A Model Case of a Bilingual Education Program in the U.S. Public Education System

—The Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program, San Francisco in 1970's—

Koichi Ando

Abstract: In the early 1970's, in San Francisco, a historical educational demand on the establishment of Japanese bilingual bicultural education program within the public school system was proposed by the third generation of Japanese American parents. The reaction to this demand was overwhelmingly negative because their American-born children were English-speaking. The general public, therefore, did not see any reason to spend tax money to teach Japanese in a public school. Why did English-speaking parents demand such a program? How did they build the foundation to maintain the program for over 40 years, as it continues up to the present as one of the best alternative programs in the school district? This paper examines the history and successes of the program based on the Japanese Americans' history and interviews conducted with the founding members of the program. In addition, I myself was employed as an instructional aide in late 1970's and my American born children attended the program. This personal experience was a strong motivation to write this paper.

Keywords: International education, American education, Japanese American education

要約

1970 年代初頭、サンフランシスコの日系三世が提唱した「日英バイリンガル教育」は、公立小学校内でのプログラム設立を要請したことによって、歴史的な意味をもつことになった。三世自身が英語を母国語とする、日本語を話せない世代であり、その子どもである四世のために「公費を使って日本語を教える。」という発想に対して、一般市民の反応は非常に否定的であった。なぜ、三世の親たちは、すでに存在する私立の日本語学校ではなく、公教育の中での日英バイリンガル教育を強く要求したのだろうか。サンフランシスコ公立学校区の中で、今、現在まで 40 年以上もの間、レベルの高い教育を提供し続けている日英バイリンガル教育プログラム創設について、日系アメリカ人の歴史と、実際に創立に尽力した三世への聞き取り調査をもとにして解明しようとした試みが、この研究ノートである。筆者自身も、70 年代後半に助教師としてこのプログラムで働き、また筆者のアメリカ生まれの二人の子どもたちも、生徒として学んだプログラムの歴史的意味を、一つの形として残しておきたいという強い思いからこの論文が完成したことを追記しておきたい。

キーワード：日英バイリンガル教育、多文化教育、国際教育

Introduction

The United States of America, as a land of immigrants, naturally required a common language to unify the country. English has become the de-facto language and English as a Second Language Programs (ESL) were developed early within the US educational system to Americanize people who arrived from all over the world. However, early ESL programs could not meet the educational needs of rapidly increasing numbers of children of immigrants from Central and South America and Asia, particularly after a new immigration law was enacted in 1965. Bilingual education was initially developed out of the weaknesses of ESL education. At that time, however, bilingual education was considered to be merely a more effective special language program for children of poor immigrant families. Therefore, when Japanese American parents attempted to establish a bilingual bicultural education program for their English-speaking children at a public school system in San Francisco in the early 1970's, the general public response to this proposal was overwhelmingly negative.

Why did English-speaking Japanese American parents demand and organize a bilingual bicultural education program within a public school system? How did they build the foundation to maintain the program for over 40 years as it continues up to the present to be one of the best alternative programs in the San Francisco Unified School District?

This paper examines the history and successes of this program. In the first section, I briefly review the post-1960's history of bilingual education in the United States and summarize the related laws to clarify the background and explain the demand for bilingual education by ethnic minority groups.

The second part contextualizes the history of Japanese Americans in the United States. Public education is one of the main instruments in reinforcing ideas and belief systems, and one idea that is implicit in educational systems is the abandoning of a minority group's culture and language. This process of assimilation creates an authoritative relationship between the majority and the minority groups in the society. In this paper, the majority is the dominant white culture and Japanese Americans are a minority group. This leads us to the question: Who are those Japanese Americans and in particular who are the "Sansei," or the third generation of Japanese Americans that demanded a bilingual education for their children? This section answers this question within the context of the history of Japanese in America.

The third section describes the process of the establishment of Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program (hereafter JBBP) in San Francisco Unified School District. When the JBBP opened its doors in 1973 there were three basic groups enrolled: Japanese nationals whose mother tongue is Japanese, fourth generation (Yonsei) Japanese Americans whose mother tongue is English, and other Americans whose mother tongue is English. Among the three groups, the founding and the most dedicated group was Sansei, or third generation Japanese Americans. The parents in this

group composed the active steering committee to organize and run the program. The question of their motivation to make such a strong commitment to the program is the subject of this section.

Finally I draw on my personal experience to underscore the importance of JBBP. I immigrated to the U.S. from Japan in 1974 and studied at San Francisco State University. Through the practicum of the education course I was introduced to JBBP, and later became an instructional aide. Through my work in this program I became aware of the existence of the Japanese American community. As a newcomer from Japan, I was an "outsider" to both mainstream society and the Japanese American community. I quickly realized that in Japan, I was a member of the majority, or the dominant group. In this light, my perspective in writing these notes is not solely from the point of view of a researcher but also that of an active participant. In addition to my personal experience, both of my American-born children, attended JBBP. After so many years, they still remember their school and teachers very well. This article is therefore one of personal as well as academic interest.

Section 1
Bilingual Education

Part 1. Minority's View and Majority's View of Bilingual Education

In the United States of America, a multi-ethnic nation created by immigrants, the first attempt was made to articulate educational programs as part of human rights in the Asian community. The Lau vs. Nichols case was one such representative struggle. In 1970, Kinney Kinmon Lau filed a suit in the Federal District court in San Francisco against Alan Nichols, President of the San Francisco Board of Education on behalf of nearly 2,000 Chinese-speaking students. The suit alleged that Chinese-speaking children were not receiving the kind of education which they were entitled to because of their need for special English classes. The plaintiffs asked the District Court to order the Board of Education to provide special English classes with bilingual teachers, basing their argument on the violation of Federal, State Constitutions,1964 Civil Rights Act, and Provisions of the California Education Code.

After being denied relief at lower court levels, the case was appealed to the Supreme Court. In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled that the San Francisco Unified School District was in violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and that it had a responsibility to provide an equal educational opportunity to non-English–speaking Chinese children. This remains the most significant federal decision protecting linguistic minority educational rights and it further represents a significant victory by a minority community. Previous to this decision, the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII was passed in 1968, and that provided supplemental funding for school districts interested in establishing programs to meet the special educational needs of large numbers of children with limited English-speaking ability. However, under this act, the children also had to be from low-income families. It was geared towards serving low-income groups, acting as a program targeting an immigrants' issue. In other words, it was

an educational strategy designed to remediate the effects of poverty and cultural disadvantages. Under the decision the Supreme Court decision expanded access to bilingual education to include all non or limited-English speaking children.

Title VII opened a new educational era. Prior to 1968, there were no federally funded bilingual bicultural education programs. Its effect was immediate and profound, as Susan G. Schneider, author of *Revolution, Reaction, or Reform:the 1974 Bilingual Education Act* noted: “In 1969, one year after Title VII was signed into law, there were 76 federally-funded bilingual bicultural programs operating in the U.S. Five years later, there were 305 federally-funded programs in 41 states” (p. 21).

Following this act, in 1970, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department sent a memorandum stating the responsibility of any school district having more than a five percent language minority student population to provide equal educational opportunities for all children. Then, in 1974, the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII was amended. The requirement to serve low-income students was eliminated and expanded to include all minority language students.

In exploring the historical background of these educational policies, an argument could be made that they were developed to balance the needs of the minority educational rights movement based on its acquired civil rights, and the national goal of public education to develop a unified body of citizens through the Americanization of all racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities. In other words, the government met its needs by utilizing the minority’s demand as an alternative solution for social integration problems. On the side of the minority educational movement, the first attempt to change the educational system based on its needs was met, although not fully.

The English language is the key tool in the national goal of public education as part of the Americanization process. This process is particularly significant in the United States of America, the nation that historically accepts the greatest number of immigrants. In part based upon U.S. power in international politics, English has come to be considered a global language and ESL has become a highly developed program to unify all children under one language. At the same time, children of immigrants were required to assimilate into the mainstream educational value system and subconsciously taught to abandon their native tongues. This has created problems, especially among rapidly increasing non-white immigration populations, such as Mexicans, Puerto- Ricans and Asian groups. One of the fundamental problems with language education was that English language acquisition classes were taught only in English.

As a result of not being able to comprehend classroom discussions and lessons, social problems such as truancy, drop-outs rates and low grades increased. Criticism from the minority community arose out of these social problems. ESL classes impeded participation in general classes where non-English speaking children were pulled out of mainstream classes and put into separate classes; this was complicated by the fact that ESL programs were usually not conducted in conjunction with general curriculum. Students therefore were alienated from their peers and, their inability to participate

impeded the development of their self-esteem. Bilingual education program was developed from the weakness of ESL programs.

From the minority community's criticism and the movement for equal educational opportunities, in dialogue with governmental need to remedy social problems, the 1968 Title VII and the laws discussed above were developed. All these educational policies, however, emphasized the assimilation mechanism to create a homogeneous, unified student body through bilingual programs rather than enhance children's multi-cultural backgrounds. Indeed, bilingual education was initially no different, as Josue Gonzalez, author of "Bilingual Education: Ideologies of the Past Decade," argues: "What legislators and witnesses alike had in mind was the use of bilingual instruction to bring about a transition from the use of the vernacular in informal situations to the exclusive use of English in the formal setting of the schools" (p. 26).

Even in the Lau vs. Nichols case, the minority's view that bilingual education was an equal educational right was not fully understood and reflected in the court decision. The court of appeals determined that the Chinese community should be blamed for causing the language deficiency of the children, and stated that, "I merely wish to make plain that when, in another case, we are concerned with a very few youngsters, or with just a single child who speaks only German or Polish or Spanish or any other language other than English, I would not regard today's decision. For me, numbers are at the heart of this case and my concurrence is to be understood accordingly" (Lau v. Nichols, 1974).

As I mentioned above, it is true that this remains the most significant federal decision protecting language minority educational rights; however, this should also be considered within the context of governmental policies, which are based on the perspective of educational approaches such as Assimilation-Compensation-Remedial described in the Part 2. Regardless of whether a program was ESL or bilingual education, the public accepted it as a means for language minority children to acquire English in order to assimilate into mainstream culture. In this sense, a bilingual education was seen merely as a more effective special language program for those children. Therefore, when the Japanese American parents attempted to establish a bilingual bicultural education program for their English-speaking children, the public rejection of this program was overwhelming as it served not assimilation function of education, but the legitimization of minority groups.

Part 2. Different Approaches to Bilingual Education

Before I examine the JBBP program, I would like to define the different approaches to bilingual education based on the definitions in "Coming of Age in Bilingual Bicultural Education: A Historical Perspective" by Josue Gonzalez as follows:

1. Transitional: primarily for limited English-speaking children to teach the curriculum in both the child's native language and English. The purpose is to teach English as a common language so that children may adjust to American society while child's native language is used as a

means to present comprehensive material.

2. Maintenance and Succession: primarily for minority children to teach the child's own cultural heritage and native language. The purpose is to enhance the child's self-esteem and create a positive self-image.
3. Recapture: primarily for English-speaking minority children to restore their ethnic language deprived them in previous history and present their cultural heritage to instill a positive self-identity as an American with ethnic roots.
4. Enrichment: for all children including mainstream Americans. In this multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society, it is important to learn and acquire other languages and cultures other than English. This type of the educational program enhances the growth of all children (Gonzales, p. 7-8).

Bilingual bicultural education is not only based upon the transitional approach but also on a recapture of cultural heritage, which is founded upon the notion of cultural pluralism. This new approach to bilingual education came about in part through the establishment of JBBP. As I stated above, JBBP basically consists of three categories of student groups: Japanese nationals, Japanese Americans, and others; the students thus have different needs, such as a transitional or a maintenance approach, which means that this program was not only viewed as a recapture program. However, the main force of its establishment was Japanese Americans, and the core philosophy is based particularly upon this group's historical experience, as I demonstrate in Section III.

Thus, because of the diverse student body, the JBBP embodies all of the approaches mentioned, with particular emphasis on the recapture approach. The recapture approach became the basis when the group eventually sought to create the educational enrichment program. This program emphasizes the importance and acceptance of differences in culture and language of both mainstream children and children with multi-ethnic/cultural backgrounds; consequently it instills a global sense of America as a multicultural society. Indeed, when the JBBP began, the program had an ethnically well balanced quota of students. It helped the program to implement its enrichment approach, benefiting all the children with different backgrounds in the US.

I also would like to call attention to this recapture approach, which is considered radical as it is in conflict with the government's educational goal based on assimilation and transitional approaches. The JBBP was formed by Japanese Americans, who historically have been considered a quiet, model minority that successfully assimilated into mainstream society. The JBBP was a turning point, bringing into focus the fact that this ethnic group turned its attention away from the assimilation process of schooling and moved towards strengthening its ethnic identity.

Section II

Japanese Americans

Part 1: A Brief History of Japanese in the US

Japanese Americans are the only immigrant group in the U.S. who have specific linguistic terms for each generation of descendants from the original immigrant group. This generational consciousness has created a pattern of changing ideas, decisions and actions. We can understand that pattern through an examination of the history of Japanese in the United States, primarily through a brief examination of attitudes in American society towards each successive generation of Japanese Americans. An erosion in the assimilation process coupled with a strong ethnic identification from the first generation to the third generation is immediately apparent. The historical climate of each generation is an important factor that greatly influenced the movement towards recapturing Japanese culture.

The history of Japanese immigration to America can be traced back over 130 years to between the 1880s and the early 1900's. The first generation of Japanese Americans are addressed as Issei, which means merely "first generation;" their off-springs are then Nisei, "second generation," and the children of Nisei are the Sansei, "third generation." Japanese immigration was forced to stop after 1924 when the US Congress passed the New Immigration Law, also known as the Japanese Exclusion Act. The term "Issei" is only applied to that tremendous first wave of immigrants in the early part of the twentieth century, unduplicated thereafter. It is this unique history of Japanese immigration that created a Japanese American community built from one family tree with little interruption from a flow of new immigrants.

The first immigrants from Japan were primarily plantation workers who came to Hawaii in 1868. In 1869, the first group of immigrants arrived on the U.S. mainland. In 1882, the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed by the U.S. Congress, and after that America needed another source of "cheap labor" to replace the Chinese. In 1885, 900 Japanese immigrants arrived in Hawaii in accordance with the Japan-Hawaii (Kingdom) Treaty. More Japanese came to work on the plantations after Hawaii was annexed as a U.S. territory. On the mainland, as the demand for cheap labor increased, the Japanese started to migrate to the West Coast through Hawaii.

This migration was in part caused by the fact that in Japan, the end of the Japan-Russo War resulted in an economic depression and created increased unemployment. These social factors forced many young men to seek opportunities abroad. During this time, the rapid influx of immigrants caused anti-Japanese sentiments in the United States. As early as 1893, a regulation was introduced by the San Francisco School Board that provided for the segregation of Japanese children within a public school, and in 1907 the School Board ordered the segregation of 93 Japanese students. After that, many anti-Japanese proposals were introduced to the legislature. In order to reduce tensions, Gentlemen's Agreement was formalized in 1908 and Japan ceased further emigration to the U.S.

thereafter.

Around this time, Japanese immigrants, most of whom were single males, found a unique form of marriage. These marriages were arranged through the "picture bride" system, in which photos were exchanged between the two parties overseas. After 1910, distinct groups of Japanese women, who were wives of Japanese immigrants started to come into U.S. ports to join their husbands. Although Japan had stopped sending out immigrant laborers, the U.S. still accepted immediate relatives such as wives of immigrants established in America. This arranged marriage system enabled Issei men to marry Japanese women and bring them to America to start a family in the new land. This was a key point in the creation of the Japanese American family and community.

The Immigration Act of 1924 was passed by the U.S. Congress, and it prohibited all immigration to the United States from Japan. Thus, the first generation families had their beginning and end between 1885 (the arrival of the first group of the plantation workers to Hawaii) and 1924. There was subsequently no Japanese immigration until after the end of World War II. Postwar the U.S.- Japan Peace Treaty Act of 1952 reopened immigration from Japan. This gap of 28 years resulted in the growth of distinct generations of Japanese descendants uninterrupted by a continuous flow of new immigrants.

The internment of 120,000 Japanese on the West Coast in February 1942, two months after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, played a significant role in shattering the dignity of Japanese Americans. They were completely stripped of their already minimal political, economic, and social rights. To prove their loyalty, many American-citizen of the Nisei generation, who comprised two thirds of the interned, joined the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, which became the most decorated team in the U.S. Army. There were some who went to prison because they contended that their basic liberties should be restored before they went to war. There were also a few of Nisei who challenged the constitutionality of their incarceration through litigation. Later this painful part of their history became a unified rallying point for demands of redress and reparation.

Part 2: Issei, Nisei and Sansei

The transmittal of Japanese language and values to younger generations was in the hands of families, but through severe hardship this link to Japanese culture was broken in less than three generations of Japanese in America. The original Japanese immigrants, the Issei, suffered overt discrimination. To survive in America during a period of high anti-Japanese sentiment, they segregated themselves by forming self-sufficient communities. In larger cities such as San Francisco and Los Angeles, Japanese restaurants, newspaper companies, churches and temples, social clubs, stores, and resident hotels sprung up to provide a safe atmosphere while living in a hostile society. During this time, there were hardly any avenues open for the Issei to assimilate into mainstream life. As a result of these factors, their lives were controlled by a culture that they did not understand and felt unable to

influence.

The Issei envisioned a brighter future for the Japanese in America with the birth of the second generation, or Nisei children. Through the Nisei, who at birth were American citizens, successful acceptance of the Japanese could be achieved through higher education because Nisei would be better equipped to live in the mainstream society. However, the constant bombardment of desirable traits by a society with little tolerance for different ways of life, lead the Nisei towards denouncing their ethnic culture and assimilating. The reaction to this stress culminated in a type of self-hatred, wherein many of the Nisei tended to reject a Japanese identity. Some of the Nisei suffered from what was vulgarly referred to as a “banana” complex, which means that physically they were Asian and yellow skinned, but inside, their souls desired to be white. The banana complex describes the difficulty the Nisei had in deciding which culture was owed their primary loyalty. It is within this context that the Nisei, the generation that did not transmit Japanese language to the Sansei, the next generation, must be understood.

Many Sansei were born during and immediately after World War II, and they were primarily raised in middle-class surroundings with few overt ties to their grandparents heritage except for their skin color and facial features. Unlike the social climate their Nisei parents were raised in, the Sansei were growing up on college campuses with minority movements advocating pride and ethnic consciousness. Cultural conflicts were reconciled by integrating aspects of both Japanese and American cultures to develop the ethnic identity. From this generation, we inherit the term “Japanese American.”

Part 3: Sansei and Identity Crisis

After the internment, many Japanese had to start life all over again. They were stripped of their homes, businesses and their communities. In the immediate postwar period, after their release from relocation camps, many returned to take up residency in Japantown or Nihonmachi of San Francisco and Little Tokyo of Los Angeles areas, which had to be rebuilt. Despite their efforts to rebuild the community, in the late 1950s, a redevelopment project began which aimed to wipe out the ghettos and undeveloped areas in the big cities, and these areas included the Japanese enclaves. Until the early 1970s, over 3,000 families were uprooted from Japantown in San Francisco in order for the redevelopment project to proceed. The Issei and Nisei, in this sense, were evacuated by the government twice in their lifetimes.

As the community was dispersed, campus activities flared. Many Sansei in their twenties began to join the Asian American student movements that flourished in conjunction with the civil rights movement during the same period. As mentioned previously, Sansei were raised by Nisei parents who attempted to assimilate into mainstream life. Some Sansei had fallen into an “identity crisis” which the civil rights movement made them face. As part of the identity crisis, Sansei questioned

their identification with the Anglo majority culture. Physically, Sansei look Japanese and some have knowledge of Japanese culture, but relatively little knowledge of the Japanese language, and are unable to communicate with their grandparents (Issei), who acted as the transmitters of history and culture. They heard about the Japanese internment of their parents and grandparents but they remained silent. The schools taught them about American history and Asian history, but not about Asians' history in America nor the grounds and argument for the internment of citizens of the United States.

The Sansei began to actively investigate their own history to find an answer to the question, "Who am I?" The search was explicitly tied into the movement to establish a new area of study, which educated Sansei about their ethnic heritage. Students requested that an Asian American Studies program be incorporated as a major at San Francisco State College in 1968, and again during the Third World Student Strike at University of California Berkeley in 1969. The purpose of such a major program was be to learn about the distinct history and experiences of Asians in the United States. To have their demands met, an Asian American Task Force was formed. This group later served as one of the primary forces in establishing the Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program (JBBP).

Part 4: The New Japanese American Community

That same minority fervor expressed in the Civil Rights Movement that had students striking for ethnic programs had motivated Japanese-Americans to return to the Japanese community. Students, comprising the bulk of the necessary manpower, devoted themselves to establishing community-based organizations and programs, under the realization that they must actively expose and combat racism. It should be noted that community organizations among Japanese Americans is not a new phenomenon, but that the concepts of ethnic pride and equality, the basis of these new organizations, was a new development that departed from traditional organizations, which were centered on an identity based upon exclusion. The community became a place where Sansei could identify themselves as Asian Americans: they also realized the significance of developing the community as it was related to their own growth.

In San Francisco, Japantown, 1969, the Japanese Community Youth Council (JCYC) was formed to provide educational services for youth groups. In 1971, Kimochi-Kai (Kimochi in Japanese means heart or thoughtfulness) was formed to provide social services for seniors and to learn ethnic heritage from Issei. In the same year, Japanese Community Services (JCS) was formed to serve the community in general, and this organization became one of the major forces in establishing the JBBP, which started its program in 1973. In 1974, Nihonmachi Little Friends (NLF), a Japanese bilingual multicultural day care center opened its doors, followed by Japantown Art and Media Workshop (JAM) and Nihonmachi Legal Outreach (NLO). Nihonmachi or Japantown was not rebuilt as a residential community, but as a center for cultural and service oriented organizations. In addition, the Committee Against Nihonmachi Eviction (CANE) was formed to fight against the destruction of the community

and the invasion of capitol from Japan. Their strong stand and direct action stripped off the label of Japanese Americans as a "silent model minority." JBBP was born in this community. These Sansei parents who were active members of the community raised the request of Japanese bilingual education program in the public school system.

Section III
Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program (JBBP)
Part 1. Brief History

In the years following the civil rights movement, racial and ethnic minorities established numerous grass-roots programs for the benefit of their community. The programs themselves may be considered minor, but when put together they reveal a new pattern of behavior in minority affairs. This pattern is a form of civil rights movement, usually referred to as a "minority movement." In short, in those years, minority communities were assuming an increasingly energetic role in the conduct of local policy. It suggests that despite the varied nature of the programs, such programs all stemmed from a shared concept of equality, and the acquired notion of a multicultural community. Indeed, some people were bold and assertive in exhibiting a scarcely restrained cultural pride. Certainly some of these characteristics can be seen in the Japanese American approach towards JBBP.

This new sense of community concern in minority social status can be discerned in the Japanese American community's changed attitudes toward the establishment of the JBBP. On February 21, 1973, the community held a forum titled "What the public education is doing for the Japanese child?" The question of the role of public education in the Americanization process was the starting point of discussion at this forum, which was sponsored by three community organizations: Japanese Community Services, Japanese Speaking Society, and the Asian American Task Force. Reflecting the principles of these organizations, the idea of a Japanese bilingual education, expanded into a bicultural program and an Asian American Studies Program. Each organization publicized their view of bilingual, bicultural education in the local Japanese newspapers as follows:

1. Representing the community concern of the needs of limited English speaking Japanese children such as new immigrants, businessmen's children, etc. was the view held by the Japanese Speaking Society.
2. Representing the concern of parents and positive self image, learning about cultural heritage and language related to children's personal growth, was the view of Japanese Community Services.
3. Representing the Japanese American view to maintain cultural heritage and expose all grade levels to this in order to build positive self-image as well as an awareness of an Asian American identity, was the view of Asian American Task Force.

Seventy-five people attended the forum. Discussion was focused on concept of the bilingual

bicultural education. At this forum a Steering Committee was formed to direct future activities pursuant to:

1. Establish a bilingual bicultural education program
2. Strengthen existing Japanese language classes
3. Create an Asian American Studies courses

Also at the forum, a subsequent community forum regarding the proposal was scheduled for March 30, 1973, and at this meeting parents were able to sign their children up for the program. Everything moved smoothly after the first forum, reflecting strong community interest and parent involvement. Community service groups, religious groups, and prominent community members began to support and endorse the program and to voice their advocacy of this program to the City Board of Education.

On April 5, 1973, the proposal for the program was presented to the Board of Education Curriculum Committee and was approved. The proposal drawn up was as follow:

1. For kindergarten to sixth grade, a bilingual/bicultural program was to be included in the general curriculum.
2. Establish Japanese language classes and Asian American Studies Courses at the junior high school level.
3. Expand the Japanese language programs and Asian American Studies at the high school level.

The next obstacle was to get the proposal budgeted. The Steering Committee had to put pressure on the Budget Committee in order to have any funds allocated for the program, because the Budget Committee had their own constituencies to whom they were obligated, and the budget was often predetermined. At the same time, the Steering Committee also asked for federal funding under the Emergency School Act. There was a constant need to search for alternative funding channels within the bureaucratic hierarchy of the local, state, and federal government. For example, to apply for district funds, they needed approval from the budget committee of the Board of Education.

On May 15, 1973, over sixty people attended the Budget Committee hearing. Many of them brought along their children. Because of the large interest group and the presence of the children, their request was placed earlier on the agenda. However, the proposed program was not included in the 1973-74 school budget due to the lack of available funds. Enormous effort was required to obtain a relatively small amount of funding, and yet the program was placed on a priority list. Ultimately the establishment of the program depended upon the final decision of the budget meeting. While it was enough to discourage many people, the Steering Committee never gave up.

The next step was to appear before the full Board of Education. Under very difficult circumstances, the Steering Committee continued to work on necessary details, such as recruiting teachers with knowledge of the Japanese language and culture, enrollment of students, including non-Japanese, finding program sites and arranging transportation, and many other details. Throughout it

all, the Steering Committee acted on the presumption that they would have funds allocated to them. In response, the school district administration was uncooperative. They neither gave the committee a list of teachers with a Japanese background who were currently employed by the school district, nor informed children in grades K-3 about the program. Finally caving to community pressure, such as letters, telephone calls, and interviews with media sources, the Superintendent agreed to cooperate. At the same time, the only available funds were a small grant the Japan Foundation had given for educational materials. The Steering Committee planned and organized activities to raise funds, such bake sales, garage sales, and soliciting private donations.

On July 25, 1973, a community forum was held regarding the school site, selection of teachers, transportation, recruitment of students, curriculum and parent participation. On August 7, the Board of Education approved the budget, and fifty-nine thousand dollars was granted to the JBBP. The funds were allotted to do the following:

1. Establish two Japanese language courses at the junior high school level
2. Establish a Japanese bilingual bicultural program for grades K-2 with two teachers and three instructional aides

In September 1973, the Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program (JBBP) started with sixty two students at Emerson Elementary School, San Francisco.

Part 2. My Experience in JBBP

In 1975 I first joined this program. I had just come to the United States from Japan and my ability to use English was weak. I was very happy, therefore, to find a program that offered me the opportunity to use my Japanese language skills. I began to work as a student intern and in 1977, I was hired as an instructional aide. I first taught third and fifth grades, eventually also teaching first grade children until 1979. During this period at the beginning of JBBP, I witnessed very active parent participation in the program. They still carried on with the spirit which created the program. There were always parent and staff meetings, and nothing could be finalized until the Parents Advisory Committee approved it.

The Parents Advisory Committee consists of eleven sub-committees under the executive board. These were transportation, curriculum, political action, site & transportation, personnel, bylaws, fund raising, recruitment & publicity, goals & objectives, social & hospitality, and classroom coordinators. Each committee includes teachers, instructional aides and parents. The committee reflects the fact that this program was established through the parents' hard work and initiative, from the sites of the school, to the transportation for students and the hiring of teachers. There was incredible parental involvement in negotiating for the school buses and other activities. The parents were fully committed to help guide and develop the program.

The subcommittees performed the day to day management of the program. To someone like me,

familiar only with school systems managed by the school officials and administrators, this style of the management was a great surprise. Indeed, my position at the school depended upon the parents' committee: in regards to hiring and firing teachers, the parents advisory committee made the final decision. When I was hired as an instructional aide, I was interviewed by a group of parents, teachers, and fellow instructional aides.

In order to develop the curriculum it was necessary to conduct research and create new teaching materials. The collective work of professionals and parents made it possible to start the program with a well-organized Japanese language segment and original material for use in the classroom. The curriculum committee contacted several existing Japanese schools in Los Angeles, California, and Hawaii. One of the Japanese schools in Honolulu was instrumental in helping to collect the teaching materials.

The difficulties of starting the program were endless. To set the transportation, and keep the site and budget to maintain the program was a constant battle. The increase of students and expanded classes required the Parents Committee to find new school sites every year. Programs which were created by parents had to be maintained by the parents because there was very little protection from the School District. The position of the school was precarious as the school administration viewed these programs as extra weight in an increasingly tight financial period.

In 1978, the program administrators changed and the program policy also changed to reflect a stricter adherence to the state and district's guidelines. These guidelines required at least one-third of limited-English speaking students be envolled in order to receive funding. There were not many new immigrants in the Japanese community. Therefore, the target population of limited-English speaking students shifted to include the children of businessmen, who only stayed in the program for a short period of time. They generally used the program for the children to acquire English skills before transferring to a regular American school. To meet the needs of these students, therefore, the JBBP also prepared traditional ESL materials. At the same time, they had to emphasize major subjects such as English reading, writing and math in order to demonstrate their high academic achievement. In terms of approach to bilingual education, the policy of the school was changing to fit a narrower adhesion to the transitional approach. The attitude towards the instructional aides, most of whom were Japanese speaking, also changed. The role of the aides had been equivalent to that of a teacher, but aides became essentially a teacher's assistant. In protest of this inequality, in June 1979, nine out of thirteen aides, including myself, resigned from the program. It is hard to maintain a program with the same spirit and principles that led to its creation, especially programs which are created from an independent spirit.

I have always, however, had a strong desire to write about the full meaning and history of the JBBP before it is lost. This is because even after I resigned my position, I strongly believed that the establishment of the JBBP was historically significant as a model case of a minority educational

program. Here is a summary of the statements submitted to the San Francisco Board of Education by the parents' steering committee in 1973 that clearly declared their educational philosophy and vision toward multicultural society. I believe that this statement describes the reasons for my enthusiasm and belief in the program: "In an era where international relations affect us daily, in a city that is proud of its pluralistic heritage. Bilingual programs enrich and enhance the educational system not only for children of these ethnic backgrounds but also for all American children. We are a valid part of America. Let our children learn about their cultural heritages and their languages along with American culture and general curriculum. Let all children enjoy and appreciate each other's differences as well as similarities" (Steering Committee Speech, 1973). This is a philosophy that continues to be an important and often overlooked pillar of global education today.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the JBBP reflects the minority movement in the educational sector and their attempts to further the rights of all racial and ethnic minority groups. The means to accomplishing this task were threefold:

1. As an educational rights movement, not only for the language minority, but for all racial and ethnic minority groups, such as English-speaking second and third generations of immigrants.
2. As a cultural movement to enhance the ethnic background and language of the minority groups.
3. As a special education language program for minority groups to restore the loss of a language other than English or to maintain an ethnic language.

Firstly, the emphasis of this program is on its effort to recapture the Japanese culture and to educate all groups of children with a common goal of legitimizing multiculturalism. This ideology vividly reflects the conflict between the melting pot theory as opposed to supporting the maintenance of diverse ethnic and linguistic minorities within the larger society. Although the efforts to place the JBBP in a public school setting was met with severe resistance, the conflict no longer centered around conflicting ideologies, but rather around practical matters, mainly involving financial support.

My interview with the original members of the parents' steering committee revealed the desire to legitimize Japanese American culture in the school system. The contrasting imagery of Japanese Americans who are quick to accept and assimilate into the mainstream society, while at the same time fighting to maintain an ethnic cultural identity, can be found in the Japanese community structure of non-English speaking first generation (Issei) and non-Japanese speaking third generation (Sansei). Within a short span of three generations, the Japanese Americans lost the ability to speak the Japanese language. According to the Sansei parents of the JBBP, this loss was not a choice that was made freely, but was an adaptation forced upon this group during periods of high anti-Japanese sentiment for mere survival. With the inspiration of the civil rights movement and its understanding of majority

societal pressures upon minority groups, the Sansei insisted on the responsibility public education had to transmit their language and culture for the sake of the future generations. The JBBP movement is an expression of a minority group's educational perspective based on the ideology of social equality.

Secondly, this is also a cultural movement to create a positive self image for minority children. If the idea of bilingualism is to guide minority people towards a new identity as a minority American, then JBBP embodied this concept. When we use the term bilingualism, we imply neither a complete entry nor a total rejection of the mainstream culture, but rather the creation of a new American culture. Thirdly, the teaching of an ethnic language is considered to be valued on the same level as the English language. If a minority group or culture is recognized as a legitimate sector of American society, then the language of that group must not be presented as a second (or second class) language but one that has equal standing with the English language since it is a key element in creating a new cultural identity. Language is not seen a means of communicating ideas but as a tool for transmitting values. It may be looked upon as a mirror reflecting personality types, style and character. Language maintains and embodies cultural values and culture must have language to continue its existence. This is why the Japanese American parents were so adamant that their children learn the Japanese language, since culture and language go hand in hand and cannot be separated. Language is an indispensable element for the growth of children as a new American. Bilingual education was seen as an inevitable mechanism to fulfill this need.

This program does not create a link to Japanese national culture but rather it restores that link which was lost to form a permanent foundation for the development of a new identity, that of a Japanese American. The goals for JBBP reflect the above mentioned as follows:

1. To seek social and political equality for minority groups within the USA.
2. To enhance the culture and language of racial/ethnic minorities to instill a sense of self-esteem as a unique cultural and/or language group.
3. To create a new value system to develop a new group of citizens as a minority American.

Education is not merely the act of teaching or being taught, but it is a process involving two interacting parties from which new values and new ideas are developed. Education needs different parties to provide the catalytic element that will create new resources. In a land filled with such a rich and colorful mixture of people, America provides an ideal setting for this educational process to occur.

Great care must be placed on this multiethnic and multicultural society. It is these differences that have caused the minority movement to enrich America. We must recognize the United States of America as a microscope of global processes and learn from its experiences to advance our educational system in the 21st century.

Bibliography

English Sources

* Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (25 May 1970). DHEW Memo Regarding Language Minority Children. Available online: http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1970.html
* Gonzalez, J. M. (Feb. 1975). Coming of Age in Bilingual-Bicultural Education: A Historical Perspective. *Inequality in Education* 19. 5-17.
* ----------------- (1978). Bilingual Education: Ideologies of the Past Decade. In: *Bilingual Education*. La Fontaine, Persky, & Golubchick, (Eds.) (p. 24-32), Wayne, New Jersey: Avery Publishing Group, Inc.
* Japan Bilingual Bicultural Program. Japan Bilingual/Bicultural Program: Its Objectives. 1973 Pamphlet.
* Lau v. Nichols. 414 U.S. 563, 94 S.Ct. 786, 39 L.Ed.2d 1 (U.S. 1974). Available online:http://www.onenation.org/lau.html
* Personal material from the Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Education Program (JBBP).
* Personal interviews conducted by the author in San Francisco in September 2002 with Phyllis Matsuno, Kay Nomura, Steve Nakajo, Nobu Fukuda, Diane Yamashiro, and Yoko Tanaka
* Schneider, S. G. (1976). *Revolution, Reaction, or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act*. New York: L.A. Publishing Company, Inc.
* Unknown (15 Sept. 1975). The Japanese Bilingual Bicultural Program. *Kazaguruma* (a publication of Nobiru-kai, a Japanese Newcomers Service), 10.
* Steering Committee for Japanese Bilingual/Bicultural Program. Speech Given at the SFUSD Board of Education, 1973.
* U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1975). *A Better Chance to Learn Bilingual-Bicultural Education*, Washington D.C.: Clearinghouse Publication No.51.

Newspaper Sources

Hokubei Mainichi (a San Francisco-based Japanese American newspaper), English language section sources

* Nomura, K. (Asian American Task Force). (16 February 1973). The Fourth in a Series of Articles on the need for Bilingual, Bicultural, and Asian American Studies in the San Francisco Unified School District.
* Matsuno, P. & Matsuno, K. (16 February 1973). The Third in a Series of Articles on the need for Bilingual, Bicultural, and Asian American Studies in the San Francisco Unified School District.
* Watanabe, S. (10 February 1973). The First in a Series of Articles on the need for Bilingual, Bicultural, and Asian American Studies in the San Francisco Unified School District.

Additional articles from the *Hokubei Mainichi* as follows:

* (10 February 1973). Bilingual Program in S. F. Public Schools Urged.
* (14 February 1973). Bilingual Program will be Discussed Wednesdat, February 21.
* (15 February 1973). 622 Japanese-speaking Students in S.F. Schools.
* (16 February 1973). Nisei Teacher Stresses Bilingual Need in S. F.
* (23 February 1973). S. F. School Mead Morena Urged to Create Bilingual.
* (1 March 1973). Bilingual, Bicultural Education Meeting at BOT Room Thursday Nite.
* (16 March 1973). Bilingual, Bicultural in S. F. Schools Being Pushed.
* (16 March 1973). Touchstone Day Upcoming April 5 for Bilingual Education.

* (30 March 1973). Asian Courses in S. F. Public Schools Demanded.
* (4 April 1973). Rev. Mizuno Supports Bicultural Program.
* (4 April 1973). For Bilingual Program Urge Parents to Attend School Curriculum Committee Meeting.
* (5 April 1973). Konko Church Bishop Supports Bilingual.
* (7 April 1973). Must Await "OK" by Full Board—Bilingual Bicultural Program in S. F. Opposed.
* (12 May 1973). Progress Report Given on Bilingual Bicultural.
* (9 June 1973). Difficulties Encountered in 'Bicultural' Revealed.
* (16 June 1973). Bicultural Nears Successful End—Ruth Asawa, Yori Wada Speaking Tuesday Night.
* (26 June 1973). Paper Carp Pennants Fly at Education Board Meeting.
* (29 June 1973). "Bicultural" on Priority List of S. F. School Plans.
* (18 July 1973). Pivnick is Responsive to Bicultural Education.
* (11 August 1973). Bilingual OK'd--$59,000 Appropriated for S. F. Education.
* (11 August 1973). Bilingual Teachers Interviewed Today.
* (24 August 1973). Asian American Children Score High in Self-Esteem, but Low Mixing Together.
* (4 September 1973). Emerson School will also have Bicultural Classes.
* (7 September 1973). 62 Students at Emerson Begin Japanese Bicultural Bilingual Classes.

San Francisco Chronicle

* (6 April 1973). An OK for Japanese Curriculum.
* (20 June 1973). School Board's Budget Impasse.
* (9 august 1973). Japan's Gift.

San Francisco Examiner

* (15 June 1973). Japanese-English Classes Asked "To Give Back Heritage."
* (19 June 1973). No Duty to Restore Ancestral Tongues.
* (27 June 1973). Community Pitches in to Retain Identity—Japanese School Program.
* (12 July 1973). Bilingual Classes.
* (10 August 1973). Rights Panel Urges Bilingual Step-Up.

Japanese Sources

* 鶴木眞「日系アメリカ人」講談社、1976 年
* フランク・F・チューマン著，小川洋訳「バンブー・ピープル—日系アメリカ人試練の 100 年—」サイマル出版会、1978 年
* 岡部一明「日系アメリカ人—強制収容から戦後補償へ—」岩波書店、1991 年
* 野崎京子「強制収容とアイデンティティ・シフト—日系二世・三世の「日本」と「アメリカ」世界思想社、2007 年