

FROM NATION-STATES TO NEOLIBERALISM:
LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND GOVERNMENTALITY

by

NELSON FLORES

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Urban Education Department in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2012

© 2012

NELSON FLORES

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Urban Education in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ofelia García

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Anthony Picciano

Date

Executive Officer

Ofelia García

Jean Anyon

Ricardo Otheguy

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

FROM NATION-STATES TO NEOLIBERALISM: LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND GOVERNMENTALITY

by

Nelson Flores

Adviser: Professor Ofelia García

Building on Foucault's concept of governmentality this research study examines the ways that current language ideologies marginalize the language practices of language minoritized students. The first half of this study examines the emergence of *nation-state/colonial governmentality* and its accompanying language ideologies as part of the European modernist project. It examines the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality in early US society with a particular focus on the early debates on language policy in the new nation. It then analyzes the impact of nation-state/colonial governmentality on contemporary US society through an exploration of the language ideologies utilized by both sides of the current debate over bilingual education.

The second half of this research study engages with recent insights from poststructuralist theory to examine the emergence of *neoliberal governmentality* and its accompanying language ideologies as part of the spread of global capitalism. It argues that *dynamic language ideologies* such as those used in the first half of this study reflect new understandings of language that are complicit in the production of flexible workers and life-long learners that lie at the core of neoliberal governmentality. Specifically, this study offers a reading of the concept of *plurilingualism* developed by the Council of Europe through the framework of neoliberal governmentality and argues that the movement in political and academic circles toward more

dynamic understandings of language marks an epistemological shift that is mutually constitutive with the corporatization of society occurring as part of neoliberal governmentality. The study then examines the ways that nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality are begin to converge in contemporary US society in ways that maintain US hegemony within the new global order through three interrelated frameworks: (1) *Global English*, (2) *the securitization of bilingualism*, and (3) *the commodification of bilingualism*.

Finally, the study explores implications of the critiques of nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality through a conceptualization of language education policies that subvert both forms of governmentality through language minoritized students in developing *meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities*. It argues that the fluidity of these subjectivities challenges nation-state/colonial governmentality while the “meta” aspect empowers language minoritized students to resist the corporatization of their fluid language practices.

Acknowledgements

There are so many people who have helped make this project possible. My adviser Ofelia García has been my biggest supporter and advocate throughout this process. Her reconceptualization of bilingualism has been my inspiration and her kindness has been my comfort throughout this long and difficult process. I couldn't ask for a more giving and brilliant mentor.

I have also been blessed with wonderful dissertation committee members. Jean Anyon showed me the power of critical social theory and encouraged me in my first attempts at making sense of Foucault. Ricardo Otheguy has constantly kept me on my toes through his probing questions and deep knowledge of bilingualism.

I have also been fortunate enough to have many other mentors during my doctoral studies. Kate Menken and Tatyana Kleyn provided me with my first research experience on a project for “Long Term English Language Learners.” It was during this project that the questions I ask in this dissertation began to develop. The two courses I took with Patricia Clough on the affective turn in poststructuralist social theory boggled my mind and became the inspiration for the critique of dynamic languaging I offer in the second half of the dissertation. Anthony Picciano's advice to follow my passion has also stuck with me since he spoke these words to me the first semester of my doctoral studies. This dissertation is definitely the result of following my passion!

There are also many brilliant students in the PhD Program in Urban Education who have shaped my thinking. This includes the students who were in the year-long research seminar where I first developed this project—Shannon Allen, Jeremy Benson, Chris Johnson, Rachel Lambert, Edwin Mayorga, Miriam Tager, and Mark Wolfmeyer. It also includes the other

students in the program working on issues of bilingualism under Ofelia's leadership—Laura Ascenzi-Moreno, Haiwen Chu, Zoila Tazi, and Heather Woodley. Nobody could ask for a more supportive and insightful group of colleagues.

I would not have gotten through this process without the support of my family. I could not ask for a more supportive partner than Luis Ramirez. He is always excited to hear about my work and always encouraging on days where I feel overwhelmed. *¡No sé que haría sin ti amor!* My mom and dad have always encouraged me to keep studying and have been so understanding about my not being able to visit as much as I would like to as I worked on this project. My sister Sonia has continued to share her stories as a classroom teacher of Latino students and has reminded me regularly of why I do what I do.

Finally, I want to thank all of the students that I worked with as a high school ESL teacher. It is their intelligence and fluid use of language that led me to question existing language ideologies. Such intelligent students could not be linguistically deficient and their brilliance has been my strongest inspiration in challenging the dominant framing of their language practices. I hope this project makes them proud!

Table of Contents

Abstract.....		v
Acknowledgements.....		vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....		xii

PART ONE

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Governmentality and the European Modernist Project.....	9
	Foucault’s Genealogical Method.....	10
	Discipline, Biopolitics, and the Emergence of Governmentality.....	12
	Nation-States, Colonization, and Governmentality.....	16
	Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Language Ideologies.....	20
	Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and the Human Sciences.....	26
	Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Language Education Policy.....	28
	Conclusion.....	32
3	The Emergence of Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in the United States.....	34
	The Traditional Narrative of the History of US Language Policy.....	35
	Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in the United States.....	40
	Revisiting the Centralist Perspective.....	43
	Introducing the Americanist and Universalist Perspective.....	48
	<i>The Americanist Perspective.....</i>	<i>51</i>
	<i>The Universalist Perspective.....</i>	<i>63</i>
	Conclusion.....	75
4	Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in Contemporary US Society.....	77
	The Current Debate on Bilingual Education.....	79

	The Journey of S.I. Hayakawa.....	85
	<i>Hayakawa the Semanticist</i>	86
	<i>Hayakawa the Politician</i>	95
	Jim Cummins.....	102
	Towards a New Language Ideology.....	114
PART TWO		
5	Governmentality in a Globalized World	116
	The Critique of the European Modernist Project from Within its Borders.....	117
	The Critique of the European Modernist Project from Outside its Borders.....	121
	The Critique of the European Modernist Project in Language Education Policy.....	126
	The Emergence of Dynamic Languaging.....	128
	Beyond Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality.....	136
	Dynamic Languaging and Neoliberal Governmentality.....	140
6	Neoliberal Governmentality and Language Education Policy	143
	Defining Neoliberalism in Education.....	144
	OECD as Neoliberal Institution.....	151
	The Council of Europe and Neoliberal Governmentality.....	158
	Conclusion.....	176
7	The Convergence of Nation-State/Colonial and Neoliberal Governmentality in the US	179
	The Global English Framework.....	180
	The Securitization of Bilingualism.....	194
	The Commodification of Bilingualism.....	205

	Conclusion.....	213
8	Toward a Meta Approach to Language Education Policy.....	215
	A Working Definition of Resistance.....	216
	Re-appropriating Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality.....	218
	Re-appropriating Neoliberal Governmentality.....	222
	Toward the Production of Meta Ethnolinguistic Subjectivities.....	225
	Creating Classroom Spaces for Meta Ethnolinguistic Subjectivities.....	229
	A Meta Approach in Practice.....	233
	Conclusion.....	239
	Bibliography.....	242

List of Figures

Table One.....50

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Postcolonial literary critic Gayatri Spivak once famously asked the question, “Can the subaltern speak?” She provocatively answered in the negative, concluding that they cannot. Of course, she did not mean this literally. Clearly, most marginalized people can physically speak. The problem is that this speaking is inevitably produced within and interpreted through a colonial lens produced as part of European colonization. Spivak’s provocative assertion sent shock waves throughout academia and is seen as a pivotal moment in the rise of postcolonial studies. No longer was knowledge production seen as a disinterested and objective process. Instead the very idea of objectivity was now critiqued as constructed within colonial relations of power that have marginalized most of the world’s population.

Over twenty years later I continue in this tradition and ask this same question: Can the subaltern speak? However, I position my question within a different socio-historical period. While Spivak was focused on Indian women and situated herself within the debate on *sati*, a form of ritual suicide, I ask the question with a focus on language minoritized¹ populations in the United States and situate myself within the field of language education policy. Despite these differences, I come to the same conclusion. The subaltern cannot speak. Once again, it is not an issue of whether they can physically speak—clearly they can. However, both policy discourse

¹ I use language minoritized here to refer to people whose home language is a non-standard variety of a national language, as well as to people who speak a language that does not have national recognition in place of, or in addition to, the national language. In the US context, which is where I situate this work, language minoritized populations are populations whose home languages are non-standard varieties of English and/or who come from homes where a non-English language is used as a tool of communication instead of, or in addition to, English. I use the term language minoritized instead of language minority to emphasize the power relations that make possible the construction of these groups as the Other to an unmarked mainstream norm.

and academic research—regardless of where they may be situated on the political spectrum—continue to represent their speech through a colonizing lens.

Building on the work of Spivak, the core of my argument throughout this dissertation will be that there is no such thing as disinterested and objective knowledge. I, therefore, hope you will indulge me in a few anecdotes here at the beginning where I attempt to break out of the privileged position of dispassionate academic and situate myself within my work. These anecdotes serve the purpose of both allowing me to explicitly refuse an objective position, while demonstrating how I came to this project and what I hope to accomplish in completing it. These anecdotes serve as an introduction to this dissertation, which will be written in a seemingly dispassionate manner. Yet, as these anecdotes from my life will show, there is nothing dispassionate in the theoretical framework I develop and apply throughout this work. Instead the theoretical framework I develop is similar to how hooks (1994) says she uses theory: it is in an attempt to understand what is happening around me in order to make the hurt go away and heal from the scars left by colonizing discourses that have positioned me, and others like me, as Other to a mainstream monolingual norm.

I am a Latino born in the US to a Puerto Rican mother and an Ecuadorian father. My mother arrived in New York City from Puerto Rico when she was twelve, as part of the mass migration from the island that occurred as a result of Operation Bootstrap, the US-led economic development of the island that transformed the society from an agrarian one to an industrial one. She was supposed to be in the sixth grade, but was put back into fourth grade. When I've asked her about what she remembers from her first year of school in the US, the one story that always comes up is that of a nice nun who allowed her to participate in a multiplication bee using Spanish, and how proud she was of herself when she won. My father came to New York City

when he was eighteen, after a bad harvest in Ecuador left his family in a great deal of debt. He spent many years washing dishes and was eventually able to send for his entire family after marrying my mother and gaining permanent residency.

My parents eventually moved to Philadelphia where I was born—the third of four children. My mother has told me how my oldest brother, who was born in New York City, did not speak any English when they moved to Philadelphia. In New York City they lived in a predominately Spanish speaking neighborhood and my parents, who were both bilingual by this point, still preferred to speak amongst themselves in Spanish. This quickly changed. The neighborhood they moved into was a predominantly White neighborhood. They were the only Latinos on the block. My oldest brother learned English very quickly and stopped speaking Spanish. By the time I was born, English was the most frequent language heard in the house. I remember sometimes trying to speak in Spanish and how my mother would usually just laugh. I understood everything she said in Spanish, but was never able to produce the language with my own mouth.

Despite my inability to produce a sentence in Spanish that didn't make somebody laugh English also appeared to not be up to par. As a young child, I remember moments of confusion when I would unknowingly say a word in Spanish believing the word to be an English word. The confused look from friends when I told them I was running away from the *cuco* (the boogey-man), and the blank stares from my teacher when I told her that my favorite show was the *novela* (my mother's soap opera) are just some examples of this "contamination" of English with Spanish. While I was soon able to reserve these words for home and produce "pure" English with friends and teachers, something about my English was still deemed strange. For example,

one girl in high school was convinced that I was from Russia because of my pale skin and my “funny accent.” My attempts at producing “pure” English were an apparent failure.

Of course, what baffled many people even more was my apparent lack of Spanish language abilities. When students in my Spanish class found out I was Latino they complained that I was at an unfair advantage because I already spoke Spanish. When I assured them that my Spanish skills were at a comparable level to theirs they looked at me quizzically and demanded to know how I could be “Spanish” and not speak the language. Similarly, we had a substitute teacher one day who chastised the Latino students in the class for not wanting to expand our horizons and learn another foreign language. Could Spanish not be a foreign language for me? Was English, therefore, my foreign language? Would I ever be able to use English or Spanish properly?

Despite all of the critics, my language skills were good enough to get me into Swarthmore College, an elite liberal arts college outside of Philadelphia. However, it quickly became apparent that the admissions office had not conveyed this information to the student population. Upon arrival, “the language police” came after me once again. I was told by my roommate that I didn’t speak English properly—one of his biggest pet peeves being that I used “talk” and “speak” incorrectly. He was also dismayed that my Spanish, which had improved after four years of study in high school, wasn’t up to par. After all, he had specifically requested a Latino roommate so that he could practice his Spanish since he planned on studying abroad for a semester. He was astonished that I could be Latino and wasn’t a “native-speaker” of Spanish. Instead of being acknowledged as a speaker of two languages, I was positioned by my roommate and others as a speaker of no language.

Yet, the language policing at Swarthmore, unlike that at previous points in my life, extended beyond issues of grammar and pronunciation. I was also expected to master a new academic discourse. In some ways this new academic discourse was very empowering to me. For example, as a gay man, being exposed to queer theory helped me affirm my identity and speak back to the heteronormativity of my upbringing. Yet, I found myself feeling extremely ambivalent to many of the frameworks I was expected to take on to become a legitimate user of academic discourse. For example, in a psychology class I learned that I was a child “at risk” who demonstrated “resiliency.” It didn’t matter that I didn’t feel like I was any more resilient than others from my childhood who had not made it out of high school, let alone gone to an elite predominately White college. It didn’t matter that I felt uncomfortable with the huge generalizations made about Latinos as we were objectified as the Other to the mainstream White norm. I ignored the voices in my head that told me that this objectification was wrong, and I learned how to make those from my community (and myself) objects of research. I took on a language that wasn’t my own and became consumed by it. Yet, the better my academic writing got, the more alienated I felt from my work. This is because I was unable to see the contradictions inherent in uncritically using a colonizing academic discourse to make my voice heard. I had mastered the tongue of the colonizer and had lost myself.

Being an uncritical user of academic discourse made me complicit in the colonization of my community. For example, as a high school ESL teacher I became the language police. In particular, many of my students were what the New York City Department of Education refers to as “Long Term English Language Learners,” students who have been receiving ESL or bilingual services for seven or more years and who have failed to pass the language proficiency exam required for exiting from official “ELL” (English Language Learner) status. I became involved

in a research project that attempted to better understand the needs of these students and found myself framing them in the same way that I had been framed throughout my life—as not having sufficient language skills in either of their two languages. I found myself arguing that because of a lack of strong bilingual education programs they had failed to master academic language in either Spanish or English, and that this is why they were failing the language proficiency exam and underperforming academically. I went from being somebody who was marginalized as a language minoritized Latino to one who was marginalizing other language minoritized Latinos. I sought to mold them into the image of their colonizer, as I had been molded.

My experiences have left me with two interrelated questions that I will struggle with throughout this dissertation. The first question is whether it is possible to subvert the language ideologies that continue to marginalize language minoritized students in US schools. The answer I will provide for this question is the way to subvert current language ideologies is to first identify their origins and unmask the exclusionary manner in which they were constructed. This historical analysis will expose the colonizing legacy of current understandings of language and allow for a more self-aware analysis of language education policy today.

To this effect, Chapter Two will introduce the concept of *nation-state/colonial governmentality*, which is the theoretical framework that I will use to conduct this historical analysis. Building on the work of Michel Foucault, I will identify the epistemological shifts that occurred in Europe as part of both the development of nation states and the European colonial project that allowed for the emergence of our current language ideologies. Chapter Three will then examine the impact of the language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality on the early US republic through a critical reading of texts written by key players in the debate over language policy. This chapter will demonstrate that the same

Otherizing process that was shaping language ideologies in Europe were also at play in the US context. Chapter Four will bring this argument to the contemporary debate over bilingual education and demonstrate how these discourses continue to be reproduced today.

The second question is whether there are contradictions in utilizing academic discourse while attempting to expose the colonizing relations of power that has made its construction possible, as I do in the first half of this dissertation. My stance is that academic discourse can be used as a tool of subversion if its users are conscious of its colonizing tendencies and use this knowledge as a form of self-critique that opens up the doors for new ways of thinking. To this effect, the second half of this dissertation calls into question the claims made in the first half. The purpose of this is not to dismiss the claims made in the first half but rather to be reflective of what relations of power may have made its arguments possible. Chapter Five situates the conclusions made in the first half of the dissertation within larger epistemological shifts in academic knowledge and raises the question of whether the arguments made in the first half of this dissertation are part of a newly emerging governmentality associated with our increasingly globalized world that I term *neoliberal governmentality*. Chapter Six then situates this claim within the current political economy by examining language ideologies being produced by European-based international organizations to examine the types of language practices they see as desirable for economic success. Chapter Seven then turns the lens back on the US context and examines ways that nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality have merged among certain sectors of US society in ways that attempt to re-assert US dominance within an increasingly globalized world.

Chapter Eight brings together the insights gained from the first and second parts of the dissertation in order to offer an alternative paradigm for language education policy. In this

chapter, I synthesize insights gained from the first half of my dissertation with insights gained from the second half of my dissertation to develop a theoretical framework that is self-aware and critical of language ideologies associated with both nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality. The second half of the chapter is an attempt at applying this theoretical framework to language education policy at both the institutional and classroom level. The ultimate goal of this is to conceptualize a language education policy that refuses to position language minoritized students as languageless while also resisting processes that seek to commodify their language practices.

In order to get to the point where I am reconstructing a new language ideology that aligns with a new form of language education policy, it is first necessary to go through the process of deconstruction our current language ideologies and exposing the power relations that made their emergence possible. In the next chapter, I begin by identifying the origins of current language ideologies in Europe before then examining their impact on the US context in Chapters Three and Four.

PART I

CHAPTER TWO

Governmentality and the European Modernist Project

The dawn of the European modernist project, with its origins in the European Renaissance and its culmination in the European Enlightenment, is oftentimes lauded as a time when freedom and reason triumphed over monarchy and superstition. It is seen by many as the beginning of the process of a universal human progress toward ultimate emancipation. However, some critical scholars have pointed to the “dark side” of this project and have argued that the production of modernist conceptions of freedom and reason were mutually constitutive with colonial relations of power that have historically and continue to marginalize most of the world’s population (Mignolo, 1995). Perhaps this statement seems counterintuitive. After all, how can freedom, which is depicted in the modernist paradigm as the absence of power and coercion, be complicit in colonial relations of power? While utilizing a range of critical social theory to explore this apparent contradiction, this dissertation will primarily focus on the work of Michel Foucault and his *genealogical method*, along with his analysis of the power relations involved in the construction of the European modernist project that he terms *governmentality*.

This chapter begins with an overview of Foucault’s genealogical method and its connection to his concept of governmentality. It then extends on his work to describe the theoretical framework of *nation-state/colonial governmentality* that will inform the first half of this dissertation. It will then utilize the concept of nation-state/colonial governmentality as a lens for understanding the power relations embedded within modernist conceptions of language before exploring the relationship between nation-state/colonial governmentality and the human sciences. The purpose of all of this will be to demonstrate that both overtly political figures such

as nationalist grammarians working in support of nationalist struggles and seemingly dispassionate academics reproduced relations of power that marginalized both the lower classes of European society and colonized populations around the world.

Foucault's Genealogical Method

In order to understand Foucault's concept of governmentality, it is first necessary to understand the methodology he used to analyze its emergence. He termed this methodology *genealogy*. Foucault (1984a) describes one of the major assumptions of genealogy as the idea that "humanity does not gradually progress from combat to combat until it arrives at universal reciprocity, where the rule of law finally replaces warfare; humanity installs each of its violences in a system of rules and thus proceeds from domination to domination" (p. 85). In short, every socio-historical context is organized into knowledge systems embedded in relations of power that Foucault terms *regimes of truth*. The tasks of a genealogist are to unearth these regimes of truth and excavate the knowledge that was subjugated to make these regimes of truth possible. Therefore, a genealogist is not interested in trying to find a chronology to a particular historical period but rather tries to excavate the discursive regimes that allowed for the emergence of certain relations of *power-knowledge*, a term Foucault uses to demonstrate the mutually constitutive nature of power and knowledge and to illustrate how one cannot exist without the other. More importantly, a genealogist must then connect this to the present to denaturalize our current understanding of the world and challenge the modernist idea of universal progress by demonstrating the power relations of our own regimes of truth (Foucault, 1984b).

The genealogical approach of Foucauldian analysis is most known as a *deconstructive* tool, meaning it is an approach to historical and contemporary research that seeks to unmask the power relations that have constructed what have previously been seen as natural Truths. This

deconstructive power may best be illustrated by a comment Foucault made in a famous debate that he had with Noam Chomsky. In response to claims by Chomsky that human beings had a natural desire for justice, Foucault responded:

You can't prevent me from believing that these notions of human nature, of justice, of the realization of the essence of the human being, are all notions and concepts which have been found within our civilization, within our type of knowledge and our form of philosophy, and that as a result form part of our class system. (Sandeford, 2008)

From Foucault's perspective, concepts such as justice have been produced by the very European modernist project that Chomsky hopes to use these concepts to challenge. For this reason, there are limitations in using these concepts as political weapons to oppose this project. Doing a genealogy exposes the relations of power that went into the creation of concepts such as justice. It also shows how these power relations continue to be reproduced through the utilization of these concepts today. This genealogical process serves to problematize the naturalized and uncritically positive position these concepts hold in current discourse on all sides of the political spectrum.

Some critics have argued that a genealogical approach is inherently nihilistic and does little to promote positive social change. As Fraser (1994) puts it, "what Foucault needs, and needs desperately, are normative criteria for distinguishing acceptable from unacceptable forms of power (and consequentially of resistance) to avoid slipping into the nihilist wholesale rejection of modernity" (p. 147). Fraser and other critics of Foucault see his approach as dangerous in its unwillingness to lay out a plan for a better future through social progress. While these critics are correct in identifying a deconstructive aspect of the genealogical approach, what they fail to realize is that Foucault's work seeks to imagine framings that allow for new forms of freedom impossible under current regimes of truth. Perhaps Foucault himself best articulates his position here: "I think that there are more secrets, more possible freedoms, and more inventions

in our future than we can imagine in humanism as it is dogmatically represented on every side of the political rainbow: the Left, the Center, the Right” (as cited in Martin, 1988, p. 15).

Building on this idea, some Foucauldian scholars have argued that a genealogical approach is vital to positive social change. Clifford (2001) notes the importance of genealogical critique:

Genealogical critique confronts the problem of how political subjects are constituted as surface *effects* of an anonymous interplay, how this interplay attaches an identity and an ideology to subjects, how it commits them to certain practices and modes of being that have the most serious consequences in the political world. (p. 9)

For Clifford, a genealogical approach opens up a space for a unique political critique by making possible the calling into question of our very understanding of humanity. As he elaborates, “genealogy can be understood as the ‘discipline’ that exposes the entrenched forms of valuation and structuralized practices that determine what we are. In so doing, genealogy creates distance—that is, spaces of freedom—from those forms” (p. 13). Therefore, far from being nihilistic as critics of Foucault have claimed, a genealogical approach is idealistic and offers the possibility of new freedoms outside of European modernist conceptions of freedom. One way that Foucault himself attempted to imagine new forms of freedom was through a genealogy of the emergence of modernist conceptions of freedom in his study of the emergence of governmentality during the European Enlightenment. It is to Foucault’s study of governmentality that I now turn.

Discipline, Biopolitics, and the Emergence of Governmentality

Foucault’s most influential work examines the changes in relations of power made possible by the European modernist project. According to Foucault (1978), the European modernist project marked a shift in governance that brought with it new relations of power-knowledge. Before the modern era, power relations in Europe were characterized by what

Foucault called “sovereign power” where power was centralized through deference to God and/or a sovereign monarch. With the challenges to this sovereign power that began during the European Renaissance and culminated in the European Enlightenment, new forms of governance emerged. This shift in governance was a realignment of power with the newly emerging subjectivities associated with Enlightenment thinking and the discourse of freedom with which it was associated. In short, discourses of freedom were not produced as a response to power, but instead were produced as part of new relations of power made possible by the democratic discourses that were supplanting the monarchical discourses of previous times.

Losurdo (2011) provides a clear and succinct example of the power relations embedded in the democratic discourses emerging during the Enlightenment. He describes how Great Britain, which was still governed by a sovereign monarch, was able to easily abolish slavery. The king simply decided to abolish slavery and so it was. Yet, anybody familiar with American history knows that discourses of democracy made the eliminating of slavery a much more difficult and contentious process. As Losurdo (2011) describes it:

While it stimulated the development of racial chattel slavery and created an unprecedented, unbridgeable gulf between whites and people of color, the self-government of civil society triumphed, waving the flag of liberty and the struggle against despotism. (p. 40)

In short, slave owners in the US were able to use the discourses of democracy and freedom to argue that they had the freedom to own slaves, while they simultaneously used this same discourse to critique the sovereign power of monarchical rule. Whereas it is certainly tempting to dismiss this contradiction as simple hypocrisy, Foucault challenges us to critically engage with the power relations that made the production of this apparent contradiction possible. The purpose of this is not to argue that sovereign power was somehow more benevolent, but instead to

acknowledge that with the decline in monarchical rule, new power relations began to organize the world—power relations that we continue to feel the effects of today.

Foucault (1978) characterizes this new power made possible by the European modernist project as “the omnipresence of power: not because it has the privilege of consolidating everything under its invincible unity, but because it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another” (p. 93). In Foucault’s view, this omnipresence of power no longer has a center or a clearly identifiable source (i.e. a king or priest), but is instead coming from the discourses that we use to understand the world around us. The implication of this argument is that power can no longer be seen simply as a repressive mechanism that prohibits subjects from acting in certain ways as had existed in times of monarchical rule. Instead, Foucault notes a shift from reliance on this type of repressive sovereign power to the production of governable subjects through discursive regimes of power-knowledge.

Foucault notes two components in these more omnipresent relations of power, which he terms *discipline* and *biopolitics*. Foucault (1995) defines discipline as the process of creating *docile subjects* through a continuous monitoring and controlling of the body. The metaphor that Foucault uses is the *Panopticon*, a prison that would allow guards to observe prisoners without the inmates being able to see whether they were being observed. The idea behind this reform proposal was that the constant threat of surveillance would create docile prisoners who would self-monitor and internalize the prison norms. While this type of prison was never built, in Foucault’s view this illustrates well how disciplinary institutions work.

While discipline is interested in control over the individual body, biopolitics refers to the management and governance of populations. In Foucault’s analysis this population control is

made possible by the emergence of statistics and demography in the human sciences which “aims to establish a sort of homeostasis, not by training individuals, but by achieving an overall equilibrium that protects the security of the whole from internal dangers” (Foucault, 2003, p. 249). In particular, the application of the normal curve to human society in disciplines ranging from medicine, psychology, social work, public health, and education marked the rise of biopolitics. The goal of these human sciences became to study populations, identify the normal and the abnormal, identify why abnormal populations are different, and attempt to bring all people closer to the norm in an attempt at improving the population as a whole. In short, while discipline is concerned with individualizing subjects to maximize their docility and compliance, biopolitics is concerned with the manipulation of populations to maximize their biological vitality.

While Foucault began his work with discipline and then moved on to biopolitics, he eventually concludes that they, in fact, always go hand-in-hand with each other. Foucault eventually connects discipline and biopolitics through his concept of *governmentality*. Foucault (2007) defines governmentality as:

the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific, albeit complex, power that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument. (p. 108)

In short, governmentality is the process where subjects and populations are made to fulfill their place in the governing structure through relationships of power-knowledge. It should be noted that within governmentality, sovereignty is no longer understood as coming from above but has now been individualized into a modernist sovereign subject who has “freedom.” In other words, individuals are now free to make choices and are responsible for their own governance.

For Foucault, this interrelated interaction of sovereignty, discipline, and biopolitics is not exclusively coming from the state. Instead, in line with his omnipresent view of power, Foucault conceives of governmentality as much more broad than this top-down centralized approach. From the perspective of governmentality knowledge produced through a variety of institutions coalesces in the creation of governable subjects and governable populations. Foucault (2007) argues that the emergence of governmentality was made possible by the gradual governmentalization of the state, a process whereby the administrative apparatus of the state became inseparable from the knowledge produced through the human sciences. With the governmentalization of the state, power is no longer an issue of brute force, but instead an issue of using expert knowledge in the human sciences to maximize productivity of citizens and populations. With this governmentalization of the state there is no longer a clear distinction between the state and other areas of knowledge production. Instead, the state becomes one point in a discursive network that also includes other knowledge-producing institutions including schools, hospitals, and government agencies. In other words, these institutions coalesce around the production and governance of disciplined subjects, while working toward the purification of the entire population from deviancy in an attempt at keeping the national body strong and hardworking while also reproductive and genetically strong.

Nation-States, Colonization, and Governmentality

While governmentality by definition does not have one identifiable origin, Foucault connects its emergence with the rise of nation-states in Europe. While the discourse of nation-states existed in Europe since as early as the Renaissance (Mignolo, 1995), it was not until the 18th century that nation-states as a political entity rose to the status of regimes of truth and began to be treated as the only way to organize society. This nation-building process marked a rupture

in epistemology that Foucault (2003) describes as a shift from “We have to defend ourselves against society” [to] “we have to defend society against all the biological threats posed by the other race, the subrace, the counterrace that we are despite ourselves, bringing into existence” (p 61-62). In other words, when there was a clear sovereign power, the corresponding understanding of governance was one of defending against an abuse of power by the sovereign. Without a clear sovereign, a new relation of power-knowledge emerged that would produce a normalized bourgeois class in opposition to a racial Other from which the bourgeoisie needed protection. In short, with a move toward more democratic types of governance and the gradual decline of sovereign power in Europe, the discourse shifted toward defending “the people” against the inferior races within the populace.

It should be noted that Foucault’s use of the term “race” here does not necessarily correlate with current definitions of race. The race struggle Foucault describes was happening among Europeans who in our current racial classification system would be considered of the same race. Foucault argues that the emergence of the European bourgeoisie was at the core of this race struggle. Foucault (1978) describes the emergence of Victorian sexuality as part of this construction of the European bourgeoisie:

The primary concern was not repression of the sex of the classes to be exploited, but rather the body, vigor, longevity, progeniture, and descent of the classes that “ruled.” This was the purpose for which the deployment of sexuality was first established, as a new distribution of pleasures, discourses, truths, and powers; it has to be seen as the self-affirmation of one class rather than the enslavement of another: a defense, a protection, a strengthening, and an exaltation that were eventually extended to others—at the cost of different transformations—as a means of social control and political subjugation. (p. 123)

According to Foucault, the rise of the study of sexuality as part of the emerging human sciences of the Victorian era was mutually constitutive with the production of the idealized sexually pure bourgeois subject produced in opposition to the sexually impure racially inferior Other. He

connects this to a political process where the bourgeoisie consolidates its power through protecting its members from this impure racial Other, all in the service of creating a strong national body politic.

Therefore, the rise of the nation-state was mutually constitutive with a form of state racism that treated a certain race as superior to the inferior races within the nation-state. As theories of race begin to merge with theories of biology, this inferiority becomes framed in terms of lack of cleanliness and impurity; i.e., the inferior races were filthy and polluted and would contaminate the superior race unless something was done to prevent them from doing so. Foucault marks this desire to defend society from the unclean Other as an overarching theme of European modernity that would culminate in the state racism displayed by Nazism. Yet, this state racism while perfected under totalitarian rule was also present within the discourses of democracy that emerged within this particular socio-historical context.

While Foucault connects the rise of governmentality with the emergence of nation-states in Europe, Stoler (1995) argues that colonization was also integral to the emergence of governmentality. Stoler demonstrates how the European bourgeois subject was not only mutually constitutive with the unclear inferior raced subject of Europe (i.e. the lower classes) but was also constructed in opposition to the colonial Other who was even lower on the scale of human civilization and cleanliness. Stoler describes how, at the same time discursive networks of power were coalescing around the creation of governmentality in Europe, this discursive shift was emerging as part of colonial governance. Just as it marked a shift in thinking in Europe, this discourse of impurity and the need for cleansing marked a shift in colonial relations. Whereas the colonized were once seen as subhuman, they were now seen as impure and in need of purification. As Mignolo (2000) argues:

While the sixteenth century was the scene of a heated debate about the boundaries of humanity, toward the nineteenth century the question was no longer whether primitives or Orientals were human but, rather, how far removed from the present and civilized stage of humanity they were. (p. 283)

Rather than being seen as unable to become fully human, colonized subjects were now seen as simply stuck at a different stage of universal human development. They could, therefore, be taught how to be properly human and cleansed of their bad habits through education in Enlightenment ideals of freedom and democracy.

Lowe (2006) explicitly makes the link between freedom and colonization and argues that “in 1807 the category of ‘freedom’ was central to the development of what we could call after Foucault, a modern racial governmentality” (p.195). Initially, freedom was only given to “superior raced” people. However, Lowe goes on to describe how eventually the needs of modern colonial regimes conflicted with the universalism embedded in the modernist discourse of freedom. In short, the Enlightenment ideals of “all men being equal” (as well as the constant fear of slave rebellions) challenged colonial governments to end slavery. Yet, the end of slavery embedded in old sovereign forms of governance allowed for the rise of discipline and biopolitics. These populations were now free—free to become docile workers and pathologized populations that needed European Enlightenment in order to attain human civilization.

Therefore, the same dichotomy of cleanliness and impurity used to justify nationalist revolutions were also used to defend colonization. As Stoler (1995) argues, “the project of revolution and the counter-history of race in the nineteenth century do not coexist par hazard; their etymologies are one and the same, derived from the recovery of earlier discourse on the war of races” (p. 71). In short, nationalist revolutions were made possible through the same discourse that also justified the continued destruction and exploitation of colonial subjects and populations. Losurdo (2011) elaborates on this point:

The discourse developed by liberalism is profoundly marked by repression of the lot imposed on colonial people. The self-celebration of the land of the free or the people of the free proved all the more persuasive in that it overlooked the slavery inflicted on colonial population or populations of colonial origin. (p. 169)

The development of democratic regimes in Europe and the US cannot, therefore, be separated from the enslavement and colonization of the rest of the world's population.

In summary, during the 18th and 19th century as sovereign power began to decline in Europe, a new form of governance ascended into dominance that was mutually constitutive with the rise of the nation-state as a political entity. It was premised on a universalizing narrative of human progress that necessitated the cleansing of impurities from the national body. This discourse prompted national revolutions in Europe and would culminate in the rise of Nazism in Europe (Foucault, 2003). What Foucault leaves unaddressed in his narrative is how colonization was also an integral and necessary part of this process. In fact, as Stoler (1995) argues, the emergence of this governmentality would not have been possible without colonization. This is why instead of discussing governmentality generically as Foucault does, I have chosen to use the phrase *nation-state/colonial governmentality* to demonstrate the mutually constitutive nature of the formation of nation-states and colonization.

Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Language Ideologies

Language ideologies were a crucial element that shaped nation-state/colonial governmentality. Thomas Bonfiglio (2010) traces the origins of modern nation-state/colonial language ideologies to the European Renaissance where the origins of nation-state and colonial discourse also originate, though neither would come to hegemonic status until the 18th century. He identifies the European Renaissance as a rupture in epistemology in regards to language and contrasts this with the Ancient Romans:

Antiquity offers no correlates for the current common notions of nativity and maternity in language, nor does it demonstrate gestures that seek to enracinate the conventional language and situate it in ethnic or biological terms. (Bonfiglio, 2010, p. 62)

Bonfiglio notes that while Latin certainly held a hegemonic role in Ancient Roman society, language contact between Latin and other languages in the empire demonstrated a key difference between Antiquity and nationalist conceptions of language that emerged as part of the European modernist project. During the Roman Empire Latin was treated as a lingua franca that was not connected to a particular ethnic identity or mother land. Therefore, Latin was a language that everybody could be a legitimate speaker of, and there was no conception of a native speaker of Latin. In addition, there was no explicit policy forcing conquered populations to learn Latin and no expectation that all Roman subjects speak Latin. Therefore, while there were certainly power relations embedded in the language ideologies of Ancient Rome, it is important to note that their understanding of language differed from the nationalist conception of language that would begin to emerge in the European Renaissance and become a regime of truth during the European Enlightenment.

Argentine postcolonial critic Walter Mignolo succinctly describes the language ideologies that began to emerge during the European Renaissance that would come to replace the language ideologies of Antiquity. As Mignolo (1995) argues, “the late Renaissance, a landmark in the idea of modernity, was the beginning of an effort to constitute homogenous linguistic, national, and religious communities” (Mignolo, 1995, p. 315). Mignolo (1995) traces this homogenization of language and its connection to ethnic and national identity to the work of Spanish grammarian Antonio de Nebrija. Nebrija worked on codifying Castilian as the language of Spain soon after the expulsion of the last Moors and Jews as part of *La Reconquista*, which Spanish elites saw as cleansing Spain of Islamic and Jewish influences. He explicitly identified

the codification of Castilian as necessary for the growth of the Spanish Empire. As Mignolo (1995) argues, “he knew that the power of a unified language, via its grammar, lay in teaching it to barbarians, as well as controlling barbarian languages by writing their grammars” (p. 39). In Nebrija’s eyes, the codifying of the vernacular spoken by the royal family and its cleansing of impurities was vital to maintaining power over their subjects in their newly cleansed territory, as well as in their newly acquired colonies overseas. In short, the codification of Castilian would allow for the production of a purely Spanish ethnic identity, while simultaneously allowing for the imposition of this ethnic identity on colonial populations.

Whereas Nebrija’s intentions were to codify a grammar to maintain and expand the sovereign rule of the Spanish monarchy, the invention of the printing press would allow this codification of grammar to assume a more democratic discourse. Anderson (1991) argues that the printing press allowed for a movement away from religious communities and their use of Latin toward ethnic communities and their use of vernacular languages. Framing it in terms of the capitalist economic system that was also beginning to emerge at this time, Anderson (1991) argues: “the logic of capitalism thus meant that once the elite Latin market was saturated, the potentially huge markets represented by the monoglot masses would beckon” (p. 38). In short, the Latin elite was a very small market for printing companies and new markets had to quickly be discovered for the printing press to be profitable. The solution was to produce markets through the codifications of vernaculars that would then be used to mold linguistic heterogeneous speakers of various language varieties into a homogenous linguistic group. The creation of homogenous linguistic communities would eventually lead political elites to favor their vernacular to Latin. Bonfiglio (2010) provides Dante as one example:

The observations of Dante on the superiority of Italian vis-à-vis Latin are indicative of a Copernican revolution in the configuration and representation of the vernacular. The

understanding of language in terms of metaphors of nativity and maternity was to become the dominant linguistic episteme thereafter; it persists to the present day, not only in popular, but also in academic discourse. (p. 73)

In short, the codification of vernaculars provided the space for Dante and other Renaissance leaders to develop “imagined communities” which were constructed as linguistically homogenous populations with a shared history, blood, and geographic space (Anderson, 1991).

To frame this in Foucauldian terms, while sovereign power was in decline in the political realm, it was also weakening in the linguistic realm. No longer would Latin be the central language that all literate people must learn. Instead literacy would be democratized through allowing people to read and write in their vernaculars, which would, in turn, free them from relying on elites to interpret texts for them. However, a decline in sovereign power is not equivalent to a decrease in power, but instead allows for the formation of new regimes of power-knowledge as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality. At the core of this process was the creation of the racial Other in opposition to a normalized static bourgeois subject. While Foucault bases this argument on a study of sexuality, Bonfiglio (2010) extends it into the realm of language ideologies and argues that the codification of a particular grammar and a particular pronunciation produced the bourgeois subject as the speaker of a more correct and perfect language than the racially inferior Other. In short, language ideologies arising with nation-state/colonial governmentality were part of the production of the European bourgeois subject as the norm for what it means to be a citizen of a particular nation-state.

Gal (2006) describes the process that the European bourgeoisie utilized in the codification of a national language. As she describes it, European nationalist grammarians began to see heterogeneity in language practices as an impediment toward the creation of nationalist subjects and the move toward purified nation-states. It was, therefore, necessary to create a

codified standardized language to cleanse the language of perceived impurities. Once nationalist grammarians codified standardized varieties they were named “a language” that represented “a people,” with rights to “a land,” with other varieties now deemed improper dialects or completely erased. As mentioned above, this was certainly not the first time in human history that certain ways of speaking were privileged over others. However, it should be reiterated that the nation-state differed from European Antiquity in that it positioned monolingualism in the standardized variety as the expectation for full citizenship and connected this monolingualism to a homogenous ethnic identity. This monolingual language ideology and monolingual ethnic identity was certainly a shift from previous language ideologies (Irvine and Gal, 2000).

Bonfiglio (2010) examines the effects of these monolingual language ideologies on European society:

A folkloric notion of genetic ownership of language lies at the root of all ethnocentric linguistic prejudice: “our native” language, which is “our birthright”, is seen as endangered by the presence of an other who is perceived as biological contaminant and thus a threat to the matrix of nation, ethnicity, and language. (p. 1)

To place this in Foucauldian terms, the language ideologies associated with the rise of nation-states was an essential component of the state racism that was an integral part of nation-state/colonial governmentality. This state racism not only treats certain linguistic forms as superior, but also treats any mixing of this superior linguistic form with inferior ones as a threat to society (Bonfiglio, 2010). In short, under nation-state/colonial governmentality any form of hybrid linguistic form, which produces hybrid ethnic identities, is a threat to society that must be eliminated.

This objectification of language, as well as the larger epistemological shift of which it was part, was also integral to colonial governmentality. For example, Mühlhäusler (1996) looks at the imposition of a modernist conception of “a language” on the Pacific Rim as part of the

process of colonization. As he argues, “the identification of languages and their subsequent naming is far from being an act of objective description, and it can constitute a very serious trespass on the linguistic ecology of an area” (p. 5). To Mühlhäusler, the categorization of language practices into “a language” on the Pacific Rim was a form of epistemic violence that did not represent the actual fluid language practices of people or the conception that the population had of their own language practices.

Pennycook (2002) provides another example through his study of the colonial governments of Great Britain in Hong Kong and Malaysia. Pennycook notes two different discursive regimes complicit in the colonial project of Hong Kong and Malaysia: (1) the Anglicists who believed that colonial subjects should be instructed in English in order to teach them the superiority of British culture and (2) the Orientalists who believed that colonial subjects should be instructed in their vernacular (codified by Europeans and not reflective of the actual language practices of colonial subjects) in order to more effectively teach them the superiority of British culture. The point Pennycook makes is that despite superficially being oppositional, both discourses were complicit in colonial governmentality. Pennycook uses the findings of his study to problematize the idea that use of the vernacular language is inherently empowering, and argues that when associated with particular discursive regimes the use of the vernacular can be used for colonizing and disempowering ends.

In summary, particular conceptions of language were necessary for the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality. This nationalist/colonial language ideology saw language as a tool for the unification of a people under one standard language living in one territory. The job of national grammarians was to codify a “perfect” language free of impurities and then work on spreading this language among the people and removing the impurities found in vernacular

speech. This top-down approach that saw language complexity as an impediment to be overcome, is very much in line with the larger nationalist/colonial discourse that sought to erase diversity through homogenization under nation-state/colonial governmentality. It is important to note that this homogenization process was not only occurring in the political realm through the work of nationalist leaders. Academic work emerging from the newly developing human sciences also reflected this epistemological shift. It is to the complicity of the human sciences in nation-state/colonial governmentality that I now turn.

Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and the Human Sciences

It is important to note that the codification of homogenous languages that was mutually constitutive with the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality was not happening in isolation but was, in fact, part of the larger European modernist project. As Bauman and Briggs (2000) argue, “a transformation of language ideologies and metadiscursive practices was shaped by and helped construct and legitimate the intellectual, technological, and social revolutions associated with the emergence of modern science” (p. 144). In other words, language ideologies associated with the European modernist project were not only mutually constitutive with the rise of nationalism but also with the rise of the human sciences. Therefore, the emergence of the human sciences occurred within the same power relations of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

In order to prove this provocative assertion, Bauman and Briggs examine the work of political theorist John Locke (1632-1704), and German nationalist Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). They show that while Locke was attempting to theorize a science of language and Herder was attempting to theorize a language ideology that would support the formation of a homogenous German national identity, they both shared the same epistemological orientation.

According to Bauman and Briggs (2000), despite superficial differences between the two thinkers in regards to language, their language ideologies are fundamentally the same in that they “relegate folk linguistic knowledge to or beyond the margins of linguistic inquiry” (p. 199). In other words, both thinkers, whose ideas were emerging along with the formation of nation-state/colonial governmentality, did not see the language practices of actual people as important to developing either a scientific understanding of language or a more affective and nationalist understanding of language. Language, in their view, could only be understood at a step removed from the actual language practices of people.

This dismissal of “folk linguistics” in favor of either a scientific or nationalist linguistics eventually converges in the rise of structural linguistics which is attributed to Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913). In *The Course on General Linguistics* Saussure differentiates between *langue* (language) and *parole* (speech). For Saussure, *langue* is an abstract system that is put into practice through *parole*. In short, *langue* represents a structure that is hidden deep under the actual practice of language manifested in *parole*. According to Saussure, linguistics should, therefore, attempt to understand this underlying structure as opposed to analyzing actual language practices. In Saussure’s view, this structure should be the focus of a science of language that strives to be objective and neutral.

While it is clear that Saussure has much in common with Locke in that both were attempting to create a science of language, there are also interesting parallels between Saussure’s ideas and those of Herder. In short, just as Bauman and Briggs see parallels between Locke’s scientific pursuit and Herder’s nationalist pursuit, parallels can also be made between Saussure’s scientific pursuit and Herder’s project, which sought to create homogenous German national subjects through the codification of a Standard German. In fact, Crowley (1991) makes an

explicit parallel between Saussure's conceptualization of *langue* and the standard language ideologies that were disseminated by Herder and other nationalist grammarians as part of the nation building process. As Crowley (1991) argues:

The phrase 'standard language' was in fact a coinage of these linguists in the 1850s and was a necessary methodological concept for their work. It was invented—in precisely the same way that *langue* served for Saussure—in order to provide stability and unity into an apparently heterogeneous mess. (p. 46-47)

While some might try to differentiate the views of Saussure and Herder in that one was an attempt to create an objective science while the other was a clearly ideological attempt to create nationalist subjects, Crowley (1991) argues that both are made possible only by a “deliberate blindness to difference” which is “an engagement in the politics of language rather than its scientific study” (p. 48).

This is not to say that Herder and Saussure had identical positions. For Herder, it was necessary to engage in an active process of standardization while for Saussure such standardization was antithetical to the scientific study of language. However, similar to Herder's nationalist language ideology, Saussure's concept of *langue* assumes homogenous ethnolinguistic communities that use a homogenous linguistic system. That is, at the core of the concept of *langue* is the idea that every ethnolinguistic community has a homogenous linguistic system that members of that community do not deviate from. In Saussure's framework, this is said to be true of both standardized linguistic forms as well as non-standard dialects of a particular language. This conceptualization of language serves a similar effect to Herder in that it erases both differences in language use between members of a supposed homogenous ethnolinguistic community and the dynamic language practices of multilingual communities where different language varieties are in contact with one another (Blommaert, 2010). In short, both language

ideologies were products of the European modernist project of cleansing difference. Therefore, both language ideologies are mutually constitutive with nation-state/colonial governmentality.

In summary, the modernist project of nation-state building was mutually constitutive with language ideologies that would eventually take two forms: (1) a standard language ideology that was designed to produce a homogenous national body and (2) a scientific ideology that was designed to produce a pure language that could be studied. Both language ideologies, while superficially expressing different motives, were both part of the larger modernist project and integral to the perpetuating of nation-state/colonial governmentality. They would eventually converge in the rise of structuralism that has its origins in the linguistics of Saussure but quickly spread to the other human sciences, including the study of language education policy.

Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality and Language Education Policy

The study of language education policy was just as influenced by structuralism as many of the other areas already mentioned and has consequently been mutually constitutive with nation-state/colonial governmentality. In fact, when the formal field of language policy emerged in the 1960s, structuralism was just coming into its heyday outside of linguistics. Originally termed *language planning*, the field emerged as a response to decolonization through the pioneering work of Joshua Fishman among others (Fishman, Ferguson, and Das Gupta, 1968). This pioneering work sought to bring together linguistics and sociology, both heavily influenced by structuralism at this moment in time. As Rubin and Jernudd (1971) describe it:

Language planning is *deliberate* language change; that is, changes in the systems of language code or speaking or both that are planned by organizations that are established for such purposes or given a mandate to fulfill such purposes. As such, language planning is focused on problem-solving and is characterized by the formulation and evaluation of alternatives for solving language problems to find the best (or optimal, most efficient) decision. (p. xvi, italics in original)

In short, what was then termed language planning was premised on the idea of language as a problem that needed to be solved through top-down planning, all in the name of furthering the project of nation-building in the decolonizing world. The idea was that through objective analysis one could find the best way for nations to create systems for language planning and to create an infrastructure to implement this plan (Eastman, 1983). This was a non-politicized form of structuralism that Ricento (2000) argues was premised on the idea of autonomous linguistics that positioned linguistics as objective and positioned the scholars as disinterested and neutral experts on the topic—as scholars simply trying to understand the underlying structures and make objective recommendations based on their understanding of these structures.

This era of language education policy came under fire from a more overtly politicized structuralism during the 1980s and 1990s that was part of a larger shift in structuralist thought emerging across the human sciences. While language education policy was still seen as having an underlying structure, issues of power began to be explored by scholars. This more critical approach was prompted by the growing distaste for top-down state planning that developed in the field after the collapse of the Soviet Union, as well as the undermining of decolonization projects with the rise of globalization (Ferguson, 2006). Ricento (2000) characterizes this second phase of work in language education policy “as one in which there was a growing awareness of the negative effects—and inherent limitations—of planning theory and models, and a realization that sociolinguistic constructs...were conceptually complex and ideologically laden” (p. 16). In short, the planning of language was no longer seen by many scholars as an objectively scientific enterprise, but rather as an ideologically driven process that was being used to benefit elites at the expense of the masses.

One important critic of the traditional approach to language policy work was Jim Tollefson. Inspired by structural Marxism and critical theory, Tollefson (1991) argues that language policy is a tool for the perpetuation of inequality, with language education policy being an integral part of this process. Phillipson (1992) elaborates on this idea through an exploration of what he terms “linguistic imperialism,” which he defines as when “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (p. 47). This linguistic imperialism is closely connected to the concept of “linguicism” that Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) defined as “ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language” (p. 13). In short, just as racism oftentimes leads to cultural imperialism, linguicism leads to English linguistic imperialism.

Some scholars have used the argument of these critical scholars to make a case for “linguistic human rights,” with a particular emphasis on the role of schools in enforcing these human rights. As Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) argues “it should be the duty of the educational system to enable minority children to become (minimally) bilingual, since bilingualism is a necessity for them, and not necessarily or not usually a matter of personal or free choice” (p. 501). She argues that the only way to ensure that this occurs is to pass legislation at both the national and international level that guarantees language minoritized communities the right to “mother tongue education”. In her view, anything less than this is tantamount to “linguistic genocide.”

These critical interventions in the study of language education policy have shifted the conversation from seeing language diversity as a problem in decolonizing nations to seeing

multilingualism as something to be cherished and promoted (Ferguson, 2006). One example that represents the fruit of the labor of these critical structuralists is the South African Constitution which recognizes eleven separate languages as official and protects the rights of individuals to “use the language of their choice” and “to receive an education in any of the official languages or language of their choice where that is practicable” (quoted in Makoni, 2003). While the South African Constitution represents much more respect for linguistic diversity than other national constitutions, some scholars have critiqued it (and the entire project of linguistic human rights) as coming from the same nation-state/colonial governmentality as seemingly less tolerant constitutions. As Makoni (2003) argues:

notions about languages and ethnicity in the South African Constitution are founded on the ‘boxed’ notions of language and ethnicity ultimately traceable to eighteenth-century German Romanticist ideas which treated territory, constructions of race, and conceptualizations of language as identical and indivisible. (p. 140)

In other words, the South African Constitution accepts the language ideologies imposed by the colonial governments and in this way continues to perpetuate a governmentality that has marginalized Africans for centuries. Therefore, advocacy within European modernity is not sufficient, and a new paradigm is necessary that breaks free of the European modern epistemology.

In summary, the field of language education policy, like all of the academic knowledge produced in the human sciences, has been produced as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality. Even the more overtly politicized perspectives that have emerged in recent years have assumed homogeneous and static language constructs and seek to defend the rights of all to speak in their “mother tongue”—the homogenous and static language they are thought to have been born into. In short, the same process that has been used to marginalize language minoritized populations throughout the European modernist project continues to be reproduced

in the field of language education policy today. It behooves those of us who are interested in empowering language minoritized students to reflect on this history and expose the ways that it continues to be reproduced in our field. It is only after we have done this that we can begin to imagine new ways of conceptualizing language education policy that challenge, rather than reproduce nation-state/colonial governmentality.

Conclusion

The framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality challenges the fundamental assertion of the European Enlightenment that discourses of democracy and freedom are by definition less embedded in relations of power than previous governance under monarchical rule. Instead, this framework offers the possibility of taking a step-back from the naturalization of these constructs and allows for an excavation of the particular socio-historical regimes of power-knowledge that made these constructs possible. What we find is a history of exclusion, marginalization, and colonization. In terms of language ideologies specifically, nation-state/colonial governmentality was mutually constitutive with both the construction of national languages and the construction of a science of language that erased difference in the pursuit of pure linguistic forms that could either unite a static ethnic community or be an appropriate study of scientific inquiry.

The next two chapters utilize the framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality in analyzing language ideologies in the US context. Chapter 3 explores the early US Republic and examines how the emerging discourses of nationalism and the European Enlightenment played out in the uniquely situated US context. Chapter Four connects this to the present context and examines how these discourses continue to be reproduced in debates around language education policy in contemporary US society. I will show that nation-state/colonial governmentality

continues to be reproduced within current US language education policy even among those advocating for bilingual education which at first glance would appear to be in opposition to this epistemological orientation.

CHAPTER THREE

The Emergence of Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in the United States

In the previous chapter I described the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality in Europe and its colonies and the impact this new form of governance had on understandings of language. In conjunction with the rise of nation-states in Europe, the concept of a discreet homogeneous language became necessary for the construction of static national subjects and colonial populations. This chapter attempts to concretize the broad-stroke claims made in the previous chapter through a demonstration of the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality in the US context.

This chapter first provides a brief description of the general narrative of the origins of US language policy and points to the limitations of this traditional narrative. It argues that this traditional narrative focuses on the fact that there was a rejection of what I term the *Centralist perspective* which argued for the formation of a National Language Academy. This framing of the issue leads to the conclusion that the early republic was a time of linguistic tolerance, thereby failing to unpack the new relations of power that were embedded within the language ideologies that came to replace the Centralist perspective. The bulk of the chapter then offers a different reading of the origins of US language policy using the framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality described in the previous chapter. Using this framework demonstrates that two contrasting yet interrelated schools of thought emerged during the early years of the United States: (1) the Americanist perspective, which advocated the codification of American English to represent the new and unique perspective of American society through a codification of the language of “general use,” and (2) the Universalist perspective, which sought to create a perfect

language based on scientific principles that united American and British English with the ultimate goal being the creation of a perfect language of universal communication. This chapter will demonstrate how these two discursive regimes marked an epistemological shift from the Centralist perspective associated with sovereign power and monarchical control. These two new discursive regimes were mutually constitutive with a new form of governance that was simultaneously emerging throughout the rest of the world as an adaptation to the newly forming discourses of democracy associated with the European Enlightenment.

The Traditional Narrative of the History of US Language Policy

The general narrative provided of the history of language policy in the US focuses on the cyclical rise and fall of the use of languages other than English in public institutions, such as schools. A foundational text that makes this argument is *The American Bilingual Tradition* by Heinz Kloss published originally in 1977. In this book, Kloss argues that language rights for ethnic minorities could be considered “promotion-oriented” or “tolerance-oriented”. He argues that promotion-oriented approaches entail “public authorities...trying to promote a mother tongue by having it used in public institutions,” while tolerance-oriented approaches imply that “governments do not interfere with efforts on the parts of the minority to make use of the ethnic tongue in the private domain” (p. 2). His basic argument is that while there were times of extreme repression against languages other than English, US history has generally been divided between the promotion and tolerance orientations. According to this framework, times of extreme repression against languages other than English are atypical throughout United States history and counter the tolerant attitudes of the Founding Fathers.

Heath (1976) is one of the seminal works that has explored the so-called linguistic tolerance at the origins of US language policy. In particular, she examines the debate by the

Founding Fathers over whether to create a national language academy to codify an American language. This perspective, which I will refer to as the Centralist perspective, advocated an active role for the federal government in both naming English as the official language of the United States and codifying an American English that would define the American people. The Centralist perspective did not receive much traction in the new country and an official language was never declared at the federal level nor a national language academy created to codify this official language. Heath (1976) concludes from her analysis that:

In rejecting a national language academy, the founding fathers made clear their choice *not* to designate a national tongue; moreover, the state refused to provide official sanction for specific criteria and procedures of language standardization. Instead, national political leaders and state and local agencies promoted respect for diversity of languages. (p. 9)

According to Heath, the Founding Fathers saw the creation of a National Language Academy as too monarchical and preferred less coercive tactics in codifying an American language, such as the efforts of Noah Webster in creating a dictionary of American English. She concludes that language policy in current times should continue in this tradition and allow for people to adapt to American English in non-coercive ways. In particular, Heath argues that bilingual/bicultural education programs continue in this tradition of linguistic tolerance and defends these programs from critics who argue that they undermine the American culture. In her analysis, linguistic tolerance is in fact an integral part of American culture that goes back to the founding of the country, and bilingual education programs continue this tolerance into the present.

While Heath focused her analysis on the debate undertaken by the English-speaking Founding Fathers, other defenders of bilingual education have elaborated on this general narrative with a particular focus on speakers of languages other than English. Crawford (1999) characterizes the colonial era as one that was in line with the tolerance orientation and focuses his work on bilingual education. Crawford argues that this linguistic tolerance was premised on

the idea that coercive implementation of English-Only policies would be counterproductive in incorporating the large German population into US society. This same hands-off approach to bilingual education is described as existing in territories that were subsequently conquered by the United States. Blanton (2004) documents how this played out in the area that we now know as Texas. As he describes it, “the bilingual tradition in Texas during the nineteenth century was rich and vibrant, involving several different ethnic and immigrant groups such as Tejanos, German Americans, and Czech Americans” (p. 153). The consensus among many scholars is that this tolerance for the use of other languages in the education of ethnic Whites was premised on the idea that bilingual education would help assimilate these groups into American culture.

Some scholars have, however, challenged this idea of tolerance-orientation in the colonial era. Schmid (2001) argues that rather than expressing tolerance toward bilingual education “the founding fathers and later policy makers held ambivalent attitudes toward languages other than English, ranging from pragmatic acceptance to deliberate policies of forced extermination and assimilation” (p. 14). One famous example of this ambivalence is a letter written by Benjamin Franklin lamenting the prevalence of the German language in colonial Philadelphia:

Few of their children in the Country learn English; they import many Books from Germany...Advertisements, intended to be general are now printed in Dutch [German] and English; the Signs in our Streets have inscriptions in both languages, and in some places only German. They begin of late to make all their Bonds and other legal Writings in their own Language, which (though I thought it ought not to be) are allowed good in our Courts, where the German Business so increases that there is continued need of Interpreters; and I suppose in a few years they will also be necessary in the Assembly, to tell one half of our Legislators what the other half say. (cited in Crawford, 1992a, p. 19)

For Franklin, the fear was that the German population was not learning English and not properly assimilating into American society. The fact that he wrote this letter in 1753—many years before US independence—demonstrates that this nationalist discourse existed concurrently with any linguistic tolerance expressed by the Founding Fathers. Franklin himself reflected this tension, as

twenty years before writing this letter he had unsuccessfully tried to create the first German language newspaper in the colonies (Crawford, 1992a). The fact that Franklin could change his attitude so drastically in a twenty-year period provides evidence of the ambivalence Schmid (2001) refers to.

Though some scholars have pointed to the ambivalence of the Founding Fathers, complicating the tolerance vs. promotion orientation that has been influential in the field, other scholars have pointed out that there was no ambivalence when it came to the languages of Indigenous and African populations (Spring, 2009). For example, while the use of Indigenous languages was tolerated initially, it was eventually barred from the many missionary schools that were created to “civilize” Indigenous tribes. As Lomawaima and McCarty (2002) argue: “the history of American Indian education can rightfully be conceptualized as a grand experiment in standardization” (p. 282). In other words, Indigenous languages were never tolerated and the expectation was that the Indigenous populations be made into the image of their White colonizers. Spring (2009) also points out that enslaved African populations were completely excluded from the educational system. Teaching a slave to read or write was illegal and African languages were not even used as a tool to assimilate the enslaved population. These scholars point to the fact that while the Founding Fathers may have been ambivalent and perhaps reluctantly tolerant toward bilingual education for ethnic, communities of color were never given this same treatment and the official policy was always the forced use of English.

In summary, the general narrative of the language policies of early US society was that there was an overall tolerance of other European languages but that this tolerance was premised on the idea that ethnic Whites would also learn English. This tolerance was not extended to African slaves and Indigenous people who were forcibly stripped of their languages. Yet within

the tolerance-oriented framework, this racism is seen as an aberration from a relatively permissive attitude toward language use among the general population. Therefore, despite this racism toward populations of color, some scholars have used the laissez-faire attitudes towards the language usage of ethnic whites present in the early Republic as justification for the tolerant approaches of today, including support for bilingual education. The argument made is that the Founding Fathers permitted bilingual education as a tool of assimilating ethnic Whites, and that similarly bilingual education could be used today to integrate immigrant populations into US society.

Below I problematize this traditional framing of the debate and argue that the framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality may provide a different interpretation of the origins of language policy in early US society. The purpose of what follows is not to challenge the events depicted in the traditional narrative. Certainly, there are ample historical documents that prove the reluctance of American leaders to legislate coercive language policies and demonstrate the existence of bilingual education programs in the early Republic for ethnic whites, as well as the lack of availability of these programs for Indigenous populations. However, by simply trying to describe what was happening, the traditional narrative misses the larger epistemological shift that was occurring at the time that allowed for the emergence of new relations of power-knowledge, new ways of understanding language, and ultimately a new form of governance to replace the centralized sovereign power of monarchies. The purpose of this is to demonstrate that beneath a seemingly tolerant rhetoric laid new relations of power that served to marginalize those who did not fit into the vision of the ideal American citizen. Therefore, what follows is an attempt at challenging this traditional narrative by exploring the emergence of US language policy in conjunction, and in fact, as a necessary component of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in the United States

As mentioned in the previous chapter, nation-state/colonial governmentality was a newly emerging form of governance arising along with the decline of sovereign power, as more decentralized forms of government replaced monarchies and the humanist and scientific thinking of the Enlightenment replaced God. This concept builds on the concept of governmentality as articulated by Foucault (2003, 2007) and as extended by Stoler (1995). Foucault was focused primarily on the emergence of governmentality as it connected to the rise of nation-states in Europe, and Stoler to governmentality in the colonial context, demonstrating the mutually constitutive nature of the formation of nation-states and colonization. While the connection between the development of nation-states simultaneously with European colonization was described in the previous chapter, here I will extend this analysis to the United States. Analyzing the US context complicates the analysis of nation-state/colonial governmentality in that it does not fit nicely into this dichotomy of nation-state and colony. Unlike European nations, the United States was simultaneously a colony and a colonizer that was forming a nation-state. In other words, the United States was perhaps the first geographic space in the world made possible by a coalescing of the discourses surrounding freedom, nationalism, and (anti)colonialism. Because of this unique position, the debates surrounding the formation of the United States are particularly relevant to understanding the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

While there has been some important studies of the emergence of governmentality in the United States (Hannah, 2000; Stoler, 2006), an exploration of the emergence of these new relations of power at the birth of the United States remains undertheorized. This is especially the case in language policy, where the tolerance-orientation vs. promotion-orientation paradigm continues to influence the framing of the history of US language policy. This fails to unpack the

way that the very understanding of language at the birth of the republic was embedded in colonial relations of power. In other words, the question of whether languages were promoted, merely tolerated, or even restricted leaves unexamined the ways that the language ideologies that emerged during this era were integral and necessary components in the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

The following quote from Benjamin Rush provides a good metaphor for the new relations of power that were emerging as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality:

From the observations that have been made it is plain that I consider it as possible to convert men into republican machines. This must be done if we expect them to perform their parts properly in the great machine of the government of the state. That republic is sophisticated with monarchy or aristocracy that does not revolve upon the wills of the people, and these must be fitted to each other by means of education before they can be made to produce regularity and unison in government. (Rush 1786, p. 16-17)

Rush wrote the statement above at a time of great excitement and uncertainty. The United States was a newly established nation with a newly formed type of government that was based on the latest ideas emerging from the European Enlightenment. No longer was it seen as tolerable to have a monarch who governed without the consent of the people. Instead, the US government could only be legitimate if it reflected the will of the people. In other words, sovereign power no longer came from a centralized authority, but instead from the people. Yet, the question remained as to how such a decentralized governing system could function. Rush's metaphor of the creation of republican machines through education provides a useful image in trying to understand how this new form of governance would work. If subjects could no longer be coerced by the will of the sovereign, then citizens would have to be molded into machines able to regulate themselves and those around them. In short, a republican form of government must educate subjects so that they would properly exert the sovereign power that had now been bestowed on each of them.

Rush's declaration on the role of education in a republic is a transitional text that both yearns for a centralized sovereign power while simultaneously embracing the possibilities offered by a newly decentralized form of government. The dialogic nature of this text and its blending of different and conflicting discourses is referred to by Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin as heteroglossia. As Bakhtin (1981) argues:

The internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects, characteristic group behavior, professional jargon, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day, even of the hour (each day has its own slogan, its own vocabulary, its own emphases)—this internal stratification present in every language at any given moment of its historical existence is the indispensable prerequisite for the novel as a genre. (p. 262-263)

While Bakhtin is speaking specifically about novels, others have extended the concept of heteroglossia to include language more broadly (Bailey & Benjamin, 2007; García, 2009). Heteroglossia points to the dialogic nature of all discourse and challenges us to critically examine the ways that discourses—even seemingly oppositional discourses—are in constant dialogue and negotiation with each other. Rush's discourse reflects a dialogic conflict between centralized and decentralized forms of power. In Rush's statement at the beginning of this section, the tension between sovereign power and Enlightenment ideals of democracy are coalescing around new relations of power and knowledge. Here Rush is calling for the disciplining of subjects through an education in republican virtues along with a biopolitics that would create a unified American population and a strong governing body. This disciplining of subjects, along with the biopolitical control over populations, are both part of the nation-state/colonial governmentality that was emerging at the time that Rush wrote his proposal. While Rush is not speaking specifically about language education policy, it is clear from his proposal

that education policy is key to molding the ideal American subject, while simultaneously molding the American population to fit into these new relations of power-knowledge.

Below I lay out the two discursive regimes that were present in these new relations of power-knowledge: (1) the Americanist perspective, and (2) the Universalist perspective. I will argue that while these two perspectives were framed as oppositional discourses in the debate surrounding language policy in the United States, they were both integral components of the development of nation-state/colonial governmentality in the US context. This is because these two perspectives were both in dialogic relation with one another, and one could not exist without the other. Similarly, they were both in dialogic relation with the Centralist perspective and could not have been formed without this dialogue. Therefore, while historians of US language policy argue that the Centralist perspective was ultimately rejected, I will argue below that the Centralist perspective became subsumed under both the Americanist and Universalist perspective to create a new form of governance that marginalized those who did not fit the mold of the republican machine Rush described above.

Revisiting the Centralist Perspective

Looking through the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality, it is possible to revisit the Centralist perspective and offer a different reading of this perspective to demonstrate that rather than being rejected, the Centralist perspective would take a different form as sovereignty shifted from centralized authority to the power of “the people.” As mentioned above, the Centralist perspective argues that language policy should come from a centralized location in the form of a national language academy overseen by the government. This call for a national language academy can only be understood within the larger context of those arguing for the creation of a national institution to systematize and centralize the study of all academic subjects.

One example of this that will be offered here is a manuscript written in 1806 by John Barlow, a famous American poet and diplomat, entitled *Prospectus of a National Institution to be Established in the United States*. The manuscript will reveal the context in which the proposal to create a national language academy was emerging as part of an argument for a top-down approach to the codification of an American language to go along with the newly emerging American academic tradition.

After exploring this larger context, I will then explore the writings of John Adams, the most notable supporter of the Centralist perspective in language policy (Crawford, 1992a; Heath, 1976). The letter that Adams wrote to Congress arguing for a National Language Academy has received much attention in the literature, and thus will be examined here. Rather than arguing, as have many language education policy historians (Heath, 1976), that a rejection of the Centralist perspective demonstrates a tolerance-orientation, I will argue that the rejection of this perspective paved the road for a new system of social control.

Joel Barlow in *Prospectus of a National Institution to be Established in the United States* argued for the importance of the creation of a national institution as a way of counteracting the tendency for the development of regionalisms in a territory so vast. As he put it:

We find ourselves in possession of a country so vast as to lead the mind to anticipate a scene of social intercourse and interest unexampled in the experience of mankind. This territory presents and will present such a variety of productions natural and artificial, such as a diversity of connections abroad, and of manners, habits and propensities at home, as will create a strong tendency to diverge and separate the views of those who shall inhabit the different regions within our limits. It is most essential to the happiness of the people and to the preservation of their republican principles, that this tendency to a separation should be overbalanced by superior motives to a harmony of sentiment; that they may habitually feel that community of interest on which their federal system is founded. (Barlow, 1806, p. 4-5)

For Barlow, who was in dialogue with the emergent nationalist discourse arising in Europe, it was necessary to create unified national subjects to maintain harmony—especially in a

republican form of government without a centralized monarchy. One way to create national subjects was through a collaborative relationship between the government and academia. In reference to how this might work Barlow argued:

This desirable object is to be attained, not only by the operations of the government in its several departments, but by those of literature sciences, and arts. The liberal sciences are in their nature republican; and they delight in reciprocal communication; they cherish fraternal feelings, and lead to a freedom of intercourse, combined with the restraints of society, which contribute together to our improvement. (p. 4-5)

In short, what Barlow proposed was a unification of the national government and the academic studies of American scholars in the newly formed nation so that they could systematically construct a coherent American academic tradition as they simultaneously created a coherent American population.

Barlow emphasized the importance of creating a systematic approach to American literature:

Researches in literature, to which may be united those in morals, government and laws, are so vague in their nature, and have been so little methodized, as scarcely to have obtained the name of sciences. No man has denied the importance of these pursuits; though the English nation, from whom we have borrowed so many useful things, has not thought proper to give them that consistency and standing among the objects of laudable ambition, to which they are entitled. (p. 11)

According to Barlow, the study of literature was intrinsically linked to moral education.

Therefore, the nationalization of literature was a necessary component in the instilling of appropriate morals in the American populace. Though Barlow did not explicitly discuss the standardization of language, it was understood to be a part of this process of nationalizing literature (Reade, 1936). After all, the nationalization of literature required a standardization of language. Otherwise, it would be difficult to ascertain the “Americanness” of the national literature. While Barlow’s proposal never got through Congress, his actions throughout the rest of his life demonstrated the direction in which relations of power were moving and how nation-

state/colonial governmentality would function in the US context. Barlow spent much of his life as a writer working precisely toward the goal of creating a national identity through literature without the support of any centralized authority. This included his influential *The Vision of Columbus*, a long poem that provided a nationalist history of the origins of the United States and provided a vision of what the American people should be (Buel, 2011).

Whereas language was not explicitly treated in Barlow's work, it was the focus of the work of John Adams. Adams explicitly called for a national language academy to codify an American variety of English. In a letter to Congress in 1780, Adams called for the formation of a national society called "the American Academy for refining, improving, and ascertaining the English Language" modeled after the language academies of Spain and France. He believed that such an academy was necessary to systematically organize the perfect language that he argued was emerging simultaneously with the rise of democracy in the United States:

As eloquence is cultivated with more care in free republics than in other governments, it has been found by constant experience that such republics have produced the greatest purity, copiousness, perfect language. (cited in Crawford, 1992a, p. 31)

Utilizing sovereign power to impose language on the American people perhaps seemed the antithesis to democracy, especially since the European language academies were associated with monarchical control. However, Adams justified his stance by appealing to Congress to take the lead:

The honor of forming the first public institution for refining, correcting, improving, and ascertaining the English language, I hope is reserved for congress; they have every motive that can possibly influence a public assembly to undertake it. (cited in Crawford, 1992a, p. 32)

In Adam's view, a decree from Congress would give the American Academy legitimacy in working on a project to codify a uniquely American English. Adams argued that this

standardization process would create a meritocratic system that created a level playing field for everybody:

It will have a happy effect upon the union and the States to have a public standard for all persons in every part of the continent to appeal to, both for the signification and pronunciation of the language. The constitutions of all the States in the Union are so democratical that eloquence will become the instrument for recommending men to their fellow-citizens, and the principal means of advancement through the various ranks and offices of society. (cited in Crawford, 1992a, p. 32)

He contrasts this systematically democratic approach with the haphazard approach taken by England in codifying the English language:

It is very remarkable, that although many learned and ingenious men in England have from age to age projected similar institutions for correcting and improving the English tongue, yet the government have never found time to interpose in any manner; so that to this day there is no grammar nor dictionary extant of the English language which has the last public authority. (cited in Crawford, 1992a, p. 31-32)

In short, unlike the lack of systematic planning of British English, which in his view led to corruptions in the language, Adams proposed that the American Academy would methodically perfect the language.

While many political leaders and scholars were interested in creating a unified American subject through a cohesive academic tradition and language Adams' proposal, similar did not gain much traction in the newly emerging nation. In particular, Heath (1976) argues that Adams' proposal was rejected because it was seen as too monarchist. Yet, this should not be seen as opening up space for less oppressive language policies. Instead, as was the case with Barlow, Adam's proposal should also be seen as a transitional text, which blended the sovereign power of monarchy with the newly emerging democratic principles of the European Enlightenment as reflected in the new American government. This was a moment when sovereign power coming from a centralized source was no longer seen as in line with the vision of the future. Sovereignty would, therefore, have to be placed somewhere else. Both the Americanist and Universalist

perspective place this sovereignty in individual subjects as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

Introducing the Americanist and Universalist Perspective

This section argues that rather than demonstrating linguistic tolerance, a rejection of the Centralist perspective was in actuality part of the process of the development of a new form of governance. It will argue that this nation-state/colonial governmentality was in many ways more insidious than the previous form of monarchical governance in that the source of control was argued to be within individual subjects and the “will of the people.” For analytic purposes, each of these discourses will be explored separately. However, I will also demonstrate the dialogic nature of these discourses, utilizing Bakhtin’s concept of *heteroglossia* described above.

Therefore, none of these documents are “pure” in the sense that, as with all writing, they reflect a blending of discourses. At certain points, I will illustrate some of this blending of discourses to demonstrate that while at times each of these perspectives is expressed as oppositional, in many ways they are mutually constitutive, that is, each of the discourses is only made possible through a dialogic relationship with the other.

Before looking at each of the discursive regimes in more detail, it is necessary to briefly lay out each of these regimes and the documents that I will use to illustrate the power relations embedded within them. The *Americanist perspective* argues that language policy should emerge from the general use of the newly created American people. In order to unpack the epistemological orientation of this perspective, I will provide a reading of the work of Noah Webster, the most prominent supporter of this position through the framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality. Noah Webster, most famous for the creation of Webster’s dictionary was also well known for the publication of a speller that was used in many schools

until well into the mid-1800s (Kendall, 2010). In order to closely examine the discursive regime in which his work was situated, I will examine below a series of his lectures on language entitled *Dissertations on the English Language*, along with a few other short writing pieces including the preface to his speller and his dictionary. At the surface level this perspective agrees with the Centralist perspective in that they both advocate the creation of a uniquely American language. However, using the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality, it is possible to identify a much broader shift in relations of power-knowledge and a particular and oppressive molding of an American subject.

The Universalist perspective argues that language policy should emerge from the best scientific principles available with the ultimate goal being the creation of a pure and perfect language. Unlike the Americanist perspective, which argues for a uniqueness of the American people, the Universalist perspective argues for the universality of human nature and a universal path to progress for all human societies. Two prominent thinkers that will be used to illustrate this perspective are William Thornton, most famous for designing the capitol building in Washington, D.C., and John Pickering, an eminent philologist of the time period (Lepore, 2002). Like with Webster, I will use the nation-state/colonial framework to read key texts written by each of these authors. To this effect, I will analyze Thornton's *Cadmus: Or a Treatise on the Elements of Written Language*, which argues for the creation of a universal English alphabet that would facilitate the teaching of a universal English. In addition, Pickering's *Vocabulary, or Collection of Words and Phrases which have been supposed to be Peculiar to the United States*, where he critiques Webster's Americanist perspective, and his *An Essay on a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America*, where he lays out a rationale for creating a universal Indian alphabet will be examined. I will show that while this discursive

regime superficially appears to disagree with the Americanist perspective in that it approaches language as a tool for universal communication as opposed to as a mark of a national identity, it is actually embedded within the same relations of power-knowledge. However, rather than creating subjects with a uniquely American identity, the Universalist perspective imposes a particular Eurocentric colonial lens on human nature that creates universal subjects.

Each of the perspectives, along with a brief description of its major argument and the corresponding documents associated with that perspective are also laid out in Table 1 below.

Table 1: The Two Discursive Regimes

Name	Description	Associated Documents
Americanist	Advocated the formation of a uniquely American English through the codification of general usage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noah Webster (1789). <i>Dissertations on the English Language</i> • Noah Webster (1783). <i>The Original Blue Back Speller</i>. • Noah Webster (1828). <i>An American Dictionary of the English Language</i>.
Universalist	Advocated the formation of a perfect English based on scientific principles on the way toward the creation of a perfect universal language.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • William Thornton (1792). <i>Cadmus: Or, a Treatise on the Elements of Written Language</i> • John Pickering (1816). <i>Vocabulary, or Collection of Words and Phrases which have been supposed to be Peculiar to the United States</i>. • John Pickering (1820). <i>An Essay on a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America</i>.

The Americanist Perspective

While a national academy may not have been popular at a time of growing resistance to the sovereign power of European monarchies, the academic study of language was seen as a much more democratic way of codifying Standard American English. Noah Webster, the most prominent spokesperson for this position, laid out his view on the codification of American English in *Dissertations on the English Language*, which is based on a series of lectures he conducted throughout the country. Reading this document— along with a few other key writings—through the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality will demonstrate that Webster’s vision of how to democratically codify a uniquely American language placed sovereignty in the hands of a very select group of Americans who were deemed full citizens. His framework rejected the language practices of the lower classes and depicted them as corrupt and full of foreign impurities. This reflected the state racism that seeks to defend society against the impurities of the Other, which is an integral part of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

In his five dissertations, Webster lays out his rationale for codifying a uniquely American English along with his proposal for a supposedly objective process on how to go about doing this. As he argued:

My motives for the undertaking were not local or personal; my enquiries are for truth, and my criticisms, it is hoped, will be marked with candor. (Webster, 1789, p. 39)

This search for an objectively true American English was contrasted with the monarchical tendencies associated with the hierarchies of European feudalism in a discussion over who had the right to decide on appropriate speech:

Yet this right is often assumed by individuals, who dictate to a nation the rules of speaking, with the same imperiousness as a tyrant gives laws to his vassals. (p. 167)

In short, Webster criticized the societal hierarchies that were reproduced by top-down approaches to language policy. Interestingly, Webster also implicates himself within this hierarchy in the preface to the dissertations:

With respect to many words, I have been in the same uncertainty; and used formerly to change my pronunciation, in conformity to the practice of the last man of superior learning whom I hear speak.” (Webster, 1789, p. x)

Therefore, the goal of the dissertations was to resist these societal hierarchies and create an objective and democratic way of codifying an American English.

In contrast to allowing language to be controlled by a centralized authority within a hierarchical society, Webster argued for the codification of the language of general use:

It is not the particular whim of such men that constitutes *custom*; but the common practice of a nation, which is conformed to their *general* ideas of propriety. (p. 168-169)

In Webster’s view, American English should not be codified at the whim of privileged men, but should instead be designed based on how the American people actually use language in their everyday lives. Therefore, sovereign power was shifted from a centralized institution, what the Centralist perspective advocated, to the American people.

Before getting into how Webster proposed to codify the true language of the American people, it is necessary to examine why Webster thought that a uniquely American English was necessary. As he argued in the conclusion of Dissertation III:

Customs, habits, and *language*, as well as government should be national. America should have her *own* distinct from all the world. Such is the policy of other nations, and such must be *our* policy, before the states can be either independent or respectable. To copy foreign manners implicitly, is to reverse the order of things, and begin our political existence with the corruptions and vices which have marked the declining glories of other republics (Webster, 1789 p. 179, italics in original).

Using the discourse of nationalism emerging during this time period in Europe (see previous chapter), Webster makes the case for a uniquely American identity articulated through a uniquely

American language. As he notes: “our political harmony is therefore concerned in a uniformity of language” (p. 20).

He elaborated on this point in the preface to his now famous dictionary written in 1828:

Language is the expression of ideas; and if the people of one country cannot preserve an identity of ideas, they cannot retain an identity of language...But the principal differences between the people of this country and all others, arise from different forms of government, different laws, institutions, and customs. Thus the practice of hawking and hunting, the institution of heraldry, and the feudal system of England originated terms which formed, and some of which now form, a necessary part of the language of that country; but in the United States, many of these terms are no part of our present language,—and they cannot be, for the things which they express do not exist in this country...On the other hand, the institutions in this country which are new and peculiar, give rise to new terms or to new applications of old and which will not be inserted in their dictionaries, unless copied from ours (cited in Rollins, 1989, p. 105).

In short, Webster saw language as intrinsically part of a people. In particular, he connected language to space arguing for the need to develop a new language to describe new environments and concepts particular to the US context. Webster believed that the newness of the land, along with the newness of the governing structure, made it necessary to create a new American language to reflect this new reality. This language, reflecting the superiority of American ideals, would be a language that was superior to all other languages.

Similar to other nationalists such as Herder in Germany, Webster saw the codification of an American language as a necessary part of constructing a unified American population. In addition, just as Herder sought to erase differences within the language practices of Germanic people, Webster sought to erase differences within the language practices of American people. In the introduction to his speller he lamented the linguistic difference apparent in the country:

Thus the pronunciation of our language tho' the most important and difficult part of grammar, is left to parents and nurses—to ignorance and caprice—to custom, accident or nothing—Nay to something worse to coxcombs, who have a large share in directing the polite taste of pronunciation, which of course is as vicious as that of any other class of people. And while this is the case, every person will claim a right to pronounce most

agreeably to his own fancy, and the language will be exposed to perpetual fluctuation. (cited in Rollins, 1989, p. 71-72)

According to Webster, unless something was done to systematize the American language, the country would revert to chaos. This could only be prevented through the formation of a standardized American language connected to a homogenous American identity—an idea that lies at the core of the Americanist perspective.

In order to make the argument for a national American identity, Webster, like Herder, reproduced a primordial story. He traced the origins of American English to the Saxons, which he describes as “the tribe that conquered England, and introduced a language and a form of government, the principles of which are still existent among their descendants, both in English and America” (Webster, 1789, p. 54). He made the case that American English was a more pure form of English than British English and should be treated as superior. He argued that “style and taste, in all nations, undergo the same revolutions, the same progress from purity to corruption, as manners and government; and in England the pronunciation of the language has shared the same fate” (Webster, 1789, p. 177). In short, the British Empire was in decline and so was its language. Webster concluded from this that “Great Britain, whose children we are, and whose language we speak, should no longer be *our* standard; for the taste of her writers is already corrupted and her language on the decline” (Webster, 1789, p. 20).

Whereas in Webster’s view the British Empire and language were on an inevitable decline, he noted that the United States was leading the way into the future, yet was also more closely aligned with the primordial origins of the English language. He argued that “in many instances the Americans still adhere to the analogies of the language, where the English have infringed them. So far therefore as the regularity of construction is concerned, we ought to retain

our own practice and be our own standards” (Webster, 1789, p. 129). He elaborated on this point later in his writing:

On examining the language, and comparing the practice of speaking among the yeomanry of this country, with the stile of Shakespear [sic] and Addison, I am constrained to declare that the people of America, in particular, the English descendants, speak the most *pure English* now known in the world” (Webster, 1789, p. 288).

In short, Webster simultaneously positioned the United States as more in touch with the perfection of the past, while also more in a position to lead the way forward than Great Britain, thus justifying the codification of the superior American language to spread the higher American ideals across the globe.

Though Webster held imperialist desires in his dream of using American English to spread American ideals around the world, he saw his role as a grammarian as simply to scientifically describe the general practice of the nation. He framed his approach within a democratic discourse that sought to allow the people to lead the way, a role he laid out for himself in the preface to his dissertations:

The principal business of a compiler of a grammar is, to separate *local* or *partial* practice from the *general custom* of speaking; and reject what is *local*, whether it exists among the great or the small, the learned or ignorant, and recommend what is universal, or general, which conforms to the analogies of structure in a language...It is our business to find what the English language *is*, and not, how it *might have been made*. (Webster, 1789, p. ix)

In short, Webster saw his role as simply separating the impurities or corruptions of local practice from the general custom of national subjects. He elaborated on this view in the fourth dissertation:

Grammar should be formed on *practice*; for practice determines what a language is. I do not mean a *local* practice, for this would subject us to perpetual variety and instability; but *national* or *general* practice. The latter, it has been remarked, is the standard of propriety, to which all local idioms and private opinions should be sacrificed. The business of a grammarian is not to examin [sic] whether or not national practice is founded on philosophical principles; but to *ascertain* the national practice, that the

learner may be able to weed from his own local peculiarities or false idioms. (Webster, 1789, p. 204)

In Webster's view this identification of the national or general practice was not only an objective and necessary process in the creation of national subjects, but also inherently democratic:

Language is a democratical state, where all the learning in the world does not warrant a citizen to supersede a received custom, till he has convinced the whole nation that this custom is a mistake. (Webster, 1789, p. 167)

Therefore, according to the Americanist perspective, using the general practice of the American people as the basis of standardization would make the language more democratic and less oppressive. Codifying the general practice is seen as democratic because it places all people on an equal playing field in terms of deciding what appropriate use of language is. No longer do American citizens have to conform to language rules imposed from above. Instead, their language is created through their collective action and can only be changed through collective action as part of democratic deliberation. Webster (1789) elaborates on this point and explicitly connects it to the creation of a strong nation:

The authority of individuals is always liable to be called in question—but the unanimous consent of a nation, and a fixed principle interwoven with the very construction of a language, coeval and coextensive with it, are like the common laws of a land, or the immutable rules of morality, the propriety of which every man, however refractory, is forced to acknowledge, and to which most men will readily submit. (p. 29)

It is here where Webster's nationalist discourse is most pronounced. The United States was a newly democratically-formed nation that needed to speak in a united democratic voice. An individual declaring what American English should be could be questioned, but the unified voice of the national American population could not be. The people would decide what American English would and would not be.

While this democratic discourse sounds egalitarian and outside of relations of power, as seen in the previous chapter, the creation of standard national languages was integral to the

development of new relations of power-knowledge under nation-state/colonial governmentality. Taking a closer look demonstrates the power relations embedded within this process of developing a national language. For one, this process of separating the general custom from impurities was for Webster an objective process to be conducted only by a trained scholar:

This language is the inheritance which the Americans have received from the British parents. To cultivate and adorn it, is a task reserved for men who shall understand the connection between language and logic, and form an adequate idea of the influence which a uniformity of speech may have on national attachments. (p. 18)

Therefore, it was not the American people per se who were deciding what American English was, but instead one American citizen with a particular understanding of language and language practices that would decide—in this case Noah Webster.

This particular American citizen also had a preference for the language practices of a particular type of American. Webster lauded the American yeomanry, educated white male property owning farmers, and placed them at the center of the national practice he hoped to uncover and document. In contrasting the American yeomanry with their British counterparts he noted:

When I speak of the American yeomanry, the latter are not to be compared to the illiterate peasantry of their own country. The yeomanry of this country consist of substantial independent freeholders, masters of their own persons and lords of their own soil. These men have considerable education. They not only learn to read, write and keep accounts; but a vast proportion of them read newspapers every week, and besides the Bible, which is found in all families, they read the best English sermons and treatises upon religion, ethics, geography, and history. (Webster, 1978, p. 288-289)

He contrasts this American yeomanry with the masses who lacking the strength and intelligence of this select group of people mindlessly conform to whatever they are told to do:

People are led by imitation; and when those in high life embrace a singularity, the multitude, who are unacquainted with its principles or extent, will attempt to imitate the novelty, and probably carry it much farther than was ever intended. (p. 158)

In other words, only the American yeomanry was seen by Webster as sophisticated enough to take advantage of the freedom bestowed on them by the newly formed American democracy; therefore, only their language practices counted as part of the general practice of the American people.

In addition to these vast qualifications that those who represent the “general practice” of the nation must possess, Webster also added the importance of the maintenance of pure language through the avoidance of interacting with foreigners:

But the peculiar traits of national character are found in the internal parts of a country, among the class of people who do not travel, nor are tempted by an intercourse with foreigners, to quit their own habits. (Webster, 1978, p. 108)

He elaborated on this idea of the superiority of the language practices of those who avoided interactions with foreigners later in his lecture:

I do not remember to have heard once in the course of my life, an improper use of the verbs *will* and *shall*, among the unmixed English descendants in the eastern states. (p. 240)

Webster saw a “pure” English uninfluenced by foreigners as the true American English that people would naturally speak were it not for foreign corruptions:

Ask any plain countryman, whose pronunciation has not been exposed to corruption by mingling with foreigners, how he pronounces the letters, *t*, *r*, *u*, *th*, and he will not sound *u* like *eu*, nor *oo*, but will express the real primitive English *u*. Nay, if people wish to make an accurate trial, let them direct any child of seven years old, who has no previous instruction respecting the matter to pronounce the words *suit*, *tumult*, *due*, &c. and they will thus ascertain the true sound of the letter. (p. 152)

Therefore, according to Webster’s argument, the more one mixed with foreigners, the more contaminated one’s language became. This is very much in line with the state racism associated with the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality laid out in the previous chapter. In other words, what is described by Webster as the “general practice” of the United States is in actuality normalized the language practices of certain American yeomanry who have a certain type of

education, certain religious beliefs, certain family values, and few if any interaction with “foreigners” as representative of the entire nation. In order to be a true American one had to ideally have the experiences of this select group of people.

However, if one did not have their experiences, one could still become a true American by mimicking their behaviors. Webster saw a key role for school in the process of making everybody a true American in the image of his particular representation of certain elite American yeomanry:

The body of the people, governed by habit, will still retain their respective peculiarities of speaking; and for want of schools and proper books, fall into many inaccuracies, which, incorporating with the language of the state where they live, may imperceptibly corrupt the national language. Nothing but the establishment of schools and some uniformity in the use of books, can annihilate differences in speaking and preserve the purity of the American tongue. (Webster, 1789, p. 19)

In fact, Webster made it his mission to bring this standardized language into schools first as a school teacher and then through the creation of his speller, which he described in the introduction as “designed to introduce uniformity and accuracy of pronunciation into common schools” (cited in Rollins, 1989, p. 72). In short, schools were an integral part of the implementation of Webster’s standardization campaign—a campaign that sought to discipline subjects into articulating an American identity through language, while simultaneously constructing a united American population through biopolitics.

The goal of Webster’s project was to create American subjects that both speak in the manner of a selected group of people and to use words in the same way that this group of people defined them. In other words, it was not simply a process of getting everybody to pronounce words the same way, but also to associate the same meanings to words such as “democracy” that the elites associated with them. In an 1848 edition of Webster’s dictionary, published just eight years after Webster’s death, democracy was defined as “government by the people; a form of

government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of the people collectively, or in which the people exercise the power of legislation” (p. 278). By then, the American people had been constructed in a way that marginalized all of those who did not fit into the language practices of the elites. It was, therefore, possible to both state that a democracy was a government of the people, while simultaneously imposing a particular way of speaking on all people who wanted to be considered authentically American.

In other words, what the Centralists failed to do was accomplished by the Americanists by shifting sovereign power from a centralized authority to the individual subject. Language was now a matter of individual choice organically emerging from the language practices of “the people.” If you did not conform to these language practices, then you were not part of “the people” and were excluded from the democratic process. You could only become part of the process by “voluntarily” learning the rules of the game. If you weren’t aware of what the rules were, then you must learn the rules in schools or through consulting a dictionary when in doubt.

Others would eventually take up Webster’s Americanist perspective and successfully do what he was not entirely able to do in his time—create an allegedly pure language deemed free of any foreign corruptions—that matched the spirit of the American people. Bonfiglio (2002) describes the development of Standard American English and how it was codified in opposition to the immigrant populations arriving in the United States in the 1800s. According to his analysis, in the process of creating a separate identity from Great Britain, the United States used the same language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality. In particular, Western speech patterns were eventually codified as Standard American English because of the xenophobic and racist movements of the early twentieth century that saw New York and other large urban areas on the east coast as polluted with immigrants. As Bonfiglio

(2002) describes it: “the discourse of opposition to New York consistently involves notions of rural idyllic purity, racial purity and authenticity” (p. 138). In short, what we currently consider Standard American English was codified as a form of state racism that was part of nation-state/colonial governmentality and is a direct outcome of the Americanist perspective as articulated by Noah Webster in his dictionary:

It is the business of *Americans* to select the wisdom of all nations, as the basis of her contributions—to avoid their errors—to prevent the introduction of foreign vices and corruptions and check the career of her own—to promote virtue and patriotism,—to embellish and improve the sciences,—to diffuse an uniformity and purity of *language*,—to add superior dignity to this infant Empire and to human nature (cited in Rollins, 1989, p. 79).

Webster sought to create a perfect American language free of impurities and cleansed of all corruptions—a process that he connected with the importance of creating a strong American nation and creating an American Empire.

Yet, while Webster’s work certainly was primarily Americanist, his work was also in dialogic relationship with the two other perspectives and could only exist in conversation with the other two. For example, he was a founding member of the Philological Society, which was modeled after the European language academies and sought to create a federal American language. However, the efforts of the Philological Society shared the same fate as those of Barlow and Adams and quickly disappeared (Reade, 1936). There is also a seemingly contradictory Universalist thread in Webster’s work that treats language as a tool for universal communication, as opposed to as a badge of national identity and strength. For example, in his first dissertation he lays out his goal as follows:

My design, in these dissertations, is critically to investigate the rules of pronunciation in our language; to examin (sic) the past and present practice of the English, both in the pronunciation of words and construction of sentences; to exhibit the principal differences between the practices in English and America, and the differences in the several parts of America, with a view to reconcile them on the principles of *universal practice* and *analogy*. (Webster, 1789, p. 37)

Here, rather than attempting to create an American language based on the general practice of the American people, Webster seems to be arguing that his ultimate purpose was to create a universal English that would be pure of both impurities in England and the United States. He made a similar point later on in the same dissertation:

We must search for such principles of analogy as still exist in its construction, and make them the pillars of a regular system. Where such principles cannot be found, let us examin (sic) the opinions of the learned, and the practice of the nations which speak the pure English, that we may determine by the weight of authority, the *common law* of language, those questions which do not come within any established rules. (Webster, 1789, p. 78-79)

Again, rather than appealing to the general practice of the American people, Webster appealed to universal (or what he calls common) laws of language in creating a pure English free of corruptions.

Similarly, despite appeal to a unique American identity, there was evidence of the emergence of a universal Euro-American identity that Webster saw in what he claimed to be commonalities between the European languages:

In the existing languages of Europe, there are many words evidently the same; the orthography and pronunciation do not exactly coincide in all the countries where they are used; yet the resemblance is obvious in these particulars; and with respect to their *meaning*, there is such an affinity, as to demonstrate that the nations, in whose languages they are found, all sprung from the same parents. (Webster, 1789, p. 44)

He contrasted this seeming commonality between European languages with the languages of “rude nations”:

That the nouns and verbs are the only parts of speech, absolutely necessary for a communication of ideas among rude nations, will be obvious to any person who considers their manner of life, and the small number of their necessary ideas. (Webster, 1789, p. 184)

Therefore, unlike the sophisticated languages of Europe, the language of the racial Other was represented as simple and unable to express complex ideas. This could be said to be a precursor

to the emergence of whiteness as an ideological construction which created a normalized White race in opposition to the racial Other (Rodediger, 1999). As we will see below this Eurocentric framing of the issues is also present in the Universalist perspective.

Therefore, Noah Webster's work was in dialogic relationship with the Universalist language ideology that was influenced by the emerging Enlightenment thinking of the time in regards to the universality of human nature; yet, in the end, his work favored the more provincial and explicitly nationalistic idea of an American language as an expression of a uniquely American people. Others in conversation with Webster would favor a more Universalist approach, which, though at times was positioned in direct opposition to the Americanist perspective, was in fact equally complicit in the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

The Universalist Perspective

While the idea of language expressing a national identity was arising in US national discourse, another language ideology that described the desirability of creating a perfect language of universal communication was also taking shape. Lepore (2002) describes the growing interest of language among European Enlightenment thinkers in pursuit of the perfect society:

Enlightenment thinkers also took up the cause, believing that if the Enlightenment promised to usher in a new age free from disease and intolerance, it also promised a world free of base divisions like those of language, divisions that could only be overcome by first establishing a universal alphabet. (p. 50)

Many European Enlightenment thinkers had great hope for the future where they envisioned all of humanity united as one people. Therefore, unlike the Americanist perspective which sought to create unique American subjects with a uniquely American identity, the Universalist perspective sought to create universal subjects based on universal scientific principles. Two American

thinkers whose work reflect this perspective are William Thornton and John Pickering. A close reading of texts written by each of these thinkers demonstrates two interrelated themes in regards to universality: (1) the universality of human nature and progress, and (2) the importance of using science to develop a perfect and universal language of communication.

The first theme is the universality of human nature. Many European Enlightenment thinkers challenged the idea that human beings were inherently different and instead argued for a common underlying essence that united all of humanity. Universalists saw language as part of this universality of human nature. Thornton (1793) describes language as one aspect of what it means to be human:

Language appears common to nature. Almost every beast and bird and insect conveys its feelings by sounds uttered in different ways. The language of man is however the most extensive: his ideas are conveyed by words formed either by single or connected sounds; these sounds are produced by modifications of the voice and breath. Every modification is called a letter, which, represented by a mark, and the marks known by the eye to be representatives of the sounds, an idea is as intelligibly conveyed by the marks as by the sounds. (p. 264)

In Thornton's view, "the language of man" has certain characteristics that are uniquely human and separate humanity from other living creatures. This idea of the universality of language went hand-in-hand with the idea that all human language was moving in the same direction toward "civilization" based on the scientific principles of the European Enlightenment. In short, utilizing the evolutionary model of human development that was integral to the European Enlightenment, some societies were seen as further on the path toward the perfect human society, while others were closer to the animalistic origins of humanity. This statement is very much in line with the state racism of nation-state/colonial governmentality that normalizes the epistemology of the European bourgeoisie and seeks to impose this epistemology on the entire world. However, in this case, rather than explicitly defending the nation-state against the foreign unclean Other from

inside its borders, there is a shift toward the protection of humanity from the animalistic savages outside of the borders of the nation-state and outside of a European epistemological framework. In other words, while the Americanist perspective most closely aligned with a nation-state ideology, the Universalist perspective most closely aligned with a colonizing ideology—thus both discursive regimes coalesce into the creation of nation-state/colonial governmentality.

The Universalist perspective also relied on a primordial story to justify its position. However, rather than having a primordial story that traces the origins of the American people and the American language, this Universalist view of language had a primordial story as to the origin of all languages. Thornton (1793) described the origins of language as follows:

The languages acquired by imitation are certainly most natural and expressive, and I am confident that the language of man, was originally formed by imitating the objects of nature; and the names of many animals were given by imitating the voice of the individual: we find this even at present in all languages, but particularly in the less refined. Man, in a savage state, imitates birds and beasts to decoy them, and by imitation alone he forms a very extensive scale of sounds. (p. 296)

The Universalist perspective tried to better understand the origin of language, through the study of those seen as objectively most primitive and outside of European civilization. In taking up this goal in his study of “Indian languages” Pickering (1820) argued:

We are beginning to inquire into the history and character of our degraded fellow-men of this continent, and to investigate the wonderful structure of their various dialects; which, indeed, to the philosophical inquirer, will now perhaps be found to be the most curious and interesting of all the languages of man. (p. 3)

He connects this goal to the larger scientific field coming into prominence as a product of the European Enlightenment:

And as naturalists are now investigating the structure and history of the globe itself, by collecting fragments of the component parts, from the summits of its mountains to the depths of its seas, so we must study the constitution and history of its possessor, man, by collecting specimens of him, especially of his distinguishing characterisck, language, from the most remote and barbarous, as well as the most refined portions of the race. (Pickering, 1820, p. 8)

In other words, the Universalist perspective was interested in systematically studying the language of the savage Other as a way to better understand human nature in its most “natural” state. This perspective was in conversation with the academic study of Indigenous languages worldwide as part of European colonization (Errington, 2001). Lepore (2002) elaborates on this point demonstrating its relationship with not just the Universalist perspective, but also the Americanist perspective:

Under the influence, in part, of Rousseau’s theory about the nobility of savages and, in part, of American’s quest for a national character and national heritage, many Americans came to embrace Indian languages and, most especially, Indian oratory. Indeed, the celebration of Indian poetic eloquence became a kind of American fetish. (p. 69)

Therefore, the study of the Indigenous populations who were the original inhabitants of the land not only provided Universalists with the opportunity to understand the origins of language, but simultaneously provided the opportunity of constructing an American identity in opposition to Europe. This production of an American identity was used to distinguish the American culture from both European civilizations and the racial Other and justify American superiority. In short, even though the Universalist perspective was interested in creating languages of universal communication, there were still traces of American superiority in this universalizing picture.

The second theme that emerges from this perspective is the faith in the utilization of scientific principles in both the study of the language practices of Europeans and Americans, as well as the language practices of the racial Other. Similar to the Americanist perspective, both Pickering and Thornton were wary of the misinformed elitism they saw in contemporary work on the study of the English language and sought to replace this elitism with the universal and objective principles of science. As Pickering (1816) argued:

In this country, as in the case of England, we have thirsty reformers and presumptuous sciolists who would unsettle the whole of our admirable language for the purpose of making it conform to their whimsical notions of propriety. (p. 4)

For Pickering, arbitrary decrees made by elite reformers were not an acceptable way of approaching language policy. Thornton (1793) seconds this claim:

I am sorry that the vague opinion of an established character can impose upon the generality of men, and I lament how much sooner the errors of the great are embraced than the truths of the little. (p. 270)

Therefore, the Universalist perspective agreed with the Americanist perspective in its suspicion of a sovereign power regulating appropriate speech.

However, where the Universalists differ from the Americanist perspective is in the ultimate goal of the codification of languages. For the Americanists the goal was to create a uniquely American citizen, while for the Universalist it was to create a more cosmopolitan subject who could effectively communicate with the British. According to the Universalist perspective, the purpose of critiquing sovereign power was not to replace it with the general practice of the American people, but instead to replace it with an objective study of language based on scientific principles in the pursuit of creating the perfect language. In a direct response to the Americanist perspective of Noah Webster, Pickering (1816) defended the construction of a universal perfect English language as opposed to a uniquely American language:

It is true, indeed, that our countrymen speak and write in a dialect of English, which will be understood in the United States, but if they are ambitious of having their works read by Englishmen as well as by Americans, they must write in a language that Englishmen can read with pleasure.” (p. 4)

In Pickering’s view, the desirability of continuing to exchange ideas with the British justified the codifying of a universal English as opposed to an American language. He connected this need to communicate not just to economics but also to cultural factors:

To say nothing of the facilities afforded by a common language in the ordinary intercourse of business, it should not be forgotten, that our religion and our laws are studied in the language of the nation, from which we are descended; and, with the loss of the language, we should finally suffer the loss of those peculiar advantages, which we

now derive from the investigations of the jurists and divines of that country. (Pickering, 1816, p. 5)

According to Pickering, taking Webster's vision to its obvious conclusion would eventually make it impossible for Americans to communicate with the British, creating a barrier to the exchange of ideas that were a vital part of the European Enlightenment. Pickering, therefore, supported the creation of a perfect English that eliminated the corruptions of both the English spoken in England and the English spoken in the United States. Whereas Webster argued for the systematic documentation of the objectively true American dialect, Pickering favored the systematic documentation of the objectively true English language that related less to national borders and more to scientific principles.

While Webster saw the American dialect as superior to British English, and sought to scientifically codify this dialect, Pickering did not believe that the American dialect was equivalent to perfect English:

Although it is agreed, that there is greater uniformity of dialect throughout the United States than is to be found throughout England; yet none of our countrymen, not even those who are most zealous in supporting what they imagine to be the honour of the American character, will contend, that we have not in some instances departed from the standard of the language. (Pickering, 1816, p. 5)

In Pickering's view, the American dialect of English while more uniform than that of Great Britain was not necessarily closer to perfection than British English. Pickering used an ideology of linguistic decay to justify his position:

Our greatest danger now is, that we shall continue to use antiquated words, which were brought to this country by our forefathers nearly two centuries ago; and that we shall affix a new signification to words, which are still used in that country solely in their original sense. Words of these descriptions have long formed a part of the language, we are not led to critically examine the authority on which their different significations rest; but those which are entirely new, like strangers on their first appearance, immediately attract our attention, and induce us to inquire into their pretensions to the rank they claim. (Pickering, 1816, p. 10)

Pickering, therefore, saw a movement further and further away from the pure English language as society continued to evolve and implicated both British English and American English in this decaying process:

Upon the impartial consideration of the subject, therefore, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion, that although the language of the United States has perhaps changed less than might have been expected, when we re-consider how many years have elapsed since our ancestors brought it from England; yet it has in so many instances departed from the English standard, that our scholars should lose no time in endeavoring to restore it to its purity, and to prevent future corruption. (Pickering, 1816, p. 8)

In short, in order to prevent the decay of the English language, American scholars had to work with their British colleagues to remove corruption from both of their language practices, in order to develop a perfect English language.

The question remained as to what the process would be for devising this perfect English language. Pickering's solution was to systematically study the writing of both British and American authors who were deemed evolutionarily superior to those of lower classes. As he describes it:

As a general rule also, we should undoubtedly avoid those words which are noticed by English authors of reputation, as expressions with which they are unacquainted; for although we might produce some English authority for such words, yet the very circumstance of their being thus noticed by well educated Englishmen, is a proof that they are not in use at this day in England, and, of course ought not to be used elsewhere by those who would speak correct English. (Pickering, 1816, p. 9)

In Pickering's view, the systematic study of these "standard authors" should be the basis of scientifically identifying the rules of Standard English:

Such standard authors, therefore, should be made the foundation of our English; but as our language, like all others, is constantly though slowly changing, we should also, in order to perfect our style, as we advance to mature age, study those authors of our own time, who have made the older writers their models. (Pickering, 1816, p. 11)

For Pickering, the learned community took the place of Webster's American yeomanry as the source of perfect English free of corruptions, though in his view this perfect English was not

uniquely American but instead a project of scholars in both nations. He argued that it was only through the consensus of this group that any changes to the language could be enacted:

But unless those, who are the final arbiters in the case, that is, the body of the learned and polite of this whole community, wherever they may be, shall sanction such new terms it will be presumptuous in the authors of them to attempt to force them into general use. (Pickering, 1816, p. 10)

For Webster, codifying American English based on general practice of the American yeomanry would allow for the true nature of the American people to be expressed and prevent people from arbitrarily changing the language on a whim. Similarly, for Pickering, codifying the general practice of the educated class of both English and the United States would allow for the true nature of English to emerge and prevent people from changing the language without the consent of other scholars. Yet, these seemingly democratic principles reveal ideologies of coercion. For the Americanist perspective the true American citizen must conform to the language practices of the American yeomanry, while for the Universalist perspective the true cosmopolitan English-speaking citizen must conform to the language practices of educated White male writers. Therefore, while positioning his work as based on science, Pickering's ideas on how to systematically create the perfect language were very much in line with the Americanist perspective.

In addition, as with the Americanist perspective Pickering was also critical of foreign influences and saw this as a potential barrier to the pursuit of a pure English:

But some of the greatest pests of speech in this country, as in England also, is the frequency of translation. Several of the corruptions, which English critics have censured in our writings, are mere Gallicisms; and unless the license of translators is checked their idleness and ignorance will reduce us to babble a dialect of France. (Pickering, 1816, p. 4)

This demonstrates that both Webster's explicitly nationalist discourse and Pickering's more scientific discourse both sought to defend the language and society from the pollution of

foreigners. In short, whether utilizing an explicitly nationalist discourse or an explicitly scientific discourse, the underlying ideology was the same. Therefore, regardless of whether one took an Americanist or Universalist perspective, the state racism of nation-state/colonial governmentality was present.

Developing an universal orthography based on scientific principles was also integral to the Universalist perspective. For example, Thornton's ideas on how to scientifically create a perfect English centered on eliminating the traditional Roman alphabet and putting in its place a simpler, more organized, and more systematic language. However, he noted the impracticality of such a proposition and argued instead for a reform of this alphabet so that each letter only had one pronunciation:

Were we to go as far as common sense would direct, and lay aside the Roman alphabet, which is exceedingly complex, adopting one that might be reduced to such simplicity, as to require only one fourth of the time to write the same matter, we must first fix all the sounds, by making for each language a correspondent table in distinct columns, then adapt the simplicity of the character, as much as possible, to the frequency of the sound in the different languages. (Thornton, 1793, p. 266)

His reformed alphabet included thirty letters, each with a unique sound. While this may sound very similar to the Centralist perspective in that it is a top-down approach from above, Thornton positioned his work in opposition to the French Language Academy in that the French Academy was more interested in maintaining the status quo, while he was attempting to use scientific principles to move toward a perfect language. Therefore, in Thornton's view the sovereignty of dictating an appropriate language is given to those trained in the scientific study of language.

Thornton saw many advantages to changing the alphabet as part of this purification process. In particular he emphasized that this universal English alphabet would facilitate correct usage among all people:

It will be impossible to write incorrectly whatever is heard in any language, containing only these letters; and as impossible to read incorrectly any language written in these

characters; for, by this method, the orthography and orthoepy determine each other; and, if the orthography of language were to be corrected, the pronunciation of the scholar, would, by reading alone, be perfectly attained by the peasant and the foreigner; destroying this, *in most effectual manner*, all vulgar and local dialects, and fitting even for oratory, every man of good capacity and utterance. (Thornton, 1793, p. 279)

As with the Americanist perspective of Webster, Thornton specifically saw his proposal as being useful in educating the lower classes and foreigners in the correct pronunciation of English. He elaborated on the role of education in this process of correcting the pronunciation among poor people, and children:

Children, as well as all the poorer classes of people, would learn to read in so short a time, and with so little trouble, having only to acquire the thirty letters, *that this alone ought to silence all the objections that can be brought*, and, particularly with the foregoing reasons, must be deemed more than *equivalent to the confusion and perplexity of such an alteration*. (Thornton, 1793, p. 273, italics in original)

He also described how he saw this as facilitating the language learning of foreigners:

Foreigners would, with the assistance of books alone, be able to learn the language in their closets, when they could not have the benefit of masters; and would be able to converse through the medium of books, which at present are of no service whatever, in learning to speak a language. (Thornton, 1793, p. 272)

He concludes that “dialects would be utterly destroyed, both among foreigners and peasants” (Thornton, 1793, p. 273). In short, a universal English alphabet would eliminate all language variation and mold everybody into speakers of a universal English free of corruptions and impurities.

While Thornton explored how a universal English alphabet would facilitate the teaching of the scientifically correct form of English (with the expressed goal of eventually having a universal Alphabet that would include all languages), Pickering was more interested in exploring the creation of a universal alphabet for so-called “Indian languages.” Similar to Thornton’s argument justifying a universal English alphabet, Pickering argued for a universal alphabet for “Indian languages” to facilitate a more efficient exchange of ideas. In particular, he noted

communication barriers among scholars of “Indian languages” as having a detrimental impact on their scientific study:

At the very commencement of my inquiries, however, I found my progress impeded by a capricious and ever varying orthography of the Indian languages, not only among the writers of different nations, but even among those of the same country. (Pickering, 1820, p. 5)

He attributed this barrier to communication as the lack of a uniform orthography for the “Indian languages” being studied:

The perplexity I felt from this uncertainty in our Indian orthography, which so much increases the labour of studies that are in themselves sufficiently dry and forbidding to most persons, led me to consider more particularly than I had ever done, the expediency of adopting a uniform orthography for the Indian, as well as other languages, which have no established written characters. (Pickering, 1820, p. 7)

In his view, the codification of a uniform orthography would not only facilitate communication but also improve the systematic study of these languages:

But, in order that we may successfully penetrate into this unexplored region of languages as barbarous and foreign to our mode of thinking, as the manners of the uncivilized people who use them, it is indispensable that we should adopt every practicable expedient to render our progress easy and pleasant. Now nothing is more clearly necessary at the very beginning, than some common and systematic method of writing them; whether our object is to enable the learned of other countries and our own to study and compare the numerous varieties of human speech with all that exactness, which is essential to accurate and useful results, or whether we confine ourselves to the more practical purpose of possessing the means of communication with the various tribes on our borders, either with a view to the common concerns of life or the diffusion of the principles of our religion among them. (Pickering, 1820, p. 9)

However, while for Thornton the purpose was to facilitate communication among speakers of the language in question, for Pickering the purpose of codifying a universal alphabet for “Indian languages” was to facilitate the academic study of Indigenous populations by European scholars, along with facilitating their evangelization:

As various nations of Europe have already published and will continue to publish books respecting the American Indians and their languages, either with a view to the information of the learned or to the propagation of the Christian religion, it is extremely

desirable, that such a common orthography as I have mentioned should be adopted. This would enable foreigners to use our books without difficulty, and, on the other hand, make their easy access to us; and it would enable the missionaries of our own and other countries (the benevolent Germans, for example, who have been so long engaged in this duty) to cooperate with the more effect in the great object of their common labours. (Pickering, 1820, p. 10)

In short, there was a double Othering process going on in this Universalist codification of “Indian language.” For one, the analysis of the languages was conducted through the colonizing lens of European academics who imposed their own understanding of the nature of language as part of colonial linguistics (Errington, 2001). Secondly, while Pickering did mention the role of evangelization, the primary concern from a Universalist perspective on the codification of an “Indian alphabet” was not to communicate with Indigenous populations, but rather to study them while excluding them from the conversation. This double Othering was part of the larger epistemological shift associated with the rise of the human sciences that began to treat the study of a mankind as an objective and scientific pursuit of knowledge (Spivak, 1989). In other words, Pickering’s attempt at scientifically studying “Indian languages” and creating a seemingly universal way of discussing these languages was in reality part of the silencing of Indigenous populations through an interpretation of their language practices through a Eurocentric colonial lens.

Yet, within this silencing process Pickering also saw an opportunity to experiment with the creation of a perfect language without the hassles of having to deal with the politics of codifying English or other European languages:

But nothing would be gained by adopting this method for the Indian languages, in which we have it in our power to establish a new notation that shall be systematic, so far as may be consistent with convenience in practice. (Pickering, 1820, p. 16)

In short, Pickering saw the creation of a uniform “Indian” orthography as an opportunity to perfect some of the corruptions of European-based orthographies. This was a common part of

colonization where many of the tools of governance that would become part of the European political system were mutually constitutive with similar projects in colonial settings (Stoler, 1995). Here, Pickering's comments demonstrate a similar phenomena occurring in the United States context. Whereas Webster was busy compiling a perfect American English that marginalized the lower classes of American society, Pickering was working on compiling a perfect "Indian" orthography that was to be used as part of the colonization of Indigenous populations through both evangelization and scientific study. Therefore, whereas proponents of the Universalist perspective explicitly opposed Webster's Americanist perspective for advocating a uniquely American language, the two perspectives were mutually constitutive with the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality and go hand-in-hand. Both the Americanist and Universalist perspective normalized the language practices of a select group of people and depicted these language practices as superior to the lower classes. They both also normalized a Eurocentric epistemology of the world that would allow for the colonization of Indigenous populations along with other people of color around the world. As was the case in Europe, the development of the United States as a nation-state not only required a state racism within its own borders that marginalized the lower classes, but also required colonization of the Other deemed outside of the nation-state.

Conclusion

The above analysis challenges the idea that the early years of the American republic were a time of linguistic tolerance. On the contrary, using the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality demonstrates that the founding of the United States was not a time of linguistic tolerance, but was instead a movement where three interrelated epistemological shifts coalesced in the creation of a national language ideology that were part of a larger shift in governance

creating a new form of social control. One epistemological shift was the movement away from sovereign power from a centralized authority to the general will of “the people.” The second one was the institutionalization of state racism through the codification of elite language practices and the creation of schools to mold the Other into republican machines in the image of these elites. The third one was the emergence of a colonizing human science tradition premised on the ideas that humanity was moving toward the same ultimate goal as laid out in the European Enlightenment and the possibility of creating a perfect and universal language to facilitate this movement toward human progress.

The question remains of where we go from here. After all, the argument that the early years of the US Republic were racist and colonizing may seem like nothing new. Yet, as will be shown in the next chapter this is not a thing of the past. On the contrary, both the Americanist and Universalist perspectives are very much alive in the modern day language ideologies that inform current language education policy with similar racist and colonizing effects.

CHAPTER FOUR

Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality in Contemporary US Society

As noted in the previous chapter, the early American republic was a unique moment in human history that allowed for particular language ideologies to emerge. These language ideologies were produced as part of the movement away from sovereign power toward more democratic forms of governance. Along with this shift toward democratic governance was the emergence of a state racism that sought to defend nation-states against the unclean racial Other, as well as the emergence of the human sciences that imposed a European bourgeois framework on the study of humanity. These three threads coalesced around two seemingly opposing discourses—the Americanist and the Universalist discourse. Yet on closer examination, these two discourses were part of the same project of codifying a static bourgeois subject as the norm for the ideal language that all people should use. In the case of the Americanist perspective the explicit purpose was to create a national American subject, whereas for the Universalists the explicit purpose was to form a universal human subject. Yet, both perspectives codify the same language practices as the ideal language—the language practices of the idealized bourgeois subject.

This chapter brings this genealogical project to contemporary language education policy. In our current context it is no longer controversial to argue for a separate American English. Following in the tradition of Webster, we have a plethora of dictionaries and grammar books that seek to provide people with the rules of American English. In this sense it can be said that Webster's project has been successful. It is also no longer controversial for academics working in the human sciences to position themselves as objective collectors of data, and for these academics to make recommendations on how to make individuals and populations fit more into

the objective norms academics have developed. Indeed, this is at the core of much educational research, which is centered on helping the Other become more like the unmarked norm (Paechter, 1998). Yet, it would be mistaken to conclude from this that the colonizing history of these perspectives is no longer relevant. On the contrary, the fact that they are no longer considered controversial in any fundamental way makes these particular regimes of truth all the more colonizing.

Through an exploration of the current era of bilingual education that emerged in the 1960s, this chapter will examine the way that these colonizing relations of power continue to be reproduced today. In particular, the work of two major figures in the debate on bilingual education will be examined. The first of these figures is S.I. Hayakawa, a semanticist who came to the forefront of the debate bilingual education, when as a US senator from California he proposed legislation to make English the official language of the nation. He then went on to form a lobbying organization to fight for this legislation, as well as fight to eliminate bilingual education programs. The second of these figures is Jim Cummins, an internationally recognized expert in bilingual education who has been one of the leading scholars in making the case for bilingual education. The theoretical justification he provides for bilingual education has become central to the claims made by supporters of bilingual education in the United States. Reading relevant texts written by each of these men, this chapter will demonstrate that, while there are clearly differences between their perspectives, at the core of each of their frameworks is the unmarked idealized bourgeois subject that was codified into the language ideologies of US society from the earliest days of the nation.

The Current Debate on Bilingual Education

Before offering a re-reading of the current debate on bilingual education, it is first necessary to provide a description of the traditional narrative of this particular debate given in the literature. As mentioned in the previous chapter, bilingual education was an integral part of language education policy during the early American republic for ethnic whites. This changed with the rise of nativism as a reaction to World War I. Xenophobia, emerging as a result of the war efforts, led to a shift in public opinion (Crawford, 1999). This culminated in many states passing laws barring foreign language instruction and dismissing teachers for using languages other than English (Wiley, 2002). In short, with few exceptions, the period from World War I to the dawn of the Civil Rights Movement was for most students a time of English-Only classrooms.

A new era of bilingual education emerged as a product of the Civil Rights Movement. Chicano and Puerto Rican activists advocated for bilingual education as an integral part of their demands for equal rights. This political context eventually led to the passage of the federal Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as The Bilingual Education Act in 1968 (San Miguel, 2004). The Bilingual Education Act authorized federal funding for: (1) the development of special instructional materials for use in bilingual education programs; (2) in-service training for teachers, teacher assistants, and counselors working in bilingual programs; and (3) the establishment, maintenance, and implementation of special programs for children who were learning English as a second language. The original 1968 version of Title VII did not define what bilingual education was or how it should be implemented in schools. Most importantly, the legislation did not address the tensions and contradictions that may have existed between supporters of bilingual education who saw it as an expediency approach that would

facilitate a quick transition to English, and those who emphasized a promotion approach that would make the maintenance of the native language a goal even after proficiency in English was achieved (Crawford, 1999).

The courts were also unclear as to the role of bilingual education in educating language minority children. In 1974, in *Lau v. Nichols*, the Supreme Court ruled that school districts were required to take affirmative steps to address the linguistic needs of immigrant children. The opinion stressed that the plaintiffs did not demand a particular remedy, but merely an appropriate one. As a result, bilingual education programs were seen as one of the options available to schools (Suárez-Orozco, et al., 1999). A federal appeals court gave another ambiguous decision in the 1981 case *Castañeda v. Pickard*, ruling that the school district in question would be evaluated to determine (a) whether it had developed a pedagogically sound approach to addressing the needs of language minority students; (b) whether it had properly implemented the approach it had chosen; (c) whether it had in place an assessment program to determine if the children were succeeding; and (d) whether it was making appropriate adjustments when assessment determined that there was such a need (Suárez-Orozco, et al., 1999). No stance was taken as to what the role of bilingual education should be to meet any of these criteria.

Because these important cases neither mandated a specific remedy nor took a stand on bilingual education, the political realm became the place that would decide the role of bilingual education in schools and the form it would take. This would eventually lead to a political explosion. One early catalyst for this was the release of the first evaluations of bilingual education programs conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and The American Institute for Research (AIR) in 1976. The GAO report concluded that there were positive effects for students who participated in transitional bilingual education programs and argued that there

was at least limited evidence of the benefits of using languages other than English in the teaching of content (García, 2009). However, the AIR study, which would receive more media attention, argued the opposite. This evaluation found that Spanish-speaking children in bilingual classes performed less well in English and the same in math as Spanish-speaking children who did not receive bilingual education. Although these findings have been critiqued in that the bilingual programs that were evaluated varied widely in quality and the study mistakenly included a large number of children who were actually fluent in English, the AIR study was very influential at the time and had a major impact on language education policy.

Reaction to the mixed results of the AIR study overshadowed the GAO report findings. Critics began to charge schools with destroying the melting pot tradition of the country by failing to mainstream students as soon as possible. These critics argued that schools should be tools of assimilation and that bilingual education should be transitional in nature (Rodriguez, 1982; Schlesinger, 1991). In 1974, The US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a statement in support of using bilingual education as a transitional tool while students learned English, which would eventually prompt Congress to vote in 1978 to restrict federal support to only transitional bilingual education programs. Henceforth, native languages could be used only “to the extent necessary to allow a child to achieve competence in the English language” (Crawford, 1999). Therefore, in order to receive federal funding, a program had to have the expressed goal of mainstreaming students as quickly as possible. From this point on, the goal of bilingual education would be to transition students into English as soon as possible, even when research began to show the superiority of programs that developed bilingualism (García, 2009). The main reason for this was a large backlash against bilingual education and immigrants in

general, that began in the 1980s with the emergence of the movement to make English the official language of the United States.

As mentioned before, Senator S.I. Hayakawa formed the group US English to lobby for making English the official language and banning bilingual education programs. After years of activism work on the part of US English, the environment was ripe for an assault on bilingual education that would begin in California, led by a Silicon Valley millionaire named Ron Unz. In 1997, Unz was successful at getting passed Proposition 227, the so-called “English for the Children” initiative, which banned bilingual education and replaced it with one year of *structured immersion*, an ambiguously described program of instruction that was described in the legislation as:

a temporary transition period not normally to exceed one year where instruction must be delivered overwhelmingly in English by teachers who possess a good knowledge of the English language. Students may be mixed by age and grade. They must be transferred to mainstream classes after they have attained a good working knowledge of English. (Crawford, 1999, p. 252)

After his victory in California, Unz quickly brought his initiative to other states. In 2000, he successfully achieved the passage of a similar initiative in Arizona with the support of an overwhelming majority of voters (Crawford, 2000). More recently, in 2002 his initiative was passed in Massachusetts. However, he experienced his first defeat that same year in Colorado (García, 2009).

Nevertheless, bilingual education continues to be challenged by opponents. Menken (2008) notes that No Child Left Behind, the newest incarnation of ESEA, while not mandating any particular program has become a *de facto* language education policy that has pressured states to shift from bilingual education to English-Only instruction so that students can pass state-required test. This has led to a drastic decline of the number of students in bilingual programs.

This is coupled with the fact that the very term “bilingual” is disappearing from the political discourse around language education policy (Hornberger, 2006). García (2009) documents this shift in discourse at the federal level. For example, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as *The Bilingual Education Act*, was repealed and replaced with Title III of No Child Left Behind, known as *Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient Students*. In addition, The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages was renamed The Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for LEP Students and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education was renamed The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs.

It is also important to note that this shift in discourse is not only coming from opponents of bilingual education. In fact, García (2009) notes that James Crawford, a longtime advocate for bilingual education, felt forced to change the title of his influential book on bilingual education from *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice* to *Educating English Learners: Language Diversity in the Classroom* in an attempt to increase his readership at a time when bilingual education was becoming so stigmatized. However, it is also important to point out that this rampant opposition has not gone completely without challenge. This is pointed out by Dicker (2003) in her description of the official bilingualism of Hawaii and the legal provisions for the use of languages other than English in Louisiana, New Mexico, and Texas. She concludes from these and other examples that despite the gains made by anti-bilingual education advocates, bilingualism is still very much alive in the United States.

In summary, the general narrative surrounding the resurgence of bilingual education in the contemporary US context is that it arose out of the Civil Rights Movement and that despite

the fact that research has come out in support of bilingual education, political forces have coalesced around eliminating the program. This narrative places pro-bilingual and anti-bilingual education advocates on opposing extremes in the debate on language education policy and presents their arguments as emerging from different sources—the pro-bilingual education argument seen as coming from the community and academics and the anti-bilingual education argument seen as coming from self-interested politicians with ulterior motives. On one level this is no doubt true. Yet, what I will argue in this chapter is that on an epistemological level, pro and anti -bilingual education stances build their arguments around the Americanist and Universalist language ideologies that were formed in the early years of US history. In short, what superficially appear to be two oppositional ideologies are, in fact, both made possible by the same underlying premise—a premise embedded in relations of power but presented as objective Truth.

What follows offers an alternative reading of the narrative in regards to language education policy in the United States during this era through the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality. Like with the previous chapter, the point of this re-reading is not to dispute the facts associated with the narrative given above. These events have been documented extensively and are certainly not fictional. Instead, the purpose is to take a different route that analyzes the debate at the epistemological level. Analyzing it at the epistemological level demonstrates the continued tradition of state racism that necessitates a racial Other. It also exposes the colonizing tendencies of seemingly objective approaches to the study of language embedded in the discourse reproduced by both proponents and opponents of bilingual education. The goal of this is to show that the current framing of language education policy in the US is in many ways a continuation of the language ideologies associated with early American society.

In order to demonstrate this point, close readings of the work of two prominent figures in the current debate surrounding bilingual education will be offered. The first of these leaders is S.I. Hayakawa, a renowned semanticist who later in life entered the political realm as a US senator from California and was the first US senator to propose legislation to make English the official language of the country. He went on to create US English, an organization that lobbies for making English the official language, with one of its stated goals the elimination of bilingual education programs. His work is of particular interest for my purposes because he developed a theory of an ideal language embedded within the seemingly objective discourse of the human sciences that then morphed into an explicit political agenda with a clear Racial Other. The second prominent figure that will be examined here is Jim Cummins, a renowned expert in bilingual education who has been a key figure in shaping the academic theory used to justify the benefits of bilingual education. Much of the work produced by advocates of bilingual education is built on the foundation laid out by Jim Cummins, and a close reading of his writings will give a clear understanding of the epistemological assumptions of advocates for bilingual education. I will argue that the same Otherizing process found in Hayakawa's academic and political work is also reproduced within Cummins' work implicating both discourses in nation-state/colonial governmentality.

The Journey of S.I. Hayakawa

As mentioned above, S.I. Hayakawa was a strong supporter of making English the official language of the United States and a vocal critic of bilingual education. Yet he had a whole distinguished career as a semanticist before he became a central opponent of bilingual education. In what follows I offer first a reading of his most acclaimed book *Language in Thought and Action* through the lens of nation-state/colonial governmentality. This book has

several different editions. I decided to use the most recent edition with the assumption being that it would reflect the most conclusive version of Hayakawa's theories. Applying the framework developed in the previous chapter, I argue that the Universalist discourse permeates this book in that its central project is an attempt at using scientific principles to create a perfect language that will lead to cooperation and avoid conflict. Building on the human science tradition of language studies pioneered by Pickering and Thornton, Hayakawa makes universal claims that rely on a primitive Other that must be molded toward a universal human civilization.

I then shift gears to look at two of his writings as a politician that advocate for making English the official language of the United States. The first is an introduction he wrote to a book entitled *Democracy or Babel? The Case for Official English in the United States* published by US English. The second is a pamphlet he wrote defending his stance entitled *One Nation...Indivisible?* In these two writings, Hayakawa reproduces an Americanist discourse embedded within a state racism that seeks to defend society against the racial Other—in this case Hispanics. Putting these two aspects of his work together create a coherent picture of how in contemporary society the Universalist and Americanist perspectives no longer require two different people to articulate them but can instead be reproduced in the work of one person. In other words, while in the early days of the US republic these two perspectives were seen as opposing, it is now possible for the Otherizing process that was an integral part of both the Universalist and Americanist perspective to be articulated by one person with no apparent tension.

Hayakawa the Semanticist

Hayakawa's work in semantics is very much embedded within the Universalist discourse described in the previous chapter. At the core of his work is an attempt to create an ideal

language that would minimize conflict and maximize cooperation. In Hayakawa's view cooperation lies at the core of the definition of language. As Hayakawa (1990) describes it:

Human beings have agreed, in the course of centuries of mutual dependency, to let the various noises that they can produce with their lungs, throats, tongues, teeth, and lips systematically stand for specified happenings in their nervous systems. We call that system of agreements *language*. ” (p. 16, italics in original)

In Hayakawa's view language is an integral part of the creation of a cooperative human society.

Any conflicts that emerge through language are, therefore, indicative of improper uses of language. He lays out the basic assumption of his book as follows:

It will be the basic assumption of this book that widespread intraspecific cooperation through the use of language is the fundamental mechanism of human survival. A parallel assumption will be that when the use of language results, as it so often does, in the creation of aggravation or disagreement and conflict, there is something linguistically wrong with the speaker, the listener, or both. Human fitness to survive requires the ability to talk, write, listen, and read in ways that increase the chances for you and fellow members of the species to survive together. (Hayakawa, 1990, p. 12)

In short, in Hayakawa's framework there are right ways and wrong ways of using language. The right way of using language develops cooperation between people and objectively and correctly describes the world, while the wrong way of using language causes conflict to emerge and misrepresents the world through the imposition of prejudices and ideological positions.

Hayakawa's book focuses on the idealized language of cooperation and objective description.

Therefore, like his predecessors Thornton, and Pickering, Hayakawa seeks to create a language that will unite people through a seemingly objective study of language practices and their codification into general principles. However, while Thornton and Pickering were focused on grammar and pronunciation, Hayakawa's attempt at creating the perfect harmonious language focuses more on the discursive level. In short, because language has already been successfully standardized, the next step for a Universalist is to develop the perfect discursive and rhetorical devices to go along with this standardized grammar.

Hayakawa identifies the ideal discourse as scientific report writing. Hayakawa (1990)

describes report writing as follows:

Reports adhere to the following rules: first, they are *verifiable*; second, they exclude, as far as possible, *inferences, judgments*, and the use of “*loaded*” words...At its highest development, the language of reports is known as science. By “highest development” we mean greatest general usefulness. (p. 23-24)

Scientific discourse is depicted in this framework as the most generally useful knowledge

because it is most clearly communicated and most easily understood. He contrasts this scientific discourse with the language produced by other discourses that exist in society:

The scientific test of “truth,” like the social test, is strictly practical, except for the fact that the “desired results” are more severely limited. The result desired by society may be irrational, superstitious, selfish, or humane, but the results desired by scientists are only that our systems of classification produce predictable results. (Hayakawa, 1990, p. 111)

Scientific language and knowledge is seen as rational and benevolent in contrast with the irrational and selfish Other. This binary continues in the tradition of the Universalists who imposed a Eurocentric epistemological framework on the Indigenous population of the United States in an attempt to create an objective understanding of reality.

A more thorough description of what Hayakawa means by scientific language will help expose some of the colonization power relations to which I just alluded. According to Hayakawa (1990), at the core of a scientific use of language is an *extensional orientation*, which he defines as pointing to the physical world. He contrasts this with an *intensional orientation*, which focuses on the meanings suggested inside one’s head. An extensional orientation focuses on the actual physical objects being discussed, while an intensional orientation focuses on one’s personal understanding of words based on one’s personal experience. Hayakawa (1990) argues that only an extensional orientation, can lead to agreement and avoid conflict:

This, then, is the important difference between extensional and intensional meanings: namely, when utterances have extensional meanings, discussion can be ended and

agreement reach; when utterances have intensional meanings only and no extensional meanings, arguments may, and often do, do on indefinitely. (p. 38)

He then goes on to describe the extensional orientation of scientists and the language that they produce and how this orientation is what has promoted scientific progress:

The most striking characteristic of science has been its continued success in the solving of “insoluble” problems. It was once considered “impossible” to devise means of traveling over twenty miles an hour, but now we have attained speeds of more than 24,000 miles an hour. It was “impossible” for humans to fly—people “proved” it again and again—but now we fly across oceans as a matter of everyday routine. I was told repeatedly during the course of my education that the release of atomic energy was merely a *theoretical* possibility—of course, they would never actually *do* it. Scientists may almost be called the professional accomplisners of the “impossible.” They do this because, as scientists, they are extensionally oriented. (Hayakawa, 1990, p. 178)

In short, there is something intrinsic to an extensional orientation that creates cooperative relationships that lead to community progress. An intensional orientation, which brings in personal biases based on one’s own partial experiences, can only lead to conflict and must be avoided at all cost.

The second binary that differentiates scientific from unscientific ways of using language is the two-valued orientation vs. the multi-valued orientation. Hayakawa (1990) defines a two-valued orientation as a thought process and organizes society into simplistic binaries. In contrast, a multi-valued orientation is able to see complexity in an issue and any possible gray-areas that may exist. Hayakawa (1990) depicts a very negative image of the two-valued orientation which he describes “as characteristic of a primitive or emotionally disturbed outlook” (p. 121) which leads to an increased combativeness that “sharply diminishes the ability to evaluate the world accurately” (p. 124). People who have two-valued orientation are depicted as over-emotional to the point of physiological deviancy:

Some individuals—especially those who are quick to lose their tempers and slow to regain them—are in an almost constant state of overstimulation, as if under the influence

of a higher-than-necessary concentration of adrenal hormones in their systems. For such people, the two-valued orientation is a way of life. (Hayakawa, 1990, p. 114)

He associates this mindset and use of language as particularly appropriate for a one-party system.

However, he warns that this mindset still exists in democratic societies such as the United States:

There remains a portion of the electorate—*and this portion is by no means confined to the uneducated*—who take the two-valued orientation seriously. These are the people (and the newspapers) who speak of their opponents as if they were enemies of the nation rather than fellow citizens with differing views as to what is good for the nation.” (italics in original, Hayakawa, 1990, p. 114)

Hayakawa (1990) goes on to argue how the multi-valued orientation is more appropriate for a democratic society:

For weighing the various and complicated desires that civilization gives rise to, a finely graduated scale of values is necessary, as well as foresight, lest in satisfying one desire we frustrate even more important ones... Indeed, many features of the democratic process presuppose the multi-valued orientation. (p. 126-127)

According to Hayakawa, this multi-valued orientation associated with the democratic process allows for the creation of proposals that meet the needs of everybody in a community:

Opposing parties argue back and forth, make bargains and compromises with each other, and by this process tend to arrive at decisions that are more nearly adjusted to the needs of everyone in the community than the original proposals. The more fully developed a democracy, the more flexible its orientations, and the more fully does it reconcile the conflicting desires of its people. (p. 127)

In short, for Hayakawa democratic discourse must be multi-valued, which will allow for the best decisions to be made for the community. The assumption here is that a multi-valued orientation will lead to the fairest outcome for all people. It is here, where despite the Universalist tendencies of Hayakawa's work, an explicitly Americanist agenda seems to seep in. The idea of a general will of the people organically developing through a unified use of language is reminiscent of Webster's stance that codifying the general practice of American English would organically lead to the development of strong American nation subjects who can participate in the democratic

process. No discussion is made about who gets excluded from this general will. Instead there is an unspoken Other who must conform to the general will or risk being ostracized.

These power relations can also be seen in the other sources that Hayakawa identifies as representing this superior multi-valued orientation associated with the democratic process:

The multi-valued orientation shows itself, of course, in almost all intelligent or even moderately intelligent public discussion. The editors of responsible papers, such as *The New York Times*, *Chicago Tribune*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, *Los Angeles Times*—to name only a few—and the writers for reputable magazines, such as *The New Republic*, *Harper's*, *Atlantic Monthly*, *The National Review*, or *Commonweal*, almost invariably avoid the unqualified two-valued orientation. (p. 126)

In other words, similar to both the Americanist and Universalist perspective of early US society, Hayakawa claims to objectively prove that the language of the bourgeoisie as reflected in middle and upper class writers is the ideal language that all should be striving for. While lauding these bourgeois writers, Hayakawa's Universalist tendencies are once again highlighted when he reiterates the superiority of scientific language to this "democratic" writing produced by segments of the bourgeoisie. In comparing scientific language to the language of democracy Hayakawa (1990) argues: "Even more multi-valued is the language of science...the language of science, therefore, can be said to offer an *infinite-valued orientation*." (p. 127) In short, while the supposed democratic language of the bourgeoisie is superior to the two-valued orientation of the emotional and primitive Other in reducing conflict and facilitating cooperation, scientific language is even more superior.

Hayakawa (1990) combines the extensional orientation and the multi-valued orientation to describe the perfections of scientific language and its ability to facilitate collaboration and prevent conflict:

When scientists work with a minimum of interference from financial or political influences—when, that is, they are free to pool their knowledge with their co-workers all over the world and to check the accuracy of one another's maps by observations and

independently made and freely exchanged—they make rapid progress. Highly multivalued and extensional in their orientations, they are troubled less than others by fixed dogmas and nonsense question. (p. 179)

In other words, because of its extensional and multi-valued orientation, scientific language can ensure an objective and non-controversial reading of the world that can easily be changed should new knowledge be produced. This ability to describe the world without bias is what makes this the ideal language because an impartial language can eliminate conflict and facilitate cooperation. Therefore, conflicts that emerge are simply a result of people deviating from the ideal language of science. Thus, the solution is to make the unscientific Other conform to scientific discourse. This will allow for a movement toward universal human progress through the development of a perfect language.

The question remains as to how our society can move in the direction of the more civilized scientific language and eliminate primitive unscientific language. Hayakawa acknowledges that there must be an imposition of the societal will on people in order to facilitate this process. In a passage very much in line with the disciplinary mechanisms of power described by Benjamin Rush in his description of “republican machines,” Hayakawa (1990) argues for the necessity of the imposition of societal pressure for appropriate behavior:

Therefore, in order that we shall continue to exist as human beings we *must* impose patterns of behavior on each other. We must make citizens conform to social and civic customs; we must make spouses faithful, soldiers courageous, judges just, priests pious, and teachers solicitous for the welfare of their pupils. (p. 68)

Hayakawa (1990) also warns of a small segment of the population who will not conform to societal pressures and will refuse to accept the movement toward a scientific language of harmony:

Small groups of dissidents using such tactics as intimidation and violence can disrupt society and create chaos, breaking down the network of cooperation. What is important

for our purposes here is that all this coordination for the functioning of society is *of necessity achieved by language, or else it is not achieved at all.* (italics in original, p. 9)

In short, while language is the necessary tool for facilitating societal cooperation, “small groups of dissidents” threaten society by not conforming to what is expected, using language to intimidate and divide rather than unite. The state racism that was an integral part of the creation of the human sciences that occurred along with the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality is evident here. For Thornton and Pickering, who were pioneers in the scientific study of language, the Other that needed to be defended against were the ignorant masses and the racialized Other. For Hayakawa, the Other is the group of people who refuse to conform to the democratic and scientific discourse of societal cooperation. They are threats from which society needs to defend itself. As we will see when examining Hayakawa’s political project, this Other will become explicitly racialized in the construction of the Hispanic Other. For Hayakawa, This becomes for Hayakawa the source of societal conflict because of a seeming unwillingness to conform to societal expectations.

Hayakawa places the onus on the Other to become an accepted member of society through the acceptance of the language rules that he lays out throughout the book. He argues that this will eventually lead to mainstream society accepting the Other as a member of society. As Hayakawa (1990) describes it:

With each new agreement, no matter how commonplace or obvious, the fear and suspicion of the stranger wears away, and the possibility of friendship enlarges. When further conversation reveals that we have friends or political views or artistic tastes or hobbies in common, a friend is made, and genuine communication and cooperation can begin. (p. 58)

He follows this quote with an illuminating story about what he means by this through a description of a personal experience he had during World War II. Being Japanese-American, he describes a time when he was waiting for a train and noticed that the other passengers were

nervous about his presence and suspicious of his motives. He decided to alleviate people's suspicion by approaching a family and beginning a conversation with the father/husband. After making some small talk the father/husband asked him if he thought "the Japs" had any chance of winning the war. Hayakawa decided to repeat assertions he heard on the news coverage that the Japanese lacked the industrial capacity to beat the United States, which finally broke the ice. As he describes it:

My remark was admittedly neither original nor well informed. Hundreds of radio commentators and editorial writers were saying much the same thing during those weeks, But just because they were, the remarks *sounded familiar* and was *on the right side*, so that it was easy to agree with. (Hayakawa, 1990, p. 59)

In other words, by conforming to the expectations of the people at the station and saying things that would resonate with them, Hayakawa was able to use language in ways that facilitated cooperation as opposed to conflict.

Hayakawa concludes from this experience that: "people need reassurance that others are just like themselves" (p. 63). Of course, he glosses over the fact that he, in fact, was not like the other people at the train station, which was the root of the conflict to begin with. The way he describes it, the onus was on him as the Other to accommodate to the majority and make them feel comfortable. The general principle that can be extrapolated from this experience is that conformity to the will of "the people" is at the core of using language in ways that facilitate cooperation while avoiding conflict. Society must be defended from anything that deviates from the will of "the people." Therefore, despite Hayakawa's Universalist strain in his effort to develop a scientific language that will by definition avoid conflict and advocate for its use, there is also a dialogic relationship with the Americanist perspective that argues for a codification of the general language practice of the "people" and an insistence that the Other must accommodate

to the language practices. This Americanist perspective will become much more salient in Hayakawa's work once he leaves the academic realm and becomes a politician.

Hayakawa the Politician

While Hayakawa spent the bulk of his life in academia, in the 1980s he was elected senator of California. His linguistic framework also shifted with this change in position from one that tried to create the ideal language that mimics the language of science to an explicitly nationalist position on the need to make English the official language of the United States. As a senator, Hayakawa introduced legislation to make English the official language of the country and eventually created an organization entitled US English to spearhead the campaign for its successful passage. This seemingly provincial stance may at face-value appear to be oppositional with the project laid out in *Language in Thought and Action*, in that his book was supposedly coming from an objective scientific perspective and US English from an overtly politically ideological perspective. At the core of both projects, however, was the need to protect society against the Other whose language use can tear society apart. In his work in semantics, the Other stayed at the abstract level. As will be seen below, in his political work the Other explicitly becomes the Hispanic Other who is a threat to the core principles of American society.

In the preface to a book written by Fernando de la Peña published by US English, Hayakawa once again makes the case for the uniting role that language can play in society, but also warned of its capacity to cause conflict. He specifically connects this to his previous work in linguistics:

Our language has the power to divide or unite us. Words can drive us to war, or they can enable us to cooperate and to live in peace and harmony. From the perspective of my eighty-fifth year, I realize that much of my life has been dedicated to the assumption that cooperation is preferable to conflict. Throughout my efforts as teacher, writer, lecturer, college administrator, and elected official, I have had a continuing interest in the role that language plays in helping people turn potential conflicts into areas of cooperation. It is

cooperation that makes possible all the achievements of our society, from the education of our children to the harvesting of food for our tables to the amazing achievements of science and technology. (Hayakawa, 1991, p. 11)

Therefore, at the core of this more overtly political version of Hayakawa's framework is still a strong emphasis on language as a tool for creating societal cooperation. Hayakawa continues his argument by noting the importance of having a common language to facilitate this cooperation:

In order for us to cooperate more fully with our families, friends, neighbors, co-workers, and fellow citizens, we must not only have language; we must have a common language. If we do not, our future holds a terrifying potential for conflict. (Hayakawa, 1991, p. 11)

Up to this point, Hayakawa's framework remains identical: language can only be used as a tool of cooperation if everybody uses language in the same way. It is, therefore, language diversity that is a threat to society. That is not to say that language diversity in some form cannot exist. Indeed, Hayakawa is always careful to point out that he is not arguing that people cannot use other languages in private life. However, the core of his argument is that a common language used in the same way must exist in public spaces.

Where Hayakawa's stance as a politician deviates superficially from the Universalist perspective of his academic work (though not epistemologically) is in the explicit Americanist perspective he takes in arguing for the role of American English in creating a unique American subject that is fundamentally different from any other historical or contemporary nationalist subject. In *One Nation...Indivisible?*, a pamphlet he wrote in defense of his English language amendment, he argued: "even as the American nation was coming into being, it has become obvious that the American experience was creating a new kind of human being" (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 6). In another piece (Hayakawa, 1991) he elaborates on what he means by this:

The miracle of the United States is that we have solved that problem. As the novelist and travel writer Paul Theroux has observed, while it is possible for an immigrant to become an American, no outsider can become, for example, an Englishman: "Foreigners are always aliens in England. No one becomes English. It's a very tribal society...No one

becomes Japanese...No one becomes Nigerian. But Nigerians, Japanese, and English become Americans. (p. 15)

In other words, unlike the blood-line subjects of other nations, where people are only seen as in-group members if they have a blood-line with a history in that particular nation-state, Hayakawa sees the United States as a place where everybody can become a member of the in-group.

Hayakawa (1985) places a specific emphasis on the importance of American English in this process of molding American national subjects:

What is it that has made a society out of the hodgepodge of nationalities, races and colors represented in the immigrant hordes that people our nation? It is the language, of course, that has made communication among all these elements possible. It is with a common language that we have dissolved distrust and fear. It is with language that we have drawn up the understandings and agreements and social contracts that make a society possible. (p. 6)

Therefore, very much in line with Webster's argument on the important of codifying an American English to unite the American people, Hayakawa sees an integral role for American English in continuing to create new American national subjects.

Therefore, superficially there is a difference between his academic work and his political work in that his academic work strives to create a universal human subject, whereas his political work strives to create an American national subject. However, epistemologically they make the same assumption—namely that there is an Other who refuses to conform to societal expectations that must be defended against. In the case of Hayakawa's political rhetoric, the primitive thinking, emotional Other from his academic work is replaced by the "Hispanic"—which I will refer to here as the *Hispanic Other*. The use of the term serves to both emphasize the Othering process embedded in the state racism of nation-state/colonial governmentality being reproduced through Hayakawa's argument, as well as stressing the constructed nature of this representation.

Hayakawa constructs the Hispanic Other as a static population, which is fundamentally different from other populations residing in the United States. He argues that this population refuses to accept the idea that all people must speak a common American language in order to be accepted as full citizens of American society. As he argues: “In the past several years strong resistance to the ‘melting pot’ idea has arisen, especially from those who claim to speak for the Hispanic peoples” (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 8). In opposition to the “melting pot” ideology, he uses the biopolitical metaphor of health to argue that the Hispanic Other seeks to impose Spanish as an official language of the United States:

The aggressive movement on the part of Hispanics to reject assimilation and to seek to maintain—and give official status to—a foreign language within our borders is an unhealthy development. (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 16)

The Hispanic Other is, therefore, a biological threat that threatens to bring down the purity of the nation-state by challenging the national language that is said to represent the American people.

Hayakawa then makes the argument that the Hispanic Other is fundamentally different from other minority groups in the United States and poses a particular threat to unity. Once again using the metaphor of health, he contrasts the Black Other in the United States with the Hispanic Other:

The ethnic chauvinism of the present Hispanic leadership is an unhealthy trend in present-day America. It threatens a division perhaps more ominous in the long run than the division between blacks and whites. Blacks and whites have problems enough with each other, to be sure, but they quarrel with each other in one language. Even Malcolm X, in his fiery denunciations of the racial situation in America, wrote excellent and eloquent English. (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 11)

Therefore, while Black-White relations has been the center of much conflict in US history, the conflict created by the Black Other through the leadership of people such as Malcolm X is less of a threat to the cooperative society Hayakawa hopes to achieve than the conflict created by the

Hispanic Other. This is because the Black Other, represented by Malcolm X in this particular example, is depicted as a monolingual speaker of English.

Whereas language differences differentiate the Hispanic Other from the Black Other, making the Hispanic Other more of a threat to societal cooperation, Hayakawa also argues that the Hispanic Other is fundamentally different from other immigrant groups in that it is the only immigrant group that opposes making English the official language of the nation:

It is not without significance that pressure against English language legislation does not come from any immigrant group other than the Hispanic: not from the Chinese or Koreans or Filipinos or Vietnamese; nor from immigrant Iranians, Turks, Greeks, East Indians, Ghananians, Ethiopians, Italians, or Swedes. The only people who have any quarrel with the English language are the Hispanics. (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 15)

The language diversity represented by bilingual non-Hispanic ethnic groups is not a threat to societal harmony because this population has accepted the idea that English must be the common language of public spaces in the United States. Therefore, the Hispanic Other is a threat because of the presence of bilingualism and a desire to give this bilingualism official status.

In addition, Hayakawa (1985) argues that unlike all other groups living in the United States, the Hispanic Other does not respect ethnic diversity and wants to live separately from the rest of the American population:

But the present politically ambitious “Hispanic Caucus” looks forward to a destiny for Spanish-speaking Americans separate from that of Anglo-, Italian-, Polish-, Greek-, Lebanese-, Chinese-, Afro-Americans and all the rest of us who rejoice in our ethnic diversity, which gives us our richness as a culture, and the English language, which keeps us in communication with each other to create a unique and vibrant culture. (p. 12)

Therefore, not only is the Hispanic Other a threat for linguistic reasons, but also because they refuse to cooperate with people from other backgrounds and celebrate American English as an integral part of American society. In his view, the English language is an essential ingredient in

expressing an authentic American identity, and a seeming refusal on the part of the Hispanic Other to master the language is truly a threat to the social fabric of American society.

Hayakawa supports his claim that the Hispanic Other is a threat to the very fabric of American society by focusing on their support for policies he considers divisive, such as the bilingual ballot amendment added to the Voting Rights Act. As he describes it:

First there was the so-called “bilingual ballot” mandated in 1975 in an amendment to the Voting Rights Act, which required foreign-language ballots when voters of selected foreign-language groups reached five percent or more of any voting district...Naturalized Americans, who had taken the trouble to learn English to become citizens were especially angry and remain so. (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 9)

For Hayakawa, the bilingual ballot was part of a larger separatist agenda of the Hispanic Other. The anger felt by those who opposed it, including naturalized Americans, is seen as a natural response to a divisive campaign spearheaded by the Hispanic Other.

Hayakawa also sees bilingual education as another divisive policy spearheaded by the Hispanic Other. He begins this exploration through a discussion of the *Lau v. Nichols* decision, which ordered schools to provide services to students learning English. He argues how this court case, initiated by the Chinese community was co-opted by the Hispanic Other and molded to fit their attack on the core principles of US society:

Because the Lau decision did not specify the method by which English was to be taught, it turned out to be a go-ahead for amazing educational developments, not so much for the Chinese as for Hispanics, who appropriated the decision and took it to apply especially to themselves. (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 10)

He argues that the Hispanic Other used this decision to create bilingual education programs, which in his view were really just programs that would teach students in Spanish at the expense of teaching them the common language of the country:

“Bilingual education,” rapidly became a growth industry, requiring more and more teachers. Complaints began to arise from citizens that “bilingual education” was not bilingual at all, since many Spanish-speaking teachers hired for the program were found

not to be able to speak English. But the Department of Education decreed that teachers in the “bilingual” program do not need to know English! (Hayakawa, 1985, p. 10-11)

In his view, bilingual education is a tool for consolidating the power of the Hispanic Other and is, therefore, something that “citizens” should oppose.

Despite Hayakawa’s claim that the Hispanic Other seeks to utilize initiatives such as bilingual ballots and bilingual education to create Hispanic subjects that will live separately from the rest of American society, he also argues that these initiatives and programs fail to make students true subjects of any nation-state. Hayakawa (1985) states: “Hispanic students to a shocking degree, drop out of school, educated neither in Hispanic nor in American language and culture” (p. 11). Therefore, according to Hayakawa these programs not only fail to produce American national subjects, but also fail to produce Hispanic subjects that have an affinity with Latin American countries. In short, in his view these programs are creating students with hybrid identities that cannot (or will not) conform to the nation-state/colonial governmentality framework of static subjects with homogenous identities. Perhaps it is this hybridity that causes the biggest threat to the continuation of nation-state/colonial governmentality, an idea that I will revisit in examining Jim Cummins’ work below.

To summarize, Hayakawa’s work as a semanticist and as a politician at face value may seem like unrelated projects. As a semanticist he sought to create the perfect language for democracy and sought to create a universal language of science that would unite mankind. As a politician he wanted to create an official language for the United States that served to maintain strong nationalist subjects. Yet, looking at them at the epistemological level, both aspects of Hayakawa’s work are contemporary manifestations of nation-state/colonial governmentality. At the core of both projects is an Other that society must defend itself from. This would culminate in Hayakawa’s arguing for an official language to protect the US and calling for the elimination

of bilingual education programs. Many advocates for language minoritized students would push back against this attack on bilingual education and would offer a counter-narrative that argued for the benefits of bilingual education. While in the traditional narrative this counter-narrative is framed as the opposite of the narrative offered by Hayakawa, as I will argue below, the same Othering process found in Hayakawa's work is also reproduced in the defense of bilingual education.

Jim Cummins

In contrast to S.I. Hayakawa, Jim Cummins has been lauded as one of the most vocal supporters of bilingual education. His work from the 1970s until today has had a tremendous impact on the academic literature on bilingual education. Indeed, his theories on bilingual education have become so widely accepted in the academic literature that it is impossible to be in the field without being familiar with his work (Baker and Hornberger, 2001). In fact, his theories might be considered regimes of truth in the academic literature on bilingual education—ideas that are no longer questioned at the epistemological level and blindly accepted as objective Truth. Yet, in what follows I will attempt to break out of this regime of truth and expose the relations of power that make Jim Cummins' theories possible. I will argue that at the core of Cummins' work is the assumption that the language practices of language majority students are the norm and that the language practices of language minoritized students need to become more like those of language majority students. This normalizing process is very much in line with both the Universalists and Americanists of previous generations who sought to codify the language practices of the bourgeoisie as both the American national language as well as the objective language of science. Ironically, this also parallels the Othering process that is at the core of the work of Hayakawa documented above.

There are two key questions that Cummins has explored throughout his over three decades of work on bilingual education. The first key question at the core of Cummins' work is best articulated in the following passage:

The question for research is not what effect does 'bilingualism', *per se*, have on cognitive processes; rather, research should be directed towards identifying those conditions under which bilingual learning experiences are likely to retard or, alternatively, accelerate aspects of cognitive growth. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 33)

While the terminology has changed over time, one major question that has been at the heart of Cummins' work is the cognitive effects of bilingualism—more specifically when bilingualism may have negative cognitive effects and when it may have positive cognitive effects. The second key question that has run throughout Cummins' work relates to the differences in educational outcomes for language majority and language minority students when immersed in a language that they do not speak at home. As Cummins (1979/2001) states it:

Why does a home-school language switch result in high levels of functional bilingualism and academic achievement in middle class majority language children, yet lead to inadequate command of both first (L1) and second (L2) languages and poor academic achievement in many minority language children? (p. 63)

Therefore, in addition to inquiring about the cognitive effects of bilingualism, Cummins' theoretical framework has been a response to his observations regarding the academic success of Anglophone students immersed in French in the Canadian context compared to the academic failure of language minoritized students in the US context when taught in English-Only classrooms.

These two questions would lead to his three major theoretical breakthroughs in bilingual education. The first of these breakthroughs is the *threshold hypothesis*. Cummins (1979/2001) describes the threshold hypothesis as follows:

The threshold hypothesis makes two theoretical assumptions regarding the relation of bilingualism and cognition. The first assumption is that failure to resolve difficulties in

coping with two languages over a prolonged period of time can negatively influence an individual's rate of cognitive development. Secondly, the threshold hypothesis assumes that when a certain level of competence in two languages has been attained, there are aspects either of a bilingual's present access to two languages or of his bilingual learning experiences which can positively influence his cognitive functioning. (Cummins, 1979/2001 p. 45)

Cummins (1976/2001) elaborates on this point:

The attainment of the first threshold would be sufficient to avoid cognitive retardation but the attainment a second higher, level of bilingual competence might be necessary to lead to accelerated cognitive growth. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 42)

In a nutshell, in order to prevent cognitive deficits associated with bilingualism a certain threshold of mastery over both languages must be attained. Similarly, another threshold must be attained in order to reap cognitive advantages associated with bilingualism. Cummins (1976/2001) uses this theoretical framework to provide a coherent picture of what up to that point appeared to be contradictory data as to the effect of bilingualism on cognitive development:

In summary, the results of a large number of studies indicate that, under some conditions, bilingualism, or rather the attempt to become bilingual, can adversely affect some cognitive processes. Negative effects have been reported most frequently in the areas of verbal and scholastic achievement and it thus seems reasonable to infer that many of the bilingual subjects in these studies failed to overcome difficulties in coping with two languages. It will be argued later that the positive cognitive consequences reported in many recent studies are a reflection of the fact that the bilingual subjects in these studies are likely to have overcome difficulties in coping with two languages. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 28)

Research studies that demonstrated cognitive deficits associated with bilingualism and studies that demonstrated cognitive benefits associated with bilingualism could now be explained using a coherent framework. Cognitive deficits were found if students had not reach the first threshold of language competence, whereas cognitive benefits were reaped by students who had reached the second threshold.

While articulated within the discourse of objectivity, this threshold hypothesis is the origin of the Otherizing process that lies at the core of current bilingual education theory, in

many ways paralleling the Otherizing process found in anti-bilingual education discourse. This Other is the cognitively deficient Other who has not mastered either of their two languages. The original term Cummins used to describe this population of students was *semilingualism*, which he defined as follows:

The term ‘semilingualism’ refers to the linguistic competence, or lack of it, of individuals who have had contact with two languages since childhood without adequate training or stimulation in either. As a consequence, these individuals know two languages poorly and do not attain the same level as native speakers in either language. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 40)

At the core of the theoretical framework justifying bilingual education is an attempt at molding this languageless Other into a subject of “native-speakers” of two autonomous, separate, and static national languages. In other words, from this moment the goal of bilingual education would be to create a type of dual-langued subject, who is able to use both languages with equal competence. The argument made by Cummins is that anything less than this would at best prevent any cognitive benefits associated with bilingualism, and at worse cause cognitive deficits that prevent strong mastery of any language.

According to Cummins (1979/2001), this production of dual-language subjects could not occur in the home of these students, which was seen as void of linguistic and cognitive stimulation:

Several investigators have drawn attention to the fact that some bilingual children who have been exposed to both languages in an unsystematic way prior to school, come to school with less than native-like command of the vocabulary and syntactic structures of both L1 and L2. Cummins, 1979/2001, p. 81)

It was, therefore, the role of school to develop this idealized speaker of two national languages:

When child bilingualism develops spontaneously, i.e. outside of the influence of training...it could inhibit the child’s mental development through confusion and interference of concepts and associative processes. However, when the application of sound pedagogical principles ensured that each language had an independent sphere of influence, bilingualism could orient the child towards more abstract thought processes

from the prison of concrete language forms and phenomena. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 49)

In other words, the role of school was to assist the semilingual Other in developing an independent sphere of influence for each of their languages. This would improve their cognitive development and lead them toward more abstract language and thought processes. Cummins (1979/2001) calls this an “additive approach”, which adds a second language and culture to the repertoire of bilingual students and allows them to reach the threshold of cognitive benefit:

The major educational implication of these hypotheses is that if *optimal* development of a minority language child’s cognitive and academic potential is a goal, then the school program must aim to promote an additive form of bilingualism involving literacy in both L1 and L2. (Cummins, 1979/2001, p. 91)

His rationale for the additive approach is that this will allow for students to develop competence in both cultures and develop balanced bilingualism:

A child who identified closely with both cultures is more likely to achieve high levels of competence in both languages than a child who identified with neither. Similarly, a child who identifies only with the L2 group is likely to actively promote the replacement of L1 by L2 while a child who rejects the L2 culture will be resistant to the learning of L2. (Cummins, 1979/2001, p. 87)

Cummins (1976/2001) contrasts this additive approach with what he terms “subtractive bilingualism”:

Subtractive bilingualism, where L1 is being replaced by L2, implies that as a bilingual in a language minority group develops skills in L2, his competence in L1 will decrease. It seems likely that, under these circumstances, many bilingual children in subtractive bilingual learning situations may not develop native-like competence in either of their two languages. (Cummins, 1976/2001, p. 39)

In his view, the consequences of subtractive bilingualism is that language minoritized students do not develop full proficiency in either of their languages, which also leads them to not identify with either of the two cultures associated with the languages they have failed to master. In short,

these programs create both semilingual and cultureless subjects who academically underperform because of their lack of language skills and clear cultural identities:

Minority language groups that tend to perform poorly under conditions of a home-school language switch appear to be characterized by ambivalence towards both their own culture and the majority culture. (Cummins, 1980/2001, p. 129)

In short, an additive approach creates a balanced bilingual who is comfortable with the use of both languages equally, while a subtractive approach creates semilingual students with a lack of competence in either of their two languages. According to Cummins (1986/2001), students who experience subtractive education suffer academically:

Widespread school failure does not occur in minority groups that are positively oriented towards both their own and the dominant culture, that do not perceive themselves as inferior to the dominant group, and that are not alienated from their own cultural values. (p. 179)

Therefore, the explanation for academic failure is found in the language practices and cultural identities of the students and their communities. While Cummins would eventually abandon the terms semilingualism and native-like competence and develop a sociocultural analysis that explores institutional factors that lead to academic underachievement for language minority students (Cummins, 2000), the core of his theoretical framework will remain the same throughout his work—the language practices and cultural identity of the linguistic and cultural Other are the root cause of their academic failure and the solution is to mold them to reflect the language practices of the unmarked norm.

The second theoretical framework that Cummins' developed in formulating his theory of bilingual education is the *interdependence hypothesis*. Originally termed the developmental interdependence hypothesis, Cummins (1979/2001) describes the concept as follows:

The developmental interdependence hypothesis proposes that the level of L2 competence which a bilingual child attains is partially a function of the type of competence the child has developed in L1 at the time when intensive exposure to L2 begins. When the usage of

certain functions of language and the development of L1 vocabulary and concepts are strongly promoted by the child's linguistic environment outside of school, as in the case of most middle-class children in immersion programs, then intensive exposure to L2 is likely to result in high levels of L2 competence at no cost to L1 competence....However, for children whose L1 skills are less well developed in certain respects, intensive exposure to L2 in the initial grades is likely to impede the continued development of L1. This will, in turn, exert a limiting effect on the development of L2. (Cummins, 1979/2001, p. 75)

Cummins (1986/2001) provides a more concise definition:

the extent that instruction through a minority language is effective in developing academic proficiency in the minority language, transfer of this proficiency to the majority language will occur given adequate exposure and motivation to learn the majority language. (Cummins, 1986/2001, p. 177)

The interdependence hypothesis argues that competencies gained in students' first language will facilitate the development of these skills in their second language. In the case of language minoritized students in the United States, learning academic skills in their L1 will eventually transfer to the development of academic skills in English. In short, strong academic instruction in the L1 will in the long run improve competency in English. Cummins (1979/2001) uses this hypothesis to justify the teaching in the vernacular for language minority students who are depicted as coming from homes without linguistic stimulation:

The developmental interdependence hypothesis would suggest that the relatively greater success of vernacular education in minority language situations is due, partly at least, to the fact that certain aspects of the minority child's linguistic knowledge may not be fully developed on entry to school. Thus, some children may have only limited access to the cognitive-linguistic operations necessary to assimilate L2 and develop literacy skills in that language. (Cummins, 1979/2001, p. 79)

In short, in order to mold language minoritized students, whose language practices do not fit into what is expected of school and society, into a mainstream language user, it is necessary to build their competency in their L1. This will then build the cognitive skills that they did not receive at home and allow them to be successful in their L2. This framing of the issue is very much in line with the unscientific Other in Hayakawa's academic work. For both Hayakawa and Cummins,

the problem is framed as in the linguistic practice of the Other that needs to become more like the unmarked norm. In other words, there is an assimilationist tendency in the work of both theorists that seeks to eliminate linguistic heterogeneity in favor of the production of linguistically homogenous populations.

Influenced by the politicization of language education policy that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s described in Chapter two, Cummins' work from the 1980s until the present has taken a much more critical framing than his work in the 1970s, now extending beyond cognitive psychology into sociocultural aspects of schooling (Baker and Hornberger, 2001). Nevertheless, the assimilationist aspects of his theoretical framework have remained unchanged. Cummins has shifted the focus from a cognitive psychological perspective that focused on the lack of native-like ability of the semilingual Other to a discussion of how schools failed to provide appropriate services for language minority students to develop "Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency" (CALP), which he contrasts with "Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills" (BICS). He (1982/2001) contrasts the two as follows:

Many minority language students acquire certain context-embedded English skills and become almost indistinguishable from native speakers in face-to-face situations within a relatively short period. In other words, they quickly acquire...communicative skills. However, this does not imply that such students have sufficient proficiency in context-reduced aspects of language to survive academically in an all-English class on an equal footing with native speakers of English. (Cummins 1982/2001, p. 145)

In other words, BICS is the language of social interaction which is embedded within a particular social context, while CALP is the language of school which offers few contextual cues. As Cummins (1982/2001) argues, CALP requires a more sophisticated understanding of language than BICS:

The crucial implication is that acquisition of meaning in context-reduced classroom situations requires more knowledge of the language itself than is typically required in context-embedded face-to-face situations. (Cummins, 1982/2001, p. 145)

In Cummins' view, it is mastery of CALP that is a prerequisite for success in school and is something with which language minoritized students often struggle. His basic argument is that BICS can be learned fairly quickly, which can lead educators to miscalculate the language proficiency of language minority students:

Educators risk creating academic deficits in minority language students by extrapolating from the considerable English proficiency that these students display in context-embedded face-to-face communication to their ability to handle the context-reduced communicative demands of an all-English classroom or an English psychological test. (Cummins, 1982/2001, p. 146)

Cummins cautions educators to be cognizant of the difference between BICS and CALP and to ensure that students receive appropriate services until they have mastered CALP in their L2, which can take five to seven years.

The concept of CALP has lied at the core of Cummins' work ever since he first introduced the concept in the 1980s and has been enormously influential in the field of bilingual education (Baker and Hornberger, 2001). CALP is not really defined as anything more than the decontextualized language of school in Cummins' work. On one level, this definition is simply stating the fact that a great deal of the language used in school is without a clear interlocutor and, therefore, does not allow for social cues of other types of interactions, making it decontextualized. However, on another level, this description of CALP as decontextualized indicates a removal of all ideological positions. It is on this level that there appears to be parallels between CALP and the ideal language of science that Hayakawa lauds as necessary for ending all conflict and objectively observing reality. If both language forms are outside of any context, then they are free from the biases that come with human interactions. In essence, both CALP and the ideal language of Hayakawa are depicted as universal languages—CALP being the universal

language of schooled individuals, and Hayakawa's ideal language the language of international cooperation.

Yet, similar to the general custom of Webster or the universal language of Pickering or Hayakawa, CALP is not a neutral language. At its core remains the Other. Therefore, while CALP is presented as decontextualized, it is emerging from a particular context—namely the language codified through the marginalization of language minoritized populations in the early US republic. In other words, CALP can be seen as the culmination of the work begun by the Americanists and the Universalists of the early US republic. What began as separate projects—one an attempt at codifying a uniquely American language, the other an attempt at creating a universal language of communication—have coalesced around this concept of CALP, which in more recent years has simply been referred to as Standard Academic English.

Therefore, the same colonizing relations of power that existed in the Americanist and Universalist perspective of the early US republic and that have been exposed in the anti-bilingual education perspective of contemporary US society can also be found in the work of pro-bilingual education advocates. Indeed, despite arguing that CALP is decontextualized language, Cummins himself notes that CALP is more prominent in the home of language majority than language minority populations:

The child's L1 abilities (i.e the development of concepts and thinking skills in L1) may be poorly developed on entry to school. This leaves children without a conceptual basis for learning L2 in an L2-only school situation and consequently they may achieve only low levels of proficiency (e.g. reading skills) in both languages. (Cummins, 1982/2001, p. 128)

In short, while Cummins moves away from terms such as semilingualism, the assumption that the language practices of language majority populations are more conceptually rich than the language practices of language minoritized populations remains unchanged. Therefore, the role

of school remains the same—the creation of structured programs that expose language minoritized children to the language of the bourgeoisie, which continues to be framed as the language of all educated people. In short, similar to his argument from the 1970s about semilingualism, it is up to the school to fill in gaps caused in the homes of language minoritized students in order to mold them into educated subjects who have mastered Standard Academic English and utilize it to objectively describe the world around them.

Of course it would be disingenuous to claim that there are no differences between Cummins and Hayakawa, let alone between Cummins and scholars in the early US republic. The key difference is, of course, that rather than desiring the creation of monolingual subjects that only identify with one nation, Cummins' seeks to create users of two autonomous languages used in two different contexts. His ideal subject is one who equally identifies with two nations and has competence in standard academic discourse in both of their languages. Cummins (1986/2001), building on his earlier theoretical framework argues that this process must begin with the affirmation of the cultural identity students come to school with:

Considerable research data suggest that, for dominated minorities, the extent to which students' language and culture are incorporated into the school program constitutes a significant predictor of academic success. As outlined earlier, students' school success appears to reflect both the more solid cognitive/academic foundation developed through intensive L1 instruction and the reinforcement of their cultural identity. (p. 181)

He goes on to argue that this affirmation of cultural identity is part of a process of empowerment that will ensure academic success for language minority students:

Students who are empowered by their school experiences develop the ability, confidence, and motivation to succeed academically. They participate competently in instruction as a result of having developed a confident cultural identity as well as appropriate school-based knowledge and interactional structures. Students who are disempowered or 'disabled' by their school experiences do not develop this type of cognitive/academic and social/emotional foundation. Thus, school empowerment is regarded as both a mediating construct influencing academic performance and as an outcome variable itself. (Cummins, 1986/2001, p. 179)

In short, for Cummins, the way to empower students is to affirm their cultural identity and build up CALP in their “L1” while also working to introduce them to their “L2.” This is, of course, a direct contrast with the monolingualism advocated by Hayakawa and scholars in the early US Republic.

Yet it would be equally disingenuous to gloss over the real similarities between Cummins and these other figures. While the state racism of needing to defend society against contamination by the Other is not apparent in Cummins’ work, there is still an Otherizing process that makes his theoretical framework possible. The language practices of the language majority in his framework parallels the language practices of the best writers as described by Thornton, Pickering, and Hayakawa and the American yeomanry of Noah Webster. In short, a static bourgeois subject is represented as producing static language practices that represent both a unified American national population as well as an objective human science. The language minority in Cummins’ framework parallels the Indigenous Other in Pickering’s work, the unscientific Other of Hayakawa’s work, and the uneducated Other of Noah Webster’s work. Like the Other of these theorists, Cummins also assumes that the linguistic repertoire of the linguistic Other is inferior and needs to be improved by schools. While the labels are different, the description is the same—the language practices of the linguistic Other must be changed to mimic the language practices of the bourgeoisie. During the early days of the US republic this was treated as an objective and inevitable process, and Cummins continues to treat it as such.

In summary, at the core of the theoretical framework that has been used to support bilingual education is the same linguistically deficient Other that needs to be taught to reproduce the language practices of the dominant culture. As with both the Americanist and Universalist frameworks that were precursors to this narrative, the ideological orientation of the dominant

culture is erased through the construction of an allegedly objective language. In other words, Cummins' work continues in the tradition of normalizing the language practices of the bourgeoisie and expecting that all people should master these language practices in order to become full citizens in society. Therefore, while Cummins' framework desires dual-language subjects as opposed to the exclusively American citizen that Hayakawa advocates, both theorists share the assumption in the superiority of bourgeois language practices. In this way they both continue the colonizing process of state racism that began with Webster, Thornton, and Pickering.

Towards a New Language Ideology

The obvious question that needs to be asked is what we do now. If both the anti and pro-bilingual education forces are complicit in nation-state/colonial governmentality and in the colonization of language minoritized populations, then, is there any way to empower language minoritized populations? Some scholars in language education policy coming from different perspectives and different sociopolitical contexts have begun asking this question. Scholars from language minoritized backgrounds have begun a movement in language education policy that seeks to excavate subaltern knowledge and challenge the colonizing tendencies in current language ideologies. The basic premise of this movement, which will be described in much more detail in the next chapter, is a movement away from static languages seen as separable and countable to the embracing of fluid and complex language practices--what García (2009) calls a shift from thinking in terms of languages as bounded entities toward languaging as a dynamic process. As she describes it:

A dynamic theoretical framework of bilingualism allows the simultaneous coexistence of different languages in communication, accepts translanguaging, and supports the development of multiple linguistic identities to keep a linguistic ecology for efficiency, equity and integration, and responding to both local and global contexts. (p. 119)

García's dynamic reconceptualization on bilingualism argues that bilingual children make meaning in the world through a process she terms "translanguaging" which she defines as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (p. 45). In short, García deconstructs language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality and opens up a space for conceptualizing bilingual populations as dynamic subjects who use fluid language practices to make meaning in the world.

Yet, taking a Foucauldian analysis to heart, one has to question the emergence of this particular epistemological orientation to language. In short, if academic knowledge associated with languages has been complicit in the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality, then what's to say that academic knowledge associated with languages in our current increasingly globalized world is not occurring alongside a newly emerging governmentality associated with neoliberal globalization? In other words, why has the academic literature on language education policy over the past decade shifted toward an embracing of fluid language practices and a rejection of static language constructs, and how might this shift be implicated in new relations of power associated with changes in our sociohistorical context? Is this shift a rejection of the European modernist project in favor of a more egalitarian and less colonizing society? Or as Foucault warns us, does this epistemological shift indicate the emergence of new relations of power? In the next chapter I explore these questions in more detail.

PART II

Chapter Five

Governmentality in a Globalized World

The first half of this dissertation examined the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality and its corresponding language ideologies with a particular focus on the US context. It has demonstrated the impact of these colonizing language ideologies on the current debate around language education policy in the United States as well as offered a space for imagining an alternative. This alternative challenges static conceptions of language, ethnicity, and identity, and instead embraces fluidity and more dynamic understandings of language. Yet what remains to be explored is the power relations that have made this epistemological shift toward more dynamic understandings of language possible.

This chapter marks a transition point in this dissertation. Having exposed the power relations embedded in nation-state/colonial governmentality, this chapter moves inward and attempts to expose the power relations that are embedded within the critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality offered in the first half of this dissertation. Continuing within the tradition of Foucault, this chapter seeks to expose the relations of power that have made the academic argument in the first half of this dissertation possible. The purpose of this is to interrogate the possibility that a new form of governmentality is emerging in relation to the many changes occurring in our current socio-historical context.

This chapter begins with an exploration of two separate but interrelated threads in social theory that have emerged as critiques of the European modernist project, which have made the critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality offered in the first half of this dissertation possible. The first of these threads that has been developed in Europe and the United States is

poststructuralism. The second of these threads that has emerged from former colonial subjects is *postcolonialism*. The purpose of introducing these concepts is not to provide a comprehensive overview of each of these large and disparate schools of thought. Such an overview is both beyond the scope of this chapter and unnecessary for my purposes. Instead, select theorists from each of these two traditions will be explored in order to situate my work within these larger epistemological shifts occurring in academic knowledge. The objective is to demonstrate that my critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality has not occurred inside of a vacuum but has been produced as part of a larger epistemological shift. The chapter then examines how these tools have been utilized by scholars in language education policy to call into question nation-state/colonial governmentality and replace the oppressive language ideologies associated with this governmentality with more fluid language constructs that I term here *dynamic languaging*. It then examines a recent shift in poststructuralist social theory that has begun to critically examine this movement toward embracing dynamism. It uses this body of knowledge as a starting point for raising questions as to whether nation-state/colonial governmentality is in tension with a newly emerging form of governmentality that seeks to produce a more dynamic subject as the new norm.

The Critique of the European Modernist Project from Inside its Borders

As discussed in chapter two, the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure is known as the father of structuralism, which was a culminating project of the European modernist project. His argument for the need to ignore the complexity of human interaction in favor of an exploration of the underlying structure of language was part of a larger movement in the European modernist project to erase complexity and difference through the creation of homogenous and static constructs. However, his work also influenced the emergence of poststructuralism, which

describes both a movement that comes chronologically after structuralism as well as a movement that attempts to move beyond the basic tenets of structuralism. Because structuralism was a culminating project of the European modernist project, this critique of structuralism would eventually allow for the calling into question of the basic tenets of the Eurocentric perspective of the world, which until that point was seen as inherently objective and outside of relations of powers.

Jacques Derrida, one of the pioneers of poststructuralism, made Saussure's work central to his theoretical framework. Derrida (1978) deconstructs Saussure's work through exposure what he sees as a contradiction that lies at its core. In particular, he argues that Saussure's work both reproduced and challenged an ideology of *logocentrism*—the idea that the *logos* (the Greek term for speech, thought, reason, or law) is the central principle of language and philosophy. Logocentrism leads to what Derrida terms *a metaphysics of presence* that seeks to find a Transcendental Truth through the logos. In other words, logocentrism is premised on the idea that there is a fundamental Truth to human existence that can only be discovered through the logos. At one level, Saussure's work challenges logocentrism in arguing for an underlying structure that organizes human interaction. This calls into question the conscious subject as the producer of knowledge. Yet, Derrida notes that despite this implicit critique of logocentrism, Saussure's work continues to reproduce logocentrism by privileging speech as the original signifier of meaning and treating writing as derived from speech. This in turn positions meaning as deriving from the *logos* originating from the conscious thoughts of the actual language user.

Derrida (1978) argues that questioning the primacy of speech over writing “inaugurates the destruction, not the demolition but the de-sedimentation, the de-construction, of all the significations that have their source in that of the logos” (p. 10). Rather than seeing speech as

primary, seeing writing as primary allows for the consideration that meaning does not come from the individual mind but through an act of translation similar to the actions one takes to interpret a text. From this perspective, rather than being the originator of meaning, the individual is written into existence. In contrast to a logocentric perspective, this perspective—which Derrida refers to as *grammatology*—demonstrates the relationship between writing and the nature of knowledge.

Derrida eventually extends this argument beyond a critique of Saussure through the concept of *iterability*, which argues that similar to how we cite other texts in our writing, we cite pre-existing texts to form ourselves as subjects. Therefore, there is no *logos* derived from the thoughts of the conscious language user. Instead, we cite texts that have already been written before our existence. Yet because there is no Transcendental Truth to any particular text, our citation is never predictable or predetermined (Derrida, 1988). In other words, it is a complex, messy, and unpredictable process. Rather than trying to eliminate these complexities in favor of focusing on an underlying structure, Derrida embraces this messiness, putting him in opposition to the European modernist project that sought to bring order to this apparent chaos.

Yet, while Derrida advocates attempting to think outside of logocentrism, he does not make claims to be able to escape from a European modernist discourse. Instead, rather than attempting to think completely outside logocentrism and the European modernist project, Derrida advocates “playing with structure.” He elaborates on this playing with structure when he described it as necessary to “begin thinking that there was no center, that the center could not be thought in the form of a present-being, that the center had no natural site, that it was not a fixed locus but a function, a sort of nonlocus in which an infinite number of sign-substitutions came into play” (Derrida, 1978b, p.280). In other words, Derrida advocates reflecting on the discourses we use on a day-to-day basis and begin to de-center the normal/abnormal binaries that form their

foundations. The purpose of this is an attempt to continuously write and rewrite the world in ways that challenge European modernist constructs.

The American social theorist Judith Butler builds explicitly on the work of Derrida and Foucault (whose theories were laid out in chapter 2) and extends their notions into the realm of gender through her conception of *performativity*. Butler argues that identities are produced through discursive regulatory regimes embedded in relations of power. She applies this conceptualization of power to the construction of gender identity in order to challenge the idea that biological sex comes first and is natural, and gender comes second and is a social construction. Instead, in a move that follows Derrida's grammatology approach, she reverses this argument and says that gender as a discursive regulatory regime comes first and then inscribes itself on the body to create the appearance of naturalized sexed subjects. Butler explicitly utilizes Derrida's concept of *iterability* in describing this process:

iterability implies that "performance" is not a singular "act" or event, but a ritualized production, a ritual reiterated under and through constraint, under and through the force of prohibition and taboo, with the threat of ostracism and even death controlling and compelling the shape of the production but not determining it fully in advanced. (Butler, 1993, p. 95)

Here Butler is making a clear connection between discourse and the material consequences associated with failure to repeat discourses in a normalized manner. Those who cite discourse in normative ways receive social rewards while those who do not face social marginalization. Yet, in agreement with Derrida, Butler believes that this repetition is never completely determined. This is where agency is possible. One major example that Butler comes back to again and again is the idea of drag. Drag performances, though not escaping from the discourses of binary gender, have the potential to create a politics of parody that bring to the surface the

performativity of all gender identities and in the process destabilize taken-for-granted understandings of gender (Butler, 1993).

The work of Derrida and Butler, along with Foucault, build on the work of structuralist thinkers, while challenging their epistemological understanding of the world. For structuralists, the underlying structure of society provides an order that can be objectively identified with the right tools as developed by the human sciences. For poststructuralists this so-called objective view of the world is actually constructed within discursive regimes embedded in relations of power that erase the messiness of human experiences and homogenizes the complexities of human interaction. While some might argue that simplification is a necessary tactic for scientific inquiry, Butler's demonstration of the material consequences for gender deviant individuals of a society organized into a naturalized gender binary provides one example of the negative effects of this approach for marginalized populations who do not fit these norm. In short, poststructuralism takes a step back from the tradition from which it emerges to expose relations of power that fundamentally challenge the most basic assumptions of the European modernist project and its search for the perfect and ordered world free of fluidity and dynamism.

The Critique of the European Modernist Project from Outside its Borders

While philosophers from within the Eurocentric tradition began deconstructing the European modernist project, scholars outside of this geographical space began to bring subaltern subjectivities into the academic discussion. Mignolo (2000) calls this the appearance of the *colonial difference* and argues that:

once coloniality of power is introduced into the analysis, the 'colonial difference' becomes visible, and the epistemological fractures between the Eurocentric critique of Eurocentrism is distinguished from the critique of Eurocentrism anchored in the colonial difference. (p. 45)

In Mignolo's view, the appearance of the colonial difference changes the discourse from *monotopic* which "remains in custody of the universal bent of the modern concept of reason" to *pluritopic* which "moves toward a fragmentation as universal project instead of the reproduction of abstract universals" (p. 84). In other words, while the work of Derrida, Butler, Foucault and other poststructuralist thinkers are deconstructing the European modernist project from inside its borders, the colonial difference allows for the possibility of incorporating subaltern knowledge that is outside of the European modernist discourse. Mignolo calls this movement toward the inclusion of subaltern knowledge and perspectives *border thinking*. This border thinking goes beyond the European poststructuralist critique and moves even further in muddying the waters of the European modernist project by demonstrating the construction of the colonial Other that made the production of the European human sciences possible.

It is important to note that postcolonialism did not emerge from poststructuralism and is a separate tradition with its own history. However, its rise to prominence in academia has developed in conversation with the critique of the European modernist project offered by poststructuralists. For example, Edward Said, the literary theorist who is considered one of the pioneers in postcolonialism, builds on the work of poststructuralist thinkers including Foucault and Derrida in his exploration of the discursive constructs associated with European colonization. In his seminal book *Orientalism*, Said examines the role of knowledge produced in the human sciences in justifying the colonization of the Middle East by Europe and the United States. According to Said, the discourse of Orientalism created a romanticized and monolithic image of people of the Middle East that constructed them as the inferior Other to the unmarked Eurocentric norm. Said (1977) argues Orientalism "assumed an unchanging Orient absolutely different from the West" (p. 96). In other words, academic knowledge produced in the study of

the Middle East utilized a colonizing lens that homogenized the population and treated this constructed population as fundamentally opposite from and inferior to Western civilization.

Said (1977) goes on to describe the political ramifications associated with exposing the colonial relations of power embedded within the discourse of Orientalism:

The great likelihood that ideas about the Orient drawn from Orientalism can be put to political use, is an important yet extremely sensitive truth. It raises questions about the pre-disposition towards innocence or guilt, scholarly disinterest or pressure-group complicity, in such fields as black or women's studies. It necessarily provokes unrest in one's conscience about cultural, racial, or historical generalizations, their uses, value, degree of objectivity, and fundamental intent. More than anything else, the political and cultural circumstances in which Western Orientalism has flourished draw attention to the debased position of the Orient or Oriental as an object of study. (p. 97)

Through exposing the colonizing lens used in the supposedly objective study of the Middle East, Said is able to call into question all knowledge produced through the Euro-American academic tradition. At the same time, his work is able to provide tools for those interested in both exposing these power relations and in offering alternative ways of representing subaltern populations that attempt to escape these power relations.

Building on the groundwork laid out by Said, the seminal postcolonial article “Can the Subaltern Speak?” by Indian literacy theorist Gayatri Spivak, discussed in Chapter One, attempts to both expose the power relations embedded within Eurocentric frameworks of Third World populations and offer alternative ways of representing subaltern subjectivities. In this article, Spivak deconstructs how the narrative of the third world subaltern population has been written or in her terms *represented*. She does this through an explicit critique of the poststructuralist deconstruction of the sovereign subject. As she argues:

Some of the most radical criticism coming out of the West today is the result of an interested desire to conserve the subject of the West, or the West as subject. The theory of pluralized ‘subject-effects’ gives an illusion of undermining subjective sovereignty while often providing a cover for this subject of knowledge. Although the history of Europe as Subject is narrativized by the law, political economy, and ideology of the West, this

concealed Subject pretends it has 'no geo-political determinations.' The much publicized critique of the sovereign subject thus actually inaugurates a subject. (Spivak, 1988, p. 66)

Specifically, Spivak offers a reading of a published conversation between Foucault and his poststructuralist colleague Giles Deleuze to demonstrate that while their work superficially deconstructs the human subject at the core of the European modernist project, there is still the assumption of homogenous Third World subjects. In short, despite extensive effort at calling into question the foundation of the European modernist project, these theorists continue to reproduce the same colonizing discourse that they inherited from previous generations of European scholars.

Despite this critique of poststructuralism, Spivak relies on this tradition to help formulate her alternative to this colonizing discourse. In particular, she uses Derrida's criticism of the concept of logocentrism to build her alternative. However, although she uses Derrida in her theorizing she goes beyond Derrida by incorporating the colonial difference. She concludes that the goal should not be to find the "authentic" voice of the subaltern because this way of thinking is logocentric in its framing and masks the fact that any representation of the subaltern will always be formed through constructs created as part of colonization. Instead, she argues that scholars interested in advocating for the subaltern should engage in a politics of representation, where the narratives of the subaltern are written in new ways that are more complex and that attempt to excavate subaltern knowledge.

One example of such an attempt at a politics of representation can be found in the groundbreaking book *Borderlands/La Frontera* by Gloria Anzaldúa. In this book, Anzaldúa, a Chicana lesbian feminist, theorizes her life and the life of others in the Borderlands through the concept of *mestizaje*. While *mestizaje* literally refers to Latin Americans who are of mixed European, Indian, and African blood, Anzaldúa uses the term more broadly in an attempt at

challenging European modernist understandings of the world. For Anzaldúa, the European modernist project by design marginalizes borderland populations. It does this by coercing them into the performance of static monolingual identities, which silences their actual fluid language practices and identities. As she describes her own experience:

Until I am free to write bilingually and to switch codes without having always to translate, while I still have to speak English or Spanish when I would rather speak Spanglish, and as long as I have to accommodate the English speakers rather than having them accommodate me, my tongue will be illegitimate. I will no longer be made to feel ashamed of existing. I will have my voice: Indian, Spanish, white. I will have my serpent's tongue - my woman's voice, my sexual voice, my poet's voice. I will overcome the tradition of silence. (Anzaldúa, 1989, p. 59)

Anzaldúa argues that the concept of *mestizaje* as constructed by borderland populations offers the possibility to think outside of the monolingual nationalist framework of the European modernist project. In place of these static constructs, *mestizaje* embraces fluidity, ambiguity, and complexity.

One can, therefore, see a great deal of similarity between poststructuralist and postcolonial social theory. Like poststructuralism, postcolonialism embraces fluidity and complexity. In this sense, both traditions offer a fundamental challenge to the homogenizing tendencies of the European modernist project. However, the major difference between the two traditions is that postcolonialism brings in the perspective of colonized people. Poststructuralism, while embracing fluidity is embedded within the tradition it is critiquing and in this sense is monotopic. On the other hand, postcolonialism, in its effort to bring the epistemological perspectives of subaltern populations into the academic conversation is creating a pluritopic discourse that is a blending of Eurocentric frameworks with subaltern epistemologies. This is not to say that postcolonialism is more subversive than poststructuralism but rather to emphasize the

point that whereas both traditions are critiquing the European modernist project, they are coming at it from different standpoints.

The Critique of the European Modernist Project in Language Education Policy

The above review of a few thinkers in poststructuralist and postcolonial thinking gives a sense of the two directions of critique that were directed at the European modernist project and nation-state/colonial governmentality. These two directions of critique have also had an impact on scholars analyzing language education policy. Scholars analyzing language education policy have also begun to question modernist language education policies connected to nation-state/colonial governmentality. The major arguments parallel the critiques in the larger poststructural and postcolonial realms reviewed above. These critiques include attempts at theorizing agency differently as well as attempts at imagining the possibility of language ideologies existing outside of the modernist mold.

In terms of retheorizing agency, Canagarajah (1999) critiques structuralist orientations to language education policy for failing to take into account the agency that peripheral subjects and populations utilize in re-appropriating English for their own purposes. As discussed in chapter 2 of this dissertation, structuralist orientations toward language education policy rely on concepts such as English linguistic imperialism, which treat English as a homogenous construct that is inherently oppressive toward postcolonial subjects (Phillipson, 1992). Canagarajah (1999) contrasts this with poststructuralism which in his view “frees subjects to reclaim their agency, negotiate the different subjectivities and ideologies offered by competing discourses, and adopt a subject position favorable to empowerment” (p. 30). Canagarajah also adds an explicitly postcolonial perspective through his argument that constructed languages such as English can be

a tool for imperialism, but can also be reconstructed by postcolonial subjects in ways that resist imperialism.

Wright (2004) provides one example of this agency when she argues:

If the spread of English is also the medium of counter discourses to contain the unwanted aspects of globalization, then it can become the means by which regulation and redistribution could be negotiated and a constraining consensus built (p. 174).

For Wright, the spread of English is not inevitably imperialistic the way that a structuralist orientation describes it (Phillipson, 1992). Instead it can become a tool of resistance through human agency. Higgins (2009) adds to this point through the use of the Bakhtinian concept of *multivocality*:

The concept of multivocality allows for an analysis of the multiplicity of meanings constructed through English that include aspects of linguistic imperialism and global hegemony, as well as resistance to imperialism in the forms of appropriation and transcultural hybridity. (Higgins, 2009, p. 14)

Multivocality provides a framework for understanding how English, while oftentimes used as a tool for oppression, can also have a different “voice” that is developed as postcolonial subjects reappropriate the language through blending it with subaltern knowledges. Canagarajah (1999) sees a role for language education policy in facilitating this resignification through the development of a pedagogy of appropriation which he argues develops “critical awareness of the rules, and consequences of the competing discourses in the classroom and outside...enabl[ing] students to appropriate the dominant codes and discourses according to their needs and interests” (p. 186). In short, similar to Butler’s argument about drag, a politics of parody in language education is possible where students are able to repeat English in new ways that were never anticipated, opening up the possibility for subversion.

In short, just as there has been an epistemological shift in social theory, there have also been shifts in thinking among scholars analyzing language education policy. Scholars explicitly

engaging with insights from poststructural and postcolonial social theory have begun to critique the static and homogenous conceptions of language that were an integral part of nation-state/colonial governmentality. In particular, postcolonialism has been particularly influential in this emerging critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality, as critical scholars have sought to introduce subaltern knowledge into the debate on language education policy. Yet, this embracing of messiness and the incorporation of subaltern knowledge in language education policy is not coming exclusively from a social theory perspective. On the contrary, as the next section will show, the poststructural and postcolonial critique of language education policy is part of a larger epistemological shift occurring throughout the field of applied linguistics.

The Emergence of Dynamic Linguaging

As mentioned above, there has been a critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality that has emerged in language education policy that explicitly engaged with the poststructural and postcolonial critiques of the European modernist project. However, this poststructural and postcolonial critique is part of a larger epistemological shift occurring in applied linguistics that seeks to break out of static and homogenous language constructs and replace them with more complex and fluid understandings of language. This epistemological shift, which I term here *dynamic languaging* does not necessarily call into question the basic assumption of an objective reality, the way that the poststructural and postcolonial strands of this epistemological shift do. Instead, a great deal of the work in *dynamic languaging* attempts to modify constructs that are seen as out-dated in an attempt to more objectively define the language practices of transnational populations.

Dynamic languaging as a discursive regime is emerging simultaneously from various disciplinary perspectives pertaining to the study of language. Scholars coming from a

sociolinguistic or sociology of language perspective tend to position their shifting conceptualization of language within changes associated with globalization. The primary objective is not to explicitly critique the European modernist project. Instead, scholars who position themselves this way see their work as a response to the increased mobility associated with globalization in combination with technological advances that allow for more global interactions. They argue that increased mobility and technology have created the material conditions for the human sciences to encounter limitations in using language ideologies embedded within the nation-state framework. However, the limitations of this nation-state framework are not typically depicted in terms that expose the colonial relations of power embedded within this framework. Instead, language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality are depicted as constructs appropriate for a previous era, but no longer able to objectively describe the present. This has led to calls from applied linguists for the development of new language ideologies that can more appropriately describe the dynamic language practices and fluid ethnolinguistic identities that are products of globalization.

Blommaert (2010) is indicative of this perspective. Taking sociolinguistics as his point of departure he describes how he thinks the study of language in our era of globalization should look:

A sociolinguistics of globalization is perforce a sociolinguistics of mobility, and the new marketplace we must seek to understand is, consequently, a less clear and transparent and a messier one. (p. 28)

Blommaert contrasts the messier linguistic constructs he deems necessary for our current era of globalization with previous constructs coming from the Saussurean tradition:

Mobility is the great challenge: it is the dislocation of language and language events from the fixed position in time and space attributed to them by a more traditional linguistics and sociolinguistics (the Saussurean synchrony) that will cause the paradigm shift we are currently witnessing to achieve success. (Blommaert, 2010, p. 21)

For Blommaert, increased mobility is at the core of a paradigm shift in linguistics that challenges many of its taken-for-granted assumptions. The reason for this is that mobility has allowed for language practices to develop that current language ideologies coming from the nation-state/colonial paradigm cannot fathom. Blommaert (2010) calls these new language practices arising *super-diversity*:

The super-diversity that arises from globalization processes results in communities of people whose repertoires are structured as such: as truncated complexes of resources often derived from a variety of languages and with considerable differences in the level of development of particular resources. (p. 107)

The emergence of super-diversity refocuses language from form (i.e. a standardized form) to communication making language into “an unfinished product” (p. 134) as opposed to a static construct. In short, in order to be able to objectively describe the language practices associated with globalization, it is necessary to develop more fluid language constructs.

García (2009) coming from the perspective of language education policy further explores the challenges that globalization pose to traditional understandings of language arising from a nation-state framework. In particular, she focuses her attention on attempting to reconceptualize bilingual education for this global era. Adapting the work of Bakhtin, she argues that research and practice on bilingualism coming from a US and Canadian context deal with bilingualism from a *monoglossic perspective*, treating languages as separable in the minds of multilingual people. This in turn leads to *diglossic* bilingual education programs where languages are expected to be separated in the instructional program of students. She argues that while this monoglossic perspective was appropriate for a previous era, it no longer reflects the fluid language practices of bilingual communities made possible by our current era of globalization. To replace this type of thinking she argues for taking a *heteroglossic perspective*, where

languages are not seen as separable and countable but as interacting in complex ways in the minds and practices of multilingual people. This perspective is said to lead to approaches to bilingual education where fluid linguistic processes would be allowed to co-exist through what García calls *translanguaging*. As García (2009) describes it:

A dynamic theoretical framework of bilingualism allows the simultaneous coexistence of different languages in communication, accepts translanguaging, and supports the development of multiple linguistic identities to keep a linguistic ecology for efficiency, equity and integration, and responding to both local and global contexts. This theoretical framework supports the integrated education of children at different points of the bilingual continuum, sometimes from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. It supports the education of children to use languages for *functional interrelationships*, and not simply for *separate functional allocations*. (p. 119)

In short, similar to Blommaert, García challenges static language constructs that privilege monolingualism and advocates for the embracing of fluid language practices and the development of dynamic ethnolinguistic identities. Her framework challenges constructs such as L1, L2 and idealized native speakers, and argues for more fluid language constructs that resist privileging monolingual populations.

García and others have begun to extend these arguments beyond the classroom and into language education policy in general. As García and Menken (2010) argue:

Ultimately, a language education policy is as dynamic as the many individuals involved in its creation and implementation (p. 1)...It may be time to dislodge the linearity of relationships between actors in language education policies as being top down, bottom up, or even side by side (p. 259).

In short, if we accept the dynamic nature of language in addition to the dynamic nature of reality in general, it becomes necessary to begin to imagine dynamic language education policies that can work within this dynamic and ever-changing reality. This offers a fundamental challenge to a field that, despite years of poststructuralist and postcolonial critique, continues in many ways to reflect top-down thinking and autonomous and static views of language.

While part of the shift toward dynamic languaging is positioned as adapting constructs to our globalized era, other scholars developing dynamic language ideologies are coming from a more natural science disciplinary perspective. Their work is not depicted in response to either the colonizing power relations of nation-state/colonial governmentality or as adaptations to our increasingly globalized world. Instead, their work is positioned as continuing in the tradition of the natural sciences and adapting insights from the natural sciences to the study of language. In fact, it is two biologists—Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela—who were pioneers in adapting insights from the natural sciences to the study of language. At the core of their framework is the concept of “autopoiesis,” which argues that organisms are inseparable from the environments in which they are produced. According to Maturana and Varela (1987) the implications for this in terms of language are as follows:

We humans, as humans, exist in the network of structural couplings that we continually weave through the permanent linguistic trophallaxis of our behavior. Language was never invented by anyone only to take in an outside world. Therefore, it cannot be used as a tool to reveal that world. Rather it is by languaging that the act of knowing, in the behavioral coordination which is language, brings forth a world. We work out our lives in a mutual linguistic coupling, not because language permits us to reveal ourselves but because we are constituted in language in a continuous becoming that we bring forth with others. (p. 234-235)

In short, if no organism can be separated from its environment, then the language created by any organism is not developed outside of this world but is part of the process of continuously constructing it. Language in this framework is understood as a continuously becoming process of cognition. Maturana and Varela use this new conceptualization to argue for shifting from thinking in terms of static languages toward an active process of languaging.

Though Maturana and Varela were interested in developing an understanding of human cognition within a general framework of biology, others coming more explicitly from

psycholinguistics have taken the groundwork of languaging laid by them in developing theories of language. In particular, much of the work on dynamic languaging has arisen as a critique of the influence of Chomskyan linguistics. Chomskyan linguistics with its emphasis on what Harris (1981) terms “the ideal speaker-hearer” treats monolingualism as the norm and is centered on the intuitive understanding of the so-called native speaker. Dynamic languaging challenges this privileging of monolingualism and attempts to reconceptualize bilingualism and multilingualism outside of this framework. As Herdina and Jessner (2002) argue:

Due to a dominance of a mentalist theory of language acquisition, as originally specified by Chomsky (1965), bilingualism is generally interpreted as a kind of double monolingualism, a view of bilingualism that would allow no connection between bilingualism and SLA [second language acquisition]. (p. 7)

In short, Chomsky’s framework can only conceptualize of a bilingual person as equivalent to two monolinguals offering little in the way of strategies for addressing issues of second language acquisition for bilingual and multilingual students.

In reaction to the flaws of this way of thinking about language, Herdina and Jessner (2002) offer a model they term a *dynamic model of multilingualism* (DMM) which is premised on the idea that multilingual people and populations are not two monolinguals, but that their language systems interact in dynamic and complex ways. As they argue:

In contrast to an analytic approach to multilingualism which presents the language systems individually, DMM provides a model of multilingual proficiency which is based on a wholistic, synthetic approach to multilingualism: the language systems involved are seen as a unity. (Herdina and Jessner, 2002, p. 58)

In their view, multilingualism is always more than the sum of its parts and while it is possible to separate these parts for analytical purposes, in the end they are all part of one dynamic system. Based on this premise, they argue that “DMM works on the assumption that human beings are complex biological systems and therefore are best studied and explained on the basis of systems

theory, complexity theory, and chaos theory rather than fundamentally mentalist and methodological models” (Herdina and Jessner, 2002, p. 154).

Therefore, Herdina and Jessner are interested in embracing the complex reality and inherent fluidity of multilingualism and using that as a starting point in thinking about effective second language acquisition programs. Where they differ from the work of Blommaert and García is that they are taking their lead from the natural sciences where it is now being considered less and less useful to “study parts in isolation from the whole” (Herdina and Jessner, 2002, p. 84). Therefore, as opposed to attempting to position themselves outside of the European modernist project, Herdina and Jessner position themselves as the next generation of unbiased human scientists who are attempting to build new knowledge that objectively describes bilingualism.

Jim Cummins, whose work I explored in great detail in the previous chapter has explicitly engaged with DMM in re-imagining pedagogical approaches for language learning. In particular, he uses their framework to advocate for bilingual instructional strategies. As Cummins (2007) argues:

When we free ourselves from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching languages by means of bilingual instructional strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, two-way cross-language transfer. (p. 222)

He goes on to describe three interrelated monolingual strategies in language learning classrooms that DMM does not support: (1) the direct method, which argues that instruction should be exclusively in the target language, (2) the no translation assumption, which argues that translation between the L1 and the L2 should be prohibited, and (3) the two solitudes assumption, which argues that the two languages should be strictly separated in bilingual programs. Though using some terminology such as L1 and L2 that DMM calls into question,

Cummins is very much in line with shifts associated with dynamic languaging by advocating the fluid use of language in the classroom. In addition, like the work in dynamic languaging,

Cummins' positions his argument within an objective pursuit of knowledge:

The assumptions identified in the paper—direct method, no translation and two solitudes—are problematic because, in their strong forms, they are unsupported by empirical data and inconsistent with current understandings of the workings of the bi- and multilingual mind. They also operate to exclude some extremely powerful opportunities for L2 learning and use from the classroom. (Cummins, 2007, p. 238)

In short, the critique of monolingual strategies is not premised on exposing the colonizing history of such an imposition or as an adaptation to globalization, but is instead seen as advocating for what the research says are effective approaches for bilingual and multilingual populations. The work of DMM has been expanded on by other scholars also in conversation with recent insights from the natural sciences. Some thinkers have used complexity theory (Larsen-Freeman and Cameron, 2008), while others have used an ecological metaphor to illustrate the point (Van Lier, 2004).

In summary, critiques of language ideologies emerging from nation-state/colonial governmentality have come not only from poststructural and postcolonial theory but also from scholars attempting to create objective constructs. Some of these scholars are attempting to objectively describe language practices associated with our increasingly globalized world while others position themselves as scholars applying insights from the natural sciences. Regardless of the disciplinary perspective, this epistemological shift argues for abandoning static constructs in favor of more fluid linguistic constructs. The question remains as to what the causes of this epistemological shift are and what power relations have made this shift possible. In an increasingly globalizing world a major question is whether nation-state/colonial governmentality still holds a hegemonic position or if whether a new form of governmentality is emerging that is

producing a new hybrid subject with fluid language practices as the norm. This question is especially pertinent for this dissertation since the first half of this dissertation with its embrace of fluidity in opposition to static and homogenous subjects and populations may possibly be complicit in this new form of governmentality.

Beyond Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality

Some poststructural and postcolonial thinkers have begun to examine whether a new governmentality is arising to replace the nation-state/colonial governmentality that has been hegemonic for the past several hundred years. According to Deleuze (1992), the end of WWII brought a shift in governmentality that he terms *societies of control*, which he connects with the rise of corporate globalization. He argues that after WWII institutions that were once separate *closed systems* became *open systems* connected through discursive networks of power and control with no center or origin. Deleuze's example of how corporations differ from factories begins to get to the heart of how these societies of control differ from previous incarnations of power:

The factory constituted individuals as a single body to the double advantage of the boss who surveyed each element within the mass and the unions who mobilized a mass resistance; but the corporation constantly presents the brashest rivalry as a healthy form of emulation, an excellent motivational force that opposes individuals against one another and runs through each, dividing each within. The modulating principle of "salary according to merit" has not failed to tempt national education itself. Indeed, just as the corporation replaces the factory, *perpetual training* tends to replace the *school*, and continuous control to replace the examination. Which is the surest way of delivering the school over to the corporation. (Deleuze, 1992, p. 4)

Corporations, rather than being separate and closed systems are interconnected networks. With factory work once you learned how to work on your particular place in the assembly line your job training was complete. However, corporations are centered on the idea that perpetual training and competition are necessary for the expansion of corporate influence and power. According to

Deleuze, these “always becoming” mechanisms are beginning to play an integral part in societies of control.

For Hardt & Negri (2000) societies of control have been produced by a new mode of production—what they call *biopolitical production*, which they define a bit differently than Foucault as “the production of social life itself, in which the economic, the political, and the cultural increasingly overlap and invest one another” (p. xiii). This biopolitical production is a direct result of the shift to immaterial labor that began to occur in the Post-Fordist economy where affective labor (i.e. service work) began to gain in prominence in industrialized countries. This is occurring at the same time that society has experienced a decline in the strength of borders between nation-states (Hardt & Negri, 2004). In short, under a Fordist economy, the assembly line was the norm and docile workers produced through disciplinary mechanisms were the ideal. However, in the service economy currently emerging in many industrialized nations, docility is no longer ideal.

Clough (2007) elaborates on how governmentality is shifting because of these political and economic changes arguing that:

the target of control is not the production of subjects whose behaviors express internalized social norms; rather control aims at a never-ending modulation of moods, capacities, affects, and potentialities, assembled in genetic codes, identification numbers, rating profiles, and preference listings, that is to say, in bodies of data and information. (p. 19)

This newly emerging governmentality is not about producing static subjects and populations. Instead, our increasingly technological and globalized world provides for the possibility of control over life itself through the creation of an “always becoming” human information body coded, recoded, and modulated all in the service of governmentality. In contrast with the static bourgeois subject which was produced as the norm under nation-state/colonial governmentality

the emergence of a global economic order along with increases in technology are producing a new more dynamic subject who can then become a better consumer—a dynamic subject with a great deal in common with the subject being produced by dynamic languaging. Puar (2009) identifies this new economic structure as *neoliberalism* (a term that will be described in more detail in the next chapter) and connects it to the production of a dynamic subject when she argues that “neoliberal regimes of biocapital produce the body as never healthy enough, and thus always in a debilitated state in relation to what one’s bodily capacity is imagined to be” (p. 167). This always becoming healthier body can then be used to persuade populations into the purchase of what Puar calls “regenerative medicines” to assist in this always becoming body. In short, societies of control mark an epistemological shift from static national subjects that were the foundation of nation-state/colonial governmentality to dynamic always-becoming subjects that are constantly being modulated and modified as part of a *neoliberal governmentality*.

While Puar is examining this phenomenon from a US context, Mignolo (2000) describes how this epistemological shift is playing out in postcolonial settings:

Although the market’s objectives cannot be detached from the ideology of development and modernization, they are spatial rather than temporal. The question is to expand the number of consumers all over the planet rather than to move toward a final destination set up by the standard of civilization created in Europe and projected as a global design. (p. 287)

In contrast to the homogenization of nation-state/colonial governmentality, under neoliberal governmentality the more differences there are, the better— so long as these differences can be commodified and marketed through the modulation of affect. This is in stark contrast to the European modernist project in that fluidity is no longer something to defend society from, but is instead desirable attributes in a consumer. As Mignolo (2000) concludes “neoliberalism is not just an economic and financial question but a new civilizing design” (p. 279). In other words,

neoliberalism is bringing a new form of governmentality that seeks to change the very fabric of human society.

This new neoliberal governmentality requires a new metaphor to understand how it works. For Foucault, nation-state/colonial governmentality was best illustrated by the Panopticon and the normal curve—the Panopticon representing the self-monitoring that resulted from disciplinary structures and the normal curve constructing the normalization of the population as part of biopolitics. In contrast to this, the newly emerging neoliberal governmentality may best be illustrated by what Pariser (2011) terms *the filter bubble*. The filter bubble is a term that Pariser uses to describe the current workings of the Internet. As he defines it:

The basic code at the heart of the new Internet is pretty simple. The new generation of Internet filters looks at the things you seem to like—the actual things you’ve done or the things people like you like—and tries to extrapolate. They are prediction engines, constantly creating and refining a theory of who you are and what you’ll do and want next. Together, these engines create a unique universe of information for each of us—what I’ve come to call a filter bubble—which fundamentally alters the way we encounter ideas and information. (Pariser, 2011, p. 9)

The filter bubble uses probability in an attempt to decipher the users affect and uses this information to try to sell the user products. Under this system, standardization is no longer needed. As he argues:

There is no standard Google anymore. . . More and more, your computer monitor is a kind of one-way mirror, reflecting your own interests while algorithmic observers watch what you click. (Pariser, 2011, p. 2-3)

Instead, personalization becomes the norm:

What all of this means is that your behavior is now a commodity, a tiny piece of a market that provides a platform for the personalization of the whole Internet. (Pariser, 2011, p. 25)

The filter bubble, therefore, provides a useful metaphor in conceptualizing neoliberal governmentality. People no longer need to be static subjects that are clear members of a

homogenous social group. Instead, they become reduced to a series of clicks on a screen that become an ever-changing algorithm that attempts to sell them products. In this framework, a dynamic subject is preferable to a static subject. As clicks on the screen indicate new interests, new products can be advertised. The ultimate purpose of the filter bubble is to continuously gauge the affect of each Internet user and change its marketing strategy with each new click.

As can be seen, there has been a shift in thinking among some poststructural and postcolonial social theorists. Some of these scholars have noted a shift in the material conditions of society brought on by neoliberal globalization that indicates the emergence of a new form of governmentality. Their analysis indicates that neoliberal governmentality may be developing new forms of governance no longer premised on the production of static subjects but rather dynamic and ever-changing subjects that are always being modulated to the service of corporate profits.

Dynamic Languageing and Neoliberal Governmentality

As demonstrated in the first half of this dissertation, the rise of nation-state/colonial governmentality was associated with corresponding language ideologies emerging from nationalist grammarians with overt political agendas, as well as by academics attempting to create a science of language. The critique offered in the first half of this dissertation is part of a growing body of academic work that has become aware of the limitations of these constructs and is part of a larger epistemological shift that is producing more dynamic linguistic constructs and more fluid understandings of ethnolinguistic identity. This chapter has attempted to lay out the epistemological underpinnings of this shift in language ideology and has connected these shifts with three separate but interrelated trends that are in tension with one another:

- (1) an epistemological shift in critical social theory that has offered tools for critiquing the colonizing relations embedded within the European modernist project,
- (2) an epistemological shift in the social sciences that is attempting to create constructs that can more objectively describe the dynamic language practices and fluid ethnolinguistic identities associated with globalization, and
- (3) an epistemological shift in the social and natural sciences that embraces complexity and dynamism that is being adapted to the study of language.

The question that remains is whether a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality is developing alongside the newly emerging language ideologies that have emerged in our current socio-historical context. If academic knowledge production was an integral part of nation-state/colonial governmentality, is it also playing an integral part in a newly emerging governmentality embedded in new relations of power? In short, while dynamic languaging may sound very radical and subversive, the dynamic subject being produced, may actually be part of a newly emerging form of governmentality that is more appropriate for a neoliberal global economy. Therefore, there is nothing inherently subversive about an always becoming process. In fact, this always-becoming subject may be at the foundation of a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality, and dynamic languaging may at some level be part of this new governmentality. As Higgins (2009) describes it, “in a consumerist world, then, prescriptive attitudes towards purity in language and the maintenance of boundaries between languages are no longer relevant” (p. 120). In short, the consumerist subject of neoliberalism no longer needs to be linguistically homogenous and pure. Instead, the use of fluid language practices can provide corporations with successful marketing tools that continue to marginalize the target population while profiting from them.

While recent poststructuralist insights indicate the possible emergence of a neoliberal governmentality that is in tension with nation-state/colonial governmentality, there has yet to be a critical reading of language education policy through this lens. To this effect, Chapter Six will examine the dynamic subjects and dynamic language ideologies being produced by Euro-American based international political and economic institutions as a way of understanding the language ideologies associated with new forms of global governance in the age of neoliberalism.

Chapter Six

Neoliberal Governmentality and Language Education Policy

Chapter Five raised many questions in regards to the complicity of newly emerging language ideologies with a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality. This chapter will attempt to answer some of those questions. The basic argument of this chapter will be that dynamic languaging as an epistemological orientation is mutually constitutive with the production of a dynamic subject that fits the political and economic context of our current socio-historical period—in particular, the need for “flexible workers” and “life-long learners” to perform service-oriented and technological jobs. Therefore, similar to the way that static and homogenous linguistic constructs were part of nation-state/colonial governmentality, dynamic languaging is complicit in a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality whether the scholars embracing this epistemological orientation explicitly frame their work within a neoliberal discourse or not. The purpose of making this argument is not to dismiss the work of advocates of dynamic languaging, but rather to push those of us invested in this new way of understanding language to grapple with the political ramifications of our work and to be more self-conscious in how we frame the issues.

This chapter begins with a formal definition of neoliberalism with a particular focus on its impact on education. In order to situate the emergence of new language ideologies within the larger discourse of neoliberalism, the chapter will then offer a Foucauldian reading of a key text of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization made up of 30 democratic nations that seeks to address the economic, social, and environmental challenges of globalization (Keeley, 2007). Despite, its lack of representation of the majority of the world’s nations, the OECD plays a central role in shaping global political and economic policies and has been a prominent advocate of neoliberal economic policies (Mahon &

McBride 2009). This reading will provide a more in-depth description of the more dynamic subject that is being produced by neoliberal discourse and how this contrasts with the static and docile subject of nation-state/colonial governmentality. Finally, the chapter will end by exploring some key texts being produced by the Council of Europe, an organization of 47 European nations with the explicit goal of creating a more unified Europe. A focus will be placed on documents that challenge the language ideologies of nation-state/colonial governmentality and argue for replacing them with a new language ideology termed *plurilingualism*. This section will argue that rather than being in a contradictory relationship with neoliberalism (as argued in McGuigan, 2005), the discourse produced by the Council of Europe parallels the dynamic subject of neoliberalism. In particular, the chapter will argue that both neoliberalism and plurilingualism are part of the emergence of a new Eurocentric governmentality developing within the new global economy. I term this new governance structure *neoliberal governmentality* to emphasize the political and economic forces that are making this new governmentality possible.

Defining Neoliberalism in Education

In order to situate my reading of OECD and Council of Europe documents within a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality, it is first necessary to provide an explicit definition of what I mean by neoliberalism. While the definition was alluded to in the previous chapter, what follows is a more explicit definition with a focus not just on the larger macro-issues associated with neoliberalism, but also on the type of subject produced through its discourse.

Foucault identifies the origins of neoliberalism in post-World War II Germany. In reaction to the state racism of Nazi Germany—a culminating project of nation-state/colonial governmentality—German economists, who Foucault termed *ordoliberals* turned to the “free market” as the organizing mechanism of society. As Foucault (2008) argues:

Instead of accepting a free market defined by the state and kept as it were under state supervision—which was, in a way, the initial formula of liberalism: let us establish a space of economic freedom and let us circumscribe it by a state that will supervise it—the ordoliberalists say we should completely turn the formula around and adopt the free market as organizing and regulating principle of the state. (p. 116)

In short, the state-sponsored genocide perpetuated by a European nation on European citizens led to a crisis in nation-state/colonial governmentality that produced an epistemological shift. This epistemological shift reconceptualized the role of government in organizing society. Ordoliberalism spread to the rest of Europe and eventually to the United States, where it would be molded into neoliberalism by Milton Friedman at the University of Chicago.

While ostensibly opposed to state regulation, at the core of neoliberalism is the need for direct state intervention in setting hospitable conditions for the free-market. In other words, neoliberalism entails the merging of the state and the market in a new corporate governance (Klein, 2007). A major element of a movement toward corporatist governance is a process that Harvey (2003) refers to as *accumulation by dispossession*—namely the process of making a profit through extracting wealth from marginalized populations. While historically this has been done through colonizing territories, under neoliberalism it is done through the manipulation of market forces. Harvey (2003) argues:

The primary vehicle for accumulation by dispossession, therefore, has been the forcing open of markets throughout the world by institutional pressures exercised through the IMF and the WTO, backed by the power of the United States. (p. 181)

In short, the US along with international organizations have sought to expand corporate influence and increase corporate profits through the marketization of life, i.e. making everything into a commodity with monetary value. One example Harvey provides are patent laws enforced by the World Trade Organization (WTO):

The emphasis upon intellectual patent rights into the WTO negotiations points to ways in which the patenting and licensing of genetic material, seed plasma, and all manner of

other products can now be used against whole populations whose practices had played a crucial role in the development of these materials. Biopiracy is rampant and the pillaging of the world's stockpile of genetic resources is well under way to the benefit of a few large pharmaceutical companies. (Harvey, 2003, p. 148)

In this example, Indigenous knowledges gained over centuries have been patented by a few pharmaceutical companies. This patenting process then requires Indigenous communities to pay to use the products that their knowledge was used to create.

Neoliberalism has been at the core of recent shifts in US educational policy. As Lipman (2011) argues:

Neoliberalism is an ideological project to reconstruct values, social relations, and social identities—to produce a new social imaginary...Educational policies are both embedded in a neoliberal social imaginary and are a means to reshape social relations and social identities. (p. 10)

In short, current US educational policies are integrally connected with the rise of neoliberalism as a political and economic force. In particular, Lipman and Hursh (2007) argue that the increasing prevalence of choice, accountability, and competition in recent education reform initiatives both at the state level and federal level are products of neoliberalism:

The current educational emphasis on choice, competition, markets, standardized testing and accountability are based on neoliberal rationalities and could neither be conceptualized nor instituted without the rise of supremacy of neoliberal thought. Therefore, anyone interested in current educational decision-making needs to understand the neoliberal principles that guide the decisions. (p. 162)

One example that Lipman and Hursh (2007) focus on is the educational reform initiative in Chicago known as Renaissance 2010. This initiative has as its cornerstone the closing down of traditional public schools, and their replacement with charter schools and other schools of choice. Yet as Lipman and Hursh (2007) point out:

Renaissance 2010 provides neither more funding for schools nor support for teachers but rather aims to improve schools by restructuring them as a private–public ventures and by introducing markets and competition, therefore ostensibly improving efficiency...Charter schools, as well as contract schools formed through Renaissance 2010, are rooted in

neoliberal economic rationality. They further open schools to corporations for investment and profit; they support markets as a solution to all problems. (p. 166)

Renaissance 2010, in its move toward corporatizing public schools is one example of accumulation by dispossession in education. This accumulation by dispossession breaks down boundaries between the state and corporations through the creation of a corporatist governance that makes profit for corporations through extracting resources from the public realm.

Most of the work on neoliberalism, both inside and outside of the field of education, has focused on the macro-level policy effects of neoliberalism such as the move toward privatization. However, neoliberalism has had more than just policy effects. It also has shaped the type of worker desired. In short, in addition to the corporatization of the state, neoliberal governmentality also entails the corporatization of the individual subject. Foucault (2008) refers to this corporatized subject as the *enterprising-self* and describes it as follows:

The idea of a privatization of insurance mechanisms, and the idea at any rate that it is up to the individual [to protect himself against risk] through all the reserves he has at his disposal, either simply as an individual, or through mutual benefit organizations and suchlike, is the objective you can see at work in the neo-liberal policies. (p. 145)

In short, the enterprising-self is an autonomous, flexible, and innovative subject who is able to adapt to the rapidly changing social contexts of our current socio-historical period. The description of this neoliberal subject is elaborated by Besley and Peters (2007):

Neoliberalism depends on the development of a set of practices of self-government whereby the individual learns to refashion himself or herself as the entrepreneur of oneself—the ‘enterprising self’—and so learns the fiduciary art of restyling the self through various forms of personal investment and insurance in a range of welfare fields—health, education, retraining—that are necessary both as a safeguard against risk but also as the preconditions for participation in a competitive society. (p. 142)

Therefore, a neoliberal subject is an adaptable subject that is able to assess risks and make informed decisions that are in his or her self-interest. This autonomous subject is qualitatively

different than the docile subject of nation-state/colonial governmentality—a difference that

Besley and Peters (2007) attribute to the changing socio-historical context of global capitalism:

The notion of enterprise culture, designed for a postindustrial information economy of the 1990s, can be seen in poststructuralist terms as the creation of a new metanarrative, a totalizing and unifying story about the prospect of economic growth and development based on the triumvirate of science, technology, and education. (p. 170)

In other words, the information economy of our increasingly technologized and globalized world

has produced new types of subjectivities that neoliberal governmentality is seeking to harness.

As Hyslop-Margison and Sears (2006) argue:

Although the generic employability skills approach that dominates career and human capital education programs is supposedly intended to prepare students for the challenges of a global labour market, it is far more directed toward shaping student consciousness in a manner to circumscribe envisioned social possibilities beyond the structures of the neo-liberal marketplace. (p. 11)

Therefore, similar to the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality as a way of molding newly emerging subjectivities made possible by the decline of sovereign power, neoliberalism seeks to mold the newly emerging subjectivities made possible by the many sociopolitical changes of our information economy.

As was the case with nation-state/colonial governmentality, education is playing a key role in the molding of this neoliberal subject. Gee, Hull, and Lankshear (1996) note parallels between the corporate push for more flexible and collaborative workers and the push in schools for more autonomous learning and collaborative group work. In particular, they note parallels between work emerging from cognitive science and neoliberalism (which they term “new capitalism”):

Such notions as communities of practice, learning communities, and mutual appropriation of thought, beliefs, skills, and practices from a rich flow of activity in a zone of proximal development are central themes around which cognitive science and the new capitalism will align to their mutual benefit. (Gee et al, 1996, p. 65)

Gee et al (1996) directly connect newly emerging themes in cognitive science to the demands of neoliberalism:

The new capitalism stresses fully informed workers who actively participate in the quality culture of the organization and have (and take) full responsibility for all the organizational ramifications of the jobs they do: This is what is meant by empowerment. (p. xv)

In short, shifts in cognitive science toward favoring more collaborative models of learning are connected to shifts in the needs of the workplace as the corporate culture of neoliberalism has begun to demand flexible workers who are able to work autonomously and make informed decisions that are in the best interests of corporate profits.

Gee et al (1996) also connect this more flexible student and worker with the production of a dynamic and ever-changing consumer. As they argue:

The new capitalism is...about customization: the design of products and services perfectly dovetailed to the needs, desires, and identities of individuals on the basis of their differences. (Gee et al, p. 43, emphasis in original)

Therefore, neoliberalism seeks to commodify rather than erase difference. In contrast to nation-state/colonial governmentality, where difference is seen as a threat that society must be defended against, in neoliberalism difference becomes profitable through the creation of a market niche. These differences no longer need to be static. The filter bubble was introduced in the previous chapter in an attempt to illustrate this point. The idea is that technological changes offer corporations the opportunity to cater to individual differences and to adapt to changes within individuals. In short, changes in personal preference will quickly be adapted to by ever-changing products and allow for more corporate profits. In fact, the more individuals and groups change preference, the more profit that can be made, making dynamic consumers more profitable than static consumers.

It is the merging of the macro-level policy shifts and the production of subjects to fit these political and economic changes that I refer to as *neoliberal governmentality*. By focusing on these two levels, the concept of neoliberal governmentality allows us to be more aware of the impact that neoliberalism is having on how society is organized. In short, neoliberal governmentality is not simply about the corporatization of society but also the corporatization of our understandings of ourselves. The corporatization of the subject does not necessarily have to be produced through an explicitly pro-corporate stance. On the contrary, the case of cognitive science mentioned above indicated that it is also possible for a neoliberal subject to be produced without an explicit acceptance of neoliberalism. The same process is occurring in language education policy—namely, more dynamic language ideologies are being produced that complement the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality, without an explicit embrace of the corporatist agenda of neoliberalism.

While there is evidence of the emergence of a new governmentality associated with neoliberal globalization and the spread of corporations worldwide, it is important to note that these changes have not replaced nation-state/colonial governmentality. Certainly the state racism associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality continues to be produced within our current sociopolitical context. Neoliberal governmentality can be thought of as in alliance with nation-state/colonial governmentality in that they are both invested in controlling diversity through the production of certain types of subjects and populations. However, where they differ somewhat is in their definition of the ideal subject and population. Neoliberal governmentality, no longer seeks to produce static subject or homogenous populations as the norm. Instead, neoliberal governmentality seeks to produce dynamic subjects that adapt to the ever-changing social context of our increasingly global world through the development of fluid subjectivities

that can be made into a commodity that can both be bought and sold. In critiquing nation-state/colonial governmentality it is, therefore, imperative that one is also conscious of this newly emerging neoliberal governmentality to prevent inadvertently supporting the continued corporatization of society—a phenomenon that continues to marginalize much of the world’s population.

OECD as Neoliberal Institution

Now that I have defined neoliberalism and neoliberal governmentality, it is now possible to examine a specific example of neoliberalism. What follows is a Foucauldian reading of a text disseminated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization with 34 democratic nations as members whose stated mission is “to promote policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world” (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2012). The document chosen, entitled *Human Capital: How What You Know Shapes Your Life* written by Brian Keeley in 2007, was selected because it is an entire text that explicitly discusses the economic theory underlying the work of the OECD. It, therefore, provides an excellent introduction to the discourse of neoliberalism.

Similar to some of the work emerging in academia around dynamic languaging, Keeley (2007) situates his advocacy of what he terms “human capital theory” within the changing nature of our increasingly globalizing society. In particular, Keeley (2007) focuses on the breaking down of both national and economic borders:

Globalisation is a complex and controversial phenomenon that takes in a wide range of social, political, cultural, and economic trends, but at its heart is a simple reality: national borders no longer matter as much as they used to...Economically, globalisation means that national economies are increasingly plugged into each other and into the world economy. (p. 13)

In terms of economic change, Keeley (2007) argues that our economy has shifted toward a knowledge economy where information has become central to economic transactions:

These days, a major source of growth comes not from physical objects, but from something quite intangible: information. And the form of that information—whether it's on a computer hard disk, an iPod or flying through the air in a satellite transmission—hardly matters. It's all just ones and zeros. (p. 23)

Keeley connects these changes in the economy with the emergence of the idea of human capital, which is about commodifying knowledge and connecting education to economic development.

As Keeley (2007) argues:

Since the early 1960s, there's been increasing agreement on one key part of the growth puzzle, namely, the importance of people—their abilities, their knowledge, and their competences—to economic growth. Or in other words, human capital. (p. 29)

In short, all human knowledge is potentially profitable and therefore all human knowledge can be commodified and made into human capital. Keeley (2007) elaborates on this point:

A consensus has tended to emerge that the link between human capital and growth is real and significant. This has been backed up by some numbers from the OECD that show if the average time spent in education by a population rises by one year, then economic output per head of population should grow by between 4% and 6% in the long run. (p. 34)

He connects this economic growth associated with the development of human capital with seemingly non-economic benefits associated with its accumulation. For example, Keeley (2007) describes health benefits associated with the accumulation of human capital:

Human capital is linked to more than just a bigger wage packet. Its benefits include gains in health and even potentially, healthier societies. (p. 92)

He quickly connects these seemingly non-economic benefits back to economic development. For instance, in his view, this improved health and civic engagement creates more productive workers:

A worker whose human capital includes strong health is more productive in the workplace and so tends to earn more. That increased productivity is good for the wider

economy. Raising the health of the overall population helps an economy to grow. According to one estimate, a country that sees an improvement in life expectancy of five years—a reflection of rising health levels—will see its economy grow up to 0.5% faster than one where life expectancies are static. (Keeley, 2007, p. 97)

He also describes increased education as increasing civic engagement, which in turn improves society:

Citizens with higher levels of education also have higher levels of civic and social engagement—they're more involved in their communities and take practical steps to help the welfare of the societies in which they live. (Keeley, 2007, p. 100)

This increased civic engagement combined with other benefits associated with the accumulation of human capital are said to have “spill-over” benefits that make all workers more productive:

For communities, there can be wider spill-over benefits from the presence of individuals with high human capital. Some studies have shown that their presence raises incomes in communities as a whole. In effect, factories and offices with some highly educated employees are more productive, and the benefit of this is felt by *all* the workers in an enterprise regardless of their education level. (Keeley, 2007, p. 100)

Therefore, increasing the human capital for some segments of society is depicted as improving the economic productivity of all segments of society.

In addition to exploring changes in the economic context that have made the accumulation of human capital important, Keeley (2007) also connects the concept of human capital to the breaking down of national borders that he associates with modern globalization. He argues that the breaking down of borders in conjunction with changes in our economy require the ability to interact with people of different cultures:

Think about the world they're heading out into: it's one in which more of us are earning a living in the knowledge economy. It's also one in which globalisation means greater interaction between people from different cultures and backgrounds. And it's one in which individuals and communities are facing major social and economic challenges—from funding retirement to tackling global climate change. (Keeley, 2007, p. 61)

In other words, just as a healthy population is seen as desirable because of the increased economic productivity of such a population, cultural competence and the ability to navigate

different cultures is also seen as desirable because of its impact on economic development. In short, awareness of diversity is treated as a commodity that can increase economic productivity.

Keeley (2007) provides an example of this commodification of diversity:

If we want to send a message to someone in another country we need knowledge, in this case knowledge of one or more languages. We also need skills, possibly the computing skills needed to send an e-mail. But, if we're to communicate effectively, we also need an attitude or approach that tries to understand the cultural references of the person with whom we're communicating. ("Never underestimate the importance of local knowledge", as the global banking bank group HSBC says in its ads.) Put these elements—**knowledge, skills, and attitude**—together and they form the beginnings of a **competency**. (emphasis in original, p. 61)

In short, unlike nation-state/colonial governmentality where diversity is seen as a threat, the neoliberal discourse being produced in this text commodifies knowledge of different cultures and turns diversity into a source of profit.

Another contrast between nation-state/colonial governmentality and the neoliberal discourse being produced by the OECD is the lifelong learning that is central to human capital theory. Unlike nation-state/colonial governmentality, which produced docile national subjects and workers that fit the socio-historical context of factory work and industrialization, the OECD favors a dynamic subject who is able to continuously learn and adapt to a changing environment.

As Keeley (2007) argues:

To go on working we'll need to continue updating our skills throughout our working lives. Why? Because the skills we need in the workplace are evolving, and the pace of that evolution is speeding up. Behind those developments are two major factors: the march of globalization and the rise of the knowledge economy. (p. 13)

He elaborates on this point later in the document:

If we need to go on working for longer, we'll also have to go on upgrading skills, education and abilities—our human capital—throughout our lives... To stay relevant at work, people will need to go on continually upgrading their education. (Keeley, 2007, p. 81)

Therefore, as opposed to a factory job where once the skill was mastered, education was finished, neoliberalism produces a subject that is flexible and dynamic.

Keeley (2007) argues that the molding of this neoliberal subject must begin before formal schooling begins:

The first years of life are crucial to human development and lay the groundwork for our ability to develop our human capital... Long before children go to school, they begin developing their human capital. (p. 40-41)

According to Keeley, this process must continue in pre-school, which he believes are not currently doing enough to develop children's human capital:

We should probably have higher expectations for what preschool children can achieve. Children have powerful learning abilities in their earliest years, and these can be developed through well thought-out care and education. Those benefits can be particularly important for children from immigrant backgrounds, who may have language difficulties and who may be at high risk of living in poverty. Unfortunately, preschool children's potential is not always fully taken advantage of. (Keeley, 2007, p. 53)

He then goes on to examine how the K-16 system should be structured to facilitate the accumulation of human capital. He makes an explicit appeal for the restructuring of these schools to fit the new economy and argues that they are not changing fast enough:

While the image of a teacher standing before a group of students seems to have been with us since ancient times, the reality is that education evolves in response to social and economic change: Latin gives way to Spanish and Chinese, Euclid gives way to New Maths and computer studies. Today, as the economic value of education—a key component of human capital—rises, schools are once again reinventing themselves. Unfortunately, they're not always doing it as effectively or as quickly as they need to. (Keeley, 2007, p. 60)

In short, the authoritarian classroom that may have been appropriate for preparing the working class for factory work (Anyon, 1980) is no longer the ideal classroom under neoliberalism. Using terminology adapted from the business sector, Keeley (2007) argues for the replacement of the traditional authoritarian classroom that focuses on reflexively following directions with a more collaborative and reflective pedagogical approach in school:

Schools have generally not kept up with the development of “knowledge management”. That’s business jargon for the process—often informal—of sharing knowledge, insights and experiences within organisations. The aim is to encourage individuals and groups to reflect on what works and what doesn’t... In the corporate world, many companies believe it’s vital to become—more jargon—“learning organisations”. These are places that put a high value on this process of exchanging information and insights, and use those exchanges as the basis for action. (p. 70)

In contrast to nation-state/colonial governmentality, where the goal was to produce docile workers who could follow instructions, neoliberal governmentality advocates the creation of autonomous learners who are able to collaborate with people of varying backgrounds and make independent decisions within the confines of a particular assignment. Keeley (2007) breaks the skills students should be mastering into three categories of competencies:

- The ability to use “tools” like language and computers effectively;
- The ability to interact with people from different cultures and backgrounds;
- The ability to manage our own lives (p. 62)

These competencies are skills that Keeley (2007) argues must continue to be developed throughout the individual’s life: “In a world where the economic value of education is rising, people can’t afford to stop developing their human capital on the day they leave school or university” (p. 80).

At a superficial level, these competencies, along with the dynamic subject being produced by human capital theory, may seem benign and even desirable. After all, progressive educators have been advocating the type of collaborative learning advocated by the OECD for many years now. However, the framework of neoliberal governmentality makes it possible to illuminate the new power relations emerging as part of this epistemological shift. In particular, neoliberal governmentality privileges productivity and economic development. Therefore, unlike nation-state/colonial governmentality where certain races (in the Foucauldian sense of the term) are seen as inherently superior and others as needing to be defended against, neoliberal

governmentality creates hierarchies based on economic productivity. In this framework, all subjects must be molded into dynamic and flexible workers who are able to think in ways that maximize corporate profits. As Keeley (2007) argues:

It's increasingly important for societies to cater for the education needs of *every* young person, not just traditional academic high-fliers. The price of not doing so could well be increased social inequality and slower economic growth. (p. 76)

To illustrate this point, Keeley (2007) describes Kanako, a Japanese girl who has locked herself in her room and refuses to go to school or work. He goes on to note:

Kanako's case is extreme, but she represents a broader group of young people who for a wide range of reasons—psychological, social, cultural—opt out of both education and employment. There's even a name for them: NEETs—not in employment, education or training. Many OECD countries, not just Japan, are increasingly concerned about the problems facing such young people. (p. 75)

In short, what you have is a commodification of Otherizing. Whereas the Other is defined in terms of biology and culture in nation-state/colonial governmentality, it is now defined in terms of participation or non-participation in economic growth.

Yet neoliberal governmentality is not just happening at the level of the individual subject, but also at the larger population level, allowing for a new type of colonization to occur. For example, Keeley (2007) describes the experiences of Bhutan, a nation that he describes as “one of the world's least developed countries” (p. 118). He notes that the Bhutanese take their Buddhist tradition very seriously and are not interested in the material wealth prized by neoliberalism. Instead, he describes how they are in the process of developing a “Gross National Happiness” which could be seen as a response to the privileging of Gross National Product and Gross Domestic Product under neoliberalism. However, rather than treating this as a statement of protest against neoliberal governmentality, Keeley (2007) interprets this action through a neoliberal lens:

This might all sound like just another example of Bhutanese eccentricity, but in fact the kingdom is not alone. Other countries too, are working on sets of alternative indicators that could include measures of their levels of human capital, among other forms of capital. In part, these indicators are aimed at providing a broad picture of national well-being. But, crucially, they're also designed to indicate whether nations possess sufficient capital—in all its forms—to ensure sustainable economic development. (p. 118)

Therefore, rather than seeing the actions of the Bhutanese as in opposition to the focus on economic development and materiality of neoliberalism, Keeley makes the case that their actions are, in fact, very much in line with economic development. Therefore, as with nation-state/colonial governmentality, neoliberal governmentality also privileges a Eurocentric framing of issues and interprets the actions of all peoples within this framework. In other words, there is also a colonizing aspect of neoliberal governmentality that continues to silence subaltern subjectivities.

In summary, the OECD provides some insight into the type of subject desired by neoliberal governmentality. It is a subject that is autonomous, flexible, and ever-changing to fit the needs of an increasingly globalized society. One can see many parallels between this neoliberal subject and the dynamic subject being advocated by academics utilizing a dynamic languaging framework. As we will see below there are also many parallels between these competencies and the concept of plurilingualism being advocated by the Council of Europe. In short, many different points of knowledge production are beginning to produce similar dynamic subjects indicating a larger epistemological shift associated with a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality.

The Council of Europe and Neoliberal Governmentality

Now that we have examined the larger context of neoliberal governmentality and how it is currently playing out within the OECD, it is now possible to focus more specifically on the issue of language education policy within this increasingly neoliberal environment. One of the

biggest advocates for a conceptualization of language education policy in line with the flexible worker and dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality has been the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe is an alliance of forty-seven European nations. According to its website the Council of Europe “seeks to develop throughout Europe common and democratic principles based on the European Convention on Human Rights and other reference texts on the protection of individuals” (Council of Europe, 2012). The four objectives of the organizations laid out on the website are:

- to protect human rights, pluralist democracy and the rule of law;
- to promote awareness and encourage the development of Europe's cultural identity and diversity;
- to find common solutions to the challenges facing European society;
- to consolidate democratic stability in Europe by backing political, legislative and constitutional reform (Council of Europe, 2012).

The objectives of its work are framed in terms of human rights and democracy and not explicitly in terms of the economy. However, the type of subject being produced by the Council of Europe is very much in line with the dynamic and ever-changing subject associated with neoliberal governmentality.

To prove this point, I will examine three key documents produced by the Council of Europe dealing with language education policy. The document that will be most relevant to this analysis is *From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education*, a document published in 2007 by the Council’s Language Policy Division. Two other documents were also analyzed to provide more context for the discussion of plurilingualism. The first document entitled *Plurilingualism, Democratic Citizenship in Europe and the Role of English* written by Stephan Breidbach provides some contexts as to the emergence of plurilingualism in response to the increasingly hegemonic role of English in Europe, or to put it differently, to the attempt at imposing nation-state/colonial governmentality at the continental level. Finally, the official *European Charter for*

Plurilingualism was also analyzed to get a better sense of how plurilingualism is being discussed in Europe more broadly.

Similar to some of the work emerging from dynamic languaging (see previous chapter) the Council of Europe situates its call for a new language ideology within the changing sociopolitical context of our current historical era. In particular, the Council of Europe offers a critique of nation-state language ideologies:

This legal definition of citizenship strongly bound up with that of the national language(s) tends to make monolingualism the official (national or regional) norm and introduce antagonistic relationships between languages, in that it leads to some languages receiving preferential treatment and a radical distinction being made between the national/official language(s) and all the others. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 12)

In a critique that mirrors that offered of nation-state/colonial governmentality in the first half of this dissertation, the Council of Europe (2007) argues that these nation-states ideologies are myths that serve to erase linguistic heterogeneity:

But this model of the nation-state, devised in the early nineteenth century, is purely theoretical, even mythical: political, linguistic and cultural frontiers are not identical and in a given population or geographical area there are always speakers of other linguistic varieties who are there as a result of ancient migration (often predating the arrival of those who brought the language that would become dominant) or recent migrations. All national entities are multilingual, even if they claim to be homogeneous. Every nation-state must therefore devise solutions in order to articulate an abstract definition of citizenship, such as adherence to certain common values that make up the social contract (where citizenship is defined independently of lineage, territory, wealth, religion, etc.) and what might be called a concrete affective adherence to one national grouping rather than another. In order to resolve this contradiction, national citizenship has again been given a cultural dimension, which receives tangible content in the form of a shared memory or language. It is this latter which is the basis of state monolingualism and leads it to reduce linguistic heterogeneity. (p. 20)

According to the Council of Europe (2007), nationalism was at the core of much of the conflict that emerged in Europe in the 20th century: “It is recalled that the exacerbated exaltation of such national identities led to the implosion of Europe” (p. 27). Monolingual language ideologies

mutually constitutive with this nationalism are seen as an essential component of what caused these conflicts:

The history of twentieth-century Europe is punctuated by domestic and international conflicts in which linguistic issues were the manifestation of far more complex conflict. Stability and peace in Europe depend upon issues of this sort being taken into account in a democratic framework that respects rights of all groups. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 32)

The Council of Europe argues that nationalist language ideologies were part of the perpetuating of state racism and that a more democratic framework needs to be developed to counteract the violence associated with nation-state ideologies.

Continuing in the vein of the critique offered in the first half of this dissertation, the Council of Europe (2007) also explores the continued impact of nation-state language ideologies on language education policy today:

Nowadays, while the presence of other varieties is recognised, national language policy continues to emphasise the preference to be given to the national variety(ies) in its (their) official usage (in government departments, at school or before the courts, where the question of language is crucial), other varieties being accepted for private use. The result is a strengthening of the current social representation which regards individuals as fundamentally monolingual. (p. 21)

The document explicitly challenges this monolingual perspective by challenging both the privileging of the national variety and the compartmentalizing of language that occurs through the imposition of this perspective:

Creating a context favourable to plurilingualism means, above all, un-dramatising the common view of languages and language learning. Social images are often monolingual. The national variety is favoured by those whose first or usual variety it is, the first variety (regional, heritage) is favoured as the only variety of affiliation and so forth. Languages are often thought of in terms of reciprocal exclusion, probably because it is believed that knowledge of one language hinders knowledge of another. This perception is accentuated by the compartmentalised treatment of each variety in schools and by the system of choosing among languages (options), one of the current modes of educational provision. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 74)

This critique of the compartmentalization of languages parallels very closely the critique of monoglossic language ideologies offered by García (2009) mentioned in the previous chapter.

The critique continues later in the document:

Such compartmentalisation leads to a false perception of languages since the acquisition of each is presented as being in competition with the acquisition of the others: the national/official varieties are compulsory at every stage of primary and secondary education, while others are optional in various ways and this leads to the introduction of a hierarchy of languages according to the order in which they are offered (first language, second language, and so on) which reinforces social representations of the supposed usefulness of linguistic varieties. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 86)

Though using different terminology than I did in the first half of this dissertation, the fundamental argument remains identical: current language education policy continues to frame language education through a monolingual lens that fails to recognize the multilingualism of many communities.

The Council of Europe rejects this monolingual perspective and argues that the nation-state paradigm is no longer applicable to the European context. As Council of Europe (2007) argues:

Europe is not a political entity of the same kind as a nation-state, to which it would be sufficient to give one (or more) official national language(s) in order to derive a form of unity or identity from it (them). It is a fundamentally novel grouping, a plural space, where numerous linguistic varieties are used—the expression of the cultural diversity of which it consists—which have enriched each other, but where no linguistic variety has had a dominant position for long. There is probably no single language which Europeans could experience as the language of affiliation to this space. (p. 31)

In short, while Europe was where nation-states and its associating governmentality were created, the Council of Europe argues that Europe is now a pioneer in a new form of governance that embraces cultural diversity and multilingualism. The defining characteristic of this new form of governance is the creation of a common communicative sphere that recognizes diversity as opposed to erasing it. As Breidbach (2003) argues:

It seems quite clear that a common communicative sphere is required for the people in Europe to negotiate their perspectives on the future shape of a polity they can identify with—both culturally and politically. But, as was the case with ‘citizenship’, such a sphere cannot be conceived of as ‘monolithic.’ (p. 15)

The need for a common communicative sphere is reiterated by Council of Europe (2007), which argues that “Europe needs common linguistic principles more than it needs common languages. (p. 31). Therefore, the newly emerging governance structure of Europe is depicted by the Council of Europe as a framework that includes respect for diversity united under a common language ideology.

This creation of a common communicative sphere with a respect for diversity is framed as necessary for the changing economy of our socio-historical context. Similar to the discourse being produced by the OECD, the Council of Europe (2007) argues that new understandings of language are essential for the changing workplace:

An increasing proportion of jobs are in the service sector which therefore require more and more intellectual skills. This learning society has led to the introduction of lifelong training, which also involves languages. (p. 47)

This document goes on to identify knowledge of several language varieties as essential for success in the workplace and identifies a role for school in facilitating language diversification:

Knowledge of several varieties used for different purposes and to a level adequate for the tasks to be accomplished is the form appropriate for such changes in working life: this suggests that the organising principle should be controlled diversification of school and post-school language education, whatever the principal language of individual linguistic repertoire. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 48)

In short, breaking out of the nation-state paradigm and its associating language ideologies is seen as necessary for preparing European citizens for an increasingly globalized workplace. As Breidbach (2003) argues:

New communicative needs arise on the level of public encounters and public assemblies because of increasing mobility within a unifying Europe, but also because of increasing internationalisation of local settings through migration (especially in cities). Increasing

economic and political interdependence necessitates mass media communication in particular. In other words, all three levels of participation are inherently multilingual. (p. 15)

Utilizing the discourse of lifelong learning and flexible worker that lies at the core of human capital theory, the Council of Europe (2007) argues for the importance of continued language learning throughout one's life:

Awareness of the growing role of knowledge and intellectual skills in the definition of production, distribution and design tasks is displacing the question of compulsory language teaching from compulsory schooling to subsequent training: the need for opportunities to learn or take up again a linguistic variety may be many, created by career changes, new tastes or interests, leisure activities and personal development. (p. 66)

In short, similar to the OECD's call for the production of a flexible and dynamic worker who can adapt across the lifespan to an increasingly changing workplace, the Council of Europe argues for a flexible and dynamic use of language that adapts across the lifespan to an increasingly changing workplace.

In a nutshell, the argument being made by the Council of Europe is that changes in Europe as a political entity, along with changes associated with globalization, have created multilingual spaces that have never existed before. Yet, what this framework neglects to recognize is that multilingualism has always existed, although it had previously been erased as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality, as argued in the first part of this dissertation. The fact that multilingualism is no longer being erased, and instead is being made central to an organization trying to unite Europe into a stronger supra-regional entity indicates an important epistemological shift occurring in Europe. This epistemological shift in regards to language ideologies is not occurring in a vacuum, but is part of a larger social, political, and economic shift occurring in Europe. The fact that the Council of Europe is now placing multilingualism at the center of its framework is mutually constitutive with the emergence of human capital theory

that seeks to commodify knowledge, making both shifts in thinking part of a newly emerging neoliberal governmentality.

The alternative language ideology that the Council of Europe proposes to replace nation-state language ideologies is plurilingualism. In line with much of the literature emerging on dynamic languaging described in the previous chapter, plurilingualism argues for a reconceptualizing of language that breaks out of the idealized monolingualism of nation-state language ideologies and embraces the communicative aspect of language. As the Council of Europe (2007) defines it:

Plurilingual and pluricultural competence is the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural action, where a person, viewed as a social agent, has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures. It is not seen as a juxtaposition of distinct competences, but as a single competence, even though it is complex. (p. 10)

Therefore, similar to dynamic languaging, which argues that languages should no longer be seen as discrete and autonomous systems (García, 2009), the Council of Europe argues that plurilingualism should be understood as a single complex competence as opposed to mastery over distinct languages. For the Council of Europe (2007), this complex competency is conceptualized as a linguistic repertoire, as opposed to mastery over distinct languages:

All the varieties available to a speaker or group of speakers are referred to as *linguistic repertoire*. Managing the repertoire means that the varieties of which it is composed are not dealt with in isolation; instead, although distinct from each other, they are treated as a single competence available to the social agent concerned. The way these linguistic varieties can be used in communication is observed, in particular, when two linguistic varieties are used successively or simultaneously: for example, going from the official to the regional variety in order to discuss subjects in a more personal way with a speaker (possessing the same regional variety) or using the mother variety as auxiliary during a discussion in a foreign language. (p. 67)

Therefore, just as with the dynamic languaging emerging in the academic literature on language education policy, plurilingualism also embraces the blending of language varieties as part of the production of a linguistically flexible and dynamic subject.

The Council of Europe (2007) also lays out explicitly the ideal plurilingual European adult and the types of language proficiency that such an ideal dynamic subject would possess:

The following illustrates what might be considered the “ordinary” linguistic repertoire of a European adult who has completed secondary education:

- first language (oral), in its customary and standardised varieties
- written variety of the first language (command of written discourse, acquisition at school then at work)
- generational and/or regional variety of the first variety (particularly lexis or accent)
- possibly, a regional language used alternately with the official variety in some communicative circumstances
- proficiency (levels A2 or B2, for example) or school and/or tourist and/or media experience and/or work experience of different language varieties, or at least one different variety²
- partial competence (understanding) in other social, generational, regional, or foreign varieties. (p. 68)

According to the Council of Europe, the idea behind plurilingualism is that through developing competence in different language varieties, European citizens will be better positioned to interact with one another despite cultural differences and develop intercultural competence:

The aim of plurilingualism and plurilingual education is not simultaneously teaching a range of languages, teaching through comparing different languages or teaching as many languages as possible. Rather, the goal is to develop plurilingual competence and intercultural education, as a way of living together. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 18)

The ultimate goal of this is to create a shared sense of belonging that will get European citizens to feel a connectedness with one another:

² A2 and B2 are levels on the Common Framework developed by the Council of Europe that measures language proficiency. The Common Framework is divided into three levels with two sublevels under each of the three levels. People in Level A are described as “Basic Users”, people in level B are described as “Independent Users” and people in level C are defined as “Proficient Users” (Council of Europe, 2001).

The plurilingual project has European valency since, in the final analysis, its goal is not for European citizens to have common linguistic varieties, but a shared manner of relating to languages, which could inspire a real sense of belonging. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 71)

Therefore, unlike with nation-state/colonial governmentality, linguistic homogeneity is not the goal of the Council of Europe. Instead, the goal is to create a common understanding of language—one that parallels the dynamic subject produced as part of dynamic languaging and the flexible worker produced by human capital theory. In short, plurilingualism is based on the same epistemological foundation as both a newly emerging trend in the academic literature on language education policy.

In opposition to the traditional view of bilingualism that continues to treat languages as separate and language communities as homogenous, plurilingualism re-envision language proficiency as dynamic and fluid, with people adapting their language proficiency to accommodate different contexts:

Being plurilingual does not mean mastering a large number of languages to a high level, but acquiring the ability to use more than one linguistic variety to degrees (which are not necessarily identical) for different purposes (conversation, reading or writing, etc.). The degree of proficiency is not necessarily the same for all the varieties used and will also be different according to communicative context (a person can read a language without being able to speak it or speak it without being able to write it well)... The degree of proficiency in the varieties in the repertoire may change over time, as may its composition. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 38)

Being plurilingual, unlike being bilingual within nation-state/colonial governmentality, does not entail equal competency in each of the languages that are part of a subject's linguistic repertoire. Instead, plurilingualism entails competency in some aspects of a variety or language varieties, with each language variety used for different purposes. In addition, similar to human capital theory, the idea is that plurilingual subjects are lifelong learners and their competency will change over time to match their particular position in society:

Being plurilingual means, as examined above, having a certain degree of competence (oral, written, etc.) in several linguistic varieties, with varying functions, the whole being subject to changes over time. It is the potential and/or real ability to use several languages to differing degrees of proficiency and for different purposes. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 67)

In other words, the concept of plurilingualism produces the same type of life-long learning and flexible use of language seen as desirable under a dynamic languaging framework, as well as crucial for economic development under human capital theory. Once again these three points of knowledge production — plurilingualism, dynamic languaging, and human capital theory — intersect as part of neoliberal governmentality.

Similar to the language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality, schools are seen as central to the proliferation of plurilingualism and the production of life-long learners. The Council of Europe (2007) argues that the state must play a key role in the development of plurilingual competence through advocating plurilingual education:

Just as it is the state's role to provide education in the values of democracy, so it is the state's responsibility to promote knowledge of the territory's languages, European languages, languages spoken in Europe or elsewhere, and to implement a form of plurilingual education, through languages, capable of strengthening or creating the feeling of belonging to the same democratic space. (p. 39)

According to the Council of Europe, plurilingualism is crucial toward the development of a new European democratic citizenship and the state should be the central figure in developing this democratic citizenry. Therefore, language education policy is seen as crucial to the responsibilities of European states. As the Council of Europe (2007) argues:

Language education policies are intimately connected with education in the values of democratic citizenship because their purposes are complementary: language teaching, the ideal *locus* for intercultural contact, is a sector in which education for democratic life in its intercultural dimensions can be included in education systems. (p. 36)

The equation according to the Council of Europe is, therefore, quite simple: plurilingualism equals democracy, so any European state interested in promoting democracy must promote plurilingualism.

The Council of Europe (2007) also lays out the primary purpose of plurilingual education:

The purpose of plurilingual education is to develop speakers' language skills and linguistic repertoires. The ability to use different languages, whatever degree of competence they have in each of them, is common to all speakers. And it is the responsibility of education systems to make all Europeans aware of the nature of this ability, which is developed to a greater or lesser extent according to individuals and contexts, to highlight its value, and to develop it in early years of schooling and throughout life. Plurilingualism forms the basis of communication in Europe, but above all, of positive acceptance, a prerequisite for maintaining linguistic diversity. (p. 7)

In line with the goals of plurilingualism described above, the Council of Europe (2007) argues that schools should reject the goal of "perfection," and instead work with students to broaden their linguistic repertoire and develop complex and dynamic language competencies:

Abandoning the goal of perfection, identical for all the languages offered in education systems, enables teaching to be diversified, considering that there may be later teaching/learning that will develop existing competences or create new ones. The role of education systems is to define learners' minimum linguistic competences, to make learners aware of their plurilingual repertoires, and to provide the means and opportunity to develop transversal competences and broaden their repertoires and awareness (new varieties, new competences in a variety, higher level in an existing competence, etc.). (p. 15)

Connected to the idea of no longer making "perfection" the goal of language education, is the idea that languages should no longer be strictly compartmentalized as part of developing students' linguistic repertoire. As the Council of Europe (2007) argues:

This means embracing the teaching of all languages in the same educational project and no longer placing the teaching of the national language, regional, or minority languages and the languages of newly arrived communities in water-tight compartments. (p. 38)

The Council of Europe also argues for language mixing and the utilization of more fluid language practices in language education policy. The ultimate goal of such an approach is to produce dynamic subjects able to negotiate linguistically heterogeneous spaces:

A given communicative situation is not necessarily managed in a single linguistic variety; speakers may use several varieties successively or in the same utterance. This simultaneous use of several linguistic varieties, known as *code switching*, gives the speaker great flexibility in communication. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 39)

Therefore, in place of working toward a perfect mastery of a standardized variety of a language, plurilingual education emphasizes creating flexible language learners who are able to continuously teach themselves new language competencies when the need arises throughout their lives. As the Council of Europe (2007) argues:

Language teaching should above all seek to make learners autonomous, i.e. teach them to learn languages by themselves by developing a reflective approach to how they learn, what they know and their needs: all language teaching should include the development of learning strategies and not be seen as an end in itself...Language teaching/learning should be seen as an on-going process, not restricted to initial training. (p. 69)

In short, the development of plurilingual competence entails the ability to self-monitor and modify one's language competency to adapt to the changing environment. As the Council of Europe (2007) succinctly describes it:

Developing plurilingual competence involves learning how to learn languages, and learning how to manage one's own language learning in an autonomous and reflective manner. (p. 46)

One of the key components of plurilingual education is, therefore, to give students the skills to self-monitor their own language proficiency and adapt it when necessary. Therefore, language proficiency is no longer seen as a static competency but is now depicted as a life-long pursuit that is ever-changing in response to the changing social context. As Council of Europe (2007) argues:

If it is accepted that plurilingual repertoires to be developed through education can be diverse, [then]...language education takes place throughout life and not exclusively during school years. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 40)

In short, as is the case with neoliberalism, plurilingualism advocates life-long training that is monitored by the workers themselves—each individual is responsible for assessing the situation and to determine if and when they require new skills. As noted in previous chapters, self-monitoring has played a vital role in nation-state/colonial governmentality. However, the type of self-monitoring advocated by the Council of Europe is qualitatively different than that of nation-state/colonial governmentality. The self-monitoring of nation-state/colonial governmentality was premised on creating docile subjects who internalized societal rules and followed them through the Panopticon. On the other hand, the self-monitoring advocated by the Council of Europe is a self-monitoring where the subject is able to read a situation and adapt accordingly. This type of self-monitoring relates to the filter bubble metaphor previously discussed. Rather than mindlessly following rules, this self-monitoring requires one to constantly modify one's approach based on the context.

While the self-monitoring of neoliberal governmentality is qualitatively different than that of nation-state/colonial governmentality, both forms of governmentality have one thing in common—they both use a democratic discourse to justify the need for new language ideologies. Similar to the Americanist and Universalist perspective that made up the language ideologies of nation-state/colonial governmentality in the US context, the newly emerging discourse of plurilingualism associated with neoliberal governmentality also utilizes a democratic discourse in justifying a shift in language ideology. As stated in the European Charter for Plurilingualism written in 2005:

Plurilingualism is a vital tool for promoting democratic citizenship and is also the most desirable and the most effective means of communication in public debates since it

enshrines the values of tolerance and acceptance of differences and minorities. Linguistic and cultural diversity which is inseparable from the concept of active European citizenship is therefore a component of European identity. (European Charter for Plurilingualism, 2005, p. 1)

According to the charter, the concept of plurilingualism is a crucial element in the production of a new European citizen that is compatible with a newly emerging democracy that values diversity. The Council of Europe (2007) elaborates on this point:

The experience of plurilingualism also provides all European citizens with one of the most immediate opportunities in which to actually experience Europe in all its diversity. Policies which are not limited to managing language diversity but which adopt plurilingualism as a goal may also provide a more concrete basis for democratic citizenship in Europe: it is not so much mastery of a particular language or languages which characterises European citizens (and the citizens of many other political and cultural entities) as a plurilingual, pluricultural competence which ensures communication, and above all, results in respect for each language. (p. 10)

Building on the ideas of the production of a dynamic subject introduced above, and similar to the work produced by the OECD on human capital theory, plurilingualism specifically seeks to produce a subject who is able to negotiate different cultural contexts. The argument made is that this linguistically fluid and dynamic subject will allow for a new sense of democratic citizenship to emerge in Europe

Plurilingualism is at once connected to the legal protection of minority groups, the preservation of Europe's linguistic heritage, the development of individuals' language skills and the creation of a feeling of belonging to Europe in the context of democratic citizenship. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 31)

Unlike nation-state/colonial governmentality, where a sense of belonging was produced through the creation of linguistically homogenous communities and the imposition of constructed standardized languages, plurilingualism seeks to create a sense of belonging through an appreciation of linguistic diversity. This, in turn, is said to lead to a more democratic environment where rights of linguistic minorities are respected:

The development of plurilingualism is not simply a functional necessity; it is also an essential component of democratic behaviour. Recognition of the diversity of speakers' plurilingual repertoires should lead to acceptance of linguistic differences: respect for the linguistic rights of individuals and groups in their relations with the state and linguistic majorities, respect for freedom of expression, respect for linguistic minorities, respect for the least commonly spoken and taught national languages, respect for language diversity in inter-regional and international communication. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 36)

Therefore, according to the Council of Europe, plurilingualism holds the key to the creation of a utopian future where all languages are respected and all groups are given equal rights. This point is elaborated by the *European Charter for Plurilingualism*, which argues that plurilingualism can alleviate conflict in a way that having a single language for communication cannot:

In view of the fact that plurilingualism intrinsically implies an openness toward others, it has the effect of replacing the psychology of confrontation and a clash of interests by a spirit of dialogue with a view to constructing a shared future. The use of a single language as a vehicle for international communication does not, in any way, ensure dialogue and peace. On the contrary, such a language becomes the expression of domination. (European Charter for Plurilingualism, 2005, p. 5)

In short, similar to the language ideologies associated with of nation-state/colonial governmentality, plurilingualism argues for the importance of language in preventing conflict and uniting people. However, for plurilingualism, the root of preventing conflict and uniting people is not the imposition of either a national language or a universal language, but rather the development of fluid language use among all people. The argument is that only through advocating fluid language use by all people, will people learn to appreciate linguistic and cultural diversity.

This shift from imposed monolingualism toward advocating fluid language use is connected to the new type of citizenship being produced simultaneously with plurilingualism. The Council of Europe argues for the replacement of nation-state citizenship that has marked the political landscape in Europe for the last several hundred years with a European citizenship. As Breidbach (2003) argues:

People will have to be able to communicate, to create a common communicative sphere and maintain a discourse about the shape of a common polity called ‘Europe’. Opportunity and ability to participate in public discourse on the questions of a future Europe are—among others—two fundamentals of ‘democratic citizenship’. Hence, language education policies gain importance not only with reference to education in general, rather they are politically relevant on a larger scale. Competence in language(s) is a characteristic of democratic citizenship in Europe both as its prerequisite and its practice. (Breidbach, 2003, p. 7)

This sentiment is also articulated by the *European Charter for Plurilingualism*:

Active European citizenship is inconceivable if it does not involve a multiplication and intensification of exchanges between peoples and individuals, the main channel for these exchanges being language. The degree of involvement of citizens in the preparation of EU policies depends on their ability to participate in the public debate and the political debate in Europe. A prerequisite for such an ability is plurilingual skills, i.e. the ability to interact effectively and in an appropriate way with other citizens of Europe. (European Charter for Plurilingualism, 2005, p. 4)

The Council of Europe (2007) elaborates on the creation of a European democratic citizenship through plurilingualism, arguing that the production of such a citizenship through language will allow for the formation of a “civic friendship” between different groups of people:

The most immediate experience of the diversity of Europe is the day-to-day experience of the languages used: plurilingualism could therefore be a basis for ‘civic friendship’ between speakers, whatever linguistic varieties they use. Citizens would regard one another as plurilingual and could constitute a community based on a common linguistic ideal. The idea is to detach first or official language from national or European belonging by recognising that a shared culture of languages is an informal element that could be a component of democratic citizenship. (Council of Europe, 2007, p. 71)

In other words, breaking out of language ideologies associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality is said to produce a new European citizenship that breaks out of the nation-state mold and develop a new European solidarity and a more democratic society.

While this European citizenship sounds like a move toward a society with fewer relations of power, a closer examination allows for the opportunity to expose the new power relations developing as part of the production of this new subjectivity. According to Breidbach (2003) this new European democratic citizen is one that transcends localisms and takes a global perspective:

From the point of view of education for citizenship, it would however be desirable for individuals to be able to transcend localisms and acknowledge global political, social, or cultural issues in their full dimension. (p. 20)

Yet the fact that this so-called global perspective is emerging from Europe raises questions as to whether it is, in fact, a global perspective, or whether, this global perspective represents a new universalizing Eurocentric perspective that is designed to maintain Euro-American hegemony. In fact, Breidbach (2003) makes it clear that nobody is permitted to remain outside of this new framework when he argues: “European communicative integration, being founded on plurilingualism, is antonymous to linguistic seclusionism as it is to linguistic homogenisation” (p. 7). According to Breidbach, no linguistic group can exclude itself from plurilingualism or the formation of a European citizenship. Therefore, just as in a previous era, the national subject of European nation-states was depicted as the natural subjectivity that all must model themselves after, the plurilingual subject of modern European society is understood to be the natural model that all must currently follow. In short, a Eurocentric epistemology of the world is once again positioned as the objective direction that the entire world is inevitably moving toward and the relations of power embedded within this move are erased.

The *European Charter for Plurilingualism* goes even further than the Council of Europe and argues that plurilingualism is something that will have worldwide consequences: “Plurilingualism is one of the ways of tackling the ‘clash of civilisations’ and the various forms of political, cultural and economic hegemony (p. 5).” In short, plurilingualism is a framework that the European Charter believes should be adopted worldwide to bring about world peace. The solution to world conflict is offered as molding everybody into a new European citizen—one that is a dynamic and flexible worker, as opposed to one that is a static and docile worker.

In summary, the Council of Europe seeks to produce subjects who engage in dynamic linguistic practices, develop fluid ethnolinguistic identities, and negotiate cultural difference. It is certainly difficult to argue against such a sentiment. In fact, as an advocate for bilingual and multicultural education, this resonates with me at both a personal and professional level. However, a Foucauldian analysis pushes me to ask difficult questions about plurilingualism and the power relations that have made the production of this language ideology possible. The many parallels between a plurilingual subject and the corporatized subject of neoliberalism cannot be ignored and indicate possible power relations in the idea of plurilingualism. Indeed, while not focused primarily on economic development, the *European Charter for Plurilingualism* does indicate the connection between plurilingualism and economic development:

Plurilingualism ensures economic progress in a pacified world...Plurilingualism, which ensures economic progress, also offers a fundamental asset to the individual by providing access to cultural and intellectual spheres. Once people have a good command of their own mother tongue, plurilingualism gives them a sense of personal achievement and a capacity for exchange which are conducive to the social and economic success of every individual. (European Charter for Plurilingualism, 2005, p. 6)

In short, implicit in the concept of plurilingualism is a commodification of language that is part of the corporatization of subjects that is molding them to fit a neoliberal economy. While framed as part of the production of a democratic European citizenship that is treated as a model for the rest of the world, the ultimate effect of plurilingualism is to develop subjects that maximizes corporate profits.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the emergence of a neoliberal governmentality that now co-exists alongside nation-state/colonial governmentality. While both seek to impose a Eurocentric perspective on the world, nation-state/colonial governmentality seeks to do this through the creation of linguistically homogenous populations and docile subjects, while neoliberal

governmentality seeks to create linguistically fluid populations and dynamic and ever-changing subjects. This difference is related to the different socio-historical contexts that made the emergence of each form of governmentality possible. Nation-state/colonial governmentality arose as a way of managing the subjectivities made possible by a decline in sovereign power in Europe. Neoliberal governmentality, on the other hand, has arisen as a way of managing the new subjectivities made possible by the breaking down of political and economic borders and the increasing technology of our current socio-historical context.

There are language ideologies emerging as part of neoliberal governmentality. These language ideologies are emerging both in the academic literature in the form of dynamic languaging, and in the policy realm in the form of plurilingualism. The first half of this dissertation is also implicated in the inadvertent production of a neoliberal subject that seeks to maximize corporate profits. In short, alongside the critique of static language policy as a manifestation of nation-state/colonial governmentality in the first half of this dissertation, is the idea that the alternative dynamic view of language policy is part of the production of a new subject that fits the political and economic needs of our neoliberal era.

The question remains as to how neoliberal governmentality relates to the US context. After all, as the Council of Europe attempts to move the European Union toward plurilingualism, the US political climate has become increasingly hostile to bilingual education for language minoritized students (Gándara and Hopkins, 2010). The implication of this appears to be that neoliberal governmentality and its associating production of dynamic subjects compatible with the needs of transnational corporations have not impacted the language ideologies of the US context. Yet, looks can be deceiving. As the next chapter will argue, in the US context, language

ideologies associated with neoliberal governmentality have merged with nation-state/colonial governmentality in ways that seek to perpetuate US hegemony worldwide.

Chapter Seven

The Convergence of Nation-State/Colonial and Neoliberal Governmentality in the US

After reading the last chapter, one might be left with the question of what neoliberal governmentality has to do with the US context especially in the climate of anti-bilingual education and anti-immigrant political movements of recent years (Gándara and Hopkins, 2010). In fact, it is very common to assume that the new language ideologies emerging as part of globalization have had little impact on US language ideologies. As Wright (2004) argues:

We appear to be witnessing asymmetric developments within globalisation: loss of economic autonomy and political sovereignty for many states; continuing economic autonomy and political sovereignty together with the survival of some elements of traditional one nation, one territory one language nationalism for the United States. (p. 165)

The common wisdom is that the decline of the sovereignty of nation-states and their homogeneous national languages is not something that applies to the US, whose national borders remain as strong as ever. While it is true that the US continues to work from a nationalist perspective in ways that may be uniquely provincial, it is important to not allow these nationalist language ideologies to mask a neoliberal turn in understandings of language and bilingualism that have begun to seep into the supposed monolingualism of the Anglo-American world in general and the US specifically. This chapter will argue that rather than resisting the push of neoliberal governmentality, the Anglo-American world has actually begun to adapt neoliberal governmentality in ways that reinforce the hegemony of the English language and that perpetuate US imperialism. In short, the US has begun producing language ideologies that map neoliberal governmentality onto a nation-state framework. This merging of nation-state and neoliberal governmentality seeks to produce a dynamic subject compatible with the needs of the corporate workplace as well as compatible with the needs of US national security.

This chapter explores three ways that nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality have converged among certain sectors of the Anglo-American world. The first section will explore the literature on “Global English” that emerged in the 1990s in Great Britain. The literature on Global English positions English in two ways: (1) as the global language of an utopian future that unites the world as a universal and neutral language of communication devoid of cultural specificity, and (2) as a dynamic and ever-changing language that is adaptable to all cultural contexts. The second section will focus specifically on the US context and will examine the ways that the US Department of Defense utilizes elements of both nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality to advocate for bilingualism in the name of national security in an increasingly globalizing world—a process I refer to as the *securitization of bilingualism*. Finally, this chapter ends with an exploration of parallels between the Global English framework and the securitization of bilingualism and recent trends in the pro-bilingual education movement that utilizes a language as resource orientation to justify bilingual education. The chapter concludes raising questions regarding the mutually constitutive nature of a more dynamic conceptualization of English, the securitization of bilingualism, and the commodification of bilingualism and the way that these language ideologies converge to maintain US hegemony worldwide.

The Global English Framework

As mentioned above, the Global English framework seeks to position English both as a language of universal communication devoid of cultural specificity while simultaneously representing English as malleable and adaptable to any cultural context. The Global English framework first rose to prominence in the 1990s most notably with the publication of David Crystal’s 1997 text *English as a Global Language*. This text, though published by Cambridge University Press was originally commissioned by US English, the organization founded by SI

Hayakawa discussed in Chapter Four. Despite a statement in his preface where Crystal claims to have no political agenda, many of the language ideologies associated with US English remain albeit merged with elements of neoliberal governmentality. In addition to this text, a 2006 text written by David Graddol for the British Council entitled *English Next* will also be examined. The purpose of this is to connect the Global English framework not only with the US-based US English organization but also with a British organization to explore ways that the Anglo-American world is uniting around this new framework.

Crystal (1997) begins his text by laying out two linguistic principles that underlie his work:

I firmly believe in two linguistic principles, which some people see as contradictory, but which for me are two sides of the one coin:

- I believe in the fundamental value of multilingualism, as an amazing world resource which presents us with different perspectives and insights, and thus enables us to reach a more profound understanding of the nature of the human mind and spirit. In my ideal world, everyone would be at least bi-lingual...
- I believe in the fundamental value of a common language, as an amazing world resource which presents us with unprecedented possibilities for mutual understanding, and this enables us to find opportunities for international cooperation. In my ideal world, everyone would have fluent command of a single world language. (p. viii)

In short, similar to the Universalist perspective of historical and contemporary nation-state/colonial governmentality, Crystal advocates for the creation of a universal language as necessary in creating a world of mutual understanding and cooperation. Yet, in his framework, the creation of this universal language is not incompatible with the valuing of multilingualism. In fact, the only way to have a lasting peace is to have both multilingualism and a universal language. As he argues:

We need to take both principles on board if we are to make any progress towards the kind of peaceful and tolerant society most people dream about. The first principle fosters historical identity and promotes a climate of mutual respect. The second principle fosters cultural opportunity and promotes a climate of international intelligibility. (Crystal, 1997, p. ix)

Though it is possible to read Crystal's call for a universal language along with a respect for multilingualism as developing as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality Crystal positions his work as developing within a new global order:

There are no precedents in human history for what happens to languages, in such circumstances of rapid change. There has never been a time where so many nations were needing to talk to each other so much. There has never been a time when so many people wished to travel to so many places. There has never been such a strain placed on the conventional resources of translating and interpreting. Never has the need for more widespread bilingualism been greater, to ease the burden placed on the professional few. And never has there been a more urgent need for a global language. (Crystal, 1997, p. 12)

Therefore, while multilingualism is seen as facilitating the process of globalization, the ultimate goal of the Global English framework is to create a universal language to represent the global community.

The idea that both the creation of a Global English and support for multilingualism are laudable goals is the basic tenet of the Global English framework. Yet, while articulating that both principles are equally important in facilitating world cooperation, the Global English framework spends most of the time exploring the creation of Global English. As Graddol (2006) argues:

We are rapidly shifting to a completely new social, economic and political order and with it a new world order in languages. English is proving to be a key part of this process. On the one hand, the availability of English as a global language is accelerating globalisation. On the other, the globalisation is accelerating the use of English. (p. 22)

In short, in line with the plurilingualism and dynamic language ideologies that are mutually constitutive with neoliberal governmentality, the advocates of Global English argue that shifts in the global economy require new ways of understanding language. Yet, unlike dynamic language ideologies and plurilingualism, the Global English school of thought continues to explicitly articulate the belief that there is a need for a common language to unite people—though in this

case, rather than under the banner of a national identity, the purpose of the common language is to unite the world community. In this sense, the Global English literature is heteroglossic in that it reflects a dialogue occurring between nation-state/colonial and neoliberal language ideologies. This dialogic relationship lies at the core of the Global English framework and represents an effort at the continuation of nation-state/colonial elements within neoliberal governmentality in ways that perpetuate Anglo-American hegemony within the new global economy.

Before getting into the power relations embedded within the discourse produced by proponents of Global English, it is first necessary to provide a clear definition of what these scholars mean by Global English. Graddol (2006) argues that Global English is qualitatively different from the standardized English codified as part of the formation of nation-states:

The history of English, or rather, the traditional way the history is told, represents an obstacle to a clear view of the future. Global English may represent an important discontinuity with the past, rather than the triumph of Modern English on the world stage... Increasing use of English must be seen in a much wider context in which the entire world language system is restructuring. (p. 60)

Crystal (1997) reiterates the difference between Global English and its predecessors connecting this to the rise of World Englishes as nations that have not traditionally been English-speaking nations begin to mold their own English varieties:

The study of language history shows that if two social groups come to be separated only by a mountain range or a wide river, they will soon begin to develop different habits of speech. It should not be surprising, then, to find new national dialects emerging when groups become separated by thousands of miles, and encounter different climates, fauna, and flora. (p. 133)

Global English is seen as developing in conjunction with the re-appropriation of English by nations that have not traditionally been English-speaking nations. In his view, in addition to the creation of new national Englishes, a process of developing a Global English removed from any geographic space is emerging:

Indeed, when the largest English-speaking nation, the USA, turns out to have only about 20 percent of the world's English speakers, it is plain that no one can now claim sole ownership. This is probably the best way of defining a genuinely global language, in fact; that its usage is not restricted by country or by governing bodies. (Crystal, 1997, p. 130)

For Crystal, Global English is seen as a new English that transcends national differences and unites the world through a common language devoid of any cultural specificity. In short, English serves two functions in the Global English literature. One of its functions is to serve as a dynamic and ever-changing language that is associated with a dynamic and ever-changing subject associated with neoliberal governmentality. This strand of Global English, builds on the World Englishes model of linguists Braj Kachru. According to this framework, the spread of English is occurring within three concentric circles: (1) an inner circle that includes the traditional English-speaking nations of the world, (2) an outer circle that includes nations where English has been a colonial presence for centuries, and (3) an expanding circle that includes nations with no prior relationship with the English language who are beginning to adopt it as an international language (Kachru, 1992). Therefore, there is no longer an entity called English but instead there are Englishes that have been adapted to meet the needs of different people in different contexts. The second function of English is to serve as a universal language of communication that separates language from any cultural context. In this strand of Global English, English is not a language that expresses a specific national identity but rather a language free of any cultural specificity. In other words, English both has the potential to express a national identity, while simultaneously escaping from national language ideologies.

Similar to the work of nationalist scholars, the literature on Global English provides a primordial story of the origins of Global English. As Crystal (1997) describes it:

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries English was the language of the leading colonial nation—Britain. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it was the language of the leader of the industrial revolution—also Britain. In the late nineteenth and the early

twentieth it was the language of the leading economic power—the USA. As a result, when new technologies brought new linguistic opportunities, English emerged as a first-rank language in industries which affected all aspects of society—the press, advertising, broadcasting, motion pictures, sound recording, transport and communications. At the same time, the world was forging fresh networks of international alliances, and there emerged an unprecedented need for a lingua franca. (p. 110-111)

In this framework, the rise of Global English was an organic process that developed naturally as a response to the changing global economy. Crystal (1997) continues to describe this process:

The story of English throughout this period is one of rapid expansion and diversification, with innovation after innovation coming to use the language as a primary or sole means of expression. It is not possible to identify cause and effect. So many developments were taking place at the same time that we can only point to the emergence, by the end of the nineteenth century, of a climate of largely unspoken opinion which had made English the natural choice for progress. (p. 75)

In short, English happened to be in the right place at the right time allowing it to transform from a national language embedded within specific sociocultural contexts to a global language devoid of cultural specificity. Graddol (2006) frames this move toward Global English as a move toward more democratization:

At the height of modernity, many social mechanisms helped produce a standard language. Only people of the right social class had access to the public domains of publication and, later, broadcasting. Hidden armies of copy editors ensured only standard forms reached print. Those days are over. As the English-speaking world becomes less formal, and more democratic, the myth of a standard language becomes more difficult to maintain. (p. 115)

As we have seen throughout this dissertation, the framing of one's language ideologies within a democratic framework has been common since the early days of nation-state/colonial governmentality and have continued under neoliberal governmentality. The Global English framework is no different. The framing of language ideologies within a democratic framework serves to mask the power relations embedded within epistemological shifts.

The epistemological shift that has produced Global English is part of the rise of neoliberal governmentality. In particular, the Global English framework positions knowledge of

English as a necessary characteristic for the flexible worker of neoliberal governmentality. As Graddol (2006) argues:

The role of education in school is now seen as to provide the generic skills needed to acquire new knowledge and specialist skills in the future: learning how to learn. Literacy in the national language and, perhaps the mother tongue where that is different, remains a basic skill, as does numeracy. But information technology— how to use computers and applications such as word processors, spreadsheets and internet browsers – has become just as important in basic education. In globalised economies, English seems to have joined this list of basic skills. Quite simply, its function and place in the curriculum is no longer that of ‘foreign language’ and this is bringing about profound changes in who is learning English, their motives for learning it and their needs as learners. (p. 72)

Therefore, the Global English framework parallels plurilingualism in arguing for the creation of dynamic subjects with mastery over multiple languages. Where it differs is in the central role it sees for English within this plurilingualism. Graddol (2006) points to a tension raised by making English central to this multilingual framework deemed necessary for a global economy:

The English language finds itself at the centre of the paradoxes which arise from globalisation. It provides the lingua franca essential to the deepening integration of global service-based economies. It facilitates transnational encounters and allows nations, institutions, and individuals in any part of the world, to communicate their world view and identities. Yet it is also the national language of some of the most free-market economies driving economic globalisation, and is often seen as representing particular cultural, economic, and even religious values. (p. 66)

In short, English is seen here as serving two functions: one as a lingua franca for the new global economy and the other as a language of the Anglo-American world with specific cultural values.

The Global English framework offers two different solutions to this dilemma of English as lingua franca while also being a language associated with particular ethnolinguistic identities. The first solution stems from the nation-state/colonial governmentality framework and advocates a diglossic bilingualism with English fulfilling the function of a universal public language for everybody and other languages serving as private languages of local communities. As Crystal (1997) argues:

The need for intelligibility and the need for identity often pull people—and countries—in opposing directions. The former motivates the learning of an international language, with English the first choice in most cases; the latter motivates the promotion of ethnic language and culture. Conflict is the common consequence when either position is promoted insensitively. There are ways of avoiding such conflict, of course, notably in the promotion of bilingual and multilingual policies, which enable people both ‘to have their cake and eat it.’ (p. 116)

According to Crystal the advocating of bilingual and multilingualism policies is a way of allowing people “to have their cake and eat it” because it allows people to maintain a distinct cultural identity while also adopting a global identity through the use of English. He elaborates on this point:

It is perfectly possible to develop a situation in which intelligibility and identity happily co-exist. This situation is the familiar one of bilingualism—but a bilingualism where one of the languages within a speaker is the global language, providing access to the world community, and the other is a regional language, providing access to a local community. The two functions can be seen as complementary, responding to different needs. And it is because the functions are so different that a world of linguistic diversity can in principle continue to exist in a world united by a common language. (Crystal, 1997, p. 19)

In other words, diglossic bilingualism offers a solution to the paradox of English being a global language that is also specific to a particular cultural group in that English can provide access to the global community while a local language can facilitate the maintenance of local cultural ties and identities. This framing of the issue is very much in line with the diglossia encouraged by much of the research on bilingual education (García, 2009), indicating elements of nation-state/colonial governmentality that lie at the core of the Global English framework.

Yet, in addition to seeing a diglossic framework as “having your cake and eating it too,” the Global English framework also offers another solution to the dilemma of English as both a global and culturally specific language. Utilizing a discourse that parallels in many ways the dynamic and ever-changing subject of neoliberal governmentality, Crystal (1997) argues that

English is also dynamic and ever-changing and capable of adapting to new cultural contexts. As he argues:

International varieties thus express national identities, and are a way of reducing the conflict between intelligibility and identity. Because a speaker from country A is using English, there is an intelligibility bond with an English speaker of country B—and this is reinforced by the existence of a common written language. On the other hand, because speaker A is not using exactly the same way of speaking as speaker B, both parties retain their identities. It is another way of ‘having your cake and eating it’. (Crystal, 1997, p. 134)

Because of its positioning as a global language available to more people than ever, English is seen as adapting itself to the contexts where it is now being used. By adapting to these new contexts it is described as able to escape the cultural specificities of its origins and be molded to fit the cultural context of its current use thereby eliminating the threat of cultural homogenization.

Graddol (2006) goes even further and advocates the creation of hybrid languages that blend English with local language practices to maintain identity under globalization:

One of the main challenges facing many countries is how to maintain their identity in the face of globalisation and growing multilingualism. There is a case for regulating the status of English but ways need to be found of reinventing national identity around a distinctive mix rather than a single language which is kept pure. (p. 116)

This statement marks very clearly the relationship between Global English and neoliberal governmentality. Under the language ideologies associated with neoliberal governmentality, pure languages are no longer deemed necessary with fluid language practices seen as desirable for both the production of flexible workers and desirable consumers. Yet, there are also remnants of nation-state/colonial governmentality in Graddol’s statement in that these fluid language practices are depicted as necessary in reinventing national identities that fit within the new global economy. In short, fluid language practices are seen as integral components in both maintaining national identities and adapting to a new global economy under neoliberalism.

Yet, in the Global English framework, these fluid language practices are seen as a supplement, not a replacement of a universal language of communication—a language that Crystal (1997) refers to as World Standard Spoken English:

Even if the new Englishes did become increasingly different, as years went by, the consequences for world English would not necessarily be fatal. A likely scenario is that our current ability to use more than one dialect would simply extend to meet the fresh demands of the international situation. A new form of English—let us think of it as ‘World Standard Spoken English’ (WSSE) would almost certainly arise. (p. 137)

According to Crystal, as the many Englishes adapt to their cultural context in ways that are specific to the needs of the local community, a new World English must emerge that is free of any provincial specificity and reflect the needs of the global community. Crystal (1997) argues that this is yet another example of people “having their cake and eating it too”:

The development of WSSE can be predicted because it enables people, yet again, to ‘have their cake and eat it.’ The concept of WSSE does not replace a national dialect: it supplements it. People who can use both are in a much more powerful position than people who can only use one. They have a dialect in which they can continue to express their national identity; and they have a dialect which can guarantee international intelligibility, when they need it. (p. 138)

In short, the Global English framework embraces elements of neoliberal governmentality in its desire to produce dynamic subjects that possess fluid linguistic repertoires. However, the Global English framework also maintains elements of nation-state/colonial governmentality through both its stance on the need for a common language as necessary for the development of coherent national identities as well its call for a universal language free of cultural specificity to unite all people.

While containing elements of both nation-state and neoliberal governmentality, the Global English framework parallels neoliberal governmentality most in its description of appropriate pedagogies for language education in the new global economy. Similar to the work on plurilingualism and dynamic languaging, the Global English framework argues that

pedagogies for language education from the 20th century are no longer valid for the 21st century.

As Graddol (2006) argues:

There is an extraordinary diversity in the ways in which English is taught and learned around the world, but some clear orthodoxies have arisen. ‘English as a Foreign Language’ has been a dominant one in the second half of the 20th century, but it seems to be giving way to a new orthodoxy, more suited to the realities of global English. (p. 82)

According to Graddol, the EFL and ESL frameworks that have dominated language education throughout the 20th century are antiquated and are currently being eclipsed by new pedagogies more aligned with the spread of Global English:

EFL and ESL represent the twin traditions in ELT, both with roots in the 19th century. It seems to me that in the last few years pedagogic practices have rapidly evolved to meet the needs of the rather different world in which global English is learned and used. (Graddol, 2006, p. 85)

Therefore, just as the plurilingualism framework argues that there is the need for a new pedagogy to go along with the changes associated with the new global economy, the Global English framework also argues that dominant pedagogical approaches are quickly becoming obsolete and that a new orthodoxy must be developed.

Graddol (2006) calls the new orthodoxy that he is advocating to replace traditional language teaching as “The World English Project”:

The developments in English teaching already described suggest that a new orthodoxy appears to have taken root in the last few years which could be described as ‘The World English Project’. If this project succeeds, it could generate over 2 billion new speakers of English within a decade. (p. 96)

Graddol argues that this new project promises to revolutionize language education:

If successful, the ‘World English Language Project’ will transform the place of English in the world and learners’ attitudes to it. It is also likely to change dramatically the nature of English teaching and the role of native speakers and educational institutions in the major English-speaking countries. (Graddol, 2006, p. 100)

The World English Project, unlike traditional EFL begins the language education process at a young age, with the goal of creating bilingual populations:

The age at which children start learning English has been lowering across the world. English has moved from the traditional ‘foreign languages’ slot in lower secondary school to primary school – even pre-school. The trend has gathered momentum only very recently and the intention is often to create a bilingual population. (Graddol, 2006, p. 88)

In addition, unlike both EFL and ESL, the goal of the World English Project is not to create

“native speakers” of English but rather bilingual subjects who maintain national identities:

The target model of English...is not a native speaker but a fluent bilingual speaker, who retains a national identity in terms of accent, and who also has the special skills required to negotiate understanding with another non-native speaker. (Graddol, 2006, p. 87)

For Graddol the very concept of native speaker is an impediment to the development of language education programs appropriate for the new global economy:

Traditionally, native speakers of English have been regarded as providing the authoritative standard and the best teachers. Now, they may be seen as presenting an obstacle to the free development of global English... In the new, rapidly emerging climate, native speakers may increasingly be identified as part of the problem rather than the source of a solution. They may be seen as bringing with them cultural baggage in which learners wanting to use English primarily as an international language are not interested; or as ‘gold plating’ the teaching process, making it more expensive and difficult to train teachers and equip classrooms. Native speaker accents may seem too remote from the people that learners expect to communicate with; and as teachers, native speakers may not possess some of the skills required by bilingual speakers, such as those of translation and interpreting. (Graddol, 2006, p. 114)

In short, not only is the native speaker no longer necessary under a Global English framework, but in many ways it perpetuates language practices no longer seen as appropriate within the new global economy.

In addition to no longer privileging the so-called “native speaker,” the World English Project is described as completely personalized to the needs of the learner utilizing a similar discourse as that associated with the filter bubble described in previous chapters:

In relation to language learning, the expectation that all learners in a class will be at the same level of proficiency– or even be studying the same foreign language – is giving way to approaches which allow more personalised learning. Such trends stress further the need for learner autonomy and diversity of learning materials. (Graddol, 2006, p. 72)

In short, the language education of the future is seen as an ever-changing, dynamic, and flexible endeavor that promises to produce ever-changing, dynamic, and flexible workers who maximize corporate profits while maintain national identities. The ultimate goal of the World English Project is the development of dynamic multilinguals that have proficiency in their national language, their national variety of English, and World English. In this sense the educational programming advocated under Global English, through its attempt at producing dynamic subjects is very much in line with the language education advocated under neoliberal governmentality though remnants of nation-state/colonial governmentality linger.

Graddol (2006) notes that this process of creating dynamic multilingualism with mastery of Global English is not inevitable:

English is no longer the ‘only show in town’. Other languages now challenge the dominance of English in some regions. Mandarin and Spanish, especially, have become sufficiently important to be influencing national policy priorities in some countries. (p. 62)

English is, therefore, seen as in competition with other national languages, with Mandarin and Spanish seen as especially threatening to the development of Global English. Because of this competition with other national languages that are part of the struggle for hegemony in the new global economy, Graddol (2006) argues that English is not enough, even for so-called native speakers of English:

The slogan ‘English is not enough’ applies as strongly to native speakers of English as for those who speak it as a second language. We are now nearing the end of the period where native speakers can bask in their privileged knowledge of the global lingua franca. (p. 118)

In short, despite the emergence of Global English, those born and raised as English-speakers cannot assume that their English language skills will suffice in the new global economy. Graddol offers up the Council of Europe's concept of plurilingualism as an alternative for so-called native English speakers to consider. As he argues:

The new European model provides more than a means of standardising approaches to language education through mechanisms such as the Common European Framework (CEF). It represents a wider ideological project to improve citizens' awareness of the multilingual nature of Europe, to encourage a positive attitude towards linguistic diversity, and to promote the learning of several languages. The European project is to foster large-scale multilingualism in Europe (or 'plurilingualism' as the Council of Europe prefers to call it). European citizens should ideally learn 2 languages in addition to their mother tongue. The expected benefits of such a programme include a better understanding between neighbouring nations, improved mobility of people in work and study, and an enhanced sense of a shared European identity. In this respect, 21st-century Europe seems keen to roll back the centuries-long modernity project which created largely monolingual societies. (Graddol, 2006 p. 92)

One can see here how in the end the Global English framework leans toward language ideologies associated with neoliberal governmentality. Its major conclusion is that for the Anglo-American world to remain competitive in the new global economy plurilingualism must become the norm in these societies. Therefore, though there are strong elements of nation-state/colonial governmentality produced within a Global English framework that seek to maintain the dominance of English and the English-speaking world, there is also a reluctant acceptance of the fact that this may no longer be completely feasible, with bilingualism increasingly seen as necessary.

In summary, the Global English framework is very much in conversation with the language ideologies associated with neoliberal governmentality, and seeks to produce dynamic subjects who are multilingual and able to navigate many different cultural spaces—a skill desirable to transnational corporations. Yet, nation-state/colonial governmentality continues to influence Global English in its argument that there must be a national language and possibly a

national English to represent each nation of the world as well as a universal English that unites all of humanity. Therefore, in many ways the Global English framework leans more toward nationalist language ideologies than the work done by the Council of Europe. This is no surprise since the Council of Europe is a supraregional organization not tied to any particular nation, while the primary advocates for Global English are from the United Kingdom and to the United States. In short, the Global English framework can be understood as an attempt at merging neoliberal governmentality with elements of nation-state/colonial governmentality in ways that maintain the hegemony of the Anglo-American world. How this newly emerging convergence of nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality being produced in the Anglo-American world attempts to harness bilingualism in ways that continue the perpetuation of Anglo-American hegemony is the focus of the next section.

The Securitization of Bilingualism

While the Global English literature seeks to merge nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality through the production of dynamic subjects who are multilingual users of local languages, local Englishes, and a Global English, another discursive regime that unite these two governance structures is also emerging in regards to bilingualism. This conceptualization of bilingualism, which I refer to as the *securitization of bilingualism*, seeks to produce dynamic subjects deemed necessary for an increasingly global capitalist economic structure who also possess bilingualism in so-called “critical languages” identified as necessary for national security purposes. While the Global English framework attempts to maintain Anglo-American hegemony through the promotion English as a language of universal communication, the securitization of bilingualism seeks to maintain US hegemony through supporting bilingualism specifically for the purposes of national security.

The Department of Defense describes its own prominent role in hiring bilingual and multilingual people as well as the need for schools to graduate more students who speak what the report refers to as “critical languages:”

The Department of Defense is the largest employer, both civilian and military, of Americans with skills in communicating in other languages. NSEP recognizes that in order for the Department of Defense and the broader U.S. national security and foreign affairs community to meet current and future needs for a globally trained workforce, it must rely on our national education system to graduate high school and college students with facilities in languages critical to our future. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 26)

The report notes that schools are not doing an adequate job in facilitating the development of this needed bilingualism in their students:

Most U.S. students do not achieve levels of language proficiency that enable them either to satisfy work requirements or communicate effectively in a foreign language. The average college graduate (including language and literature majors) reaches no more than an intermediate level of language proficiency. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 63)

In short, while much of the political rhetoric in the United States in recent decades has been anti-bilingual education for the K-12 system, the Department of Defense is advocating stronger programming for the development of bilingualism in certain languages for college students for the purposes of national security.

The importance of bilingualism in terms of national security is not only articulated by government agencies, but is also expressed by academic institutions working on issues of national security including the National Foreign Language Center and the Center for Advanced Study of Language (CASL), both housed at the University of Maryland. In one document disseminated by the National Foreign Language Center, the authors argue that bilingualism is more important than ever before:

The United States has an unprecedented need for individuals with highly developed language competencies not only in English, our societal language, but also in many other languages. In fact, the need for individuals with proficiency in languages other than

English for use in social, economic, diplomatic, and geopolitical arenas has never been higher. (Bretch and Ingold, p. 1)

This point is elaborated on by the Center for Advanced Study of Language which explicitly makes the connection between bilingualism and the changes associated with the twenty-first century:

The 21ST Century Demands that professionals across the Department of Defense (DoD) and Intelligence Community (IC) efficiently and effectively perform their missions in a multifaceted and unpredictable global threat environment. Language, cultural, and cognitive skills are recognized as vital assets enabling IC's worldwide intelligence mandate and DOD's military presence in over 140 countries. (Center for Advanced Study of Language, 2011, p. 1)

In other words, there is an emerging securitization of bilingualism by both US government and academic institutions that merges nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality in ways that work to maintain US hegemony while accommodating to the new global context of the 21st century.

One way that this has been done is through the creation of the National Security Education Program (NSEP), which is described by the Department of Defense as follows:

Initially designed to help eliminate the federal government's serious language deficit, NSEP has grown in both the scale and scope, offering an integrated approach to address the needs of an increasingly globalized national security environment. As it has expanded, NSEP has remained true to its legislative goals, permitting the federal government to advocate on behalf of international education; providing new approaches to the teaching and learning of languages; identifying and supporting outstanding American university students to study languages and cultures critical to U.S. national security; and creating a pipeline of these students to serve in government positions of national security. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 78)

As described in its most recent annual report:

NSEP is the only federally-funded effort focused on the combined issues of language proficiency, national security, and the needs of the federal workforce. NSEP is an integral component of a comprehensive national security strategy to eliminate the serious language deficit in the federal government. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 3)

Therefore, like with the Council of Europe, the US Department of Defense also advocates supporting bilingual and multilingual development. Yet, for the Council of Europe, which is most aligned with neoliberal governmentality, the purpose of supporting bilingualism is to create dynamic subjects necessary for an increasingly globalized world. For the US Department of Defense, on the other hand, this advantage of bilingualism is subordinate to bilingualism as necessary for national security. As the NSEP annual report describes it:

This report highlights the many ways that NSEP stands at the forefront of the national effort, heightened by the events of September 11, 2001 (9/11) to create a cadre of U.S. citizens with advanced, professional-level skills in language and cultures that are critical to our nation's future. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 2)

The US Department of Defense, therefore, seeks a clear link between bilingualism and the so-called “War on Terror” declared after the attacks on September 11th.

The connection between bilingualism and the “War on Terror” as articulated by the US Department of Defense relates to the fact that the target languages are “non-Western” countries, which it deems to be the area of most need for US government agencies:

Agencies are eager to locate and hire individuals with global skills that extend across a wide breadth of non-Western countries, who are proficient in less-commonly taught languages, and who have expertise in a broad range of disciplines. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 13)

More specifically, the NSEP places its efforts on the languages of “non-Western” countries that are considered crucial to the national security of the United States:

Less than eight (8) percent of all U.S. students enrolled in higher education will study in another country during their post-secondary career. Those who do study abroad usually travel only to Western Europe. NSEP's sole focus is on languages and world regions that are critical to national security where U.S. students typically do *not* study. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 65)

Therefore, while there has been a push in the US to pass English-Only legislation and eliminate primarily English-Spanish bilingual education programs for immigrant students in the K-12

system there has also been a concerted effort to develop bilingualism in certain languages deemed importance for strategic reasons for college students.

The US Department of Defense offers a variety of programs to achieve the goal of producing securitized bilingual subjects who will work to maintain US national security interests worldwide. As the annual report indicates all participants in these programs are expected to use the bilingual skills these programs supported them in developing in service of national security:

NSEP is firmly established as a significant contributor to the federal government's effort to address serious shortfalls in foreign language and area expertise. NSEP is unique as a federal program in its requirement that award recipients must seek a position in qualifying national security positions in return for support. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 11)

One such program, the States Roadmaps Project provides an interesting example of the merging of nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality into a securitization of bilingualism. As described in the NSEP annual report:

The ultimate goal of the State Roadmaps Project is to serve broad national socioeconomic, educational, and political interests more effectively by educating students to become globally competent. The State Roadmaps Project offers an appropriate, cost-effective, and efficient means for the assessment of state and local foreign language needs. In turn, the assessment allows local-level stakeholders to create public policy that directly addresses local needs. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 56)

The project as described here is clearly situated within nation-state/colonial governmentality in its positioning as serving broad national interests. Yet, there are also elements of neoliberal governmentality in its goal of creating “globally competent” students. In addition, the personalization of the project to fits the needs of individual localities marks a shift from a universalized disciplining governance structure to a personalized filter bubble that is mutually constitutive with the rise of neoliberal governmentality.

Another program that demonstrates the merging of nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality, is Project Global Officers:

Project Global Officers (Project GO) is a collaborative initiative that promotes critical language education, study abroad, and intercultural dialogue opportunities among Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) students, in order to develop future military officers who possess the cross-cultural communication skills required for effective leadership in the 21st Century operational environment. (Department of Defense, 2010, p. 49)

Here we have a program that specifically targets military reservists to provide them with the skills deemed necessary for the “21st Century operational environment.” Interestingly, many of the skills listed such as intercultural and cross-cultural skills are the very same skills desired by transnational corporations as part of neoliberal governmentality. Therefore, we have a program that develops bilingualism in the US military in ways that are very much in line with changes in language ideology associated with neoliberal governmentality indicating a convergence between neoliberal governmentality and US imperialist desires.

Finally, a third program that demonstrates a securitization of bilingualism within the US context is the Civilian Linguist Corp. In a feasibility study that originally proposed the program, the US Department of Defense describes the program as follows:

The concept of a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps (CLRC) deserves serious attention as the national security community develops and implements a more systematic and comprehensive approach to identify, educate, and maintain (higher level) expertise in a diverse array of languages critical to national security. (Department of Defense, 2003, p. 4)

The report goes on to describe the CLRC in more detail:

If determined feasible, the CLRC would address one critical dimension of the language deficit not covered by any of these efforts: the identification and “warehousing” of expertise in critical languages to be available when needed. The Corps concept extends from a reasonable assumption that the federal sector can never train, employ, and maintain high-level expertise in all languages that may be needed for short-, mid-, or long-term future requirements. (Department of Defense, 2003, p. 4)

Though ostensibly a civilian organization, the CLRC was devised within a clear military metaphor:

Built upon the reserve model, but applied in a civilian environment, it would appear to be more efficient and cost-effective to maintain a cadre of qualified persons available in time of war or national emergency. The CLRC, in theory, would maintain a readily available civilian corps, with certified expertise in languages. (Department of Defense, 2003, p. 4)

This military metaphor goes hand-in-hand with what CLRC were expected to do when sent to overseas locations:

Some CLRC members will also be required to fill support positions in overseas locations to supplement and support U.S. diplomatic, intelligence, and/or strategic operations. These assignments will require temporary relocation of CLRC members, and potentially longer assignments. CLRC members will not be integrated into operational forces, but can and should support “operations in the field.” (Department of Defense, 2003, p. 14)

In short, one of the primary purposes of the CLRC is to develop bilingualism for the purpose of espionage and other intelligence gathering abroad. Again, we see the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality being reappropriated in ways that reflect the national interests of the United States, as opposed to the needs of the so-called global community in the ways that the Council of Europe frames it.

Interestingly, despite the current anti-immigration context, the Department of Defense does see a role for what it refers to as “heritage language speakers” in the CLRC, which are defined as people who grew up speaking languages other than English:

It is recommended that both U.S. citizens and resident aliens be eligible to serve in the CLRC. Given that the U.S. military allows resident aliens to enlist, it seems reasonable to include them in the pool of potential members in the CLRC. Nevertheless, some agencies in the Federal Government may only be able to use CLRC members who are U.S. citizens, and possibly also only those with security clearance. (Department of Defense, 2003, p. 7)

In spite of the xenophobia of much of the partisan discourse of current US politics, certain immigrant subjects are seen as desirable in facilitating the securitization of bilingualism that the Department of Defense advocates. Perhaps ironically, there is the simultaneous process in the US context of eliminating bilingual education programs for immigrant children while there is a

concerted government effort to harness the linguistic repertoire of heritage language speakers in ways that defend US interests abroad.

Bretch and Ingold (2002), representing the National Foreign Language Center, argue for the need to tap into these heritage language speakers and to harness their linguistic resources:

There exists, however, a largely untapped reservoir of linguistic competence in this country, namely heritage language speakers—the millions of Indigenous, immigrant, and refugee individuals who are proficient in English and also have skills in other languages that were developed at home, in schools, in their countries of origin, or in language programs provided by their communities in the United States. (p. 1)

The Center for Applied Linguistics reiterates this point with a particular focus on how the language resources of this population could be used to benefit US national security:

In order to carry out its mission effectively, the U.S. defense and intelligence community needs personnel who are proficient speakers of a number of critical languages. One source of such personnel is communities of heritage language speakers in the United States that include U.S. citizens who are highly proficient in their native languages but lack the English language proficiency to carry out work-related duties effectively. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2005, p. 1)

In other words, the linguistic skills of US citizens who speak “critical languages” are seen as a resource that can be exploited in pursuing US interests abroad. This assumes that these heritage speakers are supported in developing enough competency in English to function in the workplace.

One program that seeks to harness the resources of heritage speakers is the Heritage Language Initiative. The Center for Applied Linguistics describes the origins of this program:

Against this backdrop of increasing interest and need, the National Foreign Language Center and the Center for Applied Linguistics launched the Heritage Language Initiative in 1999 with the goal of building an education system that is responsive to heritage communities and national language needs and capable of producing a broad cadre of citizens able to function professionally in both English and another language. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2005, p. 2)

In a political climate where bilingual education programs in the K-12 level are increasingly under attack, this program continues to receive support from the US Congress:

Congress created the English for Heritage Language Speakers (EHLS) program in 2005 as an NSEP initiative, the purpose of which is to provide intensive English language instruction for U.S. citizens who are native speakers of critical languages. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2005, p. 39)

It is likely that the ability to get support for bilingualism in this context is the explicit national security framing of the program:

The English for Heritage Language Speakers program is unique in its approach to recruiting and supporting skilled American citizens with critical heritage language skills, preparing them to work in national security positions. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2005, p. 78)

Therefore, though bilingualism is oftentimes treated with suspicion in the US context where nationalist language ideologies continue to be very strong, certain types of bilingualism for certain types of people for certain purposes receive governmental support with little controversy. In particular, support for developing the bilingualism of adults coming from other countries with skills in “critical languages” who seek to develop their English skills easily receives support in the US Congress. This is juxtaposed with the political assault on bilingual education for the primarily Spanish-speaking “English Language Learner” population in the K-12 public school system (Gándara and Hopkins, 2010).

The reason for the focus on foreign-born adults as opposed to US-educated heritage speakers is explained by the Center for Applied Linguistics (2005):

All of the heritage language experts agreed on three main points:

- In order to find participants with the requisite proficiency levels in the heritage languages, the EHLS program will need to recruit heritage speakers who were educated at least through high school, and probably through college, in the heritage language. Heritage speakers who were born in the United States or who came to the United States as children will not have professional-level proficiency in the heritage language.

- A high proportion of heritage speakers who immigrated to the United States as adults have completed education at the postsecondary level and have professional-level heritage language skills.
- The program EHLS would be of interest to heritage speakers who are U.S. citizens, particularly if it were presented as an opportunity for professional development. (p. 9)

Therefore, college educated heritage speakers from abroad who have become US citizens are seen as preferable to heritage learners born in the US. This is because their language practices are seen as more compatible with the type of language that will be expected of them when working on issues of national security. This point is also made by Bretch and Ingold (2002):

Many heritage language speakers need to learn the specific language skills required in a professional context (e.g., use of formal language registers), but because of their existing language and cultural knowledge, they may require substantially less instructional time than other learners to develop these skills. This is especially true for speakers of the less commonly taught languages. (Bretch and Ingold, 2002, p. 1)

In other words, heritage speakers who were educated in their country of origin before arriving in the US are seen as having a more sophisticated mastery of their home language that will make them more successful in their work with the Department of Defense or other national security agencies. Through recruiting heritage speakers born outside of the country, the US is able to exploit bilingualism in ways seen as benefiting national security. This can happen without the US government having to invest in developing the bilingualism of the US heritage speaking population through the development of bilingual education programs in the K-12 system.

While there are certainly parallels between the nation-state/colonial governmentality and the securitization of bilingualism in regards to an explicit framing of bilingualism for national security, the focus on the language needs of the workplace connects the securitization of bilingualism with neoliberal governmentality. The Center for Applied Linguistics argues for a curriculum for heritage language learners that is focused exclusively on the language necessary for the workplace:

The ESL experts agreed that instruction would need to use work-related content as the basis for a variety of learning activities: reading about a topic, listening to a presentation on it, talking about it, following up with research on the Internet, and writing about it. They stated that an intensive focus on writing would be essential, given their observations of the needs of advanced-level adult learners. They also noted that, since participants' job placements would not be known when they entered the program, instruction should include guidance on how to assess the needs of the workplace and continue to develop language skills accordingly. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2005, p. 17)

The curriculum seeks to produce a dynamic subject who is a life-long learner who is able to adapt their language skills to fit any particular job that they receive. The report goes on to explicitly differentiate this approach to the creation of a dynamic subject for the current workplace environment with the academic language that was part of a specific strand of nation-state/colonial governmentality reviewed in Chapter IV:

The EHLS program must have a workplace focus in order to enable participants to develop the skills they will need to carry out work-related tasks and activities. Curriculum development must therefore be done from an English-for-professional-purposes standpoint. This differs from an English-for-academic-purposes approach in that it identifies the functions and materials that characterize the workplace and builds instruction around those. In addition, the ESL experts and the heritage language experts noted that the curriculum would need to introduce participants to the culture and expectations of the U.S. workplace and introduce strategies for success on the job. (Center for Applied Linguists, 2005, p. 26)

With the securitization of bilingualism, academic language as a language to unite educated citizens is no longer the privileged language register. Instead, the professional language of work is seen as the desired bilingualism. In this sense, there is a shift from the particular strand of nation-state/colonial governmentality that underlies the dominant narrative on bilingual education reviewed in Chapter IV toward the neoliberal governmentality of the Council of Europe. Yet, this all continues to occur within a national framework that seeks to harness the bilingual resources of heritage speaking adults born outside of the US. This harnessing of bilingualism is done in ways that mold them into patriotic US workers able to defend US

interests domestically and abroad while requiring no national resources invested in developing the bilingualism of the many language minoritized students in the K-12 system.

In short, there is a securitization of bilingualism that seeks to produce bilingual subjects who are able to perpetuate US hegemony world-wide. This framework, like the Global English framework, combines the newly emerging neoliberal governmentality with nation-state/colonial governmentality in ways that position the Anglo-American world in general and the US specifically, at the center of the new global economy. Therefore, rather than being outside of recent trends in globalization in the way that Wright (2004) argues, the US is uniquely re-appropriating neoliberal governmentality to fit into its nationalist agenda and imperialist pursuits. Yet, it is important to note that the merging of nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality is not only occurring in government agencies or academic institutions targeting higher education. Instead, as will be seen in the next section, advocates for bilingual education at the K-12 level have also begun to appropriate these discourses in advocating for bilingual education programs.

The Commodification of Bilingualism

Ruiz (1984) argues that there are three orientations toward the role of language in US society: (1) language as problem, which positions bilingualism as a threat to the nation-state (2) language as right, which argues that there is a fundamental right to speak the language of one's ethnic group and (3) language as resource, which argues that bilingualism is an asset in an increasingly globalized world. Language as problem and language as right orientations, in their emphasis on the importance of language in the expression of a homogenous ethnolinguistic identity are most closely aligned with nation-state/colonial governmentality. As will be seen in the next chapter, since the 1960s these two orientations have been two-sides of the same coin.

However, the language as resource orientation, with its emphasis on the utility of bilingualism in keeping the US competitive in the new global economy is more closely aligned with neoliberal governmentality. Though all three of these orientations co-exist in the current debate over bilingual education in the US, the language as resource orientation has gained increasing prominence among supporters of bilingual education. This suggests a shift toward neoliberal governmentality within the epistemological framework of bilingual education that is very much in line with the Global English framework and the securitization of bilingualism discussed above.

A critique of the growing prominence of the language as resource orientation has already been made by scholars of US language education policy. Ricento (2005) critiques the language as resource orientation that has become increasingly prevalent among supporters of bilingual education. He specifically connects this orientation to the perpetuation of military and economic relations of power:

Some professional academic discourses are more concerned with advancing the particular military and economic interests of powerful (including state) interests than with the promotion of linguistic diversity. (Ricento, 2005, p. 350)

He connects this critique to the commodification of the language practices of heritage speakers:

Although there can be some enhancement of minority language status as a secondary effect of promoting them in education to benefit national strategic needs in the military, law enforcement, and trade, the overall effect is likely to be very truncated and have only short-term benefits. When [heritage language] speakers are conceptualized in military terms as strategic assets capable of serving the national interest (consistent with a resource argument), they are commodified as economically exploitable units. (Ricento, 2005, p. 362)

Arguments made in support of bilingual education that embrace a language-as-resource orientation parallel the securitization of bilingualism discussed in the previous section that

merges nation-state and neoliberal governmentality in ways that maintain US imperial ambitions within the new global economy.

Petrovic (2005) expands on this point, arguing that the language-as-resource orientation plays into the commodification of society that has occurred under neoliberalism—a process that reinforces current societal inequalities:

Language-as-resource is presented as a solution to issues associated with language acquisition and bilingual education that would be advantageous to both the capitalistic and materialistic wants of the dominant group and the maintenance of the primary languages and cultural identities of non-English speaking groups. While the latter goal is commendable, the strategic appeal to the market mentality of the dominant group is a severe miscalculation since such an appeal can serve only to perpetuate the inequitable linguistic status quo driven by capitalism in the first place. (Petrovic, 2005, p. 404-405)

Therefore, while the language-as-resource framework was devised with the intention of empowering language minoritized populations, in the end it offers a very limited view of bilingualism that does little to challenge linguistic hierarchies. Petrovic (2005) argues that the limited view of bilingualism produced through a neoliberal framework threatens to undermine bilingual education:

The danger of collusion with neoliberal approaches, even if only strategically, becomes evident here. Education can be misdirected with or without bilingual education. Thus, even if the neoliberal resource strategy leads to the promotion of bilingual education generally, the language of instruction may change, but the curriculum and pedagogy will still be directed to narrow economic purposes of schooling, schooling not to challenge the status quo but to provide students with skills to find their place in what I believe is an unjust capitalist system. (p. 407-408)

In other words, while neoliberal governmentality may produce discourses that are supportive of bilingual education, the programs that are created within this framework are designed not to empower language minoritized students but rather to create dynamic subjects who are able to maximize corporate profits.

Despite these important criticisms of the language-as-resource orientation, this orientation has continued to gain more and more prominence within the field of bilingual education in recent years. For example, the “English Plus Resolution” that has been introduced into Congress several times explicitly frames the importance of bilingualism within a language-as-resource orientation. This orientation is articulated within both a securitization and a commodification of bilingualism. In terms of the securitization of bilingualism, the resolution introduced in 2009 describes ways that bilingualism has historically been an asset to national security. For example, it argues:

Whereas multilingualism has historically been an essential element of national security, including the use of Native American languages in the development of coded communications during World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War (English Plus Resolution, 2009, n.p.)

In addition to describing bilingualism as an asset for national security, there is a more explicit economic argument that argues for bilingualism as a way of maintaining US competitiveness in the new global economy. As another section states:

Whereas multilingualism, or the ability to speak languages in addition to English, is a tremendous resource to the United States because such ability enhances American competitiveness in global markets by permitting improved communication and cross-cultural understanding between producers and suppliers, vendors and clients, and retailers and consumers. (English Plus Resolution, 2009, n.p.)

This framing of bilingualism can also be found in the discourse of many professional organizations that have been ardent supports of bilingual education in the United States. For example, the New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (NYTESOL) position statement opposing English-only legislation explicitly connects the value of bilingualism with free trade agreements developing as part of neoliberalism:

While many of the proponents of English-only policies cite the economic advantages of learning English, restricting the use of other languages in the social, cultural, and educational life of US citizens and residents would ultimately result in unintended and

unfortunate consequences for the US economy. It makes little sense to promote monolingualism at a time when multilingualism is becoming an economic imperative. Trade agreements, such as, NAFTA and GATT formalize the growing trend toward export-driven economies, and the ability to communicate in the global marketplace is a skill US business can ill afford to neglect. Speakers of languages other than English represent a valuable economic resource that would be wasted or even destroyed by policies promoting English only. (NYTESOL, 1995, n.p.)

More recently, when I attended the 2012 National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE) conference, several of the speakers utilized a language-as-resource orientation in justifying bilingual education. One speaker argued that the only way to ensure that the United States beats China in the race for dominance in the new global economy is to ensure bilingualism for all. In this framing of the issue, bilingualism is only valued when profitable for corporations and to maintain US hegemony. Though this framing of the issue was likely not the speaker's intent, by uncritically accepting the language-as-resource orientation, this speaker along with many other advocates for bilingual education may be contributing to a shift in bilingualism that will marginalize language minoritized students in new ways.

This call for bilingualism for all is certainly not new among advocates for bilingual education. For example, Macswan (1998) in critiquing the movement in Arizona to eliminate bilingual education argues that bilingual education should be available to all:

Rather than dismantle these highly successful bilingual programs, Arizona should strengthen them and make similar resources available to all children. Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., has introduced a program aimed to do precisely this, called "English-Plus," which acknowledges the great importance of bilingualism in our modern global community. (n.p)

He goes on to reiterate this point arguing that all children should learn two or three languages in schools:

Our goal in Arizona should be to teach all children to communicate in two languages, perhaps even three. Let's not follow California down the road of deception, misinformation, and poor public policy. Multilingualism is an asset, and Arizona must embrace it. (Macswan, 1998, n.p.)

This bilingualism for all mantra has coalesced around almost unanimous support among bilingual education advocates for “dual language” (also known as “two-way immersion”) programs which seek to place language majority and language minoritized students together to develop bilingualism in both English and the home language of the language minoritized students. Justification for these programs is oftentimes framed with the language-as-resource orientation complicit in neoliberal governmentality. Lindholm-Leary (2000) in a report written for the US Department of Education provides an example of this framing of dual language programs:

Dual language education is a program that has the potential to promote the multilingual and multicultural competencies necessary for the new global business job market while eradicating the significant achievement gap between language minority and language majority students. The appeal of dual language programs is that they combine successful education models in an integrated classroom composed of both language majority and language minority students with the goals of full bilingualism and biliteracy, academic excellence for both groups, and multicultural competencies. (p. 5)

In the same report, descriptions of the success of these “dual language” programs are also oftentimes framed within this same orientation:

Results demonstrate that the dual language education model can be successful. Students learn the communication skills and multicultural competencies to work on multicultural teams. Further, research reveals that students develop the types of competencies required by the global economy job market:

- Bilingual proficiency;
- Biliteracy;
- Achievement in content areas; and
- Multicultural competencies (Lindholm-Leary, 2000, p. 35)

In short, dual language programs, which have been the programs most advocated by many bilingual education advocates in recent years, may be the program model most in line with the production of dynamic subjects necessary for neoliberal governmentality. Through positioning language as a resource that all should have, as opposed to an integral part of the production of a

homogenous ethnolinguistic community, these dual language programs commodify language in ways that connect the development of bilingualism with the new global economy.

Though there has been fairly unanimous support for these programs among supporters of bilingual education, some scholars have raised some concerns about an uncritical acceptance of these programs. As Petrovic (2005) argues:

Bilingual proponents have begun to campaign for two-way programs with little consideration of issues of power, and a seeming collusion in the mooting of discussion and organization around other types of traditional bilingual education programs predominantly serving language minority students. (p. 407)

Valdes (1997) positions her concerns about these programs directly within the language as resource orientation that lies at their core:

While it is tempting to bill dual-language immersion programs as examples of implementations in which language is a resource rather than a problem it is important to note the arguments...within the critical language awareness perspective, which contend that educators need to carefully examine who the main beneficiaries of these language “resources” will be. (p. 419)

In a society with hierarchies between language majority and language minoritized communities, language as a resource for all is likely to benefit the language majority community more than the language minoritized community. Valdes elaborates on her point thinking explicitly in terms of the economic justifications oftentimes used to defend these programs:

Being bilingual has given members of the Mexican American community, for example, access to certain jobs for which language skills were important. Taken to its logical conclusion, if dual-language immersion programs are successful, when there are large numbers of majority persons who are also bilingual, this special advantage will be lost... At this moment in time, given strong anti-immigrant sentiments, it is not difficult to imagine that an Anglo, middle-class owner of a neighborhood Taco Bell might choose to hire people like himself who can also talk effectively to the hired help instead of hiring members of the minority bilingual population. (Valdes, 1997, p. 419-420)

Thinking about this in terms of education as opposed to Taco Bell, one could argue that one of the reasons Latinos were first able to enter the teaching workforce was because of the need for bilingual teachers. As more Anglos are educated within these dual language programs and develop bilingual linguistic resources, they will now be in competition with Latinos for bilingual positions and will likely take many of these positions.

The possibility of bilingual Anglo professionals taking jobs away from Latinos must also be considered within the US context where nation-state/colonial governmentality continues to have a strong presence and is connected in unique ways with neoliberal governmentality. As argued in Chapter IV, part of nation-state/colonial governmentality was the creation of a homogenous academic language that was seen as necessary to unite an educated citizenry. In this chapter I noted a shift from a discussion of academic language as part of nation-state/colonial governmentality toward a discussion of professional language that is catered to particular corporate workplaces as part of neoliberal governmentality. Both academic language and professional language, while presented as outside of power relations, privilege the language practices of the language majority Anglo population as well as certain educated elites from language minoritized backgrounds. In short, the language practices of these populations are seen as more valuable and are considered more of a resource in both protecting national security and keeping the US competitive in the new global economy. The result of this is that the bilingualism of the language majority and language minoritized elites are positioned as superior to the bilingualism of language minoritized people. As bilingualism becomes a resource for all the bilingualism of elites will allow them to once again be positioned as linguistically superior—leaving the students bilingual educators originally hoped to advocate for in the dust.

Conclusion

Many argue that the US, as the last world superpower, is in many ways immune from the spread of globalization and its impact on language ideologies. This chapter has argued that, though in some ways this may be the case, neoliberal governmentality has begun to converge with the nation-state/colonial governmentality that is more characteristic of the US to create new understandings of bilingualism in the US context specifically and the Anglo-American world more generally. One way that this convergence has been manifested is through the rise of the Global English framework that strives to position English as a universal language devoid of cultural context in ways similar to the Universalist strand of nation-state/colonial governmentality, while simultaneously positioning English as a language that is flexible enough to adapt to any cultural context in ways similar to the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality. A second way that this convergence has occurred is through the securitization of bilingualism that embraces the development of fluid ethnolinguistic identities along the lines of neoliberal governmentality while framing this bilingualism within the need to defend US borders. Finally, this convergence has also appeared within the shift toward a language as resource orientation among bilingual education supporters and their increasing support for “dual language programs” which co-exists alongside the privileging of academic language and professional language that mirror the language practices of the language majority population.

The emergence of these three interrelated language ideologies in the US context indicate that despite appearances to the contrary, US language ideologies have not been immune from the changing language ideologies emerging alongside neoliberal governmentality. This point is crucial to understand if one is interested in devising pedagogical approaches for language minoritized students that are not solely about molding them to fit their place within the current

political and economic order. A pedagogy of resistance within the US context must not only consider nation-state/colonial governmentality, but also the political ramifications of the rise of language ideologies associated with neoliberal governmentality. In the final chapter, I attempt to conceptualize what a pedagogy of resistance that resists both forms of governmentality within the US context might look like.

Chapter Eight

Toward a Meta-Approach to Language Education Policy

In this dissertation I began with an exploration of the emergence of nation-state/colonial governmentality, which was made possible by the re-organization of Europe into nation-states along with the simultaneous colonization of the rest of the world by European imperial powers. Nation-state/colonial governmentality was premised on the creation of docile national and colonial identities through the erasure of difference and elimination of heterogeneity. I then examined the ways that nation-state/colonial governmentality played out in the US context historically and in the present. The first half of the dissertation ended with a call for language education policies that build on, rather than erase, the fluid ethnolinguistic identities and dynamic language practices of language minoritized students and their families.

In the second half of the dissertation I took a step back and raised questions regarding the larger epistemological shift that has made a critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality possible. In particular, the last two chapters examine the parallels between the dynamic language practices that lie at the core of the critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality and the flexible worker privileged by neoliberalism as a way of maximizing corporate profits. These parallels are used to raise the questions of whether a new neoliberal governmentality is emerging alongside nation-state/colonial governmentality. Specifically, I raise questions as to the role of the dynamic language ideologies utilized in the first half of this dissertation in the perpetuating of this neoliberal governmentality. In short, just as particular language ideologies were mutually constitutive with nation-state/colonial governmentality, the second half of the dissertation asks the question of whether dynamic languaging is mutually constitutive with neoliberal governmentality.

This final chapter will attempt to answer the question of what we do with the insights gained from this analysis. In order to do this I will first revisit issues of agency that have been explored in previous chapters and provide a working conceptualization of resistance. I will then provide an example of marginalized groups who have resisted nation-state/colonial governmentality. This background will then be used to examine ways that neoliberal governmentality can be resisted by marginalized groups. I will describe the subject that is necessary in resisting both nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality—a subject that utilizes *meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities*. Finally, I will examine how meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities can be produced within language education policy with a particular focus on how classroom practice can facilitate its production. While the production of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities will differ depending on the context, to concretize what I mean, I will illustrate with examples from the context that I am most familiar with—namely, a US urban classroom with Latino adolescents across the continuum of bilingualism.

A Working Definition of Resistance

In order to understand what resistance to nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality might look like it is first necessary to define more clearly what I mean by resistance. Though power and resistance are oftentimes understood as opposites, Foucault (1978) argues that power and resistance are two sides of the same coin:

Where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power. Should it be said that one is always “inside” power, there is no “escaping” it, there is no absolute outside where it is concerned, because one is subject to the law in any case? Or that, history being the ruse of reason, power is the ruse of history, always emerging the winner? This would be to misunderstand the strictly relational character of power relationships. Their existence depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance: these play the role of adversary, target, support, or handle in power relations. These points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network. (p. 95)

Therefore, relations of power cannot exist without resistance to the normative constructs that make these relations of power possible. Butler (1993) reiterates this point:

The “I” who would oppose its construction is always in some sense drawing from that construction to articulate its opposition; further, the “I” draws what is called its “agency” in part through being implicated in the very relations of power it seeks to oppose. (p. 122-123)

Rather than power and resistance being seen as in opposition to each other, both Foucault and Butler are making the argument that they are, in fact, mutually constitutive. Relations of power cannot exist without resistance. Conversely you cannot have resistance that isn’t also already embedded in relations of power. Therefore, agency lies not in fighting against power but in re-appropriating power in ways that allow for the creation of new subjectivities.

Foucault provides a classic example of this mutually constitutive nature of power and resistance in the construction of the (White European) homosexual subject. For Foucault the creation of a pathological homosexual subject through discourses of the human sciences “also made possible the formation of a ‘reverse’ discourse: homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf, to demand that its legitimacy or ‘naturalness’ be acknowledged, often in the same categories by which it was medically disqualified” (Foucault, 1978, p. 101). For example, the gay liberation movement in the US re-appropriated the pathological constructions associated with the creation of homosexuality by embracing and celebrating the identity imposed on them and fighting back against the pathologization of this identity.

To further illustrate the re-signification process that goes into resisting relations of power, the next section will explore how nation-state/colonial governmentality has been resisted in language education policy with a particular focus on the efforts of Latino activists in their struggle for bilingual education. While demonstrating the resistance of Latinos against the colonizing relations of power that make nation-state/colonial governmentality possible, this

section will also expose the limits of focusing exclusively on a nation-state/colonial framework and examine the limited subjectivities that are possible within this epistemological framework.

Re-appropriating Nation-State/Colonial Governmentality

As documented throughout this dissertation, nation-state/colonial governmentality was produced as part of an epistemology of state racism that marginalized the Other who was seen as a threat to society. I have specifically explored the effects of this state racism on language minoritized population and have argued that current language ideologies position the linguistic practices of language minoritized people as inferior to the unmarked norm. While this may certainly be the case, language minoritized communities have constantly resisted this marginalization and rejected the negative characterizations of their communities. This resistance has come in many forms, though most have fallen under the large umbrella of *identity politics*, namely movements that seek to empower a particular group of people who have historically been oppressed. Identity politics accepts the static and homogenous community identities associated with nation-state/colonial governmentality, but re-appropriate this fixed and single identity in ways that challenge societal hierarchies. In short, identity politics pushes nation-state/colonial governmentality to become more inclusive through the development of counter-narratives that counteract the deficit view of marginalized communities held by the political and academic realms.

One relevant examples of how this identity politics has played out in US language education policy has been the Latino struggle for bilingual education programs. This may sound contradictory to statements made in Chapter Four regarding the complicity of the dominant narrative that defended bilingual education in nation-state/colonial governmentality. What I argued in Chapter Four is that the discourse produced by supporters of bilingual education was

made possible by the epistemology of nation-state/colonial governmentality. For particular, I argued that the central role of “academic language” in the bilingual education framework served a similar exclusionary function as the standardization process of the earlier era of nation-state/colonial governmentality. I also argued that the overarching language ideology in support of bilingual education paralleled those of contemporary critiques of bilingual education. What I will argue here is that the discourse produced by Latino activists who began the push for bilingual education in the 1960s and 1970s, while made possible by nation-state/colonial governmentality, was also a form of resistance to nation-state/colonial governmentality in that it was producing new bilingual identities never imagined before.

The re-emergence of bilingual education in the 1960s was explicitly framed within a nationalist discourse. One of the first bilingual programs to be implemented was spearheaded by Cuban refugees to Miami-Dade County shortly after Fidel Castro came to power. The reason that a bilingual program was politically feasible in this context was that the Cuban refugees were not typical newcomers to the United States in that their stay was thought to be temporary (Crawford, 1992b). Because the Cuban refugees were still perceived to be foreign nationals, it was deemed appropriate that they should maintain their national language. Therefore, rather than being in opposition to nation-state/colonial governmentality, the first bilingual education program was made possible by it. Yet, at the same time, this program opened up possibilities within nation-state/colonial governmentality never imagined before. The success of this program helped spearhead the way for other bilingual programs in the rest of the United States (Crawford, 1992b). While framed within the epistemological framework of nation-state/colonial governmentality, bilingual programs for Cuban nationals made possible points of resistance within nation-state/colonial governmentality that had not been possible before.

This opening up of possibilities was built upon by Latino activists nation-wide. One major force in this activism was the Chicano Power Movement in the Southwest. The dominant ideology emerging from this movement was an explicitly nationalist discourse that Mexican Americans should not have to give up their native culture in order to succeed in the United States. The call for bilingual education was a clear way that Chicano activists saw to maintain their native culture while learning the ways of mainstream America (Acuña, 2010). In short, the seeds planted by Cuban refugees in Florida opened up a space for the production of bilingual identities—identities well versed in the language and culture of two separate nations.

In addition to the mobilization by the Cuban and Mexican-American communities, the Puerto Rican community in New York City engaged in a fight for bilingual education. One of the most well known examples was the Rafael Cordero School in East Harlem. This mini-school within a larger school offered bilingual/bicultural instruction to both English and Spanish dominant Latino students and emphasized bilingual/biculturalism for all of the students involved in the program (Lewis, 2006). This maintenance model embedded within a nation-state framework was very popular and in line with the grassroots movement in the Puerto Rican community of advocating for improved education for their children. As Del Valle (1998) notes:

The Puerto Rican grassroots community wanted to see a revitalized educational experience for their children that respected their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and that developed students' Spanish literacy, while at the same time giving those students who needed it the opportunity to learn English. Most importantly, the problem was not defined as one resting within Spanish-dominant children. It instead framed the problem as a school system that did not respond to the needs of all Puerto Rican children, regardless of their dominant language. (p. 200)

For these community activists, creating bilingual/bicultural programs that valued the cultural background of Puerto Rican students was part of a larger transformation of schools from oppressive and racist institutions to welcoming and culturally pluralistic community spaces.

In short, Latino activists re-appropriated nation-state/colonial governmentality in ways that resisted the mono-nationalist subject of the era. However, this resistance was eventually reabsorbed through the implementation of transitional bilingual education programs whose ultimate goal was to produce monolingual speakers of American English (Del Valle, 1998) as well as general attacks on all forms of bilingual education spearheaded by conservative leaders such as Ron Unz (Crawford, 2000). What began as a re-appropriation of nation-state/colonial governmentality toward the acceptance of bilingual/bicultural subjects eventually became bureaucratized into supporting the docile mono-national subject it once challenged.

The story of bilingual education indicates the difficulty in maintaining resistance to nation-state/colonial governmentality. Yet, this difficulty should not be interpreted as a failure. Latino community activists were able to push nation-state/colonial governmentality toward producing new identities never imagined before. Instead, the difficulties in maintaining resistance to nation-state/colonial governmentality should be understood as related to the fact that marginalized groups have in many ways exhausted the possibilities within nation-state/colonial governmentality to imagine new identities. In short, there may be only so far that a static national or colonial subject can be re-appropriated. Butler (1991) articulates this point best when she argues:

Identity categories tend to be instruments of regulatory regimes, whether as the normalizing categories of oppressive structures or as the rallying points for a liberatory contestation of that very oppression. (p. 13-14)

The act of creating a static identity category, regardless of whether it is utilized by a dominant group or a marginalized group can be considered an act of symbolic violence that rips away the complexity of human existence creating static identities confines subjectivities to an idealized notion of commonality. As we have seen in previous chapters, this inevitably leads to a form of

“state racism” that treats difference as the enemy and those who insist on discussing difference as traitors.

This critique of static identities is, of course, the argument that lies at the core of the dynamic languaging ideology that was described in chapter 5—namely that conceptions of bilingualism coming from language ideologies associated with nation-states and monolingualism cannot fully describe the dynamic and fluid language practices of bilingual and multilingual populations. Yet, as argued in the last chapter this critique of nation-state/colonial governmentality is occurring simultaneously with the emergence of neoliberal governmentality. As is the case with nation-state/colonial governmentality, there may be ways of re-appropriating neoliberal governmentality in ways that are empowering to language minoritized students. It is to an exploration of what this re-appropriation might look like that I now turn.

Re-appropriating Neoliberal Governmentality

While nation-state/colonial governmentality seeks the creation of a static subject as part of the production of docile national/colonial subjectivities, neoliberal governmentality produces a dynamic subject who constantly modulates in ways that maximize corporate profits. In contrast to the metaphor of the Panopticon used by Foucault to illustrate the disciplining that occurs under nation-state/colonial governmentality, I proposed the metaphor of the filter bubble to illustrate the subject produced under neoliberal governmentality. The filter bubble is an algorithm that caters computer ads to the clicks and words that a user is utilizing on any particular day. This ever-changing algorithm is designed to assess the affect of a particular user on a particular day, while simultaneously hoping to direct a users affect toward new corporate products as often as possible. In short, the filter bubble produces a lifelong consumer that fits the governance structure developing under neoliberalism.

While this certainly sounds dire, Deleuze (1992) argues that “there is no need to fear or hope, but only to look for new weapons (p. 6)” In short, just as nation-state/colonial governmentality has been and continues to be re-appropriated by language minoritized groups to resist their oppression, there is a possibility for neoliberal governmentality to be re-appropriated in ways that resist the marginalization of language minoritized communities. This requires us to open our minds and bodies to new worldviews and new ways of imagining reality. Appadurai (1996) elaborates on this point in his analysis of the new subjectivities emerging in the new globalized world under neoliberal governmentality. He argues that:

Globalization does not necessarily or even frequently imply homogenization or Americanization, and to the extent that different societies appropriate the materials of modernity differently, there is still ample room for the deep study of specific geographies, histories, and languages. (Appadurai, 1996, p. 17)

For Appadurai, this process of being reincorporated into a global world (or what I am referring to as neoliberal governmentality) also opens up new possibilities and new subjectivities. For Appadurai (1996) these new possibilities create an imagination which “is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of a new global order” (p. 31). In short, this imagination offers ways of re-appropriating neoliberal governmentality in ways that resist the corporatist agenda associated with it.

For Clough (2007) spaces for this imagination may be found in the *affective turn* in poststructuralist thinking. The affective turn seeks to analyze relations of power not through the lens of static and pre-determined identity categories, but rather seeks to critically examine ways that power circulate through the modulation of affect. As Clough (2007) defines it:

The affective turn invites a transdisciplinary approach to theory and method that necessarily invites experimentation in capturing the changing cofunctioning of the political, the economic, and the cultural, rendering it affectively as change in the deployment of affective capacity. (p. 3)

In short, as opposed to making static subjectivities the object of inquiry, the affective turn seeks to place affect at the center of analysis. Puar (2007) elaborates on the significance of this affective turn when she argues:

The “affective turn” in recent poststructuralist scholarship indicates, I believe, that no matter how intersectional our models of subjectivity, no matter how attuned to locational politics of space, place, and scale, these formulations may still limit us if they presume the automatic primacy and singularity of the disciplinary subject and its identitarian interpellation. (p. 206)

The affective turn offers the possibility of thinking beyond static identities and provides new ways of analyzing power and new ways of conceptualizing resistance. The idea is that if neoliberal governmentality no longer needs a static subject but functions through the continuous and always becoming modulation of affects, then an empowering framework for language minoritized students cannot simply accept dynamic subjectivities with fluid ethnolinguistic identities as inherently subversive. Instead, empowering approaches to language education policy must be theorized in particular ways in order to subvert both nation-state/colonial governmentality and the newly emerging neoliberal governmentality.

Hardt and Negri in their discussion of the *multitude* suggest what this re-appropriation of neoliberal governmentality might look like. For Hardt and Negri (2004) “the multitude is an internally different, multiple social subject whose constitution and action is based not on identity or unity (or much less, indifference) but on what it has in common” (p. 100). The multitude is a way of thinking of populations as always becoming with every part of it at any moment being singular, but every singularity being connected in their unity against neoliberal governmentality. Hardt and Negri (2004) argue that the dynamism that is the material reality of the multitude under neoliberal governmentality could be re-signified to provide “an absolutely democratic organization that corresponds to the dominant forms of economic and social production and is

also the most powerful weapon against the ruling power structure” (p. 88). In short, the multitude, as a re-appropriation of the dynamic subject produced as part of neoliberal governmentality could provide resistance to shifts happening under neoliberalism.

Yet this concept of the multitude is not just about reconceptualizing populations. Equally important when thinking about language education policy is what the concept of the multitude implies for individuals. Puar (2007) provides some insights into conceptualizing this “multitude subjectivities” in her argument regarding the need to move away from static identities and instead thinking in terms of *assemblages*, which she defines as:

An affective conglomeration that recognizes other contingencies of belonging (melding, fusing, viscosity, bouncing) that might not fall so easily into what is sometimes denoted as reactive community formations—identity politics—by control theorists. (Puar, 2007, p. 211)

For Puar assemblages allow for movement in ways that identity categories do not. An assemblage can be moved, reworked, repaired, or substituted with another assemblage. Reimagining the subject in this transitory way may help challenge the stasis of identity categories. These assembled and reassembled and re-re-assembled subjectivities offer the possibility of imagining the new dynamic subjectivities that resist the corporatized dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality. In the next section, I provide a more detailed description of what this “multitude subject” might look like with a particular focus on language minoritized populations—a subject who is able to experiment with what I call *meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities*

Toward the Production of Meta Ethnolinguistic Subjectivities

One kind of subject that offers the possibility of resisting both nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality is a subject that is able to experiment with meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities. The ethnolinguistic aspect of the subject I seek to produce has been

covered in previous chapters of this dissertation and is a key component of dynamic languaging. The difference between the subject I seek to produce and the subject being produced by much of the literature on dynamic languaging is the meta aspect as well as the use of subjectivities as opposed to identity. This section will, therefore, unpack what I mean by meta subjectivities and how I see this as key in creating resistance to both nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality. In the next section, I will then provide an outline of general principles of how to produce these types of subjectivities in language education classrooms before providing a specific example of what this might look like.

Butler (2005) provides a description of the key principles underlying the production of meta subjectivities:

There is no making of oneself (poesis) outside of the norms that orchestrate the possible forms that a subject may take. The practice of critique then exposes the limits of the historical scheme of things, the epistemological and ontological horizon within which subjectivities come to be at all. To make oneself in such a way that one exposes those limits is precisely to engage in an aesthetics of the self that maintains a critical relation to existing norms. (p. 17)

The foundations of meta subjectivities must be the acceptance of the idea that it is impossible to transcend societal norms. The purpose of critique should, therefore, be to expose the limits of these societal norms and consciously push these norms toward their limits with the ultimate objective of making them inclusive of new subjectivities. This attempt at creating new subjectivities lies at the core of what Butler refers to here as an *aesthetics of the self*.

Foucault (2003b) further elaborates on the role of an aesthetics of the self in critiquing societal norms when he argues that: “From the idea that the self is not given to us, I think that there is only one practical consequence: we have to create ourselves as works of art” (p. 110). Building on his deconstruction of a transcendental Truth to human subjectivity, he argues that freedom lies not in trying to understand one’s true nature, a process which is embedded within

the colonizing discourse of the human sciences and nation-state/colonial governmentality. Instead, freedom lies in rejecting the idea of a true nature and embracing an aesthetics of the self that is an open-ended and indeterminate process of constant experimentation with new subjectivities. These subjectivities contrast with identities in that the ultimate goal is not to discover one's "true" self but rather to experiment with various forms of being that attempt to challenge conventional norms.

While this aesthetics of the self may sound similar to the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality, there are major differences. The dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality is part of a universalizing narrative that sees all of humanity inevitably moving toward a future of corporate expansion and flexible workers. In contrast, an aesthetics of the self rejects universalizing narratives and is a process of subject formation that frees the subject to imagine alternatives. In addition, an aesthetics of the self is conscious of the political implications of particular subjectivities and is suspicious of the power relations embedded in the formation of any and all subjectivities. As Foucault (2003b) argues:

My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not to apathy but to a hyper—and pessimistic activism. (Foucault, 2003, p. 104)

Therefore, the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality treats as universal what an aesthetics of the self exposes as contingent. By exposing the constructed nature and ideological assumptions of neoliberal governmentality, an aesthetics of the self offers the possibility of re-appropriating the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality in ways that resist the corporatist agenda associated with neoliberalism and allows for the creation of spaces where the multitude can exist as heterogeneous singularities.

Because a large part of Foucault's work examined sexuality, his exploration of an aesthetics of the self focused on sex acts. Foucault was interested in shifting the discourse of sexuality from one related to sexual identities toward seeing sexuality as a creative force that could develop "new forms of life, relationships, friendships in society, art, culture, and so on" (Foucault, 1994, p. 164). Toward the end of his life he became interested in sex acts associated with S & M. In his view, S & M opened up the possibility for creating pleasures outside the discourse of sexual identity that was created as part of current regimes of truth. As Foucault (1994) argues:

We know very well that all those people are doing is not aggressive; they are inventing new possibilities of pleasure with strange parts of their bodies—through the eroticization of the body. I think it's a kind of creation, a creative enterprise, which has as one of its main features what I call the desexualization of pleasure. (p. 165)

In Foucault's view, S & M not only offered the possibility of producing new sexual subjectivities but also turned relations of power into a game:

The S & M game is very interesting because it is a strategic relation, but it is always fluid. Of course, there are roles, but everybody knows very well that those roles can be reversed. Sometimes the scene begins with the master and the slave, and at the end the slave has become the master. Or, even when the roles are stabilized, you know very well that it is always a game. Either the rules are transgressed, or there is an agreement, either explicit or tacit, that makes them aware of certain boundaries. (Foucault, 1994, p. 169)

S & M provides a context where relations of power are made explicit. This explicit submission to power offers the opportunity to turn power relations into a game—a game whose rules have been denaturalized and can be changed. In short, while one cannot escape relations of power, one can consciously submit in ways that allow for new subjectivities within contingent relations of power to develop.

While Foucault's project related to the study of sexuality, my interest is on extending the idea of an aesthetics of the self into the area of language. What follows below is a

conceptualization of what shifting language from reflections of static identities toward the understanding of language as a creative force with the possibility of producing new subjectivities within contingent relations of power that resist both nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality.

Creating Classroom Spaces for Meta Ethnolinguistic Subjectivities

In order to concretize what I envision as the role of language education in the development of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities, I will focus on classroom practice. Because classrooms are spaces, it is important to first describe the space required to make possible the production of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities. Ellsworth (2005) provides some insight in her discussion of *transitional space*, which she defines as “the interval, the space of self-difference, and the process self change that opens up the psyche when an experience of the learning self is in the making” (31). For Ellsworth this transitional space is a space of uncertainty where knowledge and the self are always in the making and where there is the potential for new knowledge and new subjectivities to be produced. She connects this transitional space to pedagogy:

We might begin to consider pedagogy, as an address to a self who is in the process of withdrawing from that self, someone who is in a dissolve out of what she or he is just ceasing to be and into what she or he will already have become by the time she or he registers something has happened. (p. 34)

Converting classrooms into transitional spaces offers students the opportunity to continuously make and re-make themselves in a never-ending process of becoming. The ultimate goal of this transitional space is to imagine new subjectivities and new forms of solidarity with one another.

Ellsworth (2005) elaborates on this point:

If teaching is about thinking and not about complying with the one who holds the superordinate knowledge, if thinking is an encounter with the unthought, then for pedagogy to put us in relation with each other in ways we have never been before, for a

pedagogy to be a democratic civic pedagogy, it must create places in which to think about “we” without knowing already who “we” are. (p. 95)

Unlike with neoliberal governmentality, this transitional subject is one that is attempting to imagine new subjectivities that resist both the identity politics of nation-state/colonial governmentality and the corporate subject of neoliberal governmentality.

The concept of a transitional classroom space parallels in many ways the dynamic languaging described in the previous two chapters. Yet, while conceptions of dynamic languaging go a long way toward creating transitional classroom spaces, there is still a certain categorization process associated with the literature. For example, while García (2009) accepts the inherent fluidity of bilingualism, her use of the term bilingualism continues to reinforce the idea of enumerable and autonomous languages that she hopes to undermine. Through the continued conceptualization of language users as monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual, there is an already constructed “we” based on countable languages and static ethnolinguistic identities. It is the already-constructed nature of an “I” or a “we” that transitional classroom spaces seek to challenge. Below I describe five principles that attempt to extend beyond the fixed labels of the literature on dynamic languaging. It is my contention that these five principles must lie at the core of the creation of transitional classroom spaces that facilitate the development of a meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities that resist both nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality:

Principle One: Reject linguistic Othering. The first principle of this transitional classroom space is a rejection of linguistic Othering that is a product of a state racism embedded within nation-state/colonial governmentality. This means rejecting constructs such as “native speaker” and “English language learners”—terms that are central to much of the literature in language education. These constructs serve the function of normalizing certain language

practices and pathologizing those who do not fit these norms. This means treating *all* users of a language as legitimate users of dynamic linguistic repertoires. A rejection of linguistic

Otherizing requires eliminating any hierarchical conceptions of language proficiency. This involves breaking out of the strict binary of ESL and bilingual education that by definition are premised on providing services for a Linguistic Other—"The English Language Learner."

Classrooms that facilitate the development of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities are linguistically heterogeneous classrooms where fluid language practices are at the core of all of the work done and language is treated as both a tool of communication and a contested object of study.

Principle Two: Reject static and idealized notions of language. The second principle, which is interrelated to the first principle means treating all static languages as fictions—fictions that are embedded in exclusionary relations of power. What we consider English, Spanish or academic language, along with even more specific "dialectal variations" such as Indian English or Puerto Rican Spanish are not objective labels but rather social constructions that erase the heterogeneity of language practices and silence fluid ethnolinguistic subjectivities. Rather than erasing this heterogeneity, a transitional classroom space that allows for the development of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities embraces the fluidity of all language use—even among so-called monolingual populations. This transitional classroom space no longer conceptualizes students in terms of being monolingual or bilingual or multilingual but simply lingual. Seeing students as dynamically lingual moves a transitional classroom space toward an acceptance that monolingualism as a static and normalized construct is just that—a normalized construct designed to marginalize language minoritized students. A shift toward seeing all people as dynamically lingual acknowledges all people as legitimate language users of dynamic language practices—none superior to the other.

Principle Three: Provide spaces for students to experiment with their fluid language practices. In order to acknowledge the dynamic lingualism of all students, it is necessary to provide learning opportunities for students that allow them to utilize their entire linguistic repertoire. This means reframing classroom instruction from one that is centered on building students' academic language to working with them to develop their fluid voices through the use of dynamic language and literacy practices in the classroom. Rather than working with them to develop "pure" academic texts, a transitional classroom space that supports the development of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities practices will embrace the creation of *fluid texts* that allow students to experiment with a range of ethnolinguistic subjectivities. The purpose of this is to shift away from controlling student language use to supporting student in what Blommaert (2010) describes as developing "voice"—as they negotiate different language practices and discourses and develop new and linguistically fluid texts that produce new subjectivities and provide unique perspectives of the world.

Principle Four: Make language into a contested part of the curriculum. As noted in the previous two chapters, embracing dynamic language practices and privileging fluid texts is not inherently subversive or empowering. The only way to prevent fluid ethnolinguistic subjectivities of becoming engulfed by neoliberal governmentality is to make students aware of the political ramifications of their language use. Language education teachers need to place conflict and struggle at the center of any pedagogy as part of a process of developing in students what Lu (1992) terms a "mestiza consciousness" (p. 888) that allows them to blend different discourses in their writing and reposition themselves in relation to both their home language practices and the language practices expected in school. Rather than treating language use as removed from ideological processes, a transitional classroom space must be centered on a

denaturalization process that attempts to make the ideological underpinnings of all language use an explicit part of instruction. In short, it is not enough to provide spaces for students to experiment with different ethnolinguistic subjectivities. The consequences of the language forms they decide to use must be an explicit part of the curriculum.

Principle Five: Treat language as an ontologically indeterminate ‘always becoming process’ that is shaped and re-shaped through collaboration within dynamic and ever-changing communities of practice. The new framework to language education I am advocating seeks to shift conceptualizations of language from an ontology based on unified, autonomous and countable languages to seeing language practices as ontologically indeterminate assemblages that are constantly interaction with other assemblages in a community of practice to create singular events that are constantly in motion and becoming something new. In this ontology of becoming language is not treated as a static and countable entity that can be defined but rather as an always becoming assemblage that is worked and re-worked in interaction with other assemblages as race, gender, class, the media, professional role, etc. in the continuous creation of new subjectivities. In a classroom that embraces this framework, language is not treated as an entity that needs to be mastered but rather as a tool that is part of an on-going process of transformation through interaction with the self and others. Therefore, in addition to making the political ramifications of language use a central part of the curriculum, a transitional classroom space that seeks to produce meta ethnolinguistic identities must also challenge the idea that language can ever be truly defined or that language can be separated from interactions with other assemblages.

A Meta-Approach in Practice

Now that I have laid out the general principles which lie at the core of transitional classroom spaces that facilitate the development of meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities, it is now

possible to provide a concrete example of what this might look like in practice. I begin with a few caveats. First, what follows should not be read as a guide on how to undermine nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality. This should not be read as *the* way of subverting these relations of power but rather as one possible way thought of by one person. Secondly, I have chosen to create an example based on the schooling context that I am most familiar with. To this effect, the classroom that I will be providing a case study of is a fictional high school Language Arts classroom of Latino students across the continuum of bilingualism, ranging from students who use Spanish more regularly than English to students who primarily use English, taught by a Latino teacher who is a daily user of both English and Spanish. I leave it to others who are interested to extend this work to other contexts in the US or internationally. Finally, what follows should be read with the assumption that classroom realities are always much more complex and dynamic than what can be articulated in writing.

Before describing what I think is unique about this classroom, it is important to emphasize the fact that in this classroom many of the strategies that have been documented in the literature as “best practices” for “English Language Learners” are still present. For example, the teacher scaffolds instruction in ways that support students in their language learning (Walqui, 2006). In addition, the teacher organizes units around themes to support students in make connections between the many concepts that they are learning (Freeman, Freeman, and Mercuri, 2002). There is also a strong emphasis on teaching learning strategies to students through both explicit modeling and opportunities for students to practice these strategies (Chamot, 2009). In short, the critique of language education offered by this class is not about the strategies that have been developed to support students labeled as “English Language Learners.” On the contrary, these teaching strategies are practices that all teachers should implement in their classrooms.

Yet, there is one major difference between this classroom and the classrooms described in the best practices literature for “English Language Learners”—namely the ultimate goal of providing these supports. The goal in the current literature on “best practices” is to support students in the development of English as a second language—a language separate from the home language practices of “English Language Learners.” In contrast with this, the major goal of the classroom described below is to add to students’ linguistic repertoires and provide spaces for them to express their dynamically lingual voices and experiment with various subjectivities. As opposed to the traditional classroom for “English Language Learners” which seeks to mold students into idealized speakers of Standard Academic/American English, this classroom seeks to create students who experiment with their linguistic repertoires in ways that undermine current linguistic relations of power.

One way that this classroom does this is through permitting both the teacher and the students to use their entire linguistic repertoires in making meaning in the classroom. On a typical day, the teacher provides an introduction to class in Spanish then uses English for whole group instruction and caters his language practices to student need when working with students in groups. He also presents information on PowerPoint bilingually. Students typically use a mix of English and Spanish when working in groups. In addition, it is a common phenomenon for students to utilize Google translate and other Internet tools to help clarify concepts that they have not understood. As will be explored below, while there are language expectations for students in their writing they are never told what language to write in. A student is never required to write in English or in Spanish—but they are expected to make conscious choices as to linguistic form. Below I will illustrate what I mean with making conscious choices as to linguistic form through a

general description of the basic assumptions of a unit in this classroom. This will then be followed by a specific example of what this might look like in practice.

In the spirit of producing meta ethnolinguistic subjectivities, the teacher makes language central to every unit that is taught to students. The basic assumption of all thematic units is that language is a contested category and that the linguistic form one chooses to explore a particular topic is not separate from the ultimate meaning that one produces about the topic. The idea that all language use is ideological lies at the core of every unit. This includes not simply exploring issues of Spanish and English, but also the different forms within each of these constructed languages. The ultimate goal is for students to become conscious users of blended discourses which subvert nation-state/colonial governmentality and neoliberal governmentality. It subverts nation-state/colonial governmentality through critiquing static identity categories and it subverts neoliberal governmentality by empowering students to be conscious of how they use their fluid language practices as opposed to blindly being co-opted by corporatization.

A description of some activities for one particular unit will help illustrate how this goal looks in practice. The theme of this particular unit is adolescence. The activities that are described below will focus on language. However, it is important to note that the possibility of developing ethnolinguistic subjectivities is also possible in activities without an explicit focus on language.

- One major learning experience that the students participate in is a critical examination of scientific descriptions of adolescence. Students read a scientific article in either English or Spanish based on their preference. They are then asked to translate the article to reflect all of their home language practices. They are given a series of questions that ask them to reflect on what they were able to translate easily and what they had difficulty translating

or were not able to translate. They are also asked to reflect on what it is possible to express about adolescence through scientific language and what is left out about adolescence when using this linguistic form. Finally, they reflect on the larger epistemological stance of scientific language, which they are now able to identify as a constructed language with specific epistemological assumptions.

- A second major learning experience that students participate in is to conduct a literary analysis of the work of authors who use translinguaging for stylistic purposes in exploring the theme of adolescence. The class focuses specifically on a few vignettes from *The House on Mango Street* by Sandra Cisneros. After reading the vignettes students are asked to reflect on the impact that the use of translinguaging had on the subjectivities being produced in the writing. They are also asked to translate Spanish words Cisneros used into English and asked to reflect on any changes to the meaning that occurs and the effect this translating has on the vignette. This analysis will push students to reflect on their own language choices when writing their own artistic pieces on adolescence later in the unit.
- Related to the analysis of literature, the students also explore uses of language in non-written forms by artists exploring the theme of adolescence and reflect on the multimodality of communicative processes (Kress, 2010). There is a particular focus on how translinguaging is utilized by spoken word poets performing at the Urban Word Teen Poetry Slam. Students explore the ways that translinguaging and performance are blended to create subjectivities that critique current relations of power and open up spaces for new understandings of adolescence that incorporate subaltern perspectives. The students are also asked to compare and contrast the linguistic form and meaning of

these performances and others with the linguistic form and meaning of both the scientific text and *The House on Mango Street*. Part of this reflection is related to what possibilities are open up and foreclosed by each of the linguistic forms. In addition, questions are raised as to the sole focus on language in current understandings of communication and the role that performance can play in producing specific ethnolinguistic subjectivities that interact with other assemblages such as race, gender, sexual orientation etc. Students will reflect on the different assemblages of social identities produced through language and performance within these performance pieces and begin to brainstorm ways of producing particular configurations of assemblages in their own autobiographical work.

- A culminating project for the unit is for students to produce a piece of writing exploring the theme of adolescence which experiments with language in ways that create new ethnolinguistic subjectivities. In order to help them with this process, they are provided with graphic organizers that help them brainstorm ways of blending language forms in ways that convey the particular ethnolinguistic identity they are attempting to produce. One student may experiment with blending a scientific linguistic form conveyed through English with poetry written in Spanish in an attempt to convey her interest in science but commitment to challenging scientific language to become more culturally inclusive. Another student may decide to write a vignette in Spanish with a few key words in English that were key vocabulary words for the unit to demonstrate how his linguistic repertoire is growing to include academic words in English. Still another student might write a piece in English but include some dialogue in Spanish to provide an accurate representation of the home language practices of her family. The purpose of the project will be for students to engage in *language crossing* which Rampton (2001) defines as

“the use of a variety that, in one way or another, feels anomalously ‘other’ (p. 49).

Students will consciously participate in languaging that challenges conventional uses of languages that were developed as start of nation-state/colonial governmentality. Each of the pieces of writing will be creating an aesthetics of the self through the creation of new ethnolinguistic subjectivities through writing that do not represent a static identity.

Instead, these projects will demonstrate a “meta” approach to language use that experiments in challenging conventional ways of thinking through artistic expression that challenges current understandings of appropriate language use. At the same time it will make students aware of the relations of power embedded in all language use and allow them to turn language use into a game with contingent relations of power that can be changed if desired.

The ultimate goal of all of these activities is for students to become conscious of how language can be consciously used to experiment with new subjectivities. The major understanding that students are expected to gain is that they are in charge of how they use language and can consciously deviate from standard rules in order to experiment with new ways of being. The fluidity of language practices encouraged by this definition subverts nation-state/colonial governmentality. The conscious nature of it re-appropriates the dynamic subject of neoliberal governmentality in ways that empower students to resist the corporatization of their language practices. This is a classroom space where students create linguistic works of art and form a multitude of democratic language practices without linguistic hierarchies.

Conclusion

After spending so much time in the realm of the theoretical, this chapter was meant to serve as the practical application chapter of the dissertation. Perhaps these practical applications

appear anti-climatic. After spending hundreds of pages deconstructing current language ideologies and connecting them to larger political and economic forces associated with nation-state/colonial and neoliberal governmentality, it may seem unfulfilling to read about the power of the arts along with examples of a few pedagogical activities as solutions to the problems exposed throughout this dissertation. These practical applications may not sound nearly as revolutionary as the rest of the dissertation seemed to imply.

I would first reiterate the fact that the practical applications described here are not meant to be taken as solutions to the problem. I am not naïve enough to imagine that allowing students to experiment with language in the classroom will magically eliminate the state racism of nation-state/colonial governmentality or the corporatization of society under neoliberal governmentality—especially because of the fact that the ideas produced here have been developed within the socio-historical context that it attempts to subvert.

Yet, at the same time I would argue that these practical applications may, in fact, be more revolutionary than they appear at first glance. What I am proposing is a fundamental reconceptualization of language education away from thinking in terms of language acquisition as a developmentally linear process with clear stages of language proficiency toward thinking in terms of languaging as a dynamic process without clearly defined conceptions of language proficiency. I am proposing a shift from seeing languages as already-made entities with clear rules that need to be taught to seeing languaging as an always becoming process where the language user is in charge of its construction. I am calling for pedagogical approaches that empower language minoritized students to use language on their own terms and in their own ways. In particular, I am advocating the need to provide them with the tools to consciously use language in ways that subvert the relations of power that have marginalized their communities

for centuries. What I am advocating for is a pedagogy that allows the subaltern to speak for themselves in ways that critique their marginalization in both the political and academic realms. I cannot think of anything more revolutionary than that.

Bibliography

- Acuña, R. (2010). *Occupied America: A history of Chicanos*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1): 67-92.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Ann Lute Books.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.
- Baker, C. and Hornberger, N. (2001). Jim Cummins: A biographical introduction. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 1-16). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bailey, Benjamin. 2007. Heteroglossia and boundaries. In Heller, Monica (ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach* (pp. 257-274). New York: Palgrave.
- Barlow, J. (1806). *Prospectus of a national institution to be established in the United States*. Washington.
- Bauman, R. and Briggs, C. (2000). Language philosophy as language ideology: John Locke and Johann Gottfried Herder. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. (pp. 139-204). Santa Fe: School of American Press.
- Besley, T. and Peters, M. (2007). *Subjectivity and truth: Foucault, education, and the culture of self*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Blanton, C. (2004). *The strange career of bilingual education in Texas, 1836-1981*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonfiglio, T. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bonfiglio, T. (2002). *Race and the rise of standard America*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Breidbach, S. (2003). *Plurilingualism, democratic citizenship in Europe and the role of English*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Brecht, R. and Ingold, C. (2002). *Tapping a national resource: Heritage languages in the United States*. Washington DC: National Foreign Language Center.
- Buel, R. (2011). *Joel Barlow: American citizen in a revolutionary world*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1991). Imitation and gender subordination. In D. Fuss (ed.) *Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories*. (pp. 13-31). New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Center for Advanced Study of Language (2011). *2011-2017 strategic plan*. College Park: University of Maryland

- Center for Applied Linguistics (2005). *English for heritage language speakers scholarship program: Report on feasibility study and proposal for pilot study*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Chamot, A. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. New York: Pearson
- Clifford, M. (2001). *Political genealogy after Foucault: Savage identities*. New York: Routledge.
- Clough, P. (2007). Introduction. In P. Clough with J. Halley (eds.), *The affective turn: Theorizing the social*. (pp. 1-33). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Council of Europe (2012) *Council of Europe*. Retrieved, December 1, 2011, from <http://www.coe.int/aboutCoe/index.asp?page=nosObjectifs&l=en>
- Council of Europe. (2007). *From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education: Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.
- Crawford, J. (1992a). *Language loyalties: A sourcebook on the official English controversy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, J. (1992b). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of English only*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Crowley, T. (1990). The obscure object of desire: A science of language. In J. Joseph and T. Taylor (eds.), *Ideologies of language*. (pp. 27-50). London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1986/2001). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 175-194). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1982/2001). Tests, achievement, and bilingual students. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 139-147). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1980/2001). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 110-138). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1979/2001). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 63-95). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1976/2001). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins*. (pp. 26-55). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7–21 & 51–5.
- Degraff, M. (2005). Linguists' most dangerous myth: The fallacy of Creole exceptionalism. *Language in Society*, 34(4): 533-591.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscripts on the societies of control. *October* 59:3-7.
- Department of Defense (2010). *National security education program 2010 annual report*. Washington DC: Department of Defense.
- Department of Defense (2003). *United States civilian linguist reserve corps feasibility study*. Washington DC: Department of Defense.
- Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited Inc*. Evanston, ILL: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Del Valle, S. (1998). Bilingual education for Puerto Ricans in New York City: From hope to compromise. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(2): 193-217.
- Dicker, S. (2003). *Languages in America: A pluralist view*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Eastman, C. (1983). *Language planning: An introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp.
- Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- English Plus Resolution, H. Con. Res 3, 111th Cong., 1st Sess. (2009).
- Errington, J. (2001). Colonial linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30: 19-39.
- European charter for plurilingualism* (2005).
- Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University press.
- Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C. and Das Gupta, J. (eds.) (1968). *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977-1978*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2003a). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976*. New York: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2003b). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (eds.), *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. New York: New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1994). Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In P. Rabinow (eds.), *Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984: Ethics, subjectivity and truth*. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1984a). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault reader*. (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984b). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault reader*. (pp. 51-75). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, volume 1*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Fraser, N. (1994). Foucault on modern power: Empirical insights and normative confusions. In B. Smart (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Critical assessments* (pp. 133-48). New York: Routledge.
- Freeman, Y., Freeman, D., and Mercuri, S. (2002). *Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

- Gal, S. (2006). Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of practices and publics. *Social Anthropology*, 14(2): 163-81.
- Gándara, P. and Hopkins, M. (eds.) (2010). *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. and Menken, K. (2010). Stirring the onion: Educators and the dynamics of language education policies. In K. Menken and O. García (eds.) *Negotiating language policies in schools: Educators as policymakers*. (pp. 249-261). New York: Taylor and Francis
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gee, J., Hull, G., and Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of new capitalism*. Boulder: Westview Press
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next*. London: The British Council.
- Hannah, M. (2000). *Governmentality and the mastery of territory in nineteenth-century America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire*. New York: Penguin Group Ltd.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, R. (1981). *The language myth*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hayakawa, S. (1991). Introduction. In F. De La Peña, *Democracy or babel? The case for official English in the US* (p. 1-18). Washington DC: US English.
- Hayakawa, S. (1990). *Language in thought and action*. Orlando: Harcourt, Inc.
- Hayakawa, S. (1985). *One nation...indivisible?* Washington DC: The Washington Institute for Values in Public Policy.
- Heath, S. (1976). A national language academy? Debate in a new nation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 11:9-44.
- Herdina, P. and Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hornberger, N. (2006). Nichols to NCLB: Local and global perspectives on US language education policy. In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, and M. Torres-Guzman (eds.), *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization*. (pp. 223-37). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hyslop-Margison, E. and Sears, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism, globalization, and human capital learning: Reclaiming education for democratic citizenship*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Irvine, J. and Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. (pp. 35-84). Santa Fe: School of American Press.
- Kachru, B. (1992) Teaching world Englishes. In B. Kachru (ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Keeley, B. (2007). *Human capital: How what you know shapes your life*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Kendall, J. (2010). *The forgotten father: Noah Webster's obsession and the creation of an American culture*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

- Klein, N. (2006). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Picador.
- Kloss, H. (1977). *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newberry House Publishers.
- Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Cameron, L. (2008). *Complex systems and applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lepore, J. (2002). *A is for American: Letters and other characters in the newly United States*. New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Lewis, H. (2006). Protest, place, and pedagogy: New York City's community control movement and its aftermath (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University, New York.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2000). *Biliteracy for a global society: An idea book on dual language education*. Washington D.C.: George Washington University.
- Lipman, P. (2011). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. New York: Routledge.
- Lipman, P. and Hursh, D. (2007). Renaissance 2010: The reassertion of ruling class power through neoliberal policies in Chicago. *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2): 160-178.
- Lomawaima, K.T. and McCarty, T. (2002). When tribal sovereignty challenges democracy: American Indian education and the democratic ideal. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(2): 279-305.
- Losurdo, D. (2011). *Liberalism: A counter-history*. New York: Verso.
- Lowe, L. (2006). The intimacies of four continents. In A. Stoler (ed.) *Haunted by empire: Geographies of intimacy in North American history*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Lu, M. (2004). An essay on the work of composition: Composing English against the order of fast capitalism." *College Composition and Communication* 56(1): 16-50.
- Macswan, J. (1998, August 6). Bilingual education as an asset that can offer global rewards. *Arizona Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.humnet.ucla.edu/linguistics/people/grads/macswan/AR3.htm>
- Mahon, R. and McBride, S. (2009). Standardizing and disseminating knowledge: The role of the OECD in global governance. *European Political Science Review*, 1(1): 83-101.
- Makoni, S. (2003). From misinvention to disinvention of language: Multilingualism and the South African constitution. In S. Makoni, G. Smitherman, A. Ball, and A. Spears (eds.) *Black linguistics: Language, society, and politics in Africa and the Americas*. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, R. (1988). Truth, self, power: An interview with Michel Foucault. In L. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. Hutton (eds.) *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. (pp. 9-15). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Maturana, H. and Varela, F. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding*. Boston: Shambhala.
- McGuigan, J. (2005). Neo-liberalism, culture, and policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(3): 229-241.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English language learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (1995). *The darker side of the Renaissance: Literacy, territoriality, and colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Mülhäusler, P. (1996). *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific Rim*. New York: Routledge.
- New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (1995). *Position statement against official English legislation and policy*.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2012). *About the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en_36734052_36734103_1_1_1_1_1,00.html
- Paechter, C. (1998). *Educating the Other: Gender, power, and schooling*. Bristol: Falmer Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2002). Mother tongues, governmentality, and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 154: 11-28.
- Petrovic, J. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4: 395-416.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pickering, J. (1820). *An essay on a uniform orthography for the Indian languages of North America, as published in the memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. Cambridge: Univ. Press-Hilliard and Metcalf.
- Pickering, J. (1816). *A vocabulary; or, collection of words and phrases which have been supposed to be peculiar to the United States of America to which is prefixed an essay on the present state of the English language in the United States*.
- Puar, J. (2009). Prognosis time: Toward a geopolitics of affect, debility, and capacity. *Women and Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory*, 19(2): 161-72.
- Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rampton, B. (2001). Crossing. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Key terms in language and culture*. (pp. 49-51), Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Reade, A. (1936). American projects for an academy to regulate speech. *PMLA*, 51(4): 1141-1179.
- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language as resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3): 348-368.
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento (ed), *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English* (pp. 9-23), Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger of memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Roediger, D. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class*. New York: Verso Books.
- Rollin, R. (ed). (1989). *The autobiographies of Noah Webster: From the letters and essays, memoirs, and diary*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B. (eds.) (1971). *Can language be planned?: Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu: East-West Center and University of Hawaii Press.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2): 15-34.

- Rush, B. (1786). *A plan for the establishment of public schools and the diffusion of knowledge in Pennsylvania; to which are added, thoughts upon the model of education proper in a republic*. Philadelphia.
- Said, E. (1977). *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Sandeford, D (2008, February 11). The Chomsky-Foucault Debate [excerpt, part 2/2] [video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S0SaqrXgJvw>
- San Miguel, G. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education policy in the United States 1960-2001*. Denton: University of North Texas Press.
- Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in general linguistics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schlesinger, A. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Schmid, C. (2001). *The politics of language: Conflict, identity, and cultural pluralism in comparative perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education, or worldwide diversity and human rights?* New York: Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (eds.), *Minority education: From shame to struggle* (pp. 9-44). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*. (pp. 271-313). Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.
- Spring, J. (2009). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of the dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stoler, A. (2006). (ed.), *Haunted by empire: Geographies of intimacy in North American history*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Stoler, A. (1995). *Race and the education of desire: Foucault's history of sexuality and the colonial order of things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Suarez-Orozco, M., Roos, P., Suarez-Orozco, C. (1999). Cultural, Educational, and Legal Perspectives on Immigration: Implications for School Reform. In J. P. Heubert (ed.), *Law and school reform: six strategies for promoting educational equity* (pp. 160 - 204). New Haven Connecticut; London: Yale University Press.
- Tollefson, J.W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London: Longman.
- Thornton, W. (1793). Cadmus, or a treatise of the elements of written language, illustrating, by a philosophical division of speech, the power of each character, thereby mutually fixing the orthography and orthoepy. With an essay on the mode of teaching the deaf, or surd and consequently dumb, to speak. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 3: 262-319.
- Valdes, G. (1997). Dual language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(3): 391-429.
- Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2): 159-180.

- Webster, N. (1789). *Dissertations on the English language: With notes, historical and critical to which is added, by way of appendix, an essay on a reformed mode of spelling, with Dr. Franklin's arguments in that subject.* Boston.
- Wiley, T. (2002). Assessing language rights in education: A brief history of the US context. In J. Tollefson (ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalization.* New York: Palgrave.