Journal of Contemporary Ethnography

http://jce.sagepub.com

Ethnic Inclusion and Exclusion: Managing the Language of Hispanic Integration in a Rural Community

David S. Sizemore

The online version of this article can be found at:

http://jce.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/33/5/534

Published by:

SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

Additional services and information for *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* **can be found at:**

Email Alerts: http://jce.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jce.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations http://jce.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/33/5/534

"Linguistic dualism centers broadly on Hispanic . . . inclusion or exclusion, and it ultimately divides the community over how, why, and by whom the process of Hispanic incorporation should be carried out."

ETHNIC INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION

Managing the Language
of Hispanic Integration
in a Rural Community

DAVID S. SIZEMORE
Trinity University

DAVID S. SIZEMORE is a visiting assistant professor of sociology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Trinity University. He specializes in theory, race and ethnic relations, stratification, and popular culture. His present research includes examining the relationship between media and Hispanic perceptions of discrimination, as well as technology's influence on human social interaction.

534

This article is part of a larger qualitative project on the processes of Hispanic social integration in a rural Southern Illinois community. Findings indicate that Anglo insiders and outsiders describe the changes associated with Hispanic settlement by using a dualistic language of ethnocentrism and paternalism. I suggest that the discourse of inclusion is double edged because (1) it treads lightly on the sensitive nature of interethnic relations so that no one is offended, yet (2) it allows for the sentiment, especially among Anglos, that this is "our country" and Hispanics should "fit-in." A complex language of quasi-ethnocentrism is in operation that allows for Hispanic incorporation but only to the extent that it is "fair" and not based on "special" ethnic considerations. Building on critical race theory and other linguistic frameworks, several theoretical approaches are employed to understand the relationship between normative exclusion, language, paternalism, and ethnicity.

Keywords: *ethnic integration; ethnocentrism; language; paternalism; rural community*

Language use by different ethnic groups illustrates the nature of interethnic relations because semantic systems establish, identify, and perpetuate group differences. Studying language and its meanings also assists in understanding ethnic assimilation, social stratification, and social power (Kramer, Thorne, and Henley 1978). These are relationships at the forefront of critical race theory, which, among other things, emphasize (1) the normalcy of racism as an everyday affair confronted by minorities and (2) "interest convergence," which holds that white elites tolerate or encourage minority advances only when white self-interests are promoted (Delgado and Stefancic 2000, xvi-xvii).

Furthermore, critical race theory considers language to be part of an avoidance tactic where "isms" ("ethnocentrism," "racism," "sexism") are used to talk about and describe discrimination so that behavior is individualized while ignoring the social structural forces that shape individuals (Wildman and Davis 2000, 657). White people use isms to avoid being labeled and categorized without having to change the system in which language is situated. "To label an individual a racist conceals that racism can only occur where it is culturally, socially, and

legally supported," and ultimately, labels hide domination and subordination (Wildman and Davis 2000, 657). Thus, the power differentials associated with interethnic relations are obscured as individuals hedge the profound complexities of ethnic difference and community change so that existing power arrangements go unchecked and remain intact. As part of a larger ethnographic study, the present analysis examines the ethnocentric and paternalistic discourse surrounding interethnic relations in a small Midwestern community.[1]

Between 1980 and 2000, the number of Hispanics living in Appleton grew tenfold, and this growth continued to modify intergroup relations and the institutions in which they took place by prompting various community responses, including a bilingual program in the schools and more interethnic contact and interaction. It was in the institutional context, however, that the processes of ethnic integration were examined, with particular emphasis on how language was used to describe the community changes associated with Mexican and Mexican American migrant settlement. The Hispanic demographic growth fostered changes in the community's institutions and its cultural fabric, which, in turn, stimulated further settlement among Latinos who found work in an apparently receptive community.

Latinos were certainly cultural and economic forces to reckon with in Appleton, yet their presence was characterized linguistically in a divergent way that often sullied integration by highlighting ideological conflicts among and between Anglos over ethnic entitlement. Ethnic entitlements including federal, state, and local grants and other public assistance were placed in a normative context of "fairness" and stimulated a double-edged discourse between community insiders and outsiders over how to negotiate community resources. There was essentially a linguistic "masking" effect at work in the community, an idea that returned to me in discussions with Anglo community insiders who asserted frustration about the continued "intrusion" of government officials, scholars (myself included), and others wanting to study area Hispanics.

I suggest that individuals connected to this community discussed race and ethnic relations by rarely employing outright sets of pejoratives such as "nigger," "spic," or "happy-go-lucky" to denigrate and generalize about entire ethnic populations. Rather, the language used was ethnocentric and paternalistic and employed disclaimers to justify separation as logical and necessary. Although I, too, am inclined

to use isms to address the linguistic issue raised, I agree with Wildman and Davis (2000) who suggest that established systems of power are hidden by the way people talk about discrimination and oppression. Vocabulary "makes . . . power systems invisible . . . [and] -isms language masks the privileging" created by those systems (Wildman and Davis 2000, 659). The following analysis builds on this literature to explain the language of ethnic integration in a rural Midwestern town.

As a final note, I emphasize the interpretive nature of the present effort. Categories of analysis and the concepts used herein are constructs that "reflect reality as experienced rather than preconceived" (Dey 1999, 28). The explanation of data is consequently my interpretation of the subjects' views. Nevertheless, it is intended to avoid the romanticized writing that Denzin (1994, 504) claims muddles the waters of qualitative writing by separating out matters of interpretation, representation, and legitimacy. According to Denzin (1994),

> Interpretation is a productive process that sets forth the multiple meanings of an event, object, experience, or text. Interpretation is transformative. It illuminates, throws light on experience. It brings out, and refines . . . the meanings that can be sifted from a text, an object, or a slice of experience. [M]eaning is not in a text, nor does interpretation precede experience, or its representation. Meaning, interpretation, and representation are deeply intertwined in one another. (p. 504)

The following discussion is an interpretive attempt to make sense of how people described community ethnic change, and my interpretation is hardly static. After all, what the qualitative researcher "knows" about the subject matter is based on "his perceptions, his personal experiences, and his own hard-won analyses" (Glaser and Strauss 1967, 225). Interpretations are largely "up-for-grabs" outside of the analyst's experience and, thus, vary and are flexible so that the conceptual apparatus used to explain events in Appleton may shift from place to place, subject to subject, or analyst to analyst.

METHODOLOGY

This study is part of a larger community analysis that used qualitative research techniques to understand the processes of Latino[2] social integration in a rural community. Data were gathered between 1995 and

2000. The methodological approach included fieldwork and in-depth and semistructured interviews conducted in institutional and community settings. Federal, state, and local documents were also analyzed.

The project started in 1995 as a minor effort in a research methods course, and through a mentor's prodding, I decided to pursue questions about rural community life and ethnic integration. Access to participants was gained through formal and informal contacts and networks I developed in the community. I was first exposed to the Anglo and Hispanic communities by volunteering to teach English to Mexican and Mexican American migrant workers and their families living in the migrant camps just north of town. I initially telephoned "Joanne," a female Anglo manager of the camp facilities, after a colleague told me about her language volunteer program at the camps. We met on a Saturday morning when she assigned me to assist several other Anglo volunteers that had been teaching English at the camps for more than ten years. Meeting everyone that day naturally involved introductions, part of which included my revealing to them my background and research interests. Joanne immediately listed various people with whom she thought I should speak, adding that the list consisted of reliable individuals willing to discuss the community's affairs.

The researcher role I played was one of general detachment, including complete observer, complete participant, and observer-as-participant. I watched people in local parks and the school and attended *Quinceañeras*, festivals, and other activities where interethnic contact and interaction were expected. For three to thirty hours a week I helped people work on their home, tutored students, talked with business owners, attended civic and sporting events, and walked the streets. However, this role grew more complicated as things progressed and very personal contacts developed. The relationships that emerged often led to free conversational exchanges and observational opportunities. During an interview with "Alejandro," an eighteen-year-old Hispanic male, my sense of being a "detached observer" fell apart, however, as I listened to him talk about life with his father in Appleton. In many ways, I had become what Hondagneu-Sotelo (1995, 26) calls an "active reciprocator," assuming helping roles with subjects that allowed for important aspects of people's lives to be discussed. Prior to the interview, I helped Alejandro plant a maple sapling behind the house he and his father were building; only the foundation and portions of the infrastructure had been laid at that point and much of the terrain and

structure were in disarray with tools, beams, tile, and other building material scattered about the area.

As we worked the soil in the southern Illinois midsummer heat and humidity, I noticed that Alejandro was somewhat standoffish and uncertain about why I wanted to talk to him. Since we first met when I tutored him in school, he had always been congenial but skeptical of my involvement in the community's affairs. Alejandro kept our interactions brief and to the point of helping him with his school work. His trepidation that day was evidenced in his verbal and gestured appeals to his father: he seemed to seek his father's acceptance of what he was doing with me, looking over his shoulder regularly for his father's nod of approval. Eventually, he asked me to explain why his interview was important, and I told him that a range of views was needed for a broad perspective on the community, which seemed to satisfy him enough because we went about talking and working.

After an hour or so of digging, an attachment developed between us that emerged in a peculiar way. I scraped and marked up my left shoe with the shovel and Alejandro told me "Man, what'd you wear those shoes for, they're pretty nice, you don't want to mess 'em up any more do you? Come on, let me finish, you're really not dressed for diggin' holes." He was right in that I was unprepared for the work, having dressed for the interview more formally and in new shoes. But my pride took over in the heat as I said, "Ah, my shoes are fine. I'm makin' big bucks as a grad student, you know, I'll just buy another pair if these get trashed. Let's bury this thing and get out-a-the heat." Alejandro laughed at me, or at the nature of my humidity-fueled statement, and I realized we were no longer talking as "researcher/subject" but more so as co-workers who enjoyed each other's company enough to joke around. Helping him plant that tree and joking with him, however, minimized some of his anxiety, allowing him to reveal a personal experience he had with the local police.

As we talked informally about his family's plans for their property, he mentioned developing it into a horse ranch, a dream he and his father brought with them from Chicago when they decided to move to the area because it was rumored to be receptive to Hispanics. I asked him if he thought Appleton was receptive and he indicated that it was for the most part, particularly the school and some of its teachers who he said were "usually nice to him." Yet, he immediately countered his sense of well-being by discussing how a local police officer had referred to him

repeatedly as "boy" after what he claimed was "a bullshit stop. . . . The asshole said my car's windows were 'too dark.'" Alejandro's displeasure with the officer's behavior caused him to "hate" the local police and Sheriff's department. I think that Alejandro opened up to me because of our candid interaction and because we worked together on his home, even though I'm convinced my assistance paradoxically leveled my efforts at detachment. More to the point, however, this interview reinforced the idea of linguistic dualism because Alejandro at once described Appleton as amenable to Hispanics and as exhibiting ethnocentric behavior.

Informal interviews of this sort were coupled with in-depth, semistructured efforts used to elicit responses dealing with culture, intergroup relations, and views of community ethnic change. A snowball sampling technique located thirty-five Latino and Anglo informants who lived and/or worked in the area. Twenty-one Anglo (eleven female and ten male) and fourteen Latino/a (five female and nine male) individuals were interviewed between September 1998 and May 2000, ranging in age from eighteen to seventy. Individuals came from different class, ethnic, demographic, generation, and residential backgrounds. Interviews were conducted in English and Spanish with church personnel, school and legal administrators, teachers, business owners and employees, and community organizers and politicians. Latino/a participants descended from Mexico, Peru, and Columbia, and all were U.S. citizens. It was primarily during interviews with Anglos, however, that the linguistic concerns I address emerged; thus, attention is on them primarily.

The material obtained was originally organized into coded files that corresponded to questions set out in an interview schedule. Following Lofland and Lofland's (1995) coding strategies, data were categorized according to topic, the research questions asked, representation, and any ideas generated in the research process. Both units of analysis and units of observation were established and analyzed based on the conceptual categories that emerged. So, for example, data were put into files coded as organizational activity, culture, demographics, institutions, language, personal incorporation, the family, assimilation, conflict, pluralism, "special treatment," and so on. The ideas of special treatment and outsider intervention, for instance, emerged as I listened to tape-recorded interviews and read transcripts from field notes taken at the school or from conversations with people about their work. Data

were then analyzed using a "grounded theory" technique, which allows for ideas and themes to emerge as the research progresses (Strauss and Corbin 1990, 23). Grounded theory "is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents;" ideas are largely "discovered" and verified in the process (Strauss and Corbin 1990, 23).

For eight weeks in the summer of 1997, I worked as a paid teacher's aide in the grade school's bilingual program—a position offered to me by its director after several months of tutoring and gaining further access to the community. Reviewing field notes and transcripts while in this position continued to yield commentary on "special" treatment and "outsider" demands. Near the middle of my time as an aide, I counted at least fifteen different references to these concepts, suggesting a consistent theme to pursue. Many narratives below detail the ways that language was used to signify specific language that illuminated community power structures surrounding the bilingual program and, more generally, Hispanic settlement. The conceptual boundaries of categories developed were established almost immediately after the first references were made to "special" treatment and "outsiders." Specifically, the outsider notion was borne out of two local Anglo farmers' comments about the work of a Latina administrator trying to continue the school's bilingual program. Generally, however, the insider-outsider distinction was made by informants with reference to anyone working to ease the Mexican and Mexican American transition out of migrant labor, while the matter of "special" treatment flowed from descriptions of the school's efforts or bureaucratic measures to assist Hispanics.

The research process did not consistently progress in a smooth manner, however. Although interviews were seldom denied, those with Hispanics were occasionally difficult to complete because of my clumsy status as a researcher and, I suspect, by my being an Anglo. In reflecting on one unfulfilled interview with a Latina, my status as an Anglo male surely played on the interviewee's decision-making.

Naively, I thought "getting along" with residents would be simple since I grew up in a rural community, lived in South America, and had conversational ability in Spanish. Yet, people's reluctance was not easily assuaged, and I continued to attribute any disinterest in interviews to fear. Perhaps Latinos/as feared that I was associated with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), or were concerned with raids. Perhaps Anglos thought I was a "liberal" academic searching to uncover employer misdeeds and disparage the town's residents.

Whatever the case, the most challenging and unfulfilled interview exemplifies the difficulties I experienced.

I originally set up a meeting with a middle-aged Latina named "Maria." After a typical "cold call" to her home—based on a referral, I called her unannounced one Saturday afternoon—I arranged to meet her the following week, but when I knocked on the door, no one answered. I talked with neighbors who were sitting on their lawn nearby, eyeballing me with what seemed to me great suspicion. After explaining my intentions, they mentioned that Maria's vehicle was in the driveway and that she was usually home at this time. I knocked again to no avail. I waited five minutes and decided to write a brief message explaining that we missed one another, and I requested a more convenient date and time and apologized for any inconvenience. Two days later, I called her to reschedule, and we talked about our failed effort (she was running late from a family gathering) and scheduled another interview. On the second attempt, she was not at home. I called her later that day, but no one answered. This interview was eventually abandoned for several reasons.

In trying to secure Maria's interview, Blea's (1988) discussion of respect played on my mind. She claims respect must be established between an Anglo interviewer and a Chicano/a respondent to avoid the Hawthorne Effect. Chicano respondents may only say what they think the Anglo researcher wants to hear so that he or she will go away (Blea 1988). I thought being fairly bilingual and familiar with the deference found in Latino culture would help me overcome such problems. I recognized that respect was important for interaction with Hispanics and that using formal language rules, listening more than speaking, and showing genuine interest in people's lives was necessary for obtaining some degree of *verstehen*. Of course, thinking these efforts might help is no guaranty for success. My experience with Maria did not reflect any kind of research failure, personal animosity, or hypocrisy. Rather, I think it fell in line with Blea's argument in that Maria may have agreed to our meeting because it was impolite or disrespectful not to. Clearly, we may have simply missed each other on the various occasions when I called or visited, but Blea's insights are likely applicable in that Maria knew I would eventually go away after continued missed dates.

An Anglo male interviewing a Latina is complicated in terms of gender and ethnicity because of the history of ethnocentrism and sexism leveled against minorities and women. Blea's notion of Hispanic

responses to Anglo interviewers applied in Maria's case as I did not call the woman again. The loss of this interview struck me hard since it was one of my earliest attempts at a formal interview with a Latina. It effectively reduced my confidence in getting through the remaining interviews as I started to question whether I could muster interest among Latinos/as. Despite this setback, the data continued to reveal interesting material on interethnic relations and language in Appleton.

THE APPLETON COMMUNITY
AND ETHNIC CHANGE

The analysis of Latinos in the Midwest has paid attention to urban settings primarily (Valdés 1991), and although issues of race and ethnicity in rural areas receive some sociological attention (Snipp 1996), ethnic differences and the changes they produce were obvious in this small, *gemeinschaft*-like community. In the midst of a dualistic language, Latino settlement continued with considerable growth since the late 1970s, fueled primarily by the settlement of Mexican and Mexican American migrant laborers and their families.[3]

Appleton's demography, geography, and culture are decidedly rural and Anglo, and the town is divided into two voting districts that split the city and outlying areas in half. The split is represented by a divided inner "township/village" that is part of two surrounding "districts." Spanish origin persons in 1980 made up roughly 0.4 percent of the town's population and 0.7 percent of the two districts combined.[4] By 1990, Hispanics constituted 2.2 percent of the village population and 3.14 percent of the two districts. The upward trend continued through 2000, when Hispanics accounted for 7.9 percent of the district's population: in raw terms, this growth is a 167 percent increase from 1990. In the village, however, Latinos made up 12.9 percent of the population in 2000, a 500 percent leap from 1990. Isolating the districts, more compelling growth is documented in district one, where the Hispanic population surged 1,650 percent between 1990 and 2000. Much of this settlement stems from Mexican and Mexican American migrant laborers occupying the community's need for agricultural labor.

By the mid-1800s, migrant labor started traveling through Appleton to harvest its principal economic exports: apples, peaches, strawberries, and tomatoes. Hispanic seasonal wage labor migration into the

Midwestern United States has a long history dating back to the early 1900s (Valdés 1991), but for Appleton, Hispanic labor emerged in the late 1950s, largely replacing white and black migrant labor in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Although Mexicans in the United States have been caught up in the capitalist need for an easily exploited and politically docile labor supply (Gomez-Quiñones 1994; Valdés 1991), Appleton's agricultural economy has continued to pull in Mexican and Mexican American labor. A Mexican American Catholic priest and community resident asserted the economy's obvious power: "Hispanics, it's the principle reason why Hispanics are here—it's the economy. This we know perfectly well, to make money. This is the principle objective. . . . There is very, very much work. It couldn't be more sufficient." This position was reinforced by a former Mexican migrant laborer now residing and working permanently in Appleton as a manager. He emphasized, however, that Hispanic settlement now includes family: "In that time, most [Mexican migrants] . . . were single males, right, without family. They're not all coming now solely for temporary work. That is the difference, because there are also children, there are more families than when they arrived alone." Hispanic migration through this area partly transformed into permanent family settlement, which motivated the linguistic dualism addressed below.

INSIDERS, OUTSIDERS, AND LINGUISTIC DUALISM

Dualistic language is certainly not uncommon, and it seems to divide groups along ethnic lines in both obvious and subtle ways (Bosmajian 1984). However subtle or effective racist language is or has been in the process of assimilation, talk about ethnic issues today has to do with what is "just" or what "should be," and it shows little trace of obvious racism. In Appleton, individuals acknowledged that Hispanics suffered disabilities associated with language or inequality, yet efforts at compensation were criticized as "unfair" and suspect.

In essence, Appleton's Anglo residents asserted that they were not "racist," but rather, they merely insisted on "fair" rules of the game and that they were capable of handling the Hispanic "problem" in their own way, without the intrusion of outsiders. Outsiders, however, praised the

virtues of ethnic pluralism. They, too, were guided by a language of paternalism that stressed the "need" to assist Hispanic assimilation and to improve their lot through varying degrees of involvement via the political maneuvering of community, state, and federal resources. This language system was egalitarian and based on universal-rights thinking that was disconnected from the agriculturally dependent local position. Linguistic dualism ultimately revolved around rights, human dignity, norms, and matters of ethnic entitlement so that on one side of the equation, (outsiders) ethnic entitlement was just and necessary, while on the other (insiders), entitlement may have been necessary but unjust.

"Linguistic dualism" was connected to a state of paternalism that played on Hispanic inclusion in, or perhaps exclusion from, community affairs. Individuals talked about interethnic issues by expressing sensitivity to Hispanic settlement, yet they extolled the sentiment that this is "our country" and Hispanics should "fit into" its prevailing social structures. Specifically, linguistic dualism refers to two-sided language of paternalism that (1) describes a measure of "caring" assistance given by Anglos to Hispanics in the assimilation process, yet (2) is also a coded language of quasi-ethnocentrism that conditions Hispanic inclusion by operating to allow incorporation only to the extent that it is "fair" and *not* based on "special" ethnic virtues.

Appleton's ethnic incorporation was likened by both insiders and outsiders to Gordon's (1964) notion of assimilation, which suggests a seven-step process that incoming groups experience in a new society. The direction of the process is such that shifts in the incoming group occur in the direction of the host society: the process is from cultural through civic assimilation, although marital assimilation is arguably the final outcome of the process (Yetman 1999). As assimilation proceeds, newcomers allegedly move though these stages and shed their ethnicity. Assimilation is effectively a "straight-line" theory, implying that ethnic groups will "disappear" into a single host society, eventually conforming to the values, mores, institutions, and lifestyle of the majority group (Gordon 1964). Yet, Gans (1979, 9) indicates that an emergent "symbolic ethnicity" based on a "nostalgic allegiance" to an ethnic group's traditions or original immigrant ways can be juxtaposed to the instrumentality of ethnicity as it is used for political or social gain. Symbolic ethnicity was arguably a mechanism employed by Appleton outsiders to improve Hispanic opportunity by calling attention to ethnic

entitlement. Although Hispanic assimilation was expected, when opportunity was attached to ethnicity, it provoked insider demands for linear assimilation that followed Gordon's model. Thus, symbolic ethnicity may have encouraged paternalistic language by forcing ethnicity to the fore of entitlement issues.

For white Appleton insiders, problems associated with ethnic inclusion were linguistically evaded in one of two ways, each of which was arguably a tactic to avoid claims of discriminatory treatment. Insiders talked as if (1) the town's ethnic affairs were "fine" and therefore should be left alone, and (2) when there were problems, they stemmed from outsiders pushing for unwarranted ethnic entitlements. Insiders wanted to be left alone to deal with the community's ethnic transition as they saw fit, using disclaimers effectively by asserting, "We treat Hispanics well, but it's those 'outsiders' who cause trouble." Outsiders simultaneously perceived little interest among whites in the community for the welfare of Hispanics, arguing that the town "plodded along," "didn't care about Hispanics," and that "more needed to be done for them." The language used to describe interethnic relations smacked of paternalism because when all the "niceties" were boiled away, both insiders and outsiders regarded Hispanics as needing care: for insiders, Hispanics were cared for adequately and should be free from further intervention; for outsiders, Hispanics were cared for poorly, needing more assistance as they settled. Both groups were keenly aware of how to discuss race relations; no informants wanted to convey a lack of understanding what they knew was a sensitive issue, and they worked hard to avoid "racist," "bigoted," or "paternalist" labels. Ultimately, Hispanics were caught in the middle of a linguistic dual between insiders and outsiders that effectively stifled their voice by stripping them ideologically from the decision-making processes associated with integration.[5]

The language used by insiders and outsiders reveals a complex commitment to and need for Hispanic inclusion but only if carried out impartially and in the direction of assimilation. Linguistic dualism centers broadly on Hispanic (or perhaps ethnic) inclusion or exclusion, and it ultimately divides the community over how, why, and by whom the process of Hispanic incorporation should be carried out. The analysis is informed by work on exclusion, Bar-Tal's (1990) link between delegitimization and language, and van Dijk's (1987, 1993) connection between paternalistic language and ethnicity.

LANGUAGE, PATERNALISM, AND ETHNIC ENTITLEMENT: A DOUBLE-EDGED DISCOURSE

The symbolic manifestations of racism, ethnocentrism, prejudice, and discrimination have deep roots in the United States. Language is clearly tied to ethnic divisions, and it works as a "tool" of inclusion or exclusion by categorizing minorities as "(un)acceptable," "(dis)similar," or "(un)worthy" (Baldwin 1998; Desimone 1993; Hecht 1998; van Dijk 1987, 1993). As critical race theorists have noted, language obscures power differentials by allowing its users to avoid more profound matters of structural domination (Wildman and Davis 2000). The language surrounding Hispanics in Appleton suggested that some ethnic traits (Spanish language at home, religion) were more acceptable and less threatening to the prevailing social system than others (Spanish language in the schools, Hispanic uncertainty about bureaucracy and legal issues). In essence, Anglos discussed the process of Hispanic assimilation by using an ideological lens of paternalism that was evident in two variants (local and universal), each supporting distinctive views about the "place" of Hispanics and their labor. These two variants were related to an insider-outsider division, where community insiders asserted a benevolent position toward Hispanics that was rooted in the local agricultural economy and that sought to protect the labor supply. Outsiders, however, derived an interest in Hispanic inclusion based on understanding the assimilation process as connected to disadvantage or some degree of lending newcomers a hand.

The first form of paternalistic language is a sort of "local benevolence," which means that local residents described Hispanics as being treated appropriately and in need of nothing different than what others received. This was a local framework because it was confined to Appleton's circumstances and the networks its residents shared. Ideologies of this sort were linked to migrant labor because of its close association with Hispanic ethnicity and any entitlements it produced. Proponents of benevolence-based paternalism had their economic basis in the local agricultural economy—specifically orchards and their satellite businesses. Hispanic inclusion revolved around the material interests of the local orchards (the welfare of farms and the local agricultural market). Benevolence-based paternalist language was cloaked in massive economic self-interest within the local agricultural community,

whose need for Hispanic labor required arguing that Hispanics were cared for well and earned good money as field workers and should therefore be left alone by outsiders.

"Universal-rights" paternalist language, however, was used by "outsiders," who asserted that Hispanics were not cared for well enough in the local community and should be attended to better by the host or some bureaucratic agency. This language had its origins in an ideological framework that emphasized egalitarian thinking about racial affairs found in more urban environments and not the supposedly provincial sentiments of small towns. Proponents of this sort of paternalism did not have their economic basis in the local agricultural community, were economically uninvolved with the community's orchards, and, thus, represented ideal interests. Paternalist language in this realm had to do with political agencies—and those in their service—that were charged with providing entitlements to minority groups. Such agencies included the local migrant council, state and federal administrations, and several community boards. Academics, civil rights proponents, teachers, and local religious leaders were also involved with rights-based paternalism.

The nature of (in)tolerance expressed in Appleton can be connected to notions of exclusion and inclusion. Exclusion is about movement outside the boundaries of which certain values, rules, and fairness applied. Inclusion, however, is set by Baldwin (1998) in normative terms and consists of three dimensions: "(a) the belief that a common standard of fairness applies to both in- and out-groups, (b) the willingness to share community resources with others, and (c) the willingness to make personal sacrifices so that others can have the same well-being as oneself." (p. 37) Anything outside of these criteria signifies exclusion. When Anglos inside and outside Appleton discussed their relationships with Hispanics, they struggled with the more normative conditions of fairness and how they, as Americans who believed in it, should operate to bring Hispanics into their world.

On one side of the linguistic equation, Appleton sounds like a nice place where diversity was not only tolerated but embraced. Of course, a more disenchanting image was gleaned once perspectives changed. Part of the reason diversity was "tolerated" had to do with what local residents saw as "outsider" influence (the government, special interest groups, and everyday citizens "pushing" for enforcement of state and federal mandates against local resistance). Natives considered

outsiders from two positions, each having some attachment to Hispanic and local culture, customs, law, norms, and so on. To them, an outsider was (1) anyone from within or outside the community that sounded an alarm for any number of reasons having to do with entitlement based on Hispanic culture or ethnicity (greater accommodation, improved tactics of incorporation, recognizing diversity as beneficial to the community, "fair" treatment, or the "need" to speak a second language), and (2) until Hispanics were accepted as a legitimate variant of Anglo-Americanism, they were deemed as outsiders who had yet to acquire the outward appearances and behaviors required of citizens in the community (speaking English, obtaining an auto license and insurance, and obeying the law, local customs, and bureaucracy). *Outsider* is defined in the present analysis with reference to normative matters so that it is understood as an individual or group that stands in contrast to, or is not situated within, the "normal boundaries" of community behavior, expectations, and rules.

When the local community shored-up a firm-handedness and benevolent direction that guided Hispanic incorporation as locals saw fit, van Dijk's (1993) "firm, but fair" paternalist language usefully applied. There exists a "complex and continuous interplay between positive self-description and negative other-description in ethnic affairs discourse" (p. 93). The majority sees itself as a stern father, or wise doctor, "whose firmness only benefits his children or his clients" (p. 93). Yet, being firm should not exceed what is fair, thus making both positions relatively positive in nature because the majority presents itself in a legitimate and rational way, as somehow helping minorities along the best path. Anglo farmers and residents recognized that "their Mexicans" were vital to agricultural production in the area; statements such as "who else would do this work" (picking crops), were often followed by disclaimers that low-income "whites and blacks prefer welfare over a regular day's agricultural labor." White employers held a protective attitude toward Mexican workers that actually set the latter above other laborers. They spoke in terms that expressed (1) a great demand for labor and (2) a justification for why Mexicans were "best suited" for the work. Although local Anglos were often upset by Hispanic "special treatment," they perceived themselves "fair" about it, given assimilation was assured and the labor supply remained secure.

van Dijk (1993, 90-1) uses "benevolent" in a traditional manner with reference to state action on race issues. Here, a "'benevolent' state pre-

supposes the conservative ideology of individual responsibility and merit, . . . implying that minorities apparently cannot make it on their own" (pp. 90-1). This approach was precisely how the *local* benevolent position considered *outsider* intervention. "Liberal" supporters of a benevolent position were alleged to be against freedom, equality, and justice, and they were thought to falsely accuse local employers of discrimination and to promote racial strife and unfair competition. Although van Dijk's proposition may target conservatives as against the benevolent state, it stresses how outsiders attempted to engage some form of rights-based assistance for Hispanics in Appleton.

A consequence of the paternalist posturing was that rifts opened between insider and outsider groups, not because they necessarily loathed one another, but because each had a certain vision about Hispanic incorporation. Local benevolent Anglos resented the tension that could have been avoided if matters were simply left alone as local affairs. Rights-based advocate pressures, however, negated what their representatives viewed as simplistic thinking among locals, and they moved in the direction of immediate action to amend "problems" associated with Hispanic treatment. An ideological clash developed concerning Hispanic migrant labor and contributed to a festering hostility not only between Hispanics and whites but also among whites over the distribution of resources associated with Hispanic ethnicity.

Since the language of interethnic relations in Appleton had to do with the extent to which Hispanics "fit" into the orderly state of community affairs, Bar-Tal's (1990) discussion of two linguistic frameworks ("outcasting" and the "use of political labels") applies to Appleton's ethnic circumstances. Outcasting categorizes "members of a group as transgressors of such pivotal social norms that they should be excluded from society and/or institutionalized" (Bar-Tal 1990, 66). The use of political labels may be equally fitting to both outsiders and Hispanics, describing groups as political entities that threaten basic social values, endanger its system, and are therefore unacceptable (Bar-Tal 1990, 66). Hispanics labeled in such a way were described as "best" suited for agricultural labor, and confining them to such positions was not a concern in the absence of another group replacing them. Outsiders, on the other hand, are said to be "intruders," "rabble-rousers," "outsiders," and "pushers." Those who were characterized in this manner exerted administrative pressure to make life "better" for Hispanics. According to Bar-Tal (1990), outcasting and political labels serve to

"delegitimize" groups as extremely negative social categories, thus lending to their exclusion from acceptable norms and values.

To a local Anglo businesswoman, for example, Hispanics must fit into everyday community activities, as do other residents. She claims "odd" behaviors remained among Hispanics that illustrated difference: "one [Hispanic] neighbor who still washes her clothes and hangs them on the bushes. . . . So we do still see some things that are very different." She went on to emphasize the importance of learning "American ways" even if it meant obtaining some assistance in the effort:

> I think more educational programs need to be done [to teach Hispanics]. If they're going to be landowners and homeowners, I would like to see someone come in and teach these people how to be a homeowner. These things have to done in the United States; you have to pay these things. You have to do these things. There should be more education for adults to learn our ways.

There was a call among Anglos in Appleton that Hispanics learn how to live by the rules of the host community and the country. The dominant majority expected, even demanded, that Hispanics latch on to the "superior" American ways in the process of assimilation; otherwise outcasting, delegitimizing, or exclusive language was used to describe them. It was acknowledged, however, that Hispanics probably could not do it alone, and responsibility for helping them fell on the community, state, or nation. Although confusing—it was unclear who should pay for what—the responsibility of teaching Hispanics how to be "good" homeowners was consigned to some other entity either inside or outside the community. The problem remained; local residents evaluated Hispanics negatively as somehow not quite fitting in, as suggested in the language of outcasting and delegitimization.

"FAIRNESS" AND THE "BOILING POINT" OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONS: THE "BATTLE"

The two sides identified in Appleton at once anticipated and worked for Hispanic movement out of migrant labor (universal-rights-based) or, in direct opposition, were concerned with the strains produced by potential labor shifts that threatened the competitiveness of agriculture (local-benevolent). It was in this oppositional realm that I suggest that

the distribution and procurement of resources was increasingly characterized by ideological posturing represented in a language of paternalism. Despite both sides claiming to be in favor of "helping" Hispanics, double-talk created a strained and divisive atmosphere in the community that led to uneasiness about Hispanic settlement.

A college professor who had grown up in Appleton, moved away, and finally returned to live permanently in the region described to me that during the course of his life here, he had developed close ties to both the Anglo and Hispanic communities. He had sat on or chaired various town councils and was intimately involved in developing Appleton's festivals, effectively making him an insider on whom residents relied. The professor described the misunderstanding surrounding the Hispanic presence as perhaps dissipating but not abating:

> This little Appleton is curiously tolerant, and has been since the last century. . . . Immigrant people to work the harvests, and you can't always pick the color of the people you want to work, but there's history, and given that history, kind of like managed care, and they see things down the road that doesn't strike. . . . See, if I had somebody in [Abbyville] helping, Abbyville would never tolerate a Hispanic festival. They've got big festivals, a big black population, and would never put up with something like this, this wouldn't happen. And in general, they wouldn't allow a festival. I don't know if that's true. . . . So comparatively speaking, given the region we're in, yeah, I feel positive about the growth, I think there's many, many chances for misunderstanding and hard times. Like what happens at the school, not so much with the Methodist church, because you can get away with it, but that would be a parallel scenario, because the Hispanic Methodist congregation would be doing, would be too much geared to Hispanics, and not geared toward the wider milieu. But I think that's a good thing, it's good for my kids, the police, emergency, to kind of have to struggle with it.

According to the professor, there was something unique about the relationship Appleton built with the Hispanic community. Ethnicity was a distinguishing feature that he viewed as a "good thing," suggesting that whatever it was Hispanics offered the community translated into benefits for his family and the police, and these benefits emerged from struggling with the issues. The problem as he saw it, however, was that room remained for uncertainty.

For example, the professor linked the struggles experienced in Appleton to an inability to actually take on a consistent measure of responsibility for Hispanic incorporation. He said,

> I wish there were more people around who were comfortable brokers, and not just advocates, who were just comfortable saying, "yeah, I got real problems with that program down there [at the school], and maybe it got too big, too fast." It's an important thing to have educational opportunities with kids. But you can't play the game. And you can have a bazillion dollar grant, and one afternoon of rumoring at the feed store will give it a black spot. Nobody will have anything to do with it. And to understand the dynamics of a small town, and the dynamics of a migrant population, and the dynamics of demographics that is forcing that population in a small town and the growers around. There aren't a lot of people running around that have that capacity; there are a few, not a lot. What you get, primarily frothy-mouthed-advocates, and they blow in and out of town on a two-and-a-half year cycle, and come in and see all these injustices, see how nobody's doing anything. They'll initiate things, and they don't take, particularly things that smell of politics: "We want to organize. We want to have a common voice." Legal assistance folks come in and out. Pesticide educators, housing folks, and yet, it looks like we're going to have a hiatus [a train passes]. So, anyway, it would be helpful if there were more brokers. Father [Samuals] is a good broker. As big a heart as she [referring to the director of the school's migrant education program] has, she turns me off.

Among other things, understanding interethnic relations in Appleton was to learn that very few people willingly stood up to do anything about the "Hispanic issue." The fickle nature of outsiders was to the professor indicative of how the "dynamics" surrounding the varied conditions in Appleton were poorly understood without a basic immersion in the town's affairs. Because so few "brokers" existed and that "frothy-mouthed-advocates" were commonplace, I was forced to see how seldom interpretations of this community were well thought out and actually rooted in the conditions its members—those with the most intimate knowledge and experience—understood as significant. Too many times, the community faced various outsiders that narrowly grasped its ethnic circumstances. According to the professor, there was a slow natural sequence to ethnic incorporation that was influenced by the dynamics of small-town life, migration, and demographic change.

Individuals and groups arriving in town with limited information and certain they had the "solution" to the town's problems would push for fast-paced change using political measures and then disappear without assuming the long-term, "responsible" behavior necessary to negotiate change. Rather, Appleton was scrutinized under the light of rights-based paternalist ideologies seeking to stimulate the political machine for a quick-fix rather than serving the genuine and long-term needs of the community. He continued,

> My sense is that the school, I want to describe this accurately: I think they're [teachers/staff] qualified, skilled people. I think it [bilingual program] was blown up without a lot of conscious put into the wider community. So it's grown in a cloistered way, so they're battled. I've talked to people, and the battles they've seen are largely with the [local] campus administrators and campus faculty, without a lot of thought and attention given to the wider community. A small town like this, school is it. This is where the sports happen, and the kids go to this one school! I don't think that's been played very well over the last fifteen years. . . . I believe I would have slowed it down, David, but I say that knowing how grants work, how bilingual grants work. "Here's your money, pal." And I know how things go, and I know they're numbers-driven, and I don't fault any of the staff of the program, that's how the game is played. If you want money, the Feds are doling it out.

As an academic, the professor knew "how grants work." He revealed to me that he was one of the "brokers" he thought were necessary in dealing with Hispanics. He served at all hours of the day as a translator whenever Hispanics or Anglos needed to communicate in the event that language was a barrier. I suspect, however, he was in favor of bilingual education yet was reluctant about how its funding was appropriated and distributed and the problems such matters raised. Knowing the process led him to assert that internal fighting among the school's staff and administration was inevitable in light of the ease with which bilingual grants flowed into town.

Although the "battles" he described were between the school's administration and staff, they also had consequences for the wider community since the objectives set out were narrowly focused and centered on what appeared to be the school's needs as opposed to the town's. In Appleton, a language of fairness and the "American way" lent itself easily to defensive posturing among local community members that

responded to outside bureaucratic pressures. Local and insider residents quickly associated the problems of interethnic relations with outsiders stirring up commotion, claiming a "battle" was ensuing. When discussing how the town responded to the Hispanic presence, a regional Democratic politician claimed all citizens should be treated the same and "intruders" did not understand the community's circumstances:

> Politician: We have got to work with them [Hispanics] every way that we work with our citizens, like we provide for anybody. Sometimes they have to ask, but once we realize what they're saying and what they're asking for. . . . Now we've had a few people, I can't tell you what percent, or who, but we have a few who feel like they're intruders here. They own orchards and fruit patches, or labor, so they [intruders] don't have the appreciation of what these people [Hispanic migrant workers] are supplying to the community.
>
> Author: How do you think Hispanics have responded to the changes the school made?
>
> Politician: I think that in the beginning, the Hispanic children are lost, you know, with children; they pick up on things and grow with it, and it kind of blossoms with them. I think that we've done about all we can do without simply singling them out and making a total effort just for that. That's not typically the American way, and I'm sure if the table were turned, if it was in the other direction, they wouldn't want us to single them out the other way either, see, so we try to let them blend in at their own speed, and they're citizens, property owners.

To this insider, incorporation was a gradual process confounded by outsiders' anxious efforts. In a diplomatic sense, and perhaps being a Democrat, the politician certainly had to check his views as relatively neutral to avoid saying something that might jeopardize his position in the community or how he interpreted its circumstances. But the point here was that "intruders" failed to understand the importance the community placed on the Hispanic presence, and that change was a slow process. Lacking these insights, outsiders were thought to drive special programs with insufficient information to justify them. The "American way" did not involve singling out any group for special treatment, and it was in this context that animosity sprung up in the local residents' minds, boiling over to such an extent that Hispanics had to demonstrate their worth as Americans by being "adequate" property owners and citizens. Otherwise, their exclusion was justified easily and attributed to rights-based intervention.

A long-time local farmer claimed, for example, that Hispanic settlement was neither "good" nor "bad," but was potentially volatile when outsiders pushed change too forcefully. Before the interview started, he suggested that a "boiling point" was being reached with reference to Hispanics in the community, claiming about their settlement,

> Farmer: I guess it's all right. I mean, the main thing is if the outsiders leave them [Hispanics] alone.
> Author: You mentioned before . . . a "boiling point."
> Farmer: Some people are getting there. They've got a basketball goal set-up [in the park]. It used to be the Mexicans and whites, they'd all play together, and if the outsiders, I don't know what they are, I think everything will be all right. History repeated itself. It's like the cities were a few years ago with blacks, you know, get somebody in there and stir-it-up, and everybody gets along all right, until some body stirs the kettle a little bit. "He's no good, and he's no good." One against the other.
> Author: So the community suffers?
> Farmer: Yes, they suffer.

He continued by giving his thoughts on whether or not the two cultures changed one another:

> Farmer: I don't . . . I can't say. They're [Hispanics] buying houses. It's hard to say. There's some people that they buy a house next to you, well, it's the same thing, they kind of get upset with you.
> Author: Overall, then, do you think they're getting a little more comfortable with Hispanics moving in?
> Farmer: I think so. You don't hear as much talk as you used to. Maybe, but I don't hear that so much anymore. I don't know if the people were getting used to it. I don't know. It looks to me like it's running pretty smooth.
> Author: The town?
> Farmer: Yeah. You're not going to make them happy with what's going on if they don't want to be. They [Hispanics] want their own culture. They like their time off, to sit around and visit.
> Author: Do you think that's different than everybody else in town, or the U.S. in general?
> Farmer: Well, I tell you what, it kind of reminds me of how things were back when I was a kid; the people would go to town on Saturdays and it [downtown park] would be full, they were all visiting, that's the

way Mexicans are. A lot of times you'll see them over there, 50 to a 100 of them.

Author: White folks don't do that anymore?

Farmer: They don't do that.

Author: Do you think that's a good thing?

Farmer: Yeah. It's a good thing, if people would just slow down a little bit, I think if all American people would just slow down a little bit, and kind of look at the thing a little different. . . . Well, they've got these programs, which they should, I think they're taking away and putting too much emphasis on Mexican programs. I know for some reason, everybody wants to help the Latins. Well, I mean, they're poor in a sense, in another sense, they make pretty good money. They work for it. . . . The welfare thing on these Mexicans, it's just like all these other government programs. These people [government bureaucrats] are not going to, they're only after the numbers. [The] food stamp office, if they do a million dollars of business a year, they're going to keep it open and get them some help. If they do a hundred dollars worth of business, they're going to close it, they're going to be out of a job. All they're after is numbers. The more they get, on this welfare . . . [*trailed off*].

Local Anglos who thought assistance was unwarranted demonstrated that the Hispanic presence conjured up images of differential treatment and unnecessary accommodations. More important, perhaps, this informant was convinced that governmental bureaucrats and their administration were inherently self-serving, reasoning that programs such as "welfare" and "food stamps" existed only to generate money to maintain the employment status of the people operating the service. Hispanics were doing rather well, he claimed, earning a decent wage and managing to buy homes in the community, and they even conjured up nostalgic recollections of a by-gone era. Government intervention and services were not about assisting the disadvantaged but rather generating funds to keep the organization afloat, and thus, the target of hostility was hardly the Mexican and Mexican American populations. Although the Mexican move out of migrant labor may have been a potential threat to the stability of agricultural labor, and therefore itself a point of tension, local Anglo residents and business owners pointed the finger of blame in the direction of outsiders, describing them as "stirring the kettle" and generating tension.

The resistance found in this dimension of interethnic relations resulted from Mexican and Mexican Americans benefiting from system agen-

cies that funneled in money to serve their causes. Not all natives appreciated this fact and were aggravated by it. But the "boiling point" of the inclusion process was also a strong sign that integration was going on; the aggravation stirred by intervention and special accommodations centered on redistributive issues that demonstrated the effective manipulation of the political system on behalf of and by Hispanics and their advocates. The Hispanic population used the system by getting sympathetic outsiders to work in their favor and create alliances that generated benefits. Whatever Anglo resentment existed was couched in terms of fairness and expressed so that inclusion became a matter of controversy about "special" programs.

"SPECIAL" FUNDS AND "PUSHING" ANGLO HOSTILITY

The tension found in the Appleton community was revealed in discussions of the school's programs to assist Hispanics. The Appleton schools recently instituted a bilingual-based Hispanic school program called *Niños*, which generated substantial sums of money to fund the development of programs that catered to Hispanics. What emerged, however, was a backlash of resentment among local residents, and it may be argued that "special" programs such as Niños were just as much annoying to local residents as they were beneficial to Hispanics.

Niños alone contributed significant money to the school, community, and regional budgets. The school board decided recently to draw money from local resources to fund the programs. The school's principal claimed,

> Most outreach is district[-wide]. . . . Bilingual programs are out of district funds. The school district will spend a minimum of $80,000; maybe a little more of local funds, that being state aid and local tax funds. So the district is responding, yeah. With the kind of budget we have, $80,000 is a pretty substantial chunk of money to be putting into these programs. So, yeah, the board, in our last retreat, you know, knows and understands the importance of the Hispanic community. I mean, let's be truthful here, there are over a hundred [Hispanic] students here at any one time. There may be 150. And you know they count toward our state aid count—more students means more money. But if you look at each student in terms of ADA (average daily attendance), each one's worth $4,325. You know, for state aid payments, that's a lot of money. The school district has

grown slightly over the past ten years, and to be truthful, quite a bit of that growth is mainly in the number of Hispanic students. Now, there's been growth in Anglo students also, but we're getting more and more students here, and we think it's because of the programs. We believe we [the schools] have something to offer.

The funds generated by this program were considerable, and spillover into the broader community inevitably went beyond the migrant population. Hispanics and others benefited through actual occupational and educational opportunities, or investment derived from Niños.

This program was, however, more complicated than its derived benefits suggest. There was, for instance, considerable displeasure in the host community over Niños, where the intended distribution and use of the money it generated was thought to slight whites. The administrator pointed out earlier in the interview that resentment in the community could be pinned directly on special funding and programs for Hispanics. The context of special funding manifested political divisions between local and universal perspectives that were exposed in the tense language used to describe the school programs. The administrator continued by describing the program's consequences with reference to its outsider director:

Administrator: [T. Jones is] a pusher, [she's] very good at it.

Author: So there's some resentment?

Administrator: Oh, yeah, that's out there. We've talked about this, [T. Jones] and I did. There are, you know, there's a push that, you know, that Hispanic kids get things that Anglos don't get. They have all this stuff, and a lot of the grant money, the categorical grant money, has to be spent specifically on those programs. And it does create some resentment. Hey, yeah, I would be a liar if I told you otherwise. You know, people in the community, you know, I have said that, you know, [*pause*] . . . I mean they're just special programs for that particular group. Specifically categorized, . . . and sometimes Anglos feel left out. I've always said: my perception is I don't think I'd want to trade places with a Hispanic family. I mean, they're away from their home; they're up here to work. I don't know any of 'em that are livin' in castles and drivin' Mercedes. I would not want to switch places with 'em. I would not want to be living outside my own country seeking, working in agricultural work, you know, limited proficiency in the language. It doesn't sound like that's a good deal to me. The fact the government is willing to put money in to helping those students, it's fine

with me. But I can see how some folks would think, well, you know, they get everything. So there is that perception out there.

Despite the administrator's sympathy for the Hispanic condition, he recognized the divisions created by the universal perspective describing issues with disclaimers and justifications about why the programs are necessary but still "special." The semiotic label "pusher" was attached to proponents of special funding, implying that in and of themselves, programs would not develop absent outside intervention. More important, resentment was tied directly to intervention wherein Anglos would be slighted and receive less of the available community resources in light of the Hispanic presence. Evidently, locals thought Niños generated certain contradictions:

Author: But the school treats people the same: resources, courses?
Administrator: Right. Well, I'll give ya for example: There's summer school for Hispanic students. Uh, it's over a hundred, over $100,000 we spend every summer for summer school. We send 'em all day, we feed 'em, we transport 'em. That whole ten yards. We don't do that for the Anglo kids, you know, it's very easy for the public to say, "well, the government pays for that, why don't they pay for my kids to go to school this summer? They need help, too." And I can't answer that. You know, the government doesn't see fit to target money for that. I wish they would. I think if an Anglo needs summer school, needs help, why not? But they don't. But why should you be angry at someone because they're fortunate enough that they do get the funding to do that? We're gonna run a summer school this year for Anglo kids because the board itself sees that we finally have a few extra dollars; let's spend our money to run a summer school program for at-risk kids that are Caucasian. I don't think it's a get even thing. It's certainly not at the same level as the Hispanic program. We're gonna run a half [day], versus, they [Hispanics] go a whole day, and lunch, and transportation. It's not gonna have the perks, but at least we're trying to fill that gap that says "here's a program for kids that need help." I mean, we try to cover all of 'em. But, I mean, when you start looking at inequities with the government, you certainly can't focus on Hispanics when you spend $500 on a toilet seat for the navy.

I could not help but think how informants consistently figured in "government" as a central player in Appleton's ethnic rifts. It seemed as though the political press was great to see to it that Niños did not slight

Anglo students, demonstrating that the community would not tolerate too much consideration for Hispanics without remediation for Anglo children. The press was so forceful that the school board felt compelled to use extra funds from the budget to finance a program for disadvantaged white children.

THE LEGAL AND NORMATIVE LANGUAGE OF INTERETHNIC RELATIONS: "FOLLOWING THE RULES"

Normative and legal demands abounded in the community regarding Hispanic incorporation. The demands made on Hispanics and their spokespersons included nothing more than following established rules and guidelines, as well as adhering to the "normal" procedures of the administrative and legislative apparatuses that were in place. The general theme of this final section is simple: informants claimed that if one wants to live in the United States, then one must adhere to its governing rules and principles of behavior. Not doing so should not warrant special consideration solely in the interest of ethnic equality. Hispanics must, in other words, follow community and national laws and norms. When they failed to do so, resentment in the local community was again stimulated. But not adhering to legal and normative restrictions was also problematic because it was associated with the special privileges I described earlier. Local residents viewed non-English-speaking Hispanics as departing from the norm, and they considered communicating in the host language a necessity. Residents saw bilingual programs as perhaps necessary but fundamentally supporting nonnormative behavior. To them, it was an unfair condition based on the premise that one does not need to be in line with the rest of the community. Local Anglos claimed that rewarding and accepting fundamental differences between two cultures was not what American life was about, and the former should be avoided. To this end, nonnormative conditions and the interests they generated widened the rifts between groups in Appleton.

A good example of the community's normative structure came from a local Anglo resident who discussed Hispanic suspicions about law enforcement: "Yeah [they're leery of law enforcement], because I think any minority has a feeling of insecurity. If I went to Mexico, I think I would be, too. Because I was out of the norm, and I think any time you're out of the norm, you feel somewhat threatened and insecure.

And I think they probably do." For this respondent, being out of the legal and normative expectations had consequences including fear and insecurity: if he went to Mexico, he would be the minority and would feel awkward and insecure. But in the case of Mexicans in Appleton, he recognized how they would logically be insecure around the police in a community where Hispanics remained a minority and did not fit the "norm." It seems to be their status as an ethnic minority that drives this view.

It was common in Appleton to hear individuals talk about following the rules of American society. With reference to being able to read contractual English, a local Anglo businesswoman claimed,

> I find the worst difficulties in dealing with them is when you get to the questions [such as] any bankruptcies, any judgments. They have no notion of what this is, and some of our terminology and organizational laws, they just don't understand. But we try to have someone present. They have to follow the rules. It's up to them. As long as they're able to live, . . . it's up to them. If they think they can live in the community not being able to speak English . . .

To this person, problems centered on the fact that Hispanics did not fit normal operating procedures and, again, required "special" consideration. An Anglo high school teacher drawing from a universal position discussed the press for learning English:

> Teacher: And, basically, what our problem in Appleton is, they [local residents and school administration] don't see it as a bilingual education. They want to take the Spanish away from the Anglos and give them [Hispanics] all English. Any effort made to do any kind of instruction is looked at as though, "Uh! Why do they need to do that, why are we doing that?!?" It's English, English, English, English, English!!! [People say] "Niños is stupid!" And they don't realize— and we're getting more into the education side of it—they don't realize it's a transfer of, you know, your ability in one language to another language, or that's my belief. But I believe that the stronger you are in one language, the easier it will be for you in the second language. So they're trying to take away from, instead of add to. We're trying to add to, but that's the attitude in the community, as far as that's concerned.
> Author: Do you think or see anything like this Las Cruces program being implemented here in Appleton?

> Teacher: No, it would be way too hard. You would have to employ bilingual people. And that's [Mrs. Jones's] point; whenever there's a position available, the school doesn't necessarily move; as far as a bilingual program, they should be looking at bilingual people, bilingual administrators, bilingual secretaries because we are a bilingual community. But this school, unless it's for the Spanish class or the Niños program, wouldn't even consider bilingual candidates. And they don't even pay higher for 'em, either. There's a lot of places that have different pay scales for bilingual employees. But I don't think that will ever happen in Appleton.

According to this informant, little interest existed in the community to fund bilingual programs, despite the need to do so. The perceived less-than-determined efforts of the community and school administration to do something in favor of bilingual courses was seen as a push to get Hispanics to learn English and that any other consideration was, in fact, "stupid."

The Democratic politician noted earlier emphasized normative reasoning when he discussed contact with Hispanics, stressing the pointlessness of special privilege:

> Politician: No, we really don't [have contact]. They're [Hispanics] utility users, taxpayers, property owners, and they respect ordinances like everybody else, and get on with their own lives, no special contact with them.
> Author: So when you see the services they're providing, is it friendly or is there conflict between . . . ?
> Politician: If they [Hispanics] understand what we're [government] trying to do, as long as they understand they're not being singled out, the ordinances cover everybody. What we do allow or we don't allow, they must abide by it, and once they get that understanding, and most of that, about 90 percent is a language barrier. Now the young generation, any time I talk to them, I try to find the smaller children and get them to stand there and interpret for them and help me explain what I'm trying to say to them, and once that goes through to them, there isn't a problem.

The fair treatment of Hispanics was at the root of contention in Appleton. People were expected to meet certain legal and normative conditions (abiding by community ordinances, for example), and special consideration should be temporary and situated toward

normalizing Hispanic behavior. In the above statement, younger generations of Hispanics were found to be overcoming the "language barrier" that stalled communication. The trend Anglo community members envisioned was one where the boundaries separating the host population and Hispanics would eventually—in a few generations—be overcome, thus making the latter group one that need not be singled out. Hispanics were, in other words, just like everyone else—law-abiding, ordinance-following citizens. They were, in a word, part of the "normal" order of the community. A school administrator discussed Hispanics becoming "normal" citizens, clarifying respect for neighbors as necessary for Appleton's welfare and the responsibility of all its inhabitants regardless of ethnicity. Indeed, he claimed to have no use for *anyone* that did not follow normative standards:

> I don't really have a problem with it [Hispanic settlement]. As long as they are normal citizens just like whites, just like blacks, anybody, as long as they treat their neighbors with respect. As long as they treat their town with respect. Just like us, I feel no different toward a Hispanic family than I do a white [family]. If they treat ya the same. If whites, a family, they go by breaking and entering and all those sorts of things, I have no use for them either.

When Hispanics did not adhere to "normal" community conditions, however, they were thought to take advantage of the system by exploiting its resources unnecessarily and without due cause. An Anglo high school teacher frustrated with the bilingual program made a point of emphasizing how it permits Hispanic exceptions to the rules:

> Teacher: I don't . . . they should like it, the additional program.
> Author: Why?
> Teacher: Because they didn't have it before. But I think for so many it's such a crutch.
> Author: Crutch? Well, I mean, to get out of work, a lot of 'em [Hispanics] use it to get out of class, and say they need help translating. But I think, maybe, they understand pretty good.
> Author: So they use it as an escape?
> Teacher: Yeah, like any other kid, if they can get out of class, why not? Like, we have a couple now that are getting ready to graduate that never took two years of science, and they try to get through with these independent, these bilingual courses. And, I mean, oh, they're here for three years and don't take a year of science!

Although this example demonstrates that *all* school children are inclined to do whatever it takes to avoid class, the teacher made specific reference to Hispanics steering clear of responsibilities through involvement with the bilingual program. His frustration was partly motivated by the responsibility expected for all school children that he thought Hispanics skirted by taking "independent . . . bilingual courses" as substitutes for requisites such as science.

The preceding examples suggest that Hispanic social integration had to do with the rights—and any advantages these rights afforded—that were normally anticipated for community members. Yet, Appleton residents struggled with ethnic prerogatives: Are Hispanics entitled to differential privileges because they are Hispanic? How far should ethnicity stretch the normally appropriate responses to the needs of community members? The Anglo answer was "no" and "not at all," and accommodations made in this manner only amplified problems.

No Anglos made overtly racist claims about Hispanics, but the paternalistic perspective was strangely fitting. Many did assert that Hispanics needed some kind of care until they "learned the rules," and how or why to follow the "law," and other nationalist expectations. A hesitant unease was expressed in the community that at once recognized Hispanics required "special" treatment that disrupted standard operations and that the rules can bend only so far. At its bare minimum, the rule was that newcomers function in the system according to established organizational procedures, and Hispanics must follow the prevailing guidelines even if they do not understand the English language. Disclaimers checked such sentiments by giving leeway to Hispanics gradually learning the rules via some responsible party, either the community, state, or nation. The problem was negotiating who should control this process and why.

Anglos talked about these issues without recognizing the paternalistic attitudes they held, freely expressing what they thought about the contributions Mexicans made in the community. Anglos considered Hispanics as different from other classes and ethnic groups. They thought Hispanics had family values, a work ethic, religious faith, a sense of community, and so on, that made them a labor supply to be protected. Local Anglos were at pains to portray themselves as helpful because they considered theirs a cooperative relationship with Mexican and Mexican American laborers. Business owners and employers had a unique relationship with Hispanic workers that included establishing

friendships, chauffeur services, attending family gatherings and wed-
dings, and providing rent-free housing. This cooperation may have also
been paternalistic as it implied dependence, yet whites were convinced
it was genuine care for Hispanic laborers.

The way people talked about the change Hispanics brought, how
they described and justified following rules, and how they interpreted
problems revealed the lingering divisions between ethnic and class
groups in Appleton. It was in the realm of language, therefore, that the
community was cast in two distinct lights. In one light, usually with
immediate reference to the local population, a long-time Anglo male
resident insider claimed that "both Anglos and Hispanics have [based
on their experience together] kind of laid a bedrock of unspoken com-
pany." Similarly, an Anglo female outsider who had lived in Mexico
claimed, "I love Mexico, I would live in Mexico in a heartbeat, and I
would surround myself in the Hispanic community." But, in another
light, she lamented the tension and hostility in Appleton while
struggling to identify how people got along:

> Anglo Female: There are incidents where, very few though, where
> they're friends, where the Anglos and the Mexicans are actually
> becoming friends. I would say that more at the high school level. At
> the elementary level, they're starting to become friends. And there are
> very few interracial friends that are dating. There's a lot of hostility, a
> lot of fist fights. KKK and swastikas. Basically, there are two sections
> of students: The Anglos and the Hispanics. And that's it!
> Author: So you see them as . . .
> Anglo Female: Totally separate: oil and water.

Informants in Appleton at once extolled the virtues of the town and dis-
missed its problems, or they glorified problems and disclaimed what
was praiseworthy. The language and jargon used to describe interethnic
relations in Appleton gave testimony to the contradictory sentiments
and actions elicited by the Hispanic presence.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

There was a catch-22 to the process of Hispanic incorporation in
Appleton. Intended to bring Hispanics into the mainstream, various
programs highlighted ethnicity or culture and further set Hispanics

apart from Anglos by emphasizing the latter's exoticness. Difference was created, maintained, and highlighted when ethnic characteristics were treated in their own right as valuable. Linguistic dualism regarded ethnicity as at once important, but, Anglo insiders claimed, not important enough to warrant "special" privileges and programs that benefited one group exclusively. Clearly, there was a symbolic utility to ethnicity (Gans 1979), and whites did not want Hispanic culture simply tossed aside. But they also did not favor having it used as a means to gain. The paradox led Anglos both from within and outside the community into one of two ideological positions that mirrored the linguistic approaches developed by van Dijk (1987) and others: opposition to, or reluctance about, special treatment and its proponents or advocacy for the Hispanic cause. Both perspectives were situated in paternalistic language and ideology. The Hispanic presence may have certainly created resentment, but the administrative and policy gerrymandering of outsiders heightened anxiety that was ideologically expressed in language.

The nature of interethnic relations in Appleton had to do with the struggle over political and material resources and the extent to which Hispanics obtained a measure of entitlement to certain rights and privileges. Hispanics arriving in the community were often set apart as requiring unusual responses absent from the general framework of community affairs; they were legally entitled to bilingual education and perhaps unique religious worship. When entitlements were thought to be issued because of "ethnicity" or "culture," insiders employed a language that was at once paternalistic and subtly ethnocentric, yet also strangely receptive.

The language of inclusion, therefore, boiled down to a few simple observations extracted from my research in Appleton: on some dimensions, local Anglos considered Hispanics compatible. For Anglos, this was based on a sense of community, morality, economic need, rationality, and a novel interest in, or appreciation of, diversity. For Hispanics, there was also a sense of compatibility based on community, diversity, morality, need, and rationality. These were some of the premises on which an accommodating argument could be structured. In dissimilar fashion, these same circumstances (community, norms, need) stimulated tension that was illustrated in a unique set of linguistic conditions that centered on paternalism.

The Hispanic presence in Appleton did not create Anglo resentment for insiders. It was, rather, the administrative and policy demands of

universal proponents who struggled with local residents about resources that created hostility in the latter. Arriving in Appleton, Hispanics required "unusual" responses not found in the general framework of community affairs: governmental labor guidelines must be followed, bilingual education must be initiated, and Hispanics had unique cultural and religious needs. Tension was created in the community because entitlements were expanded for "ethnic" or "cultural" reasons, which also happened to be connected to outsider intervention.

In the end, Hispanic inclusion and the erosion of ethnic boundaries were caught up in a sort of linguistic centrifuge where Anglo insider/ outsider interests and their subsequent paternalistic tendencies pulled assimilation in divergent directions. The interesting, yet paradoxical language in this rural town necessarily complicated the process as informants avoided the very nature of inclusion by appealing to one side of the resource debate or the other. In deconstructing the language of white entitlement in Appleton, the local-benevolent and universal-rights perspectives added to existing linguistic efforts developed in critical race theory and the more general approaches that connect language to ethnic divisions by demonstrating how Appleton's language of entitlement was tied to issues of "fairness" and "special treatment." This language tended toward ethnocentrism and paternalism as the process of "fitting" Hispanics into the community centered on what was "just" for either the existing community and its normative framework or what was "just" for Hispanics. "Caring" positions were expressed by both sides of the linguistic battle that, as critical race theory suggests, obscured the underlying interests associated with garnering the political and economic resources that surrounded Hispanics. More to the point, matters of power were masked by language use in Appleton as insiders and outsiders cast light away from power issues by emphasizing ethnic entitlement.

NOTES

1. For anonymity, the town is renamed "Appleton," the county "South," and participants' names are replaced by pseudonyms.

2. "Hispanic" and "Latino" are used interchangeably to refer to residents of the United States who can trace their ancestry to the Spanish-speaking regions of Latin America and the Caribbean. However, my primary focus was on Mexican and Mexican American migrants or residents since they represented the majority of Hispanics in the

community. To maintain definitional clarity, I defer to the definition above despite its obviously controversial nature as an imposed panethnic category with which not all Latinos identify (Jones-Correa and Leal 1996).

3. Persons of Mexican and Mexican American descent made up roughly 85 percent of Appleton's Latino population and all but three Latino interviewees in the present study.

4. All demographic data were gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau. For the sake of anonymity, specific data references have been removed from the bibliography and may be made available on written request to the author.

5. The present study is concerned primarily with the Anglo reactions to Hispanic settlement. In its own right, the analysis of language among whites is a fascinating element of linguistic studies. However, focusing on Anglos gives rise to a significant methodological problem of giving insufficient voice to Hispanics. Although "voice" has multiple dimensions (Hertz 1997), the present analysis suffers from my continued struggles to let both Anglo and Hispanic informants speak for themselves while minimizing the authors' voice. I remind readers that my interpretive attempt is to explain and understand how language is *used* by community members without removing focus from the subjects and their independence from the author, despite the methodological complications created.

REFERENCES

Baldwin, John R. 1998. Tolerance/intolerance: A multidisciplinary view of prejudice. In *Communicating prejudice*, edited by Michael L. Hecht, 24-56. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bar-Tal, Daniel. 1990. Causes and consequences of delegitimization: Models of conflict and ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Issues* 46:65-81.

Blea, Irene I. 1988. *Toward a Chicano social science*. New York: Praeger.

Bosmajian, Haig A. 1984. *The language of oppression*. New York: University Press of America.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 2000. Introduction. In *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*, 2nd ed., edited by Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, xv-xix. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Denzin, Norman K. 1994. The art and politics of interpretation. In *Handbook of qualitative research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 500-15. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Desimone, Laura M. 1993. Racial discourse in a community: Language and the social construction of race. *Journal of Negro Education* 62:414-8.

Dey, Ian. 1999. *Grounding grounded theory: Guidelines for qualitative inquiry*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2:1-20.

Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Gomez-Quiñones, Juan. 1994. *Mexican American labor, 1790-1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hecht, Michael L., ed. 1998. *Communicating prejudice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hertz, Rosanna. 1997. Introduction: Reflexivity and voice. In *Reflexivity & voice*, edited by Rosanna Hertz, vii-xviii. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 1995. Beyond "the longer they stay" (and say they will stay): Women and Mexican immigrant settlement. *Qualitative Sociology* 18:21-43.

Jones-Correa, Michael, and David L. Leal. 1996. Becoming "Hispanic": Secondary panethnic identification among Latin American–origin populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18:214-54.

Kramer, Cheris, Barrie Thorne, and Nancy Henley. 1978. Perspectives on language and communication. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3:638-51.

Lofland, John, and Lyn H. Lofland. 1995. *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*, 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Snipp, C. Matthew. 1996. Understanding race and ethnicity in rural America. *Rural Sociology* 61:125-42.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Valdés, Dennis Nodín. 1991. *Al Norte: Agricultural workers in the Great Lakes region, 1917-1970*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

van Dijk, Teun A. 1987. *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

———. 1993. *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wildman, Stephanie M., and Adrienne D. Davis. 2000. Language and silence: Making systems of privilege visible. In *Critical race theory: The cutting edge*, 2nd ed., edited by Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, 657- 63. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Yetman, Norman R. 1999. Patterns of ethnic integration in America. In *Majority and minority: The dynamics of race and ethnicity in American life*, 6th ed., edited by Norman R. Yetman, 227-71. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.