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Fighting for Language and Power

Colorado Upholds the Right to Bilingual Education

CONTROL UNIDS

On November 5, 2002, a broad-based alliance of grassroots organizations, individuals, churches, unions, elected officials, and coalitions united to defeat Ron Unz's "English for the Children" initiative in Colorado.

Nationally, this was the first time Unz's initiative was defeated as a ballot issue. Ron Unz, chair of English for the Children, is a California multi-millionaire software developer and former Republican candidate for governor. Unz launched a national movement to eliminate bilingual education across the country by amending state constitutions, with the ultimate goal being to amend the Constitution of the United States. He also spearheaded the defeat of bilingual education in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, but his xenophobic anti-immigrant campaign met with fierce resistance in Colorado.

On November 5, more than 56 percent of all Colorado voters opposed the antibilingual amendment and voted "No on 31." Among other things, the amendment to the state's constitution would have given all students only nine months to learn English before being placed into all-English classes. For many, this would mean a lifetime of being illiterate. And therein lies the importance of "holding the line" on bilingual education and defeating the likes of Ron Unz: Illiteracy and inequity in education translates into political and economic apartheid for millions of immigrant students.

Conditions in Colorado

Historically, Colorado is a conservative state and has a weak track record concerning bilingual education and language rights. Denver's public schools, with the largest bilingual student population, have been under a court ordered decree since 1984—demanding compliance with federal policy on bilingual education. They remain out of compliance to this day. In 1987, voters passed an "English Is the Official Language of the State of Colorado" amendment to the constitution, mandating all state business be done in "English only." In 1992, a complaint filed by Padres Unidos with the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) resulted in the Denver Public Schools being found guilty of "Discrimination Based on Race in Bilingual Education." Because of the OCR findings and the creation of dual-language schools across the state, Colorado received national attention and became a target for local and national anti-bilingual proponents.

It was in this context that Ron Unz chose to target Colorado for his anti-bilingual "English for the Children" campaign.

continued on page two
Tailoring the Message

Critical to the success of the campaign was everyone's ability to unite around "No on 31" while also recognizing the need to approach various constituencies differently. In other words, depending on their conditions and concerns, different groups were approached with different reasons for voting against Amendment 31.

To defeat the amendment, it was essential to win over white middle-class voters. Our message was that the measure was too punitive because teachers could be personally sued for speaking Spanish in the classroom; too costly, because it would involve starting new programs; and too restrictive because it would have eliminated dual-language programs and parent choice. These points appeared in yard signs, on TV and radio — thanks to a $3 million donation by a generous parent whose daughter attends a dual-language public school in Northern Colorado. There is no question that the resources brought forth by this mother had a tremendous impact on the movement to win the campaign.

To win over the Latino and African-American communities, we helped them understand that the right to bilingual education is a part of the struggle for democracy and justice.

When the question of bilingual education was connected to becoming literate, being able to vote, and having equal access to education, members of the African-American community could easily relate to the issue and see it as their own. One person pointed out how in the past, slaves caught learning how to read could be killed or have their tongues cut out.

For the immigrant community, it was important to connect the amendment to the recent raids and deportations taking place in their communities. There were many discussions connecting the amendment to Latinos' right to maintain their native language and culture.

In the Black community, Padres Unidos participated in discussions on the need for African Americans and Latinos to come together to defeat 31. In Colorado, schools are an equal opportunity failure for both African-American and Latino students. Both suffer from high suspensions and expulsions with disproportionate representations in our prison populations.

Despite Unz's contention that he had the support of the Latino community, Amendment 31 was overwhelmingly defeated in every Latino majority district throughout the state.

Building Unity

English Plus was a Denver-based coalition that emerged to defeat Ron Unz's English for the Children. With the help of political consultants, the mainstream political message evolved: "Too Costly, Too Punitive, Too Restrictive." However, some people involved in community organizing in Denver and from around the state raised the need to approach communities of color on different ground — and felt that the main campaign pitch would not appeal to or win over Latino and African-American voters. There were highly charged discussions and debates on this issue. Many English Plus members maintained that putting anything out publicly other than the "Too Costly, Too Punitive, Too Restrictive" would lose the critical white vote. Others claimed that not connecting this amendment to the struggle and issues of Latinos and African Americans would conversely result in losing needed votes from communities of color.

Out of this debate another group emerged: La Gente Coalition. Some organizations and individuals felt it was important to have a forum for framing the work differently in communities of color, and wanted an open and supportive environment in which to create strategies to do so. Even with their differences, the two groups were able to work together to defeat Unz by agreeing on the following guidelines for both coalitions in the work:

• Everyone would honor the mainstream campaign message in front of the press;

• Everyone would honor the mainstream campaign message in front of the press;
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• People could frame the messages differently in communities of color; and
• There would be open lines of communication and collaboration between the two groups regarding presentations and events.

Padres Unidos
Many grassroots efforts helped to contribute to the defeat of Amendment 31 across the state. Members of Padres and Jovenes Unidos (the youth component of Padres Unidos) dedicated weekends throughout the fall to walking their neighborhoods with flyers, talking with people, registering voters door-to-door, and distributing information at their churches. At one housing project, volunteers registered more than 75 first-time voters. In their schools, students made classroom presentations to raise awareness and gain support for the campaign. People marched and spoke at rallies, gave interviews, and appeared on Spanish-language TV to explain how the amendment would affect the immigrant community. Students also organized a community forum and debate at their high school.

Lessons Learned
We feel we learned a number of lessons in defeating Amendment 31 in Colorado:
• We must build broad-based coalitions and unifying entities to defeat such measures;
• Different messages will resonate with different nationalities and groups of people, and we should not negate one for the other;
• We need to consciously build unity by educating one another on the reasons for coming together to defeat such attacks; and
• While we need to immediately defend the right to bilingual education and defeat backwards initiatives such as Amendment 31, we also need to see this organizing as part of building a movement for the long haul that has the capacity to take up future struggles for language rights and educational justice for all.

Padres Unidos, a RESIST grantee, organizes parents and students of color to fight for educational equity and justice. For more information contact Padres Unidos, 2009 W 33rd Ave, Denver, CO 80211; padres_unidos@hotmail.com. This article is reprinted with permission from Rethinking Schools (Spring 2003 Volume 17, No. 3), 1001 E. Keefe Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53212; (414) 964-9646, or (800) 669-4192, webrs@execpc.com.

Bay State Votes to Kill Bilingual Ed
Bilingual Vote Exposed Voter Biases on Language, Culture and Race

TY DEPASS

Bankrolled by Silicon Valley millionaire, Ron Unz, “English for the Children” is becoming a national crusade to eliminate bilingual instruction in our public schools. In an interview prior to the 1998 California vote, Unz explained that Proposition 227 was supposed to end “the poisonous brew of bilingual education, multiculturalism and other ethnic separation policies...[that] threaten to destroy the tradition of American Education” (“Unz Keeps Focus on Bilingual Issue,” Sacramento Bee, 6/2/98). Instead, something called “sheltered English-immersion” is offered as a “common sense” alternative to bilingual instruction.

Following stunning successes with voters in California (1998) and Arizona (2000), Colorado and Massachusetts became battlegrounds in 2002. In “liberal” Massachusetts, “English for the Children” (Question 2) passed by a lopsided 70 percent to 30 percent suburban-based landslide. Meanwhile, its counterpart in “conservative” Colorado (Amendment 31) lost by an equally impressive margin (see page 1). Race, or more properly, racism, played a central role in each outcome.

Building on Myths and Money
It ain’t what you don’t know that hurts you, it’s what you do know that ain’t so... Language, culture and race have always been prominent factors defining what “being an American” means. In the earliest vision of an American nationhood, the US Constitution barely recognized blacks beyond three-fifths personhood, and Indians were considered “domestic foreigners.” Likewise, immigrants and refugees to the US have always confronted the bitter irony of having to renounce their homelands, customs and languages as the price of entry—checking who they are and what they bring at the borders. Consequently, bilingual education, rightly a method of academic instruction, is more commonly debated as a matter of social policy, individual rights or group entitlements.

In “What Works for the Children?” researchers with Harvard’s Civil Rights Project (June 2002) described the debates over bilingual education as “contentious because they have turned into arguments over what type of society America should be, rather than, simply, over the best way to help children learn.” Proponents of “English for the Children” routinely employ myths, half-truths and cynical misrepresentation of alternatives.

“Bilingual education is a classic example of an experiment that was begun with the best of humanitarian intentions,” Rosalie Peladino Porter explained to Atlantic Online (“The Case Against Bilingual Education,” May 1998). Alleging that a “bilingual education industry” is segregating immigrant children in failed programs, Porter, an outspoken Unz supporter, has made a career of discrediting research findings that favor bilingual strategies.

Among the research findings Porter objects to are those suggesting that literacy in the child’s first language facilitates literacy in a second language; or that English proficiency depends on a number of factors including the child’s age, level of prior schooling, parents’ educational level, the quality of teachers, and degree of exposure to English in the community. Porter also chooses to ignore the significant distinction between “playground English” and the language of the classroom, the Stanford-9s and SATs.

One of Unz’s favorite arguments against bilingual education in California used some creative manipulation of statistics to prove that bilingual education had failed 95 percent of “Limited-English-Proficient” (LEP) children in California’s public schools. Unz "continued on page four
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maintained that since only five percent of children designated LEP moved into “mainstream” English-dominant classrooms each year, bilingual classrooms were really “Spanish-only” ghettos that retarded their progress as English-language learners.

Among the facts not selected by Unz was that only 30 percent of all LEP students were in a “bilingual program” of any kind; of these, only 20 percent were in classrooms with teachers trained and certified for bilingual instruction. However, in pre-227 California, the percentage of English-language-learners successfully achieving literacy—acquiring academic content in two languages and moving into the mainstream annually—is roughly equivalent to the percentage afforded access to quality bilingual instruction.

A reasonable person might conclude that children exposed to the benefits of an accessible curriculum, competent teachers, and adequate classroom resources and support are more likely to succeed academically than children allowed to flounder in English-only classrooms with poorly prepared teachers.

And after five years, the annual rate of transition for LEP students in California is barely eight percent; the miraculous claims for sheltered immersion have proved disappointing in practice.

In truth, the rhetoric of “English for the Children” intentionally obscures a critical public policy question: whether or not children have the right to learn in a language they understand. Bilingual education emphasizes recognizing and using students’ cultural assets as the foundation for developing new academic competencies—including literacy in a second language.

Who Benefits and Who Decides?

Over the last 25 years, citizen-initiated ballot propositions, many bankrolled by corporate interests and organized by conservative groups, have become the vehicle-of-choice promoting a reactionary social agenda. In 1978, California’s Prop. 13 loosened an “anti-tax backlash” that swept the country, promising tax-relief to the middle class while forcing drastic reductions in much-needed public services.

California voters also approved the nation’s first “official English” legislation by ballot initiative (1986), inspiring similar measures in 37 other states. Flushed with success, a conservative bloc of wealthy Californians has since orchestrated a spate of well-funded, media-driven ballot campaigns tapping into the electorate’s fears, prejudices, and distrust of government—encouraging voters to ignore the critical social, fiscal and political consequences of their choices.

During the 1990s, California voters approved a number of ballot measures that: restricted the access of non-citizens to basic public services (Prop.187, 1994); ended alleged “racial preferences” in college admissions, state contracting and public employment (Prop.209, 1996); and dismantled bilingual education in favor of English-only instruction in the state’s public schools (Prop.227, 1998).

The term “liberal Massachusetts” begs the question: compared to what? One of 24 states authorizing citizen-initiated ballot questions, Bay State voters endorsed the “tax revolt” with Proposition 2-1/2 (1979); this was followed by a series of measures seeking further tax roll-backs, overturning rent control in Boston and other cities (1996), rejecting reforms in health care (2001) and electoral finance (2002). In each instance, a white, middle class, suburban electorate (not directly affected by the issue) played the decisive role in deciding critical policy questions.

Unz in Massachusetts

In Massachusetts, the Unz Initiative (Question 2) presented itself as a plebiscite on second-language instruction, multiculturalism and liberalism. On the table was a choice between what they called “a failed experiment,” and their tested “commonsense” teaching approach. This frame was never directly challenged—either by way of a forceful defense of the record of bilingual instruction, or by exposing Unz’s avowed political and ideological agenda.

That this voting bloc would opt to dismantle bilingual education came as no real surprise to anyone—with the possible exception of the statewide Vote-No campaign leadership. The “NO-on-2” campaign in Massachusetts displayed a curious unwillingness to defend bilingual instruction, deciding instead to “remove the Latino face” from the equation by adopting a hear-no/see-no/speak-no racism stance—effectively disarming the effort even before the battle was joined. Meanwhile, the ever-present currents of racism, cultural chauvinism and family mythology swirled, unmentioned, under the table.

The “No” campaign stubbornly clung to the belief that passing reform legislation would somehow blunt the momentum of Unz’s populist message. Counting suburban votes overshadowed efforts to edu-
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cate, consolidate and mobilize a language-
minority and progressive base. As a result,
the campaign lost precious time and di-
verted irreplaceable resources to an ill-con-
ceived quest for a message that white sub-
urbanites would be willing to hear. Accord-
ing to the political consultants, “Don’t Sue
Teachers” would appeal to the presumed
pro-union sentiments of most Bay State
voters; “One Size Doesn’t Fit All,” refer-
ing to the impact of this draconian policy
on students and families, seemed almost
an afterthought. Unz exploited these tacti-
cal errors and missteps to great effect—
the front-running gubernatorial candidate’s
opposition to bilingual education didn’t hurt.

The Morning After

The day after elections, as the reality of
the vote totals sunk in, the Internet buzzed
with analysis, predictions and not a little
venting. Activists debated whether to pur-
sue a legal injunction, support calls for a
phased implementation, lobby legislative
support for amendments, or secure “home-
rule” exemptions for school districts vot-
ing against Question 2.

In Boston, an alternative strategy fo-
cusing on organizing grassroots resistance
among primary stakeholders (bilingual stu-
dents, their parents, teachers and commu-
nities) has been proposed by a loose group-
ing of community-based organizations.
In the near-term, this effort will emphasize a
social justice framework challenging the
“tyranny of the majority” that denies so-
called minorities any real voice in the mat-
ter. The centerpiece of this strategy is a
citywide, monitored referendum on bilin-
geual education, restricted to the parents of
children actually enrolled in these programs
as of the 2002-2003 school-year. In addi-
tion to its symbolic value, this initiative
would contribute to the political moment-
num for a “home-rule” exemption in Boston.

For the long haul, the organizing task
will involve engaging the families of bilin-
geual students and monolingual parents in
joint exploration of the connections be-
tween the assaults on bilingual education
and systemic disparities of power, influence
and resource access in our public schools.

Ty dePass is a member of RESIST’s Board
of Directors. He is the associate editor of
Nonprofit Quarterly Magazine and a
bilingual activist in the Boston area.

FAQ About Bilingual Ed

MASSACHUSETTS ENGLISH
PLUS COALITION

Below are a series of questions prepared
by the Massachusetts English Plus Coa-
lition (a RESIST grantee) and reprinted
with their permission. For more infor-
mation, contact them at 18 Tremont
Street, Suite 320, Boston, MA 02108;
info@massenglishplus.org

What is bilingual education and how
long do students stay in the program?

Bilingual Education is a program used
to help limited English proficient (LEP) chil-
dren keep up with all their required aca-
demic competencies, such as math, history
and science, while they are learning En-
glish through ESL (English as a Second
Language) classes. Many LEP students
learn to speak conversational English
within the first 2 years, but research con-
sistently shows that it takes 4 to 7 years
before most students are able to use En-
glish to learn academic subjects and perform
on a par with native English-speaking peers.

National research (Collier & Thomas
1996) shows that late-exit quality bilingual
programs actually create the best results,
with students in two-way bilingual pro-
grams (bilingual students and native-En-
glish speakers learning in two languages
in the same classroom) out-performing their
mainstream peers. Despite what the research
is showing, most bilingual education pro-
grams transition their students into the
mainstream within the first three years.

What was the early history of bilingual
education in this country?

Bilingual Education has been used to
teach immigrants at various times, espe-
cially during the first wave of European
immigration during the 19th century. In
the public schools of many states between 1839
and 1880—including Ohio, Louisiana, and
New Mexico—German, French, and Span-
ish were used for instruction. Between 1880
and 1917, German-English bilingual schools,
in which both languages were used for in-
struction, operated in Ohio, Minnesota, and
Maryland. At the turn of the century, bilin-
geual education began to decline as the re-
sult of the rise of nativism and the Ameri-
canization movement which called for to-
tal assimilation as a goal for all immigrants.
Aside for some parochial schools, bilingual
education was almost completely eradicated
after the first World War as anti-German
attitudes and xenophobia began to take hold.

What is the legal basis for bilingual
education?

The legal basis for bilingual education
is Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
which prohibits discrimination based on
race, color, and national origin. Under this
principle, the Supreme Court ruled in the
1974 case of Lau vs. Nichols that school
districts must have affirmative programs
to ensure that LEP students have equal ac-
cess to the standard curriculum.

Our grandparents did not have bilingual
education, Why do we need it now?

In the past, without bilingual education,
most immigrants did not even finish high
school. Immigrants at that time could sur-
vive working in low-skilled manufacturing
jobs without a high school diploma and
with limited English-speaking skills. How-
ever, the job market has changed today—
three out of every four jobs require some
post-secondary training. Quality bilingual
education programs would help students
to finish high school and go on to post-
secondary educational training.

Is bilingual education cost effective?

Average per pupil expenditure for bilin-
geual education students in Massachusetts
is approximately $1.13 to every $1.00 spent
on mainstream students (1993 figures). Bilin-
geual programs have been proven to be
cost effective for the following reasons: 1)
LEP students who choose bilingual edu-
cation programs are less likely to be placed
into expensive special education programs
as those who choose to stay in English-only
programs. 2) With the additional support,
bilingual education students are less likely
to drop out of high school than their lan-
guage minority peers in English-only pro-
grams. 3) Bilingual education helps to nur-
ture and support the continual develop-
ment of valuable bilingual/bicultural skills
that are needed in our global economy.

continued on page six
Who is behind the English-only movement?

The English Only movement is the organized effort to make English the official language of the United States. While multi-millionaire Ron Unz has funded many anti-bilingual education ballot initiatives, the English-only movement is led principally by a multi-million dollar right wing organization called US English.

Dr. John Tanton, principal founder and architect of US English, is also the founder and former chairman of the anti-immigration organization, FAIR (Federation for American Immigration Reform). FAIR is the leading national agency promoting the current wave of legislation and policy restricting immigration and denying benefits for immigrants.

Another questionable source of US English's earlier funding was the Pioneer Fund, which supports eugenics research for racial betterment. Pioneer Fund was created in 1937 to support what it called "applied genetics in present day Germany," referring to Hitler's program of forced sterilization.

The third principal funding source for US English was Mellon heiress Cordelia Scaife May, who poured at least $5.8 million to US English, FAIR and other affiliated organizations during the 1980s through her Laurel Foundation. May's Laurel Foundation sponsored the publication of The Camp of the Saints, a futuristic novel about the destruction of European civilization by Third World immigrants.

Reading, Writing and Rights

Bilingual Education is A Human and Civil Right

A RETHINKING SCHOOLS EDITORIAL

In 1864, Congress prohibited Native-American children from being taught in their own languages. It took the US government 70 years to overturn that law. Now they're at it again. The federal government and the states have taken steps toward banning bilingual education in several states and weakening it in virtually every state. We hope it won't take another 70 years to restore students' right to learn their own languages in school.

Silicon Valley millionaire Ron Unz has spearheaded four statewide ballot initiatives to ban bilingual education. Three of these have won and resulted in anti-child policies in California (1998), Arizona (2000), and now Massachusetts (2002). In this latest election in Massachusetts, 70 percent of the voters approved the "English for the Children" initiative, which will take bilingual education away from children who need it. (Ironically, Massachusetts was the first state in the nation to legislatively support bilingual education some 31 years ago.)

In Colorado, voters defeated a similar measure (56 percent to 44 percent) this past November, thanks to the hard work of bilingual education activists such as members of English Plus and the financial support of Pat Stryker, a wealthy parent whose child attends a two-way bilingual program in Fort Collins. But such state referenda are just the tip of the iceberg. The federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) includes significant anti-bilingual components that threaten bilingual students in all states.

The ESEA requires English Language Learners to take standardized tests in English within three years of entering the US school system—not enough time to gain academic English proficiency. This time crunch forces many bilingual schools to restructure their programs and emphasize English over native-language instruction. The mean-spirited way many states have decided to implement these assessment regimes makes them partners in the federal government's attack on bilingual education. (See www.rethinkingschools.org for background articles.)

James Crawford, one of the nation's best-known writers on bilingual education, wrote in the Summer 2002 issue of Rethinking Schools that the ESEA was an "Obituary for the Bilingual Education Act of 1968." He explained that a provision of the ESEA eliminated the Bilingual Education Act and replaced it with the English Language Acquisition Act. Where the former stressed language development in both English and students' native languages and promoted equal access to the curriculum, the latter expects schools to focus on English only. And if these attacks weren't enough, "English Only" groups continue to organize to have cities, counties, and states proclaim English as their "official language." Such proposals build on public anti-immigrant sentiment and lead to divisive and unnecessary conflicts.

Xenophobic Policies

It's no coincidence that all of this is occurring during the largest wave of non-English speaking immigrants in the history of the United States. The current xenophobic policies in our schools and communities are the newest chapter in a long, predictable book. (Previous chapters included, among other embarrassments, the outlawing of Native-American languages in schools in 1864 and a rash of shutting down German bilingual education programs in the Midwest during a surge of "nativism" around the time of World War I.)

Many mark the beginning of this new anti-immigrant organizing with the 1994 passage of California's Proposition 187, which made it illegal for children of undocumented immigrants to attend public schools. (Fortunately the Federal Courts ruled this law unconstitutional.) And Unz has since successfully dismantled bilingual ed in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts.

continued on page seven
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Bush took the same side, using federal legislation to weaken bilingual education in those states that Unz has not yet conquered.

A Human and Civil Right

The current attack on bilingual education denies children a basic human and civil right—the right to learn in their native language. Article 29 of the Convention on the Rights of a Child adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1989 (and ratified by all nations except the United States and Somalia) states that "the education of the child should be directed to ... the development of respect for the child's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language and values." Article 30 states that "a child belonging to an [ethnic, religious, or linguistic minority] should not be denied the right ... to use his or her own language."

In 1998 the Linguistic Society of America also affirmed this basic human right. It passed a resolution supporting the right of all residents of the United States "to have their children educated in a manner that affirmatively acknowledges their native language abilities as well as ensures their acquisition of English."

Not only is the right to learn in one's native language a human right, it is a civil right as well. In 1974, the US Supreme Court ruled in Lau vs. Nichols that California schools without special provisions to educate language minority students were violating the students' civil rights. This decision gave impetus to the bilingual education movement.

In our minds, the civil right to an equal opportunity in education is clearly violated when children are denied an education that is comprehensible. If students are placed in "English immersion" classes, large chunks of the curriculum will be incomprehensible. This violates a basic civil right to equal treatment under the law.

We are disturbed by the way voters are manipulated by money and misinformation to vote for policies that harm children, but it's difficult to hold individual voters accountable for their actions. However, elected officials who voted for the ESEA can and should be held accountable for their actions.

Any hope of overturning the current anti-bilingual policies begins with students, families, and educators. We need to show state and federal legislators how their discriminatory policies affect children and force them to change their positions before the ESEA comes up for reauthorization six years from now.

As educators who believe in social justice we think it is important to fight for everyone's human and civil rights. Ultimately, we believe that all children should have the right to learn at least two languages, including their mother tongue. Throughout the world children become bilingual or multilingual and it is valued. We call upon everyone who believes in bilingual education to testify, organize, and demand that our children's rights be restored and protected.

This editorial is reprinted with permission from the Winter 2002/2003 issue of Rethinking Schools, an independent journal available for $15/year. See resource list below for more information.

Below is a partial list of resources about bilingual education.

Massachusetts English Plus Coalition, 18 Tremont Street, Suite 320, Boston, MA 02108; info@massenglishplus.org
A statewide coalition dedicated to helping communities confront the problem of racism as it is linked to language-based discrimination through advocacy, coalition-building and educational activities

National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), 1030 15th St., NW Suite 470, Washington, DC 20005; www.nabe.org
A national nonprofit organization devoted to representing the interests of language-minority students and bilingual education professionals

National Association for Multicultural Education, 733 Fifteenth Street NW, Suite 430, Washington, D.C. 20005; name@nameorg.org; www.nameorg.org
Provides resources and support that help educators promote a philosophy of inclusion that embraces the basic tenets of cultural pluralism

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 2121 K Street NW Suite 260, Washington DC 20037; www.nclca.gwu.edu; askncela@nclca.gwu.edu
News, discussion groups and resources for educators working with linguistically and culturally diverse students

National Coalition of Education Activists (NCEA), 1420 Walnut Street, Suite 720; NCEA@aol.com
A multiracial network and membership organization of parents, school staff, union and community activists, and children's advocates committed to social justice, the elimination of bias of all kinds, and high quality public schools

Department of Education office that deals with bilingual education, including a website on federal policies on bilingual education, links to research information, and more governmental grants.

Political Research Associates, 1310 Broadway, Suite 201, Somerville, MA 02144; www.publiceye.org
An independent nonprofit research center that has been studying the political Right since 1981, and offers Defending Public Education, a Resource Kit for public school advocates

Radical Teacher, P.O. Box 382616, Cambridge, Ma 02238; www.wpunj.edu/radteach
An independent magazine for educational workers focusing on critical teaching practice, the political economy of education, and institutional struggles.

Rethinking Schools, 1001 E. Keefe Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53212; www.rethinkingschools.org
An independent journal committed to equity and to the vision that public education is central to the creation of a humane, caring, multiracial democracy. Their website includes a collection of articles on bilingual education.

Salem/Keizer Coalition for Equality, PO Box 4296, Salem, OR 97302
A multi-racial educational justice group working to protect bilingual education and other educational services
GRANT TYPES

RESIST provides several ways for radical and progressive activist organizations to get money to do their work. For a more complete description of what, when and how RESIST funds, please visit our website (www.resistinc.org) or call the office (617-623-5110).

Priority Grants

Priority Grants are the heart of RESIST's grant-making program and include the bulk of RESIST's awards. Groups with a budget of $125,000 or less that are engaged in activist organizing and educational work within movements for social change may apply for a one-year grant. The maximum amount requested cannot exceed $3,000. RESIST provides both general support and grants for specific campaigns or projects.

One form of Priority grants focuses on media-related activism. The radical use of the media can have a powerful impact on organizing actions for change. In making media-related grants, RESIST prioritizes funding for cultural and/or artistic projects that are effective tools or means for organizing. Funding will be given to those projects that are not individually driven, but rather reflect a group process. The primary funding request must be for the dissemination or utilization of the resource, and the actual product will be assessed in terms of its potential impact. The bottom line for a successful media proposal, however, will be whether the project will be used specifically in the context of a campaign for social change.

Accessibility Grants

RESIST is committed to supporting projects that enable all people to participate in the movement for social justice. RESIST will fund the additional costs of projects or events in order to make them accessible to people with disabilities (e.g. signers for events, or wheelchair accessible venues) for amounts up to $3,000.

Application procedures for Accessibility Grants are the same as for Priority Grants. Organizations which receive an accessibility grant may apply for a second project within the same 12-month funding period.

Emergency Grants

Emergency Grants of up to $300 are available on an "as-needed" basis. These grants are designed to help groups respond quickly to unexpected organizing needs. While it is impossible to precisely define an emergency, these grants are generally given to provide support for demonstrations, or other events arising from a political crisis. These grants are not intended to provide a safety net for groups who have failed to adequately plan for their financial needs, or who have missed the regular funding deadline.

Loans

RESIST has a revolving loan fund for groups that are planning direct mailings, fund raising events, subscription campaigns and other projects that are intended to raise money. Groups can also apply to the RESIST loan fund for advance payments on bus rentals to transport members to marches or rallies. Loans are available in increments of $500 up to $3,000. Loan reimbursements are expected within six months unless a specific agreement has been made to the contrary. Application procedures for loans are the same as for Priority Grants.

Multi-Year Grants

Grantees who have been funded by RESIST at least twice during the preceding five years may apply for a multi-year grant. Multi-year grants will cover a three year period and are designed to provide general support to eligible grantee organizations. All multi-year applicants must: 1) complete the RESIST Grant Application; 2) submit answers to the Multi-Year Grant Questionnaire; and 3) be currently eligible to receive grant awards under RESIST’s Funding Guidelines. All applicants must provide specific, measurable objectives as part of their proposal. These objectives should demonstrate the capacity to plan at least one to three years ahead.

Join the Resist Pledge Program!

We'd like you to consider becoming a Resist Pledge. Pledges account for over 30% of our income.

By becoming a pledge, you help guarantee Resist a fixed and dependable source of income on which we can build our grant-making program. In return, we will send you a monthly pledge letter and reminder along with your newsletter. We will also keep you up-to-date on the groups we have funded and the other work being done at Resist.

So take the plunge and become a Resist Pledge! We count on you, and the groups we fund count on us.

☐ I'll send you my pledge of $____ every month/quarter/six months/year (please circle one).

☐ Enclosed is an initial pledge contribution of $_____.

☐ Please automatically deduct my pledge from my credit card (below).

☐ I can't join the pledge program now, but here's a contribution of $____ to support your work.

Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________

Phone Number (for confirmation only) ________________________________
Visa/Master Card # ____________________________
Expiration Date ___________________________

Resist • 259 Elm Street • Somerville • MA • 02144. Donations are tax-deductible.

New Application Available Online

RESIST recently revised its grant application, which will be used beginning with the April 2003 grant cycle. It can be downloaded by visiting RESIST's website: www.resistinc.org.