

31 Planning Spanish: Nationalizing, Minoritizing and Globalizing Performances

OFELIA GARCÍA

1 Introduction

Spain carefully planned for Spanish to be its national language, as well as the language of its colonies in Latin America through explicit legislation and formal institutions. But the Spanish that is part of the languaging¹ of Latinos in the United States operates in a nation that does not have explicit English language laws or bodies. Thus, Spanish today exists at the crossroads of two traditions – one of *explicit* language planning handed down by Spain and that continues to operate in Latin America; the other of *hidden* language planning that operates implicitly in US society. This chapter starts out by reviewing advances in the language planning and policy field and identifying the different traditions of Spanish language planning in the world, and specifically in Spain, Latin America, and the United States.

In both Spain and Latin America language has been deeply linked to nationhood. But throughout US history, Spanish has been planned as a minoritized language through dominant ideologies and discourse. In today's globalized world, Spanish in the world, and even in the United States, has started to acquire status as a global language. It is this multi-faced phenomenon of Spanish as a nationalized, minoritized, and globalized language, imbued by different traditions of language planning, all of them with distinct social goals, that is the subject of this chapter. By referring specifically to the performances of Spanish, this chapter wants to highlight the important role of people in language planning for different social goals. It ends by focusing on how bilingual people in the twenty-first century have appropriated Spanish, projecting these multiple globalized Spanishes into the world scene.

The Handbook of Hispanic Sociolinguistics, edited by Manuel Diaz-Campos
© 2011 Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

2 What is language planning?

Einar Haugen, considered the founder of the field, identified four activities associated with language planning: (i) selecting a language norm, (ii) codifying it, (iii) implementing its functions by spreading it, and (iv) elaborating its functions to meet language needs (Haugen 1972). At first, the field of language planning focused on finding solutions to social problems created by language differences, as well as on solving language problems of developing nations (Fishman et al. 1968; Jernudd and Das Gupta 1971). But even from the beginning, the possibility of planning language was questioned in the title of Rubin and Jernudd's influential book of 1971, *Can Language be Planned?*

Language planning has been said to encompass three activities: (i) *corpus planning* – the development of new linguistic forms, the modification of old ones, and the standardization of others; (ii) *status planning* – changes to increase the uses of a language, and (iii) *acquisition planning* – increasing the number of those who language and in what ways. This last component is usually the domain of education (Cooper 1989).

In the last 20 years, the field has moved from speaking about language planning as a top-down activity mostly conducted by governments, to language planning conducted by communities and individuals from the bottom-up (Hornberger 1996). At times, a distinction has been made between language planning and language policy, reserving language planning for the systematic linguistic change promoted by government, and language policy for the “ideas, laws, regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve planned language change in society” (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997). Other times, the two have been linked. In taking up the designation “language planning and policy” (LPP) Hornberger (2006) reminds us that although linked, the two processes are important. Many scholars maintain that the distinctions are not clear in practice and that scholars need to engage them jointly (Fishman 1983, 2006). The complex dynamism between the components have led Spolsky (2004) to refer to the activity only as “language policy” with three components: (i) *language practices* or the habitual patterns of using language; (ii) *language ideology* or beliefs about language; (iii) *language management or planning* as specific efforts to modify or influence language.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) have argued that various forces – non-linguistic and linguistic at the macro and micro levels – are at work in language planning, and that, therefore, social, political, and economic considerations are at the heart of language planning. This critical perspective of language planning and policy has been taken up by recent scholarship (Ricento 2006; Shohamy 2006; Tollefson 1991, 1995, 2002). Tollefson sees language policy as “one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use” (Tollefson 1991: 16). Pennycook (2006) believes that decisions about languages and language forms are a form of “language governmentality.” By focusing on micro-level discourse in local, situated, and contextual ways, Lin and Martin (2005) reveal how power

operates in language planning and policy. In 2006, Shohamy pointed to the important distinction between “overt policy” – having to do with the use of language to influence sociolinguistic use and norms and thus social life – and “covert or hidden policy” – not explicitly addressing language itself but relying on the discursive power of language to have the same social effects. The emphasis in the field has shifted from policies that are handed down to how different actors perform their languaging and their ideologies about languaging. Scholars have increasingly focused on the dynamism of the different levels of what Hornberger and Ricento (1996) have called “the layers of the onion” (Menken and García 2010).

As we will see, the difference in language planning conceptualizations between Spain and the United States correspond to their distinct ideologies about nationhood. While Spain has continued to elaborate top-down explicit policies to correspond to different historical periods – royalty, dictatorship, democracy – (*language management or language planning*), and Latin America has continued that tradition, although it is actual practices that seem authoritative (*language practices*), the United States has relied on ideologies that construct implicit and hidden policies that obfuscate their powerful impact (*language ideologies*). Thus, each of the national contexts emphasizes a different aspect of language policy, as defined by Spolsky (2004).

3 Spain, the nation, and language management: nationalizing performances

3.1 *Planning Castilian dominance in the peninsula*

Although the field of language planning, as a sub-component of sociology of language, is only half a century old, activities to plan the use of language are as old as humankind. In medieval times, dialects of Romance spoken in the Iberian Peninsula would have been mutually understood by adjacent local communities who had face-to-face interactions. But between the sixteenth and the eighteenth centuries, feudal systems crumbled, and national identity started to develop (Wright, S. 2004).

By the time that the marriage of Isabella of Castile to Ferdinand of Aragon (*los Reyes Católicos*) took place in 1469, there was a sense that the dialectal group that became known as Castilian was becoming dominant. The other dialectal Romance groups (Portuguese-Galician, Asturian-Leonese, and Catalan-Valencian) had not had an important role in the *reconquista* of the territory that had been invaded by Arabic speakers from North Africa in 711. Hall (1974: 121) explains: “Concomitantly with the *Reconquista*, the Castilian dialect became the standard for the regions which came under Castilian rule, gradually overlaying the other regional koinés such as Asturian, Leonese, Aragonese, and the conservative Mozarabic spoken in

the central area." Castilian, the variety spoken in Burgos, became the standard, first accepted in Toledo when the old capital was retaken from the Moors, and then spreading southwards. In 1235 King Alfonso X, the Wise, declared Toledo to be "the measure of the Spanish language" (Wright, R. 1997).

In 1492, the last Moors were expelled from Granada, and Castilian established itself as the dominant language. In that same year, 1492, Antonio de Nebrija published his Castilian grammar, the first written in a romance vernacular language. In his famous dedication to Queen Isabella, Nebrija says that "language is the perfect instrument of empire" (*Siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio*). Nebrija's rules of orthography were published in 1517.

Sue Wright (2004) categorizes Spain as a "state nation" (and not a nation state). That is, the polity came first through the marriage of Isabella and Ferdinand and the union of the crowns of Aragon/Catalonia and Castile/Leon/Galicia. From its very beginning, the idea of molding the population to be linguistically and religiously cohesive, and planning for the spread of Castilian throughout the territory, became important.

Although the printing press, coupled with the Reformation, were responsible for the spread of other European standards, in the case of Spain, the printing press, as the mechanism of the Catholic Church, also created some linguistic divergence. The introduction of the printing press in Valencia, Seville, Barcelona, and other places led, we are told, to as much chaos as uniformity (Wright, R. 1997). Thus, Spain's rulers had to have a heavy hand in imposing Castilian as the standard. In 1567 Philip II prohibited the use of Arabic in Spain (Burke 2004).

The territorial borders of the Spanish state were established by 1659 when the Treaty of the Pyrenees, settling the Thirty Years War, drew the borders between France and Spain. In 1640 the border with Portugal had also been drawn. But Castilian was far from being the language adopted throughout the territory and among all social classes at that time. Once the borders were stable, the process of homogenizing peoples, especially linguistically, became a priority (Wright, S. 2004).

In the eighteenth century, with the advent of the Bourbon kings, Spain passed laws and established bodies to establish the hegemony of Castilian. In 1713, the *Real Academia Española* was founded, on instructions of Philip V, the first Bourbon ruler of Spain, with the explicit purpose of influencing Castilian – *limpia, fija y da esplendor*. A year later, in 1714, Castilian was declared to be the language of the state. In 1726 and 1739, the *Real Academia Española* published the first dictionary, and in 1741 an orthography of spelling norms (Mar-Molinero 2000). By 1768, King Carlos III of Spain decreed that there should be one language and one currency in his kingdom, including its colonies. The stage was now set for a nationalism that increasingly focused only on the language spoken in central Spain and that dismissed the languages of other regions, especially those of Cataluña, Galicia, and the Basque region.

As time passed, the increased importance of the centralized state, as well as conscription in the national army and universal education, both with Castilian as the language used, made it possible for Castilian to spread. Increasingly, the spread

of print and newspapers resulted in an "imagined community" (Anderson 1983) that made little room for its other languages. Spanish was now established as the language of citizenship.

3.2 Managing the other languages of Spain

But people continued to speak different languages, and especially in Cataluña, Galicia, and the Basque Country, language activists engaged in different aspects of language planning. In the Basque Country, Sabino Arana (1865–1903) names the nation Euskadi and creates its flag and national anthem (Mar-Molinero 2000). Because Euskara (Basque) and Spanish are *abstand* languages, that is, isolates with no linguistic relationship (Kloss 1967), language planning activities for Euskara focused on elaboration of its code and status planning. But Galician, Catalan, and Castilian are *ausbau* languages, that is, dialects in a continuum. Thus, distinguishing each of the varieties on the Romance continua became an important language planning activity. During the second half of the nineteenth century, Catalan lived its *Renaixença* and Galician its *Rexurdimento*, both of them supported by the development of a rich literature (Mar-Molinero 2000), and having the effect of differentiating these varieties from Castilian so as to come closer to becoming separate national communities. But Castilian language planning activities continued to mandate that Castilian only be used for administration and law, for economic exchange, and as the standardized tool of literature and education.

During Francisco Franco's dictatorship (1939–1975), all languages other than Spanish were banned in publications, radio, religious and public events, and education. After Franco's death, the new Spanish constitution in 1978 reiterated that Castilian was the official language of the State, although it recognized the other languages of the autonomous regions as official (Article 3). In 1983, the Catalan Law of Linguistic Normalization and similar legislation passed in Galicia and Euskadi further promoted the other languages of Spain, now no longer considered *lenguas regionales*, but *lenguas propias* (Mar-Molinero 2000).

Spain has signed the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages developed by the Council of Europe, which came into force on January 3, 1998 (Wright, S. 2004). The charter promotes the use of regional or minority languages in education and media, and urges their use in judicial and administrative settings, economic and social life, and cultural activities.

Throughout history, Spain has been comfortable with a language planning tradition that is top-down and that is based on explicit top-down policies. Until its democratic days, Spain imposed language policies through royal decrees or dictatorial means to promote homogeneity and silence diversity. In democracy, Spain has held on to a tradition of explicit top-down language policy, although now providing some spaces for linguistic diversity and linguistic rights. It is this tradition of explicit language planning and management that Spain handed down to its colonies and that continues today in much of Latin America. But, as we will see, it is actual language practices that set the language policy in Latin America.

4 Latin America and national language practices: nationalizing performances

Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, a noted Mexican anthropologist, says about Latin America and its "linguistic culture" (Schiffman 1996):

Una sola lengua, una sola raza, una misma historia, una cultura común: tales eran los requisitos para consolidar un verdadero estado (napoleónico). Y la realidad iba por otros cauces, lo que exigió que el Estado se pretendiera constituir en forjador de la nación unificada, uniforme culturalmente, inexistente. La terca realidad seguía siendo plural: había indios, ante todo; pero también negros y ciertas regiones que desarrollaban su propia identidad. (Bonfil Batalla 1992: 19)

'Only one language, one race, on same history, a common culture: those were the requirements to consolidate a true (Napoleonic) state. And reality went a different way, making it a requirement for the state to try to constitute itself into the creator of the unified nation, culturally uniform, nonexistent. The stubborn reality continued being plural: There were, beyond everything, Indians; but there were also blacks and some regions that had their own identity.'

This quote contains the contradictions that characterize Latin American language policy – an explicit top-down language planning and policy tradition handed down by the *madre patria* to consolidate the power of Spanish in its colonies – alongside "stubborn" language practices that include Indigenous² languages and languages of others. It is the huge social distance and separation that exists between the linguistic culture of white Latin Americans of European descent and of brown and black Latin Americans, many Indigenous to its lands, that is responsible for why top-down language planning efforts, even those of today, have not seemed highly successful. Whereas from the beginning Spanish was legislated as the language of the new colonies and then independent states, Indigenous language practices have never been totally repressed. As we will see, today, when it is Indigenous languages that are being legislated in new democratic states, Latin American language practices uphold Spanish as dominant. Thus, it is the language practices of Latin Americans, in all their plurality and "different ways," that dominate over language planning measures. I now turn to how this has happened historically.

4.1 Indigenous language practices over managing Spanish language

Though the Spanish monarchs aimed to make Spanish a mandatory language of their territories, the linguistic diversity of the New World was too great to allow for the immediate use of Spanish. A policy of bilingualism was begrudgingly

authorized in 1570 by King Phillip II in order to impart education and evangelization in what was assigned as "the" language of a vast territory – Nahuatl, Quechua, Chibcha, and Tupí-Guaraní. These "constructed" languages were called *lenguas generales* 'general languages' and were then extended into territories where the language practices were totally different (García 1999; García et al. 2010; Howard 2000; Moreno-Fernández 2006).

By 1782, King Charles III mandated that only Spanish be used to evangelize, an impossible task given the very small number of Spanish speakers at the time. For example, at that time in Mexico City there were 8,000 Spanish residents and more than 2 million Indians (García 1999).

The cultivation and spread of Spanish for its homogenizing nationalist effects became an important objective of the first independent governments. And Spanish language planning followed the explicit tradition that had been handed down from Spain. In 1835, Mexico founded its first Language Academy, followed in 1875 by a Mexican Academy of Language that corresponded to the Real Academia Española in Spain. As early as 1847, Andrés Bello, born in Caracas before independence, wrote *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana* to avoid the degeneration of the Spanish of Spanish America into "irregular dialects" and to maintain "national unity" (Ripoll 1966: 56). When, in 1877 education in Uruguay was declared to be free, required, and under secular control, it was stipulated that Spanish, as the national language, had to be used in all schools of the country. Spanish spread quickly, although not entirely. By 1898, when Spain lost its last colonies, including Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Caribbean, only 17% of the entire population did not speak Spanish. In 100 years, Spanish had gone from being the minority language of the powerful European elite to the vehicular language for much of the population and the officially sanctioned language of Latin American identity (García 1999). But at the local level, Latin American language practices were varied and diverse, and a great number of Indigenous peoples continued to use other languages as part of their linguistic repertoire.

4.2 Spanish language practices over managing Indigenous languages

Since the 1990s, international agreements linked to general movements of democratization and human rights have led to a shift in social and linguistic policies throughout Latin America. Eleven countries – Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela – have passed laws recognizing their multiculturalism and multilingualism (Hamel 2004), and at least four others (Chile, El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama) have acknowledged these rights and moved closer towards intercultural-bilingual education models (López and Kuper 1999). Significant advances were made by the development of the United Nations draft *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, and the adoption by the International Labour Organization (ILO) of the Convention (no. 169) *Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries*. This

convention has been ratified by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, México, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela, among others, and it is particularly significant given that this agreement is the only international legally binding instrument that specifically tackles the rights of Indigenous and tribal peoples (García et al. 2010; Mato 2007).

Peru has established Spanish as official, but Quechua, Aymara, and other indigenous languages are also official languages in zones where they predominate (Coronel-Molina, forthcoming). In Ecuador, Quichua has also been recognized as belonging to the national culture (King and Haboud 2007). And in Paraguay, Guaraní has been granted co-official status with Spanish (Gynan 2007). These provisions and legal dispositions declaring the protection of national language diversity and linguistic rights are part of larger efforts to acknowledge the multicultural dimension of these countries. However, there has been a gap between these policy and the language practices observed on the ground, as evidenced by the strong imposition of Spanish as the only national language of administration, thus subordinating and weakening Indigenous languages (Godenzzi 2008). In addition, the use of these Indigenous languages in education is supported in these legislations only as an aid to becoming educated in Spanish, but not as an object of education in its own right (García et al. 2010).

It turns out that although Latin America has continued in the tradition of Spain in that language policies are legislated, managed, and planned, it is its diverse language practices that define its policies. Given the huge social divide between those who speak Spanish and those who do not, between the white population that speaks mostly in Spanish only, and the Indigenous population that is increasingly bilingual but that remains marginalized, it is language practices that seem to best define the language planning tradition of Latin America. The divide between what is written and the language practices is just too great, and people continue to enact individual language policies based on their own linguistic practices.

5 The United States and language ideology: minoritizing performances

5.1 *Language and US ideology*

From its early history, the US approach to language planning was derived in large part from ideologies and philosophies set by the history of Great Britain, with language a matter of individual choice (Heath 1978). British policy makers assumed that individuals would see the merits of adopting the prestige variety. In like manner, the United States never seriously considered a national language policy. The Founding Fathers debated the value of having English as the official language and they decided against it (Heath 1976), believing that the economic opportunities derived from English would be enough of an incentive.

Spanish was spoken by original settlers in the territory, and thus, according to Heinz Kloss (1977), should have special rights. However, as we will see, an ideology

of Spanish as the language of the conquered and colonized, the dark and the poor, the immigrant, and an ideology of US Spanish as being inferior to other Spanishes, has placed Spanish in a minoritized position in the United States. In keeping with a British/Anglo tradition of "hidden" language planning, educators, instead of governmental policy-makers, have played a most important role in acting on these ideologies. But it is discourse itself, as shaped by ideologies, that seems to determine the many shapes of Spanish language planning in the United States by different actors.

5.2 *The conquered and colonized: US Spanish as inferior*

The *Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo* (1848), which ended the Mexican-American War, ceded nearly half of the Mexican territory to the United States, what today is California, Arizona, Texas, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming. But keeping with a US tradition of language policy, it was educators, rather than policy-makers, who promoted the extension of English, and who planned for English only and against Spanish and the other languages of these territories. A case in point is the territory of New Mexico which when added to the Union in 1863 was around 50% Spanish-speaking. New Mexico was not admitted to statehood until 1912 when more Anglos had moved in and the majority was English speaking. The pressure to linguistically assimilate was carried out, in part, by repressing schooling in Spanish and replacing it with schools in English only. For example, in 1874, 70% of the schools were in Spanish, 33% were bilingual, and only 5% were in English only. Fifteen years later, in 1889, 42% of the schools were in English only, whereas only 30% of the schools were conducted in Spanish, and 28% remained bilingual (del Valle, S. 2003; García 2009c).

Beyond the language of the *conquered*, Spanish was also ideologized as the language of the *colonized*. When Puerto Rico was occupied as a result of the Spanish American War, English-only was first used in Puerto Rican schools. Eighteen years later, Spanish was allowed only during the first four years of school, a policy that continued until 1948 when Spanish was re-established as medium of instruction (García et al. 2001). Puerto Rican children were seen as inferior colonial subjects, as Spanish speakers, unable to be educated in the only language that was then considered an appropriate language to educate – English.

The idea that US Spanish was the language of the conquered and the colonized was combined with another prevalent ideology – that which stated that only Castilian, the Spanish spoken in central Spain, was "true" Spanish, and that the language of the conquered and the colonized was inferior. The first editor of *Hispania*, the journal of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP), Aurelio Espinosa, who was himself of Hispanic descent, expressed this ideology in a 1923 article entitled, "Where is the best Spanish spoken?" where he says: "The best modern Spanish... is that spoken by the educated people of Old and New Castile" (Espinosa 1923: 244). It was Castilian, and not the language of Spanish speakers in the United States, that was valued (García 1993).

5.3 *The immigrants, the US-born and the many: US Spanish racialized*

The *Bracero Program* was established in 1942 to bring short-term Mexican contract laborers for agricultural work to the United States. Spanish language use had been racialized by then, meaning that it was assigned negative characteristics, including that of an inferior or separate race, and those characteristics were then transferred to their speakers (Urciuoli 1996; García 2009c). Mexican children were thus placed in segregated schools where only English was used and the use of Spanish was punished.

Castellanos (1983) says that teachers in seven states who were caught in the "criminal" act of using Spanish to teach in public schools had their certification revoked. And students who used Spanish "were subjected to sundry indignities, such as small fines or detention. 'Spanish detention,' for example, became a household word in the Southwest' (Castellanos 1983: 39). Many Latino children were placed in special education classes meant for disabled students. Spanish was now minoritized as the language of poor immigrant children who were "handicapped" by the language.

In 1965, the *Immigration and Naturalization Services Act of 1965* abolished the national origin quotas³ that had been established by the *National Origins Act of 1924*. As a result, an unprecedented numbers of immigrants came from Latin America (García and Mason 1999). In a recent tabulation of Latinos at mid-decade, the Pew Hispanic Center (2006) reported that there are 41,926,302 Latinos in the United States; that is, one out of every seven people (although not all of these are speakers of Spanish). Of these, 26,784,268 Latinos are of Mexican descent, that is, 64% of US Latinos. Twenty-five million US Latinos are native born, whereas 17 million, or 40%, are foreign born. US Spanish speakers are now many, and 60% of them have been born in the United States.

It is then in the context of its strong demographics that the words of Samuel Huntington (2004: 30, 45) about Latinos and Spanish language use have to be interpreted:

The persistent inflow of Hispanic immigrants threatens to divide the United States into two peoples, two cultures, and two languages. Unlike past immigrant groups, Mexicans and other Latinos have not assimilated into mainstream US culture, forming instead their own political and linguistic enclaves – from Los Angeles to Miami – and rejecting the Anglo-Protestant dream. There is no Americano dream. There is only the American dream created by an Anglo-Protestant society. Mexican Americans will share in that dream and in that society only if they dream in English.

It has been precisely this ideology of perceived threat that has motivated the testing of a different language planning tradition in the United States – one of official legislation. In 1981, Senator Samuel Hayakawa introduced the first constitutional amendment to make English the official language of the United States. With Dr. John Tanton, Hayakawa founded *US English* in 1983. US English was thrown

into disarray when in 1988 an internal memo authored by Tanton was circulated which speaks about the "threats" of Hispanics, and mentions a tradition of the *mordida* 'bribery', their Catholicism, their "low educability" and their high birth-rates (Crawford 2004; García 2009a).

Joshua A. Fishman explains the growth of the Official English movement as a case of insecurity and says that:

The English Only/English Official movement may largely represent the displacement of middle-class Anglo fears and anxieties from the difficult if not intractable *real* causes of their fears and anxieties to mythical and simplistic and stereotyped scapegoats. (1989: 646)

Although efforts to pass a constitutional amendment at the federal level have fizzled, it has been at the state level where English Only legislation has been successful. English Only laws had been passed by 28 states in 2007. And three states have passed legislation that forbids the use of Spanish and other languages in bilingual education (California, Proposition 227 1998; Arizona, Proposition 203, 2000; Massachusetts, Question 2, 2002) (García 2009c).

But the struggle in Colorado over an amendment that would have also outlawed Spanish/English bilingual education makes evident the persistent "linguicism" (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000) in these decisions. A TV commercial warned that the measure would "force children who can barely speak English into regular classrooms, creating chaos and disrupting learning" (quoted in Crawford 2004: 330). As Crawford (2004: 330) says, the approach used could be described as "If you can't beat racism, then try to exploit it."

Because so many US Latinos are bilingual, ideologies against Spanish in the United States have been extended to encompass those against bilingualism. The word "bilingual" (what Crawford has called "the B-Word" 2004L 35) has been progressively silenced (Crawford 2004; García 2006a, 2009b, 2009c; Hornberger 2006). In every major federal law and office, the word "bilingual" has been substituted by "English language acquisition." And education programs that use Spanish to teach Latinos have declined significantly.

In 2001, the Bilingual Education Act (Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) which had supported educational programs that used Spanish in teaching Latino students whose bilingualism was emerging, was repealed. The new legislation, known as *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* contains Title III (Public Law 107-110) which is now titled, *Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students*. The focus has been redirected from a bilingualism that included, at times, US Spanish, to one that clearly excludes it.

No longer viewed as the language of original settlers, or even of the conquered and colonized who might be entitled to language rights, US Spanish is held in contempt in political and educational circles. The language Latinos speak is often characterized as *Spanglish*, a debased and mixed contact variety (Stavans 2003) and not as US Spanish in its own right (Otheguy 2008, and this volume). The words of the comic Dame Edna in an advice column reflects this ideology:

Forget Spanish. There's nothing in that language worth reading except Don Quixote ... There was a poet named García Lorca, but I'd leave him on the intellectual back burner if I were you. As for everyone's speaking it, what twaddle! Who speaks it that you are really desperate to talk to? The help? Your leaf blower? (2003: 116)

By establishing a discursive linguistic hierarchy with English on top, Spanish at the bottom, and bilingualism as non-existent, US language policy ensures that privilege continues to be in the hands of English monolinguals. But rather than imposing this policy from above, the policy is constructed through ideological discursive practices, which construct Spanish speakers as racial poor minorities who are being left out of the American Dream precisely because of their Spanish language practices. It is through the power of ideologies that language policy in the United States is constructed.

6 Planning globalizing performances for a minoritized and nationalized language

While keeping Spanish on the "back burner," another language policy effort was entering the picture. At the end of the twentieth century, Spain started to promote Spanish as a globalized language beyond its national context (García 2008b; Mar-Molinero and Stewart 2006). But the expansion and spread required by a global economy and in a global landscape, rather than in a national one, has meant that Spain too has entered the discursive area of language policy (Pennycook 2000; 2006), while it continues to exert influence through status planning.

One of the most evident acts of planning the performance of Spanish as a globalized language was the establishment of the *Instituto Cervantes* on May 11, 1990 with the purpose *Agrupar y potenciar los esfuerzos en la defensa y promoción del español en el extranjero* 'To bring together and empower the efforts to defend and promote Spanish outside Spain' (Sánchez 1992: 60). By 2006, there were 66 Instituto Cervantes Centers all over the world, with four in the United States – Albuquerque, Chicago, New York, and Seattle. Among the most important activities of the centers is the teaching of Spanish as a global language, the preparation of teachers for such an enterprise, and the certification of Spanish language professionals through its DELE (*Diploma de español como lengua extranjera*). The *Instituto* has developed a virtual Spanish language classroom (the *AVE* or *Aula Virtual de español*) that especially targets children between the ages of 7 to 9 years old (García 2009b).

In promoting Spanish as a global language that is fashionable and that people all over the globe would want to speak, Spain emphasizes the strong demographic presence of Spanish, as well as its high status in economic profitability and global influence. That demographically Spanish is strong is evident by the fact that in

1996 Spanish ranked fourth in number of native speakers (Grimes 1996); it also ranked fourth in number of speakers, after Chinese, English, and Hindi-Urdu (Graddol 1997). According to *Ethnologue* (2005), there are over 322 million speakers of Spanish worldwide (Gordon 2005). Spanish is also official in 21 countries. Only English, French, and Arabic hold official status in more than 21 countries.

It is often said that although Spanish is demographically powerful, it is economically weak. But increasingly Spanish is recognized for its economic profitability, as well as for its global influence. In Graddol's analysis (1997), Spanish has a GNP of \$610 billion and ranks sixth after English, German, French, Chinese, and Japanese. Graddol (1997) has also developed an *Index of Global Influence*, which is based on what he calls the *Engco Model*. The Engco Model includes three major components:

- Demographics (numbers, age, and rate of urbanization);
- Economics (gross national product and opening to international trade);
- UN Development indices (combines quality of life with literacy and education).

Using the Engco model, Spanish receives a score of 31 when English gets 100. In fact, Spanish is in fifth place behind English, German, French, and Japanese.

The Spanish-speaking Latin American market is huge – consisting of over 324 million "possible" speakers. It has grown exponentially, from \$40 million in 2005 to \$168 million in 2006. And Spain's investment in these Latin American markets has been swift, growing since 1986 by 40 times, and surpassing those of the United States, especially in the areas of banking, finance, telecommunications, mines, and agriculture (Casilda Béjar 2001).

But beyond Spain and Latin America, the Spanish-speaking market in the United States has grown significantly. In 2008, the Latino population controlled \$951 billion in consumption power, and it is expected to reach \$1.4 trillion by 2013 (Humphreys 2008). From 1990 to 2007, the Hispanic buying power grew by 30%, and it is now the same size as Mexico's entire economy in terms of gross domestic product (Humphreys 2008; for more on the buying power of US Spanish, see especially, Carreira 2002; Villa 2000).

Hispanic firms in the US also grew by 31% between 1997 and 2002, more than three times faster than the increase in number of all US firms (Humphreys 2008). From 1990 to 2002, the earnings from Spanish language ads increased more than seven times – from \$14.3 million in 1970, to \$111 million in 1990, to \$786 million in 2002 (Eric García, personal communication). The economic power of Spanish in the United States cannot be ignored. Marcos-Marín (2006) remarks that the economic volume produced by Spanish in US television, radio, movies, newspapers, magazines, and schools is superior to that of any other country in the world. Despite Spain's campaign for globalizing Spanish, it is the US economy that is driving its globalization.

Spurred by the economic growth of Spanish-speaking markets, Spanish has begun its globalized performances, as a language that is "fashionable" (Guareschi 2001),

the chic language of “Latinidad” (Mar-Molinero 2008). It is the language of Shakira, Salma Hayek, Ricky Martin, Penélope Cruz, Daddy Yankee, and Jennifer Lopez. But it is important to keep in mind that in order to be successful in its globalizing performance, Spanish alone is not sufficient. Instead, its performance is not only multidialectal, but also multilingual, and it is to that topic that I now turn.

7 The globalizing dynamic performance of Spanishes plus

In the introduction of a recent issue of the *International Multilingual Review Journal* that I edited on global Spanish (2008b: 4), I said:

For Spanish to become a truly global language, it will have to shed its armor of the conquistador, and allow itself to be pierced by some of the arrows of the Indigenous population that it attempted to silence. It will also have to embrace the ways in which US Latinos “language” with Spanish, in varieties that have undergone deep cross-linguistic influences of Englishes and Spanishes. And it will also have to accept that Spanish is not a mark of linguistic nationalism, but a tool of communication that can also encompass those who speak it as a second or foreign language.

In raising the status of Spanish globally, Spain has already loosened up its demands for a “Castilian” corpus – although as Hamel (2004) has said, it continues to place itself at the top of the national pyramid by imposing a *Hispanofonia* (Hamel 2004; del Valle, J. 2006). Spain is no longer adamant in imposing one Castilian standard, but allows a diversity of performances in order to gain the global market, as Hamel (2006) has said:

basado en una política de diversidad piramidal. [España] ya no intenta exportar, como en sus primeros años, el español con la “zeta.” Admite la diversidad del español.

‘based on politics of pyramidal diversity. [Spain] doesn’t try to export, as it did during its first years, Spanish with the “zed.” It allows the diversity of Spanish.’

The reasons for this flexibility has to do with the fact that as the French sociolinguist Louis-Jean Calvet (1999) has said, without Latin America – and I can add, the Spanish speakers of the United States – Spanish would be considered only a regional language in Spain. Although Spanish is spoken today by between 322 and 358 million people as a native language, only 28 million, that is, 9%, live in Spain itself (Grimes 2006, *Ethnologue*, fourteenth edition). This last figure might be even lower since it was gathered in 1986, before the enormous language consciousness uprising of the autonomous regions in Spain.

In the twenty-first century, the movement of people, goods, and information has meant that more and more interactions are among people who are bilingual and multilingual. The language practices of Spaniards, Latin Americans, and Latinos include varieties of Spanishes that are deeply influenced by contact with other languages – English, Catalan, Gallego, Euskara, Indigenous languages, and

many more. The bilingual communities in Spain, Latin America, and the US have little to do with a global image of Spanish only. Increasingly, it is Spanish Plus that is performed by its speakers. For example, listen to a supposedly Spanish language radio call-in program in the US, and you will soon understand that Spanish varieties and English varieties coexist, often within the discourse of a single caller or of individual radio personalities. This “translanguaging” (García 2009a) reflects the linguistic *mestizaje* of Spanish speakers today – in Latin America, the US, and even Spain itself. Technology and (im)migration have placed all of us in linguistic borderlands with constant inter-penetration of multiple discourses. And as human beings, we exhibit considerable agency selecting languaging that responds to the multiple identities in which factors such as age, race, social class, generation, sexual orientation, geopolitical situation, and institutional affiliation come to bear (Pavlenko and Blackledge 2004). So, it is local Spanishes, bilingual Spanishes, as performed by people in the twenty-first century, that are responsible for the globalized performance of what we call this global “Spanish” today.

8 Conclusion

A dynamic understanding of language planning and policy is needed to understand how Spanish today can no longer be constructed as simply a national language or a minority language. Instead, people in the twenty-first century have appropriated Spanish, imbuing it of local and community practices that reflect their transnational/transcommunal lives, a product of postmodern societies. The flows of language planning and policy are not simply top-down or bottom-up, or even side-by-side. The flows are dynamic because people who enact the policies have agency. By appropriating the policies, the many people involved become policy-makers themselves (Menken and García 2010).

It turns out that language planning for a global Spanish in the future must do more than just respond to nationalist tendencies that impose it (Spain and Latin America) or that exclude it (US). It must take into account the practices and ideologies of Spanish speakers who are increasingly bilingual and whose languaging includes many Spanishes, as well as many other language practices, in order to express the complex and multiple identities of an increasingly interconnected (and yet local) world.

NOTES

- 1 Languaging refers to the myriad discursive practices that individuals use, following Makoni and Pennycook (2007), Shohamy (2006), and García (2009b).
- 2 We capitalize Indigenous to indicate a land-based group and to be consistent with Indigenous scholarship on this topic.
- 3 The quota was only 2% of the number of people from that country who were already in the US in 1890.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Bonfil Battala, Guillermo. 1992. *Identidad y pluralismo cultural en América Latina*. San Juan: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Burke, Paul. 2004. *Languages and communities in early modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean. 1999. *La guerre des langues et les politiques linguistiques*, second edition. Paris: Hachette.
- Carreira, María. 2002. The media, marketing and critical mass: portents of linguistic maintenance. *Southwest Journal of Areal Linguistics* 21. 37–54.
- Casilda Béjar, Ramón. 2001. Una década de inversiones españolas en América Latina (1990–2000). El idioma como ventaja competitiva. II Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española. Instituto Cervantes. Available at: http://congresosdelalengua.es/valladolid/ponencias/activo_del_espanol/1_la_industria_del_espanol/casilda_r.htm (last accessed July 30, 2009).
- Castellanos, Diego. 1983. *The best of two worlds: bilingual bicultural education in the US*. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.
- Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford, James. 2004. *Educating English learners: language diversity in the classroom*, fifth edition. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.
- Del Valle, José. 2006. US Latinos, la hispanofonía, and the language ideologies of high modernity, 27–46. In Clare Mar-Molinero and Miranda Stewart (eds), *Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world. Macro and micro perspectives*, 27–46. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1983. Modeling rationales in corpus planning: modernity and tradition in images of the good corpus. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), 107–118. *Progress in language planning: international perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 2006. *Do not leave your language alone. The hidden status agendas within corpus planning in language policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Charles Ferguson, and J. Das Gupta. (eds). 1968. *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- García, Ofelia. 1993. From Goya portraits to Goya beans: elite traditions and popular streams in US Spanish language policy. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 12. 69–86.
- García, Ofelia. 1999. The forging of a Latin American ethnolinguistic identity: between the written and the oral word. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*, 226–243. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- García, Ofelia. 2008a. Spanish and globalization: shedding its armor and baring its undulating rhythms. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 2 (1). 1–4.
- García, Ofelia (ed.). 2008b. Spanish as a global language. *The International Multilingual Research Journal* 2 (1) (entire issue).
- García, Ofelia. 2009a. *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, Ofelia. 2009b. Livin' and teachin' la lengua loca: glocalizing US Spanish ideologies and practices. In Rafael Salaberry (ed.), *Language allegiances and bilingualism in the United States*, 151–171. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- García, Ofelia. 2009c. Racializing the language practices of US Latinos. Available at: http://congresosdelalengua.es/valladolid/ponencias/el_espanol_en_la_sociedad/1_la_prensa_en_espanol/guareschi_r.htm (last accessed September 21, 2010).
- Gynan, Shaw. 2007. The language situation in Paraguay: an update. In Richard Baldauf and Robert Kaplan (eds), *Language planning and policy in Latin America*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hall, Robert. 1974. *External history of the Romance languages*. New York: Elsevier.
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique. 2004. Interview with Rainer Enrique Hamel. *Reforma*, November 15, 2004.
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique. 2006. Interview. *Argonauta*. January 25, 2005. Available at: <http://nadiatalamantes.blogspot.com/2006/01/lengua-e-identidad-los-linguistas.html> (last accessed January 9, 2010).
- Haugen, Einar. 1972. *The ecology of language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Heath, Shirley. 1976. A national language academy: debate in the new nation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 11. 9–43.
- Heath, Shirley. 1978. Bilingual education and a national language policy. In James E. Alatis (ed.), *International dimensions of bilingual education*, 55–66. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics.
- Hornberger, Nancy. 1996. *Indigenous literacies in the Americas. Language planning from the bottom up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, Nancy and Thomas K. Ricento. (eds). 1996. Language planning and policy (special issue). *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (3).
- Howard, Harry. 2000. Latin American language policy. In Daniel Balderston, Ana López, and Mike González (eds), *Encyclopedia of contemporary Latin American culture*, 832–833. New York: Routledge.
- Humphreys, Jeffrey M. 2008. The multicultural economy 2008. *Georgia*
- In José Cobas, Jorge Duany, and Joe Feagin (eds), *How the United States racializes Latinos: White hegemony and its consequences*, 101–115. Boulder, CO and London: Paradigm.
- García, Ofelia, Dina López, and Carmina Makar (2010). Language and identity in Latin America. In Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia García (eds), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity: disciplinary and regional perspectives*, Vol. 1, second edition, 353–373. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- García, Ofelia and Leah Mason. 2009. Where in the world is US Spanish? Creating a space of opportunity for US Latinos. In Wayne Harbert (ed.), *Language and poverty*, 78–101. Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- García, Ofelia, José Luis Morín, and Klaudia Rivera. 2001. How threatened is the Spanish of New York Puerto Ricans? Language shift with vaivén. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited*, 44–73. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Godenzzi, Juan Carlos (2008). Language policy and education in the Andes. In Stephen May and Nancy Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, second edition. Vol. 1. *Language policy and political issues in education*. New York: Springer Science Business Media LLC.
- Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.). 2005. *Ethnologue: languages of the world*, fifteenth edition. Dallas: SIL International. Available at: www.ethnologue.com/ (last accessed March 11, 2010).
- Graddol, David. 1997. *The future of English?* London: The British Council.
- Grimes, Barbara F. 2006. *Ethnologue: languages of the world*, fourteenth edition. Dallas: SIL International.
- Guareschi, Roberto. 2001. El español: economía y cultura. II Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española.

- Business and Economic Conditions* 68 (3) (a publication of the Selig Center for Economic Growth, University of Georgia).
- Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. The Hispanic challenge. *Foreign Policy* (March–April). Available at: www.foreignpolicy.com (last accessed March 11, 2010).
- Jernudd, Bjorn H. and J. Das Gupta. 1971. Towards a theory of language planning. In Joan Rubin and Bjorn Jernudd (eds), *Can Language be planned?*, 195–216. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Kaplan, Robert B. and Richard B. Baldauf. 1997. *Language planning. From practice to theory*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- King, Kendall and Marleen Haboud. 2007. Language planning and policy in Ecuador. In Richard B. Baldauf and Robert Kaplan, *Language planning and policy in Latin America*, 39–104. Ontario: Multilingual Matters.
- Kloss, Heinz 1967. Abstand languages and Ausbau languages. *Anthropological Linguistics* 9, 29–41.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1977. *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lin, Angel M.Y. and Peter Martin (eds). 2005. *Decolonisation, globalisation. Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- López, Luis Enrique and Wolfgang Kuper (1999). La educación intercultural bilingüe en América Latina: balance y perspectivas. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación* 20, 17–85.
- Makoni, Sifree and Alistair Pennycook. 2007. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare. 2000. *The politics of language in the Spanish-speaking world*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare. 2008. Subverting Cervantes: language authority in global Spanish. *International Multilingual Research Journal* 2, 27–47.
- Mar-Molinero, Clare and Miranda Stewart (eds). 2006. *Globalization and language in the Spanish-speaking world. Macro and micro perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Marcos Marín, Francisco. 2006. *Los retos del español*. Frankfurt and Madrid: Vervuert and Iberomanica.
- Mato, Daniel. 2007. *Educación superior intercultural en América Latina*. Instituto Internacional de la UNESCO para la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe.
- Moreno-Fernández, Francisco. 2006. *La diversidad lingüística de Hispanoamérica: implicaciones sociales y políticas*. Madrid: Real Instituto Elcano.
- Otheguy, Ricardo. 2008. El llamado espanglish. In Humberto López (ed.), *Enciclopedia del español en los Estados Unidos. Anuario del Instituto Cervantes 2008*, 222–246. Madrid: Instituto Cervantes.
- Pavlenko, Aneta and Adrian Blackledge. 2004. *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Pennycook, Alistair. 2000. English, politics, ideology: from colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: focus on English*, 107–119. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pennycook, Alistair. 2006. Postmodernism in language policy. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *An Introduction to language policy. Theory and method*, 60–76. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Pew Hispanic Center. 2006. *A statistical portrait of Hispanics at mid-decade*. Available at: www.pewhispanic.org/files/other/middecade/complete.pdf (last accessed March 11, 2010).
- Ricento, Thomas (ed.). 2006. *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ripoll, Carlos. 1966. *Conciencia intelectual de América: antología del ensayo hispanoamericano*. New York: Las Américas.
- Rubin, Joan and Bjorn Jernudd. (eds). 1971. *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu: East-West Center and University of Hawaii Press.
- Sánchez, A. 1992. Spanish language spread policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 95, 51–69.
- Schiffman, Harold F. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Shohamy, Elana. 2006. *Language policy. Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2004. *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, James W. 1991. *Planning language, planning inequality: language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Tollefson, James W. (ed.). 1995. *Power and inequality in language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, James W. (ed.). 2002. *Language policies in education. Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie. 1996. *Exposing prejudice: Puerto Rican experiences of language, race, and class*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Villa, Daniel. 2000. Languages have armies, and economies, too: the presence of US Spanish in the Spanish-speaking world. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 19, 143–154.
- Wright, Roger. 1997. Linguistic standardization in the Middle Ages in the Iberian Peninsula: Advantages and disadvantages. In Stewart Gregory and David A. Trotter (eds), *De mot en mot. Aspects of medieval linguistics: essays in honour of William Rothwell*, 261–275. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Wright, Sue. 2004. *Language policy and language planning. From nationalism to globalization*. New York: Palgrave.

FURTHER READING

- Coronel-Molina, Serafín. Forthcoming. Quechua in Peru. In Joshua A. Fishman and Ofelia García (eds), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Volume II. *The success and failure continuum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dame Edna (Barry Humphries). 2003. Ask Dame Edna. *Vanity Fair* (February). 116.
- García, Ofelia. 2006. Lost in transculturation: the case of bilingual education in New York City. In Martin Putz, Joshua A. Fishman, and JoAnne Neff-Van Aertselaer (eds), *Along the routes to power: exploration of the empowerment through language*, 157–178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hornberger, Nancy. 2006. Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In Thomas Ricento (ed.), *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method*, 24–41. Oxford: WileyBlackwell.
- Makoni, Sifree and Alistair Pennycook. 2007. *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Menken, Kate and Ofelia García. 2010. *Negotiating language education policies: educators as policymakers*. London and New York: Routledge.