

The past is prologue

Language policy and nativism in new immigrant contexts

David Cassels Johnson, Crissa Stephens and
Stephanie Guglielmo Lynch
University of Iowa

This article examines reactions to the changing linguistic ecology in the U.S. state of Iowa, which is experiencing a demographic phenomenon often referred to as the New Latino Diaspora (NLD) (Hamann et al., 2002). We first examine the historical processes and social structures that link current language policy initiatives within Iowa to local and national nativism. We then analyze public policies and texts to reveal how language ideologies circulate across diverse texts and contexts, forming discourses that shape the experiences of Latin@s in Iowa.

Keywords: language policy, intertextuality, New Latino Diaspora, English, nativism, discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Emboldened by the election of Donald Trump in the U.S. and the passage of Brexit in the U.K., anti-immigrant nativism enjoyed a public resurgence in 2017. Within the U.S., Trump claimed he would build a wall between the U.S. and Mexico, conspicuously failed to denounce white nationalist groups, and made anti-immigration policies a cornerstone of his presidency. Yet, the past is prologue and a U.S. politician who would overtly champion nativist causes is nothing new, even if it has not been a popular political position in recent years. As is the case throughout U.S. history, Trump targets particularly vulnerable groups as a cause of societal ills.

In this paper, we examine how U.S. language policy and public discourse has historically responded to immigration and focus on the reaction to recently increasing numbers of Latin@ families in the state of Iowa. While Iowa has historically not been a popular destination for Latin@ immigrants, over the past 20 years,

it has experienced a dramatic increase in its non-native English speaking population in schools, the vast majority of whom are Spanish speakers (Iowa Department of Education 2017). The New Latino Diaspora (NLD) (Hamann et al. 2002) is a demographic phenomenon describing immigration to contexts that have not previously been popular destinations for Latin@s. As in other NLD contexts, community leaders, businesses, educators, and policymakers in Iowa have struggled to accommodate a changing population. In this paper, we offer a historical-structural analysis of how discriminatory language policies are intertextually and interdiscursively linked to nativism. We then examine how current language policies have adapted to the shifting linguistic ecology.

2. Critical language policy

Early language planning research developed theoretical frameworks, steps, and procedures for national language planning processes (e.g. Rubin & Jernudd 1971). While this early work built vital conceptual and theoretical foundations for the field, it has been criticized for (1) facilitating the continued dominance of colonial languages in post-colonial states (Ricento 2000), (2) ignoring the ideological dimension of language planning (Tollefson 1991), and (3) focusing on planning success in an overly technocratic way (Wiley 1999). Tollefson (1991, 2015) contrasts the neo-classical approach with the historical-structural approach, which focuses on the historical and structural forces that give rise to language policies. According to Tollefson, language policy is always politically and ideologically situated, and policies and plans serve the interests of dominant groups: “[L]anguage policy is viewed as one mechanism by which the interests of dominant sociopolitical groups are maintained and the seeds of transformation are developed ... The historical-structural model presumes that plans that are successfully implemented will serve dominant class interests” (Tollefson 1991, 32, 35). Since then, Tollefson has further developed Critical Language Policy (CLP), which (1) eschews apolitical LPP approaches and instead “acknowledge[s] that policies often create and sustain various forms of social inequality, and that policy-makers usually promote the interests of dominant social groups”; (2) seeks to develop more democratic policies that reduce inequality and promote the maintenance of minority languages; and (3) is influenced by critical theory.

The focus of this paper is how the structural, historical, and ideological forces within and outside the U.S. state of Iowa are infused into current language policy and public discourse. The central focus for the historical-structural approach is *power*, and, in particular, “how individuals and groups are coerced into language acquisition, language loss, and patterns of language use by powerful external forces

that control the process of policymaking” (Tollefson 2015, 141). Policies are products of historical forces, structural factors (class, race, ethnicity, and gender), and hegemonic ideologies. Two ideologies are of particular interest herein. Building upon Silverstein (1996), Blommaert (2006, 244) describes a *monoglot ideology*, which idealizes a language-people-country link and imposes “particular ascriptive ethnolinguistic identities for its citizens” (e.g. “People who are American speak English”). Even when language policies publicly advocate for multilingualism and multilingual education, monoglot ideologies normalize the dominance of one language variety while obfuscating multilingual realities (cf. Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). *Nativism* champions a monoglot ideology. Higham (2002, 3–4) defines nativism as “every type and level of antipathy toward aliens, their institutions, and their ideas” and an “intense opposition to an internal minority on the ground of its foreign (i.e., “un-American”) connections.” Nativism focuses on an internal minority – immigrants and those perceived as immigrants – who are portrayed as a threat to national unity.

3. Method: Intertextual and interdiscursive analysis

While the historical-structural approach has been criticized for lacking an empirical mechanism for capturing language policy and planning processes (Davis 1999), recent research (Barakos 2016; Barakos & Unger 2016b; Cincotta-Segi 2011) reveals how CLP can be enhanced with discourse analytic techniques that focus on texts and discourses across multiple layers, levels, and contexts. The persistent challenge of analyzing connections across language policy texts, contexts, and discourses is benefited by discourse analysis that employs *intertextuality*, which focuses on how utterances derive meaning from other utterances. Julia Kristeva (1986, written in 1966) is credited with coining the term (*l'intertextualité*) in her analyses of Mikhail Bakhtin’s writings on literary semiotics, which popularized his mostly unpublished and unknown work (Allen 2011). Bakhtin (1986) proposes that the (spoken and written) texts we create are filled with echoes of previous speakers and any given utterance can only be understood against the background of other utterances: “[A]n utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication, and it cannot be broken off from the preceding links that determine it both from within and without” (Bakhtin 1986, 94).

Whereas intertextual analysis largely attends to lexico-grammatical features, interdiscursivity refers to the connections between texts and discourses. Defined by Fairclough (1992, 271) as “the configuration of discourse conventions that go into [the text’s] production” interdiscursive connections reveal how discourses circulating across various contexts and timescales get reified in language policy.

For example, the content of national educational language policies are dependent on the political debate and discourses surrounding their creation, and the recontextualization of the policy relies on the unique language ideologies and discourses circulating in local contexts (Johnson 2015). In this paper, we utilize intertextual and interdiscursive analysis to trace connections and disconnects across policy texts and public discourse. We first contextualize the analysis with a review of how Iowa and other states have responded to increasing Latin@ immigration. Then, we analyze the historical and structural forces that have given rise to current language policies and trace nativist and deficit ideologies that have engendered and normalized language policies for U.S. immigrants. The analysis focuses on court cases and juridical language, political discourse, public signage, and policy documents. We focus on how the texts position a marginalized other as threatening to a White English-speaking “American” and how nativistic and monoglot ideologies interdiscursively connect a history of policy texts and discourses.

4. Community responses in new immigrant contexts

Iowa has not historically been a popular destination for Latin@s. In 1990, the Latin@ population was 1.3% but grew to 2.8% in 2000 and 5.8% in 2016 and is steadily growing (U.S. Census Bureau 2016). While these numbers are still relatively small compared to the U.S. as a whole, from 2000 to 2016, there was a 121.4% increase (State Data Center of Iowa 2017). The number of non-native English speakers in Iowa schools, the majority of whom are Spanish speakers, has increased 292% over the past twenty years while the number of native-English speakers has decreased (Iowa Department of Education 2017). The demographic data suggests that the Latino population will continue to steadily grow while the percentage of non-Latin@s will shrink in the coming years. In the 1993–1994 school year, most emergent bilingual students were concentrated in particular areas like Des Moines, Ames, and Davenport. However, there has been rapid growth in new contexts, like the small town of Denison, IA (pop. 8298), which experienced a growth in its English Learner (EL) population from 0% to over 50% in the past twenty years (Iowa Department of Education 2017). Thus, many Iowa school districts are experiencing rapidly increasing linguistic diversity without policies or infrastructure to accommodate these students.

Most of this immigration is driven by agricultural and manufacturing needs (e.g. meatpacking plants), both of which rely on immigrant workers. Some workers stay in Iowa permanently while others use the work as a temporary means of supporting their families in Mexico with whom they eventually reconnect (Grey 1999, 2002). This makes the notion that this is part of a permanent “diaspora”

problematic. While immigrant workers in Iowa have provided a major boost to the economy (Grey 1999), they also face skepticism, ignorance, and racism. For example, Grey & Woodrick (2005) report on the owners of a meatpacking plant who established a relationship with a town in Mexico but the Anglo employers eventually expressed frustration when the workers would return to Mexico for months at a time. Some English speakers react to the changing linguistic ecology with skepticism or outright anger, interpreting not speaking English as a marker of disinterest in joining the community (Naples 1996). However, other research has shown how these tensions can be ameliorated and community relations improved when English classes for adults are offered and/or educational opportunities are available that provide guidance and orientation to community agencies such as health care providers (Raffaelli & Wiley 2012; Riffe, Turner, & Rojas-Guyler 2008). Some communities report successful incorporation of church services in Spanish or religious programs aimed at White community members, the goal of which is to dispel stereotypes and false information (Woodrick 2010).

Iowa is not the only state with demographic shifts. Neighboring Midwestern states such as Wisconsin, Missouri, and Illinois as well as Georgia, North Carolina, Maine, Indiana, and Arkansas are also experiencing rapid growth in Latin@ populations (Lowenhaupt 2016; Wortham et al. 2009). Schools in these areas have had to reconsider their educational policies and practices, with mixed results, and teacher preparation and training are important for accommodating new Latin@ students (Gallo and Wortham 2012). For example, Paciotto & Delany-Barmann (2011) report on a rural school district in Illinois, in which the teachers collaborated to develop a dual language program to accommodate linguistic diversity. However, Wortham et al. (2009) describe a school district in which the principal fought to get Latino students transferred to another school out of fear that they would hurt test scores. Resources, infrastructure, and a lack of qualified educators are often problems when trying to accommodate new students, especially in school districts that have had little diversity in the past. It can be difficult to start programs if there are no bilingual teachers or native speakers available to help communicate with families (Wortham et al. 2009).

5. Public reactions and scripts of interethnic interaction

Hamann et al. (2002) argue that within NLD communities, Latin@s are confronted with formidable challenges, including a suspicious Anglo host community and a lack of institutional support (notably in schools), both of which can generate “interethnic tension”. Marshalltown, Iowa is a case in point. In the 1993–1994 school year, Marshalltown (population 27,552) had 87 ELs, totaling 1.9% of the student

population. Ten years later, the numbers increased to 21.6%, and, today, ELs make up 36% of the student population. In response to this rapidly changing linguistic ecology, the schools have adopted bilingual education in an attempt to provide equal educational opportunity. However, such an accommodating spirit within the schools is not always reflected in the community and, in 2014, someone spray-painted “Mexico” over the Marshalltown welcome sign:



Figure 1.

Interpretations of the welcome sign varied: Was it an expression of anti-immigrant racism? A joke? A declaration that Marshalltown was turning into a “little Mexico” (which the author could perceive as either a good or a bad thing)? (WHOTV 2014). The vandal(s) may or may not have realized that their act was intertextually and interdiscursively linked to the genre of city welcome sign vandalism. This protest takes different forms, and can be explicitly racist/xenophobic as is the case with the tag on Dublin, California’s welcome sign, reading “Stop the Asian Invasion of the City of Dublin.”



Figure 2.

Yet, perhaps even more relevant to Marshalltown is the welcome sign from Hereford, England (population 58,896), a town that was experiencing increased levels of Polish immigration in 2012 when the welcome sign was vandalized. And, much like the Marshalltown sign, "Poland" was spray painted over the name of the town:



Figure 3.

In both literary and policy theory, the intentions of the authors are often eschewed in favor of the interpretation and appropriation by the reader (Ball 1993). In other words, it matters less what the author meant than how their writing is interpreted. Whether meant as a joke or racist comment, the defacing of the welcome signs in Marshalltown, like Hereford, UK, documented the interethnic tension and anti-immigrant discourses within the small Iowa town, which is a reminder of how nativism continues to be a challenge for educators and policymakers.

6. A history of linguistic discrimination within and without Iowa

Higham (2002) points to three themes that embodied the nativist movements in the U.S.: anti-Catholicism (or pro-Protestantism), a fear of foreign radicals, and racism. As the country grew more diverse in the 19th and 20th century, nativists questioned the ability of non-Protestants and non-Anglo-Saxons to assimilate and become true American citizens. Nativism was the guiding philosophy for groups like the Know-Nothing Party (started in the 1840's) and the Immigration Restriction League (started in the 1890's) both of whom fought for restricted immigration and restrictive language policies. For example, in 1854, the Know-Nothing Party proposed an amendment to the Massachusetts state constitution which asserted that citizenship and literacy *in English* be a prerequisite for voting and none but native-born Protestants should be eligible for citizenship (Billington 1938). This helped lead the way for other states to adopt literacy tests as a requirement for voting. Likewise, the Immigration Restriction League (IRL) lobbied for a literacy requirement for suffrage and immigration, motivated by antipathy toward Eastern and Southern Europeans (e.g. Italians), who they argued were “dumping on the United States an alarming number of illiterates, paupers, criminals, and madmen who endangered the American character and American citizenship” (IRL papers, cited in Higham 2002, 103).

While a recently changing linguistic ecology has engendered new challenges in Iowa, it is no stranger to linguistic discrimination. Towards the end of World War I, on May 23, 1918, Governor William L. Harding signed an anti-foreign language policy into law, entitled the Babel Proclamation. Presumably a response to anti-German sentiment, it actually outlawed the public use of *all* foreign languages in schools, churches, public spaces, and even telephone conversations. After erroneously declaring English the official language of the United States, the policy states that freedom of speech ends when a citizen ceases to use English because foreign languages threaten “peace and tranquility” and potentially “create discord among neighbors and citizens”:

- (1) Every person should appreciate and observe his duty to refrain from all acts or conversation which may excite suspicion or produce strife among the people....every word and act will manifest his loyalty to his country and his solemn purpose to aid in achieving victory for our army and navy and the permanent peace of the world (Harding, 1918).

Harding argues that peace would emerge not just from military efforts overseas but by extinguishing dangerous foreign languages at home. He concomitantly equates English with loyalty and victory and justifies a monoglot ideology as part of the war effort.

This law was a stark contrast to the relatively pragmatic and pluralistic policies preceding it. Despite Harding's claim to the contrary, throughout the 19th and most of the 20th century, Iowa lacked an explicit language policy and bilingual schools like the Freie Deutsch Schule of Davenport were allowed to thrive. Throughout the 19th century, immigration was encouraged to the territory that would eventually become Iowa and, in 1870 for example, the Board of Immigration in Iowa released, "Iowa: The Home for Immigrants" in German, English, Dutch, Swedish and Danish. This document contained promises of cheap and fertile land and a new life, thus actively encouraging immigration to Iowa (Frese 2005, 59). Throughout the latter part of the 19th century, and into the 20th, many Iowa communities' existed as microcosms of other nations, in which local economic structures facilitated the support and maintenance of linguistic and cultural traditions. Shortly before World War I, at the height of this demographic shift, Germans were the largest immigrant group in Iowa.

While Iowa was the only U.S. state to outlaw public use of all languages besides English, the policy received support from President Theodore Roosevelt. Speaking in Des Moines in support of the Babel proclamation in the summer of 1918, Roosevelt declared,

- (2) This is a nation – not a polyglot boarding house...There can be but one loyalty – the stars and the stripes; one nationality – the American – and therefore only one language.

Roosevelt actively champions a monoglot ideology and, like Harding, *loyalty* to the U.S. is contingent upon speaking only English. Despite Roosevelt's support, however, the Babel Proclamation was not a popular law and was repealed in December 1918, lasting only about 8 months. Nevertheless, the damage had been done, and the German language faded from Iowa communities and schools.

The Babel Proclamation coincided with national concerns about immigrant assimilation and a persistent nativism that was promoted by the Know Nothing Party a century earlier (Schmid 2001). The nativist movements in the mid-19th and

early 20th centuries paved the way for a new immigration policy aimed at restricting particular immigrants. The argument that English alone demonstrated being “American”, therefore, was gaining acceptance well before Harding and Roosevelt took up the cause. Nevertheless, it was not until 1906, that the Naturalization Act was enacted, under the guidance of Roosevelt’s Federal Immigration Commission, which made the ability to speak English a requirement for citizenship. In a written report, the commission argued,

- (3) If he does not know our language he does in effect remain a foreigner... no man is a desirable citizen of the United States who does not know the English language”. (cited in Leibowitz 1984, 34; see also review in McKay & Weinstein-Shr 1993)

Here, pronoun use (“*our* language”) is used to position the non-English speaker as, by definition, an undesirable foreigner, even if “he” lives in the U.S.

The courts legitimized nativism and monoglot ideology. In 1923, in a court case in which Robert Meyer was accused of giving a Bible lesson in German, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld Meyer’s conviction:

- (4) To allow the children of foreigners, who had emigrated here, to be taught from early childhood the language of the country of their parents was... to educate them so that they must always think in that language, and, as a consequence, naturally inculcate in them the ideas and sentiments foreign to the best interests of this country.

(Meyer V. Nebraska 1923, 107 Neb. 657, 187 N. W. 100)

Echoing, and yet expanding upon the Babel Proclamation, Meyer V. Nebraska portrays non-English languages as dangerous as well, but also relies on what Mertz (1982) describes as a Whorfian folk theory of language, according to which the understanding of concepts considered essential for American citizenship are *only* expressible in English. As is often the case, juridical language shared intertextual and interdiscursive connections. For example, the Supreme Court of Wyoming ruled that reading a translated version of the state constitution in Finnish did not allow someone to vote: “[C]ivil liberty as it exists in the States America being unknown to the subjects of a despotic government, they could in the very nature of things, have no word or phrase in their language to describe or define it” (Supreme Court of Wyoming 1897, 153, quoted in Mertz 1982, 4). And, in 1921, the Iowa Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a schoolteacher who was teaching German: “The harmful effects of non-American ideas, inculcated through the teaching of foreign languages, might...be avoided by limiting teaching below the eighth grade to the medium of English” (Sup Court of Iowa 1921, 1060, quoted in Mertz 1982, 5). The language from these court decisions expands upon the

monoglot ideology (“Americans” speak English) by emphasizing the danger of foreign ideas that are transmitted through foreign languages, which are particularly harmful for children.

Thus, while the Babel Proclamation gave voice to a particular – anti-German – nativism, the law was part of a larger tapestry of historical movements and concomitant policies that portrayed English as *the* language of the United States, demonized all non-English languages, and warned against the danger of the messages lurking within. However, the languages were not really the target; restrictive language policies were directed at particular *people* – immigrant groups deemed undesirable – stoked by a nativistic fear of a foreign other. The past is prologue, as it were, and current political discourse relies on the demonization of particular marginalized groups, especially Latin@s, which is emphasized when Trump refers to Mexican immigrants as “bad hombres”, a turn of phrase utilized both during his campaign and after his election. We argue that current Iowa language policy and public discourse are intertextually and interdiscursively connected to nativist and racist movements of the past. Even if such developments, institutions, and policies have shed overtly racist intentions, they can only be fully understood against the backdrop of these historical, structural, and ideological processes.

7. Official English and legal repercussions

Today, the most well recognized organization promoting a law to make English the official language in the United States is U.S. English. U.S. English publicly acknowledges its founder, S.I. Hayakawa, who was a Senator in California from 1977–1983 and president of San Francisco State College from 1968–1973. However, they fail to mention on the U.S. English website that Hayakawa had help from a co-founder, John Tanton, who also launched the Federation for American Immigration Reform in 1979 to limit the number of immigrants entering the United States (Schmid 2001). The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) describes Tanton as “the racist architect of the modern anti-immigrant movement” who has white nationalist interests and eugenic beliefs about European-American superiority. For example, in a letter uncovered by the SPLC, Tanton clarifies that he has “come to the point of view that for European-American society and culture to persist requires a European-American majority.” Tanton’s racism is applied especially and specifically to Latin@s as revealed in the following excerpt of a prepared statement authored by Tanton in 1986 for one of his “retreats” to discuss immigration:

- (5) Gobernar es poblar translates to ‘govern is to populate’...In this society where the majority rules, does this hold? Will the present majority peaceably

hand over its political power to a group that is simply more fertile...As whites see their power and control over their lives declining, will they simply go quietly into the night? Or will there be an explosion?... We're building in a deadly disunity. (quoted in Schmid 2001, 46–47)

It was perhaps because of this leaked memo that Tanton eventually resigned from U.S. English, either by choice or by force, but the racist origins of U.S. English are nonetheless rendered transparent. Some advisory board members, like Walter Cronkite and Gore Vidal, left the organization, but notably, Donald Trump, himself an early advisory board member, remained until 2017. In the leaked memo, Tanton makes an interesting intertextual connection to the famous Dylan Thomas poem, “Do not go gentle into that good night”, in which Thomas ponders mortality and ends with the famous existential battle cry “Rage, rage against the dying of the light”. Tanton’s allusion to Thomas’ poem (Will they simply go quietly into the night?) suggests a deadly fear of a white minority but intimates an explosion (i.e. a rage against the dying of the light) is possible. Perhaps Tanton envisions an “explosion” at the voting booth, which would demonstrate a great deal of prescience, given the 2016 elections. However, he may have been referring to a more literal and violent “explosion,” considering his reference to a “deadly disunity.”

Because a federal bill to make English the official language continues to fail in the U.S. Congress, individual states have enacted their own legislation. 32 states have adopted English as the official language, although in two of these states (Hawai’i and Alaska) indigenous languages are also recognized in the policies. The Iowa English Reaffirmation Act of 2002 (SF 165) made English the only official language of Iowa:

- (6) The state of Iowa is comprised of individuals from different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. The state of Iowa encourages the assimilation of Iowans into Iowa's rich culture. Throughout the history of Iowa and of the United States, the common thread binding individuals of differing backgrounds together has been the English language...In order to encourage every citizen of this state to become more proficient in the English language, thereby facilitating participation in the economic, political, and cultural activities of this state and of the United States.

At 620 words, the full text of the policy is scant, yet there are notable features of the law that index a monoglot ideology. The rationale that official English laws will encourage language is a common argument. The benefit, as expressed here, is for those who are “from a different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic background” and will need to assimilate. This implies, however, that there are other individuals who do *not* need to assimilate, who are a longstanding part of “Iowa’s rich culture”. Because this rich cultural history has included German ethnolinguistic

enclaves, as well as Indigenous groups (the name of the state “Iowa” is borrowed from the Ioway people or Báxoje in the Chiwere language), it raises the question about who the authors envision as the intended audience of this policy, and how increased Latin@ immigration influenced this decision. This text also places the emphasis and burden on the individual “with a diverse background” to assimilate. There is no language recognizing the state’s responsibility in teaching English nor are any mechanisms of English language education mentioned. In fact, the text makes clear that the law “shall not apply to the teaching of languages,” which is presumably intended to protect foreign language instruction, but also alleviates any responsibility for state funding of English language education. Therefore, *how* this policy would encourage acquisition of English is an open question that is not answered in the policy language.

Such apparent vacuous intentions are not lost on critics in the U.S. legislature who argue that English-only policies “do nothing to help immigrants learn English” (Lynn L. Woolsey, D-California) and are simply a “code for official discrimination” (Rubén Hinojosa, D-Texas) (Hernandez 2006). In Iowa, opponents viewed the policy as “thinly veiled racism” (Associated Press 2002), yet the Democratic Governor, Tom Vilsack (who would later work in the Obama administration) nonetheless signed the policy into law, apparently viewing it as a potential benefit to education:

- (7) My hope is that we will look beyond the controversy...so we can focus on our commitments and responsibility to improve education for all our children. (Associated Press 2002)

Here, Vilsack leverages an inclusive “our” to reference the political establishment and/or educational policymakers (first “our”) and Iowa parents (second “our”). However, since native English speakers are not the intended targets of English-only policies, the children in question must be immigrant kids. It is worth noting that a Senate amendment (S-3154) proposed changing SF-165 to an English-*plus* policy – enacted in other states like Oregon and Washington, which has been proffered as an alternative to English-only and recognizes multilingualism as an asset – but it was eventually rejected. Vilsack eventually expressed regret that he had signed the bill although it might have been a political calculation since SF 165 was a popular law in Iowa and he was seeking reelection at the time.

There is a perception that Official English policies are mostly symbolic, a belief which is reinforced in the media (Associated Press 2002). Yet, Iowa’s SF-165 has had a direct impact on voting rights. In 2007, Representative Steve King (Republican-IA), who is an avid backer of making English the official language of the U.S. and colleagues (including Joni Ernst, who is now a Republican Senator from Iowa) brought suit against the Secretary of State, Michael Mauro (King V.

Mauro 2008), for issuing voter registration materials in other languages besides English. Their case relied on SF-165. As Ernst argued:

- (8) Offering voter registration forms in foreign languages is not only unlawful but serves to segregate our population, rather than unify. (U.S. English 2007)

Here, Ernst's comments reflect the monoglot ideology, expressed more than a century earlier by President Roosevelt, and promoted a century and a half ago by nativist organizations like the Know Nothing Party. A Polk county judge ruled in favor of King et al. and ordered Mauro to stop using any other languages besides English on official voter registration forms. Thus, Iowa's English-only law has been leveraged to restrict voter participation among those who do not speak English as their first language. The conspicuous timing of this case occurred in the lead-up to an election year.

While Ernst stresses that monolingualism contributes to unity, a tweet from Steve King on March 12, 2017, in which he praises the far-right Dutch leader Geert Wilders, suggests a different motivation:

- (9) Wilders understands that culture and demographics are our destiny. We can't restore our civilizations with somebody else's babies.

If we assume that "somebody else's babies" are non-white babies, then the "we" and the "our" must be white people, whose "culture" is threatened by changing demographics. When combined with a previous statement in which King questioned whether any other "subgroup of people" (other than White people) contributed to civilization, a starkly racist and unapologetically nativist rationalization for English-only laws is made clear. King's logic is very similar to Tanton's and both draw upon a discourse of white supremacy through procreation.

8. Educational language policy

Hamann et al. (2002, 1) argue that schools are the major institutions that mediate the experiences for Latin@ immigrants and are "key sites for the enactment of status hierarchies". Thus, we turn to Iowa educational policy to illuminate how a changing linguistic ecology, characterized by increased diversity, has been treated in schools. The only official educational language policy in Iowa is found in Iowa Code 280.4, which states:

- (10) The medium of instruction in all secular subjects taught in both public and nonpublic schools shall be the English language, except...when the student is limited English proficient...[program options] shall include but need

not be limited to (1) English as a second language (ESL) or (2) transitional bilingual instruction until the students is fully English proficient.

Adopting the deficit-oriented term “limited English proficient”, Iowa law opens the door to two different types of educational programs – ESL and transitional bilingual education. It is noteworthy that no transitional bilingual instructional programs are currently offered in Iowa.

While 280.4 is the official law, the Department of Education’s handbook – *Educating Iowa’s English Language Learners* (Iowa Department of Education 2010) – is what guides educational programming and, therefore, acts as the unofficial language policy. Within, there is no mandated language education model and, instead, the handbook lists a series of guidelines and suggestions for educators about how to implement their chosen program. The umbrella programs are described as English as a second language (ESL) and bilingual education. In the guidelines about bilingual education programs, the goals of English and academic content mastery are foregrounded along with a statement about transitioning students into mainstream English classrooms:

- (11) As the student’s level of English proficiency increases, instruction through the native language may decrease, and academic content may be eventually obtained through English in the mainstream classroom.

(Iowa Department of Education 2010, 38)

This excerpt suggests that increased acquisition of English should move students to mainstream English classrooms, which is a pedagogical structure typical of transitional bilingual education programs. However, use of the modal “may” (instead of “must” or “will”) creates interpretive space and leaves open the possibility that students continue in native language instruction, even after they have acquired English. Indeed, other bilingual programs listed as options include Heritage Language Preservation, which has the explicit goal of maintaining heritage languages, and Dual Language Education, the goal of which is bilingualism and biliteracy.

As of 2017, there were three dual language programs in the state of Iowa, in Marshalltown, Sioux City, and West Liberty. The small town of West Liberty was the first in the state to develop a program, which has existed for almost two decades. While Iowa educational policy leaves space for resource-oriented educational programs that promote bilingualism and biliteracy, it does *not* provide support, and in fact places the burden on local school districts.

- (12) Inherent in a school district’s obligation to take “appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students” (*Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974*, Point F) is the obligation to

finance these programs... The primary responsibility for meeting the needs of ELLs lies with the local school district.

(Iowa Department of Education 2010, 8)

Not only is it the school districts' obligation to design their own programs, they also must fund them and, if they do not, the blame is placed on the schools who would be denying their students equal educational opportunity. While there is plenty of implementational space (Johnson 2010) for a variety of education programs – including various types of ESL and bilingual education – there is no funding tied to successful implementation.

Nevertheless, Iowa educational language policy provides an opening for multilingual education in schools. Educators in the bilingual education programs are committed to equal educational opportunity for their students, which includes the maintenance and promotion of Spanish. However, bilingual educators report feeling “on their own” and bilingual education programs rely on proactive educators who take it upon themselves to design their own program, hire the appropriate staff, and implement a programmatic model that is not funded through Iowa educational policy. Educators express frustration at the lack of support from around the state and argue that advocacy for their programs is desperately needed.

9. Discussion

Higham (2002, 162) argues that nativism “touched the springs of fear and hatred; it breathed a sense of crisis.” While current political discourse breathes a renewed sense of crisis that leverages xenophobia, highlighting the links to a history of racist and nativist movements in the U.S. reveals how what's past is prologue. From national anti-immigrant movements in the 19th century, to Iowa's *Babel Proclamation* in the 20th century, to Iowa's English-only law in the 21st, intertextual and interdiscursive analysis of historical and current public discourse and language policies shows how nativism and monoglot ideology are interwoven throughout. In the 19th and early 20th century, foreign languages, and their speakers, were portrayed as dangerous to national interests and reflected a lack of loyalty. This ideology relied on a conceptualization of “Americans” as white monolingual English speakers. Any disunity or disturbance in the “peace and tranquility” of the nation was the fault of non-English speakers, whose lack of assimilation was portrayed as threatening. Overtly racist and nativist intentions have been rendered less transparent over the years and replaced with the paternalistic rationale that the targets of monolingual language policies are being benefited. Yet discursive features, like pronominal use in public discourse, still construct an imagined

(yet fictitious) community of Iowans who are monolingual English speakers, good Americans, and white. The idea that they are Iowa's true "natives" is naturalized in public discourse and policy, which concomitantly erases the history of Indigenous people from the region. As has often been the case, the focus of restrictive language policies is *not* the languages themselves, but the speakers of those languages.

It is in this structural, ideological, and political context that Iowa's educational language policies are created, interpreted, and appropriated as its schools adapt to the growing population of newly-arrived immigrant students. While Iowa educational policy allows for pluralism, and rejects a monoglot ideology, there is no infrastructure in place that helps guide educators interested in bilingual education or rewards successfully implemented bilingual programs. Furthermore, bilingual educational programs are still viewed as a threat, as indexed in the defacing of the Marshalltown sign, and educators must constantly advocate for their value. Thus, while monoglossia is rejected within the walls of the schools, a monoglot ideology outside is a constant and formidable pressure.

Barakos and Unger (2016a, 1) argue that, "language policy is a multilayered phenomenon that is constituted and enacted in and through discourse." Leveraging discourse analytic techniques to analyze language policy discourses and processes enhances analyses of power and ideology and contributes to "discursive approaches to language policy" (Barakos & Unger 2016b). In this paper, we utilize the historical-structural approach in Critical Language Policy (CLP) research to examine how monoglot ideology and nativism infiltrate U.S. language policy and political discourse and marginalize non-English speakers. Within the CLP framework, we argue that intertextual discourse analysis can provide methodological teeth for tracing hegemonic ideologies in the historical and structural processes which give rise to language policy and public discourse.

When Trump refers to Mexicans as "bad hombres" he is referencing a nativistic fear that has been a durable feature of U.S. political discourse throughout history. While we report on what Hamann et al. (2002) describe as "interethnic tensions" in NLD contexts, the notion that increased Latin@ immigration creates tension – and perhaps suggests equal blame – should not overshadow how such tension is simply a product of racism. While current initiatives to make English an official language have mostly shed an explicitly xenophobic rationale, nativism persists, which is emboldened by the current occupant of the White House and intertextually links language policy and public discourse about non-English languages and their speakers.

References

- Allen, Graham. 2011. *Intertextuality*. 2nd Edition. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Associated Press. 2002. "Iowa governor signs English only bill." *Quad-City Times*, March 2.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.
- Boone, Dana. 2001. "Two Languages; One Purpose: Innovative Instruction Clicks for West Liberty." *Des Moines Register*, February 6.
- Ball, Stephen J. 1993. "What is Policy? Texts, Trajectories and Toolboxes." *Discourse* 13: 10–17.
- Barakos, Elisabeth. 2016. "Language Policy and Governmentality in Businesses in Wales: A Continuum of Empowerment and Regulation." *Multilingua* 35 (4): 361–391.
- Barakos, Elisabeth and Johann W. Unger. 2016a. "Introduction: Why are discursive approaches to language policy necessary?" In *Discursive Approaches to Language Policy*, ed. by Elisabeth Barakos and Johann W. Unger, 1–10. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barakos, Elisabeth and Johann W. Unger. 2016b. *Discursive Approaches to Language Policy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Billington, Ray Allen. 1938. *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860*. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2006. "Language Policy and National Identity." In *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*, ed. by Thomas Ricento, 1–10. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Cincotta-Segi, Angela. 2011. "Signalling L2 Centrality, Maintaining L1 Dominance: Teacher Language Choice in an Ethnic Minority Primary Classroom in the Lao PDR." *Language and Education* 25 (1): 19–31. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2010.511232
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. "Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis." *Linguistics and Education* 4 (3), 269–293. doi: 10.1016/0898-5898(92)90004-G
- Frese, Stephen J. 2005. "Divided by a Common Language: The Babel Proclamation and its Influence in Iowa history." *History Teacher* 39 (1): 59–88. doi: 10.2307/30036745
- Gallo, Sarah and Stanton Wortham. 2012. "Sobresalir: Latino Parent Perspectives on New Latino Diaspora Schools." *International Journal of Multicultural Education* 14 (2): 1–17.
- Grey, Mark A. 1999. "Immigrants, Migration and Worker Turnover at the Hog Pride Pork Packing Plant." *Human Organization* 58 (1): 16–27. doi: 10.17730/humo.58.1.g48p765x62574761
- Grey, Mark A. and Anne C. Woodrick. 2002. "Unofficial Sister Cities: Meatpacking Labor Migration between Villachuato, Mexico and Marshalltown, Iowa." *Human Organization* 61 (4): 364–376. doi: 10.17730/humo.61.4.8xhdfg6jggqccb2c
- Grey, Mark A. and Anne C. Woodrick. 2005. "Latinos Have Revitalized our Community: Mexican Migration and Anglo Responses in Marshalltown, Iowa." In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*, ed. by Víctor Zúñiga and Rubén Hernández-León, 133–154. New York: Russell Sage.
- Hamann, Edmund T., Stanton Wortham, and Enrique G. Murillo Jr. 2002. "Education and Policy in the New Latino Diaspora." In *Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity*, ed. by Stanton Wortham, Enrique G. Murillo Jr., and Edmund T. Hamann, 1–16. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Harding, William L. 1918. "Original Copy of the Babel Proclamation." *German Iowa and the Global Midwest*.

- Hayakawa, S. I. 1985. "The Case for Official English." In *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*, ed. by James Crawford, 94–100. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Higham, John. 1955 *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860–1925*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Iowa Department of Education. 2010. *Educating Iowa's English Language Learners (ELLs): A handbook for administrators and teachers*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education.
- Iowa Department of Education. 2017. *2016–2017 Iowa Public School K-12 Limited English Proficient Students (LEP) by District and Grade*. Iowa Department of Education.
- Johnson, David Cassels. 2010. "Implementational and Ideological Spaces in Bilingual Education Language Policy." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 13 (1): 61–79. doi: 10.1080/13670050902780706
- Johnson, David Cassels. 2015. "Intertextuality and Language Policy." In *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide*, ed. by Francis M. Hult and David Cassels Johnson, 166–180. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- King v. Mauro. 2008. Case No. CV6739, (Iowa District Court March 31, 2008).
- Kloss, Heinz. 1969. *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
- Kloss, Heinz. 1977/1998. *The American bilingual tradition*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1986. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." In *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. by Toril Moi, 34–61. Oxford UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Leibowitz, Arnold H. 1984. "The Official Character of Language in the United States: Literacy Requirements for Immigration, Citizenship, and Entrance into American life." *Aztlan*, 15 (1): 25–70.
- Lowenhaupt, Rebecca. 2014. "School Access and Participation: Family Engagement Practices in the New Latino Diaspora." *Education and Urban Society* 46 (5): 522–547. doi: 10.1177/0013124512468003
- Lowenhaupt, Rebecca. 2016. "Immigrant Acculturation in Suburban Schools Serving the New Latino Diaspora." *Peabody Journal of Education* 91 (3): 348–365.
- Matheson, Donald. 2005. *Media Discourses: Analyzing Media Texts*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- McKay, Sandra Lee and Weinstein-Shr, G. 1993. "English Literacy in the U.S.: National Policies, Personal Consequences." *TESOL Quarterly* 27 (3): 3. doi: 10.2307/3587473
- Mertz, Elizabeth. 1982. "Language and Mind: A Whorfian Folk Theory in United States Language Law." *Sociolinguistics Working Paper* 93. Accessed at: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/theory/mertz1.html>.
- Naples, N. A. (1996). "A Feminist Revisiting of the Insider/Outsider Debate: The 'Outsider Phenomenon' in Rural Iowa." *Qualitative Sociology* 19 (1): 83–106. doi: 10.1007/BF02393249
- Paciotto, Carla and Gloria Delany-Barmann. 2011. "Planning Micro-Level Language Education Reform in New Diaspora Sites: Two-way Immersion Education in the Rural Midwest." *Language Policy* 10 (3): 221–243. doi: 10.1007/s10993-011-9203-x
- Raffaelli, Marcela and Angela R. Wiley. 2012. "Challenges and Strengths of Immigrant Latino Families in the Rural Midwest." *Journal of Family Issues* 34 (3): 347–372. doi: 10.1177/0192513X11432422
- Ricento, Thomas. 2000. Historical and Theoretical Perspectives in Language Policy and Planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4 (2): 196–213. doi: 10.1111/1467-9481.00111

- Riffe, Holly A., Shiloh Turner, and Liliana Rojas-Guyler, 2008. "The Diverse Faces of Latinos in the Midwest: Planning for Service Delivery and Building Community." *Social Work & Health* 33 (2): 101–110. doi: 10.1093/hsw/33.2.101
- Rubin, Joan and Björn H. Jernudd (eds). 1971. *Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. The University Press of Hawaii.
- Schmid, Carol L. 2001. *The Politics of Language: Conflict Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1996. "Monoglot 'Standard' in America: Standardization and Metaphors of Linguistic Hegemony." In *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. by Donald Brenneis and Ronald H. S. Macaulay, 284–306. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 2000. *Linguistic Genocide in Education – Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- State Data Center of Iowa (2017). *Latinos in Iowa: 2017*. Des Moines: Iowa Library Services and the Office of Latino Affairs.
- Tollefson, James W. 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London and New York: Longman.
- Tollefson, James W. 2012. "Language Policy in a Time of Crisis and Transformation." In *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues* (2nd Edition), ed. by James W. Tollefson, 11–32. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tollefson, James W. 2015. "Historical-structural Analysis." In *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide*, ed. by Francis M. Hult and David Cassels Johnson, 140–151. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2016. Quick Facts: Iowa.
- U.S. Department of State (2010). Becoming American: Beyond the Melting Pot. *eJournal USA* 15, 9, 1–29.
- U.S. English. 2007. *Opening Arguments in Iowa Official English Case Heard Today*. Accessed at <http://archive.is/ndQxE>.
- Wiley, Terrence G. 1999. "Comparative Historical Analysis of U.S. Language Policy and Language Planning: Extending the Foundations." In *Sociopolitical Perspectives on Language Policy and Planning in the USA*, ed. by Thom Huebner and Kathryn A. Davis, 17–37. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi: 10.1075/sibil.16.06wil
- Wiley, Terrence G. 2002. Assessing Language Rights in Education: A Brief History of the U.S. Context. In *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*, ed. by J. W. Tollefson, 39–64. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- WHOTV (2014). *Vandals Spray "Mexico" on Marshalltown Sign*. Accessed at: <http://whotv.com/2014/07/24/vandals-spray-mexico-on-marshalltown-sign/>
- Woodrick, Anne C. 2010. "Revitalizing a Midwestern City: Immigrants in Marshalltown." *eJournal USA*, 15 (9): 15–20.
- Wortham, Stanton, Katherine Mortimer, and Elaine Allard. 2009. Mexicans as Model Minorities in the New Latino Diaspora. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 40 (4): 388–404. doi: 10.1111/j.1548-1492.2009.01058.x

Address for correspondence

David Cassels Johnson
University of Iowa
240 Lindquist Center, North
Iowa City, IA 52242-1529
USA

david-c-johnson@uiowa.edu

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0316-2884>

Co-author details

Stephanie Gugliermo Lynch
University of Iowa
605 Blank Honors Center
Iowa City, IA 52242
USA

Crissa Stephens
University of Iowa
Department of Teaching & Learning
Iowa City, IA 52242-1529
USA

Biographical notes

David Cassels Johnson is associate professor of Education at the University of Iowa.

Crissa Stephens is a PhD candidate in Foreign Language/ESL Education at the University of Iowa.

Stephanie Gugliermo Lynch is a PhD candidate in Foreign language/ESL Education at the University of Iowa.

Publication history

Date received: 6 September 2016

Date accepted: 27 November 2017

Author queries

Please provide a complete reference for the citation '(Higham 2002), (Hernandez 2006)' in this article.

Please provide a citation for the reference id "CIT0004 (Boone, Dana. 2001), CIT0020 (Hayakawa, S. I. 1985), CIT0021 (Higham, John. 1955), CIT0027 (Kloss, Heinz. 1969), CIT0028 (Kloss, Heinz. 1977/1998), CIT0030 (Matheson, Donald. 2005), CIT0032 (Lowenhaupt, Rebecca. 2014), CIT0047 (Tollefson, James W. 2012), CIT0053 (Wiley, Terrence G. 2002)" since citation is missing in the article.