

BILINGUAL EDUCATION & BILINGUALISM: 99

The Bilingual Advantage

Language, Literacy and the US Labor Market

Edited by

Rebecca M. Callahan

and Patricia C. Gándara

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS

Bristol • Buffalo • Toronto

2 Benefits of Bilingualism: In the Eye of the Beholder?

Reynaldo F. Macías

Introduction

‘What, if any, are the advantages to bilingualism and/or biliteracy?’ is a question that has been asked in sociolinguistics, economics and other disciplines for several decades. It has been asked specific to the US; it has been asked of specific languages in the US; it has been asked of bilingualism or multilingualism in the US. The answers have been mixed, often depending on how the questions were asked; which disciplines asked the questions; which languages were involved; whether individual or social (group) benefits were the focus; and whether monetary or nonmonetary benefits were of concern. My colleagues in this volume take up the question again with respect to the economic benefits, but this time with new data, new methods of analysis and a new demographic reality. This chapter contextualizes the questions about the economic benefit of bi/multilingualism within a historical context in the US. How languages have been viewed and regulated historically in the US is intimately linked to their economic value both in the past and in the present.

About 7000 natural oral languages are spoken in the world (with a similar estimate for signed languages), in about 200 organized political units (e.g. nation-states, kingdoms), within increasingly globalized political-economic networks and systems. While there are speech communities for each of these single languages, the majority of the world’s population is bilingual rather than monolingual. Whether the result of language contact between neighboring speech communities, or migration, or language impositions, or economic/political interactions, many of us are in contact with naturally occurring and modal language diversity. No country is without language diversity. The questions regarding the benefits (or costs) and advantages (or disadvantages) of languages are about how we, as human communities, have organized ourselves into social and political groups and have accommodated our language diversities within them, reflecting our valuations of those languages and that diversity in political and economic policies and practices.

It is useful to note the need for interdisciplinarity in exploring this topic (Grin, 2008), especially those disciplines that deal with language, political economy and human collectivities. The study of the covariation between language variables and social or economic variables in the context of language diversity has been used as a way to view and study those accommodations, often more descriptively and polemically than explanatorily at a micro level. At a macro level, the study of language policy and politics has been viewed as an explicit societal expression of our accommodations to language diversity and their concomitant valuations. The subfields of critical sociolinguistics, critical applied linguistics or critical linguistics place ‘power’ as a central element in the study of language and society, implicating notions of inequalities in social structures and group relations that are reflected in language uses, functions, varieties, ideologies, attitudes and status. Official social (and language) policies adopted by the state are framed as often reflecting the dominant values of a society – that is, the values of the dominant group(s) rather than the majority of the polity – including the political-economic value of languages.

The rise of disciplines organized around human collectivities (e.g. Chican@ Studies, African American Studies, Women’s Studies) is not new if we accept the epistemological notion of the humanities as being organized around (language) groups (e.g. French and Francophone Studies, English Language and Literature). While the centrality of language, speech or linguistics in these disciplines may vary, research on these groups (especially in the US) over the last 45 years has provided us with conceptual tools and much empirical research on these groups, qua speech communities, that inform our exploration of the questions posed on language, (in)equalities and benefits (González, 2002; Romero, 1979).

Lastly, the discipline most concerned with ‘value’ is economics. A subdisciplinary area called the economics of language has developed over the last 20 years and this provides important conceptual and methodological tools to explore the values of language(s) to individuals (private) and groups (social) (Grin, 2008; Grin & Vallaincourt, 1997). Economics, then, is also the discipline that can inform us about the economic structures and activities that may underlie the valence (positive–negative; advantages–disadvantages; benefits–costs) and salience (importance; intensity) of individual languages or multilingualism. This chapter focuses on the US economy, understanding that economies today are hardly constrained by political national limits and borders, and that politics, policy and governance are often about economic regulation, trade and commerce, material conditions and surplus allocation (Wolff & Resnick, 2012). For example, the US has a large and variegated capitalist economy with formal, informal, public and private ‘sectors’ (Weinberg, 2002). For our purposes, it is important to understand how the economy is organized and

how different ethnolinguistic groups participate in it, whether there is an ‘ethnic economy’, and the language(s) in which these economic activities are undertaken. Since racial, ethnic and language groups occupy different positions/spaces in the social, economic and political structures of the society, it is also important to take into account the intersectionalities of race, ethnicity, national origin, gender and age with language abilities and economic participation.

The focus of this chapter, then, is to briefly belabor the social- and political-economic relationships, accommodations and valuations across time of people with different language abilities in this society. This heuristic exploration provides us with a picture of how language resources have been variously valued within this political economy to be better able to answer whether and why there may be economic benefits to bilingualism or to specific languages within the US.

Language Practices and Policies in the Political Economy

How do the language policies of, and the institutional practices in, the US affect our questions about the benefits of bilingualism? Language demography, population growth, geographic expansion, political consolidation and economic development across time within the US provide a political-economic frame of reference for understanding the relationship between language diversity and language policies in the nation, and should provide a more substantive frame of reference for the analyses of our questions.

Planting the seeds: The prenatal period

The language diversity of the North American continent on the eve of contact with Europeans in 1492 has been estimated at over 500 languages. The number of these languages that survived 500 years later, was less than half. Over the same time period, colonial languages – Spanish, Portuguese, English and French – became regionally hegemonic throughout the hemisphere.

Spanish was the first European language to take root in what became known as the Americas. Unlike colonial languages in other parts of the world, Spanish in the ‘Americas’ became the native language of much of the indigenous, native-born majority over time. The overwhelming majority of people in early 21st-century ‘Latin America’ were monolingual Spanish speakers with a smaller proportion of bilinguals and monolingual speakers of indigenous languages (e.g. in 2007, Mexico estimated that 10% of its national population spoke indigenous languages). As independence from colonialism took hold in the western hemisphere, nearly two dozen

of the new nations adopted Spanish, their colonial language, as their national political-linguistic legacy (Macías, 2014).

English was the legacy of the British colonies in North America. No specific language policy for the British colonies was formulated by England during the colonial period. According to Heath (1976a), in England, language choice and style was a matter of individual choice, something that was not to be legislated by the state. This attitude toward language use was paralleled in the colonies. The language contacts of colonists with American Indians tended to be limited during the colonial period, with some schooling provided to the indigenous for religious conversion and diplomatic purposes, and trading jargons developed for hunting and bartering. Few colonists learned or valued indigenous languages.

By the time of the colonial revolution against the English crown, the economic structures of these colonies were primarily mercantile trade, subsistence agriculture with limited agricultural products and human slavery. The colonial population was primarily rural (and remained so until about 1900, when the majority of the population shifted to city living). They lived in cohesive European-language speech communities throughout the colonies. There was significant language diversity, then, within the British colonies on the eve of the revolution.

Inside the colonies at the time, there were not so many native English speakers as generally assumed. First, non-English European settlers made up one quarter of the total white population. (Two-fifths of Pennsylvania's population alone spoke German.) Second, the languages of the Amerindian populations—called 'Aborigines' by George Washington—were numerous and widespread. Third were the blacks, mostly slaves, with their many African languages, who numbered more than one-fifth of the total population. (Had a slave the courage to speak his native language, punishment was sometimes severe; there are reports of blacks having their tongues removed.) (Shell, 1992: 105)

The compact language communities were principally German, French and Dutch (Kloss, 1998/1977). In fact, the German language was so widely spoken in the new colonies that in 1751, Benjamin Franklin was reported as bemoaning the possibility that Pennsylvania 'in a few years [would] become a German colony' (Schmid, 2001: 15). German was the most commonly spoken non-English language in the British colonies and in the young nation. By 1850, Germans also constituted one-third of all immigration to the US (Schlossman, 1983). As a result, during the 1800s, the German language and German bilingual schools flourished throughout large swaths of the country, particularly the Midwest. Especially in rural areas, there was a strong inclination to teach only in German, as this was the first language of both the students and the teachers. Moreover, many

newspapers were printed in German, providing jobs for German speakers and reinforcing the German language among the literate classes. Most of the arguments for German language education were cultural and practical – maintaining the German culture and community ties and providing an education in a language that students understood (Schlossman, 1983). The social, political and economic structures of these compact communities, townships and farms linguistically operated in German, maintaining a local economic value for the language.

There was also impressive language diversity prior to the British colonies, in territories that would eventually become part of the new nation-state.

Outside the colonies, too, there were mostly non-English speakers, principally the various Amerindians and next the French and Spanish. Hence Thomas Jefferson suggested that Americans should travel to Canada in order to acquire a knowledge of French, and he emphasized that Spanish was an important influence in the New World. (Shell, 1992: 105–106)

The official ‘tolerance’ of languages other than English within the British colonies, however, was group and language specific. The exception was enslaved black Africans, who were brought to these British colonies (and later to the US) from the beginning of the English colonization of North America until 1808, when the importation of slaves was made illegal in the US. Even though the importation of slaves continued illegally until the Civil War, the number of foreign-born African people diminished after 1808 in the US in favor of native-born African Americans. These ‘Africans’ were transported to the British colonies, speaking many languages but not knowing English. They were forced to develop a limited proficiency in English speech (enough to understand commands in English) during a ‘seasoning’ process (lasting as long as three years) to socialize them as forced labor (cf. Gómez [1998], especially Chapter 7, ‘Talking Half African’). White slavers and slaveholders were suspicious of the use of African languages, fearing organized revolts by the enslaved Africans.

These peculiar institutional language domestication practices had broader social, political and even legal support. Colonies (and, later some states) adopted policies and laws prohibiting the teaching of reading or writing to the black population (any language, but specifically English) and/or the schooling of blacks altogether. Widely adopted, these laws were collectively named the ‘compulsory ignorance laws’ (Weinberg, 1995). The first of these ‘compulsory ignorance’ laws was adopted by South Carolina colony in 1740.

These language policies and practices were specifically designed for the economic control of this population, and went hand in hand with other

socially constructed rationales that maintained human slaves as a form of property, as unfree labor, a status that gave them few or no political, civil or language rights, and for whom learning only a 'limited English' was considered economically 'valuable'. Human development (literacy instruction or schooling) of this population was criminalized, the speech of Africans and African Americans became stigmatized and devalued, and English was promoted as the key to 'success', all in the name of a productive economy and the social order.

At the same time, American Indian languages were overwhelmingly ignored as being 'outside' the colonial polity, with limited colonial settler contact, primarily through the use of interpreters.

Setting up a new nation: Incorporating language diversity into the body politic (1776–1898)

The political and demographic expansion of the new nation in its first century is important to understanding its linguistic diversity and political economy. No official language was designated in the 1789 Constitution (nor had there been in the Articles of Confederation), even though the members of the Continental Congress were predominantly British, and English speakers. One could argue that this was a reflection of the English cultural and political legacy that an individual's languages were to be respected, and not for government to impose. One could also argue that this was a social policy for the individual states to consider if desirable; language was not the province of a central authority since it was not explicitly defined as a federal responsibility. Alternatively, one could propose that on a practical basis, the political leadership of the new nation needed to persuade as many of the linguistically diverse settler population as possible about the wisdom of the new politics, and exclusionary language policies would be detrimental to this *realpolitik*. Selected founding documents were printed in German to inform and persuade the large German-speaking populations in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and other areas about the desirable nature of the revolution and the new republic.

However, there was a continuing discussion, if not debate, about the role of language, as part of the new nation building. Some proposals advocated distinguishing an American English from British English by standardizing it on the basis of the particular speech varieties used in the former colonies with the help of a language academy (Heath, 1976b) or independent dictionaries (Lepore, 2002). Other proposals rejected anything associated with England, even language, and advocated substituting another language, such as Hebrew, Greek or French, as a common, national or official language; and prognostications were also made that a new language would develop in the new nation given its linguistic diversity (Shell, 1992). All in all, no official language proposal was officially adopted.

The 19th century was dominated by population growth and territorial expansion, political reunification, consolidation and reorganization, economic integration and restructuring, and sociopolitical assimilation. In the first half of the century (1803–1853), the territorial jurisdiction tripled, adding the Gulf of Mexico and Pacific Ocean coastlines to the new nation. In 1803, the US purchased the Louisiana Territory from France (explored by the Spanish in the early 1500s, under French colonial administration between 1699 and 1763 and again under Spain's rule between 1763 and 1803). This purchase was a total of 1 million square miles, doubling the jurisdiction of the US. The purchase treaty maintained that the liberties (cultural and language rights), properties and (the Catholic) religion of the persons remaining in the sold territory were to be respected (Klotz, 1968: 24). However, when the US military governor began governing this new territory only in English the local popular leadership challenged this policy and so it was revised to include the use of both the English and French languages in legislative deliberations and the administration of government, setting a critical practice and precedent that English be required as a language of government in any new territory or political unit (Fedynskyj, 1971). More broadly, the territory included many and various indigenous communities, provided unfettered access to the length of the Mississippi River as a major transportation and commercial waterway and solidified jurisdictional control of all lands east of the Mississippi River, in part by catalyzing the transfer to the US of other Gulf Coast territories claimed by Spain (including the Floridas in 1819).

In 1848, the US acquired 945,000 square miles of land as spoils of the war against Mexico (1846–1848). This included the recognition of Texas independence from Mexico (1836) and its subsequent annexation by the US (1845). This cession added to the national US population about 100,000 Spanish-speaking Mexicans and another 100,000 indigenous persons of various tribes and nations who had already collectively developed transportation routes and several important settlements (Martínez, 1975: 55). In 1853, the US acquired another 45,000 square miles of land from Mexico, known as the Gadsden Purchase, along the southern edge of what are now the states of Arizona and New Mexico, for a southern railroad route to the Pacific Ocean.

According to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848), those Mexicans who stayed on the ceded lands for one year automatically became US citizens (Griswold del Castillo, 1990). Language rights in the treaty, however, were not explicitly mentioned; Mexicans who remained in the territory, according to the treaty, 'shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction'. The treaty's statements on liberty, property and religion were apparently based primarily on those in

the treaty for the Louisiana Territory between France and the US (Klotz, 1968: 22–24, 108). The similarity of the terms (and, one would expect, definitions) between the Treaty of 1803 and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 is of interest if ‘liberty’ and ‘religion’ were understood to include not only unfettered use of the (non-English) language, but public access and support for its use.

In recognition of the prior sovereign, and of the predominantly Spanish-speaking legacy populations of the ceded areas, the federal government of the US recognized an official status for Spanish for varying periods of time and for various purposes, in areas organized as territories, and even after the statehood of some areas. Despite the dominant Mexican-origin population of the new southwestern territories and their new status as US citizens, as areas became more Euro-American, political power shifted from Mexicans to Anglos, and Spanish was often officially tossed aside and only English was officially embraced, favoring the newcomers politically and economically with commerce tied to the predominantly English-speaking East of the country. The new territories, especially California, were an economic boon to the new country, especially after gold and silver were found in Sutter’s Mill in 1848. The mining of these precious metals in northern California attracted over 300,000 miners, half from other parts of the US and the other half from around the world, generating much wealth that was transferred to the northeast and catalyzing the second industrial revolution in the country in the second half of the 19th century.

In the mid-western part of the country, the federal government’s population and settlement policies similarly ‘opened up the Plains to white settlers’ by adopting the Homestead Act in 1862, and promoting ecological warfare against the buffalo to overwhelm the various indigenous populations and their livelihoods. In 1867, Congress established the Indian Peace Commission, with the purpose of investigating and making recommendations on the ‘permanent removal of the causes of Indian hostility’. Leibowitz (1971) quoted the following passage from the Commission’s 1868 report.

in the difference of language today lies two-thirds of our trouble. Schools should be established which children would be required to attend; their barbarous dialects would be blotted out and the English language substituted. (Leibowitz, 1971: 67)

This position that language was ‘two-thirds of our trouble’ should be placed in the context of the purpose of the Commission: ‘the permanent removal of the causes of Indian hostility’, which was seen as the principal obstacle, after the civil war and reconstruction, to national unity and security. So, in 1871, Congress included a rider that unilaterally ended the

Treaty Period between the US government and the Indian nations in the Appropriation Act for that year. It read in part:

Hereafter, no Indian nation or tribe within the territory of the United States shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent tribe or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty. (Quoted in Leibowitz, 1971: 68)

The same year that the rider was passed, the federal government began establishing English language schools for the purposes of domesticating Indian children and displacing the religious, missionary, bilingual schools. These government schools displaced the Indian-created and Indian-run schools that had previously flourished. Initially, the government schools were run as day schools; however, in 1873, the Board of Indian Commissioners objected to the lack of progress in domesticating the children. So, 'in 1879, the first off-reservation boarding school—the institution which was to dominate Indian education for the next 50 years—was established at Carlisle, Pennsylvania' (Leibowitz, 1971: 69). It was not long before greater coercion, force and violence were used to promote the English-only language policy, forcing the assimilation (domestication) of the children and further denigrating the value and utility of indigenous languages.

In the Caribbean at the end of the 19th century, the US intervened in the Cuban war of independence from Spain (the Spanish-American War), and in the process gained the former Spanish colonies of Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines and Guam. Under the Teller Amendment (1898), the US was forbidden to annex Cuba, but it acquired Puerto Rico and occupied the Philippine Islands and Guam in the South Pacific. The US gave the Philippine Islands their qualified political independence as of 4 July 1946. The US still includes Guam and Puerto Rico within its jurisdiction, the latter having its political relation changed from colony to commonwealth in 1952.

The occupation of Puerto Rico alone resulted in the addition of over 950,000 Spanish speakers to the US population, with limited US citizenship granted *en masse* in 1917, through an act of Congress known as the Jones Act (Castro, 1977: 93). A few English language policies were included in the 1900 Territorial Organic Act (known as the Foraker Act), including that the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico to the US Congress be literate in English, the members of the legislative lower house be literate in English *or* Spanish and that the federal courts on the island operate exclusively in English. Spanish and English became the official languages of government in Puerto Rico by an act of its legislature on 21 February 1902. This 1902 Act provided that in the government and in the courts 'the English language and the Spanish language shall be used indiscriminately; and, when necessary,

translations and oral interpretations shall be made from one language to the other so that all parties interested may understand any proceedings or communications made therein' (Alvarez-González, 1999: 365). The 1902 law was in effect until 1991, when it was repealed in favor of Spanish as the only official language for the island's government by the procommonwealth Popular Democratic Party to stress its support for autonomy. When the prostatehood New Progressive Party returned to power in 1993, it reinstated the 1902 bilingual policy (Alvarez-González, 1999: 366–367).

More generally, the official purposes of these English-only policies and laws throughout the 19th century were to reaffirm an (Anglo) 'American identity', provide a privilege to Anglo-Americans and wipe away the 'native' language and culture of the 'foreign' populations altogether. Despite no constitutional or official federal language policy, Congress and the Executive branch promoted English throughout their territorial and statehood policies as well as strategically in their immigration, population and settlement policies, all of which reinforced English as the favored, privileged and valued language in the economy and the nation.

Legal segregation and English-only: 1890–1960

At the beginning of the 20th century, reflecting the nativism of the period, most states: (1) had officially subjugated non-English languages, including Spanish; (2) had made English the exclusive and official language of instruction in schools; (3) operated *de jure* and *de facto* segregated schools; (4) required English fluency for immigration and English literacy for naturalization and voting; and (5) used English exclusively as the language for the administration of government.

European immigration increased dramatically in 1880, but from southern and eastern Europe, peaking between 1900 and 1910, when over six million people immigrated to the US. The percentage of foreign-born during this decade reached a peak of 15% of the total population in 1910. Between a quarter and one-third of these European immigrants who came between 1880 and 1930 returned to Europe after having made and sent monies to their European towns and families, or having saved enough money to restart their economic livelihood back home (cf. Wyman, 1993: 6). These immigrants left Europe to escape droughts, poverty and severe social and economic conditions, came and found jobs in the northeastern, eastern and Midwestern US cities as these places became urban centers of manufacturing and industrial factory work.

At the turn of the century then, large southern and eastern European immigrant populations dominated US language diversity. It was concentrated in cities and urban areas, which meant that language contact was greater between these different ethnolinguistic groups, requiring a lingua franca (often English) and other means of social accommodations (Fishman

et al., 1966). These groups settled in ethnolinguistic concentrations, i.e. neighborhoods, where they could carry out their daily life in the languages they knew with family and friends of similar backgrounds. And, some of them began to learn English.

Immigrants had been highly resourceful in hiring themselves out as groups working under an interpreter in foundries, stockyards, and construction projects. 'Gang work' in employment and efforts to learn about city transportation systems, labor laws, and union practices had provided means by which immigrants were cushioned through group efforts to acquire English for necessary function. (Heath, 1977: 42)

The increased, linguistically diverse, European immigrant population, particularly as it concentrated in single-ethnic urban neighborhoods in eastern and Midwestern cities with the political ward boss and similar electoral mechanisms, threatened the political dominance, and hence the public sector economic power, of white, English-speaking natives in many states. The view of these foreigners was filtered through language. White nativist protectionists throughout the country adopted laws that restricted voting to those who could read and write English, as a way to politically neutralize their non-English-speaking (NES) brethren. Nativists aggressively promoted their antforeigner policies as linguistic and cultural diversity increased throughout the nation from southeastern European immigration, such that 'rioting directed against various national origin groups occurred, and nativists called for more restrictive immigration laws and the expulsion of the foreign born' (Piatt, 1993: 10; also see Bustamante (1972) for a social history of undocumented immigrant treatment in the US).

In the southeastern states, English literacy requirements for voting were adopted by politically dominant whites to exclude blacks, who by this time were largely monolingual English speakers, from voting. Mississippi political bosses were well aware, for example, that 60% of blacks and only 10% of Anglos could not read English, as they promoted English literacy requirements in order to vote (Leibowitz, 1974: 29–36). The voting booth converted into political power for whites who used it to maintain their privileges and advantages in the political economy and to regulate labor, work conditions and public budgets, often discriminatingly, as with the Black Codes after the Civil War and the Jim Crow Laws after Reconstruction.

These restrictive language policies were complemented by prohibitory language policies. When the US entered World War I in 1917, in the third year of fighting, Anglo-American nativists took advantage of the war context by promoting fear, stereotypes and questions about the political loyalties of German Americans, and foreigners residing in the US who did not speak English natively, as a threat to national security (Wiley, 1998).

The federal government adopted war measures regulating and censoring the non-English press, requiring English translations before publication. In the burgeoning radio broadcast industry, initially involving many languages, the federal government required English-speaking engineers as monitors and censors during broadcasts. Local governments responded likewise, adopting laws outlawing the use of German in public. These measures, and others, dealt a near fatal blow to the widespread German-language private and public schools and the study of German as a second and foreign language and to many German language businesses (e.g. printing), and caused the unemployment of many German-speaking Americans. The government and others promoted the acquisition of English as a patriotic activity. English-speaking and literacy abilities were adopted as requirements for employment (e.g. to practice as a barber in New York City) and to pass certification and licensing examinations for various professions (e.g. medical competency examinations). The US government even created a 'mother tongue' question on the decennial census to track the size of the white and European immigrant populations, and their English language (linguistic) incorporation into the body politic (cf. Leeman, 2004).

Congress engaged the issue of racial and language diversity by adopting immigration laws requiring English-speaking ability to enter the country and to naturalize, and then established the national quota system in 1924 that favored northern and western Europeans. At this point, the Chinese Exclusion Act (1882) and the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' between the US government and Japan (1907) already excluded worker immigration from China and Japan, respectively, to protect white workers from labor competition. Defining who was a citizen qua 'American' became a central public policy issue after the *Dred Scott v Sandford* (1857) decision holding that African Americans were not and could not be citizens, resulting in the adoption of the 1866 Civil Rights Act and of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution (1868) providing for birthright citizenship. It was reignited as a popular concern on the heels of massive southern and eastern European immigration at the turn of the century; the 1917 grant of citizenship to the people of 'Porto Rico'; and the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 (P.L. 175), which granted full US citizenship to America's indigenous peoples, in partial recognition of the thousands of American Indians who served in the armed forces in World War I.

The western hemisphere, however, was exempted from the national quota system of 1924, because agricultural and railroad construction interests wanted to maintain a free cross-national flow of Mexican labor. Many Mexicans also moved north to the US to escape the civil war in Mexico between 1910 and 1917 (Délano, 2011). Native and foreign-born Mexicans diversified their occupations and the industries in which they worked, and consequently the regions of the US in which they resided.

‘Soon Mexicans were to be found in steel mills, mines, meat packing plants, canneries, brick-yards, construction sites, dry cleaning establishments, and restaurants’ (Piatt, 1993: 15), in Chicago, New York and other parts of the US.

By 1910 the superintendent of the Boston public schools observed that of the estimated thirteen million immigrants in the US, three million spoke no English. Yet, in noting that the public schools could not be the sole agent of immigrant education, he warned against forcing language-acquisition programs upon immigrants. (Piatt, 1993: 9)

Industrial owners and management responded to this consequent language diversity, as well.

The industrial response to a linguistically diverse work force was neither to refuse employment to the foreign born nor to those who spoke a language other than English, nor was the response to prohibit immigrant workers from speaking their own languages on the job. ... Rather, American industry realized that immigrant workers were a necessary component of industrial society and that immigrant workers ultimately needed knowledge of the English language not only for their own benefit but also for the sake of industry. Rather than rely on legislation to make English official and attempt to coerce people into conformity, American industry generally concluded that it, and not government, bore initial responsibility for educating and training its workers, including English instruction. (Piatt, 1993: 10–11)

However, the owners and management of agriculture and the railroads did not share the attitude of manufacturing industry leaders. Consequently, employer responsibility for educating and training its workers did not extend to Mexicans or blacks.

One obvious explanation for the disinterest in educating these [Mexican] workers is that agricultural work required less training than in many industrial settings. Less need seemingly existed for them to acquire English language and other skills. Another explanation is that these workers and their children were the victims of the same educational discrimination aimed at African-American and Asian workers and their families. Apparently, no formal language or other training programs were organized for agricultural workers of these ethnic groups, either. In fact, because skin color was central to the image that white Americans had of these Mexican workers, many of the discriminatory practices whites had established against African-Americans were transferred to the Mexicans. (Piatt, 1993: 14–15)

Of course, the fact that lack of ability to speak English could impede union organizing and official redress of illegal treatment in the workplace could not be discarded as factors in 'tolerating' NES workers in the agricultural and railroad industries.

Civil society also engaged this immigrant language diversity much more widely than ever before, leading to the Americanization Movement of the early 20th century. The teaching of English and government or 'civics' in settlement houses were components of this movement (Bale, 2008). Schools were also important for adults as well as children and youth, although adult education could not and did not meet the English language instructional needs of the population.

Nonetheless, state curriculum requirements began to include the teaching of a political patriotism and civics (limited often to government) in elementary and secondary schools. Civil War (Union) and then World War I veterans promoted patriotism by distributing US flags to every school, and developing a required public pledge, in English, of political allegiance to the national government was instituted in schools as a way of integrating the reconstructed former confederate states, foreigners and their progeny, as well as socializing the youth of the nation as 'Americans' (cf. Ellis, 2005).

By the beginning of the 20th century, public elementary schooling was secular and near universal and secondary schooling was dramatically expanded. Mandatory school attendance together with child labor laws filled the public schools. Greater state-level control of the curricula and language of instruction in private as well as public schools became a major English-only offensive of states in response to the linguistic diversity of immigrants during this period. For example, beginning in the 1880s, the teaching of German in the rapidly growing urban public schools of the East and Midwest came under severe attack. In several cities, including St Louis (Missouri), Louisville (Kentucky), St Paul (Minnesota) and San Francisco (California), public schools discontinued their use of German.

As a result of the legislation requiring English as the only medium of instruction in public schools in the late 19th century, and the subsequent antialien German feelings, German Americans developed large numbers of private and religious schools (especially Catholic and Lutheran) that taught in German or bilingually with English, with German language textbooks and curricular materials. In places where Germans were settled in large numbers, this practice all but displaced the public schools (Leibowitz, 1971: 11).

The five states that were admitted into the Union between 1875 and 1889 (Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington) included constitutional provisions that prohibited sectarian (read Catholic) schooling; banned sectarian books from the classrooms and school libraries; or prohibited state fund allocations to church schools. By 1903, a total of

39 states had some form of these provisions (Leibowitz, 1971: 12–13). This undermined the various language groups' capacity to develop and maintain non-English private and religious schools.

In addition to the laws against sectarian schooling, states engaged in controlling and standardizing the curriculum (cf. Wright, 1980) and the language of instruction in the public and private secular schools. The study of the English language became a universal, mandatory part of the school curriculum from elementary to secondary and tertiary schooling, and also became increasingly dominant as the required medium of instruction in elementary and secondary schools. In 1903, 14 states had laws requiring that instruction in elementary schools be conducted in English. By 1923, 34 states required English as the medium of instruction in the schools (Leibowitz, 1971: 15).

These English-only laws were coercive, not just symbolic or regulatory, by criminalizing language behaviors, and they were often harshly enforced in some areas and for some groups, reminiscent of the compulsory ignorance laws of earlier years and the federal government's Indian boarding school policies of the time. For example, Texas passed a stringent English-only law in 1918, which made it a criminal offense for teachers, principals, superintendents and other school personnel to teach in a language other than English. The following year, Nebraska adopted a law that imposed restrictions and criminal penalties on both the use of a foreign language as a medium of instruction and on foreign languages as a subject of study, unconstitutionally affecting the livelihood of German language teachers and their work conditions, and parents' abilities to direct their children's education (*Meyer v Nebraska*, 262 US 390, 1923; Luebke, 1980).

The English-only school laws that directed the language of instruction (and the subject of English language study as well) were also enforced on the students in cruel ways. For decades, Spanish-speaking children in the Southwest were punished for speaking Spanish in school, even at recess or lunch. Oral histories relate instances of corporal punishment and abuse for speaking Spanish or having their mouths washed out with soap. And yet, school districts used Mexican students' alleged lack of English-speaking ability as a subterfuge to racially segregate them into 'Mexican schools' and racially segregated tracks that provided inferior schooling (Weinberg, 1995). These language practices reinforced in dramatic, coercive and violent ways that English was a required valuable language and that the Spanish language or other non-English speech was not only less valued, but also a detriment to physical, social, economic and mental health.

From 1875 to 1930, through statehood constitutions and new state legislation, the principal source of linguistic diversity of the period, immigration, was addressed with language policies that required English in

public and private schooling, as a condition for employment, professional licensing and political participation. These policies also censored the non-English language press, and even criminalized the speaking of German in public. Federal policies extended English language requirements to statehood proposals, the administration of government, territorial and Indian schooling, immigration, naturalization and other areas (Leibowitz, 1984). Many of these policies were coercive and criminalized language and speech behaviors. Through political and institutional policies and practices, the recruitment of immigrant labor pools, access to jobs, work conditions and economic value were promoted for English and restricted for non-English languages. These English-only laws dominated through most of the 20th century.

The Cold War, civil rights, education and languages: Federal initiatives (1960–1990)

At the close of the 1950s, with the Cold War at its height, global and regional international organizations like the United Nations were taking root and expanding, language capacities in the US were associated with national security (Brecht & Rivers, 2012), and the dominance of US prestige and power in the world was well established. The US reaction to the successful launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 and the continuation of the Cold War led to concern about the ability of US schools to train students in mathematics, the sciences and foreign languages, reaffirming the notion that there were critical languages for the purposes of national defense and security. The 1958 National Defense Education Act (P.L. 85-864; 72 Stat. 1580) provided for language learning for high school and college instructors, and promoted the teaching and learning of foreign languages, albeit within the legal restrictions adopted in the early part of the 20th century in which foreign languages were generally taught in secondary schools and not in elementary schools, with a great bias toward teaching these languages in English or in contrast to English.

Other world events also influenced language diversity and language teaching. The Cuban Revolution of 1959 caused major changes on the island, especially after Fidel Castro declared Cuba a socialist state in 1960. Many Cuban political elites, professionals and members of the upper class left the island and settled in southern Florida. The US federal government provided financial and other support to these expatriates by expanding a little-known category in the immigration laws – the refugee. The policies developed in local Florida communities in response to the arrival of Cuban refugees in the early 1960s differed from the Americanization and ‘English-only’ policies directed at turn-of-the-century southern and eastern European, Japanese and Chinese immigrants, Hawaiians, American Indians and other native Americans, or even other Spanish-speaking

children in the Southwest and Puerto Ricans. Situated within the context of Cold War politics, school policies toward the Cuban refugees were more flexible, open and supportive of Spanish maintenance. The Cubans saw themselves and were seen by others as temporary visitors. A good number of these adult refugees were bilingual, and many were provided with English-language assistance and recertification of their Cuban professional credentials as teachers, doctors and lawyers, so that they could practice in the US.

As early as 1961, Miami's public schools offered Cuban students a variety of separate 'pull-out' English as a second language (ESL) programs. In 1963, with funding from the Ford Foundation and Dade County Schools, and the availability of recertified bilingual Cuban teachers, Coral Way Elementary School in Miami, Florida, became the first two-way bilingual, bi-ethnic public school in the post-World War II era. In 1973, the growth and robustness of bilingual schools and the resulting social and economic structures led Dade County to adopt an ordinance declaring it officially bilingual in English and Spanish. The economic power of an educated and capitalized population that had fled Cuba with significant resources was a factor in the acceptance of their language. After all, the first wave of Cuban immigrants had produced an economic boon for the southern Florida region, albeit in Spanish. Along with new research on the cognitive benefits of bilingualism in Canada and success in achieving civil rights in the US, there came a renewed support for, and promotion of, bilingual education to improve the schooling of language minority groups in other parts of the country.

The civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s caused the federal passage of the Civil Rights Act (1964), the Voting Rights Act (1965), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) and its 1968 amendment and the Bilingual Education Act. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452) was the basis of the national war to end poverty. Immigration policies were also changed dramatically in 1965, extending the national quota system to all countries of the world, eliminating the bias in favor of northern and western Europe, ending the racial exclusion of Asians and removing the exemption of the western hemisphere established in 1924. This immigration reform opened the door to an extensive change in the cultural and linguistic diversity of the nation, allowing it to become more like the rest of the world than just its white and European imagined community legacy.

A new era was in play. The Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act were concerned with the protection of the rights of individuals and equality for members of minority groups. The Civil Rights Act led to identifying language discrimination by defining language as a characteristic of the protected class of 'national origin'. The Voting Rights Act codified several federal court decisions in suspending the use of English literacy

tests as a basis for voting registration and exercising one's franchise. It also eliminated state laws requiring voter literacy in English by incorporating schooling in US flag schools in which the language of instruction was a language other than English, a nod to Puerto Rico and the Spanish language medium of instruction of the island's schools and the native citizenship of its population. In 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act, Congress found prior language-based discrimination used by states to exclude or discourage voter registration and the voting of Chicanos, American Indians and Asian language citizen groups. Congress required relief and provided for bilingual ballots and bilingual electoral services as remedies in selected jurisdictions where this discrimination had occurred.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 provided formula-driven funding for programs for all poor children, early childhood education, migrant education, adult education and teacher preparation. The Bilingual Education Act, a 1968 amendment to the ESEA, however, was only intended to demonstrate the effectiveness and utility of using two languages (one of which had to be English) for instruction to acquire English and improve the academic achievement of language minorities who were limited in their English-speaking abilities. It was funded as a voluntary, discretionary, competitive program. It would take litigation and civil rights laws to get school districts to provide bilingual education more widely (San Miguel, 2004).

On 25 May 1970, the Office of Civil Rights in the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare issued a memorandum to school districts throughout the country indicating that in order to be in compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act regarding its prohibition of national-origin discrimination, they must take affirmative steps to address the language needs of national-origin students who are limited in English ability, stop high-stakes testing of these students in the English language and communicate with their parents in a language they can understand. Using this memorandum as a standard for school services, Chinese-origin parents brought a lawsuit against the San Francisco Unified School District for national-origin discrimination. In *Lau v Nichols* (1974), the US Supreme Court affirmed the legality of the May 25th memorandum, and indicated that such instruction would make a mockery of education. The consent decree between the San Francisco Unified School District and the parent-plaintiffs selected bilingual education as the remedy for this national-origin discrimination. In the 1974 Equal Educational Opportunity Act (§ 1703(f)), Congress echoed the *Lau* decision and required that states take 'appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students'.

It took almost a decade for these programs to be widely implemented and to develop a functional infrastructure and a theoretical and research base. This infrastructure included a bilingual teacher, paraprofessional and

counselor workforces, teacher credential standards, bilingual curricular materials and textbooks and relative language proficiency tests, all of which can be seen as language-based economic activities. The issues raised by the bilingual instruction of limited English proficient (LEP) students influenced the development of bilingual special education and bilingual vocational education as well.

Even with the tremendous growth in efforts to address the language needs of LEP students, bilingual education was available to only a fraction of those K-12 students who needed it, seldom reaching 10% nationally during the 1980s and 1990s. Most LEP students received, and still receive, some form of ESL instruction, 45 years after the adoption of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act. In fact, since the onset of the 21st century, fewer and fewer LEP students each decade have had access to bilingual instruction (Gándara & Hopkins, 2011; Zehler *et al.*, 2003).

The adoption of these federal laws caused several things to happen: (1) it encouraged states to amend or repeal laws that prohibited the use of non-English languages, or that mandated English as a restrictive condition, or as a required language for specific functions, like the medium of instruction in public schools, most of which were adopted between 1890 and 1920; (2) it signaled that it was alright for government to use the non-English language in service to the public, or to teach language minority students, particularly Chicanos in the Southwest and Puerto Ricans in the Northeast of the country, as a transitional process for a limited time with the goal of English acquisition; and (3) it made nationally visible the conditions and problems of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, other Latin@s and other language minorities, and revived the notion of an NES or a limited English-speaking (LES) community.

In other areas, language issues were being raised with a similar concern about discrimination. Language policies were developed to protect individual rights and liberties. In 1973, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), for example, announced that it had instituted proceedings against a union that published its constitution, collective bargaining agreement and bylaws only in English and conducted its meetings solely in English (Leibowitz, 1974), indicating that the individual rights of national-origin union members who were limited in their English abilities were being violated. The EEOC issued regulations on English-only rules in the workplace in 1980, allowing them only with a business necessity rationale, and with a limited application of the rule to working hours (e.g. not breaks, lunch) (Macías, 1997).

California adopted the Bilingual Services Act in 1974, to guide the provision of bilingual state government workers to meet the needs of constituents who spoke a language other than English and were limited in their English. While the execution of the law has been much criticized, it was used as a blueprint for President Clinton's Executive Order

13166 (2000), which directed the federal government to seek the same goals by requiring departments and agencies to develop plans to serve LEP Americans.

In 1978, Congress enacted the Court Interpreters Act, providing interpreters for deaf, hard-of-hearing as well as language minority criminal defendants in federal court who could not understand English well enough to participate effectively in those proceedings, to protect their Fifth Amendment constitutional rights and to meet their needs, as well as the court's needs. The Act also provided funds for the training of translators and interpreters.

Reflecting these changing language policies, the US Census Bureau substituted its decennial census mother tongue question in 1980 with three questions on whether a non-English language was currently used in the home, and if so, what that language was and how well English was spoken by each person in that home (e.g. to be able to identify persons of LES ability, their location and concentrations).

By 1990, there were several federal language laws and policies intended to remedy prior language-based discrimination, or secure protections of fundamental rights. In addition, many of the restrictive English-only language policies established at the beginning of the 20th century by the states were eliminated in the name of an expanded understanding of civil rights.

Challenges to language diversity and retrenchment: 1980–2013

Even while the official bilingual education goals were benign and transitionally assimilationist, debates raged over the purposes and uses of bilingual education, the roles of non-English languages, especially Spanish, in schooling, government and society. In the last two decades of the 20th century, a nativist English-only movement reemerged that made bilingual education the controversial centerpiece of its political agenda to eliminate the use of all non-English languages in the country. This movement attempted to make English the official language of the states and the nation, to eliminate the use of non-English languages in economic activities (e.g. protested the use of bilingual menus at McDonalds restaurant in Miami, Florida), schools, public libraries and government, and sought to return to the English-only policies of the early 20th century. It had some success. Seventeen states declared English their official language between 1981 and 1990. By 2010, 31 states had some new form of official English.

In 1989, the District Court for the Northern District of California in *Teresa P. v Berkeley Unified School District*, found that the all - ESL program of the school district was theoretically sound and constituted 'appropriate action' under the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974. This provided a boost for the English-only movement to push for such English-only programs against a bilingual instruction option. The English-only

movement later successfully reversed the bilingual education policies of California (1998), Arizona (2000) and Massachusetts (2002), replacing them with a form of ESL called structured English immersion as the default instructional program for all LEP students. The consequence of these policy changes was that language minorities, especially Latin@ LEP students, had even fewer bilingual education services available to them in public schools, even though almost all of these programs had been transitional (designed to move students to English-only instruction as quickly as possible) in nature.

At the beginning of the 21st century, with the executive and congressional branches of the federal government in Republican Party control, the federal government withdrew its support for bilingual education and put considerable pressure on state and local educational agencies to move away from bilingual education toward English-only instruction. While LEP enrollments increased across the country, federal policies echoed the restrictive educational language policies of the early 20th century with the passage of the conservative No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2002), which: (1) expanded the use of English-only instruction for LEP students; (2) eliminated the use of the term 'bilingual education' from government offices and programs; and (3) required greater participation of LEP students in state and federal accountability systems, especially English-only standardized testing, regardless of students' English proficiency level or the ecological validity of such testing. Of course, prior to NCLB many districts paid little attention to how their LEP students were doing and failed to evaluate their programs at all. One principle of educational policy reflected in the early calls for bilingual instruction was that a student who was not yet English proficient had a right to be taught in a language that he or she could understand, or it would make a 'mockery of education'. While the implementation of this principle left much to be desired, it guided much of the educational policy, teacher education and program standards for 30 years. Recently, the English-only movement successfully overturned this principle in several states, replacing it with mandatory, coercive anglicization.

Leaders of English-only organizations have been appointed to various government bodies, on which they continue to advocate for retrograde language policies. Appointees to the US Commission on Civil Rights held hearings and issued reports on the constraints to free enterprise that are represented by the EEOC rules on English-only policies in the workplace as presumptive violations of law (cf. US Commission on Civil Rights, 2011).

These English-only policies in schooling, commerce, the workplace and US society in general, are steeped in a propaganda-like discourse of tough love that frames non-English languages as the source of educational and economic problems and English monolingualism as the solution.

This rhetoric ideologically frames English as the key to success in schools, the workplace, society and the body politic, as if it was, has been, and forever shall be in the US.

A Historical Perspective on the Economic Value of Languages

This brief historical survey informs our inquiry on the benefits of bilingualism in several ways. We note that (1) there has been a long history of policies and practices attempting to and actually influencing the language abilities and uses of the domestic population favoring English acquisition and use, often in coercive ways; (2) there have been several political-economic rationales or justifications for these various policies and practices, with the dominance of an English-only ideology in the 20th century that ‘protected’ the white, English-speaking and literate population in the labor market, the workplace and other economic and political spheres; (3) language diversity has been part of the history of the country, and this reality has often clashed with the ideological desires of these official policies and institutional practices, even while many immigrant language groups have not maintained their immigrant languages across generations (see Rumbaut, this volume).

Historical excavation of language politics

There is little question anymore that there is an ‘American bilingual tradition’ (see Kloss, 1977, 1998) of language diversity and a history of language politics, policies and practices that echo the national valuation of that diversity. Yet, there are seemingly disparate descriptions of that language policy history on how or whether specific languages (including English) or bilingualism have borne positive value, advantages or benefits within the political economy of the US.

In the 19th century, language policies were differentially tailored for specific languages. The degree of political consolidation of the federal government over a particular new land area as the country expanded from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts and beyond to Alaska, the Caribbean and the South Seas, also made a difference as to whether and what types of language policies were adopted. With only a tenuous hold over an area, there was little prohibitory language legislation and even an official recognition of the language of the prior sovereign or of a significant portion of the population speaking the language. As the federal government drew tighter reins of geopolitical control, there seemed to be a concomitant increase in migration to the area by Euro-American English speakers, rural to urban population shifts and explicit English language legislation, facilitating the transfer of power, wealth, property and other economic

resources from local populations to Anglo Americans. This geopolitical consolidation by the federal government was reinforced when statehood was granted by Congress to those parts of the country designated as territories, by often requiring English as the language of state government administration, even while nominally allowing Spanish, or French, to be used for limited periods of time in recognition of the prior sovereign of those territories, or the significance of the legacy populations speaking those languages within those jurisdictions. Issues of national identity became intertwined with the economic interests of the dominant Anglo, white population. Access to governmental and administrative power could be controlled and regulated via the English language, and economic enclaves dominated by non-English speakers could be marginalized, exploited, dismantled and transferred to Anglo Americans.

The 20th century was different from the 19th century in both language diversity and language policies. The urbanization of the population, the spread of the public school systems and mandatory attendance laws, antichild labor laws forcing children into schools, the rise of the mass media industries and the debates over immigration, citizenship and American identity, all affected the formation of language policies and their configuration in the 20th century.

English language laws, policies and practices were adopted much more widely throughout society, making it an English-only era for most of the 20th century. This English legal adoption and use was so widespread that it created a normative social expectation of accommodation to English-only as the valued language, almost exclusively, and gave substance and body to an English language ideology rationalizing the anglicization of all non-English language (LEP) speakers and communities, associating them with foreignness, and with immigrants or nonnatives, and so with lesser rights than 'citizens'. Non-English languages, indigenous, colonial and immigrant, were devalued, 'minoritized' (García & Mason, 2009; Hill, 2008), made invisible by being lumped together and conflated as the 'non-English proficient' (NEP or LEP).

If we were to broadly paint modal types, patterns or 'streams' of language policies in the 19th and 20th centuries, we might say that there were at least two fragmented streams in the 19th century, tied to the social and political relations between groups: a 'tolerant' stream involving German and French, Dutch and other Western and Northern European-origin settler language groups; and a 'repressive' stream involving American Indians, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, Hawaiians, Afro-Americans and others. The two streams mixed into a 'restrictive' stream that dominated the first three quarters of the 20th century by conditioning social, political and economic benefits on English language abilities, thus differentially valuing English over other languages, and advantaging white English speakers.

Language ideologies and economic control

The ideological rationales for English-only language policies and legislative and executive language policy strategies changed until they were consistent with the legal framework of the country. When anti-immigrant language legislation was drafted in the 19th century, it initially prohibited the use of non-English languages in various institutional settings (not unlike the earlier legal prohibitions on the use of the non-English languages of racialized groups, indigenous, blacks and militarily conquered populations). As these laws were legally challenged in the late 19th century and early 20th century, the courts declared prohibitory language policies as unconstitutional on equal protection, liberty and other constitutional grounds. At the same time, they developed a legal and ideological rationale that allowed the states to reach the same objective, but with a legally approved means. Legislative acts that universally mandated English, say as a medium of instruction in schools or a prerequisite for voting, were approved by the courts as being within authorized and appropriate state interests, and within their state police powers. With legal support, then, many states in their search for standardization mandated English abilities as a condition for the exercise of many rights, access to benefits and services and even participation in the economy and society. It became a small policy extension to then make these English language requirements exclusive, and increase the language proficiency threshold of these laws by adding English literacy requirements to English oral fluency.

The general promotion of English was rationalized to secure Anglo 'American' identity dominance, used to develop and maintain white privilege, thus minoritizing, dismissing and devaluing non-English languages as part of the policies of social control between groups, even 'blaming' the non-English language, accent or inability to speak English as the reason for economic subordination (De La Zerda & Hopper, 1979; Lippi-Green, 2012). Both official language policies and social ideologies contributed to the affirmative valuation and privileging of English and the devaluation of all other languages and the resultant or concomitant differential participation and status of groups in the political-economic structures of the nation.

Language diversity in the US today

Another note that arises from our brief historical summary is the change in the language diversity of the country over time. Through the 19th century, most of these language communities were compact in rural communities and small townships without intense language contacts with other language groups. By 1900, the majority of the national population lived in cities and the language contact among newly arrived immigrant communities was much greater and more

intimate. As we know from Fishman *et al.*'s (1966) major study of the language loyalty of these groups between 1900 and 1960, most of the European immigrant language groups shifted to English monolingualism over three generations, reducing the number of immigrant heritage language speakers, and the consequent language diversity of the nation. Yet, unlike these European language groups, during the 20th century the Spanish-speaking population grew at a higher rate than the rest of the country and benefitted from a continuous stream of in-migration of Spanish speakers, primarily from Mexico, and other parts of the western hemisphere. It became possible to maintain compact Spanish-speaking communities in which native-born Chican@s, Boricuas, refugee Cubans and other immigrants primarily from the western hemisphere could live and work in Spanish without knowing much, if any English. These communities were and are the legacy of historical Spanish colonial settlements and the wide-ranging and long-lasting racial and ethnic segregation of these peoples.

In 1850, there were an estimated 118,000 Spanish speakers, who represented about 0.5% of the total national population of about 23 million. In 1900, the Spanish-speaking population was estimated at 2% of the national population, while in 2011, there were 34.7 million Spanish speakers in the country, representing 12.3% of the total national population of 308.7 million. Not only was there an increase in the absolute numbers of Spanish speakers, but there was also an increase proportionately to the national population as well.

Ethnic and racial projections of the national population from 2012 to 2060 indicate a large increase in the 'Hispanic' population (Toosi, 2012; US Census Bureau, 2012). After 2020, within one generation, Latin@s may contribute more net growth to the US population than all other groups combined. The Latin@ population would more than double, from 53.3 million in 2012 to 128.8 million in 2060. Consequently, by the end of the period, nearly one in three US residents would be Latin@, up from about one in six today. The US is projected to become a non-white majority nation for the first time in 2043. The US national population will be more like the rest of the hemisphere, if not the rest of the world, than it has been in the dominant American imagination. Non-whites were 37% of the US population in 2012, and are projected to comprise 57% of the population in 2060.

If we assume a similar language distribution among Latin@s in 2060 as in 2011, when 75% spoke Spanish (25% as Spanish monolinguals and 50% as bilinguals), then the number of Spanish speakers could be as large as 96 million in 2060, nearly tripling in size from 2011 (even if we assume 50% of the national Latin@ population will speak Spanish, there will be almost a doubling in the number of Spanish speakers). The number of Spanish speakers has increased for over 150 years in the US at a rate that

is faster than the national population, the ethnic base of the Spanish-speaking population has become bilingual and there is every indication that the growth of Spanish speakers will continue into the near future.

The Latin@ demographic growth is reflected in language practices throughout the country. In commerce, for example, 98.9% (14,325,928) of the companies that responded to the 2007 business survey undertaken by the US Census Bureau used English in their customer transactions (receipts, sales and shipments), representing \$21.8 billion, while 7.4% (1,079,350) of them also used Spanish in these transactions, representing \$6.3 billion, with all other languages each being used by less than 1% of these companies. Among the 2,260,269 respondent firms owned by Hispanics, 90.1% of them transacted exchanges in English (representing \$221.8 million), while 56.1% of them also used Spanish (representing \$129.4 million).

Spanish language print, broadcast and digital media have also reflected the growth of the Latin@ populations. In 2010, the number of Spanish language newspapers in the country remained stable over the previous year, with 832 publications, including 25 dailies and 428 weeklies. Television and radio both grew in audience and value, and often competed successfully in local markets against the English language media companies (Guskin & Mitchell, 2011). In July 2013, Univision, the largest Spanish language television network in the country won the network sweeps. *Daily Finance* reported 'This summer, there's a new No. 1 among television viewers aged 18-49: For the fourth week in a row, the Spanish-language network Univision has won the primetime ratings contest for this coveted demographic, as well as the 18-34 cohort. It's Univision's first top finish in a sweeps month; the network previously beat NBC to come in fourth in the critical February sweeps period' (Murphy, 2013). The economic activity in business and employment in this language industry continues to be important (Valenzuela & Hunt, 2004).

Will the changes in the racial/ethnic composition of our national population and the multiple Spanish language economic practices throughout society affect the valuation of our language diversity? Would this valuation change require a reconsideration of or at least a challenge to the English assimilation goals of the current language policies that predicate abandonment of non-English languages as a condition of political, economic and social participation in the US? European national language policies are accommodating their regional political reorganization (the European Union) and more intimate linguistic diversity with multiple languages in their school policies and other social, political and economic structures, challenging the 'one nation, one language' political principle of the 19th century. The US currently has the fourth-largest Spanish-speaking population in the world. Global Spanish has the second-largest number of native speakers behind Chinese and slightly ahead of English. With a

greater number of second language speakers of English than Spanish, it is still the third most spoken language in the world. So, in the future, whither the US? As other chapters of this book make clear: the times they are a-changing.

As we explore the value of bilingualism or single languages within the US economy, we should keep in mind this history of language diversity and language policies and practices as well as the ideological forces that affect the organization of the economy, social relations between groups and the participation of people with different ethnolinguistic characteristics and talents in these political economies. Demography and the dollar may yet trump ideology. Ultimately, we should bear in mind that the social, political or economic value, benefit or advantage of bilingualism or of specific languages may very well lie in the eye of the beholder.

References

- Álvarez-González, J. (1999) Law, language and statehood: The role of English in the great state of Puerto Rico. *Law and Inequality* 17, 359–443.
- Bale, J. (2008) Americanization by schooling. In J. González (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education* (pp. 32–38). London: Sage Publications.
- Brecht, R. and Rivers, W. (2012) US language policy in defence and attack. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp. 262–275). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bustamante, J. (1972) The historical context of the undocumented immigration from Mexico to the United States. *Aztlán-Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* 3 (2, Fall), 257–282.
- Castro, R. (1977) The Bilingual Education Act – A historical analysis of Title VII. In R.F. Macías (ed.) *Perspectivas en Chicano Studies* (pp. 81–122). Los Angeles: NACCS & UCLA Chicano Studies Center.
- De La Zerda, N. and Hopper, R. (1979) Employment interviewers' reactions to Mexican American speech. *Communication Monographs* 46 (2), 126–134.
- Déllano, A. (2011) *México and Its Diaspora in the United States: Policies of Emigration since 1848*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2005) *To the Flag: The Unlikely History of the Pledge of Allegiance*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Fedynskyj, J. (1971) State session laws in non-English languages: A chapter of American legal history. *Indiana Law Journal* 46 (4), 463–478.
- Fishman, J.A., Nahirny V.C., Hofman, J.E., and Hayden, R.G. (1966) *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Gándara, P. and Hopkins, M. (2011). *Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. and Mason, L. (2009) Where in the world is US Spanish? Creating a space of opportunity for US Latinos. In W. Harbert, S. McConnell-Ginet, A. Miller and J. Whitman (eds) *Language and Poverty* (pp. 78–101). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Gómez, M. (1998) *Exchanging Our Country Marks: The Transformation of African Identities in the Colonial and Antebellum South*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- González, A. (2002) *Mexican Americans and the US Economy*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

- Grin, F. (2008) Economics and language policy. In M. Hellinger and A. Pauwels (eds) *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity & Change* (pp. 271–297). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grin, F. and Vallaincourt, F. (1997) The economics of multilingualism: Overview and analytical framework. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 43–65.
- Griswold del Castillo, R. (1990) *The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Guskin, E. and Mitchell, A. (2011) Hispanic media: Faring better than the mainstream media. *The State of the News Media, An Annual Report on American Journalism*. Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. See <http://stateofthemediacenter.org/2011/> (accessed 1 September 2011).
- Heath, S. (1976a) Colonial language status achievement: Mexico, Peru and the United States. In A. Verdoodt and R. Kjolseth (eds) *Language in Sociology* (pp. 49–92). Louvain: Éditions Peeters.
- Heath, S. (1976b) A national language academy? Debate in the new nation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 11, 9–43.
- Heath, S. (1977) Our language heritage: A historical perspective. In J. Phillips (ed.) *The Language Connection: From the Classroom to the World* (pp. 21–51). Vol. 9 of the ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Hill, J. (2008) *The Everyday Language of White Racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kloss, H. (1998, 1977) *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Klotz, E. (1968) Honest and glorious. In G.E. Frakes and C.B. Solberg (eds) *El Tratado de Guadalupe Hidalgo/The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo 1848* (pp. 10–28). Sacramento, CA: Telefact Foundation.
- Leeman, J. (2004) Racializing language: A history of linguistic ideologies in the US Census. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3 (3), 507–534.
- Leibowitz, A. (1971) *Educational Policy and Political Acceptance: The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools*. ERIC document no. ED 047321 (March). Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Leibowitz, A. (1974) Language as a means of social control: The United States experience. Paper delivered at the VIII World Congress of Sociology, Committee on Sociolinguistics. University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada (August).
- Leibowitz, A. (1984) The official character of English in the United States: Literacy requirements for immigration, citizenship, and entrance into American life. *Aztlán* 15 (1), 25–70.
- Lepore, J. (2002) *A is for American: Letters and Other Characters in the Newly United States*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997, 2012) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States* (2nd edn). London and New York: Routledge.
- Luebke, F. (1980) Legal restrictions on foreign languages in the Great Plains States, 1917–1923. In P. Schach (ed.) *Languages in Conflict: Linguistic Acculturation on the Great Plains* (pp. 1–19). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Macías, R.F. (1997) Bilingual workers and language use rules in the workplace: A case study of a non-discriminatory language policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 127, 53–70.
- Macías, R.F. (2014) Spanish as the second national language of the United States: Fact, future, fiction, or hope? *Review of Research in Education* 38 (1 March), 56–80.
- Martínez, O. (1975) On the size of the Chicano population: New estimates, 1850–1900. *Aztlán* 6 (1), 43–68.

- Murphy, E. (2013) Univision bests the big four in July sweeps ratings contest. *Daily Finance*, 26 July. See www.dailyfinance.com/on/univision-number-one-nielsen-tv-ratings-july/ (accessed 26 February 2014).
- Piatt, B. (1993) *Language on the Job: Balancing Business Needs and Employee Rights*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Romero, F. (1979) *Chicano Workers: Their Utilization and Development*. Monograph No. 8. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center.
- San Miguel, Jr., G. (2004) *Contested Policy: The Rise and Fall of Federal Bilingual Education in the United States, 1960–2001*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Schlossman, S. (1983) Is there an American tradition of bilingual education? German in the public elementary schools, 1840–1919. *American Journal of Education* 91 (2), 139–186.
- Schmid, C. (2001) *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Shell, M. (1993) Babel in America; or, the politics of language diversity in the United States. *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1), 103–127.
- Toosi, M. (2012) Employment outlook: 2010–2020. Labor force projections to 2020: A more slowly growing workforce. *Monthly Labor Review* (January), 43–64.
- US Census Bureau. (2012) US Census Bureau projections show a slower growing, older, more diverse nation a half century from now. *Press release*. CB12-243 (12 December).
- US Commission on Civil Rights. (2011) *English Only Policies in the Workplace*. Washington, DC: Author. See http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/English_Only_Policies_Report-July2011.pdf (accessed 21 April 2013).
- Valenzuela, A. and Hunt, D. (2004) Labor and Spanish-language broadcasters. *Working USA* 7 (4, Spring), 78–102.
- Weinberg, M. (1997) *A Chance to Learn: The History of Race and Education in the United States* (2nd edn). Long Beach, CA: California State University Press.
- Weinberg, M. (2002) *Short History of American Capitalism*. New History Press. See <http://www.newhistory.org/AmCap.pdf>
- Wiley, T.G. (1998) The imposition of World War I era English-only policies and the fate of German in North America. In T. Ricento and B. Burnaby (eds) *Language Policies in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities* (pp. 211–241). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wolff, R. and Resnick, S. (2012) *Contending Economic Theories: Neoclassical, Keynesian, and Marxian*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wright, E. (1980) School English and public policy. *College English* 42 (4 December), 327–342.
- Wyman, M. (1993) *Round-Trip to America: The Immigrants Return to Europe, 1880–1930*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zehler, A., Fleischman, H., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendzick, M. and Sapru, S. (2003) *Descriptive Study of Services to Limited English Proficient Students*. Washington, DC: Development Associates.

AQ: Please confirm in the text citation, do we need to change the year for Shell reference as 1993?

AQ: Should Weinberg 1997 can be changed to Weinberg 1995?