourdieu (1988, 1994), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977), and Bourdieu and Hacquant (1992) described the educational system as the principal institution controlling the allocation of status and privilege in contemporary societies. Schools represent the primary institutional setting for the production, transmission, and accumulation of the various forms of cultural capital that Bourdieu defined as “cultural goods”: schemas of appreciation and understanding internalized by individuals through socialization. Bourdieu argued that education actually contributes to the maintenance of a nonegalitarian social system by allowing inherited cultural differences to shape academic achievement and occupational attainment. Moreover, education has become the institution most responsible for the transmission of social inequality, cultural resources, and educational credentials. Therefore, educational practices, the mechanisms for selection, admission, and cognitive or academic classifications, are controlled by individuals and groups who perpetuate their own positions of privilege and power. Ultimately, these inequities of power and privilege persist intergenerationally without conscious recognition or public resistance. This is possible because, as Ross (1991) argued, a cycle of social reproduction occurs, what she called the “Bourdieu effect.” Based on the work of Ranciere (1991), she explained this effect in the following terms:

They are excluded because they don't know why they are excluded; and they don't know why they are excluded because they are excluded. Or in other words, the system reproduces its existence because it goes unrecognized. The system brings about, through the reproduction of its existence, an effect of misrecognition. (pp. xi–xii)

Therefore, resistance within educational institutions is neutralized because reproduction is misrecognized. Furthermore, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) posited that exclusion occurs because educational institutions are powerful labeling systems that subtly translate social distinctions into academic evaluations and classifications. Formal schooling contributes to the maintenance of an unequal social system by privileging certain cultural heritages and penalizing others. While Chicano activists sought to interrupt and transform this system, bilingual/ESL academics and bureaucrats have sought to legitimize themselves within the system and, intentionally or not, have perpetuated misrecognition.

The Illusion

The signing into law of the Bilingual Education Act in 1965 and the subsequent appropriation of federal dollars enabled bilingual/ESL education to enter into

restricted spaces and procure a level of status secured by state and federal resources and funding. This funding has been essential to the survival and growth of bilingual/ESL education as a field of expertise and a program of study. It has also served universities in two ways: (a) by allowing more overhead funds for other functions and (b) by providing the community with the illusion that the needs of displaced and subjugated “others” have been addressed. Over time, the management of these resources gave rise to a bureaucracy that controls the administration of policy, grants, research, practice, evaluation, and testing, as well as college programs of study at both federal and local levels. In turn, some academics were allowed and encouraged to create undergraduate and graduate programs of study in order to recruit and train subsequent generations of bilingual/ESL educators. These positions provided entry, mostly for minorities, into closed, White spaces of privilege such as administration.

University scholars within bilingual/ESL education programs decontextualized and disembodied knowledge by centering on the development of what was considered potentially a high-status form of knowledge (i.e., second-language acquisition, linguistics). Thus, cultivating various academic features of such knowledge has more to do with formalizing knowledge than it has to do with the practices of teachers serving linguistically diverse students. These discursive practices, which Foucault (1972) regarded as forms of knowledge constituted in texts and in institutional and organizational practices, have led to a “university hegemony” (Goodson & Dowbiggin, 1990) of programs that credential teachers and foster the mastery of form without any substance or content (Labaree, 1997). Unfortunately, students learn quickly how to acquire only the credentials needed to help them become more marketable, encouraging the smallest investment of intellectual engagement, time, and energy. As a consequence, these students are well schooled and poorly educated. University academic fields that prepare teachers, such as bilingual/ESL education, can be viewed as forms of controlling and disciplining behavior and thought through the strategies and tactics of knowledge production, thus docilizing bodies and minds (Foucault, 1979).

For example, in a study we have been conducting since 1998 on the historical and genealogical constitution of bilingual/ESL education in New Mexico, teachers are interviewed in order to explore their perceptions of their experiences as students and teachers within bilingual/ESL education programs. When speaking about their preparation as bilingual/ESL teachers and their experiences in regard to becoming licensed, certified, and endorsed, they have acknowledged that university programs have created courses, requirements, and expectations with little relevance for them or the linguistic and ethnic minority students they are serving. The following comments are representative:

In my preparation as a bilingual educator I was not prepared for the reality in the schools. We needed to learn about coalition building, community building, and activism to challenge the administration so that we could provide for minority kids. The needy students get the least amount of services and programs. In my teacher preparation program, I didn't learn how to help these kids. We never discussed what our real purpose in working with monolingual or minority kids is all about in any of the classes at the university, particularly the core courses. The core classes that are required didn't address the larger societal issues that I was going to encounter when I started teaching. I never

learned how to change the system, or how to get the system to work toward justice for all students.

Another bilingual resource teacher lamented:

Living here in the heart of New Mexico, we have very fertile grounds to develop strong, effective bilingual programs. The university does not have a good program to prepare teachers, to maintain and develop language and literacy in order to produce solid bilingual and multilingual teachers. There is no rigor. The content of the classes is minimal, at a low level, and repeated in many of the courses. I didn't need classes to learn what is offered there.

The question emerges, Are the educational needs of students addressed in bilingual/ESL programs? When we examined bilingual/ESL teacher preparation programs at New Mexico universities, we found that the programs were developed in the early 1970s and have virtually remained the same. For example, the cadre of courses required by students in these programs reflects bilingual and ESL education as nothing other than dealing with language as a commodity, while culture is approached as a superficial treatment toward understanding the client to be served.

Our archival research at the New Mexico State Department of Education in Santa Fe provided us with documents on teacher education.⁴ For example, at a major research university, the bilingual teacher education program in the 1970s consisted mainly of courses that dealt with language. In this institution, 12 credit hours (four classes) were required in Spanish language, 3 credit hours were required in cultural foundations, and 9 credit hours were required in generic curriculum and instruction. At another major research university, the program required only 3 credit hours (one class) in cross-cultural education but required 9 credit hours in Spanish, 6 credit hours in reading methods and diagnosis, and 12 credit hours in teaching methods (similar to the regular program, except that the instruction was done in Spanish and the field experience took place in a bilingual setting). Another example is that of a private college in northern New Mexico. This college offered the same teacher education program offered in English, but for bilingual majors it was offered in Spanish. Not much has changed.

Currently, at one of these major research universities, the bilingual teacher education program requires 6 hours of Spanish, three classes in language acquisition (9 credit hours), two methods classes, one class on the "theory" of bilingual education, and only 3 credit hours (one class) from a list of classes on culture, Chicano studies, folklore, literature, or *juegos y canciones* (games and songs of the Southwest). There is enough evidence (a) to doubt that teachers were and are educated to foster a pedagogy congruent with a cultural and political critique and (b) to assert that departments of Spanish and linguistics were the winners within the establishment of these new programs. These departments were able to gain a large new clientele, along with credit-hour production, because many of the students in the new programs were required to take these classes.

Graduates of these university programs who become the classroom teachers, administrators, bureaucrats, and academics within the field of bilingual/ESL education in school districts and universities are prepared only to perpetuate what continues to exist for linguistic and ethnic minority students. We agree with Darder (1997) that instead of creating an empowered teaching force by helping educators "develop a critical understanding of their purpose," these "programs foster a dependency on

predefined curriculum, outdated classroom strategies and techniques, and traditionally rigid classroom environments that position not only students, but teachers as well, into physically and intellectually oppressive situations” (p. 332).

In the case of bilingual/ESL education, the cultural and political struggles of Chicano activists during the civil rights movement of the 1960s were co-opted and institutionalized within the system that has maintained the inequality struggled against. Trained brokers have been indoctrinated within the institution to serve on the front lines of the constructed illusion of inclusion, which masks the actual reality of their placement within the lower rungs of the academic hierarchy. The responsibility of these agents is to wear the mask of inclusion in order to prepare subsequent generations of agents to maintain the continued flow of resources and to constitute bilingual/ESL education as a subsidiary practice that classifies, docilizes, and disciplines the disenfranchised into their place within the larger social system.

The Collusion

As suggested by Saavedra (1998), in many cases there is a hegemonic unity constituted by not only the dominant force of the powerful and the privileged but also collusion within the institution among its subjugated members to protect this same system of power, privilege, and interest. Teresa Cordova, a Chicana scholar and activist, has explored the choreography of conflict between the colonizer and the colonized in academia. She (Cordova, 1997) defines the university as a central location for establishing knowledge as a discourse of power and for cultivating social relations that shape definitions of the university itself. She uses the concept of colonization to explore the relations of power constructed within academia. Cordova contends that colonial relations serve the exploitative needs of colonialism and the appropriation of resources of those colonized, and while force is often applied to impose these unequal relations, ideology attempts to convince people of the appropriateness of their respective subservient roles. Therefore, for the colonized, detecting the ideology of colonial social relations is a critical strategy toward changing these relations. However, as asserted by Freire (1970b), oppressors disfavor promoting the community as a whole and prefer to select a few leaders. This manipulation maintains alienation and controls resistance and transgressions in order to avoid class solidarity.

Minorities have two choices: either to collude in their own oppression or to engage in action that will lead to the transformation of oppressive contexts. Yet, any attempt to transform the institution is viewed as an act of transgression and is not without its consequences. For those who choose to collude in their own oppression—the colonized minority, as Fanon (1952, 1968) and Memmi (1965, 1984) labeled them—oppression creates an “alterity identity,” the constitution of an identity that is dependent upon the dominant other to define the self. As Carlson (1998) defined the term:

[Alterity identity is] a reduction and definition of the self to its identities, most often . . . a predominant identity. The amplification of this alterity identity usually results in the formulation of a culture of separatism which gives the appearance of supporting a broad based democratic progressive movement, but which ultimately denies participation in creating the condition in which others can join in solidarity, in struggle against dominating powers. (p. 132)

Cordova (1997) argues that when minorities deny their reality within the institution, "the negation of who we are, our history, our past and our culture leads to 'internal colonialism' characterized by defining ourselves in the eyes of the colonizer" (p. 223). Furthermore,

dominant authority deems it necessary to patrol the behavior of the colonized, hoping that she/he will not do or say anything to rock the boat; to tread carefully while in the midst of the colonized; or to simply avoid associating with anything or anyone potentially "controversial." (Cordova, 1997, p. 224)

From an equity perspective, it should be acknowledged that the creation of jobs was a concrete benefit of bilingual education for many Latinos and others. However, once they enter the system, internal processes of colonization take over. Collusion by bilingual/ESL educators at various levels occurs because of internalized oppression and misrecognition, resulting in strategies that reflect their own brand of institutional violence and domination employed in an effort to maintain allegiance. As discussed previously, the "Spanish heritage" has contributed to the collusion of the bilingual/ESL settlement (Carlson, 1997). In turn, this collusion has preserved the illusion of solidarity and a pretense of resisting domination while, in fact, maintaining power and privileged arrangements within the dominant power structures.

The Delusion

In a paper on Black feminist thought, Patricia Hill Collins (1991) quoted a 73-year-old African American woman:

My mother used to say that the black woman is the white man's mule and the white woman is his dog. Now, she said that to say this: We do the heavy work and get beat whether we do it well or not. But the white woman is closer to the master and he pats them on the head and lets them sleep in the house, but he ain't goin treat neither one like he was dealing with a person. (p. 38)

This quote captures the delusion of bilingual/ESL education. Although minority scholars have gained entry into educational institutions, the radical purpose has mostly been lost. Misrecognition of power relations favors a collusion that continues to attract resources and funding supporting the Americanizing agenda of the institution. The delusion is that because the colonized have a space and have become part of the system, colonization has ended. Power and privilege are practiced by members only within these spaces, subjugating other colonized groups and reproducing the larger context (Fanon, 1968; Memmi, 1965, 1984; San Juan, 1998). Through being co-opted within the system and simultaneously legitimizing the system, bilingual/ESL education deludes itself with a sense of equality, a false sense of arrival, a delusion that the historical struggle has been overcome. As argued by Reyes and Halcon (1997):

As minorities, we know from personal experience that racism in education is vigorous and pointed. We realize that, in spite of bona fide college degrees, our credentials are challenged by pervasive racist attitudes, and our efforts toward full incorporation into academic positions in institutions of higher education are hampered by layers of academic stratification. We find that, even with earned PhD's the academic road is the beginning of another Sisyphian climb. If current patterns of minority hiring persist, the best we can expect is to occupy positions outside the mainstream ranks, those most peripheral to the hub of governance and power. (p. 424)

Conclusion

A genealogy of bilingual/ESL education has enabled us to understand that, as a disciplinary practice, it has fostered the routines, conventions, models, practices, rituals, power relations, and contradictions of the system in which it was institutionalized, the same system that perpetuated the problem in the first place. Moreover, with the emergence of bilingual/ESL education as an academic field and as a set of practices supposedly derived from the knowledge base generated within this field, both academic institutions and school systems shifted old racist discriminatory practices into a new bilingual/ESL space. In this new "ghetto" where faculty and students are controlled through routines and practices, racism and discrimination are maintained in two new ways: (a) by validating and legitimizing segregation of students as a sound pragmatic practice and (b) by constituting an island of scholars who are also institutionally segregated and relegated to second-class status (through cooperating with a system that reproduces marginality rather than problematizing it). These faculty and students are trapped within an organizational web that forces their own reproduction and controls their resistance through a benevolent colonization. Their unrealized potential for resistance could instead have focused on creating alternative practices and modes of knowledge production and transgressing the academic models that historically have segregated, undervalued, and discriminated against the few minority students and faculty who (although relegated to tokenism) have become part of the institution.

We have argued that in order to legitimately exist within the broader institutions of education, bilingual/ESL education constituted itself as a settlement and formulated itself as a palatable co-optation within the mainstream political and ideological agenda, placing itself within the bureaucratic interest game. More important, this location undermined any potential for bilingual/ESL education to serve as a transformative and emancipatory force within and against dominant educational practices and social structures.

Our role as public intellectuals is to challenge the power arrangements that constitute colonizing practices. We do so by mapping genealogies and questioning rather than by accommodating. For too long, educators have colluded with the establishment and have neglected their social, moral, and political responsibility as public intellectuals. Problematizing in specific and contextualized spaces is one way to interrupt, one way to transgress, and this in turn may alter unjust and oppressive practices that have historically benefited a few at the expense of the rest.

Liberatory practices are surrendered within institutional contexts that constrain critique and favor compartmentalization. However, these practices invite the public intellectual to engage in a closer analysis of their particularities. In short, we have to problematize by paying close attention to the violence of institutional discourses and practices, and we have to "question over and over again what is postulated as self-evident, to disturb people's mental habits, the way they do and think things, to dissipate what is familiar and accepted, to reexamine rules and institutions" (Foucault, 1980, p. 265).

In these times of extreme chauvinistic discourses that advance nationalistic narratives of unity (Schlesinger, 1992), cultural literacy (Hirsch, 1988), and overreliance on deterministic standards and assessment for the purpose of credentialing and legitimizing success and failure, it is essential to reclaim the legacy of the civil rights movement and its influence on educational and social policy. Those of us

who see education as a possibility for social transformation and for the advancement of justice, equity, and equality have as our task the responsibility of justifying, explaining, and defending what is deemed a basic human right: the right to preserve, cultivate, and disseminate our individual cultural heritages, languages, worldviews, and capacities.

Notes

¹In spite of the fact that these two disciplines have had different origins, histories, and perspectives, ESL and the psychological, mostly cognitive, study of language acquisition became the core knowledge base for practitioners interested in bilingual education. For that reason, we refer to them in a unified way.

²Pearlman (1990) reported that, from the 1840s until the First World War, some schools in Cincinnati had half a day of instruction in German and that, in Indianapolis from 1878 until the First World War, German students were instructed for an hour a day in the earlier grades and were taught geography and history in German in the middle grades.

³Note that because of the complexity and different patterns of colonization, we chose not to analyze the relationship of these processes to the conditions of American Indians, whose many languages and lifestyles were smashed first by the Spanish colonization and its active agenda of “conversion” and then by the U.S. policies of extermination (Spring, 1994, 1997).

⁴Documents were not organized by themes or placed in labeled boxes. We found these documents in an unlabeled box in the multicultural office. An untitled folder with survey data from the State Board of Education provided us with this information.

References

- Almaraz, F. (1978). Bilingual education in New Mexico: Historical perspective and current debate. *New Mexico Historical Review*, 53, 347–360.
- Anderson, G. L., & Grinberg, J. (1998). Educational administration as disciplinary practice: Appropriating Foucault’s view of power, discourse, and method. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34, 329–353.
- Anderson, T., & Boyer, M. (1978). *Bilingual schooling in the United States* (2nd ed.). Austin, TX: National Education Laboratory.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: La frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Baca, C. (1992). Enseñanza del Español en las escuelas [The teaching of Spanish in schools]. In J. Vigil (Ed.), *El discurso elocuente Nuevo Mexicano: Speeches from “La Voz del Pueblo,” 1889–1919* (pp. 105–108). Santa Fe: New Mexico State Records and Archives. (Original work published 1915.)
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Academic discourse*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Hacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Carlson, D. (1997). *Making progress: Education and culture in new times*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Carlson, D. (1998). Self education—Identity, self, and the new politics of education. In D. Carlson & M. Apple (Eds.), *Power/knowledge/pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times* (pp. 191–200). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Collins, P. H. (1991). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. In M. M. Fonon & J. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 35–59). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cordova, T. (1997, Fall). Power and knowledge: Colonialism in the academy. *Taboo, the Journal of Culture and Education*, pp. 209–234.
- Darder, A. (1997). Creating the conditions for cultural democracy in the classroom. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & H. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Donato, R. (1997). *The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican Americans during the civil rights movement*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Donnelly, M. (1986). Foucault's genealogy of the human sciences. In M. Gane (Ed.), *Towards a critique of Foucault* (pp. 15–32). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Eco, U. (1983). *The name of the rose*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Faltis, C., & Hudelson, S. (1997). *Bilingual education in elementary and secondary school communities: Toward understanding and caring*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fanon, F. (1952). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1968). *The wretched of the earth*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings by Michel Foucault, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977–1984* (L. Kritzman, Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970a). *Cultural action for freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review and Center for the Study of Development and Social Change.
- Freire, P. (1970b). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Freire, P. (1989). *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gallegos, B. (1992). *Literacy, education, and society in New Mexico, 1693–1821*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gallegos, B. (1998). Remember the Alamo: Imperialism, memory, and postcolonial educational studies. *Educational Studies*, 29, 232–247.
- Getz, L. M. (1997). *Schools of their own: The education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850–1940*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Gonzalez, G. (1990). *Chicano education in the era of segregation*. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press.
- Goodson, I., & Dowbiggin, I. (1990). Docile bodies: Commonalities in the history of psychiatry and schooling. In S. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge* (pp. 105–129). London: Routledge.
- Grinberg, J., & Goldfarb, K. (1998). Moving teacher education in/to the community. *Theory Into Practice*, 37, 131–139.
- Guerrero, M. (1997, Winter). Spanish academic language proficiency: The case of bilingual education teachers in the U.S. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21, 23–38.
- Hernandez-Chavez, E. (1996). *La pérdida del español entre los chicanos* [The loss of Spanish among Chicanos]. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the New Mexico Association for Bilingual Education, Albuquerque.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage.

- Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 39–81.
- Landavazo, R. (2000). *The progressive education of Hispanics in New Mexico: A historical analysis*. Unpublished document, University of New Mexico.
- Lewis, E. G. (1980). *Bilingualism and bilingual education: A comparative study*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of language minority education in the United States. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 27–44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, J. (1990). Foucault and educational research. In S. Ball (Ed.), *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge* (pp. 11–28). London: Routledge.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Memmi, A. (1984). *Dependence: A sketch for a portrait of the dependent*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pascual, H. (1978). *Clients and teachers in bilingual education programs*. Paper presented at the National Conference on the Education of Hispanics, Alexandria, VA.
- Perlman, J. (1990). Historical legacies: 1840–1920. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 508, 27–37.
- Ranciere, J. (1991). *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Reyes, M. L., & Halcon, J. (1997). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. In A. Darder, R. Torres, & H. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Latinos and education: A critical reader* (pp. 69–83). New York: Routledge.
- Ross, K. (1991). Translator's introduction. In J. Ranciere, *The ignorant schoolmaster: Five lessons in intellectual emancipation* (pp. vi–xxxiii). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Saavedra, E. (1998). *Against hegemonic unity: Narratives on becoming a public intellectual and provocateur in the academy*. Freeman Butts Lecture presented at the meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Philadelphia.
- Samora, J., & Simon, P. (1977). *A history of the Mexican-American people*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Sanchez, G. (1940). *Forgotten people: A study of New Mexicans*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- San Juan, E., Jr. (1998). *Beyond postcolonial theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- San Miguel, G. (1978). Inside the public schools: A history of the Chicano educational experience. *Atisbos: A Journal of Chicano Research*, 3, 86–101.
- Schlesinger, A., Jr. (1992). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York: Norton.
- Spring, J. (1994). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Spring, J. (1997). *The American school, 1642–1996* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Spring, J. (1998). *American education* (8th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyack, D. (1993). Constructing difference: Historical reflections on schooling and social diversity. *Teachers College Record*, 95, 8–34.
- Walter, P. (1927). First meeting of the New Mexico Educational Association. *New Mexico Historical Review*, 2, 67–82.
- Ware, L. (1994). Contextual barriers to collaboration. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultations*, 5, 339–357.
- Zamora, J. (1978). Perspectiva historica de la educación bilingue en los Estados Unidos [Historical perspective on bilingual education in the U.S.]. *Hispania*, 61, 308–311.

Authors

JAIME GRINBERG is Associate Professor of Education, Division of Language, Literacy, and Sociocultural Studies, Hokona Hall 269, College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131; grinberg@unm.edu. His areas of specialization are cultural, social, and historical foundations; policy; and teacher education and leadership.

ELIZABETH R. SAAVEDRA is Associate Professor of Education, Division of Educational Leadership and Organizational Learning, Hokona Hall 202, College of Education, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131; lizaave@unm.edu. Her areas of specialization are literacy, biliteracy, teacher transformation and leadership, and social and cultural aspects of organizations and schools.