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One of the most pressing problems in foreign language education concerns the financing of foreign language instruction and foreign language associations. Alternatives that the profession may have to consider in this regard are discussed, and some possible courses of action are suggested. The chances of future survival of discipline-oriented associations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), in the face of competition from unions, is considered in the light of a futurist approach. The purpose of the futurist movement in education is to find a new basis for organizing the instructional process. The pedagogical applications of the futurist movement to foreign language education are discussed, including Toffler's system of skills involving three primary areas: (1) learning how to learn, (2) relating to other people, and (3) making intelligent value judgements. Professional organizations such as ACTFL are needed to identify and implement educational alternatives. Central activities include exchanging ideas about classroom practice, publishing theoretical articles, and applying theories through workshops and conferences. It is also important to have a single professional voice to speak out for the entire membership at the national level. The current status of ACTFL and its importance in making the foreign language instructional program attractive are also reviewed. (CLK)
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My topic for today contains an allusion to "futurism," a term which relates to attempts within the social sciences and in management circles to establish a new discipline — a new way of coping with accelerating change and with the so called "knowledge explosion." It is my intent to use certain aspects of the futurist movement as a framework for examining some of the problems which we face in the foreign language teaching profession in general and within foreign language associations in particular. One of the most pressing problems today has to do with the financing of foreign language instruction and foreign language associations. In this respect, I would like to examine some of various alternatives which the profession may have to consider and to suggest possible courses of future action. We are most interested, of course, in alternatives which could help the profession survive or even flourish in an economic environment which seems to be increasingly hostile to foreign language education.

I am happy that this year's conference has included — in addition to ACTFL — an international congress of foreign language teachers as well as one of the major language associations of the United States, the American Association of Teachers of German. I have been a member of AATG for many years, and have been an active member of ACTFL since it began less than a decade ago. In addition, as a professional state employee, I am vice-president of a 600-member union local. This latter affiliation is the result of a Wisconsin law.

*A speech delivered in Washington, D.C. on November 29, 1975 during the 1975 Annual Meeting of ACTFL.
which specifies that all state employees are to be represented by a bargaining
unit, (111.70). The professional educational employees in Wisconsin voted to
be represented by the Wisconsin Chapter of the American Federation of Teachers,
an AFL-CIO affiliate. I mention this because it has to do with the question
of survival of those professional associations which relate to one's special
professional function within a given discipline. Or, to put the matter in the
form of a question; What are the future chances for survival of the discipline-
oriented associations in the face of competition from the unions which deal
with such matters as working conditions, salary, fringe benefits, and job
tenure? There is a real question today with respect to whether both kinds of
organizations can co-exist in the future. In this regard let us reflect upon
the fact that, in 1973, less than 7% of the professional education employees
in Wisconsin state government belonged to a union-type organization. By 1975,
this figure had risen to over 80% thereby giving the union the strength to
carry a fair-share vote. Fair share simply means that every non-management
professional employee without exception has the union dues automatically
deducted from each pay check. (My union dues are ten times as much as my
ACTFL dues.) However, it is significant that the vast majority of Wisconsin's
state educational employees voluntarily submitted to the $150 a year checkoff
in order to be represented by the Federation. It is also noteworthy that,
just last week 2,000 university professors joined the Wisconsin Federation of
Teachers. Nationally, teachers at the elementary, secondary and junior college
levels are paying hundreds of millions of dollars in union dues to NEA and AFT
affiliates. By contrast, the dues requests of organizations such as ACTFL are
quite modest. Dues payments received by organizations representing subject
matter interests tend to be in terms of tens of thousands or, at most, hundreds
of thousands of dollars. Will such associations tend to be over-shadowed and
perhaps destroyed by the growing trend toward professional employees unions which are seeking to enroll everyone in the profession from kindergarten through college?

Before I deal with that question, let me digress for a few minutes in order to show how all of this relates to the question of "future shock." People in the language teaching profession have been concerned in recent years with the phenomenon of "culture shock," a term referring to the particular kind of disorientation which is experienced by persons who are compelled to function for extended periods of time within an environment which is culturally and, (in most instances) linguistically different from one's native environment. In 1970 Alvin Toffler's book Future Shock introduced the assertion that a similar phenomenon is taking place within all technologically-developed nations, and particularly within their educational systems. A number of futurists view contemporary education as being excessively past-oriented. According to futurists, we have long since passed the point where minor adaptations of past practices will serve for students who must function in the future. As Alvin Toffler expressed it: We are now in the "super-industrial era" in which the future is rushing upon us like "a roaring current of change, a current so powerful today that it overturns institutions, shifts our values and shrivels our roots. (Toffler, 1971, p.1) Futurists foresee increasing numbers of teachers and students falling into a state of "future shock" when faced with the multiplicity and rapidity of change which our so-called "post industrial" world will thrust upon them. What is even worse, according to the futurists, our educational institutions are not responding to the real needs of the future; educators are simply too concerned with maintaining the status quo. Higher education is seen as the worst offender because of course requirements which have fossilized the curricula of the colleges and
secondary schools. The result is an inflexible pattern of studies reflecting the vocational and social requirements of a vanishing society. (Toffler, 1974, p. 410) "The instinctive recognition of this state of affairs by young people," says Toffler, "has been one of the key factors behind the collapse of teacher authority." (Toffler, 1974, P. 13)

Another factor which is said to contribute to the alienation of students is the problem of "over choice." As one futurist expressed it, "There is so much that could be taught that it is almost impossible to decide what should be taught." (McDaniel, p. 105) In fact, this question came up in a workshop which I was conducting last month in Wisconsin. Some of the teachers noted that their foreign language textbooks were already overcrowded with material. However, in addition, they were now being asked to deal with content relating to the ethnic heritage, to the Bicentennial, to the target culture, to career education, etc. How, they asked, does the teacher choose what to add, what to delete, what to study in depth, or what to treat superficially? Those of you who have visited the displays of books and materials at this conference must have been aware as you walked through that area, that there is more material available than the most precocious student could possibly assimilate even in four years of continuous study even assuming there were no other subjects in the curriculum. So the question becomes, "How do we cope with an immense and expanding data-base?"

With respect to the question of rapid change, some of us in the foreign language field have, over a period of years, been told of the need for historical grammar, traditional grammar, structural linguistics, and generative grammar. Even in this one small area of scholarship (the study of human language) the foreign language educator is confronted with vast, conflicting bodies of highly esoteric data. Furthermore, the more outspoken
advocates of each new school of linguistics have regularly come forth with the declaration that their emerging field of knowledge is "basic" to the practitioner in the field of foreign languages. Simultaneously, of course, advocates of an older (or newer) school will declare that theirs is the basic area of knowledge which everyone ought to know. The only thing that appears certain is that yet another conflicting school will soon emerge and that its proponents will claim to have developed the proper way of looking at language. The same situation exists in other related fields such as the study of culture, pedagogy, and the psychology of learning. Each of these areas presents the practitioner with rapidly changing theories and confronts him with the problem of "over choice".

The purpose of the futurist movement in education is to find a new basis for organizing the instructional process. Educational futurists tend to disassociate themselves both from technological gadgetry and from attempts to predict the future. That is, the intent of futurists is not to supply a final projection, but to present an array of possibilities. As Buchen expressed it, "The futurists are not so much interested in predicting as in creating desirable futures; the stress is not on what will be but what can or what should be." (Buchen, p. 142-143) Thus, one of the techniques of the futurist involves making projections (not predictions) of various possible futures. In some cases, inferential statistical procedures, the systems approach, and computer technology are used to project what might happen to various contemporary trends if they were to continue on into the future. Such projections of trends can be useful in helping educators to make choices or value judgments concerning not what is predicted as inevitable, but rather what among the various choices ought to be favored. Humanistic futurists tend to shy away from the outputs of the data gatherers and to put more emphasis
upon the products of creative genius; (for example, the utopian and dystopian novels of writers like Huxley and Orwell.)

There are, of course, the non-humanistic futurists who advocate a technology of human manipulation which they frankly refer to as "human engineering." The leading proponent of this view is B. F. Skinner who, in his book Beyond Freedom and Dignity, comes out flatly in favor of the deliberate manipulation of people so that they will meet predetermined behavioral specifications. The humanistic concept of autonomous mankind and the commitment to freedom and dignity have not worked, in Skinner's opinion. Therefore, a technology of human behavior is developing which has "wonderful possibilities" and which will ultimately replace the "traditional approaches which have been so ineffective." (Skinner, 1971, p. 204) In his behaviorist utopian novel, Walden II, Skinner claims that in the future, education will have to "abandon the technical limitations which it has imposed upon itself and step forth into a broader sphere of human engineering." Nothing short of the complete revision of a "culture" will suffice according to Skinner. (Skinner, 1948, p. 312)

In his famous book 1984, Orwell agreed with Skinner's view of the future which included a world controlled and manipulated by the technological experts. However, unlike Skinner, Orwell views the inevitable outcome of human engineering as a total dehumanization of everyone by an amoral, power-hungry group of controlling bureaucrats. In 1984 even the emotions are totally manipulated so that love and loyalty to the central bureaucracy (symbolized by "big brother") are the only overt displays of feeling which are permitted. And big brother's behavioral objectives are strictly enforced by an all-powerful central party. As one controller expressed it, (Quote) "If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face--forever." (Uncoute) (Orwell, p. 220) How does all this relate to a conference
on the teaching of language? The answer relates to the Orwellian picture of
the future, in which language is one of the chief human behaviors to be
manipulated. In 1984 "Newspeak" is the official process whereby words will
mean only what the controller wishes them to mean at any given time. In this
regard, a British journalist writing in the London Observer in October 1973,
viewed the language of the Watergate hearings as being a giant step in the
direction of Orwellian newspeak. And the journalist coined the word
"waterspeak" to refer to the way in which Watergate team members were willing
to depersonalize themselves and their actions to seemingly accept government
as being "essentially a machine, a complex piece of engineering rather than a
collection of people." (Sampson, 1973) The rhetoric of the Watergate
hearings abounded with mechanical metaphors such as "input," "output," and
'zero defect system." The men involved in Watergate frequently referred to
themselves as "conduits." Also, unethical, immoral and criminal behaviors were
converted to euphemistic rhetoric: a bribe became "a payment with increments
in the form of currency"; burglary was described as "surreptitious entry"; an
outright lie came out as, "my statement is inoperative." The British
journalist concluded his article by suggesting that "Water speak seems to
indicate how men in power can become conditioned by language to regard
themselves as part of a machine in which individualism is, to borrow a word,
inoperative."

As I see it, all of this has a great deal to do with foreign language
education and its role in the future. The signs of technological
dehumanization are everywhere. Time does not permit an enumeration of the
evidence which, in any case, is obvious. However, what should be equally
obvious to the teacher of humanistic subject matter is the fact that second
language learning offers one of the strongest walls of resistance against the
kinds of linguistic manipulations which are described in most of the dystopian novels. (Orwell, 1984, Huxley, Brave New World, Vonagut, Player Piano) The study of a symbolic system which refers to a culture other than one's own is surely one of the best ways to become better attuned to the relationship between symbol and meaning in the native language, and, thus to perceive the purposes of those who use language deceptively. This proposition carries with it a number of assumptions and value judgments. One is the belief that verbal deception is bad, a belief that might be contested by some people such as those in the advertising business. Another assumption relates to the belief that personal freedom is in some way related to the ability of the electorate to make accurate judgments of that which is spoken and written. This in turn implies a belief in freedom itself and, by implication, in some form of democratic government. (As we in America approach 1976 this larger question may well be worth considering, for the Bicentennial year.) For there is evidence of positive carryover from second language learning to the learner's first language as well as to other kinds of cognitive functioning.

In this regard, one problem I see with the futurist movement in the United States is its tendency to omit foreign languages from consideration. The futurist movement is largely represented by people with social science backgrounds who appear to believe either that the world is to become a monolingual English-speaking area, or else that our multi-lingual world can be adequately studied in one's native language. As an example of this, one sociologist stated that the study of other societies helps to counteract "false prejudices, uncritical ethnocentricism, and ignorant parochialism." (Bell, p. 84) He further stated that future-oriented educators must be like the cultural anthropologist who transcends his "cultural envelope" of the present in order to function in the future. However, he consistently omitted
any mention of foreign languages despite the fact that seven-eights of the world's people do not speak English natively. This is just one of many examples of how we in the foreign language field are ignored and bypassed by movements which are obviously relevant to what our field is all about. I will return to this question a bit later in relation to the future of professional organizations, and associations, and their futures.

First, however, I would like to say a few words about the possible pedagogical applications of the futurist movement to the field of foreign language teaching. Contemporary educational futurists are looking for ways to cut through the formalism, compartmentalization, and rigidity of the existing modes of schooling without destroying the important humanistic elements contained therein. They have this in common with progressive educators of the past. Both the progressivists and the futurists tend to reject the empirical approach which necessarily draws upon data from the immediate past. As the progressivist Bode said in 1939, "Conditions in industry are changing so rapidly that the problem of enabling the individual to readjust himself as circumstances may require becomes a matter of primary importance. The demand is for 'free intelligence' rather than for skills in connection with established patterns." (Bode, p. 92) Thus, in a sense, futurism is a return to some of the basic ideas of the progressivists. However, the problem today is much more urgent. For not only do occupations appear and disappear with increasing rapidity, but also, the whole structure of society undergoes massive changes in rather short periods of time. According to Toffler, all of this will require a system of skills involving three primary areas: 1) learning how to learn, 2) relating to other people, and 3) making intelligent value judgements. (Toffler, 1971) The implications of all of this for the foreign language program are quite serious. For example, if the
first area -- learning how to learn is taken seriously -- then it is clear that the "specific data" of learning a language are not nearly so important as the generalizations relating to the future acquisition of any language which might eventually be needed. This carries with it the belief that the process of learning languages is more important than the information which one acquires about a specific language (although both are obviously necessary to some degree). However, for many students it might be better to acquire some minimal acceptable level of competence in one language while viewing this acquisition as principally a vehicle for learning how to approach any second language or culture which the individual might encounter in the future.

Toffler's second top priority category -- "learning to relate to other people" -- is thought to be important because of the growing instability of family, neighborhood and community relationships. This element, if taken seriously, would call for a modification of many existing instructional procedures. For example, it would be indefensible to have a class of 30 foreign language students sitting in the classroom "isolated together" merely because the subject matter and the competitive grading system militate against cooperation and social interaction. Equally untenable would be the perpetuation of heavy emphasis on bogus communicative interchanges and repetitive drill work. The implication is that this kind of activity would be minimized in favor of pedagogical techniques which involve genuine communication with fellow students in situations which require cooperative social interaction.

However, "learning how to learn" and "learning how to relate" are not sufficient in themselves. In addition, the futurist curriculum would be designed to help students make choices and to develop a value system for coping with a chaotic and changing world. (Kirschenbaum) Both progressive
educators and traditional academicians have failed to find answers to this question. How do we help young people to develop inner moral resources? For very complex reasons American educators have tended to restrict their activities to teaching facts; the deep human need for having a built-in value system has tended to get lost in this process. Some years ago a Professor I know at the University of Wisconsin introduced to his class the idea of balancing the budget in the United States by making 70 the "terminal age." He asked students to discuss and comment on this proposal. He was expecting an outburst of indignation against the entire idea. However, such a reaction did not occur; in fact, they bought the idea almost in toto. The most that students were willing to do was to suggest that certain people with good credentials in creativity or in scientific or mathematical genius should be exempted. A few Picassos and Einsteins, they said, should be allowed to survive beyond age 70. This is illustrative of the kind of moral relativism which has crept into many classrooms. In my opinion this is also an example of misplaced impericism; an improper attempt to treat moral and ethical issues as if they were capable of being approached with an aura of scientific neutrality. In this regard, part of the futurist movement is directed toward changing the role of the teacher from that of the neutral authoritarian knowledge-dispensing figure to that of a person who facilitates active, creative, participatory learning by the students themselves. In fact, this is already underway in other disciplines such as English and social studies. Among the kinds of pedagogical changes which have been suggested by various educators — and in our field, by Helen Warriner (1973) are these:

An instructional system:

Which moves from the teacher doing all the teaching to the teachers and students learning from each other;
Which moves from passive answer absorbing by students to active answer-seeking and problem solving;

Which moves from teacher dominated curriculum planning to group planning of the curriculum involving both student and teacher initiative;

Which moves from isolated and compartmentalized subject matter to interrelated interdisciplinary content;

Which moves from evaluation based upon memorized answers to an evaluation based upon student ability to solve problems and to apply what has been learned to new situations;

Which moves from the emphasis upon a single textbook or text series to the use of many media, field trips, personal experiences, and simulations;

Which moves from the view of the student as an object to be talked at and processed by the teacher to a view of the student as the subject of learning (that is one who learns with the teacher);

And which moves from a situation where the teacher makes all the choices (to which the student is expected to comply) to a situation where students make meaningful choices for which they are held strictly accountable.

In commenting on the individualization movement, Lorraine Strasheim has suggested the need to redesign our curricula so that foreign language programs can meet the future needs of virtually all students. We should be less elitist, less exclusively concerned with preparing future specialist scholars and more insistent upon making a humanizing educational experience available to all students. As Strasheim expressed it, such a program would "contribute to the student's intellectual, social, aesthetic, and emotional growth through foreign language study." Also, future programs would "assist the student toward a more positive approach to other peoples through in-depth experiences with the
thought processes and social behaviors of native speakers." (Strasheim, p. 32). The program which Strasheim outlined included a variety of alternatives. It would offer something to the student who is pursuing a general interest in language as well as the student who wishes to major in foreign language study, and it would include most other students in between.

The examples which I have cited here relate to possible alternatives for future action. I hasten to add that they are meant neither as predictions nor as recommendations. I would suggest, however, that the concept of providing for increased student creativity and of broadening the opportunities for language study are not to be taken lightly. By clinging overlong to an elitist philosophy of student participation and to a rather sterile form of grammar-based pedagogy the American foreign language teaching profession almost parsed itself into oblivion during the first half of this century. And now foreign language programs are being cut back again. Many languages at the College level show double-digit enrollment losses. Teachers are being laid off or put on part-time pay. And increasingly we hear gloomy proclamations of disasters yet to come. There are even articles proclaiming the inevitability of decline. This, I insist, is a dangerous self-destructive tendency. For, as Marshall McLuhan has said, "there is absolutely no inevitability as long as there is a willingness to consider the alternatives." Our tendency to regard a negative future as inevitable, based upon extrapolations from past trends, is simply an easy way to excuse oneself for doing nothing. We do, in fact, have alternatives to consider. For example, there are schools in which enrollments are on the increase and in which students continue to achieve. There are even entire states -- such as Minnesota -- where high school foreign language enrollments are on the rise. Furthermore, successful programs can be found in large cities, wealthy suburbs, small towns and rural areas. One can find everything
from a new elementary school German program (in Cincinnati) to expanding French programs at major universities. All of this in spite of a depressed economy and an educational establishment which is allegedly inhospitable to second language learning.

The point of all this is that we do, indeed, have the alternatives available to shape a positive future. The problem lies in identifying and implementing those alternatives. And that is why we need professional organizations such as those represented here today. Such organizations provide an essential vehicle for exchanging ideas about classroom practice. The theoretical articles which our organizations publish are also essential. In addition, we need the practical applications of those theories which are demonstrated and discussed in workshops and conferences. If time permitted, I could list many other values which professional associations provide. However, I'll mention only one more, namely, the advantage of having a single professional voice to speak out for the entire membership at the national level. Perhaps the failure of potential members to appreciate the value of having such a voice is one of the reasons that our professional language organizations are experiencing difficulties today. But there are other reasons, not the least of which is the economy. Inflation has hit the professional associations hard as has the drying up of external funding sources. For example, the cost of publishing professional journals virtually doubled between 1973 and the present; during this same period federal support for bibliographies has been cut in half. Also, the once-powerful National Defense Education Act, which used to provide tens of millions of dollars in support of foreign language program, is now down to a trickle. On June 30, 1976 it will be phased out completely. These and other cutbacks have — directly or indirectly — hurt the foreign language associations. It is perhaps no consolation to know that ACTFL is not the only
professional association to have faced a deficit in recent years. Last year the Modern Language Association requested donations from its membership to balance the budget, as did ACTFL. And even the formerly affluent American Medical Association has had fiscal problems. In fact, the AMA assessed each of its members $60.00 extra in order to erase a six million dollar deficit for the years 1974-1975. And the 1975 AMA meeting included a proposal to increase dues from $110 to $250 per year! (AP, June 16, 1975)

It was in this kind of economic climate that ACTFL became (in 1975) officially a separate, not-for-profit association incorporated under the laws of New York State (we could never be accused of good timing). This means that we are no longer operating under the legal and financial wing of the Modern Language Association. I hasten to add that MLA is still supplying us with some valuable services and facilities. However, even these are scheduled for phase out, which means that we may soon be facing the prospect of selecting a new office location for ACTFL with all that that entails. Our new status has also produced some internal parliamentary problems in that the old constitution is superseded by the new articles of incorporation. We are working on the necessary changes and hope, in the process, to come up with a more streamlined format which will improve communication among members and between the membership, and the ACTFL staff. The addition to the staff of an inhouse editor is, I think, a step toward improved efficiency of operation and improved service to the membership. It will, I am sure be reflected in the new combined format of ANNALS & ACCENT. The materials center containing inexpensive classroom-oriented materials has been well-received by hundreds of teachers in the field. Efforts are being made to expand the number and variety of available items and to improve the technical quality of reproduction.
So, that gives a brief overall summary of the current status of ACTFL; the details will be reported elsewhere. Now, the question which sometimes arises is: "Is it all worth it?" Which is another way of asking if ACTFL ought to exist. It is significant, I think, that the question comes up as often as it does. It is my impression that teachers of English, social studies, math, science, music, art and reading seldom question the need for a national pedagogical organization. The reason for this I think is obvious. The other disciplines are less fragmented than we are; less tied to the concept of the teacher as a dispenser of a particular body of knowledge. Perhaps because of the enormous effort required to gain even a minimum working knowledge of a second language we tend to emphasize content rather than student needs. Or at least we have that image among many administrators, counselors, parent groups, and people in competing disciplines. We are accused of being elitist and insensitive, more interested in the subject matter of a particular language than in people.

I believe that ACTFL can help to change that image and can help teachers to change some of the classroom practices which have contributed to its perpetuation. That is why the educational unions are really not in competition with ACTFL. In the face of growing administrative bureaucracies, unions give teachers at all levels a strong voice in bargaining for salaries, working conditions, tenure, and fringe benefits, and they provide a means of grieving management decisions which are arbitrary or unfair. However, neither unions nor professorial tenure rules are of much help if the instructional program does not attract students. Even in formerly secure areas, such as English and the social sciences tenured teachers and professors have found themselves unemployed in recent years when requirements in those subjects were reduced. Students stayed away in droves from courses which had been mandated in previous
years. And, without students, there is no job security. In short, the students are in a powerful position because, as electives become more and more the pattern, they can opt out of that which they consider irrelevant. And, if we project into the future, there are two other factors which tend toward increased student power. First, the birth rate decline has caused a 10-20% decrease in available warm bodies. This enrollment vacuum is moving through the grade schools now. It will be hitting the high schools and colleges in the 1980's. The second factor is even more chilling in its implications; it comes from the world of business and industry. I refer to the fact that automation and cybernation have already brought us to the point where less than 25% of the work force is "directly involved in manufacturing products, mining, growing crops, and constructing buildings." (Fulmar, 1972, p. 19). This, in effect, means that three out of four of us are irrelevant to the production of basic necessities — food, clothing, shelter and tools. And the percentage drops year by year. This has led to a predominance of white collar jobs and to increased leisure time for both white collar and blue collar workers. Also, industrial futurists are predicting that the elimination of survival needs will cause an erosion of the work ethic; the loss of "the concept of work as a consuming necessity ..." of life. (I have talked to teachers at state foreign language meetings around the country who report that a considerable erosion of this concept has already taken place.)

Thus, the reason foreign language teachers keep coming to state, regional and national conferences is probably because they recognize the need for keeping abreast of the changing conditions in education which are due to the changing attitudes in their students. So, while discipline-oriented associations are not likely to supplant the union type of organization, they will, I feel, be an increasingly necessary component in the economic and professional
survival of teachers in the academic disciplines. However, instead of responding defensively and after the fact to difficult situations which have developed, we must support association leaders who try to anticipate trends and shape them in desirable directions beforehand. For example, there are pressures now to push students out of academic courses and out of school at an ever earlier age. Flooding an already-overcrowded job market with poorly-educated adolescents can hardly be the best alternative for improving the future prospects of the emerging super-industrialized, internationally-dependent society. Surely, a better alternative would be to seek increased educational contacts and improved educational sophistication in all young people. This would certainly include a sufficient exposure to another world language with the purpose of enabling the student to better understand what it means to be from a different linguistic and cultural background. Some may view this as visionary. The fact is, it is well within the wherewithal of any developed nation. It is a matter of rearranging priorities and methods. Let us settle for nothing less than the goal of universal literacy in two languages. And in planning the future of our discipline and of our professional associations, let us heed the words of George Bernard Shaw who said: "You are things as they are; and you ask 'Why?'. But I dream things that never were: and I ask 'Why not?'". Within our profession, let us continue to set goals based upon a belief in universal multilingualism... And let us continue to ask, "Why not?"
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