

Volume 2, 1986-1987

COMMENTARY

Jul Yzaguirre

FORUM

Peter D. Roos

Manuel J. Justiz

Dr. Lars G. Bjork

Charles L. Kyle, Jr.

& Roberto Rivera



FEATURE INTERVIEW

The Honorable

Henry G. Cisneros

POLICY PERSPECTIVE

The Honorable Bruce Babbitt

Mauro Alzati

FEATURE ARTICLES

Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil

& Eve Fielder

Dr. David T. Abalos

Dr. Harry P. Pachon

JOURNAL OF HISPANIC POLICY



Published by The Hispanic Student Caucus
of the John F. Kennedy School of Government
at Harvard University

The *Journal of Hispanic Policy* is a publication of the Hispanic Student Caucus at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. The *Journal's* fundamental objective is to serve as a forum for meaningful discussion and debate of policy questions affecting the Hispanic community in the U.S. Accordingly, the *Journal* is a nonpartisan publication, welcoming reasonable analyses and prescriptions of divergent political orientations. Authors are fully responsible for the contents of published works.

The editors are particularly interested in manuscripts that emphasize the relationship between policy making and the political, social, and economic environments (both domestic and international) affecting Hispanics in the U.S. Articles that present the results of original research and analysis and/or propose innovative policy directions are given high priority; but the *Journal* also invites policy surveys, analyses and descriptions of new or revised policy techniques, broader perspectives on contemporary political, social and economic issues, book reviews, and pieces written by and for policy practitioners in a multitude of fields. The *Journal* will also consider publishing excerpts from forthcoming books.

Donations provided in support of the *Journal* are tax deductible as a non-profit gift under the John F. Kennedy School of Government's IRS 501(C)(3) status. Grants and other contributory assistance should specify intent for use only by the *Journal of Hispanic Policy* in order to facilitate accounting.

Address correspondence to:

Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Hispanic Policy
Harvard University
John F. Kennedy School of Government
67 Winthrop St.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Special thanks to Yolanda Barrera, Assistant Director of the Kennedy School's Public Policy Program; Sara Salvade, Senior Admissions Officer for Harvard College; and Lori Carlisle, Administrative Assistant at the Center for Business and Government. Our thanks also to Paul Bograd, Director of the Kennedy School's Forum; Charlie Erickson of Hispanic Link, Inc; and to Paul Luna. Without their care and assistance this publication would not have been possible.

The *Journal of Hispanic Policy* was designed and produced with the assistance of Xanadu Graphics and Puritan Press. Cover photo by Joe Wrinn.

JOURNAL
OF
HISPANIC POLICY

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

- Jesse Aguirre
Vice-President
Corporate Relations
Anheuser-Busch
- The Hon. Polly Baca
Vice-Chair, Democratic National
Committee
- The Hon. Henry Cisneros
Mayor, San Antonio
- Dr. Alicia V. Cuarón
President, Cuarón & Gomez
Associates, Inc.
- Fernando E.C. DeBaca
Co-Chair, Republican National
Hispanic Assembly
- Guarione M. Diaz
Executive Director, Cuban National
Planning Council
- Ernest Garcia
Former Sergeant at Arms
United States Senate
- Jose Garza
Director, Affirmative Action
Premark International, Inc.
- Lamond Godwin
Vice-President
American Express Bank
- Antonio Gomes
Chairman, Board of Directors
Multicultural Career Intern Program
- Winthrop Knowlton
Director, Center for Business &
Government, Harvard University
- Ronnie Lopez*
Chief of Staff
Governor Bruce Babbitt
- Dr. Sarah Melendez
Associate Director, Office of
Minority Concerns, American Council
on Education
- Jack Otero
International Vice-President
Brotherhood of Railway and
Airline Clerks (BRAC)
- Beatriz Olvera-Stotzer
Comision Femenil Mexicana Nacional
- Harry Pachon
National Director, National
Association of Latino Elected
and Appointed Officials
- Cecilia Preciado Burciaga
Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies
Stanford University
- Dr. Fern R. Ramirez
Dean of Students, GMI Engineering
& Management Inst.
- Consuelo Santos-Killins
Chair, California Arts Council
- Pablo Sedillo
Executive Director, U.S. Catholic
Conf./Secretariat for Hispanic Affairs
- Raul Tapia, Esq.
Partner
Tapia & Buffington
- Roberto Trujillo
Chief, Foreign Language &
Area Collections, The Stanford Libraries
- Raul Yzaguirre
President, National Council of La Raza
- Carmen Zapata
President, Bilingual Foundation of
the Arts

*Executive Advisory Board Chairperson

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Yolanda Barrera

Assistant Director, Public Policy
Program, John F. Kennedy School of
Government, Harvard University

Walter Broadnax

Lecturer in Public Policy, John F.
Kennedy School of Government,
Harvard University

Kenneth Burt

Alumnus, John F. Kennedy School
of Government, Hispanic Caucus,
Class of 1984

José Llanes

CEO and Chief Social Scientist,
Marzell Corporation

Sara Salvide

Hispanic Congressional Caucus and
Alumnae, John F. Kennedy School of
Government, Hispanic Caucus,
Class of 1985

Richard Santillan

Director of Latino Studies, Rose
Institute of State and Local Govern-
ment, Claremont McKenna College

Marta Tienda

Professor of Rural Sociology,
Institute of Research on Poverty
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Fernando Torres-Gil

Staff Director
Select Committee On Aging
U.S. House of Representatives

BOARD OF EDITORS

Editors

Marlene M. Morales
1986

Adolph P. Falcon
1987

Associate Editors

Regina Aragon
Stephanie Hernandez

Ada Puentes

Carlos Hernandez
Sylvia Puente

Section Editors

Barbara Alonso
Tony Choi

Luis Martinez

Eddie Cadena
Roberto Rey

General Editors

Yolanda Barrera
Judy McCloskey
Sara Salvide

Donna Guerrero
Barbara O'Hanlon
Perry Tribolet

Lynn Klamkin
Edwin Rodriguez
Margarita Vela-Banks

Former Editors

Henry A.J. Ramos, Founding Editor

"Equity and Excellence" by Peter D. Roos is reprinted from Vol. II of "Make Something Happen," report of the National Commission of Secondary Schooling of Hispanics, with permission of the Hispanic Policy Development Project.

All rights reserved, 1987 Kennedy School Hispanic Student Caucus. Except as otherwise specified, no article or portion herein is to be reproduced or adapted to other works without the express consent of the author or the *Journal's* editors.

(ISSN 0892-6115)

CONTENTS

Editors' Remarks	1
Commentary	
The Perils of Pandora: An Examination of the English-only Movement <i>Raul Yzaguirre</i>	5
Forum	
Equity and Excellence <i>Peter D. Roos</i>	9
Access and Excellence: Realizing the Potential of American Education <i>Dr. Manuel J. Justiz and Dr. Lars G. Bjork</i>	17
The Successes of the Hispanic Community Movement for Drop Out Prevention in Chicago <i>Dr. Charles L. Kyle Jr. and Roberto Rivera</i>	25
Feature Interview	
Urban Economic Policy: <i>A Discussion with the Honorable Henry G. Cisneros</i>	31
Policy Perspective	
Toward a New U.S.-Mexico Economic Relationship <i>The Honorable Bruce Babbitt</i>	39
Response <i>Fausto Alzati</i>	45
Feature Articles	
Long-Term Care Policy and the Hispanic Population <i>Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil and Eve Fielder</i>	49
The Politics of the Latino Family <i>Dr. David T. Abalos</i>	67
Citizenship as an Obstacle to Political Empowerment in the Hispanic Community <i>Dr. Harry P. Pachon</i>	77
About the Authors	89

EDITORS' REMARKS

In 1985, the *Journal of Hispanic Policy* was introduced under the title of the *Journal of Hispanic Politics*. The *Journal* was conceived and is published entirely by Hispanic graduate students of Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government.

In our introductory issue the founding editor, Henry A.J. Ramos, introduced the *Journal's* primary goals. First among these goals is the development of the *Journal* as a non-partisan, authoritative, scholarly information source—innovative, responsive, and practical—on the U.S. Hispanic community's political, social, and economic development. The *Journal* serves as a forum both for the presentation of new policy ideas and techniques, as well as analysis and debate of existing ones. Articles are solicited from academics and graduate students, elected and appointed officials, and representatives of business, labor, and community interests. Article selection is intended to provide a well-balanced publication which appeals to a broad national audience of both Hispanic and non-Hispanic readers.

A second goal of the *Journal* is to facilitate consensus and cooperation among the individual groups which comprise the U.S. Hispanic community. The term "Hispanic" is used broadly to include U.S. residents of Spanish origin or descent who classify themselves in one of several specific categories listed on U.S. census questionnaires. These categories include: "Mexican," "Puerto Rican," "Cuban," or "other Spanish/Hispanic" origin (such as Spanish, Central or South American, and Portuguese). While we acknowledge that the range of ideologies and concerns of all Hispanic subgroups is individually and collectively as diverse as any other segment of society, we also believe the *Journal* is one way to emphasize shared concerns and overcome past differences.

A third goal is to provide and maintain the *Journal's* organizational structure in order to ensure quality and facilitate stability as one class of students graduates and another class enters. The constant influx of staff members provides the *Journal* with an opportunity to utilize fresh perspectives and ideas, while Executive and Editorial Advisory Boards of established Hispanic community and academic leaders encourage community-mindedness and continuity in each successive *Journal* issue.

Our final and most important goal is to provide a financial base which ensures the *Journal's* viability. The *Journal* has received funding support from a variety of individuals and institutions which have made this second issue a reality. The *Journal* has also benefitted from generous in-kind assistance provided by the Harvard Center for Business

and Government. This assistance alone, however, will not sustain our efforts. We are currently seeking additional funding from public and private sources. If you (or your organization) concurs with the *Journal's* goals, please demonstrate your support with a contribution to our efforts.

The introductory issue of the *Journal* was well received and inspired considerable response from a broad range of readers. The feedback received resulted in several changes in the *Journal's* presentation and format. One particularly noticeable change is the *Journal's* name; the *Journal of Hispanic Politics* is now the *Journal of Hispanic Policy*. The name change reflects an effort to emphasize our non-partisan commitment to the presentation of analysis and ideas on issues and governance in both the public and private sectors.

Besides the name change, this issue incorporates four new sections—a Commentary section, a Forum section, an Interview section, and a Policy Perspective section—along with the previous *Journal* format which consisted of feature articles focusing on economic policy, social policy, and political organization and strategy. The Interview section features a prominent individual directly involved with Hispanic American concerns. The honorable Henry G. Cisneros, Mayor of San Antonio, Texas is the subject of this issue's Feature Interview. The Forum section presents three viewpoints on a particular policy-relevant issue. This issue's Forum topic is Hispanic achievement in secondary and higher education. The Commentary section provides policy and community leaders with the opportunity to voice their opinions and viewpoints—in an annotated form—on a topic of particular concern to the U.S. Hispanic population. In this issue, Raul Yzaguirre, president of the National Council of La Raza, presents his views on efforts to declare English the official language of the U.S. The Policy Perspective section features an extended examination of a policy question, by a policy practitioner, on a question with which he or she has first-hand experience.

The initial feature article in this issue of the *Journal* falls under our Policy Perspective section and relates to economic policy. Authored by the Honorable Bruce Babbitt, former Governor of Arizona, this article explores the significance of economic relations between the U.S. and Mexico and provides recommendations for future policies, focusing particular attention on the need for Mexican debt restructuring. For a Mexican perspective on these issues, a response to Governor Babbitt's article is provided by Fausto Alzati, a doctoral candidate at the John F. Kennedy School of Government who has served in various official capacities at the Mexican Treasury.

The second feature article in this issue of the *Journal* relates to social policy and is by Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil and Eve Fielder on long-term health care for Hispanics. Their article offers insights and analysis on the need for greater policy attention to Hispanic concerns in this critical, but traditionally neglected, area. A third piece related to social policy is by Dr. David Abalos of Seton Hall University, whose article on the "Politics of the Latino Family" offers some provocative thoughts on the issue of Hispanic empowerment in American society.

A fourth and final feature article relates to political organization and strategy. Entitled "Citizenship as an Obstacle to Political Empowerment in the Hispanic Community," this article by Dr. Harry Pachon, of

the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, offers important insights into the relationship between Hispanic naturalization and civic participation in the U.S.

We think this second issue of the *Journal* should inspire a substantial amount of thought and response on the many timely and important topics it addresses. Accordingly, we welcome any comments or suggestions our readers may have.

Finally, before we encourage you to read on, we must acknowledge with much regret the recent loss of two very special individuals whose work and vision contributed significantly to the *Journal's* development—Allen W. Amen and Jorge N. Hernandez. Amen, who served on the production staff of the Harvard News Office, was the *Journal's* original graphic designer and production consultant. Hernandez, who was executive director of *Inquilinos Boricuas en Acción*, one of the nation's leading Hispanic community development agencies, was a member of the *Journal's* first executive advisory board. Both men died unexpectedly in 1986. Those who knew them know especially that they gave much more to this world than they took from it. For all they gave to the *Journal*, we dedicate this issue to their memory. We will miss them immensely.

Adolph P. Falcon
Editor, 1987

Marlene M. Morales
Editor, 1986

February, 1987

COMMENTARY

THE PERILS OF PANDORA: AN EXAMINATION OF THE ENGLISH-ONLY MOVEMENT

Raul Yzaguirre

In this initial Commentary section of the *Journal*, Hispanic civil rights leader Raul Yzaguirre offers his views on efforts to declare English the official language of the U.S.

Most of us are familiar with the Greek myth about Pandora's box—the story of a young woman whose curiosity got the better of her and led her to open a forbidden and tightly chained box. According to the myth, as soon as Pandora unlatched the container to peer inside, the lid burst wide open and all sorts of evil creatures were set free to roam among us, never to be captured again.

While most Americans have long understood this truth—that it's impossible to dabble with the devil and then casually walk away—some of the organizers of English-only efforts have been willing to strike that deal, despite the negative ramifications. By playing on mainstream fears about immigrants and distorting the facts about Hispanic Americans, they have awakened, encouraged, and provided for a surface legitimacy to racist and nativist sentiment.

The current English-only movement is relatively young, fueled primarily by the efforts of former California Republican Senator S.I. Hayakawa, and linked tightly to organizations working to enact restrictive immigration policies. Hayakawa made several unsuccessful attempts to amend the U.S. Constitution to designate English as the official language during his tenure in the Senate. Upon his retirement, he founded a private organization—*U.S. English*—to carry on this work. The group, which initially operated as a project of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), has grown substantially since its inception in 1983, attracting both members and money. *U.S. English* now has chapters in several states and its own political action committee—L-PAC—to funnel funds to sympathetic policymakers.

The organization has a diverse constituency. Its advisory board includes such luminaries as Walter Annenberg, Saul Bellow, Alistair

Cooke, Norman Cousins, Walter Cronkite and Gore Vidal. Some local members are undoubtedly fine citizens, thinking that they are simply supporting symbolic measures to proclaim English as our common language and promote its use by all Americans.

However, *U.S. English* has also attracted scores of members who are openly anti-Hispanic and adhere to an agenda much broader than symbolic recognition of English as our common language. This agenda includes such issues as repealing bilingual education and portions of the Voting Rights Act, restricting licensing for Spanish-language radio stations, ending 911 emergency services in Spanish, and prohibiting American companies from advertising in Spanish.

U.S. English leadership is aware of its increasingly nativist membership. John Tanton, a former national president of Zero Population Growth (ZPG), who chairs both *U.S. English* and FAIR, admitted earlier this year that both groups may draw some racist or xenophobic supporters.

Although *U.S. English* at times tries to distance itself from these supporters, suggesting that there is no company line that every member of *U.S. English* buys, these nativist members did not come to *U.S. English* by accident. They joined in response to the organization's carefully crafted rhetoric which framed the issue in terms of an "Hispanic menace." *U.S. English* chose to open Pandora's box and unleash nativism and fear of foreigners as fundraising tools.

U.S. English literature has warned that the English language is "under attack" by Hispanics who refuse to learn English, pursue a separatist agenda, and do not assimilate well into American life. The organization has raised money and recruited members by telling the public that the United States is "facing another Quebec" and has consistently spread misinformation about bilingual education, bilingual voting materials, and the use of non-English languages.

Now the group finds itself in a sticky situation of its own making. The radical right has captured this movement and made it its own. Perhaps inspired by the rapid growth of *U.S. English*, these folks have discovered that nativism is a lucrative ground for fundraising. Not only have far-right groups adopted this agenda as their own, but a splinter group, calling itself "English First" has also been formed.

This spring, Richard Viguerie, the ultra-conservative fundraiser, financed a mass mailing to a quarter of a million American homes for an organization he calls "Save Our Schools," asking for financial support to repeal bilingual education. Each letter included a Mexican peso, and began, "I know the peso is worthless in the U.S., but I enclosed it to make an important point about a billion-dollar U.S. government program that's worthless too. It's called the Bilingual Education Act." The letter goes on to accuse Hispanic immigrants of refusing to learn "our language, our customs, even our currency," and plays on stereotypes of immigrants as a welfare class: "Think of the billions of dollars it will cost us, our children, and our grandchildren."

Another group, the Council for Inter-American Security goes even further, claiming that the public use of non-English languages promotes "cultural apartheid" and warns that "terrorist groups are now seeking to restore old Mexico, which they call Aztlan." Although the Council has disclaimed responsibility, copies of their report on the

"Hispanic menace" were sent anonymously to scores of influential Republicans this summer with a cover letter implying official party endorsement of the report.

Our country's history demonstrates the dangers posed by demagogues who play on fear and intolerance to promote an anti-ethnic agenda. Certainly our own institution of slavery was justified on the notion that blacks were somehow inherently inferior to whites—a notion which lived on long after the Emancipation Proclamation in a multitude of "Jim Crow" laws. In the late 1800s, fears of a "yellow peril" resulted in a series of laws known as the Chinese Exclusion Acts, which denied Chinese and other Asians the opportunity to come to this country. During the same period, Italians, Southern and Eastern Europeans, and Jews were thought to be inferior races and immigration laws were designed to restrict the entry of these peoples. Xenophobia and anti-Japanese hysteria led us to incarcerate thousands of loyal Japanese Americans at the outbreak of World War II.

Hispanics themselves have been the target of similar campaigns in which public bigotry and hysteria incited immoral and in some cases illegal government actions. In the 1930s and again in the 1950s, fears of a "wetback" menace resulted in repatriation efforts, which included large numbers of native-born Americans and legal immigrants of Hispanic descent. The recent resurgence of white-supremacist and anti-Semitic groups, and continuing reports of violence directed against ethnic Americans, indicates that nativism is still alive, well, and living in America.

We cannot afford to laugh at those who are drawn together by *U.S. English* demagogues. Nor can we dismiss them as part of some lunatic fringe. They do not represent a groundswell of public opinion as they claim, nor are xenophobic hordes taking over the nation. But these groups are large enough in power and influence to cause much of the nation's media to buy their line that Hispanics are "resisting assimilation." They pose an increasingly serious problem with their inflammatory rhetoric, distortion of reality, and use of fear and innuendo. What these folks are doing is dangerous not just to ethnic minorities but to our nation as a whole. Unfortunately, neither the press, nor the Hispanic community has responded effectively to these xenophobic assertions.

How should Hispanic and other Americans committed to cultural tolerance and diversity respond? First and foremost, I believe our response should be a positive one. We should affirm our community's desire to learn English, without surrendering our hard-won civil rights gains, such as bilingual education and language assistance under the Voting Rights Act.

I must admit, however, that it is becoming tiring to have to explain over and over that Hispanics do want to learn English and that a growing body of literature confirms that they lose their native language—perhaps unfortunately—in about the same number of generations as other immigrant groups: three. I am tired of explaining that the federal bilingual program is transitional, designed to help students learn English without falling behind in other subjects. Finally, I am tired of trying to explain (to all those who purportedly love English so much) the meaning of the word *bilingual*.

The real problem is not that Hispanics do not want to learn English, but that adequate opportunities to learn are often unavailable. In other words, demand often exceeds supply. Hispanic elected officials and other perceptive policymakers have recently taken some positive steps to address this imbalance. The 1984 Bilingual Education Act created a new Family English Literacy Program to help schools teach English to parents of limited-English proficient children. The Congressional Hispanic Caucus has recently introduced an English literacy bill aimed at the wider adult Hispanic community. This bill, the English Proficiency Act, was introduced in the House with over 50 co-sponsors and is being readied for introduction in the Senate. These measures, developed with the assistance of the National Council of La Raza and other national Hispanic organizations, represent a positive first step.

The negative nativist attitudes and increasing xenophobia among a small but highly visible portion of our population is disturbing and should be taken seriously. But we must have faith in the sense of fairness which has characterized the American people, once they are made aware of the facts. The challenge for us, as Hispanics, is to get the facts across to the American people.

FORUM

INTRO

The following articles initiate the *Journal's* Forum section, which will present various viewpoints on a particular policy-relevant subject. This issue's Forum topic is Hispanic achievement in secondary and higher education. The initial piece by Peter Roos offers a legal viewpoint on questions of equity and excellence against the backdrop of national education reform. This article, which is reprinted with permission of the Hispanic Policy Development Project, appeared originally in Volume II of "Make Something Happen", a recent report of the National Committee on Secondary Schooling of Hispanics. The elements of improving Hispanic educational performance from a "best practices" standpoint are addressed in a second submission by Dr. Manuel J. Justiz and Dr. Lars G. Bjork. A third and final piece by Dr. Charles L. Kyle and Roberto Rivera, provides a local advocacy perspective on the important role community mobilization has played in addressing Chicago's Hispanic drop out problem.

EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE

Peter D. Roos

INTRODUCTION

Virtually every educational report which has been issued in recent years has sought to assure us that there is "no conflict between quality and equality." If the mechanical recitation of this cant is not enough to make one suspicious, a perusal of the commonly proposed recommendations quickly informs us why the authors of these reports feel compelled to make this requisite disclaimer. First, a number of the proposals run directly counter to positions long held by advocates of equality. Among these are included a heightened reliance on standardized testing, tightened discipline (often with a call for a reduced emphasis on due process), and a stated preference for non-bilingual means of teaching English to limited English proficient students. Although these direct conflicts with positions of minority advocates raise conflict enough, the possible implications of other proposals pose

Peter D. Roos 9

problems of potentially greater concern. An outstanding example is the common proposal that the high school curriculum be made more rigorous and that diplomas be withheld from all who fail to meet these higher standards. Though racially neutral, this proposal has the potential to devastate the already low graduation statistics of Hispanics and blacks who frequently are unable to handle the present, less rigorous, curriculum.

It is not the purpose of this paper to judge the wisdom of these and other proposals; rather, the purpose is to evaluate some of the more common recommendations or educational "solutions" being proposed with an eye toward their impact on Hispanic and other minority students, and to suggest, where appropriate, possible legal ramifications. While the utility of each or all of the proposals may well justify adoption, no one should be ignorant of the fact that most of the proposals currently under consideration pose a considerable tension between traditional views of equality and the proposed concepts of quality.

ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH TESTING—ISSUE NUMBER 1

Virtually every report that has criticized the educational system has concluded in one form or another that students are passing through the system on to graduation without acquiring the skills expected at the appropriate level. A fairly common response, whether suggested by the reports or by concerned legislatures, is to create "gates" at certain levels which can be entered only by earning a passing score on an examination. Frequently these examinations are standardized achievement tests created for this specific purpose.

Predictably, Hispanic students are failing those examinations at a higher rate than Anglo students. This means that these students are frequently held back in greater numbers than their Anglo counterparts; more seriously, it means that these students are being denied diplomas in greater numbers and percentages than Anglos.

This disparity in numbers, while certainly raising policy questions, does not, *by itself*, have legal implications; however, if the disparity can be traced to either (a) discriminatory practices of the school district¹ or (b) bias in the test,² grave legal questions are raised. The most common discriminatory practices that might be implicated include *de jure* (intentional) segregation, failure to implement a legally sufficient language assistance program,³ or the use of an otherwise lawful tracking system which becomes a dead end and which therefore denies students access to the curriculum needed to pass the examination. This latter practice, discussed in more detail in the next section, is one which may cast a legal shadow over even the most well-meaning program—one in which the accountability system envisions a remedial program to overcome educational deficits.

Despite the call in several of the recent studies for an end to tracking,⁴ a number of factors are pushing school districts and legislatures in the opposite direction. It seems fair to assume that the immediate future is likely to bring greater ethnic and socioeconomic segregation through tracking than that which presently exists.

The first factor of immediate relevance was touched on above. More specifically, failure by poor and minority children to pass the "gate" tests will frequently be accompanied by their reference to a remedial track. Of itself this might not be a bad thing (certainly one could not in good conscience accept an accountability scheme that did not include a remedial component); however, history warns us that these "remedial" tracks often end up as leveled programs that merely set a lower standard for participants rather than addressing their needs with the goal of returning them to a fully competitive position. A number of legal precedents suggest that should this occur, it violates the law as well as logic. These precedents include a number of southern tracking cases in which courts have stated that tracking was not *per se* illegal but could become such if it was dead-end tracking,⁵ and also include cases challenging the misclassification of minority children into classes for the retarded.⁶ In these latter cases, the courts have found particularly weighty the fact that a classification as retarded results in a leveled curriculum that scales down the expectation for and thus the competitive opportunities of those so classified. A "remedial" track which effectively does the same thing for students having the potential to compete with other students contains the same flaw that has offended these courts. The lesson is thus obvious: an accountability system that withdraws from students the opportunity to proceed with their classmates must build in a remedial system that is *fully* and *effectively* implemented with an eye toward allowing these students to catch up.

Another aspect of the new tracking is the effort to create programs for the more advanced. This occurs in the form of magnet schools or specialty programs. It is occurring in some instances to meet the new concern that the gifted must be given a boost and in other instances as a mechanism to attract or hold middle and upper class students—who frequently are Anglo. Bias and thus legal vulnerability can creep into these initiatives in several ways.

First, magnet programs, even where free transportation is provided, are commonly known to attract Anglos more than Hispanics, absent a major focus on educating Hispanic parents and students. If one adds to this the common pattern of "balancing" gifted programs in Anglo neighborhoods with bilingual programs in Hispanic ones, a pattern of intentional segregation can be inferred. Secondly, tests which serve as barriers to enrollment may be biased. Finally, and typically, many of these programs offer no access to the student who cannot speak or understand English. A persuasive case can be made that this violates various civil rights laws.

Another potential problem related to the effort to upgrade the curriculum is the possibility of differential curriculum offerings in

Anglo and minority schools. Indeed, this is already a discernible pattern in many districts where more advanced courses are offered only in Anglo schools. In and of itself this raises some legal issues; where the curriculum becomes so contracted in minority schools that it becomes virtually impossible to take the courses needed to attend four-year institutions of higher education, a fairly clear case can be made.

A variation of the above problem is the placement of more lower-level vocational programs in poor and minority areas than are offered in other areas. It is possible that this will be exacerbated by the new "partnerships" between industry and the schools. This needs to be watched closely or legal and equity issues will arise.

THE PUSH TO LEARN ENGLISH—ISSUE NUMBER 3

Hardly a report has been issued in recent memory that has not discussed the lack of English literacy by high school graduates. This has led to a number of proposals which have potentially damaging impact on Hispanic students.

The most obvious impact of this concern has been a further lessening of support for bilingual education. Bilingual advocates have not been very successful in conveying the message that a properly implemented bilingual education program offers the promise of more certain progress in English than the most commonly advocated alternatives. Indeed, much of the world believes that bilingual education and the learning of English are antithetical.

Although the evolving federal standard for addressing the needs of limited English proficient students does not mandate bilingual education *per se*, its logic compels such an approach in practice. The leading decision, *Casteneda v. Pickard* 648 F2 989 (5th Cir., 1981), allows school districts the option to focus their initial attention on English language learning but acknowledges that this will result in a decline in substantive learning. Under *Casteneda*, a district that chooses this course must implement a program that is responsive to this loss of substantive learning. Additionally, if a bilingual approach is not chosen, the alternative must be structured and implemented so as to achieve early and competitive English language proficiency. These alternatives are both problematic and much more costly than a bilingual education program.

In any event, it is crystal clear that the rush toward English language learning cannot pass legal muster if it fails to provide meaningfully implemented differential programming.⁷

Though logistically more difficult, this principle applies with equal force to secondary schools. Indeed, evidence presented at several trials⁸ supports an argument that bilingual instruction is of greater importance at the secondary level due to the increased complexity of the curriculum.

A side issue which has important equity implications and possible legal ramifications is whether credit toward graduation can be denied for English as a second language course. The push toward greater literacy for high school graduates has frequently been accompa-

nied by a more rigid approach to course credit. On the one hand, school systems and states have a legitimate right to set graduation standards. On the other hand, where such systems are compelled by federal law to provide special courses for students, it can be argued that they cannot penalize the student for taking them. If the evidence were to show, as is likely, that few of the students who took such courses at the high school level ever in fact were able to take the required courses and thus able to graduate, a fairly compelling case could be made that the practice violates these students' rights under the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974.

A TOUGHER DISCIPLINE POLICY—ISSUE NUMBER 4

Several months ago the President declared war on school violence. He also suggested that the Justice Department find a vehicle for obtaining Supreme Court review and reversal of the principles established in *Goss v. Lopez* 419 US 565 (1975). That case established the principle that due process must be accorded students who are removed from a school for even a short period of time; as the time removed becomes longer, the student is entitled to more stringent protections.

At least the President recognized the fact that constitutionally protected rights are implicated in student discipline. In the rush to make our schools "safe havens for learning," we seem to be forgetting this fact. It is also sometimes forgotten that we have a history of racial discrimination in discipline that has, on occasion, drawn judicial fire.⁹ In addition to intentional bias, discrimination has often crept into the disciplinary process because of the failure of Anglo faculty members to understand different cultural patterns of minority students.

Another discipline issue which has important ramifications for the school concerns the discipline of students who are handicapped and whose disciplinary problems flow from that condition. This occurs most frequently when one is dealing with emotionally disturbed students—many of whom may not be formally diagnosed as such. In such a case, suspension and expulsion may violate PL 94-142, the Education of the Handicapped Act.¹⁰

Thus, while schools have a right and possibly a duty to assure that a safe learning environment is maintained, their actions are constrained by legitimate protections for students charged with disciplinary infractions. This fact cannot be forgotten in the mindless pursuit of "troublemakers."

ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY—ISSUE NUMBER 5

There has been increasing recognition of the importance of computers in the schools. Those who have drawn our attention to this fact have noted their importance as an educational tool as well as the fact

that a lack of computer skills will hurt a student's vocational future.

Recognition of the importance of computers has not been matched by equal access. There is ample evidence that great disparities exist between rich and poor districts and indeed between rich and poor schools within the same district.¹¹ This latter situation has occurred on occasion because computer purchases have been left up to PTAs or their equivalent. Predictably, wealthy parents have been more able than poor parents to make such purchases or to leverage gifts from computer manufacturers.

Although the Supreme Court in *San Antonio ISD v. Rodriguez* (411 US 1 (1973)) condoned spending disparities as a matter of federal constitutional law, a number of state courts have followed the example of *Serano v. Priest* (5 C3 584 (1971)) in striking down such disparities under state law. Gross difference in access to an increasingly important part of the curriculum could invite scrutiny under these authorities. Too, differential access on the basis of ethnicity might run afoul of regulations issued pursuant to the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

PROPOSALS TO UPGRADE THE TEACHING PROFESSION— ISSUE NUMBER 6

The potential legal questions raised by the various proposals to address teaching "ills" are worthy of book-length treatment. Suffice it to mention that increased reliance on standardized tests for teachers, e.g., the National Teachers Examination, is likely to disproportionately deny access to Hispanic and other minority teachers. In light of the desperate need that exists for teachers who have bilingual skills, special judicial scrutiny of this impact may be appropriate under either the Constitution or several federal Civil Rights Acts. As the court stated in *Casteneda v. Pickard* (648 F2 989, 1012) "any school district that chooses to fulfill its obligation under §1703 [20 USC 1703] by means of a bilingual education program has undertaken a responsibility to provide teachers who are able competently to teach in such a program."

In addition, proposals for subjective evaluations of teacher skills for purposes of determining "merit" raise the substantial possibility of an ethnic or racial factor entering into such determinations. While a measured and reasoned consideration of ethnicity might justify a preference for a Hispanic or black teacher (*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke* 438 U.S. 265, (1978)), bigotry against such teachers is a real possibility and decidedly unlawful.

CONCLUSION

As the above review has sought to make clear, tension does exist between equity and many emerging proposals for excellence and equal-

ity in education. This is not to suggest, however, that the two concepts are incompatible; rather, it is to suggest that educational reforms need to be scrutinized to assure that equity considerations are addressed. If this is not done by those making the proposals, it almost certainly will have to be done by the courts.

FOOTNOTES

1. *Debra P.V. Turlington* 644 F2 397 (5th Cir., 1981) upheld a District Court ruling which enjoined the use of a competency test which had a disparate impact on the graduation rate of black students. One basis of the injunction was that the state (Florida), by maintaining segregated schools, had contributed to the disparity.

2. Test bias need not be intentional. *Larry P. v. Riles* 495 F. Supp 926 (D. Cal 1979).

3. See discussion in Issue Number 3.

4. See e.g. Goodlad, "A Place Called School" New York, McGraw Hill, 1983.

5. e.g. *McNeal v. Tate County School District* 508 F2 1017 (5th Cir. 1975).

6. *Ibid.* N.2.

7. *Lau v. Nichols* 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

8. *U.S. v. Texas* 506 F. Supp 405 (ED Tex 1981) Rev'd on other Grounds & Remanded 680 F2 356 (5th Cir., 1982); *Keyes v. School Dist. #1*, Denver 576 F. Supp 1503 (D. Colo., 1983).

9. See e.g., *Boykins v. Ambridge Area School Dist.* 621 Fe 75 (3rd Cir., 1980). *Hawkins v. Coleman* 376 F. Supp 1330 (N.D. Tex 1974).

10. See e.g., *S-1 v. Turlington* 635 F2 342 (5th Cir., 1981).

11. The Education Commission of the States, Law and Education Center "Footnotes", reports in its Summer 1983 edition: "A recent Market Data Retrieval survey indicates that 50% of American schools have at least one microcomputer. There is a pattern of acquisition, however: 80% of the 2,000 richest districts own microcomputers while 40% of the poorer districts own them, followed by only 12% of the high-poverty districts. Since more minority students are found in the poorer districts, questions of equity arise." "Footnote," p. 11.

ACCESS AND EXCELLENCE: REALIZING THE POTENTIAL OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Dr. Manuel J. Justiz and Dr. Lars G. Bjork

One of the greatest challenges faced by the Hispanic population today is raising academic standards and improving the quality of schools and colleges without compromising the principles of access. These issues were the essential thrusts of two major reports that were released by the National Institute of Education: *A Nation at Risk* and *Involvement in Learning*.

In our view, the controversial report, *A Nation at Risk*, made a major contribution to the "renaissance" in American education. The report recognized the significant accomplishments and contributions made by the Nation's schools and colleges to the well being of the people, but also recognized that "the rising tide of mediocrity"¹ may threaten the very future of our nation as a democratic society. Although it was admittedly a devastating critique of the condition of education in our high schools, it reflected the concern, and focused the attention, of public-minded citizens to improve the nation's schools. In this sense, it was considered by many to have initiated a national reform movement in American education, a movement that promised to forge new partnerships between classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, legislators and parents.

The public's attitude toward their schools is reflected in the steadfast conviction that public education is the foundation for our nation's strength and the cornerstone of a strong and truly representative democracy. The American people recognize that an unfailing system of public education bonds our pluralistic society, by helping to advance our society, but also by helping tie us to other cultures around the world.

A Nation at Risk not only examined the problems which we must overcome to successfully improve American education, but underscored that as a nation in pursuit of excellence, we must be equally concerned with preserving access. The report noted that "all, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the

utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself."² The report also expressed concern that without a sound education we may lose that shared vision of America—a land of opportunity whose principal instrument for the realization of dreams has been a quality education. The report also emphasized the need to search for shared solutions that are more educationally encompassing and sensitive to the needs of all Americans.

A Nation at Risk stressed the need to raise educational standards and improve the quality of academic progress in our schools. It was also an effort to acknowledge the current educational realities confronting our nation, and raise the consciousness of the American public to the fact that many students, especially minority students, were not receiving an education that would equip them to compete successfully in a technological society. Technological advancement will be far more demanding for future generations in terms of education than our forefathers experienced and will require a higher level of academic competence. A close examination of the issues surrounding education in American high schools made it abundantly clear that we need to raise standards and to improve academic programs.

Enthusiasm for educational reform and increasing academic standards, however, must be tempered with the unyielding reality that the national call for excellence included all students, not just the most academically able. Moving our nation's schools towards excellence by pushing out the low performers will only displace the problem rather than solve it. In this context, the report wasn't merely calling on states to manage a crisis, but calling on them to assist all students in meeting increased academic standards. In our judgment the Hispanic student may especially benefit from this new emphasis on excellence. We are confident that Hispanic students, like other students in American high schools, have the intellectual capacities to not only meet but exceed higher standards and obtain the education they justly deserve.

Hispanic and other minority youngsters, however, will require more than higher standards to make the current system more accountable to their rights and needs. A society in pursuit of educational excellence must also provide the support required to help our young people succeed in their educational experience and meet increased expectations. The Commissioners for the *A Nation at Risk* study recognized that the proper use of testing is to better inform the teaching and learning community and not to serve a gate-keeping function. What is needed is a process that can effectively identify students requiring advanced placement or remedial help and provide them with the academic support and encouragement they need to meet or exceed proficiency standards.

Unfortunately, the emphasis on testing appears to serve as an education report card, a means of reporting school effectiveness to state departments of education and legislatures. While standardized tests can serve useful purposes in improving education in our nation, for the most part they are only simple proxy measures that serve accountability

needs but don't tell the whole story. When standardized test scores are used as a sole measure of student ability, Hispanic students are unjustly treated. Standardized test results, however, can be used effectively with other assessment tools to provide useful information for remedial assistance and corrective action. A more appropriate focus for testing is its use as an ongoing formative mechanism for improving the teaching and learning process. Tests should be used in combination with other approaches to identify learning difficulties and appropriate corrective programs. It is crucial for testing to support the teaching and learning process, to maximize retention, and to assist students in developing the necessary skills to complete their education and make a contribution to our society. Challenging the suitability of standardized tests and ensuring the proper focus of testing in the educational process is an area in which Hispanic parents, educators and policymakers can make a difference.

Increasing the educational level of our nation's citizens and reducing the drop out rate has been one of our most significant achievements of this century.³ In 1900 only 10 percent of the nation's youths graduated from high school. By 1978 that percentage increased to 85 percent for whites and 75 percent for blacks. Hispanic students have not fared as well. In 1980 it was estimated that only 60 percent of Hispanic students graduated from high school. The typical profile of this group of drop outs is not particularly surprising to educators, parents, or policymakers. They come from low-income families, have few academic skills, perceive themselves as academic failures, and feel alienated from school. Accepting the high drop out rate in the near term is unnecessary and in the long term socially, economically, and politically unacceptable. Based on the experience of local school districts that have established successful drop out prevention programs, a substantial body of knowledge has been generated. These programs share a number of important characteristics such as small class settings with low student-teacher ratios, personalized attention to student needs, materials and teaching approaches that underscore the immediate and practical needs of students, emphasis on basic academic skills, and consistent patterns of rewarding student achievement.⁴ In addition, it has been recognized that behavior closely associated with dropping out can be identified as early as the third grade. This suggests that most drop out intervention programs generally start too late to be effective. The integration of effective teaching and learning approaches, early intervention, and parental reinforcement can increase the child's self confidence at an early age and can provide a powerful framework for success. We believe the enormous gains that were made during the first half of the twentieth century can be repeated for Hispanic students during the next several decades and into the twenty-first century.

Action must be taken to solve this problem. Information must be provided to two important groups that impact children in schools: educators and policymakers. Policymakers must be informed as to what the problem is, its short and long term implications. Educators must know what approaches work as well as those that don't work. This information must be compiled by an organization of unimpeachable integrity, free from political bias, and capable of effectively disseminating it to educators, parents, and policymakers in states and local school districts

who are in the vanguard of educational reform in the nation. The leadership for educational reform and financial support is clearly shifting from the federal government to states and localities. We must refocus our efforts to reflect this shift. It is abundantly clear that states will have to be persuaded to include remediation and drop out intervention in emerging educational reform legislation to ensure that all children are served. Giving the states and local school districts this opportunity is in the interest of our collective future.

Students being prepared in our schools today will directly affect the number and academic ability of students enrolling in institutions of higher education. The number of minority students in the pipeline will significantly increase during the next several decades. If they are inadequately prepared in high school, fewer will graduate, and fewer will enter college and enter the economic, social and political mainstream of American society. Unfortunately a growing number of minority students that could have enrolled in college didn't or entered with inadequate high school preparation.

Part of the cause of the decline in the number of Hispanics enrolling in institutions of higher education is the lack of critical information on colleges, programs of study and financial aid. The information, provided by high school counselors in many instances, varied according to student characteristics.⁵ Differential treatment and an absence of good information on college and financial aid opportunities represents new institutional barriers to education. This critical issue in part will define future minority access. Improving access, student retention, and improving academic performance of Hispanic students in the secondary school pipeline is of considerable importance. One of the most crucial agenda items for the Hispanic community during the coming decade will be developing and acting on specific strategies to improve academic skills, increase graduation rates of Hispanic students from secondary schools, and facilitate student transition from high school to college. Concurrently, the higher education community must become more responsive to working with high schools in order to ensure a smoother and more effective transition to higher education.

The second report, *Involvement in Learning*, which followed *A Nation at Risk*, addressed a number of similar concerns with respect to undergraduate education in our nation's colleges and universities. The report stressed the importance of involvement as the key to a successful undergraduate collegiate experience. Involvement is referred to as "how much time, energy and effort students devote to the learning process."⁶ Substantial evidence suggests that the more time students invest in their own education, the greater their growth, achievement, persistence, and satisfaction with their undergraduate educational experience. Student involvement is measured not only by the amount of time students dedicate to studying, but by other factors as well, such as working on campus rather than off campus, participating in student government, attending special lectures, and working more closely with faculty members and other students—in effect becoming involved in their education. According to the evidence, these activities unquestionably enhance student motivation and measurably contribute to their success and persistence in college.

Student retention has recently emerged as an important institu-

tional strategy for adapting to declines in student enrollment. This new focus has created an unprecedented opportunity to both improve the quality of education and advance the interests of minority students in our nation's colleges and universities. Retaining more students, however, will require fundamental changes in how colleges treat incoming freshmen. The freshman year experience is crucial as the highest percentage of drop outs occur during this period. In fact, some institutions have recognized that students that are experiencing difficulties and are potential drop outs send signals early in the first term of the freshman year and have increased their retention rates by modifying standard student examination schedules. Rather than waiting for midterm, they have started using several interim tests or written work in the first several weeks of class. In this way, students who are having trouble can be helped while there is still time to correct their study habits and classroom behavior.

Institutions must also commit talented faculty in the freshman year classes and remedial programs. *Involvement in Learning* recommends that institutions invest themselves in improving undergraduate education by providing more faculty and the most talented instructors during the freshman year. The concept of "front loading" is directly related to not only improving the quality of undergraduate academic programs, but is a useful approach to improve retention. Reducing class size, using talented instructors in freshman classes, and establishing effective counseling and remedial programs will be expensive but the alternative will be far more costly.

There is an important message to the Hispanic community in the report *Involvement in Learning*. We know that for social and economic reasons many Hispanic students attend school on a part-time basis. That's reality. However, one of the most precious resources in the educational process for students is time. Hispanic students are often faced with constraints that prevent them from spending more time with their education. Transferring discretionary activities to campus involves some trade-offs but these trade-offs will have substantial beneficial effects, particularly in enhancing retention. The dedication of students to become intensely engaged in their educational experience is essential; they must become active participants rather than spectators. The Hispanic community needs to develop strategies that increase student involvement while acknowledging that time and energy are also finite.

Some of these strategies should focus on areas that are the greatest impediments for Hispanic students. For instance, we know that some doubt has been cast on the belief that a college degree is an essential part of the American dream for an increasing number of bright and accomplished students regardless of ethnic background.⁷ Institutions must focus on helping students make the connection between their academic work and their futures. Hispanic students have and continue to express concern that they are falling deeply into debt while pursuing their college education. Better academic counseling and information regarding the availability of financial aid, particularly grants, can be enormously helpful in alleviating concern for indebtedness, reducing part-time enrollment, and increasing student involvement. In addition, institutions can convert a large number of potential drop outs to stop

outs by establishing a set of new advisement procedures that would allow them to stay in contact with those students and assist them in determining their readiness to continue their college education in the future.

All the recommendations to college and university officials aimed at improving student learning and performance will be of little consequence if students themselves fail to respond. The most important ingredient in improving learning and achieving excellence in American undergraduate education is the commitment by students to become involved. They must make their investment in education count. Hispanic students need to become an active part of the leadership cohort on college and university campuses and this can only be done through involvement. Becoming involved in campus activities provides valuable opportunities to develop intellectual skills, gain experience, and build confidence that can contribute to advancing future careers.

Increasing student involvement in campus activities, however, can only emerge from a campus environment that is individually, academically and financially supportive. Stimulating Hispanic students' success in college will be directly related to the degree to which institutions invest in improving their academic skills, providing academic and financial counseling, engaging in "front loading," reducing class size, providing early assessment, ensuring excellence in remedial programs and increasing the number of educational grants. When the needs of the students are compatible with the campus environment students will not only stay but will excell. Whenever possible, Hispanic students should attend college on a full time basis. This enhances student involvement and participation in the academic environment. Hispanic students should make their education their number one priority. Full-time college attendance provides important opportunities for learning and involvement which transcend the classroom.

The issues of excellence and access are inextricably linked and are coming to the forefront of the debate in American education at a time when significant demographic shifts are changing the very face of our nation.⁸ The Hispanic population is increasing by significant proportions and will be the single largest minority group in the nation in the not too distant future. We have a responsibility to ensure that our Hispanic youth develop the skills necessary to be among the nation's leaders. To be represented in these influential circles, it is incumbent upon us to encourage our youths to invest wisely in their future. We must join other public-spirited citizens working towards improving our educational system.

Demographic indicators suggest that more than 50 percent of the present faculty in our colleges and universities will be replaced during the next decade. In fact higher education institutions in America will have to hire approximately a half a million full-time-equivalent faculty members, the entire professoriate, between 1985 and 2010.⁹ This emerging demand for trained faculty has created an unprecedented opportunity to both advance the professional interests of Hispanics and other minorities and the quality of their educational training, credentials and experience. What was perhaps only a dream in the 1960s can become a reality in the 1990s: moving Hispanics into the professorship—a field in which they have historically been underrepresented.

But successfully taking advantage of this singular opportunity will depend on whether our youth can meet the rigorous academic standards of graduate schools, become faculty members, and advance in their fields. We must ensure that Hispanics as well as other minorities acquire the credentials and training not only to compete for these positions but to succeed in obtaining and retaining them.

The enormous significance of the emerging debate on excellence and access means the Hispanic community must actively participate in crafting the standards and shaping the direction of educational excellence in our public schools, colleges and universities. We must recognize and accept the challenge that participation in the American educational enterprise is critical in taking advantage of expanding opportunities in our nation.¹⁰ The challenge is no less than preserving the continued validity of our democratic society. The consequences of failure are unthinkable.

FOOTNOTES

1. U.S. Department of Education (1984). *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 5.
2. U.S. Department of Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 4.
3. Hodgkinson, H. (1985). *All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Leadership, Inc., pp. 11.
4. Hodgkinson, H. (1985). *All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Leadership, Inc., pp. 11.
5. Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
6. U.S. Department of Education (1984). *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 17.
7. Hodgkinson, H. (1985). *All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Leadership, Inc.
8. Hodgkinson, H. (1985). *All One System: Demographics of Education, Kindergarten Through Graduate School*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Leadership, Inc., pp. 17.
9. Bowen, H.R. and J.R. Schuster (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Equal Opportunity Commission (1979). *Higher Education Staff Information Report*. (Research reprint EEO-6). Washington, D.C.: Author.

THE SUCCESSES OF THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY MOVEMENT FOR DROP OUT PREVENTION IN CHICAGO

Dr. Charles L. Kyle Jr. and Roberto Rivera

The high drop out rate of Hispanic students in Chicago was a grievous social problem, recognized and understood in Chicago's Hispanic community for nearly 15 years; yet the phenomenon was never considered a public problem until Aspira Inc. of Illinois inaugurated a social movement focused on the drop out problem. Since this Hispanic community based movement began in February of 1984, it has been responsible for the firing of the general superintendent of Chicago public schools, the installation of Chicago's first Hispanic public high school principal, the passage of eight state laws concerning drop out prevention, the establishment of "safe school zones", the opening of three alternative high schools in the *barrio*, and the election of the first Hispanic state senator in Illinois history.

Many scholars of educational research on Hispanics know that in 1971, Dr. Isidro Lucas indicated the drop out rate of Puerto Rican youths from Chicago public high schools was 71.2 percent. For 13 years after his report, this catastrophic drop out rate decimated the youth of the Chicago Hispanic community. The constant flow of young people who dropped out of Chicago schools into the streets resulted in the dominance of Hispanic neighborhoods by violent street gangs.¹

For the Illinois Legislature, 1985 was the year of educational reform. Bills were passed that promoted teacher accountability, provided for recertification of principals, and increased funding to education as a whole.² In the midst of this legislative package, which comprised the most comprehensive revision ever attempted of the Illinois School Code, was a series of bills which dealt with the problem of high school drop outs. The inclusion of the drop out bills in the education agenda did not result from efforts of the education establishment, but were rather a direct result of a community involvement centered in Chicago's Hispanic community.

In February of 1984, a meeting called by Aspira Inc. of Illinois and the Network for Youth Services was held for parents and educators to discuss the Hispanic drop out problem. The meeting's purpose was to

announce the results of the *Aspira Chicago Drop Out Study*. The predominantly Hispanic parents of the Humbolt Park area of Chicago were chosen as the audience. Discussion highlighted the findings of Lucas' 1971 study, which for years were covered up by academia and the educational establishment.³ If the Lucas study was not divulged, it was decided, the catastrophic drop out problem would continue. Community leaders decided to by-pass the academic community and go directly to the parents.

Preparations for a "Conference on Hispanic Drop Outs" were made at the Trina Davila Center overlooking Humbolt Park in the center of Chicago's Puerto Rican *barrio*. Aspira Inc. of Illinois and the Network for Youth Services hoped for the participation of 200 parents. More than 500 parents came to the all-day conference; "There weren't enough chairs. There wasn't enough food."⁴ While the Chicago public school system claimed a 8.5 percent drop out rate, in reality, more than 60 percent of the young people in this area of Chicago were leaving school unprepared for work and without a diploma. These youths ended up on the streets. Gangs flourished. Dr. Irving Spergel, a national expert on street gangs, came to refer to this area of Chicago as Beirut.

Although a great success, the February "Parents Conference on Hispanic Drop Outs" was not covered by the media. The media had been quick to cover many negative incidents in Humbolt Park, yet it was not disposed to cover a conference of Hispanic parents who wanted to address the drop out problem. Press releases were sent out two weeks in advance and additional notices were hand delivered to radio, TV, and newspaper city desks the day before the event. Although the press was not at the conference, Illinois Senate President Philip Rock did attend the event. At the conference, Senate President Rock pledged to the parents that he would initiate a state legislative task force to investigate the drop out problem.

Aspira Inc. of Illinois and the Network for Youth Services decided to again pursue a public forum for this issue. On March 26, 1984, nearly one thousand people marched in a candlelight procession from St. Mark's Catholic Church to Roberto Clemente High School. The people filed behind a casket which symbolized their friends and relatives who had died in street violence, which they believed a direct consequence of the prevailing drop out problem. The message of the marchers was that, if Roberto Clemente High School was "graduating" more than 70 percent of its students rather than pushing 70 percent of its students out of school, many of the young people being mourned would still be alive.

This march was especially strategic. That evening, the National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics was holding hearings in Chicago. The Commission was invited to hear the concerns of Hispanic parents at Clemente High School. The full Commission did not attend the march but agreed to have a few commissioners meet with some of the parents at an alternate location.

Aspira and the Network arranged for a private conference room at St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital. The commissioners did not know that St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital is adjacent to Clemente High School and that the conference room was directly above the path of the marchers. The National Commission's hearing was impacted by the outpouring of

emotion that evening. A *New York Times* reporter assigned to the Commission hearing instead wrote an article about the march and the concern of Hispanic parents over the drop out problem.⁵ The parents were joined in the march by School Board President George Munoz, School Board Member Myrna Salazar, and Chicago Auxiliary Bishop Placido Rodriguez. That evening the drop out problem was "news" on all four Chicago television stations and both major Chicago newspapers. This brought the Hispanic drop out problem into public view.

Aspira and the Network quickly followed up this event with a trip to the state capital. Five bus loads of young adults and parents were brought to Springfield, Illinois on April 24, 1984 to hear Senate President Philip Rock honor his promise to the community and introduce Senate Joint Resolution 82 which called for the creation of a legislative task force to investigate the Hispanic student drop out problem. In a moving speech, Senator Rock pointed to the galleries jammed full with young Hispanics and exhorted his fellow Senators that: "We dare not lose another generation so precious." The resolution passed the Senate 59-0 even though at that time there was not one Hispanic member of the Senate. On June 30, 1984, the Illinois House passed SJR 82 which insured that the Hispanic drop out problem would remain a public problem until the task force issued its recommendations in March of 1985.

Chicago public schools used two main strategies in order to keep the empirical understanding of the drop out problem from becoming known. The first strategy was to use bogus formulas which appeared to yield reliable data but actually revealed a drop out factor that was a fraction of the true rate. For example, the Chicago Board of Education released a drop out rate for the graduating class of 1984 which was 8 percent, while in reality the rate was over 40 percent.⁶

The second method used was to keep research groups from obtaining the data which was necessary to evaluate the schools' performance.

The breakthrough in the empirical understanding of the drop out rate came from three different directions almost simultaneously. Through the joint influence of the National Center for Bilingual Research and the three Hispanic members of the Chicago Board of Education, including then Board President Raul Villalobos, permission was granted in 1981 by Chicago public schools to Aspira Inc. to study the Hispanic drop out problem. The *Aspira Chicago Drop Out Study*, published in 1984, followed the entering freshmen cohort of 1979 in two predominantly Hispanic High schools in Chicago over four years until their scheduled graduation in June of 1984. The study found that of 1985 entering freshman at least 45 percent had dropped out of school by graduation. This study included analysis of individual student records, analysis of the racial/ethnic counts done for the federal court, an analysis based on counting yearbook pictures, and a qualitative component consisting of interviews with a random sample of 100 drop outs and 100 stay ins. The Aspira study found that the reason most often given by the youths for leaving the schools was fear of the gangs.

In January of 1985, Designs for Change Inc. released a study of the holding power of Chicago public schools. The study, titled *The Bottom Line: Chicago's Failing Public Schools*, indicated that the estimated drop

out rate for the class of 1984 in Chicago Public Schools was 47 percent and that of those who did graduate one-third could not read at the ninth grade level.

In May of 1985, the Chicago Panel on Public School Finances issued a study on the Chicago drop out rate which was conducted in cooperation with the Research and Development Department of the Chicago public schools. This study was based on actual archival records. The conclusion was that the drop out rate for the class of 1982 was 43 percent.⁷

The first event which gave a major dramatic impact to the drop out problem was a television documentary done by Ed Villareal of WBBM-TV, a CBS-TV subsidiary in Chicago. The documentary was titled *The Lost Generation*. In the documentary, Mr. Roberto Rivera of *Aspira* shared the disastrous effects which were being borne by the Puerto Rican community because the Chicago Board of Education was hiding a severe problem through the use of bogus statistics.

Once the real drop out rates were uncovered, those who accepted responsibility for this catastrophe fared well. For example, Benito Juarez High School formed a community task force and initiated a fine computerized attendance system which monitored their students on a class by class basis. The district superintendent for the two schools studied in the *Aspira Drop Out Study* said from the very beginning that his drop out problem exceeded 50 percent. He was later promoted to a position of greater responsibility. On the other hand, the principal of one of the high schools in that same study steadfastly refused to admit to the problems of the school. She was later replaced by the first Hispanic high school principal in the Chicago public schools' history. General Superintendent Ruth Love was not afforded an opportunity to renew her contract because she refused to admit to drop out rates which exceeded 10 percent.⁸

As a result of this Hispanic community movement, a number of new laws have been passed in Illinois. Drop out rates in Illinois will now be based upon a proper definition which will be uniform statewide and will include any person not in a regular course of study who has not received a high school diploma. These rates will be included in the annual report submitted to the governor. A special report on this topic also will be submitted yearly to state leaders who make budget appropriations for education. In addition, both of these reports will be submitted to the Office of the State Auditor General for compliance audits. Finally, it will be a Class A misdemeanor punishable by one year in jail to knowingly enter false drop out statistics in an official report.

In response to the crime issue, "safe school zones" have been established within 1,000 feet of Illinois schools. Anyone arrested for possession or distribution of weapons or drugs within these zones will face increased penalties. Furthermore, more than 11 million dollars were appropriated to create a Truancy Alternatives Program. As part of this money, three alternative schools were established in the Humbolt Park area of Chicago for youths who have been out of school for at least six months. Money was appropriated to allow 65,000 youths at risk of leaving school to attend free summer school. In addition, a scholarship program was initiated for Hispanic educators to pursue advanced degrees in administration.

An added result of the community's initiative was that Miguel Del Valle, a community leader who founded the Network for Youth Services, ran for the Illinois Senate on a platform based on school reform. He won and will be officially seated in January of 1987 as Illinois' first Hispanic State Senator.

FOOTNOTES

1. Dix, Paul, ed., *Gangs* 1984. Chicago, IL: Chicago Tribune Co.
2. Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education, *Excellence in the Making* 1985. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.
3. Anonymous Chicago Board of Education Internal Memo, 1971.
4. *Chicago Reader*. July 27, 1984. p. 3.
5. Shipp, E.R., March 28, 1984. *The New York Times*. "Chicago's Hispanic Parents Protest 70% Dropout Rate."
6. Chicago Panel of Public School Finance. 1984.
7. Hess, G. Alfred, Jr. and Lauber, Diana. *Drop Outs from the Chicago Public Schools*. April 1985. Chicago, IL: Chicago Panel on Public School Finances.
8. Walter Jacobson. July 17, 1985. *Perspective*. WBBM-TV. Chicago, IL.

FEATURE INTERVIEW

URBAN ECONOMIC POLICY: A DISCUSSION WITH THE HONORABLE HENRY G. CISNEROS

Henry G. Cisneros is mayor of San Antonio, Texas, the nation's tenth-largest city. He holds degrees from Texas A&M, Harvard University, and George Washington University. Already in his relatively brief political career he has obtained national prominence as a member of Henry Kissinger's Special Commission on Central America and as a near vice-presidential candidate in 1984. In addition to his many duties as mayor, he is former president of the National League of Cities, a visiting professor of Urban Studies at Trinity University, and a member of the Board of Regents of Texas A&M University and Notre Dame University.

Mayor Cisneros has made economic development of San Antonio one of his primary concerns, and the results have attracted national attention. This interview focuses on the mayor's opinions about economic development and the role of Hispanics in national politics.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

JHP: How do you define economic development?

Cisneros: Basically, what we are trying to do is raise income. That's the one criteria I use more than any other in defining economic development. Many other kinds of statistics, like general regional product growth, unemployment rate, and especially the labor force participation rate, are good proxies, but what I depend on is income. What we are now trying to do is focus on the level of income as it relates to specific areas. We are focusing on individuals by doing some longitudinal studies to see how individuals fare under my economic development policies.

JHP: In terms of fostering economic development, you based your strategy on San Antonio's strengths. What have you identified as San Antonio's strengths, and why?

Cisneros: I felt that it was silly for us to reinvent the wheel and start

from scratch, to pretend that a city can be *anything*. Frequently, people fall into traps and resort to whatever seems to be fashionable in urban policy at the time. What we try to do is focus on our traditional strengths. One is that we have a large military presence, and as a result certain kinds of electronic and high-tech kinds of jobs support that industry. We are also the central banking and wholesale center for the farm and ranch industry of Central Texas and that relates to agricultural processes. Additionally, we have a very large tourism industry. Thus, we have built on these industries, including the recent decision by Sea World to locate a major facility here. Our other strength is the biosciences and biotechnology, and we have been putting a lot of emphasis on that. Those are our major strengths and they are matched against demographics, labor supply, transportation base, energy supply, and a good governmental climate—including tax rate. You put it all together and that begins the winds of change.

JHP: What effect does the large military presence have on San Antonio's economy? And, has San Antonio been successful in luring businesses that work with the military establishment?

Cisneros: One of San Antonio's assets is and has historically been its large and stable military presence. Five military installations and related facilities employ some 29,000 civilian workers and have over 43,000 military personnel. Over 63,000 retired, guard/reserve military personnel have an impact on the local economy. Their annual civilian and military payrolls totaled over \$2.5 billion for 1985.

In the fall of 1985, the City of San Antonio's Department of Economic and Employment Development created and set into motion the Procurement Outreach Program (POP). This program is designed to assist business and industry interested in bidding for government contracts. The diversity and volume of what the federal government purchases makes it an attractive prospect to firms from a wide range of industries. Within three months, the POP assisted over 100 businesses and facilitated \$5.3 million in contracts to local businesses. The federal procurement market is vast and opportunities exist for businesses offering their products and services. This effort in and of itself is a critical element in the site selection process of many companies and firms. San Antonio has many positive programs and incentives in place to assist companies interested in military procurement.

JHP: You have talked a lot about trying to change the city's image from a "cheap labor town" to that of an "educated and skilled labor town." How have you done that?

Cisneros: Well, that's a tough call. Because we have a large pool of uneducated people, it's going to take quite a long time before we are able to say we have successfully altered that image. My sense is that, at least in some respects, we are beginning to turn the corner and what was once considered a sleepy, inward-looking provincial city with no ambitions whatsoever has changed.

The fact that San Antonio is 54 percent Hispanic was once perceived to be synonymous with a kind of *manaña* mentality about eco-

conomic development. We have been able to make the political, social, and economic ambitions of the Hispanic community generally fit within a context of the ambitions of the city. I recognize that without a generally prosperous area economy there cannot be upward mobility within it. So prosperity is a precondition. Minority upward mobility and economic development generally are very compatible notions. Also, truthfully, I think it will take this kind of preconditioning in order to achieve minority upward mobility.

JHP: You were saying that you matched the ambitions of the Hispanic community to those of the city. How did you find out what the ambitions of the Hispanic community were?

Cisneros: It's clear to me that the Hispanic community wants greater political participation, basic civic improvements, better jobs, lower unemployment, higher income, basic neighborhood improvements—streets, drainage, and adequate city services. Also, I am in constant dialogue with the Hispanic community and its leaders, and this is my sense of the direction they want to go.

JHP: Have you done anything with the high schools, grammar schools, or universities in an attempt to change the city's labor image?

Cisneros: Yes, we have fought hard for changing the state system of school finance to a more equitable system. We have fought hard for a technical high school, a health careers high school, and are now trying to relate our progress in the biosciences to the educational opportunities. In effect, we are encouraging the vocational high school educators to transform their thinking from upholstery and small engine repair to higher technology opportunities. And when I say high-tech, I mean those opportunities made possible by the explosion in the high-tech field.

JHP: Are you fostering small businesses in any way, such as helping small business start-ups or helping existing small businesses grow?

Cisneros: Yes, there might be several ways of thinking about our economic development plan. Certainly, one dimension is attracting businesses from the outside, but another even more important one is supporting our existing economic anchors. This means supporting the military, tourism, and the biosciences. It means not allowing any sliding of what we already have in place.

And then another aspect is creation of new growth businesses. We have created a new small business and technology center with Control Data Corporation. It now has 35 students and has created over 100 jobs—all operating out of small businesses. We use the term "growth" because what we are really after are businesses which will grow—not specifically high-tech, but those which have entrepreneurial qualities which will allow them to grow. We generally assist them in any way they need: training, business education, site location, accounting—whatever it takes to allow them to grow. In his most recent book, John Naisbitt [author of *Megatrends*] cited San Antonio as one of the ten best

places in the country in which to start a business.

JHP: What have you done to foster economic development in addition to enticing industry to relocate within your city?

Cisneros: I generally regard economic development as a two-fisted proposition. One fist is to focus upon the standard Chamber of Commerce agenda: attraction of industries, creating an entrepreneurial environment within the city government, and creating what we call our One-Stop Business Center. The other half of it is to try to relate whatever economic progress we are making to those who have been outside of the economic mainstream.

JHP: How do you respond to [Washington Post political columnist] David Broder's argument that your economic development policies benefit the already advantaged parts of the city but do little to create jobs for the traditionally disadvantaged?

Cisneros: The flaw in David's analysis is that he did not look at people, but at census information on geographic areas. One of the things that is happening is that as our economic development policies create jobs and income, people move out of their old neighborhoods and move up to better neighborhoods. When that happens, the statistics of the area that they left actually end up looking worse. You have the constant process of the most capable people moving up and moving out. If you looked at the people themselves and not individual blocks of geography, I think the statistics would show something different. We have no basis to check this since the Census Bureau keeps their analysis by census tract. That's why we are doing longitudinal studies, following the people and their experiences to try and determine if our economic policies are sound.

JHP: Do you think your model of economic development can be replicated in other cities, such as Oakland or Miami?

Cisneros: Yes, I do. It is a model I have tried to characterize as composed of three elements. The first is strategy. You need to select a strategy and acknowledge that without a strategy there is no rallying point—there is nothing to sell, there is nothing that people can relate to, plug into, and share a vision with. There is no ability to do what President Reagan has done so successfully, and what good leaders do, which is to stand for something. If you can articulate to people what that is in clear, simple terms, the chances are you will pose a very good contrast against your opponent and others that can't articulate what it is that they stand for. You set the agenda. So the selection of strategy is very key, and the ability to repeat, repeat, repeat and be consistent is very important.

The second element is consensus building, the inclusiveness that is characterized in our economic development. Our purposes are inclusive, our tactics are inclusive, our constant preoccupation is to be inclusive. That means patient dialogue, constant information sharing, and lots of time spent in communication and cross checking—something perhaps on the Japanese model of consensus building.

Thirdly, a constant pressure for results, a kind of tension in the system, is needed. If a strategic analysis is somewhat arcane and long-range, and inclusiveness is time-consuming, then somebody has to keep constantly pressuring for results in order to manage the agenda. That's my job. To push, nudge, move people along, keeping the focus, producing results, week in and week out.

JHP: In other cities, such as Detroit and Atlanta, there was a strain between city hall and the business establishment when the first blacks were elected mayor. Unlike mayors before them, the blacks didn't attend the same schools or the same clubs as the city business leaders and thus were not their friends or acquaintances. Was this a factor in your relationships with business leaders when you were first elected?

Cisneros: No. Although I don't have the same social background, what I tried to make clear is that for different reasons we are trying to go down the same road. My objective is not to line the pockets of any particular development agency; it is to create jobs. To the extent that my agenda of job creation and income growth can be served while they in the meantime can meet their needs, then we have every reason in the world to work together. I acknowledge that in our system people are entitled to make money. I have no problem with that as long as in the process there is a community benefit: be it revitalization of an area that is dying, jobs for a certain number of people, or raising income for those that work there. Then, I'll support them to the hilt.

JHP: What differences do you notice in working with business versus community groups?

Cisneros: To tell you the truth, there's not a lot of difference. I try to be as even-handed as I can. One of the absolute essentials for the mayor's survival in a very diverse city like ours, where there's such a fine tight-rope balancing act all the time, is that you can't be caught saying different things to different people. I try to be available to both business leaders and community organizations. This is one of the more demanding aspects of the job. I try to be direct with folks and keep them informed of what's coming down the road. I suppose there are some subconscious differences in style that I don't acknowledge, but the substance of a meeting with a business group and the next day with a community group, or vice-versa, is going to be very much the same.

JHP: Mayors Richard Daley [Chicago] and Kevin White [Boston] focused on direct services, the traditional kind of economic development where people can see their actions. You have opted for long-range planning. Do you think this approach is politically feasible?

Cisneros: Obviously, you have to keep providing direct services and be available to people, but I think you have to overlay a longer-range agenda on top of that. The task is to work in duality: delivering services and yet still keeping the focus on longer-range planning.

HISPANICS AND THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

JHP: There appears to be a large number of Hispanics moving to the Republican party, which can be seen most clearly in Hispanic businesspeople. Do you see this as a trend?

Cisneros: Oh, I suspect there are a few who are changing parties, but the majority of Hispanics continue to be loyal to the Democratic party. And with the exception of Florida, I would say the numbers are 70-75 percent Democratic in most parts of the country. Barring any dramatic policy break in which the Republicans produce things which are favorable to Hispanics, and barring a kind of dynastic succession of Republicans where over time they make all the appointments and set all the trends that would lose the Democrats their place as the majority party, Hispanics will continue to be predominantly Democrats.

JHP: Is there anything the Democratic party can do to halt the influence of the Republican party?

Cisneros: I would say there are three things. First is to advance Democratic Hispanic candidates as much as possible, and that means in statewide and congressional races in California, New Mexico, Arizona, Florida, Texas, New York, and Illinois.

Secondly, the Democrats need to continue to produce on the non-negotiable issues of governance: voting rights, education, and immigration.

Thirdly, the Democratic party has to listen carefully to what Hispanics are saying about basic values, not just rearticulate the party position. Hispanics are not always in accord with the other constituencies within the Democratic party. The Hispanic community may indeed have a different orientation on many basic family issues such as school prayer, which is a function of their religion, family structure, and history.

JHP: On a larger scale, what do you see as the strategy needed to pull together the Hispanics in this country, brushing aside for the moment our political and historical differences?

Cisneros: My sense is there are some basic issues on which we have a common cause. We need to identify the rallying points, we have to agree in advance that we are not going to create permanent alliances, but rather floating coalitions on the issues that affect us all, like education and discriminating policies. All of us—Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Central Americans, South Americans—have certain fundamental issues that pull us together. We ought to focus upon those and agree to disagree on other matters so we won't let those disagreements disintegrate our floating coalitions. I think the immigration fight last year proved this to be possible.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

JHP: From your vantage point as former president of the National League of Cities, what do you see as the fundamental challenges facing the U.S. economy, and where do you think society should make its investments for the future?

Cisneros: I think the fundamental problems posed by the American economy revolve around the transformation of the industrial economy to a service economy, and the implications this has on public policy. Important issues include the transformation of education, the growth of low-paying service jobs, the demise of the middle-class, and the problem of the chasm that will exist between those in an ever more demanding society of scientists and engineers versus the illiteracy that exists in many Hispanic communities. The juxtaposition of these issues can be very, very explosive. We should continue to focus upon education in all its forms, and aggressively insist upon technical literacy and the creation of economic opportunity in our cities.

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

JHP: Have you modeled yourself after anyone?

Cisneros: I don't know that I have. Basically, there are a lot of people that I have admired and worked with. In my earlier days I enjoyed my relationships with Ed Muskie [former U.S. Senator and Secretary of State] and Eliot Richardson [former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare]. My real heroes were JFK and Dr. King. In terms of my preparation I guess I just knew what I wanted to do. I set out to develop very precise ways and skills that would help me do that, without really modeling myself after any one person.

JHP: Do you have any aspirations of running for a higher office?

Cisneros: No, I do not. I hope to serve as mayor for a few more years if the voters here allow it. I hope that the models I have developed here—the consensus approach to politics, the focus upon community services, economic development, and working from an equity agenda which is linked to business practicality—can be used in other communities.

JHP: If you weren't mayor, is there another profession that would attract you?

Cisneros: I've been offered positions such as college president, chancellor of the university system, and other jobs within business, but I truly

believe that I am in a job that is completely challenging all my mind and skills, one which is totally engrossing and engaging. I can't imagine another position which would give me the same level of fulfillment. Obviously, I won't be able to be here forever; as a result I hope to be happy, productive, and to contribute in other areas such as education.

This feature interview was conducted by Kimura Flores with the assistance of Stephanie Hernandez, both of whom are master's degree candidates at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Ms. Flores is currently on leave from the School while completing a Congressional Women in Public Policy Fellowship.

POLICY PERSPECTIVE

TOWARDS A NEW U.S.-MEXICO ECONOMIC RELATIONSHIP

The Hon. Bruce Babbitt

During his two terms as governor of Arizona (1978-87), Bruce Babbitt often addressed U.S.-Mexico economic and foreign policy. He was a member of the Bi-National Governor's Conference, which brings together border state governors of the U.S. and Mexico to discuss mutual policy interests. And in 1983, he served as Chairman of the Southwest Border Regional Council, which oversees policy issues relating to border states. In this article, Babbitt offers his perspective on the need for, and elements of, a new U.S.-Mexico economic relationship.

About a week after I became governor of Arizona in 1978, a group of angry farmers – piqued at the import of cheap produce – struck up a confrontation with Mexican truckers and closed the border at McAllen, Texas. Next they headed to Arizona for more. Not unduly influenced by the Logan Act, I picked up the phone and called the Governor of Sonora, Mexico. “We have a problem,” I said. “What are we going to do about it?” The two of us worked out a plan: Sonora would intercept its truckers and brief them south of the border, while I calmed the farmers on the Arizona side. For insurance I called up a unit of the National Guard and concealed them in a warehouse nearby. Things never got that far: the conflict defused, the truckers went about their business, and we sent everyone off to a conference to talk about it.

Three days later I got an urgent call from Mexico City. The American ambassador to Mexico was on the line, and he had news for me. “Bruce,” he said, “we’ve just received word that a group of angry farmers is headed to Arizona for a protest.”

I wish I could call this an anomaly. That kind of lapse, after all, would be difficult to imagine in a crisis with one of our European allies, or with the Soviet Union, or Japan. But it is not a bad specimen of U.S.-Mexico relations: for all their importance to us, we are well nigh oblivious to our friends south of the border.

Mexico is a foreign country. It deserves a foreign policy from us. Distance is at least partly a state of mind, and the great paradox of Mexico is that in *our* minds it might as easily be 10,000 miles away. Mexico City, somewhere along the line, found itself classified in Washington as one of those exotic foreign capitals which merit modest

seasonal attention and no more. In fact, we spend a good deal *less* time thinking about Mexico than we do about a dozen other important but ultimately second-order concerns.

We need a geography lesson. Mexicans and Americans share a 2,000-mile border on the North American continent. Mexico is our third largest market, our third largest source of imports, and our principal foreign supplier of oil. Its land mass exceeds Western Europe's. Its population would fill three Canadas, four Central Americas. Its domestic economy tops Central America's combined, with an Argentina to spare. When Mexico slashed imports in 1982, America lost 200,000 jobs. In short, the political and economic stability of Mexico is nothing less than critical to our continued well-being. U.S.-Mexico relations should rank with U.S.-Soviet and U.S.-NATO relations at the top of our priority list.

How, then, have we come to ignore such an important neighbor?

Part of the answer is what I call the inverse ratio rule: the nearer the country, the less we notice it. It's a cliché to accuse Washington of myopia: what we have here is just the reverse. Distant wars and famines shine through as clear as day, and yet we cannot see Mexico in front of our faces. The inverse ratio rule disregards the very first principle of strategy, which is to tend your home ground. With Canada to our north and oceans to the east and west, we've historically seen no reason to worry about our immediate neighborhood. That was not so bad when the neighborhood more or less took care of itself, but it does so no longer.

When we *have* turned our sights on Mexico, Mexicans have not always had reason to be grateful. Every Mexican schoolchild learns that Mexico lost half its territory to the United States in the nineteenth century and that intervention, when it suited us, continued well into the twentieth. Our shared history, therefore, makes for a barrier to sympathetic relations. And there are continuing asymmetries: affluence against underdevelopment, and the contrasting legacies for this continent of Great Britain and Spain. Mexicans can't help viewing the giant to their north with mixed emotions—warmth and fear, admiration and anxiety, closeness and a compulsive need for distance. This ongoing ambivalence explains the Mexican rejection of direct American aid, whether from Peace Corps volunteers or from humanitarian funds in the wake of disaster. It also explains why our foreign relations at times seem so abstract, so weighed down with symbolism, so distracted by personality and press reaction.

Along with the cultural barriers, you must add a political one. Washington today has about it the trappings of a vast imperial bazaar. Foreign nations, like domestic interest groups, arrive hat in hand in Washington to lobby, explain, and contend for their share of our largess and attention. For better or for worse, this is how we do our business. Most countries recognize that, and when in America they do as Americans do. There are few of them so small, or so remote, that they fail to mobilize their influence in Washington.

Mexico does little of this, and it suffers for it. I've tried, on occasion, to persuade Mexican officials that they ought to be more aggressive. And the answer I hear is the following: you keep out of our politics, they tell me, and we'll keep out of yours.

We have to respect that. And we have to compensate for it. In a world in which the squeaky wheel gets the grease, Mexico is not getting the attention it deserves. Mexico's friends—those of us who believe in the immense significance of our bilateral relations—ought to take it upon ourselves to see that our neighbor is not forgotten. Mexico's family—those of you whose lives continue to be shaped by the two cultures, the two languages and the two histories—have an obligation to give leadership in the United States for a new, more insightful and more intelligent policy towards Mexico. It is said that the Hispanic community is a giant who is waking up, but in reality it is a giant who is already awake, who has power, and who is learning how to exercise it. I believe there is only one way to change the policy of this present administration, and it is with the help of those who intimately understand Mexico. What better place to start than with the nation's Hispanic community, 60 percent of whom are concentrated in five southwestern states?

Those of us who are from the Southwest bear a special responsibility in this respect, for we are all, at least a little bit, the sons and daughters of Mexico. It only takes one trip "back East" to demonstrate the extent to which our shared culture has made us different. We must stick together. Because it is together that we can meet the task of educating the people in the United States and then, more urgently, the politicians in Washington. Our futures depend on it for the simple reason that the social and economic decline of Mexico affects us directly. Our own cities suffer when Mexico suffers, and we ought to bear witness to that.

* * *

In the recent past, when the U.S. has paid notice to Mexico, we have tended to concentrate on irritants: Central America, drug trafficking, and corruption.

Central America was first on the agenda. On inter-American matters Mexico has traditionally gone its own way—maintaining relations with Cuba, opposing the Pinochet dictatorship, and sponsoring the Contadora process in Central America. This independence served to placate the left in internal politics, promoted Mexican prestige in the Third World and gave Mexican presidents room to cooperate quietly with the United States.

From its earliest days, the Reagan administration discarded tolerance for this traditional difference of opinion. It instinctively treated Mexico as a shadow of the United States, seeking nothing more or less than a translation of its own views into Spanish. In pursuit of this chimeric goal, the White House has consistently badgered and embarrassed the most pro-American, free-market administration in recent Mexican history. And it has done so deliberately.

It was left to Senator Jesse Helms to reach the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Reagan administration's approach. In a series of hearings beginning last May, he questioned the legitimacy of the Mexican government with sweeping accusations—on undisclosed evidence—of massive electoral fraud. He endorsed reckless charges of personal corruption by senior Mexican officials. He even expounded on the "volatile" nature of Latin people generally.

Little though we might wish to, we had to take this seriously.

Helms, after all, is a senior member of the President's party. Was he speaking for the administration? That is exactly what the White House failed to answer.

A good example of its negligence was the case of my friend Felix Valdes, governor of Sonora. On May 13, 1986, in the first Helms hearing on Mexico, Customs Chief William van Raab charged him with owning four ranches that produce opium and marijuana. Immediately there followed an uproar, and for good reason: the charges were false and defamatory. The Mexican government protested. The State Department said it stood behind van Raab. (A spokesman described his testimony as "a candid, public, balanced review of our concern over narcotics-related corruption.") Ed Meese, on the other hand, told his counterpart in Mexico that van Raab had been speaking out of line. A Customs spokesman countered that Meese was out of line. The State Department said it did not know what Meese was talking about. Days passed. On May 25, Meese told David Brinkley on ABC television that the charges against Valdes were "reckless" and "absolutely not true." Two days later, Meese's remarks were "clarified" by an unnamed senior official. Helms meanwhile repeated the original accusations. On May 28, Treasury Secretary James Baker confessed that the administration needed to get its act together, but declined to say just how. Mexico is still waiting.

* * *

It is time for the U.S. to concentrate on the heart of the matter. Debt, and its consequences for both the Mexican economy and its political system, requires urgent American attention.

Mexico is in a state of economic disarray. It is drowning financially. In July we helped throw it a line with instrumental participation in a short-term rescue package by the International Monetary Fund. But Mexico is not out of the water yet.

Two goals should govern the American response towards Mexico, one conditional on the other. These goals should be structural debt relief and structural economic reform. The International Monetary Fund has historically favored a stunted version of this trade-off, conditioning new short-term loans on another notch or two of austerity. But in miniature the deal is poison to Mexico, having most of the political costs and few of the economic benefits of a full-sized solution.

Structural debt relief, the first half of the equation, must address the reality that Mexico's financial obligations have surpassed its capacity to pay. Consider the share of gross domestic product which goes to debt service: at seven percent it is *twice* the peak figure imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles.

In Mexico now as Germany then, the danger lies in the unbottled resentment of the populace. After years of steady growth, the real income of the average Mexican plunged 40 percent in the four years following 1982. That kind of setback is calamitous for social and political stability. One hint of the threat came in the sustained booing of President Miguel de la Madrid at the World Cup last June—an unprecedented humiliation for a Mexican head of state.

What's worse, the crisis looks indefinite. About a third of Mexico's domestic savings has been diverted from vitally needed capital projects to service the \$98 billion debt. Roads, harbors, airports, factories,

houses and education are falling apart, with nothing in prospect to replace them. The industrial sector is starved for investment. Growth, the only cure for the long term, is at present a pipe dream. Mexico's economy will *contract* between three and five percent during 1986.

To meet any hope of growth, Mexico's burden of debt service must be cut in half. The precise means of doing this must be left to negotiation, but the possibilities are hardly unknown. The extension of short-term debt maturities has largely been accomplished, but the capitalization of interest has scarcely been utilized. Nor has the long-term write-down of a portion of the debt been adequately discussed. The banks are a lot stronger now than in 1982, and the Federal Reserve could revise its loan-loss rules to recognize that in the context of an overall settlement, the write-down of government debt actually increases the prospects it eventually will be made good.

Mexican oil could be part of the deal. For years, we have been filling our Strategic Petroleum Reserve with \$28 oil. Now that oil is between \$10 and \$15 per barrel, the Reagan administration wants to stop. A commitment to add 200 million barrels to the reserve over a three year period would cut about \$1 billion from Mexico's annual payments and help us build a genuinely strategic reserve.

The flip side of structural debt relief is structural economic reform. Thoughtful Mexicans recognize that their fiscal woes are in no small part self-inflicted, the result of heavy-handed state intervention in every sector of the economy. The list of required reforms commands remarkable consensus among economists: sale or closure of loss-making state enterprises, reduction of the government work force, retargeting of investment from patronage to development, elimination of protectionist import restrictions and restrictions on foreign investment, relaxation of exchange controls, and repatriation of domestic capital.

If Mexico carries out the reforms it has thus far announced, it will have made a serious start. For example, President de la Madrid has moved to enter his country into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). He has also promised to sell or close money-losing state enterprises. Last May his government shut down Fundidora Monterrey, a huge and inefficient steel mill, throwing 11,000 people out of work. The sugar, fertilizer and petrochemical industries have candidates for similar closure.

Not all reforms need be so painful. For example, one bank has proposed to help repatriate Mexican capital by creating an offshore mutual fund that could then bargain to reinvest the capital in selected Mexican development projects.

How much reform will be enough? A numerical goal—parallel to the goal of halving Mexican debt service—would be ideal, but the Mexican side of the bargain does not quantify as easily. Some measurement, nonetheless, of such indicators as the proportion of state-owned businesses in the economy, the number of employees in the government work force, the spread between state-controlled and free-market exchange rates, and so on, would have a place in the negotiations.

Thoroughgoing economic liberalization will be very difficult for the Mexicans, just as structural debt relief will be for their creditors. But one can be used to leverage the other for the benefit of all. Mexico

would finally see the light at the end of the tunnel, and its creditors would trade some diminution of paper rights for a much higher probability of payment.

What's missing from this equation is an initiating party. The Mexican government and the commercial banks are in thrall to immediate pressures: political survival on the one side, quarterly profits on the other. The International Monetary Fund, the principal broker until now, is geared by long tradition to the short term. Only the U.S. government has the clout and the freedom to take the long view. It should act on that view while it can.

A MEXICAN RESPONSE TO GOVERNOR BABBITT'S REMARKS

Fausto Alzati

The following is a Mexican perspective on Governor Babbitt's remarks provided by Fausto Alzati, a Mexican citizen and former official in the Mexican government.

Mexico looks very different when seen from Arizona and when seen from Washington. Governor Babbitt's story about the belated response of the American ambassador to one of the small crises that so frequently occurs at the U.S.-Mexico border shows how, though living in Mexico City, the ambassador couldn't help but see Mexico through Washington's oblivious eyes.

A democratic and politically complex nation, the U.S. is also *the* major world power. Inevitably, the perspective from Washington is primarily global. Urgency matters more than geographic proximity and the democratic process causes policymakers to respond to immediate political pressures rather than to a thoughtful and detached concern for issues of long-run importance.

For this reason, to Mexican ears the governor's call for a special U.S. economic and foreign policy towards Mexico, though well meaning, has some threatening overtones. A likely outcome of such heightened attention would be to raise the profile of Mexico as an issue in the American political debate. To most Mexicans the thought of our government getting entangled in Washington's political maze in order to defend our legitimate international interests is deeply disturbing. It runs against a central element of Mexico's political culture—the reluctance to interfere in other countries' domestic politics, which is simply the counterpart of our insistence in demanding foreigners to refrain from interfering in our own domestic political affairs. As Governor Babbitt recognizes, this attitude is well grounded in our historical experience of ruthless and repeated external aggression.

True, Americans have their own legitimate reasons to be concerned with safeguarding Mexico's political stability. But from a Mexican perspective the best the U.S. government can do to foster political stability in Mexico is to refrain from disrupting the delicate process of

democratic political reform that is gradually and quietly, but effectively, taking place in Mexico.

Mexico's political system will most probably never conform to America's institutions and practices. There is no reason why it should: we are the heirs of profoundly distinct political and cultural traditions that no amount of geographic proximity or economic integration can ever bring together. Americans should realize that, in its own way, Mexico's political system is becoming more open and pluralistic, responding successfully to the challenges of an increasingly complex, modern and urbanized country by institutionalizing new channels for political participation.

Americans would commit an irreparable mistake if impatience or intolerance led them to spoil this historically unique experiment in political, social and cultural creativity by trying to shape modern Mexico in their own image. Governor Babbitt shares this concern when he calls for enlisting the help of those Americans who intimately understand Mexico—the nation's Hispanic community. No doubt his intention is good, but as a Mexican I feel that even "intimate understanding" will not be *sufficient*. Of course many Americans of Mexican origin show genuine concern for the well being of Mexico and respect the historical project chosen for our country—the *only* country we have—by those of us who in spite of the costs involved decided to remain Mexicans. But to the extent that Hispanic Americans are primarily committed to the values and goals of American society, we cannot assume their authentic respect for the distinct historical goals, values and worldview of the nation that failed to fulfill some of the legitimate ambitions of their ancestors and themselves.

This is not to say that those in the U.S. Hispanic community who share an attitude of respectful concern are unimportant to Mexico in its present predicament. They can bridge the immense cultural gap that divides us—a border in fact far more significant than the Rio Bravo—and help non-Hispanics in the U.S. develop a more tolerant attitude towards Mexico. To do so, however, Hispanic Americans must come to terms with their dual cultural heritage and embrace their identity as a valuable addition to the plural society that America is becoming as it daringly moves beyond the dull uniformity of the old "melting pot." They would perhaps be more willing to adopt that attitude if, when looking towards Mexico, they could point to a more prosperous, fair and democratic country of which they could be proud.

To move in that direction Mexico must go back to a path of healthy and sustained economic growth. Governor Babbitt recognizes the urgency of this need and accurately focuses on the deleterious effects debt servicing has on the performance of the Mexican economy.

The severe negative impact the sudden collapse of oil prices recently had on Mexican export revenues imposed an additional burden that Mexico cannot bear alone without dangerously straining a social fabric already worn by three years of sharply declining living standards.

Most of the policies of structural economic reform the governor advocates are precisely those that have been courageously and consistently pursued by the government of President De La Madrid, even at substantial cost for his personal popularity. Their positive effects, how-

ever, cannot materialize unless Mexico's non-oil exports can grow, benefitting from the incentives provided through the growth of real wages and a more favorable exchange rate. The main obstacle to Mexico's economic growth is the discouraging effect on investment in Mexico that results from the policy uncertainty imposed by the nation's debt burden. Shifting incentives to favor new export sectors has no tangible effects unless new investment allows those sectors to grow.

Thus, Governor Babbitt is correct to advocate a long-term solution to Mexico's debt problem. However, the way in which he proposes to tackle the problem has troublesome implications. It suggests the need to ease Mexico's debt burden at once without acknowledging that nation's long-term capital needs. Indeed, Mexico's central objective must necessarily be to return as soon as possible to the status of a *normal* borrower in global capital markets. Even with success in export markets, instituting structural reforms and creating a diversified and strong productive base, Mexico's large and growing population will need to supplement its own domestic savings with foreign capital for many years to come.

Because of this, an adequate solution to the current debt problem must be one that increases Mexico's access to global capital markets and restores credibility to Mexico's economic policy, thereby reducing its vulnerability to external economic events. It is hard to envision how the U.S. government could entice commercial banks to agree on cutting Mexico's debt service burden in half. Such a move could hurt rather than help Mexico's chances to regain creditworthiness. Besides, in any case debt burdens must be assessed in proportion to growth and exports.

On the other hand, whatever the U.S. government does to facilitate and speed up the process through which Mexico is seeking a negotiated settlement with its creditors would be extremely valuable. It is crucial to be prudent when proposing responses to the present crisis and to avoid unilateral and spectacular moves that could preclude the future flow of foreign and domestic investment in the Mexican economy.

Unless a reduction in debt service burden leads to new capital inflows and to growth, it will not address the real Mexican predicament. Thus, a negotiated measure of debt relief, adequate for Mexico and acceptable to its creditors, and involving the right kind of conditionality—one based on serious and creative economic analysis rather than on mere privatizing ideology—would be a large step in the right direction.

However, I am afraid that from Washington's global and highly politicized perspective Mexico's difficulties appear less pressing than from the neighboring and friendly viewpoint of Arizona. Unlike 1982, there is now no imminent threat to the international financial system that could help drive Mexico's troubles home to Washington. The urgent need to reactivate foreign markets for American exports which results from the growing U.S. trade deficit may get U.S. policymakers to realize that a prosperous Mexico offers one such market, especially if there is a healthy way to finance its imports. For this reason, Mexico needs sympathetic partners rather than short-sighted creditors.

Our Hispanic American half-brothers, and such well-meaning

friends as Governor Babbitt, can indeed help us by contributing to dispell the unjustified climate of alarm that now prevails in most American opinion towards Mexico. This will improve Mexico's chances of promptly attaining a satisfactory agreement on debt renegotiation and will allow Mexico to move back to the path of sustained economic growth that has cemented our social peace and political stability.

FEATURE ARTICLES

LONG-TERM CARE POLICY AND THE HISPANIC POPULATION¹

Fernando Torres-Gil and Eve Fielder

The increasing elderly population of the U.S. has made the provision of long-term health care one of this country's most pressing public policy problems. In their article, Fernando Torres-Gil and Eve Fielder present the needs for and utilization of long-term care by Hispanics, the policy developments in the area of long-term care and guidelines for providing long-term care that is sensitive to Hispanic populations. They conclude that long-term care research, planning and implementation must incorporate concerns of race, language and culture.

Long-term care is, in many respects, the most important health policy issue facing this nation. The graying of America and the aging of the "baby boom" generation (roughly consisting of Americans born between 1945 and 1965) will insure that increased attention is focused on the long-term health care needs of the elderly. Long-term care is, at the same time, a political issue, an economic factor and a highly personal concern. It affects the political decisions of the Congress, state legislatures and local governments in determining the allocation of scarce resources. As an economic factor it presents difficult questions of financing long-term care services and determining who will pay for such services. And as a personal concern, it directly affects the lives of families and younger persons who are faced with the financial and emotional costs of caring for frail older persons.

Long-term care refers to a continuum of interrelated health and social services for individuals facing sudden or gradual decline of human behavioral functioning due to chronic physical or mental illness or to disability caused by disease that persists over a long period of time.² These interrelated services encompass both institutional and noninstitutional programs such as nursing home care, home health care, adult day care, occupational and physical therapy, home delivered meals and homemaker assistance. The purpose of these programs is to minimize the disabilities of chronic illness, support independence of lifestyle and prevent further complication of chronic health conditions.

The advances made in medical knowledge and technology have increased life expectancy and enhanced capabilities of disabled and

elderly persons. In so doing, however, the elderly population is increasing, and age makes this population vulnerable to many health problems. Thus there is an increasing cohort of frail elderly. Additionally, the disabled require assistance in order to maximize independence, self sufficiency and good health status. As a result, the adequate provision of long-term care to this increasingly frail and disabled population has become a major public policy issue.

The older population—persons 65 years or older—numbered 28 million Americans in 1984, or 12 percent of the U.S. population. Yet the percentage of this population is expected to increase dramatically for the foreseeable future as the “baby boom” generation matures.³ The greatest increase will be among the “old old” (age 75 or older), those most likely to require long-term care. In 1980, the young old (age 65–74) outnumbered the old old by three to two. By the turn of the century, half of the elderly population are expected to be age 65 to 74 and half will be age 75 or older.⁴

During the 1960s and 1970s, Congress passed legislation to meet the social and health needs of the elderly: Medicare, Medicaid, Title XX, Social Services, and the Older Americans Act in particular. The public services and benefits resulting from these legislative developments provided a major impetus toward the development of long-term care services including home health agencies, adult day care facilities, nursing homes, visiting nurses and homemaker workers. The 1980s, however, have seen a dramatic decline in funding for such long-term care services and a moratorium on further legislative efforts. Yet, the general public is increasingly aware of the need for a comprehensive set of long-term care services that provide families with the options of caring for their elderly in the home, in the community, or within institutions. That public awareness may yet create pressure for federal and state governments to initiate more broadly based long-term care services.

Little attention has been given, however, to subgroups who may differ from the total cohort by virtue of language, race or culture. Assuming that long-term care initiatives develop, it is uncertain to what extent Hispanics will need, or benefit from, developments in long-term care policy. Long-term care programs and benefits generally rely on age or functional ability as the criteria for receiving services and assume the aged population is homogenous.⁵ There is little question, however, that the minority elderly and disabled population is also increasing and their cultural, social and linguistic uniqueness will require that more than age and functional ability be considered in the development of long-term care policies. One growing American subgroup that exemplifies the issue of cultural differences and the relevance of these differences to policy and service responsiveness is the Hispanic population.

THE HISPANIC: CHARACTERISTICS AND NEEDS

Hispanics officially comprise approximately 7 percent of the U.S. population.⁶ Although Hispanics are a relatively young group with a

median age of 23.2 years, the increase in life expectancy for all Americans has presumably begun to generate a larger cohort of Hispanic elders. In fact, data show that in the five-year period from March 1975 to March 1980, the Hispanic population 60 years and over increased at a rate nearly 2½ times that of the remaining Hispanic population (25 percent vs. 9 percent). The increase in the 65 and over age group (34 percent) was substantially higher than the increase of persons 60 years of age and older. The growth rate for older Hispanics during that period was more than twice the rate for non-Hispanics in the same age group (25 percent vs. 10 percent).⁷ The growth of Hispanic elderly also increases the number of persons who will be vulnerable to inevitable physical and health problems most prevalent among the frail elderly, a population most in need of long-term care services. The increase in the proportion of Hispanics in the older cohorts exacerbates an already difficult problem. The incidence and severity of health problems among the Hispanic aged is well documented. Although data concerning levels of physical impairment among Hispanic elderly are limited, existing information suggests that older Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans are more likely to suffer from such physical impairment than their white counterparts.⁸ Not only are poor health and related limitations in functioning more prevalent among older Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans than among Anglos, but the onset of health problems occurs earlier among older Hispanics than among older whites.⁹ Health differences between Hispanics and whites are directly correlated with socio-economic differences. Hispanics are more likely to work in physically taxing jobs involving physically debilitating working conditions, leading to early retirement due to poor health and disability.¹⁰

While life expectancy among Hispanics is believed to be increasing, the evidence to support this supposition is conflicting. For example, some researchers state that Hispanic life expectancy is much lower than it is for whites or blacks.¹¹ However, a recent analysis of the 1980 census data for California Hispanics shows that the Spanish surnamed population now has a life expectancy of 75.5 years, with females having a higher life expectancy rate (79.4 years) than males (72 years).¹²

The direction in which life expectancy rates actually move, higher or lower, raises important implications. If Hispanic life expectancy rates are lower than those of non-Hispanics and Hispanics do not reach the ages of 60 to 65, then programs based on those age thresholds will not serve needy Hispanics because they will not live to benefit from programs designed to serve persons with their disabilities. In California, it was the assumption that they lived less than 65 years that led Hispanic advocates to support inclusion of younger disabled in a long-term care system for older persons to assure that frail and disabled Hispanic young-old (55-65) would be included.¹³ However, if Hispanic life expectancy is indeed increasing then Hispanics are beginning to live long enough to face the higher probabilities of chronic illness generally associated with the old old (75 years and over) and the frail elderly.¹⁴

CHRONIC ILLNESS

Further evidence of chronic illness and physical disabilities of the elder Hispanic population are documented by the National Center for Health Statistics, whose surveys show that 43 percent of the Hispanic population 65 years and over is limited in activity because of chronic conditions.¹⁵ "Limitation of activity" is a measure of the long-term impact of chronic disease and includes limited ability to perform activities such as keeping house, shopping, attending church, etc.¹⁶ Moreover, in 1976-1977 Hispanics 65 and over had 42 restricted-activity days and 19 bed disability days per person per year, a figure somewhat higher than for persons of other races in the same age group.

Additionally, survey research conducted in 1979 by Newquist *et al.* suggest that 33 percent of Los Angeles Mexican Americans between the ages of 45 and 50 have health problems impairing their ability to work compared with 5 percent of white non-Hispanic respondents in the same age category. Data from the same survey shows that the aging process magnifies existing health differences between younger Hispanics and Anglos, with middle-aged Hispanics being more impaired than whites in old age.

A more recent study conducted in Los Angeles County of 1,000 Hispanics over 60 years of age provided an assessment of the physical and mental health disabilities and rehabilitation needs of older Hispanics.¹⁷ It showed that 30.8 percent appear to suffer from depression while 49.4 percent are affected by subjective memory problems. The most frequent physical disabilities are arthritis, (28.3 percent) hypertension (23.7 percent) and respiratory symptoms (19.7 percent). Of this sample 35.5 percent indicated some form of sleep disorder, while 24.7 percent suffer from activity limitation and 17.2 percent are affected by ambulation problems. In examining the incidences of the number of problems among the sample, researchers found that the largest proportions of respondents are affected by two or three problems, (13.8 percent and 13.6 percent respectively). Fifty percent or more of the respondents suffer from four or more problems, and about 9.5 percent are free from psychiatric and physical disabilities. The data from the study clearly show that Hispanic elderly face many chronic illnesses associated with the need for long-term care services.

The study also examined some of the social and environmental factors affecting the receipt by Hispanics of services and support that address their problems.¹⁸ Looking at family living arrangements, the study found 43.8 percent married, 39.7 percent widowed and 19.9 percent living alone. The data corroborates the existence of large families, with about 53 percent of the sample having four or more children and 38.2 percent having between six and thirteen children. When asked where they go when they need medical attention, 49.9 percent said they go to a local doctor. 26.7 percent indicated that they go to a general hospital and 18.6 percent said they go to a neighborhood clinic. The data revealed also that access to medical services remains a major problem for Hispanics due to a substantial (65.2 percent) lack of health insurance coverage (Medicare, Medicaid, private health insurance).

LONG-TERM CARE UTILIZATION

While timely and useful, these data survey one region of Hispanic concentration and are applicable only to a highly urbanized area. Nonetheless, they do demonstrate that, like all elderly, Hispanics face many of the chronic health problems that increasingly require long-term health care. The extent to which this care is being met and by whom remains largely unknown, although these few studies indicate that Hispanic elderly rely on a physician, a hospital, their family or themselves. The literature on Hispanic aging indicates that unlike other elderly, Hispanic elderly continue to place primary reliance upon the family to provide for their care. This factor leads some to conclude that any gaps in service are being met by the family. However, the nature of Hispanic families may be changing.

Research suggests that relative to black and white families, Hispanics are more likely to have a stronger commitment to extended family relationships and to care for their own elders by providing the emotional, financial and physical supports for those older persons experiencing health and physical disabilities.¹⁹ Consequently, few elderly Hispanics are found among institutionalized populations of older persons.²⁰

However, others argue that rapid social change is breaking down the traditional extended family, and as a consequence older Hispanics are suffering from isolation and alienation.²¹ Solis' research indicates that family and social supports are eroding in some areas and that a significant number of elderly Hispanics are isolated both residentially and socially and are increasingly subject to institutionalization.²² This apparent contradiction may not represent two opposing viewpoints. Instead, it may merely reflect that Hispanic culture is changing in some geographic areas and income classes and that the priority the family places on care of aged adults varies. Relative to whites and blacks, however, data demonstrate that Hispanics and their elderly are more likely to rely on each other in times of need and that elderly Hispanics are more likely to be living in a family setting than their counterparts in the general population.²³

Moreover, when chronic health problems occur there appears to be reluctance by Hispanic elders to use institutional health care facilities (e.g., intermediate and skilled nursing facilities)—facilities alien to the culture of that population—suggesting that it may be imperative to give Hispanic elders and their families access to noninstitutional services that provide services offered in the home, non-residential service centers and congregate housing programs, as well as skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities.

To what extent, however, have Hispanics used nursing homes and other forms of publicly provided long-term care services? Here the information is sketchy. Earlier works on Hispanics and their use of nursing homes shows underutilization by this group. The extent to which they are making use of services such as hospices, adult day care, respite care, in-home supportive services and home health services is largely unknown. The traditional practices of Hispanics and the role of the family indicates this use may not be great. Most early works on the

elderly and the family focus on the traditional structure and practices of the family and the grandparenting role ascribed to the elderly (e.g., child-rearing, counselor, maintenance of culture).²⁴

The literature on Hispanics and long-term care is limited, and what does exist relates primarily to the use of nursing homes. Eribes and Rawls, who have examined the underutilization of nursing home facilities by Mexican American elderly in the Southwest, suggest four explanations: a) nursing homes are not geographically situated within Mexican American communities; b) Mexican Americans do not live long enough to need them; c) older Mexican Americans cannot afford to use them; and d) nursing homes are not culturally appropriate to the Hispanic population.²⁵ They conclude that a "policy must be explored which rewards, or at least supports, this propensity of Mexican Americans to handle the housing and medical care of their elderly in other than the institutional setting (P. 371)." Luevano builds upon this study by examining the attitudes of elderly Mexican Americans toward nursing homes, finding that the primary determinant is cultural, not economic or geographic, with the elderly viewing nursing home facilities as a last resort, not as a choice.²⁶ He points out the need for establishing nursing home facilities staffed by bicultural personnel.

Further support for the growing recognition of minority underutilization of nursing homes is provided by Vladek.²⁷ He estimates that 9 percent of the elderly are nonwhite, but only 5 percent of nursing home residents are nonwhite, although they suffer more disability than elderly whites. He attributes this to differing cultural attitudes, particularly among Hispanic cultures, and a persistent pattern of discrimination existing in nursing homes.

In examining related issues of ethnicity and long-term care, Chee and Kane studied the cultural factors affecting nursing home care for black American and Japanese American groups.²⁸ They found that the Japanese placed more emphasis on ethnic-related services (e.g., food, staffing, community involvement) which relate to their culture, while blacks placed more emphasis on how well they were treated, access by family members and ability to participate in their church. In San Francisco the On Lok Day Care experiment successfully provided health and social services to elderly Chinese. It incorporated linguistic and cultural components (e.g., bilingual and bicultural staff) and showed that elderly Chinese eligible for intermediate-care facilities and skilled nursing facilities, as well as persons at risk of institutionalization, can be cared for in a humane and less costly way without disruption of lifestyle and family relationships.²⁹

These few studies are as important in what they do not say as in what they have found. Long-term care refers to a continuum of services that provide alternatives to nursing homes and other institutional facilities—alternatives such as congregate housing, day care facilities and in-home supportive services, with nursing homes lying on the low end of the continuum. Without stating as much, Eribes and Rawls, and Luevano and Vladek, lend support to the need of providing noninstitutional services for Hispanic elderly—services on the other end of the continuum—and for providing choices to family members who wish to continue caring for the frail person but need in-home assistance.

Assuming, then, that Hispanic life expectancy will increase, that Hispanic elderly increasingly will face chronic illnesses, that Hispanic family supports will change, with more unable or unwilling to provide traditional care in the home; and that Hispanic elderly will continue to be reluctant to use institutional services, how can we best address the long-term care needs of Hispanics? The answer lies, in part, with the current focus of long-term care policy: the development of a continuum of alternative services to provide families with the choice of quality noninstitutional services, support for family care of elders in the home, and use of institutional facilities. But to what extent have long-term care policies pursuing this approach taken Hispanic concerns into account?

LONG-TERM CARE POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

Programs that support the majority of long-term care services are funded by Medicaid, Title XX of the Social Security Act and Title III of the Older Americans Act. There are portions of other programs that may support long-term care such as congregate housing, but their contributions are relatively small. The major public support for long-term care, Medicaid, is directed toward nursing home care, which accounts for about 40 percent of total state and federal Medicaid costs.³⁰ Medicare is intended to provide skilled services for the elderly in their homes rather than health-related social support services for the chronically ill. Because Medicare home health services are directed toward homebound individuals in acute situations, they do not serve as a continuing source of long-term care for the chronically ill elderly. Title XX authorizes payments to states for a wide range of community social services including homemaker services, family planning, preparation and delivery of meals, transportation, counseling, adult day care and supportive health services. Title III of the Older Americans Act funds a variety of home- and community-based services including in-home (e.g., homemaker, home health aide), access (e.g., transportation and outreach) and legal services.

The political and fiscal events of the 1980s, including the election of a national administration committed to reducing the role of the federal government in providing for the health and social needs of older persons has meant a lessening of federal commitment to leadership in long-term care. The massive federal deficit has dampened congressional enthusiasm for new initiatives that may cost more money or expand federal programs. The unwillingness of the public to support higher taxes has created questions about where the burden of services will fall: on the individual, voluntary groups or local and state governments. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Amendment of 1986 further exacerbated the ability of the Congress and the Executive branch to respond to the growing need for long-term care solutions by reducing Medicare and Medicaid benefits and placing a greater fiscal burden on the beneficiary. Nonetheless, the growing numbers of frail elderly, concerns by baby boomers about their aging parents and the political influence of senior citizen groups insure that Congress and the Execu-

tive branch will not be able to ignore for much longer the need for some type of long-term care program. Hearings before the House Select Committee on Aging, for example, reveal numerous instances of families forced to care for their elderly in their homes without the necessary supportive services or means to pay for such care.³¹

That type of pressure will lead to expanded services at some point. In addition, a variety of projects and demonstration programs are creating the systems, practices and approaches for delivering a continuum of long-term care to a diverse elderly population. The private insurance industry, for example, is exploring the feasibility of long-term care insurance. "Think tanks" such as the Brookings Institution are examining alternative methods for financing long-term care. Policy researchers, such as those at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, have proposed major reforms in Medicare which include comprehensive long-term care coverage.³²

In addition, the Department of Health and Human Services is exploring methods for covering catastrophic costs associated with costly health needs that burden many families and individuals. Those efforts are promising signs that a comprehensive delivery system of long-term care may eventually be established. To the extent that that occurs, it is critical that the needs of culturally diverse populations such as Hispanics be taken into account.

A review of policy developments in long-term care reveals significant issues and debates that affect the future delivery of long-term care services—issues that will determine the extent to which Hispanics will benefit. These include:

- a) the tension between the designs of Medicare and Medicaid programs, which reimburse for most institutional and acute care services but do not fulfill the need for a continuum of medical and social care strategies that include community-based services;
- b) the necessity of developing a balance between medically-oriented treatment and social services-oriented care;
- c) the need to create a coordinated long-term care system for the chronically ill who have multiple service needs but who are hampered by dissimilar eligibility requirements and program guidelines, as well as difficulties with accessibility and cultural bias against institutionalization;
- d) the role and responsibility of the family in providing long-term care services at home (it is estimated that the family provides over 80 percent of all long-term care services) and the danger that expanded long-term care programs will displace this family role;
- e) the costs of providing these services, the uneven ability of individuals to be covered by health programs providing long-term care, the high personal costs, and a reimbursement system that encourages and rewards costly and efficient care; and
- f) the need to develop methods and practices such as case management and functional assessments in order to better deliver long-term care to those most at risk of institutionalization.

These issues have a direct impact on Hispanics, since they also benefit from noninstitutional services, an adequate mix of medical and social services, a coordinated system, incentives for family responsibility, affordable costs and reimbursement, and effective and humane

treatment modalities. A major issue, however, is the extent to which those unique factors affecting Hispanics and the Hispanic elderly are taken into account in the analysis, discussions and resolution of these debates. For example, what impact will differential life expectancy rates in the Hispanic population have on eligibility criteria, especially for long-term care services geared to persons 65 years and over? How will long-term care services take into account the higher disability rates among the Hispanic population and the fact that they occur at an earlier age than for whites? Will long-term care systems consider the greater prevalence of natural and informal supportive systems and extended families in the Hispanic population? How will the preference and attitudes of Hispanics against nursing homes and other institutional services—preferences that differ from those of black and white elderly—be incorporated? Assuming Hispanic interests are incorporated, how will this population, with a large percentage of older Hispanics below the poverty level, pay for these services? These and other questions are difficult to address, because the majority of research and demonstration programs are not using samples of Hispanics and are not focusing on these populations.³³

The fact that the literature and policy debates have not included Hispanics does not imply that Hispanic advocates fail to recognize the need to promote long-term care for Hispanics.³⁴ The 1981 White House Mini-Conference on Hispanic Aging identified long-term care as a major area where advocacy, research and services are needed.³⁵ A series of California public forums on the minority and rural perspectives regarding long-term care and aging graphically illustrated this need.³⁶ Hispanic, Native American and Asian participants repeatedly and consistently stressed the need for alternative services such as psychosocial support, homemaker assistance, home health aides, case management, respite and adult day health care, as well as the need to incorporate cultural elements, and assistance for family members who provide some of these services.

What is implied by these advocacy efforts is that while attention is beginning to be directed toward the long-term care needs of Hispanics, this attention needs to grow in a systematic and effective manner. A concerted and coordinated effort must be made to develop strategies that define the actions and steps to be taken. Such strategies will outline the major components of long-term care in which specific needs and activities can be described and in which the role of individuals and groups affected by this issue can participate. In turn, more effective and comprehensive research, policy analysis, practice and program development will result.

GUIDELINES FOR LONG-TERM CARE SENSITIVE TO HISPANIC POPULATIONS

Developing appropriate strategies for affecting long-term care will require the identification of several key areas around which work should proceed. Those areas, or components, in which guidelines and

strategies can be developed, reflect key factors germane to promoting long-term care for the Hispanic population: research, culture, policy and practice. In the first area—research—the information base and available literature is very limited. Work must proceed on providing data, theory and information for accurately identifying the needs of this population. The second component will address the unique cultural, racial and linguistic characteristics of the Hispanic population that can be incorporated into long-term care services. A third component will address the contemporary developments in long-term care policy and the importance of affecting the decisions and debates that influence the implementation of long-term care systems at the federal, state and local levels. The final component—practice—addresses the methods, treatment modalities and procedures for delivering services to frail Hispanic elderly in an efficient and cost effective manner.

I. AN ACCURATE IDENTIFICATION OF MEDICAL, SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL NEEDS

An important gap is the lack of sufficient data on health and social conditions of Hispanics necessary for accurately identifying their long-term care needs and therefore the type of services most appropriate for this population. The few studies that have examined the general areas of health and the Hispanic elderly have focused on the anthropological factors in health care needs (e.g., use of *curanderos* and home remedies), the difference in health status between older Hispanics and other groups (primarily older whites and blacks), the perceptions and attitudes among Hispanic elderly about their health status and situation, and the factors affecting access and utilization of health services.³⁷

Each of these areas of research have made important contributions to an expanding knowledge of the health and mental health status of Hispanics and their elders. However, the aggregate body of knowledge on health and physical conditions, need for rehabilitation and maintenance services, utilization of health services, ability to afford and provide health care, and preferences and attitudes concerning health care delivery systems remain geographically fragmented—sketchy in some cases—and are inadequate for planning of health service delivery systems. The difficulty of generalization from the limited samples currently available is a major obstacle in drawing accurate and definitive conclusions about the type and level of health care best suited to the health status of older Hispanics.

A major attempt at national data on Hispanic health needs is the Hispanic Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (HANES), which is gathering information on chronic illness, disability, nutrition and health data and promises to provide a wealth of information. Data and surveys of this nature must be expanded to account for regional and subgroup differentials (especially among Mexican American, Puerto Rican and Cuban American elderly), as well as social, economic and cultural variations. Research on disease and illness behavior of Hispanics is needed, e.g., diabetes, stroke and alcoholism, including

basic research on underlying processes of diseases in old age, epidemiology research on the prevalence of specific diseases in the Hispanic elderly, health services research on illness, and help-seeking behaviors of older Hispanics. Specific data and information needed will also include life expectancy, morbidity and mortality rates, the physiological and psychological aspects of aging and their relation to age, health and culture, the cultural variants in defining physical and mental illness, the rehabilitation needs and functional problems affecting older Hispanics (as well as the incidences of physically debilitating illness, such as stroke, high blood pressure and arthritis), the prevalence of dementia and major depressions among older Hispanics, and accurate predictions of current and future demands for health care.

II. THE IDENTIFICATION AND INCORPORATION OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL ISSUES

Minority aging literature provides some useful information about the social, economic and cultural profiles of the Hispanic elderly.³⁸ These must be identified, understood, and where appropriate, incorporated into the planning, provision and delivery of long-term care to the Hispanic population. The major variables to consider include: the relatively higher rates of poverty among the Hispanic elderly, and correspondingly, the lower levels of income and economic resources to afford costly health services or health insurance, which in turn place a greater reliance on public benefits such as SSI, Medicare, Medicaid and Title XX. In addition, a greater understanding is needed in the areas of: the role of the elderly in the family and community, the role of the family and use of natural support systems in providing elderly assistance, and variations in willingness and ability to provide support by those systems. Health and disability factors, which create greater need for health care, are important variables. Also critical are labor and occupation factors, which affect health and impede the acquisition of adequate pension and retirement benefits, which in turn, force Hispanic elderly to continue working.

These variables are important elements in understanding and incorporating the uniqueness of Hispanic elders—a uniqueness shaped by their social, economic, political and historical situation in this country. Those involved in research, policy, and program development must be aware of these variables. In this regard, perhaps, the literature is replete with information.

While the body of knowledge on Hispanic aging is growing, some major problems should be noted. First, the majority of the data collected and subsequent publication are based on today's cohort of older persons. Little attention has been given to the social, cultural and economic profiles of upcoming generations of Hispanics: today's young-old (those 55–65 years old), middle-aged and young adults. How will they differ from today's older person? Will their cultural preferences be the same? Will they have similar needs and attitudes? To the extent there are significant differences among and between cohorts, it will be

essential that they are identified early. Second, implications derived from existing literature are an issue. As an example, researchers point to the greater frequency of interaction between the elderly and families as proof that the Hispanic family remains the primary support for the elder. However, this conclusion does not examine the many dimensions of this interaction as they affect long-term care. For example, if a Hispanic parent suffered a major stroke, would the family have the ability or willingness to provide expensive and emotionally trying in-home care? Could they financially afford to do so? What are the psychological and emotional pressures facing the family in making the decision to institutionalize the older person in a skilled nursing facility, particularly if there is no cultural precedent for doing so. Literature on aging has not taken into account the affect of an aging Hispanic population. Over 80 percent of personal care needs of the elderly are being met by family and friends. Is this true for Hispanic families? Research is needed on the preference, financial resources and attitudes of the family in caring for their elders. Consideration must be given to providing options such as financial supports to family (e.g., caregivers, tax credits and deductions, family allowances), supportive services to family members (e.g., counseling, mental health, personal support, respite and emergency caretaking), services that supplement family care (e.g., home health care, chore services, day hospitals, family visitors, respite care), and options serving to ease the burden on caregivers and that encourage preservation of traditional supports.

Further research and understanding is also needed in the following areas: the impact of family responsibility laws on Hispanic families, the use and preference for institutional and noninstitutional services, the cohort changes and the variation in language and culture, the ability and willingness of the family to provide care, including the incentives (tax and governmental) that make it easier to provide home care, and the integration of culturally sensitive practices in institutional facilities.

III. AFFECTING LONG-TERM CARE POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

A third guideline revolves around the need to have an influence on the various developments occurring in long-term care policy and the changing health marketplace. The recent history of community-based long-term care is an example of the dramatic change occurring in the health care marketplace. The concept of "community-based long-term care" has changed in the last few years, in large part due to the creation of a prospective reimbursement system. That system allows the federal government to put a cap on what it will pay to hospitals that care for older persons with acute and episodic needs. In turn, the use of DRG's (Diagnostic Related Services)—the essential component of a prospective payment system—has led to increased pressures on nursing homes and home health care agencies which are increasingly taking care of older persons released from hospitals "sooner and sicker." In addition, the health care market place is changing. Other providers and non-

health businesses are venturing into new sections of the long-term care market. Nursing homes are offering both more intensive institutional care as well as home and residential services. Home health agencies are expanding their services to bring high tech medical care into the home and private corporations are entering the home health and nursing home industries. Increasingly, retirement living facilities are expanding into life care communities with recreational, social and health services within one project. These and other changes are dramatically altering health policy and the various systems for delivering long-term care. Yet, Hispanics have little, if any, involvement or influence in the developments and changes occurring with long-term care.

The first two components emphasized the need to have a greater knowledge of the Hispanic population in order to better serve them, but at the risk of appearing contradictory, there is insufficient time to focus only on these first two strategies. Parallel to the efforts described earlier, it is necessary to proceed with policy analysis research on Hispanics and long-term care and with advocacy efforts to ensure that representatives of Hispanic elderly are involved in policy deliberations. Policy analysis research will be needed to provide short-term information on critical areas affecting Hispanic elderly that should be incorporated into policy formulation. Policy analysis, as a discipline, investigates public policy issues in an applied and practical fashion with the intent of affecting the said policy. Although it involves developing a knowledge and theoretical base, its first priority is to provide information useful for decision makers and policy making. This is the purpose for many of the research and demonstration projects underway.

It is imperative that policy analysts be involved with long-term care gerontology centers, SMOs and HMOs (social and health maintenance organizations), Medicaid waivers, nursing home training programs, and Alzheimers research centers. As important and critical is the fact that these projects consider the Hispanic population and take their issues into account. The only major project that has made this an objective is the California Multipurpose Senior Services Project (MSSP). This statewide project was established in the early 1980s to evaluate the effectiveness of delivering a broad array of social and health services, coordinated through the use of case management, to the elderly who are at risk of being institutionalized.³⁹ Among the ten sites selected was one in East Los Angeles, which focused on the Hispanic elderly of that area. This project is providing much valuable information about the use of community people with similar cultural characteristics as aides and volunteers and assessment and case management methods that take into account culture and language, as well as the need to employ bilingual professionals trained in gerontology and geriatrics. More of these efforts are needed in order to determine how Hispanics can benefit best from long-term care.

Systemic barriers that negatively affect Hispanic elderly, giving them little choice in service selection, need examination since the current health care system is not structured to be flexible to individual and family needs. These systemic barriers include: a) the bias toward long-term funding of institutional and medical care arrangements preventing the adequate funding of effective community-based programs; b) the multiplicity of rules, regulations, eligibility requirements and

administrative mechanisms, making it difficult for Hispanic elderly to negotiate those programs and for sharing resources among service providers in minority communities; and c) the lack of governmental accountability for types and quality of care, hindering the development of comprehensive plans for coordinating services in local communities and at the policy and operational level.

In addition, it is important that policy analysts sensitive to Hispanic concerns participate in the policy dialogue occurring over various issues and approaches to long-term care developments in order to affect their outcomes. For example, if long-term care systems rely increasingly on functional ability rather than age, will they benefit Hispanic elderly? If physicians and medical personnel take the primary lead in coordinating long-term care services rather than social service personnel, what effect will they have on the Hispanic community? Should hospitals be allowed to create hospice and respite services in unused wards, and if so, will Hispanic elderly be willing to use them? These and other issues are being debated, and unless the views of the Hispanic community are known, outcomes will occur which may not be in the best interest of the Hispanic elderly.

There are various legislative proposals being considered in Congress and the Executive branch to respond to some of the long-term care needs facing the U.S. population. They include catastrophic insurance to protect families from the expensive and financially draining cost of major catastrophic illness, as well as legislation that would require employers to grant leave of absences for workers with dependent children or elderly who need in-home care. Congress is also exploring a requirement that states develop "at risk" pools of health insurance for those who cannot afford health insurance or are turned down by health insurance companies. In addition, efforts are underway to provide a more comprehensive approach to health and long-term care needs by developing a national health and long-term care coverage. Those proposals are being debated but their passage remains uncertain. Current preoccupation with federal deficits and concerns about the costs of Medicare and Medicaid have stalled the passage of initiatives that promote long-term care policies. Nonetheless, sooner or later, there will be expanded systems of health and long-term care and as the debates evolve, Hispanics should engage in that dialogue.

Organizations representing Hispanic elderly have a major role to play in that regard. Advocacy and professional groups exist, such as the National Hispanic Council on Aging and the National Council of La Raza. It is vital that they participate in the task forces, advisory committees, boards and commissions involved in long-term care at the local, state and federal levels. Furthermore, legislators and public officials who represent Hispanic constituents are in a position to influence the legislative and funding decisions that are at the heart of long-term care policy. Here too, policy researchers knowledgeable of Hispanic concerns can play a useful role by serving as consultants and policy advisors in an area that is complex and requires specialized knowledge.

IV. PRACTICE AND SERVICE DELIVERY

Hispanic elderly, in general, use public services and public benefits less than other elder cohorts. In many cases, difficulty in using public services relates to lack of information, nonexistent outreach and the failures of providers to understand the community they are attempting to reach.⁴⁰ In other cases, the problems relate to the structure and methods of delivering services, the lack of bilingual and bicultural staff, use of methods and practices not culturally compatible with the Hispanic population and the unwillingness to hire staff that speak the language and represent the community.⁴¹ Eligibility requirements, difficulties with procedures, the complexity of negotiating public bureaucracies, and the difficulty meeting means tests and paying for care contribute to the underutilization of public services by Hispanic elderly.⁴²

Beyond these known reasons, which give important lessons as to what long-term care systems must consider if they are to be fully accessible to the Hispanic community, lie many practice issues about how to work with frail Hispanic elderly that must be pursued. For example, comprehensive functional assessment is critical in the continuing care of the elderly. Disease, producing the substantial burden of functional impairment of elderly, is often treatable and curable; but detection is essential, and Hispanic elderly have great difficulty accessing health services or obtaining early diagnosis. Accurate functional assessment that is culturally and linguistically compatible and the accompanying provision of compensatory services can decrease further functional impairment and general decline. A surveillance program for high risk Hispanic elderly can address the problem of underreporting symptoms and of passivity of current health care systems in providing early diagnosis.

Health promotion and health education are important tools in altering the behavior of Hispanic aged and improving the use of health care systems. They include improving knowledge, beliefs and attitudes about diseases in old age and providing elderly Hispanics with the knowledge and resources to be actively involved in their own health care. Health care professionals should expand this knowledge to encompass Hispanic families.

Other areas of practice requiring attention include: the proper case management methods, the mental health paradigms and techniques that reflect the culture of Hispanics, the methods doctors, nurses and allied health professionals should use in diagnosing and treating Hispanic frail elderly, techniques that case workers and social workers can use in involving family and other natural networks, the effective and culturally compatible assessment procedures to use with this group, the extent of Hispanic ownership and administration of nursing homes, and the attitudes and behaviors of service providers toward elderly Hispanic patients and how these attitudes influence clinical decision making processes.

Effective practice and service delivery will require the training and education of Hispanic professionals in the disciplines of gerontology and geriatrics. The nation is woefully short of trained geriatricians

and nurses, occupational and physical therapists, and other health care professionals who will increasingly require more specialized training and education in gerontology and geriatrics. Those two fields—gerontology and geriatrics—will be among the most important professions in the next thirty years, yet, Hispanic students, whether in high school, college or graduate school, are not aware of their social and policy importance or their potential for rewarding careers.

CONCLUSIONS

This article brings attention to a topic that will grow in importance in the years to come: the long-term care needs of the Hispanic population. Its purpose has been to examine the extent to which long-term care research and planning has taken cultural variables into account and to suggest that formulation and implementation of long-term care services incorporate race, language and culture.

Hispanics are used as a case study of how these factors influence delivery of these services. This paper has described the health characteristics and needs of the Hispanic population that indicate growing rates of chronic and debilitating illnesses and examines the changing nature of cultural and family patterns that will require the creation of choices for Hispanic families in caring for their elders; choices that include the traditional practice of caring for them at home, publically supported in-home services or day care programs, and use of institutional facilities such as nursing homes.

An examination of the literature reveals limited information about long-term care implications for the Hispanic population and illustrates the importance of Hispanics participating in policy and program developments as well as the need for long-term care planning to incorporate Hispanic issues. As a guide for further action in this area four components are identified with which future work can proceed: the need to have accurate identification of medical, social and psychological needs, the identification and incorporation of linguistic and cultural issues, the necessity of affecting long-term care policy developments, and the need to develop services in a manner compatible to this population. These guidelines also serve to identify the areas and roles that professionals can play. Recognizing that much work remains in developing this area, the guidelines serve to focus specific efforts. For example, researchers and scholars in the basic and social sciences can proceed in identifying medical, social and psychological needs while social scientists and those engaged in minority aging can continue expanding and adapting the linguistic and cultural issues to long-term care. Policy analysts, advocates, political scientists as well as public officials have important roles to play in affecting policy developments while physicians, social workers, allied health professionals and occupational and rehabilitation therapists can develop the practice methods for delivering long-term care services. The greatest growth areas in the next three decades will be in health and gerontology. It is important for Hispanics to become familiar with aging as it will become

necessary for Hispanics to be trained in gerontology and geriatrics.

We should see to it that not only are long-term care services available to Hispanics but that Hispanics participate actively in the field as owners and investors in the proprietary industries delivering nursing home and home health care, as administrators of hospitals and institutional facilities providing acute care and skilled nursing care, and as therapists, social workers, gerontologists and mental health professionals in long-term care programs.

The messages and information presented in this paper are not new or startling discoveries; the need to incorporate cultural diversity in public policies has been argued repeatedly. The fact that this is not occurring in long-term care makes this message significant. If we are to avoid a homogeneous view of long-term care that will invariably exclude culturally diverse groups, we must understand and examine these concerns now, while the systems are being debated and developed.

FOOTNOTES

1. The authors would like to thank Nancy Smith, director for long-term care issues, U.S. House Select Committee on Aging, for her invaluable input and Judith Lee, executive assistant for the U.S. House Select Committee on Aging, for her assistance.

2. Koff, T. *Long-term Care: An Approach to Serving the Frail Elderly*, Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company, 1982.

3. American Association of Retired Persons, "A Profile of Older Americans: 1985" American Association of Retired Persons: Washington, D.C., 1985.

4. *Aging America: Trends and Projections*, A publication by the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, American Association of Retired Persons and the Administration on Aging, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.

5. Neugarten, B. (ed.) *Age of Need? Public Policies for Older People*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1982.

6. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1985."

7. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Human Development Services, Administration on Aging. "Characteristics of the Hispanic Elderly," *Statistical Reports on Older Americans*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

8. Newquist, D., Berger, M., Kahn, K., Martinez C., and Burton, L. *Prescription for Neglect: Experiences of Older Blacks and Mexican-Americans with the American Health Care System*, Andrus Gerontology Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 1979. Also see: Torres-Gil, F. "Age, Health and Culture: An Examination of Health Among Spanish-speaking Elderly," in *Hispanic Families*, M. Monteil (ed.) pp. 83-102, Washington, D.C.: The National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Services Organizations, 1978.

9. Newquist, et al., Op. Cit.

10. Newquist, Op. Cit. Also see: Torres-Gil, F., Abbot, F.P. and Ragan, P. "Implications for Raising the Eligibility Age for Minority Elderly," paper presented as testimony to the President's Commission on Pension Policy, Washington, D.C., 1980.

11. Op. Cit., Newquist. Also see: Lacayo, C. "A National Study to Assess the Service Needs of the Hispanic Elderly: Final Report," Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores, Los Angeles, CA, 1980.

12. Health and Welfare Agency. "California Life Expectancy: Abridged Life Tables for California and Los Angeles, County," Department of Health Services, California Center on Health Statistics, July, 1983.

13. Torres-Gil, F. and Pynoos, J., "Long-term Care Policy and Interest Group Struggles," *The Gerontologist*, forthcoming.

14. Torres-Gil, F., "An Examination of Factors Affecting Future Cohorts of Elderly Hispanics," in *The Gerontologist*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 1986: 140-146.

15. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1981), Op. Cit.

16. Ibid.

17. Lopez-Agueres, W. "An Assessment of the Rehabilitation, Physical and Mental Health Status of the Elderly Hispanic: Highlights of the Findings," in *An Assessment of the Rehabilitation, Physical and Mental Health Status of the Elderly Hispanic: Conference Proceedings*, Rancho Los Amigos Hospital and the University of Southern California, 1983.
18. Torres-Gil, F., "Social Policy and the Elderly Hispanics: a Preliminary Analysis of Health Status, Rehabilitation Needs and Barriers to Service Utilization," in *An Assessment of the Rehabilitation, Physical and Mental Health Status of the Elderly Hispanic: Conference Proceedings*, Rancho Los Amigos Hospital and University of Southern California, 1983.
19. Bengston, V. and Burton, L. "Familism, Ethnicity and Support Systems: Patterns of Contrast & Congruence." A paper presented for the Symposium on Long-term Care Policy, Williamsburg, VA, 1980.
20. Newton, F. and Ruiz, R. "Chicano Culture and Mental Health Among the Elderly," unpublished paper, Spanish Speaking Mental Health Center, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, 1979.
21. Maldonado, D. "the Chicano Aged," *Social Work*, 20: 213-216, 1975.
22. Solis, F. "Cultural Factors in Programming of Services for Spanish Speaking Elderly," in *The National Conference on the Spanish Speaking Elderly*, A. Hernandez and J. Mendoza (eds). Kansas City: National Chicano Social Planning Council, 1975.
23. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1981, Op. Cit.
24. Sotomayor, M. "A Study of Chicano Grandparents in an Urban Barrio," D.S.W. Dissertation, University of Denver, Denver, CO, 1973. Also see: Miranda, M. "Latin American Culture and American Society: Contrasts," in *The National Conference on the Spanish-speaking Elderly*, A. Hernandez and J. Mendoza (eds.), Kansas City: National Chicano Social Planning Council, 1975.
25. Eribes, R.A., and Rawls, M.B. "The Underutilization of Nursing Home Facilities by Mexican-American Elderly in the Southwest," *The Gerontologist*, 18(4), 1978, P. 371.
26. Luevano, R. "Attitudes of Elderly Mexican-Americans Toward Nursing homes in Stanislaus County," paper presented at the 9th Annual Conference of the National Association of Chicano Studies, University of California at Riverside, April, 1981.
27. Vladeck, B. *Unloving Care: The Nursing Home Tragedy*, New York: Basic Books, 1980.
28. Chee, P. and Kane, R. "Cultural Factors Affecting Nursing Home Care for minorities: A Study of Black-American and Japanese-American Groups," *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 31(2): 109-112, 1983.
29. Von Behren, R. *Adult Day Health Services*, Final Report, Sacramento, CA: Department of Health Services, 1978.
30. U.S. Congress, Senate Special Committee on Aging, *Developments in Aging: 1982*, Vol. 1, Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.
31. House Select Committee on Aging, U.S. House of Representatives, "Protecting America's Aged, Children and Poor: Multi-generational Needs, Multi-generational Solutions," Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986.
32. Harvard Medicare Project, "Medicare: Coming of Age. A Proposal for Reform," Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1986.
33. There are exceptions, such as multi-senior services projects in California that include an Hispanic site.
34. Valle, R. "Long-term Care: Hispanic Elderly," Washington, D.C: National Hispanic Council on Aging, 1984.
35. Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores, "White House Mini-Conference on Hispanic Aging: Final Report," The National Association for Hispanic Elderly, February, 1981.
36. Health and Welfare Agency, "Public Forum on Long-term Care and Aging: Minority and Rural Perspectives," State of California, 1981.
37. Torres-Gil, F., "Age, Health and Culture: An Examination of Health Among Spanish-speaking Elderly," in *Hispanic Families*, M. Monteil, (ed.) Washington, D.C: The National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Services Organizations, 1978, pp 83-102.
38. Cuellar, J., E.P. Stanford and D.L. Miller Soule, *Understanding Minority Aging: Perspectives and Sources*, University Center on Aging, San Diego State University, 1982. Torres-Gil, F., and Ngem, M., "Policy Issues Concerning the Hispanic Elderly," *Aging*, 305-306: 2-6, 1980.
39. White, M., and Grisham, M. "The Structure and Processes of Case Management in California's Multipurpose Senior Services Project: Final Report," Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1982.
40. Cuellar, J. and Weeks, J. *Minority Elderly Americans: The Assessment of Needs and Equitable Receipt of Public benefits as a Prototype for Area Agencies on Aging*, Final Report, San Diego, CA: Allied Home Health Association, 1980.
41. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Minority Elderly Services: New Programs, Old Programs*, Washington, D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.
42. Gutman, D. *Perspective on Equitable Share in Public Benefits by Minority Elderly*, Executive Summary, AOA Grant No. 90-A-1671, Washington, D.C: The Catholic University of America, 1980.

THE POLITICS OF THE LATINO FAMILY

Dr. David T. Abalos

Political impotence is an often cited criticism of the Hispanic Community. In his article, David Abalos rejects traditional definitions of politics, which tend to focus on power and/or actions within the public realm, and instead, defines politics as relations and actions which shape our daily lives and environment. He concludes that relationships of domination, like those typically learned in Latino families, must be broken before a "politics of participation on a plane of equality" can be practiced. This paper will appear in a forthcoming volume, *Latinos in the United States: The Sacred and the Political*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986. Various earlier and modified versions of the paper were delivered in a series of public lectures at Yale University (1985); M.I.T. (April, 1986); Seton Hall University (May, 1986); and Corpus Christi State University (July, 1986).

Politics is what we can and need to do together. Only when we turn our backs on conscious, critical and creative participation does politics become a realm dominated by power and powerlessness, violence and utopia.¹

The view of politics being employed in this paper is radically different from that of traditional political science. Politics here is being re-defined to be what we can and need to do together; politics is a participatory experience on a plane of equality with others by which we shape our daily lives and environment. This conception and practice of politics rejects the views of such notable political experts as: Hobbes, who saw politics as the pursuit of power after power; Machiavelli, who saw politics as the practice of gaining and maintaining power; Aristotle, for whom politics was the act of governing for white males (thus officially excluding most of the human race which consisted and continues to consist of women, children and people of color); and Max Weber, who saw political legitimacy as the monopoly of coercive power.² These and other political commentators have encouraged many to see the realm of politics as belonging only to that select group of legitimate, official people who somehow understand better than those for whom they make decisions the complex workings of society, the economy and the body politic. This is known as *hochtpolitik* which is contemptuous of the ordinary citizen.

My intent in this article is to present a view that seeks to restore politics to each of us as human beings, so that we can participate in the process of fostering patterns or institutions that nourish the best of what we have established, but also provide ordinary people greater authority to uproot or de-institutionalize in order to advance more responsive and equitable relationships. This is a radically democratic proposition, because it would dramatically expand the capacity of common people to shape political reality. This view of politics recognizes that we have the opportunity, by virtue of being human, to participate in the process of dissolving, creating and nourishing institutions. In the final analysis, institutions are human relationships that belong to all of us. From this perspective, the family is the most critically important institution in one's preparation for political participation.

Political transformation is the real subject matter of this paper. Transformation is the creation of fundamentally new and better relationships. Policy analysis, as it is presently practiced in our country, is not interested in transformation. The liberal agenda of policy analysis is dominated by two questions: What is practical within our present system? How can we implement it? These questions are asked in order to maintain stability. The greatest fear is anarchy, the breakdown of shared values, authority patterns and political legitimacy. Policy analysis never asks *why* do we have this problem. Policy analysts and practitioners do not ask ultimate questions because they accept society as it is. Therefore, they are unprepared to raise *fundamental* questions beyond existing political models about the pressing human dilemmas of our times: inequality, poverty, poor housing, schooling and nutrition, among others. To restore and maintain faith in the system, that is, to stabilize the situation, is their main concern. As a result we no longer speak of real human beings who are the victims of economic dislocation or unemployment; they are turned into abstractions in mathematical models used to play out various scenarios. During mean and lean times for the less fortunate, such as the Reagan years, stability takes on a mean face by pushing people to discover the furthest limits before the system is considered to be in trouble. All of this inspires the logic, suddenly and legitimately, that the much-vaunted safety net was never meant to help the needy; rather, it was intended to cushion and protect the system. Where there is a problem with the system, whole armies of trained bureaucrats create a policy. This is really hierarchical politics and social engineering, a conscious attempt to depoliticize people. Not surprisingly, therefore, the hurting members of society are not allowed to trace the causes of their pain to the way society is set up.

Policy analysis has a further problem. Our best and brightest, as brilliantly described by David Halberstam, are not immune from practicing profoundly immoral politics.³ People like McGeorge Bundy and Robert McNamara were deeply disturbed by what the Vietnam War was doing to the social, economic and political fabric of our country. They saw the threat to the nation, but in their discussions they did not anguish over the maimed bodies of both U.S. and Vietnamese victims of the bombings and systematic poisoning of the land with Agent Orange. For them the bottom line was a cold and rational conclusion dictated by cost/benefit analysis. In the end we could not have guns and butter; the cost of the war was too high, not in human lives, but rather in the effects

on the economy, which would have political ramifications.

Throughout this paper I use the language of the sacred.⁴ This is for several reasons; first of all, Latinos are a deeply religious people. For us the term god has always been used positively. I hope to show how the sacred is not always positive but also has destructive faces. Therefore, we must not ask is this god's will but rather *which* god is testing us.

Since the time of the conquest in Latin America there has been an alliance between the god of the established church and the god of the state. Together, these gods have jointly enforced a theological and political orthodoxy. On the other hand, liberation theology speaks of a different god, distinct from the orthodox god and the official god of the state, who blessed the emergence of the individual as a conscious person capable of analyzing the sources and costs of his or her isolation. It is no accident that this view of the god of transformation leads to breaking up patterns of docility (blessed by the gods of church and state) and the creation of cooperatives, unions, literacy movements, and other new vehicles for political participation. As we shall see, these competing gods or manifestations of the sacred determine a radically different kind of family and politics.

A THEORY OF ARCHETYPAL RELATIONSHIPS AND ARCHETYPAL WAYS OF LIFE

This paper analyzes the personal, political, historical and spiritual aspects of three fundamentally different archetypes of family life. My hope is to radically ground the discussion of the family and of male/female relationships in transpersonal depths and thereby help us to build a more fulfilling society for all of us as Latinos.

Each of these three ways of life determines the ultimate meaning of life and relationships and frames the kind of politics we practice. I shall introduce each briefly and expand their meaning in the context of the paper.

For Latinos, as for others, the three fundamentally different archetypal ways of life relate to emanation, incoherence, and transformation. We enact politics in these three ultimate ways, each of which is in the service of a particular god. The first god or sacred source that commands us from the depths can be described as a god of possessive jealousy demanding loyalty. This sacred source is the god of emanation. The politics of the family in the service of this god and its way of life "holds us within containers in which all we can and need to do together is already codified and ritualized, and declared to be no longer a problem except for the skill and intensity with which we affirm, elaborate, deepen or refine what we are already performing together. The paradigm of emanation is a way of life in which a moment of truth has become frozen, distorted or corrupted."⁵ The family as a necessary institution has become corrupted and distorted because a moment of truth was used to justify locking persons into permanent relationships which gave us security but at a great cost, one's own selfhood. It is this kind of family and this kind of politics within Latino culture that is

being challenged and overthrown. Similarly, in the larger context this kind of once-for-all truth and the god of emanation are everywhere dying.

When our Latino families endowed with emanation begin to break down it means that all of our concrete inherited relationships exercised within the family no longer give us the capacity to deal with our lives. Thus when families from Mexico, Puerto Rico or El Salvador come to the United States, they begin to learn and enact alternative patterns of behavior exercised in U.S. society. But even before coming here our families were affected by the shift from the rural to the urban centers with all of the demands of a market society. That market society meant that we could no longer share common values that held the previous traditional peasant society together. Adjusting to the urban centers and to U.S. society really meant choosing a new god, with a new vision of life. Often it meant a secularization but in reality it meant the presence of a new sacred source because the city did not recognize the old gods. The new way of life, the new paradigm and its god is the god of incoherence with a corresponding experience of fragmentation. The breaking and dying of our traditional way of life led many of our relatives, and indeed led us, to choose the pursuit of power as our god.⁶

Politics as conventionally conceived—politics solely as the exercise of power—is the politics of preserving, enlarging, masking, repressing and profiting from incoherence. Politics in the service of incoherence takes account of the fact that in the modern age, all our concrete inherited forms of relationships are breaking, but rather than facilitate change it builds fortresses in a desert it cannot overcome. For Latinos in the U.S. survival has meant building fortresses in a desert that we could not overcome. The collapse of the traditional role of the father has been met with an appeal to naked force and power. Where a father has lost power it has been taken by the wife and children. Thus the family has become a microcosm of the struggle for power taking place within the larger society.

A third possibility for the Latino family is the politics of transformation. The reigning god and way of life in this context demand that we continuously persist in creating and nourishing fundamentally new and better relationships. The god of transformation tells us that it is our inalienable right to demand that relations between men and women, parents and children, the individual person and the outward realization of her or his inner dreams be recognized as issues of political justice that make it imperative to find new and better connections with each other.⁷ If the family environment, i.e., the existing quality of relationships that link the members of the family together, does not allow each individual to grow to full potential, then we have a political and sacred problem. In the final analysis, only our authentic selves, not selves that have been imposed upon us, are capable of creating history, rather than being victims of a corrupted traditional past.

THE WAY OF LIFE OF EMANATION: THE GOD OF EMANATION

None of us is an individualist as our liberal society would have us believe. All of us have been born and reared into a web of relationships. We are the products and handiwork of our parents, our culture and history, our relationships to significant others, and to our unconscious, sacred sources. To discover, recognize and name this network of relationships in our own personal and collective history is to discover both the connecting and disconnecting patterns of our life. If we fail to do this we shall waste our time beating the air and attacking phantoms.

Our history and culture in general has not been kind to us Latinos when we look for help to guide us in regards to creating a new kind of family and male/female relationship. Indeed our ancestors lived for the most part in the way of life of emanation of fixed faith and frozen patterns of behavior. This kind of family politics prepared our forebearers to accept the hierarchical social arrangements that prevailed in Muslim society, the Spanish state of *Los Reyes Catolicos*, the Jewish synagogue, and finally in the various indigenous empires of the new world. This hierarchy was capped and legitimized by males both divine and human.

At the heart of the family is the relationship between men and women. Our European and Indian cultures both institutionalized the inferiority of women. The Aztecs valued women for their loyalty in upholding the real purpose for their existence: giving birth to warriors, taking care of the needs of male warriors and providing them pleasure. Two very important goddesses took their names from these functions: Cihuateteo was the name given to women who died in the battle of giving birth; women who provided pleasure, prostitutes, were named Ahuianime and were protected by the goddess of pleasure, Tlazolteotl. The Spaniards also used a double standard: the woman who took care of them and procreated their children did not have to be the same woman who gave pleasure. Thus *la casa chica* was institutionalized and blessed by our history and culture several centuries ago.⁸

The Catholic Church frowned on the institutionalization of the mistress but as long as the Church was unwilling to tackle its own view of women as inferior, it was in no position to be taken seriously. As a result, the Church took an approach towards women which mirrored its preaching regarding the treatment of the Indians and the peons; in both cases the Church acted as a mediator to lighten their burden but without questioning the system itself. In this way the Church actually helped to strengthen the inferior status of both women and *campesinos*. The role of the Church was to help people accept and live with the system by reforming its harshness from time to time. This actually became god's will, but again, the will of the god of emanation wherein all truth was finished and all people could do was accept it.

The resulting subjection of Chicana/Latina women in this way has made them perpetual mothers because their only fulfillment has come from exercising influence over their children, who in turn they never allow to grow up. Our mothers do not consciously and coldly cripple us in this way. This is not their personal, subjective ego speaking, but

rather the power of an underlying sacred source, the god of emanation. That god saw to it that our mothers were lamed, possessing us to cover their own lack of love and passion. Mothers serving this god have often said to their male offspring: "*No se te vaya olvidar quien viene primero en tu vida*" (Don't you ever forget who comes first in your life) in front of the son's wife. Ironically, in choosing his wife, the Latino man has already sought a maternal figure, not even aware of this underlying archetypal drama.⁹

The politics of sexism destroys both the man and the woman, the wife and husband, and wounds the next generation. Intimacy and passion are possible only between equals. A man who sees a wife as a shadow of his mother cannot relate to her as an equal because she is either above him, on a pedestal, or because she fails to meet up to the expectations of being like his mother, and therefore below him. The other woman, *la otra*, is not burdened by such associations and is a source of sexual release. Yet here again there is no fulfillment because, while *la otra* might be a wonderful woman, conventional values tell us that she is still a *puta*, whore, and therefore inferior.

The Latino male living within and perpetuating this way of life is thus a victim of his own dishonesty. He knows that it is the woman who provides continuity, who raises the children in the face of abandonment and creates the emotional environment. Yet, he harbors ambivalent feelings towards women, a mixture of loyalty and honor with distrust and anxiety. Each generation of Latinos, men and women alike, has inherited the grave consequences of these unhealthy phenomena.

This is not a perspective that by definition sees Latino culture as defective or pathological. These relationships make some sense given a whole way of life that has necessarily emphasized survival in the throes of hostility through family continuity, cooperation and security, and which has thus discouraged the individual, especially women, from initiating change and conflict. However, a great price has been paid for unquestioning loyalty to this way of life: experiences, dreams, hopes and feelings have not been fulfilled.

If we are to avoid romanticizing our cultural past, we must painfully but truthfully seek to heal it by going beyond overly protective attitudes, on one hand, and destructive criticism, on the other. We cannot continue to blindly believe in the god of emanation. But neither should we choose the way of incoherence as the success model for Latinos.

THE WAY OF LIFE OF INCOHERENCE: THE GOD OF POWER

The Latino family entered into a whole new way of life, that of incoherence, when our families were displaced from the land and forced to migrate to the cities and/or United States. The displacement was due to many factors: revolution, drought, economic policy of the central government, refusal to stay or, in a money society, inability to raise enough currency to live. The move from rural to urban life shattered the web of life that our people had come to accept as given by god. In the cities they met their fellow *paisanos* but it was different; they were

not the same as country people. City people were wise in a different way—*listos*, eager and willing, they had learned new patterns of behavior and, in addition, had accepted the whole new way of life of incoherence, the pursuit of power, as the life of the city. The god of emanation was of little value in this new pursuit but since they felt guilty leaving the entire old way behind they still went to the church and recited the traditional prayers. But this was now the peripheral part of their life. The god of incoherence offered no ultimate why or meaning to people's lives except the pursuit of self interest and power. This explanation, I believe, helps to explain why Oscar Lewis's families experienced such traumatic changes in the urban center.¹⁰ Women often took power because the males were not able to adjust to the new demands. The men's inability to respond meant they could not provide security, dominate or bargain. Women learned skills to compete in the larger society; they had no choice. But men still knew how to manipulate the guilt of women by appealing to fragments of the dying way of emanation. Two competing ways of life, that of emanation and incoherence, provided further confusion and fragmentation in the lives of parents and children in the family. The children also saw the change in the patterns, the loss of authority and respect. This breaking often led to their rejection of old relationships. The father who was conscious of his loss of power and respect frequently turned to violence to reassert control. For a time, force and appeals to guilt, sin and shame created a safe haven for males in their own home while the larger society forced all into new patterns. These new patterns were those of asserting one's own autonomous personality based on new skills that were marketable. In addition, to make money, the husband/father had to agree to give women time away from home or isolation. The ability to learn and earn for women gave them increased bargaining power. If the father became impossible the mother could now evict him from the home; women now experienced some domination over men. In many cases, traditional roles were reversed. But this kind of change did not transform, it merely altered the terms of power while leaving the old system of inherited relationships intact.

Because of this heritage, many Latinas have rejected the traditional structures of the Latino family. In this country, our women can make comparisons to the relative freedom of Anglo women. As a result many have chosen to marry Anglos in order to escape the dominating Latino/Chicano male. This has been a form of assimilation for Latinas who believed that Anglos have better male/female relations. But Anglo culture offers us rational marriages¹¹, based on mutual rights, obligations and contracts. Its rhetoric is that marriage is for love, but in reality it is firmly founded on a bedrock of power. It is true that women have less power, but they can gain power through achieving new skills for which the opportunities are available. When women hesitate to exercise power they are seen as weak.

The availability of birth control, economic freedom, the feminist movement, and a society committed to equal opportunity have had a powerful impact on the Latino family structure in this country. Yet the old way of life remains side by side with the new. As a result many Latinos live fragmented lives, using different patterns and vacillating between emanation and incoherence. Others have bitterly renounced

the old culture and family reared in the way of emanation and have identified it with stigma.

THE ARCHETYPAL DRAMA OF DEFORMATION

Deformation is the creation of fundamentally new but worse relationships. As the traditional Latino family living within the way of emanation breaks, the resulting experience of incoherence can lead people to sheer violence in an attempt to restore the old *respeto* (respect) and authority. In their efforts to return to the old way of life they have to deny the reality of the individual who is breaking away. The authority of the father, for example, is considered sacred and so masculine authority, which is a fragment of emanation, is endowed with a sacred legitimacy. In reality this is no longer the way of emanation but a pseudo paradigm of emanation because it is based on a lie, male supremacy. The relationship of incoherence, initially experienced due to the breaking of emanation, is now turned into a whole way of life and indeed incoherence is deepened into deformation. Since the women in the family no longer accept the legitimacy of male dominance they feel alienated by such an effort to restore it. There is no security, characteristic of emanation, and there is also no longer an unconscious surrender of the self. To try to push people back to a state of unconsciousness is not possible. The psychic and physical violence employed thus no longer occurs in the name of emanation or of incoherence.

THE POLITICS OF TRANSFORMATION: THE GOD OF TRANSFORMATION

There is, however, a third god, a third way of life available to us, that of transformation. This way of life demands a four-fold process: the transformation of myself, my neighbor, the world and the sacred. For the first time this god wills our stepping forward urgently as full persons, free to create conflict and change, to experience new consciousness, creativity and new linkages to others. Each of us counts and all are impoverished if anybody violates us and prevents our coming forth. We have the opportunity to be a participatory self wherever we find ourselves. All aspects of our life are available to us to be shaped by our choices.

But in order to embark on the journey of transformation that all of us must take to realize this brand of sacredness, we must reject three dragons: the archetypal drama of the patriarchal family; the resort to power in itself as a legitimate relief; and the gods of emanation and incoherence who created the initial mystery and energy for these ways of life. Unless we empty ourselves of the gods who uphold these entire ways of life, we will end up incarnating these same gods over and over again.

CREATING THE ALTERNATIVE: THE FAMILY AS RELATIONSHIPS IN MOTION

The family remains a necessary container for all of us. It provides us with the necessary security, affection, and continuity to begin the process of individuation. But we fail to see that patterns of relationship emphasizing security and protection are only temporary. In the hostile area in which most Latinos grew up it was essential to have a close-knit protective family. Yet this has led too many Latinos in this country to romanticize and to pass over abuses in the family. As Latinos we must be careful that in our protest against the assault on our culture we do not glibly state that *everything* Latino is good. Revolutions have to remain consciously critical of self and other and not allow a tribal fusion to hide the problems. We require courage based on a new consciousness to grow our own marriages and families which are neither Anglo Saxon nor blindly Latino. There is no attempt here to consider love, affection, emotion or close relationships as outmoded. A family that as a group is dedicated to the liberation of its individual members will never be out of date. We need the family but in a qualitatively different way. Too often love is oppressive. What we need is love that frees us to have what nobody can give us: the decision to shape our own selfhood. This is the inner, sacred force that begins to demand that the family give us space both internal and external. Thus to perpetuate relationships beyond the time that they are necessary and to fail to transform our linkages is to create neurotic personalities.

Giving birth to and nourishing the next generation is sacred and political work. Latino family politics practiced in the way of transformation can allow the nurturing of each child to emerge as a full self. This kind of socialization can prepare children for a particular kind of task—radical participation in shaping their daily lives wherever they find themselves. Politics is what we can and must do together; furthermore, politics is participation with others by which we shape our daily lives and world. Family life, therefore, is always political; either we prepare children for a life of being dominated and possessed in order, in their turn, to control and possess others, or we guide them to transformation. To question, to criticize, to dissent in the family context prepares our children to question all authority. Rearing children with a fear of punishment and appeals to authority, and not allowing them to create conflict and change, prepares them for authoritarian liberalism wherein they can pursue their own self interest and power as long as they are loyal to the powerful. Contract marriages and families that stress power, individual autonomy and individualism prepare children to compete with others in the larger society. On the other hand, to live in a family where each person is treated with respect *as* a person is a beginning for true democratic citizenship where each appreciates both self and others as sacred.¹²

Children are always learning and being prepared to reproduce, in their relationships outside the family, the kind of politics and community they have experienced in the home. These different kinds of politics, as we have seen, are enacted in three different ways of life. Each of these ways of life will mean a different kind of democratic politics:

authoritarian democracy, as in the way of emanation, liberal democracy, as in the way of incoherence, or participatory democracy, as in the way of transformation. All are called democracy, but we now know that there are three fundamentally different sacred sources, and archetypal ways of life, underlying the same term. Our challenge as Latinos is to guide our children to create a fundamentally new and loving society through transformation.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Choosing Between Ways of Life and Death and Between Forms of Democracy: An Archetypal Analysis," Manfred Halpern, p.6, forthcoming in *Alternatives, A Journal of World Politics*, Winter 1986-1987. Published by the Center for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, India and the Institute for World Order, New York.

2. In the writing of this paper, I am heavily indebted to my friend and colleague, Manfred Halpern, whose work on transformation theory and view of politics have served as a constant guide. The paper quoted above is a brilliant analysis of the archetypal drama of democracy which largely inspired my understanding of the Latino family, enacted within three archetypal ways of life. In addition Manfred Halpern's unpublished manuscript entitled *Transformation: Its Theory and Practice in Personal, Political, Historical and Sacred Being* has been of invaluable help in providing me with the necessary theoretical language.

3. See David Halberstam's book, *The Best and the Brightest*, (New York: Random House, 1972).

4. Halpern, "The Human Being in the Image of God: A Cosmos of Creative Participation," Chapter V, *Op. Cit.* In addition see "Transformative Commitment: A New Paradigm for the Study of the Religious," *Journal of Dharma*, July-September, 1981, Vol. VI, No. 3.

5. Halpern, "Notes on the Theory and Practice of Transformation," an unpublished manuscript, Princeton University, 1980, p. 1. See also "Choosing Between Ways of Life and Death," pp. 8-9 and 13-24.

6. For an excellent portrayal of how the journey from the rural to the urban centers helped to destroy a whole way of life, I know of no better reading than Rene Marques' *La Carreta*, Editorial Cultural, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, 1971.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2. See also "Choosing Between Ways of Life and Death," pp. 43-54.

8. Alan Riding's *Distant Neighbors, A Portrait of the Mexicans*, is one of the best books that has been written by an American about Mexican history and culture. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), see especially Chapter 12, "The Family Safety Net," pp. 238-243.

9. See Chapter III, "The Politics of the Latino Family," in a forthcoming volume by David T. Abalos, *Latinos in the United States: The Sacred and the Political*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, Fall, 1986.

10. Oscar Lewis, *Five Families*, a Mentor Book (New York: New American Library, 1959).

11. For a good discussion of the rational marriage, see Ann Belford Ulanov's, *The Feminine* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1972).

12. For a parallel view of how teachers prepare the young for sacred and political participation, see David T. Abalos, "The Teacher as Guide," *Journal of Dharma*, January-March, 1986, Vol. XI, No. 1, pp. 62-75.

CITIZENSHIP AS AN OBSTACLE TO POLITICAL EMPOWERMENT IN THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

Dr. Harry P. Pachon

Naturalization, the process through which immigrants obtain U.S. citizenship status, is an essential, yet often misunderstood or unappreciated, element of Hispanic political empowerment in American society. In this article, Harry P. Pachon examines the important relationship between citizenship acquisition and Hispanic civic participation in the U.S.

Discussions of U.S. immigration policy, as exemplified in Congress' recent passage of the Simpson-Rodino bill, implicitly assume that every person admitted through America's "golden door" eventually becomes a naturalized citizen. Naturalization, the act by which an immigrant renounces his native citizenship and formally pledges allegiance as an American citizen, is assumed to be the automatic final step in the immigration process. A quick look at the facts indicates otherwise.

The issue of American citizenship for Hispanics has a long history dating back to the cession of Mexican territory to the United States in 1848. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo guaranteed the citizenship rights of Mexicans living in ceded territory, but left the citizenship rights of future Mexican immigrants undecided.

Since federal law at that time limited naturalization to "free white aliens," there arose a question of whether Hispanics were racially qualified. A 1897 court case (*In re Rodriguez*, District Court W.D. Texas, 1897, 81. F. 337) sidestepped the race question in concluding that natives of Mexico were eligible to naturalize based on the precedent of the Guadalupe-Hidalgo treaty and related agreements between the United States and Mexico. Although no large-scale challenges were made to the racial eligibility of Hispanics for citizenship, it was not until 1940 that Congress formally extended naturalization rights to those races "indigenous to the Western Hemisphere." (See Nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1137).

The unclear citizenship status of Mexican residents and Anglo-

American hostility in the 19th century toward Mexicans in the Southwest may account for low Hispanic naturalization rates as early as 1910, when only 11 percent of the 100,000 natives of Mexico living in the United States were naturalized.¹

The tendency to equate all Hispanic immigration with illegal immigration has obscured the issue of noncitizenship among Hispanics. In fact, since World War II, Hispanic *legal* immigration has risen rapidly, growing from 25 percent of total immigration to the U.S. in the 1950's. During the 1970's alone, more than 1 million Hispanics became legal permanent residents of the United States, a number equal to one-fourth of the total Hispanic population growth measured by the Census Bureau for the decade.²

Yet 2.7 million of all Hispanic immigrants who were eligible to be naturalized in 1980 did not become American citizens. The extent of Hispanic noncitizenship is most graphically illustrated among Mexican immigrants. Fully 70 percent of the Mexican immigrants who had lived in the United States five or more years when the 1980 census was taken were legal resident aliens.³

Noncitizenship is not unique, however, to Mexican immigrants. In 1980, 70 percent of Colombians, 75 percent of Salvadorans and 70 percent of Dominicans here five or more years were not yet citizens.

Nor is citizenship simply a reflection of recent arrival in the United States. As demonstrated by the following 1980 census data, foreign-born Latinos here longer than ten years are far more likely than their non-Latino counterparts to be without American citizenship. (See Table 1).

Table 1
Citizenship Status of Foreign Born

Residents Here Over 10 Years				
	Total	Citizens	Non-Citizens	% Non-Citizens
Latino	1,788,500	789,000	999,500	56
Non-Latino	6,733,900	5,344,100	1,389,800	21
Residents Here Between 11 & 20 Years				
	Total	Citizens	Non-Citizens	% Non-Citizens
Latino	1,159,300	434,400	724,900	63
Non-Latino	1,976,500	1,127,200	849,300	43
Residents Here Over 20 Years				
	Total	Citizens	Non-Citizens	% Non-Citizens
Latino	629,200	354,600	274,600	44
Non-Latino	4,757,400	4,216,900	540,500	12

Source: Unpublished Census data produced June 1983.

FACTORS AFFECTING CITIZENSHIP AMONG LATINO IMMIGRANTS

Research on naturalization uncovers only a few studies that address the problem of low Hispanic naturalization rates.⁴ Keeping in mind that the reliability of these studies is limited by their age, their concentration on Mexican immigrants to the exclusion of other Hispanic immigrant groups, and the fact that they are geographically localized, it is nonetheless significant that they reach similar conclusions about the reasons why Hispanics fail to naturalize. These reasons include:

- I. Proximity and ties to home country;
- II. Sense of being "outsiders" subject to discriminatory treatment;
- III. Inability to meet statutory naturalization requirements; and
- IV. Obstacles in the naturalization process.

I. PROXIMITY AND TIES TO HOME COUNTRY

Because of the proximity of Latin American nations to the United States and the fact that modern transportation has made travel easier, many Latino immigrants return to their native lands or at least believe they will eventually do so. Thus, they may live in the United States to gain economic benefits while maintaining political ties at home. Conversely, those who have left their homelands for political reasons and do not expect to return are more likely to become American citizens, as is the case with many Cuban immigrants.⁵

Many new immigrants believe that they stand to lose important rights and benefits in their native countries if they become American citizens. Many Mexican immigrants, for example, mistakenly believe they must forfeit all their rights of property ownership if they relinquish Mexican citizenship. In fact the Mexican Constitution prohibits ownership by non-citizens only of coastal properties, properties within 100 kilometers of the national borders, and properties designated as in the "national interest."

II. SENSE OF BEING "OUTSIDERS" SUBJECT TO DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT

Studies of Hispanic noncitizenship in the 1980's echo those done 50 years earlier in concluding that many Hispanic immigrants fail to naturalize because of their sense of being outsiders. In 1934, for example, Emory Borgardus, an authority on Mexican American acculturation, commented that "Citizenship is disappointing (to the Mexican

immigrant), for he is still likely to be treated as a Mexican and a foreigner."⁶

Through the first half of the Twentieth Century this sense of being outsiders was reinforced by a pattern of discrimination towards Mexican Americans that varied throughout the Southwest. Not visible to the larger American society, Mexican Americans experienced dual school systems, segregated public facilities, gerrymandering and discriminatory stereotyping.⁷ Although these conditions changed markedly after the 1960s—and then only because protests within the Mexican American and Puerto Rican communities highlighted the exclusion of Hispanic concerns in civil rights agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—these historical experiences undoubtedly had impact on Hispanic immigrants. A *Los Angeles Times* article in 1983 underscored the relevance of this history when it noted "...Mexican immigrants—feeling themselves less than welcome in a country that has historically sought them out as cheap labor, but otherwise disdained them—tend to hold fast to their Mexican identity, sometimes with an air of defiance."⁸

Hispanic immigrants may also be skeptical of pursuing naturalization because they have a negative perception of the treatment they will receive by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). INS is viewed as emphasizing arrest, deportation, and other enforcement activities over service-oriented activities such as naturalization. Moreover, since naturalization examinations are conducted in private, "an arbitrary or even prejudicial judgment by the individual examiner may result."⁹ Professor Jose Bracomonte has commented that concern about treatment from INS "has led to feelings of antipathy that are deep and strong and ingrained, so much so that Mexicans as a group would rather have as little to do with the agency as possible."¹⁰

The irony of these feelings on the part of Mexican and other Hispanic immigrants is that without citizenship—which brings with it the right to vote and to help shape social, economic and political policies—Hispanics continue to be limited in their ability to fight the very discrimination that is the cause of their failure to naturalize.

III. STATUTORY NATURALIZATION REQUIREMENTS

Some Hispanics, the literature reveals, because of their age or lack of formal education, do not feel they can master the skills necessary to meet statutory citizenship requirements such as knowledge of English, U.S. government and history.

IV. OBSTACLES IN THE NATURALIZATION PROCESS

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has failed to reach out to help immigrants naturalize. As Milton Morris has observed:

To some extent this situation is understandable. Aliens, the principal constituency being served, are generally patient, politically powerless, and unwilling or reluctant to complain.¹¹

Although INS is statutorily required to widely disseminate information about the naturalization process, the agency does not make it a policy to otherwise encourage naturalization. In the words of INS's Outreach Director, Mr. E.B. Duarte, "The service goes out and enforces the law. We pick up people who shouldn't be here. The INS also informs refugees one year after their admission to come in and apply [for lawful permanent residence]. So why don't we do the same thing for naturalization applicants?...because naturalization is viewed as a voluntary act on the part of the applicants."¹²

Compounding this problem, the naturalization process is—in the words of former INS Commissioner Leonel Castillo—"...so arduous...it actually repels rather than attracts potential citizens."¹³

In 1981, Congress enacted legislation to help simplify and expedite the naturalization process by eliminating requirements for undocumented individuals to present two character witnesses and to wait 30 days after completing the administrative process before having a court hearing. Nonetheless, David North, an authority on immigration and naturalization issues, notes that "while U.S. laws are relatively generous on [naturalization], *de facto* U.S. policies are not."¹⁴ Three of these *de facto* policies identified by North and others are as follows:

The first of these policies is that the INS traditionally has not been provided with enough staff, resulting in a backlog of naturalization cases that slows down the process and discourages would-be citizens from submitting citizenship applications.

Table 2 on the following page is a chart by the Immigration and Naturalization Service showing the naturalization case backlog in INS district offices that serve large Hispanic populations. The chart shows the average number of cases each office receives per month, the number of staff who adjudicate those cases, the length of time an applicant must wait to have his case adjudicated, and the total backlog of cases in each city. Given the staff limitations and the fact that each naturalization case requires an interview lasting about 20 minutes, it is no surprise that the total nationwide naturalization pending case load had reached 212,881 at the end of fiscal year 1984.

Table 2

Naturalization Case Backlog – Immigration & Naturalization Service
as of May 1, 1984

Offices	Average Monthly Receipts N-400's*	Officers Assigned (conduct exams)	Clerks Assigned (process paperwork)	Waiting Period from Receipt to Interview Date	Latest Pending Figures	Total Cases
Eastern Region						
Brooklyn	1,900	7	10	14 months	N-400s* (Included in New York figures)	
Newark	1,350	5	10	6 months	908	11,919
New York	1,350	11	15	4-5 months	23,508	27,923
Northern Region						
Chicago	1,850	7	9	7-8 months	10,484	13,018
Southern Region						
Dallas	688	3	2	8 months	3,302	4,043
Harlingen	96	2	2	14 months	2,091	3,578
Houston	632	4	4	12 months	7,529	9,070
Miami	4,136	10	13+4 temps.	4 months	17,779	19,772
Western Region						
Los Angeles	4,000	18	26	14 months	47,688	59,120

*N-400 = application for naturalization. N-600 = application for citizenship certificate. The N-600 is used by applicants who either derive citizenship through the naturalization of 1 or both parents or by applicants who acquired U.S. citizenship.

Source: U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Service, 1984.

The Los Angeles INS District best illustrates the seriousness of the backlog and its implications for naturalization applicants. In April 1981, members of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees and International Law visited Los Angeles to investigate activities of the INS. Following is an excerpt from the report of their findings:

One of the most telling backlogs is in adjudicating and processing applications for naturalizing. It takes an average of a year for a petition for naturalization to be processed. It then takes as long as another year for the individual to go before a judge to be naturalized.

The backlog has become so sizable that the Los Angeles office of INS held a mass naturalization proceeding...at which approximately 10,000 individuals were naturalized en masse. Given the large number of Indochinese who entered the country in 1975-76 who are now becoming eligible for naturalization, this demand for naturalization is likely to continue to grow.¹⁵

The predictions made in the committee's report proved to be on target. By the Fall of 1983, the backlog of citizenship cases in Los Angeles had risen to 90,000. With the objective of eliminating this backlog, INS formed a temporary task force in February 1984 to concentrate on processing citizenship cases. The task force was made up of staff in the Los Angeles District who are normally assigned to enforcement duties such as the inspection of undocumented individuals entering the country. With each task force member processing 20 or more citizenship cases a day, the original backlog of 90,000 cases had been reduced by one-third by 1984.

Nonetheless, the task force was only a stop-gap measure. For the 1984 Summer Olympics, task force members were diverted to inspecting athletes and tourists who were entering the U.S. from other countries.

After an applicant's case has been adjudicated by INS, he waits in still another backlog of cases pending court hearings. (All naturalization applicants must be given final approval by the federal courts.) In Los Angeles, for example, there is only one naturalization court capable of handling 24 hearings a year at which 1,000 applicants at a time can be approved and sworn in as new citizens. Consequently, even if INS were able to adjudicate the existing backlog of 50,000 cases in Los Angeles, it would take the court there two years to finish hearing them.

These INS and court backlogs discourage immigrants from naturalizing by forcing them to wait an inordinate length of time to have their cases adjudicated after meeting the initial five-year residency requirement for U.S. citizenship. Backlogs also unfairly delay access of new immigrants to the rights and privileges associated with American citizenship.

A second policy that has contributed to the backlog has been that the U.S. Congress and successive administrations have failed to provide sufficient staff and resources for INS to handle the ever growing number of citizenship applications from immigrant communities.

INS has begun using computer technology to help expedite the

movement of paperwork, but additional staff are also needed to conduct required citizenship examinations. Nonetheless, no new staff have been added for over three years to adjudicate naturalization cases. Consequently, INS estimates that it will have over 200,000 naturalization cases pending at the end of the current fiscal year and nearly that many at the end of the next fiscal year.

Finally, a third policy affecting the naturalization process is the very procedure itself. For example, David North in a study called the *The Long Grey Welcome* indicates that INS naturalization examiners are examples of what the public administration literature labels "street level bureaucrats," i.e. government employees who have substantial, and often final, discretionary power in dealing with an often disadvantaged segment of the general public. For example, the I.N.S. naturalization examiner has the potential for making the citizenship examination relatively simple by asking elementary questions ("Who was the first President of the United States?") or making the examination so difficult that a college graduate might fail ("Who was the seventh President of the United States?"). North's findings that the I.N.S. does not approve 30 percent of all applicants highlights the relative complexity of the naturalization process for many.

The finding of a 30 percent non-approval rate (as opposed to the official denial rate of roughly 3 percent) is also important in that it reinforces the perception within the Hispanic community that the transition to citizenship is not automatic.

Another important consequence of non-citizenship is to restrict Hispanic interaction with public service bureaucracies. U.S. citizens who deal with these bureaucracies can use their elected officials as an avenue of last recourse. In fact, some argue that elected officials serve as "ombudsmen" in the American political system. Hispanic resident aliens, who do not participate in the political system, may not be likely to turn to elected officials with complaints to or about public service agencies.

In sum, U.S. citizenship entails more than simple political entitlement. It offers individuals concrete benefits and the means to fully participate in American society. The literature on naturalization does not factor out the relative importance of each of the above factors in accounting for citizenship in the Hispanic community. It does, however, reveal a set of common themes in Latino noncitizenship that have remained constant over half a century.

CONSEQUENCES OF NONCITIZENSHIP IN THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

A. CIVIC CONSEQUENCES

The most obvious benefit of citizenship is the right to vote. Consequently, should the growing Hispanic immigrant population reject or

continue to delay the acquisition of U.S. citizenship, the political consequences for our society are grave.

Table 3 shows the large numbers of Hispanics who are ineligible to vote because they lack citizenship. The basic component of community control and civic participation—the electoral process—is beyond their reach.

The foundations of democratic government are built on individual and community-based representation and participation. Having large segments of a minority community ineligible to participate because of noncitizenship affects these basic principles of democratic government. The characteristics of powerlessness and alienation from the political system that have been attributed by some to the Hispanic community may be due in part to the presence of large numbers of legal resident aliens. A few examples from the literature on Hispanic politics illustrate this well:

A study conducted among Mexican Americans in Houston, Texas found that “the population figures used in districting, which include noncitizens, overstate the real electoral potential of this group.”¹⁶

In Chicago, Illinois, a study on political behavior among Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans and Cuban Americans found that “about 70 percent of Mexican Americans and Cubans in Chicago are foreign citizens.”¹⁷

Another and less well noted consequence of having large numbers of individuals ineligible to participate in the political system is the potential effect on accountability of publicly elected officials. What are the consequences to society when elected officials realize they are not accountable through the electoral process to large numbers of their constituents? Specific studies on this issue remain to be done.

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
					$\frac{B}{(A-D)} = \%$
Year	All Hispanics of Voting Age	Reported Registered by Census	Not Registered	Not Eligible Due to Non-Citizenship	Revised Registration
1974	6,095,000	2,125,000(34.9%)	3,970,000	1,582,000	47.1%
1976	6,094,000	2,494,000(37.8%)	3,970,000	1,582,000	47.1%
1978	6,788,000	2,233,000(32.9%)	4,556,000	2,137,000	48.0%
1980	8,210,000	2,984,000(36.3%)	5,226,000	2,645,000	53.6%
1982	8,765,000	3,091,000(35.3%)	5,674,000	2,785,000	51.7%
1984	9,471,000	3,797,000(40.1%)	5,677,000	3,027,000	58.9%

table continued on next page

A Comparison of Hispanic Voter Registration
Rates With and Without Ineligible (Non-Citizen) Voters

Year	With Ineligibles	Without Ineligibles
1974	22.9%	31.0%
1976	31.8%	42.6%
1978	23.5%	34.3%
1980	29.9%	44.1%
1982	25.3%	37.1%
1984	32.6%	48.0%

Source: H. Pachon, "Recurring Issues in Hispanic Politics" (Washington, DC: NALEO Education Fund, 1984).

Other civic consequences of noncitizenship include restrictions on holding elected office and serving on juries. The latter is relevant to the underrepresentation of Hispanics on juries in most large urban areas. This underrepresentation may be attributable not only to institutional discrimination (e.g., exclusion of Hispanics from jury selection panels), but also to the existence of an eligible population pool that is smaller than the commensurate population at large. In California, for example, 38 percent of all Hispanics over the age 19 are not citizens and therefore cannot serve on juries.

B. OTHER SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

The inability to participate in basic democratic processes of American society has other social and economic consequences. Hispanic immigrants, usually at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, have important avenues of economic mobility closed to them by their lack of citizenship. Most government employment, for example, requires U.S. citizenship. Presently, one in seven persons is employed by the government. Legal resident aliens are therefore excluded from the increasingly significant employment opportunities of the public sector.¹⁸ In the private sector employment opportunities in certain industries, such as aerospace, also exclude noncitizens.

CONCLUSIONS OF CITIZENSHIP FOR THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY

If citizenship is the hidden obstacle to Hispanic political empowerment then policies and programs need to focus on how to address this issue. An obvious factor that needs to be addressed is Hispanic community awareness of the rights and benefits of American citizenship. American society presently does not give emphasis on the value of immigrants acquiring U.S. citizenship. This is in marked con-

trast to the turn of the century when European immigrant communities were the subject of "Americanization campaigns."

Community education, however, is not enough. Immigrants applying for naturalization may need assistance in the acquisition and filling out of forms, advice and counseling on the complexities of the INS, and support in understanding the delays present in the process. Unfortunately, community based organizations solely devoted to citizenship counseling are few in number. The National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Education Fund's *Directory of Citizenship Services* (1985), for example, lists only twelve such agencies in the Southern California area which has close to three quarters of a million Hispanic legal resident aliens. A role clearly exists for voluntary and community based organizations in redirecting resources to assist in the citizenship process.

Moreover, the role of the INS in assisting or hindering citizenship has to be redefined. The INS spends less than 20 percent of its annual budget on naturalization. Its national outreach on citizenship has only three full time staff members. Yet the potential clientele of this office is three million in the Hispanic community alone. An obvious first step in making INS more responsive to its citizenship clientele is to increase its resources and staff in the area.¹⁹ Important questions, however, on the arbitrary nature of the citizenship exam point to the need for research/monitoring in this area.

The Hispanic population is growing rapidly, in part because of the steadily rising influx of immigrants from Mexico, Central and South America and the Carribean. Some demographers are predicting that the Hispanic community will be the largest minority group in the U.S. in the early part of the Twenty-first century. Noncitizenship, however, is the reason why one-third of all adult Hispanics in the United States in 1980 were unable to vote and shape the social and economic policies that affected their lives.

FOOTNOTES

1. Manuel Gamio, *Mexican Immigrants to the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930).

2. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Conditions of Hispanics in America Today," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983).

3. Edward Fernandez, U.S. Bureau of the Census, from a presentation before the NALEO Education Fund's "First National Conference on Citizenship and the Hispanic Community," May 5, 1984.

4. NALEO Education Fund, "An Annotated Bibliography on Naturalization of Hispanics," (Unpublished, 1984).

5. Alejandro Portes, "Naturalization, Registration, and Voting Patterns of Cubans and Other Ethnic Minorities: A Preliminary Analysis," a paper presented at the First National Conference on Citizenship and the Hispanic Community, held by the NALEO Education Fund, May 5, 1984.

6. Emory Bogardus, *The Mexican in the United States* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1934).

7. Joan Moore and Harry Pachon, *Hispanics in the United States*, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1985).

8. Marita Hernandez, "Citizenship—Why Latinos Resist Move" *Los Angeles Times*, January 5, 1983, p. 1.
9. J. Michael Walls, "The Law of Naturalization: A Uniform Law, Devoid of Uniformity," *Cumberland Law Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Spring 1976), p. 212.
10. Celestino Fernandez, "The Causes of Naturalization and Non-Naturalization for Mexican Immigrants: An Empirical Study Based on Oral Case Histories," Unpublished Final Report to Project Participar, September, 1984.
11. Milton Morris, *Immigration: The Beleaguered Bureaucracy* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1985) p. 127.
12. E.B. Duarte, from a presentation at the NALEO Education Fund's First National Conference on Citizenship and the Hispanic Community, May 5, 1984.
13. Lori Rodriguez, "Staying Mexican—Fear, Distrust of INS Discourage Citizenship," *Houston Chronicle*, August 16, 1983.
14. David S. North, "Is the 'N' Disappearing in INS?" A Proposed Study of the Naturalization Process," (New TransCentury Foundation, Center for Labor and Migration Studies) February 1984, p. 2.
15. House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law, *Immigration and Refugee Issues in Southern California An Investigative Trip* (Washington: Government Printing Office), 1981.
16. Susan MacManus and Carol Cassek, "Representing America's Mexican Americans: The Districting Difficulties," a paper presented at the 1980 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August, 1980.
17. Luis Salces and Peter Colby, "Manana Will Be Better: Spanish American Politics in Chicago," a paper prepared for publication in *Illinois Issues*, 1980.
18. Michael K. Brown and Steven P. Erie, "Blacks and the Legacy of the Great Society," *Public Policy* 29 (Summer 1981), pp. 606-621. Also Russell W. Rumberger, "The Employment Impact of Government Spending," Project Report No. 83-A11, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University School of Education, May 1983.
19. David North, *The Long Grey Welcome*, (Washington, D.C.: NALEO Education Fund, 1985).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Raul Yzaguirre is President of the National Council of La Raza. He earned a bachelor's degree in general studies from George Washington University. In 1979 he was awarded the Rockefeller Public Service Award by the trustees of Princeton University. He also serves on several boards, including the U.S. Commission on UNESCO, and chairs the Hispanic Association of Corporate Responsibility.

Peter D. Roos is a leading civil rights attorney with META, Inc., a Cambridge, Massachusetts-based legal research and advocacy organization.

Dr. Manuel J. Justiz is a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policies at the University of South Carolina and former Director of the National Institute of Education. *Dr. Lars G. Bjork* is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and Policies at the University of South Carolina and former Executive Assistant to Dr. Justiz. Currently, Justiz and Bjork are co-editing a book, *The Federal Role in Educational Research*, scheduled for release in the spring of 1987. The book will examine critical policy issues involved in defining an appropriate federal role in educational research.

Dr. Charles L. Kyle, Jr. is an adjunct research associate at the Chicago Areas Studies Center of DePaul University. He is also a member of the Education Committee of the Chicago-based Network for Youth Services. *Roberto Rivera* is the director of the Chicago Intervention Network for the City of Chicago Department of Human Services. He is also a former chairman of the Network for Youth Services Educational Committee.

The Honorable Bruce Babbitt served as governor of Arizona from March 1978 through January 1987. He completed his undergraduate education at Notre Dame University and subsequently received a Marshall Scholarship to study at the University of Newcastle in Oxford, England, where he earned a master's degree in Geophysics. He completed his education at Harvard Law School, earning a juris doctorate.

Fausto Alzati, a Mexican citizen, holds a Masters degree in Public Administration from Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. He is currently pursuing his doctorate in Political Economy and Government. Mr. Alzati held several positions at the Mexican Treasury from 1976 to 1982. In 1983, he served as Director of Energy Planning for Mexico's Department of Energy, Mines, and Public Enterprise.

Dr. Fernando M. Torres-Gil is Staff Director for the Select Committee on Aging, U.S. House of Representatives. He is on leave from the University of Southern California, where he is an Associate Professor of Gerontology and Public Administration. Previous to those positions, he was a Special Assistant to former Secretary of Health and Human Services Patricia Harris, and a White House Fellow to Joseph Califano, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Eve Fielder, MPH, is head of Research and Consulting at the Institute of Social Science Research, University of California, Los Angeles. She is also a doctoral candidate in the School of Public Health, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. David T. Abalos is an Associate Professor of Religious Studies and Sociology at Seton Hall University. He has also served as a visiting Associate Professor of Sociology at Yale University and a visiting lecturer in politics at Princeton University. He has recently published a book, *Latinos in the United States: The Sacred and the Political*.

Dr. Harry P. Pachon is National Director of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials and Kenan Professor of Politics at Pitzer College. He is co-author of a recent volume, *Hispanics in the United States*.

INSTITUTIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL DONORS

ANHEUSER-BUSCH, INC.
ST. LOUIS, MO

BEATRICE/HUNT-WESSON, INC.
FULLERTON, CA

RICHARD DENNIS
CHICAGO, IL

THE FORD FOUNDATION
NEW YORK, NY

RONALD N. HAMPTON
MIXNER-SCOTT, INC., LOS ANGELES, CA

RAUL JIMENEZ
JIMENEZ FOODS, INC., FT. WORTH, TX

KENNEDY SCHOOL STUDENT GOVERNMENT

WINTHROP KNOWLTON
CAMBRIDGE, MA

RONNIE LOPEZ
PHOENIX, AZ

ANTONIO MENDOZA
CASTANEDA & MENDOZA
SAN ANTONIO, TX

BEATRIZ OLVERA-STOTZER
COMISION FEMENIL MEXICANA NACIONAL, INC.
LOS ANGELES, CA

GILBERT R. VASQUEZ
GILBERT R. VASQUEZ & COMPANY
LOS ANGELES, CA

COMMENTARY

The Perils of Pandora:
An Examination of the English-only Movement
Raul Yzaguirre

FORUM

Equity and Excellence
Peter D. Roos

Access and Excellence:
Realizing the Potential of American Education
Dr. Manual J. Justiz and Dr. Lars G. Bjork
The Successes of the Hispanic Community Movement
for Drop Out Prevention in Chicago
Dr. Charles L. Kyle Jr. and Roberto Rivera

FEATURE INTERVIEW

Urban Economic Policy:
A Discussion with the Honorable Henry G. Cisneros

POLICY PERSPECTIVE

Toward a New U.S.-Mexico Economic Relationship
The Honorable Bruce Babbitt
Response
Fausto Alzati

FEATURE ARTICLES

Long-Term Care Policy and the Hispanic Population
Dr. Fernando Torres-Gil and Eve Fielder
The Politics of the Latino Family
Dr. David T. Abalos
Citizenship as an Obstacle to Political Empowerment
in the Hispanic Community
Dr. Harry P. Pachon