

## Language Politics and Policies

Tensions and conflicts related to linguistic identity and security are inevitable – even necessary – in liberal democracies. However, if conflicts related to language and identity negatively impact democratic participation, and lead to social fragmentation, civic withdrawal, and lack of trust in societal institutions, then the political system itself may become suspect and unstable. Written by experts from the fields of sociolinguistics, bilingual studies, political science/philosophy, and education, this volume provides a comprehensive picture of the current political, cultural, and social factors impacting language policy in the United States and Canada. The chapters cover many aspects of social life in North America, such as immigration, bilingual education, heritage languages, and linguistic identity, and explore the challenges and set-backs, along with the many positive steps taken in recent years to advance the values of inclusion amidst diversity in a variety of contexts and domains in the United States and Canada.

THOMAS RICENTO is Professor and Research Chair Emeritus at the University of Calgary, Canada. He has published widely in the field of language policy and on the politics of language in North America. His recent publications include *Language Policy and Political Economy* (2015), *Language Policy and Planning: Critical Concepts in Linguistics* (2016), and *Language Policy and Political Theory: Building Bridges, Assessing Breaches* (2016).

# Language Politics and Policies

*Perspectives from Canada and the United States*

---

*Edited by*  
**Thomas Ricento**  
*University of Calgary*



Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-45314-1 — Language Politics and Policies  
Edited by Thomas Ricento  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

## CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom  
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi - 110025, India  
103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781108453141](http://www.cambridge.org/9781108453141)

DOI: 10.1017/9781108684804

© Cambridge University Press 2019

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2019

First paperback edition 2022

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data*

Names: Ricento, Thomas, editor.

Title: Language politics and policies : perspectives from Canada and the United States / edited by Thomas Ricento.

Description: New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2019. |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019002496 | ISBN 9781108429139 (hardback) |

ISBN 9781108453141 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Language policy—United States. | Language policy—Canada.

Classification: LCC P119.32.U6 L365 2019 | DDC 306.44/971—dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2019002496>

ISBN 978-1-108-42913-9 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-45314-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Barbara Burnaby

## Contents

---

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>List of Contributors</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xiii
<i>Contributor Personal Statements</i>	xvi
Introduction	1
THOMAS RICENTO	
<b>Part I Theoretical Orientations</b>	<b>25</b>
1 The Liberal Tradition in America: A Historical-Institutionalist Approach to US Language Policy	27
SELMA K. SONNTAG	
2 The Political Ethics of Linguistic In-Betweenness	45
Yael Peled	
3 Alienation, Language Work, and the So-Called Commodification of Language	60
JOHN E. PETROVIC	
4 Canadian Language Politics in Global and Theoretical Contexts	78
PETER IVES	
<b>Part II The United States Context</b>	<b>95</b>
5 Disciplining Bilingual Education	97
NELSON FLORES	
6 Measured Multilingualism: Census Language Questions in Canada and the United States	114
JENNIFER LEEMAN	
	vii

viii	Contents	
7	The Rise, Fall, and Rebirth of Bilingual Education in California and the Ongoing American Dilemma	135
	TERRENCE G. WILEY	
8	Language Policy Conflicts: New York City's Efforts to Expand Bilingual Education Amidst English-Only Pressures	153
	KATE MENKEN AND SHARON AVNI	
9	Indigenous Language Movements in a Settler State	173
	TERESA L. MCCARTY	
10	The Politics of Language Education Policy Development and Implementation: Minnesota (Not So) Nice?	192
	KENDALL A. KING AND MARTHA BIGELOW	
	<b>Part III The Canadian Context</b>	211
11	Heritage Language Education Policies and the Regulation of Racial and Linguistic Difference in Ontario	213
	JEFF BALE	
12	A Foucauldian Approach to Language Policy in Canada	232
	EVE HAQUE	
13	Promises, Acts, and Action: Indigenous Language Politics in Canada	244
	DONNA PATRICK	
14	Language, Land, and Stewardship: Indigenous Imperatives and Canadian Policy	263
	MARK FETTES	
15	A Land of Immigration and Official French–English Bilingualism: Politics and Policies for Integration of Adult Immigrants into French-Canadian Minority Communities	281
	MONIKA JEZAK	
16	Ethnocultural and Linguistic Diversity: New Challenges to Canada's Language Regime	298
	LINDA CARDINAL AND RÉMI LÉGER	
	<i>Index</i>	316

## Figures

---

6.1	Education and language questions from the 1901 Canadian census schedule	<i>page</i> 117
6.2	1911 Instructions on how to record “Language commonly spoken”	118
6.3	Language questions on the 2016 Canadian Census short form	121
6.4	Question on the ability to speak non-official languages on the 2016 Canadian Census long form	124
6.5	Question on language use at work on the 2016 Canadian Census long form	125
6.6	American Community Survey language question (2016)	127
11.1	Map of metropolitan Toronto prior to amalgamation in 1996	218
14.1	Calls to Action on language from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015b)	266
14.2	Recommendations 1 and 2 from the Task Force on Aboriginal Languages and Cultures (2005)	268
14.3	The Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) – Article 8(j) (United Nations, 1992)	270
14.4	General Comment 21 of the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (2009, para. 36)	272

## Tables

---

15.1	<i>Answers to the question</i> What Francophone organizations, services or events are you familiar with in Ottawa?	<i>page 292</i>
16.1	Proportion of the immigrant population in Canada according to continent of birth and visible minority status (15–64 years old), 2011 and 2036	301
16.2	Proportion of the immigrant population in Québec according to continent of birth and visible minority status, 2011 and 2036	302
16.3	Proportion of the population by mother tongue, home language, first official language, Canada, 2011 and 2036	304
16.4	Proportion of the population by mother tongue, home language, first official language, Québec, 2011 and 2036	304
16.5	Proportion of the population by mother tongue, home language, first official language, Canada outside Québec, 2011 and 2036	305
16.6	Proportion of the immigrant population in Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver, 2011 and 2036	306
16.7	Proportion of the population with visible minority status, Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver, 2011 and 2036	306
16.8	Proportion of the population with non-official mother tongue, Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver, 2011 and 2036	307
16.9	Proportion of the immigrant population in Ottawa–Gatineau, 2011 and 2036	307
16.10	Proportion of the population with visible minority status, Ottawa–Gatineau, 2011 and 2036	308
16.11	Proportion of the population with non-official mother tongue, Ottawa–Gatineau, 2011 and 2036	308



## Contributors

---

- SHARON AVNI (City University of New York)  
JEFF BALE (University of Toronto)  
MARTHA BIGELOW (University of Minnesota)  
LINDA CARDINAL (University of Ottawa)  
MARK FETTES (Simon Fraser University)  
NELSON FLORES (University of Pennsylvania)  
EVE HAQUE (York University)  
PETER IVES (University of Winnipeg)  
MONIKA JEZAK (University of Ottawa)  
KENDALL A. KING (University of Minnesota)  
JENNIFER LEEMAN (George Mason University)  
RÉMI LÉGER (Simon Fraser University)  
TERESA L. MCCARTY (University of California, Los Angeles)  
KATE MENKEN (City University of New York)  
DONNA PATRICK (Carleton University)  
YAEL PELED (McGill University)  
JOHN E. PETROVIC (University of Alabama)  
THOMAS RICENTO (University of Calgary)  
SELMA K. SONNTAG (University of Colorado, Boulder)  
TERRENCE G. WILEY (Arizona State University)

## Preface

---

In 1998, Barbara Burnaby and I co-edited the book *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities*, consisting of fourteen contributions by American and Canadian scholars from various academic disciplines. That book contributed to the emerging field of comparative language policy, and the findings and frameworks articulated in that collection remain relevant to the present day. Yet, it seemed a worthwhile idea to revisit the terrain of language politics and policies in the United States and Canada to consider how well those earlier views and findings applied to the current situation in both countries, and to highlight some new research perspectives that could yield interesting insights on the same issues that animated the earlier book. This led to the planning of the Banff Symposium that took place on June 8–10, 2017 in the town of Banff, Alberta, funded by my Research Chair in English as an Additional Language at the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. I invited sixteen scholars, three of whom were unable to attend the meeting, to prepare papers related to their particular interests in advance of our gathering in Banff. I provided a rationale for the meeting and a general framework that would guide our collective intellectual collaboration. The papers were circulated among all of the participants well in advance of our meeting together in Banff, and everyone was given the opportunity to provide written comments on all of the papers. Therefore, when we finally did convene in June, the discussion had already been well underway and our time together in Banff was more fruitful than it might otherwise have been. Those who were unable to attend the symposium contributed to this volume, and were able to read the papers and comments as they prepared their contributions. In the course of those three days at the Kinnear Centre for Creativity and Innovation on the Banff Centre Campus, conversations begun during our formal sessions continued during meals, coffee breaks, and (especially!) during cocktail hour on the veranda in full view of the magnificent Rockies. The final product, i.e., the book you now hold, reflects the many changes in individual thinking and argumentation that occurred in the wake of our co-deliberations, and the result is a coherent and integrated volume that is far better than it might otherwise

have been had we simply prepared chapters without the benefit of the hard work and input of the participants before, during, and after our June meeting. This book is truly a collaborative project, not a collection of individual articles on an assigned topic. As you read the chapters, you will find cross-references to other chapters, along with commentary that contributes to a cohesiveness and coherence among the constituent parts that is rare in edited volumes.

I'd like to acknowledge Jim Tollefson for his insightful and constructive comments on earlier versions of this book that have improved the final product in many ways, large and small. I'd also like to thank Sam Sonntag for her comments and suggestions on aspects of my Introduction to the book. Brian Jansen, my editorial assistant, provided detailed comments, corrections, and queries on all of the chapters, and I know that the contributors are deeply appreciative of his important contribution to this project over many months and through a myriad of e-mail exchanges. Lawrence Kan, Conference Services Manager, Banff Centre for Arts and Creativity, made planning for our event in Banff a breeze, and, once we arrived, Lawrence made sure that everything worked smoothly down to the smallest details. I appreciate the support I have received from my editor at Cambridge University Press, Helen Barton, who recognized the potential of this project from the very beginning and provided support, suggestions, feedback, and encouragement throughout the entire process. I also want to acknowledge the generous support of the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. Over the past decade, as Professor and Research Chair in English as an Additional Language, I have had the good fortune and privilege of being able to organize a number of conferences on language policy and linguistic diversity, including the annual Multidisciplinary Approaches in Language Policy and Planning conference, that have brought together scholars from around the world to convene in Calgary and engage in spirited conversations and debates on a wide range of topics in the field of language policy and planning. It is important to note here that the Research Chair I held from 2007 through 2017 was supported by local philanthropy (institutional and individual), a testament to the commitment of community stakeholders to support research that can deepen our understanding of social problems and controversies that, in turn, can lead to the development and promotion of policies to enhance democratic inclusion and participation and, thereby, promote the common good for all citizens in Canada and beyond.

I have dedicated this book to Barbara Burnaby, who passed away on February 2, 2018. Barbara was for many years a professor at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, and later professor and dean, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland. I first met Barbara in Toronto in 1994, but I had worked with her previously as a contributor to a book she co-edited with Michael Herriman, *Language Policy in English-Dominant Countries: Six Case Studies* (1996). The collaboration on

our 1998 co-edited book *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada* was an optimal professional and personal experience for me; although I had conducted research on the Canadian language context prior to my work with Barbara, her own impressive research and insights on language matters in Canada broadened my understanding and influenced my thinking on many important topics dealing with language, culture, and society. She was an inspirational colleague, a valued friend, and she will be missed.

Finally, I'd like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to all of the contributors to this book. Their commitment to the highest standards of scholarship, along with a common desire to enhance social equity and democratic inclusion in societies riven by divisions and hierarchies related to social class, race, gender, ethnicity, language, and the political and historical structuration that maintains such divisions, has made our work together as a collective both possible and enjoyable. As members of linguistically and culturally diverse communities and societies, we scholars of language are no different from other human beings who, for better or worse, are both united and divided by our/their linguistic and cultural differences. While we may (as dispassionate scholars) succeed to some degree in accounting for the reasons for these divisions and hierarchies, and suggest ways of mitigating them, we cannot discount our own investment and participation in the worlds we inhabit. Our tools – language and reason – inform our scholarship and shed light on matters we care about as human beings. Of course, we also recognize that language and reason are not sufficient unto themselves to understand and deal with our linguistic and cultural differences. The title of Francisco Goya's iconic 1799 etching, 'El sueño de la razon produce monstros' (The sleep of reason produces monsters), can mislead us if we fail to recall the complete caption for his work: "*Imagination* [italics added] abandoned by reason produces impossible monsters; united with her, she is the mother of the arts and source of their wonders." We certainly need to imagine a better world if we hope to change the current one, relying on reason, empathy, and imagination; the work presented in this volume by these outstanding scholars offers some ideas on how we might move in the direction of a better, more just, more inclusive world, one that all of us can easily imagine, and one that we can work collectively to achieve if we so desire.

THOMAS RICENTO, Calgary, June 2018

## Contributor Personal Statements

---

### Jeff Bale

One purpose of these reflection statements is to clarify how we came to the chapters we've contributed to this book. There is an immediate way to address this, which I will get to in a moment. But, what struck me while sitting around the table in Banff is that I came to this work in many ways because of the people sitting in the room with me. Most important among them is Terry Wiley, who was my doctoral advisor. I could write about a million positive memories of working with Terry. But the most relevant here was the impact that his thinking about language policy has had on mine. Sometimes, advisors are quite explicit about expecting their students to adopt similar analytical strategies or methodologies. There was none of that with Terry. He gave me wide latitude to study the topics I cared most about. And yet, we share the same instinct to approach current conflicts over language policy from historical perspectives. I know that imitation is the greatest form of flattery, but what I am saying here is not just flattery; it is acknowledging an intellectual tradition, one for which I am very grateful.

I could – and in Banff, did – say the same about many others around that table: Tom's ongoing generosity toward me as a more junior scholar; the inspiration I found in reading Kate's dissertation when I was still thinking about mine; the model I found in how Terri unifies social justice advocacy and rigorous scholarship; learning from Peter about political-theory traditions for conceiving of language and language policy. In other words, I would not have been able to undertake the study I report on here without having benefitted from the work of many others contributing to this book. To be sitting in one room with them, and to be able to widen that circle with the other contributors to this volume, was extraordinarily rewarding.

The more immediate explanation of how I came to the chapter I've contributed here has to do with my concerns about where the field of language planning and policy is headed. In short, I don't see the liberal underpinnings

of our field as sufficient for understanding, let alone helping to resolve the conflicts over language education policy that endure in multilingual, settler-colonial contexts such as Canada and the United States. In previous work, I have attempted to distill principles from earlier Marxist scholarship on the intersection of language, racism, nationalism, and resistance, and I still believe that those lessons are as rich for us today as they are overlooked. At the same time, I have been so inspired by reading Eve's and Nelson's work and how they understand the intersection of language and race. It is the critical, liberatory sensibility of their work that I think is vital for us as a field, and, more important, for effecting real change in practice. It is in reading their work that I have learned to ask the questions I did in the chapter here, although I recognize I still have much more to learn.

Finally, my own background positions me well to take up the study I've reported here. While I was born in the United States and lived my life there until moving to Toronto in 2014, I was raised by Canadians, and was in regular contact with my extended family, most of whom live in Manitoba and points west. Some of my earliest political questions were about why my relatives were so angry about seeing and hearing French where they live and why my one great aunt was so keen to volunteer for the Reform Party (and why she had to hide that from her letter-carrier husband, a die-hard New Democratic Party (NDP) supporter!). And it was nothing short of exhilarating to live in Montréal the summer before the 1995 referendum on independence. In other words, my personal and political life has not only been shaped by crossing this border, but also by wondering about the many conflicts in Canada over language and politics. So, it makes perfect sense to contribute to a book that does the same.

### **Linda Cardinal and Rémi Léger**

As political scientists, we were both trained in the "Canadian tradition" of blending normative political theory with sociopolitical and institutional approaches. This tradition has explored a number of issues related to democracy in diverse societies, including language and linguistic diversity. In Canada, key works from Jean Lapointe, Kenneth McRae, and Kenneth McRoberts have enriched the study of language policy and planning. The first two developed the distinction between territorial and personal language rights. After much debate, Canada chose the personal approach with a territorial element, while Québec chose a territorial-heavy approach that resembles the Swiss and Belgian approaches. A student of federalism, Kenneth McRoberts deserves recognition for his contribution to the study of language policy and planning. Connecting language with nationalism, constitutionalism, and federalism, McRoberts examined the federal language policy from the perspective of national unity and solidarity. A strong advocate of asymmetrical federalism,

xviii Contributor Personal Statements

McRoberts envisaged language policy as a way to reconcile Québec and the rest of Canada.

Tom Ricento's *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities* (1998) came at a time when political science in Canada was going through a comparative turn. It remains one of the only – if not the only – books that compares Canada and the United States in the area of language politics. We are grateful to Tom Ricento for inviting us to participate in the second edition of this comparative project.

In this volume, our co-written chapter reflects on the future of language and linguistic diversity in Canada. Its starting point is two Statistics Canada reports that, drawing on data from 2011, aim to present a realistic portrait of Canada's ethnocultural and linguistic diversity in 2036. We were compelled to think about what these projections could mean for Canada's language regime, the federal language policy, and francophone minority communities. Our hope is that our analysis and reflections will elucidate the past and future roles of state traditions of federalism and political compromise in the design and redesign of language policies in Canada.

### **Mark Fettes**

My contribution to the first volume on *Language and Politics in the US and Canada* was written when I was still a graduate student, at the invitation of Tom's coeditor Barbara Burnaby. Indeed, I owe my academic career in some sense to that article, since it was the original phone call from Barbara that led me to apply to a doctoral program at her institution, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, and to a line of research that brought me eventually to my present position in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. It seemed fitting, then, for this follow-up volume, to go back to some of the original concerns that motivated me then and see what I have managed to learn in the intervening two decades. For a variety of reasons, I have not written a lot about Aboriginal language policy in that period, though the questions I encountered in the early 1990s, while working for the Assembly of First Nations, have always been with me. My research has been focused on ways in which schools might become more responsive to the communities and places where they are located – in part because of my conviction that this is the only way they might become appropriate, supportive environments for Aboriginal languages. Tom's invitation offered an opportunity to go back to the broader policy context that has always interested me, and in particular to explore the connections between language and land that loom larger and larger in my thinking as the years go by.

Initially I thought of contrasting rights-oriented and land-oriented approaches to policymaking on Aboriginal languages, and this was the

structure of the paper I wrote for the Banff Symposium. Sitting there on the first day, however, and looking out at the Bow Valley, I was struck by an absence, an underlying silence, stemming from a century and more of dispossession. I shared some of this with my colleagues on the second day, and they were moved in a way that told me that this would be the place to begin – literally and figuratively. With the opening in place, the rest of the chapter started to sort itself out. The land, indeed, kept drawing my attention, as I found myself reading through reports on biological diversity, the *Species At Risk Act*, land claims, and the defense of sacred sites. As so often, I found that the best way to honor the languages was not to look at them directly, but to glance in their direction from time to time, from the corner of one eye.

Like others, I owe a debt of gratitude to Tom for his enthusiasm, broad-mindedness, organizational acumen, and intellectual discipline – a source of inspiration not only for the present volume, but for other endeavors through the years. But my greatest debt, of course, is to my Aboriginal colleagues and mentors, who have tolerated my well-intentioned fumbblings and moments of misplaced arrogance, and slowly, patiently educated me into the art of listening. If I still sometimes think and act like a stupid white guy, it is not their fault.

### Nelson Flores

My chapter came to fruition in response to ongoing frustrations that have plagued me throughout my career in bilingual education about the disconnect between the social transformation promised by advocates of these programs and the realities of social reproduction that I have witnessed in my work with many of them. This frustration has led me to begin a historical analysis of the institutionalization of bilingual education in the post-Civil Rights era and the ways that this institutionalization failed to address the root cause of racial inequalities – the unequal material distribution of resources that are a product of generations of racial oppression.

What stood out to me the most from our conversation in Banff was just how much I saw my ideas reflected in different ways in the work of others in the group. For one, it became increasingly clear to me that what I was describing through the lens of critical race theory as whiteness as property is the other side of the same coin of what political theorists typically call the American liberal tradition. In a similar vein, what I refer to as a liberal multicultural view of racism has certain resonance with discourses of Canadian or Minnesota nice that we also discussed. Yet, what stood out to me the most was how, despite many important differences between the US and Canadian context, many of the historical developments I document for the United States have certain parallels in the Canadian context. Both are white settler colonial contexts



created in ways that afforded property rights to white people that were denied to Indigenous populations. They both experienced efforts in the post-World II era to challenge the racial inequalities that were produced by this white settler colonialism. These efforts did not have the intended effect, and they both continue to struggle with racial inequalities today. Particularly relevant for our conversation was the fact that, despite the official bilingual policy of Canada, both contexts reproduce nationalist framings of language that relegate Indigenous and immigrant languages to second-class status.

That said, it also became apparent to me that there are important differences between the United States and Canada. For one, there is a history of slavery in the United States that has produced particular forms of anti-Blackness that differ from the Canadian context. There is also a history of Manifest Destiny and imperialism that has produced particular colonial relations between the US and Latinx communities (especially Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans) that also differ from the Canadian context. Yet, the biggest difference that stood out to me was the fact that, in the Canadian context, there seems to have been more work in discussing its legacy of white settler colonialism with many of the members of the Banff group leading the way in imagining alternatives to current Canadian liberal multiculturalism that dismantle the marginalization of Indigenous communities. I was inspired by these efforts at imagining alternatives, even while recognizing that imagining is only the first step in dismantling white supremacy both in the United States and Canada.

### **Eve Haque**

My involvement with the field of language policy and planning studies dates back to the late 1990s when I started graduate school in Applied Linguistics and first encountered the book *Language Politics in the United States and Canada* (1998). This book was eye opening for me, as the various chapters outlining different Indigenous language policies in the Territories and detailing the lack of comprehensive policies for immigrants forced me to rethink the normalization of Canada as a French/English bilingual country, something drilled into me from elementary school in federally-mandated bilingual Ottawa. That need to disinter the normalization of two official languages in Canada has always been a guide for my thinking about the political relationality of languages ever since, and eventually led me to my work on the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, as well as my ongoing interest in the “integration” of immigrants through official language training regimes.

What has been exciting for me is to see how the field of language policy and planning is slowly expanding theoretically to allow for newer approaches for thinking about the relationality of languages and language speakers through,

for example, critical race theory and approaches that center on white settler colonial studies. Therefore, it was with excitement and interest that I participated in the Banff Group to revisit and build on the important work of *Language Politics in the United States and Canada* almost twenty years later. I hope that my chapter can make a contribution to our ongoing efforts to expand the interests and boundaries of the field in the ultimate quest to collectively imagine a more inclusive and just future for speakers of all languages.

### Peter Ives

This is the first piece of research I have ever published explicitly focused on Canadian language politics and policy. It only came to fruition because of the excellent collection of scholars that Tom Ricento assembled and invited to the Banff Centre for a fabulous workshop. I am a trained political and cultural theorist with a focus on the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci and his lifelong interest in language politics. It is from this perspective that I came to research on language policy and investigations of global English. So, when Tom Ricento invited me to the Banff workshop, it presented a bit of a problem: what did I have to offer this particular formulation of language politics? But I soon realized this was not a problem but a great opportunity to explore issues I have been living with and thinking about for a long time.

Both my parents are English, immigrated to Canada in the 1950s, and had three “Canadian” children before moving to the United States, where I was born and raised. As an adult, I moved to Canada for graduate school and have lived here, in different cities, ever since. So I have a deep personal interest in comparisons between Canada and the United States, but have never conducted actual research specifically on language policy in either country. However, I couldn’t say no to the invitation, and not only because Banff is such a gorgeous place. Much more important than that was the list of scholars invited, some of whom I knew well and had worked with before, including Selma Sonntag, Yael Peled, Eve Haque, and Jeff Bale, and most of the others are scholars whose work I’d known, been influenced by, and respected. What a great group of people to develop the implications of my related work and methods to language policy in Canada and its relation to Canadian multiculturalism. Since a key guiding thread of all my work has been to show how language is a terrain of struggle and needs to be understood as inextricable from issues of class, race, gender, and other power relationships and hierarchies, this invitation offered a crucial opportunity to further develop those ideas.

While my chapter makes little note of comparisons between Canada and the United States, it very much comes out of my own working through of differences and similarities between two white-settler colonial societies that

have (ab)used language and language policy in very different ways. It made me think a lot about how Canada presents a critique of the dominance of liberal individualism that underlies much of the United States's language ideology, but itself is very problematic. Both language ideologies and the language policies stemming from them are deeply imbricated by racialized hierarchies that do more to obscure ongoing power dynamics than change the current inequalities and ongoing colonialism.

The particular mix of both US and Canadian scholars that Tom Ricento brought together in Banff offered an amazing intellectual setting for me to think through many of these issues that have laid dormant in my previous life, work, and experiences. The days in Banff were essential, entailing wide-ranging discussions, stemming from specific presentations but extending to fundamental issues of power and language. Translating our disciplinary languages and viewpoints in discussions with other scholars turned out for me to be even more transformative and central than the differences between the United States and Canada or differing regional foci in either country.

### **Monika Jezak**

In 1998, when the book *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada* was published, I had just completed my PhD, and was in the very early stages of my career. During these years, Barbara Burnaby's innovative research projects on language and immigration policies, as well as on workplace literacy in Canada, were a reference for my personal research choices. It was Professor Burnaby's commitment to state her ethical position, to take into account all stakeholders and actors of her research projects, and her belief that research should bring policy change at micro-, meso-, and macro-levels that influenced greatly whom I became as a scholar. Throughout the last twenty years, I have continued to refer to the seminal work of both Tom Ricento and Barbara Burnaby, whom I cited in my own studies and while training young researchers. Therefore, it was with much emotion and humility that I accepted an invitation to participate in the *Language Politics and Policies: Perspectives from Canada and the United States* publication project.

My chapter deals with realities that Canadian minority francophone communities face nowadays, due to pressure from ever-increasing numbers of linguistically diverse immigrants. It was for personal reasons that I became interested in those issues crucial for contemporary Canadian language policy: I am myself an immigrant and a francophone. Living in Ottawa, with both English and French, I wanted to better understand the "francophone minority community" to which I belong. However, the first draft of my paper, descriptive in nature, underwent substantial revision as a result of the three days of

exchanges at the invitational symposium in Banff, Alberta. Resonating with other chapters in this volume (that I acknowledge throughout my paper), the data from my project was placed into a perspective that allowed me to conclude on a critical note. I thank my colleagues wholeheartedly for this opportunity.

### **Kendall A. King and Martha Bigelow**

The language education policy that we write about is from our own context of work. The US state of Minnesota has been welcoming refugees in relatively large numbers since the resettlement of the Hmong in the 1970s, and presently has large refugee-background East African, Burmese, and Bhutanese communities. Concomitantly, the state has supported multilingualism through numerous immersion schools and K–12 world language programs for English speakers. For instance, Minnesota boasts more than 70 immersion programs, serving more than 20,000 students across the state. However, there has been a longstanding gap in programming for minority language students, including less-than-optimally effective English as a second language programs, absence of instruction to develop and build upon students' native languages, and, as a result, a longstanding academic achievement (or opportunity) gap between English learners, most of whom are students of color, on the one hand and English proficient students on the other. The language education policy that we discuss here, known as LEAPS, is an attempt to address this gap. This law frames multilingualism as an asset for all Minnesota students and sets a high bar for native language support for English learners.

For more than a decade, we have been invested in the creation and success of this policy, and thus by no means are we impartial outsiders conducting an analysis of a text that we do not have a stake in. We also have strong professional relationships with the authors of the legislation, staff at the Minnesota Department of Education, and many teachers and administrators in schools who, like us, have also invested in this legislation by responding to drafts, testifying at the capital, and implementing the legislation. Therefore, our analysis is intertwined with our investment in all of these relationships and the value we see in maintaining them as we work together to effect positive change in the language education experiences of youth in our state. As we engage in local and regional policy work, we are mindful of our own roles as researchers, as employees in the major state institute of higher education, and advocates for multilingualism. The work reflects and shapes our continually shifting understandings of the complexities of educational reform, education finance, and the ideologies (and constraints) of all involved as we attempt to make strides toward policy implementation and/or policy revision.

### Jennifer Leeman

I began my research on census language questions after reading news reports on the 2000 US census. I was struck by their language-as-problem discourse, which represented non-English languages as a threat to English, portrayed immigrants as failing to learn English, and in some cases equated not speaking English to living in poverty. It quickly became clear that similar language ideologies were also reflected and reproduced in the questions themselves, as well as in the production and dissemination of language statistics. However, although linguists had lamented the historical inconsistency of the language questions, there had been very little if any sociolinguistic analysis or public commentary on the ideological or political implications of the US Census Bureau's different ways of asking about language. This stood in stark contrast to the race and ethnicity questions, about which scholars, activists, and the general public engaged in intense and heated debate regarding both their symbolic and political implications. Thus, in my analysis of the intersection of ideologies of language, race, and nation in the census, I drew from critical race scholarship on the US census and research on the language questions from other countries. Still, while I drew from international research, the primary focus of my analysis was the United States.

When I presented my analysis, whether in academic contexts, at the US Census Bureau, or to people unfortunate enough to have been assigned the seat next to mine on various flights, one fairly common response was that I was reading too much into how the language questions were asked, and that they didn't necessarily reflect any particular view of language. For this reason, I sought to bolster my argument by comparing the US Census Bureau's questions with questions from around the world, and highlighting the way in which different ways of asking about language reflected different ways of thinking about language, as well as different language policies and politics. Given the role of language in social differentiation and politics in Canada, where census language questions have long been a topic of debate, a US–Canadian comparison seemed the natural choice.

The first *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada* proved extremely useful for understanding the language politics and policies in Canada, and providing a foundation for my analysis of the census language questions. Further, Ronald Schmidt Sr.'s chapter demonstrated the utility of the comparative approach and the juxtaposition of two different ideological and policy regimes for understanding the unique characteristics of each one. Perhaps even more importantly, his chapter demonstrated that even what appear to be similar political positions in the United States and Canada must be understood in accordance with the particular context in which they are found, and in contrast with the alternative positions in each country.

Along these lines, in my comparison of Canadian and US census language questions, ideologies, and policies, I seek not only to identify differences and similarities across the two countries, but also to show how even similar questions can serve different language regimes. It is an honor to be included in the new edition of a volume that has proved so valuable for my teaching and research.

### **Teresa L. McCarty**

In many ways this chapter began with my early work at the Rough Rock Demonstration School, now called Rough Rock Community School, discussed in the chapter for its role as the first contemporary American Indian community-controlled school. It was the 1980s, and I had recently met Rough Rock cofounders Robert and Ruth Roessel, long-time leaders in the American Indian education self-determination movement. The Roessels were again working at Rough Rock, and they invited me to join them in a project to develop a K–12 Navajo bilingual–bicultural curriculum. I lived and worked at Rough Rock for the next three years, and continued to work with the school and its bilingual–bicultural education programs over more than two decades. Although the focus of this early work was creating a linguistically and culturally inclusive curriculum, the deeper meaning was the right and the fight of Native people to control their children’s education. This early community-based work at Rough Rock and with other Native American communities inspired a lifelong commitment to both study ethnographically and work “on the ground” in the field of Indigenous education. As a non-Indigenous scholar-educator, I am present in this edited volume because of the Indigenous educators who have been my teachers and partners, and who invited me to work alongside them in their efforts to provide a decent and an equitable education for Native children.

Language has been the heart of this work. In a 2005 chapter on educational sovereignty, Luis Moll and Richard Ruiz, colleagues during my first academic appointment at the University of Arizona, wrote that a main barometer of education sovereignty is the degree to which people feel they are in control of their own language. As the scholarship of Richard, Luis, Thomas Ricento, Terrence Wiley, Nancy Hornberger, Joshua Fishman, Bernard Spolsky, James Tollefson, Ofelia García, Ana Celia Zentella, Geneva Smitherman, H. Samy Alim, Django Paris, and others has shown, feeling – and being – in control of one’s own language is a function of power relations that are raced, classed, and gendered. And, as Indigenous scholars K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Sheilah Nicholas, Tiffany Lee, Mary Hermes, Bryan Brayboy, Audra Simpson, and Wesley Leonard have shown, in Indigenous communities those power relations cannot be understood short of a face-front reckoning with settler colonialism.

That is the intellectual and political ground I have sought to engage in this chapter. More importantly, this is the ground navigated every day by the people whose life work *makes* language movements. No book chapter can do justice to the scope of this work, or to those who make the road by walking it. I nevertheless hope the chapter gives a sense of the human ingenuity, resilience, and commitment that breathes life into these movements. Above all, I hope readers will understand these movements as historicized, emplaced, and guided by Indigenous ways of knowing and being. This is hopeful, visionary, necessary work. And it is all about Indigenous sovereignty on Indigenous terms.

### **Kate Menken and Sharon Avni**

Kate Menken: My introduction to bilingual education began when I was a new teacher of English as a second language (ESL) in the mid-1990s in Vineland, New Jersey, where the city's Latinx population had grown rapidly. I had been trained to teach students monolingually in English, but because the school offered both ESL and bilingual education programming I was quickly able to see how my students who had the opportunity to learn bilingually did far better in a range of ways than those who learned only in English. I also saw that the bilingual classrooms were overcrowded and received fewer resources than the monolingual classrooms. And so began my first introduction to language education policies in US schools, and the reality that our policy decisions are typically far more political than they are pedagogical. The research we conducted that is presented in this book continues that trajectory through my first formal examination of bilingual education programs and policies for my own community – US Jews. The Banff Symposium provided a wonderful opportunity to join scholars from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, where we read one another's draft chapters and then listened to each author present their work. This intense, disciplined process deepened our understandings about one another's work as well as our own, and about language policy in North America more broadly.

Sharon Avni: The majority of my scholarship over the past decade has focused on the ideological, discursive, and policy dimensions of Hebrew learning among American Jews in Jewish contexts, such as private day schools and Jewish summer camps. One of the guiding questions has been what it means for a religious and diasporic community to feel attachment to a language that is not its vernacular and in which communal members have minimal proficiency. My interest in understanding what it means for a community to mobilize a language such as Hebrew, and enact language policies to address its values, concerns, and priorities became even more complicated as

I began several years ago to think about non-Jews and different types of American Jews' relationship to Hebrew study. These questions led me to MPMS, the public intermediate school in NYC on which our chapter is based. The recent growth of Hebrew language charter schools across the United States and the expansion of Hebrew programs in American public middle and high schools, in which non-Jewish children are learning Hebrew alongside Jewish children, forces us to think about the meaning and value of dual language education from a religious perspective. For me, being able to study the diverse students learning Hebrew at MPMS, as well as the policy dynamics of establishing a Hebrew–English dual language program helped me to think through questions about language ownership and language authenticity in new ways, and has opened my eyes to the different affordances that learning Hebrew offers to a wide range of learners.

### **Donna Patrick**

I have had a very long interest in minority and Indigenous languages in Canada and elsewhere, and the many social, political, economic, and legal issues that they raise. This interest began with the study of a French-speaking community in my home province of Saskatchewan in the mid-to-late 1980s and with my experience teaching adults in a small Nunavik community a few years later.

This long involvement with minority-language and Indigenous communities has made me keenly aware of their marginalization and racialization in Canada – which is not only linguistic but also social, political, and economic. At the same time, I have also become aware of, and inspired by, the tremendous resilience shown by these communities in the face of this marginalization. This resilience is especially worth highlighting in the case of Indigenous communities, whose interactions with the Canadian settler state over generations form a mostly dark history, which has included efforts, sponsored or abetted by the state, to undermine or destroy Indigenous languages, cultures, and environments. These facts are still slow to be recognized, in a country where it is still politically possible to deny or ignore them or the problems resulting from inequitable funding for Indigenous education, housing, health-care, and other services, or to blame Indigenous communities themselves for these problems.

This context raises an important question for non-Indigenous scholars (like me) whose work focuses on Indigenous languages and communities: what role, if any, can scholars play in raising awareness of Indigenous language use in Canada and in supporting the use of these languages in formal as well as informal domains and in urban as well as land-based contexts? These are some of the questions that I seek to address in my contribution to this volume.



### Yael Peled

My interest in the political ethics of language originated from a dual fascination with both ethics and language as perhaps the two most fundamental human commonalities, but which are paradoxically only realizable in difference. My interest in this complex question led me to pursue first a joint degree program, and later a subsequent research trajectory that draws on political science, philosophy, and linguistics. As such, my own disciplinary approach to understanding and theorizing the political ethics of language can be said to reflect just as much of an “in-betweenness” perspective as the one outlined and explored in the chapter.

Among the most important elements that contributed to my highly interdisciplinary research training and later research career were several professional connections established over the years with researchers in the various fields who strongly supported my disciplinary approach and encouraged me to continue expanding and developing it. Of these researchers, Tom has been a particularly prominent colleague (and friend) from our very first communication and then meeting at the 2010 Sociolinguistics Symposium. Tom’s own work, intellectual insights, and professional experience have greatly influenced my own work and thinking ever since.

### John E. Petrovic

My contribution to this volume is in some ways an extension of an article I published in the journal *Language Policy* in 2005. That piece was a critique of the language as resource orientation to language planning. As readers will know, the very generative article introducing various “orientations” to language planning and policy was provided by our late friend and colleague, Richard Ruiz. Interestingly, in what might be called a case of simultaneous anticipatory plagiarism, Tom Ricento published a very similar critique, similar to the extent that we both highlighted the neoliberal bent in language as resource, even as the two pieces took different directions beyond that. Well, we certainly had something to talk about when we finally met for the first time in person at the Sociolinguistics Symposium in Southampton some years later. I should point out that Richard had the last word on this in his response to both Tom and me (and others), in his chapter, *Reorienting Language-as-Resource*.

In the *Language Policy* article, I referred vaguely to what I called the “capitalization of language.” The basic argument against the language as resource orientation was that language was primarily obtained as a resource for national defense and economic productivity. The neoliberal focus of the latter was problematic to the extent that, as I argued it, “the forces of neoliberalism are far more likely to be successful at manipulating diversity

to maximize profit than cultural pluralists will be at manipulating neoliberalism to maximize diversity.” The notion of capitalization of language is, for all intents and purposes, just a variation on what is increasingly referred to in the literature as the commodification of language. But I do think there is an important difference here. The capitalization of language understands that we do use language as a skill to make money, to earn a living. This, I think, is very different from saying that language can be a commodity. In the end, both notions are trying to pinpoint what it means to say that language is a resource.

Thus, in an early version of my contribution to this volume presented at Tom’s language policy and planning conference in 2015, I tried to tease apart a variety of ways that language has been conceptualized, especially as related to the notion of resource, e.g., instrument. Throughout the literature there are examples of terms being thrown together, made synonymous, or made distinctive only to be put together again. Some of this confusion owed, I argued, to the arguments suggesting something called the commodification of language. I continue to wrestle with the idea that language can or should be conceived of as a commodity. I don’t think so. I am grateful to Tom for providing a forum to test some of the arguments in such a stimulating symposium and for giving me the space to try to suss it all out further in this volume.

### **Thomas Ricento**

One of the great joys in my career has been to collaborate with scholars from different disciplines who share common interests in understanding the complex roles that language plays in all aspects of human society, and who are committed to advocating for policies that can promote democratic inclusiveness and participation while respecting cultural and linguistic diversity. My rationale for convening the Banff Symposium was simply to bring together some of the best scholars in North America and provide a congenial setting in which they could share their ideas, their research, their concerns, their critical insights, and their passion for advancing the just interests of individuals and communities that continue to face various types of overt and covert economic, political, educational, and societal discrimination and marginalization based on perceived and/or ascribed linguistic, cultural, racial, religious, and/or national origin affiliations. I believe that our meeting in Banff was successful both professionally and personally because of the commitment of participants to contribute, in their own ways, to positive social change through collaborative engagement with various communities in Canada and the United States. Our extended face-to-face discussions and interactions helped us better understand our own views on important – often vexed – issues, the views of our colleagues, and the ways that our own views might be critically re-examined and modified in the unfettered and supportive environment of freewheeling

discussions, unconstrained by covert agendas or imposed time limits. I hope that the topics, analyses, and policy recommendations offered in this book will serve to stimulate continuing discussions and debates on topics and controversies that are germane to diverse contexts around the world; our collective ability to acknowledge and respect cultural and linguistic diversity while finding common ground to advance the universal desire to enjoy meaningful and productive lives is one of the greatest challenges facing human survival and well-being in the Anthropocene.

### Selma K. Sonntag

I first met Tom about the same time as his co-edited volume, *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and Realities*, the “base-line” for the Banff Symposium, was published. Tom had invited me to present some of my work on India at a panel he organized on ideology and language politics at the American Association of Applied Linguistics (AAAL) conference in Seattle in the spring of 1998. For me, it was an opportunity to return to the Language Policy and Planning (LPP) fold after a hiatus of a few years, during which I worked on more “traditional” political science topics, specifically institutional arrangements for self-government in India, testing components of Will Kymlicka’s theory of liberal multiculturalism. The AAAL panel also brought me back to research I had published a decade earlier on language ideology in the United States.

I have enjoyed and appreciated being included in Tom’s projects ever since. Credit is due to his remarkable talent of bringing together a rich array of scholars in interdisciplinary pursuits focused on LPP, with specific topics ranging from Global English to political theory and political economy. The Banff Symposium was exemplary of this talent of his, thereby providing a rich context in which to take stock of my own trajectory in the field of language and politics over the past twenty years. My Banff paper continues my work of the past several years in employing historical institutionalism, an established political science approach, to analyze language policy – in this case in the United States. I claim that liberalism is the American state tradition that has informed how language policy has been institutionalized in the United States, with shifts in policy corresponding to normative changes in the political interpretation of liberalism at critical junctures. Liberalism, the Banff crew reminded me, is a political theory and an ideology, prompting me to recall those topics I had grappled with twenty years ago. My Banff colleagues also pointed out to me that the emphasis I put on liberalism potentially masks the American tradition of racialization – and I was reminded of my twenty-year-old critique of Kymlicka’s liberalism applied to so-called tribals in India. Hence, the re-writing of my paper is, in many ways, an exercise in culminating

my scholarship on language politics. It would not have happened without the atmosphere of Banff, that is, a small, diverse group of LPP scholars taking each other's work seriously through continual dialog over two and a half days. And, while I benefitted enormously from my Banff colleagues' input and feedback, I contributed a few notions as well: by the end of the symposium, almost everyone was referring to "critical junctures." Of course, our discussions ranged far beyond the specifics of any particular paper. We discussed Marx, Foucault, and Chomsky. We debated multiculturalism, languaging, and constructivism. We probed policies on education, immigration, and indigeneity. This volume is testimony to the breadth and depth of our collective intellectual engagement.

### **Terrence G. Wiley**

In the original Ricento and Burnaby edited volume (1998), which was focused on language policy and politics in the United States and Canada, I concentrated on the rise of the English-only and Americanization movements and their consequences for German immigrants and foreign language education during the World War I era. In my contribution to this volume, I reflect on the lingering impact of those ideologies over the course of the last century, with emphasis on the politics of voter-approved propositions in California that have affected language, ethnic, and racial minorities. The controversies surrounding these political events have also helped to shape the focus of much of my research, scholarship, and practice over the past several decades. Beyond the works cited in my chapter, the material is also directly informed by my previous work in California with immigrant and refugee populations and in university-based teacher preparation during the 1980s and 1990s, and particularly by my prior affiliation with David Ramírez and colleagues in the erstwhile Center of Language Minority Education and Research (CLMER) at California State University, Long Beach.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-45314-1 — Language Politics and Policies  
Edited by Thomas Ricento  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---



Terry Wiley, Kate Menken, John Petrovic, Sam Sonntag, Donna Patrick,  
Monika Jezak, Yael Peled, Jeff Bale, Nelson Flores, Eve Haque, Peter Ives,  
Martha Bigelow, Mark Fettes, Tom Ricento.  
Participants at the Banff Symposium, June 8–10, 2017