

FROM GOYA PORTRAITS TO GOYA BEANS: ELITE TRADITIONS AND POPULAR STREAMS IN U.S. SPANISH LANGUAGE POLICY*

OFELIA GARCÍA
Long Island University
Brooklyn Campus

ABSTRACT. The paper identifies the unwritten Spanish language policy in the United States by presenting a historical analysis of the different roles that Spanish has had throughout U.S. history.

Drawing from sources of the Spanish language profession itself, the paper gives evidence of how Spanish has been used for the benefit of the Spanish and English-speaking elite, but has been restricted, and at times even forbidden, as a socioeconomic tool and symbol of identity of less fortunate U.S. Latinos.

Five different historical periods are identified:

1. The colonial period and early nation: 1699-1840. Spanish for trade.
2. The 19th Century: Spanish for conquest and polite accomplishment
3. The 20th Century: 1900-1968. From Spanish for imperialism to Spanish as ethnic marker.
4. Post Civil Rights: 1968-1980. Spanish as ethnic problem and ethnic resource.
5. The last decade: 1980 to present. Spanish for communication with monolinguals.

Throughout the paper reference is made to the tension between the two traditions of US Spanish: that of high culture, Goya art, and the museum, and that of Goya beans and the street. The paper ends by calling on the US Spanish language profession to bring together the two traditions.

*This paper is based on a keynote address given at the University of Minnesota at El español en los EEUU, October 24, 1992. My husband, Ricardo Otheguy, deserves credit for his support during the library stage of this paper, his careful reading and constructive criticism of the paper, his minding the home-front while I went to Minneapolis. I also wish to acknowledge the help given to me by the following students at City College of New York: César Coronado, Arelis Javier, María Pesantez, Rosa Salcé. Some of them took pictures, others conducted interviews, all of them brought the Goya beans and the Goya art a little closer together.

INTRODUCTION: GOYA BEANS AND GOYA PORTRAITS. On July 6, 1992, a 24 year-old Dominican named José García was shot and killed by an undercover policeman in the New York City neighborhood of Washington Heights. As in many other times in U.S. history when a poor Spanish-speaking community has felt misunderstood by the majority, there were riots in Washington Heights, the Dominican Heartland within the United States (Dao 1992, Revest 1992). Five years later, there was unrest again in Washington Heights over the shooting death of 16 year-old Kevin Cedeño on April 6, 1996, killed by a policeman just blocks away from where José García had been shot. There are reasons for the problems in Washington Heights. The area leads the city in homicides, has the largest concentration of teenagers, the most overcrowded schools, one of the highest unemployment rates, inadequate day care, and scant affordable housing (González 1992). Yet, less than ten blocks away from where García and Cedeño were shot stands the building that houses The Hispanic Society of America, founded by Archer M. Huntington in 1904, and containing one of the largest collections of Spanish art and literature in the United States (For information on the Society, see, The Hispanic Society of America 1938, Grattan Doyle 1956).

Neither of these two—the Hispanic Society or the Dominican community—has made much of an effort to touch the other. The building across from the Society, once the home of another learned institution, has been little by little occupied by the growing Latino student body of Boricua College, the first private four-year bilingual college in New York City. We recently interviewed fifty Latinos who were walking on Broadway right in front of the Society, many of them students at Boricua. Except for one, none had any idea of what was in the building, even though some of them had lived in the community for a long time. The words of the one person who was familiar with the Society only brought into sharper focus the gap that separates the institution from the people: "*Existe una librería. Hay muchos retratos de Suroga, y bueno, diferentes cosas españolas. Se llama Hispanic Associate. Es este building. Yo trabajo allí, en la librería.*" ["There is a library. There are many portraits by Suroga, and well, different Spanish things. It is called Hispanic Associate. It is this building. I work there, in the library."] His limited knowledge of English, evident in his incorrect version of the name of the Society; his New York Spanish with the inevitable loanword, *building*, and calqueword, *librería*; his limited education seen in the substitution of Suroga for Sorolla, all are evidence of the distance between Huntington and García, of the impenetrable wall that the Society has built around itself, unable to nourish New York Latinos, their Spanish, their education, their lives.

Inside the Hispanic Society one finds the largest collection of Goya portraits in the United States. The Francisco Goya who was critical of the court in *La familia de Carlos IV*, who was sympathetic to popular resistance against political oppression in *El 3 de mayo de 1808*, and tormented and horrified by the repression of the restored Spanish monarchy in his later *Proverbios* is known only to

those fortunate enough to have visited El Museo del Prado in Spain or the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. To most people in New York, however, Goya is simply the brand name of beans that Latinos eat, of the *habichuelas rositas* of the Nuyoricans in East Harlem, of the *pintas* of the Dominicans in Washington Heights and the *frijoles negros* of the *fondas chinas cubanas*.

That the diffusion of the Goya one eats at the table has been so much greater than that of the Goya one admires at the museum is indicative of the powerless state in which Spanish has found itself in relation to English from the earliest days of the thirteen colonies. The *leyenda negra* has dominated Spanish in the United States, limiting any possible symbolic role for Spanish as the reflection of a people with dignity, and assigning it only a practical role as the language of the poor and the downtrodden (For an insightful discussion of the effects of the Black Legend, see, among others, Wayne Powell 1971). Spanish for low culture, for the street, yes; Spanish for high culture, for the school and the museum, no.

U.S. Spanish language professionals have recently done much to expand, diffuse, value, and liberate the Spanish of the street, what might be called the Spanish of the *beans Goya* view. But the *artistic Goya* view, with its strong symbolism of ethnic pride and its powerful formula of high art expressing resistance to political oppression, has been seldom brought to people, and especially to U.S. Latinos.

The reason for this difference is understandable. The quincennial celebration of the encounter between the old and the new world brought to sharp focus the conquering role of Spain in the oppression of the indigenous people of Latin America. But the emphasis on the atrocities committed in Latin America under the Spanish Crown and in the name of Castilianization and Catholicism in the colonial centuries takes the attention off the exploitation of the same Latin America by Great Britain in the 19th century, by the United States during the 20th century, and by elite Latin Americans today. This continued history of political domination and oppression is of great significance, for it has been partially responsible for the 27 million Latinos who live in the United States today, and for the sad lives and even sadder deaths of all the Garcías of all the many Washington Heights of the United States.

It turns out, then, that even though the Latin American poor have been oppressed in Latin America no less than here, it is in the United States where they have had limited opportunities to express the indignities of oppression. And when it has been expressed, it has been in a variety of Spanish different from that of the educated elite, Latin American or Spaniard.

U.S. Spanish professionals have done much to describe and validate this U.S. Spanish variety (See, for example, Aguirre 1985; Amastae and Elías-Olivares 1982; Bergen 1990; Elías-Olivares 1983; Hernández-Chávez, Cohen and Beltramo 1975; Ornstein-Galicia, Green, Bixler-Marquez 1988; Peñalosa 1980; Roca and Lipski 1993; Silva-Corvalán 1994; Teschner, Bills and Craddock 1975; Wheritt and

García; 1989; Zentella 1997). And Latino activists have achieved some results in pushing for equal opportunity with the Anglo community. But by failing to claim Spanish as a link to a U.S. Latino identity, with its history of past and present oppression, the U.S. Latino community has been left without a transcendental symbol, without the possibility of becoming educated in Spanish, and sharing in the history of the Spanish speaking resistance of the likes of Francisco Goya and Rigoberta Menchú. And Goya portraits and Goya beans continue to coexist without any connections, unable to enrich one another, just as the Hispanic Society, holding the Goya portraits, sits in the middle of Washington Heights, holding the Goya beans, untouched by each other.

In the United States, there has always been more attention paid to an elite Spanish foreign tradition than to a popular Spanish U.S. tradition. But the time may now be ripe to bring down the walls that have falsely separated Spanish in the United States into these two camps. For unless a valid role for Spanish in a Latino identity is *negotiated*, U.S. Spanish language professionals will have to acknowledge their role in the cultural and linguistic genocide of Latinos.

1. THE UNWRITTEN SPANISH LANGUAGE POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES. A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENT ROLES OF U.S. SPANISH. Five generalizations about the unwritten Spanish language policy in the United States are derived from the historical facts that follow:

1. Spanish has been used as a *resource for their own benefit* by Anglos, Spaniards, Latin Americans and even Latinos during all historical periods.
2. Spanish for the U.S. government's benefit, called by Kloss (1977) *expediency language rights*, has always been *promoted*.
3. Spanish for U.S. Latinos has been *restricted* and even *forbidden* during most historical periods up to the Civil Rights Era. Since then, Spanish for Latinos has been *tolerated*, although it has become the target of attack of the English-Only movement since the 1980's.
4. *Distinct varieties* of U.S. Spanish have been validated during different historical periods depending on the role to which Spanish has been assigned by the majority. During periods of economic and political expansion into Latin America, what has been promoted as an important tool in socioeconomic and political domination is oral communication in Spanish, along with the Spanish of the Latin Americans who have been doing business with the United States. But at historical times when large numbers of uneducated, poor Spanish speakers have been recognized in the United States, what has been promoted is Spanish literacy skills and a Castilian model, thus further *weakening the link* between people of Spanish descent in the U.S. and their Spanish language.
5. Spanish has rarely been allowed to be used as a *symbol of a positive Latino ethnic identity*, thus ensuring that Spanish is reserved as a resource only for those who have power.

The historical analysis that follows contextualizes the generalizations about Spanish language policy made above. Because the tension between the elite and popular traditions of U.S. Spanish comes into sharp relief in New York City, with its elite culture and its need for industrialized labor, this history will focus on the Northeast and New York City.

The history of Spanish in the United States can be divided into five periods in which Spanish has taken on different roles:

The colonial period and early nation: 1699-1840's. Spanish for trade

The 19th Century: Spanish for conquest and polite accomplishment

The 20th Century: 1900-1968. From Spanish for imperialism to Spanish as ethnic marker

Post-Civil Rights: 1968-1980. Spanish as ethnic problem and ethnic resource

The last decade: 1980 to present. Spanish for communication with monolinguals

1.1. THE COLONIAL PERIOD AND EARLY NATION. 1699-1800'S: SPANISH FOR TRADE. Significantly, the first recorded use of written Spanish in the English colonies was the 1699 printing of *La fé del cristianismo* to proselytize in Spanish America (Spell 1927: 147). This early use of Spanish already points to what was to become an important feature of the unwritten Spanish language policy in the U.S., that is, the use of Spanish to expand U.S. influence over Latin America.

During the entire colonial period and the early nation, Anglos learned Spanish in order to trade with the Spanish colonies. The first account of Spanish language teaching in the New York area is recorded in a 1735 advertisement in the *New York Gazette* (Spell 1927: 147). And in 1751, Garret Noel, a book-seller, issued *A Short introduction to the Spanish language*, considered to be the first textbook in the United States for the study of Spanish (Leavitt 1961: 605). By 1773 there are accounts of Spanish teachers who provided services to merchants in carrying on correspondence in Spanish and translating bills and accounts.

During the Revolutionary War, Spain lent aid to the English colonies and diplomatic and consular representatives were sent to New York in order to awaken further interest in Spain and its colonies. By 1788, the ports in the Indies had been thrown open to trade, and ships were regularly coming and going between the U.S. and the Spanish colonies (Spell 1927: 148-149).

Both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson lent support to the value of Spanish as an Anglo resource in commercial expansion. Although Franklin saw German as a threat to national unity, he urged the inclusion of Spanish in colonial schools. In 1751 he advocated that Spanish be included in the curriculum of the Public Academy of the City of Philadelphia, later to become the University of Pennsylvania (Spell 1927: 148). And Thomas Jefferson in a 1787 letter to a nephew suggested: "Bestow great attention on Spanish and endeavor to acquire an accurate knowledge of it. Our future connections with Spain and Spanish America will render that language of valuable acquisition. The ancient history of that part of America, too, is written in that language".

In the early 1800's, Spanish speaking *criollos*, eager to foster independence from Spain, started setting up headquarters in important cities in the United States. Propaganda for the revolution was printed in Spanish for distribution in the Spanish colonies. Philadelphia, home of Manuel Torres, a liberal Spaniard, became an important center of propaganda. Torres came to the United States in 1797 and served as a liaison agent between the revolutionaries and the United States (de Onís 1952). Translators became needed during this period to print material that would arouse U.S. citizens to sympathize with the revolutions.

After the revolutions of 1808-1826 which resulted in political independence for thirteen Latin American nations, trade with the U.S. increased as the old mercantilistic monopolies collapsed. But as in the previous centuries, the Anglo interaction was mostly with the upper and middle classes who controlled the seats of government and the ports. By 1830, for example, the Sociedad Benéfica Cubana y Puertorriqueña was established in New York, a society of island merchants and land owners that needed to protect their interest in the continued trade with the Middle Atlantic States (Sánchez Korrol 1983). Although indeed all this promoted an interest in learning Spanish, in reality, much activity was conducted in English, since elite Latin Americans had studied English in the United States since the late 18th century. We know, for example, that with the religious freedom that came with independence, Catholic schools were established around the Baltimore area specifically to attract Spanish speaking children, especially from Mexico and Havana (Spell 1927: 148). Francisco de Miranda, a representative of Liberal Spain, studied in the United States from 1783-1784; and José Felipe Flores, a Guatemalan scientist, came to study in 1797 (For an interesting account of these two early Latin American visitors see, de Onís 1952).

1.2. THE 19TH CENTURY: SPANISH FOR CONQUEST AND POLITE ACCOMPLISHMENT. It was the period surrounding the annexation of the territory that is now the American Southwest and the discovery of gold in California that put Anglos in direct contact with Spanish speakers who lacked power and wealth and who often were non-white. As Anglos moved into Spanish speaking territorial areas, translators were needed both in the Army and Navy, as well as in private commercial ventures, creating a great demand for private teachers of Spanish (Spell 1927: 152-153). Spanish for conquest had made its entry.

It is precisely during this period that the more elite tradition of Spanish became entrenched in the United States, a tradition which looked away from Latin America and toward Spain, adopted Castilian Spanish and was dominated by the Northeast. Although Spanish was used as a means to culturally and linguistically assimilate the newly acquired population, it was "the other" Spanish, and not the one that was spoken in the territories, that was valued. The debasement and stigmatization of the variety of Spanish spoken throughout the Southwest served as a means to effectively carry out the conquest and linguistic assimilation of Spanish speakers.

The elite tradition of Spanish for polite accomplishment could be traced back

to 1816 and the establishment at Harvard University of the Smith Professorship of French and Spanish, occupied until 1835 by George Ticknor (For a more exhaustive treatment of this part of the history, see Grattan Doyle 1926, Leavitt 1961, Nichols 1945, Spell 1927). In 1815, Ticknor was the first American to travel to Spain for literary study, and his *History of Spanish Literature* was published in 1849. At Harvard, this Spanish teaching tradition was continued by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, James Russell Lowell, Washington Irving, and William Prescott. Yet, throughout the entire 19th Century, there are neither accounts of U.S. scholars traveling in Latin America nor texts about Latin America published in the United States.

By the later part of the 19th century, language teaching enters its professionalization stage. In 1883 the Modern Language Association (MLA) came into being, recognizing the aim of modern language study to be "literary culture, philological scholarship, and linguistic discipline" (Quoted in Parker 1954: 45). Limited attention was paid to Spanish, and only the method of reading-translation was recognized (Leavitt 1961: 616).

It is instructive then to realize that the language teaching profession advocated Spanish for Anglos only for literary value or English linguistic discipline, and that this was happening at the very historical juncture in which the United States was coming into contact with Spanish-speakers as a result of its territorial expansion into the Southwest and its seizure of Spain's colonies in the Spanish American war.

As in the early part of the 19th century, political emigrés from Cuba and Puerto Rico arrived in New York after 1868. Many of the founding fathers, the "próceres" of Cuba and Puerto Rico were in New York during this period: Ramón Emeterio Betances, Eugenio María de Hostos, José Martí, Arturo Alfonso Shomburg (for this history see, especially, Andreu Iglesias 1980); and many taught Spanish to make a living. But already in this early period, Spanish was used by Spanish-speakers for the benefit of the Spanish speaking community, as well as that of the United States. While some advocated independence from Spain, others used Spanish to argue for annexation to the United States. Even before some of us were Latin Americans, Spanish had already been used by some of our own ancestors to help the United States in its conquering role.

1.3. THE 20TH CENTURY: FROM SPANISH FOR IMPERIALISM TO SPANISH AS ETHNIC MARKER. The first two decades of the 20th century saw the quick expansion of U.S. interest over Latin America. The Panama Canal opened in 1914, as World War I began. As Europeans abandoned Latin America markets, the U.S. took over, moved by its need for Latin American raw material, as well as the Latin American demand for capital. During the next three years commerce with Latin America increased by 100 percent with the opening of five steamer routes between New York and Valparaíso, the Pan American Railway, and nine branches of the National City Bank of New York (For an interesting account of the reasons for the interest, see "On the threshold" 1917, McCarthy 1917, Coester 1923, Shepard 1924). During

the Second Pan American Scientific Congress held in Washington in 1919, a resolution was passed "that the teaching of the Spanish language be made general in the schools of the United States" (quoted in Harrington 1932, p. 369).

But at the same time, Spanish was becoming increasingly recognized as the characteristic of the poor and the nonwhite (For an insightful discussion of how this ideology developed, see Macías 1985). The MLA, founded in 1883, made it a point to distance itself from that Spanish. In its 1906 publication, E.C. Hills writes about New Mexican Spanish and reports the high illiteracy among the older Spanish speakers of Colorado and New Mexico, and the English monolingualism of the young. In New York, the image of the revolutionaries had been replaced by that of subjugated colonial people. And this was reflected in the sign that Bernardo Vega, a *tabaquero puertorriqueño*, remembers hanging from a building on 89th Street in his *Memorias*: "Apartment to let. No Cubans, Puerto Ricans or dogs allowed (p. 70)."

It was in this climate of imperialism and prejudice against Spanish speakers that the Spanish language profession came into being. The American Association of Teachers of Spanish, now AATSP, held its first meeting in 1917 in New York. Lawrence A. Wilkins, then Director of Modern Languages in the High Schools of New York City became its first president; Aurelio Espinosa, from Stanford University, the first editor of its journal, *Hispania* (For a history of the organization, see Nichols 1945, Klein 1992).

Perhaps the attitudes expressed by the early leaders of the Spanish language profession, Wilkins and Espinosa, are helpful today in understanding the role of Spanish during this period. It was Wilkins who promoted Spanish in New York City High Schools. But it is instructive to also remember that it was Wilkins who declared illegal the teaching of German, who fought against the inclusion of Spanish in the elementary school curriculum, and who prevented the employment of foreign teachers in NYC schools. His words are instructive in this regard: "We have had far too much teaching of German in New York City. It was fast becoming the second language of our nation. And I personally believe that it was taught chiefly for the purposes of furthering propaganda from Berlin" (1918, p. 208). And in the same article, he adds: "I believe no foreign language should be taught in the elementary schools. Americanism and the three R's, if you will, should be the subjects taught and taught thoroughly well in such schools" (p. 220).

Although of Hispanic descent, Aurelio Espinosa, advocated against the hiring of foreign teachers and against a Latin American variety and even the concept of Latin America itself. In 1921 he wrote: "American teachers must do in the future 99 percent of the teaching of Spanish, French and German" (p. 281). And in a 1923 article entitled "Where is the best Spanish spoken?" he said: "The best modern Spanish . . . is that spoken by the educated people of Old and New Castile" (p. 244). In fact, Espinosa (1918) announced that *Hispania* would not accept the term Latin America because it was "vague, meaningless, unjust and unscientific" (p. 135), suggesting instead that only Spanish America be used.

The vogue of Spanish as an antidote to German in the national defense turned out to be short-lived. The 1918 slogan of the early AATSP: "The war will be won by the substitution of Spanish for German" was answered in 1923 by a Teachers' College professor who called Spanish "the biggest gold brick in American education" (For a history of these attacks, see, among others, Grattan Doyle 1945a).

The rise in popularity of the social sciences in the 1920's also led to the decline in foreign languages (Parker 1961). And the Modern Foreign Language Study of 1929 recommended reading as the primary aim of foreign language instruction and limited foreign language study to two years (For an extensive treatment of this subject see Report No. 12, *The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States*, by Algernon Coleman. See also Huebener 1961).

Although Pan American Clubs, an outgrowth of the "Good Neighbor Policy," continued to expand in American High Schools throughout the 1930's and 40's (see, for example, Ryan Wickham 1935), little emphasis was given to language proficiency or real communication with Latin Americans (See, among others, Grattan Doyle 1943, Pitcher 1943). Although the fear of Germany during World War I had introduced Spanish into the High Schools, World War II and the increased U.S. participation in "global affairs" had only a negative impact on foreign language study. The Spanish Language Profession adopted such slogans as "Foreign Languages for the Air Age!", "Americans, awake to language needs!". In reality, however, there was less interest than ever in languages. In 1940 the American Youth Commission in its report entitled "What the High Schools ought to teach" characterized "foreign languages as useless and time consuming". And in 1944 Harvard's "General Education in a Free Society" repeated: "Foreign language study is useful primarily in strengthening the student's English. Translation is excellent practice. . . . For the average student there is no real need at all to learn a foreign language. . . . The aim of foreign language teaching is not to give a practical command of the new language but to improve one's English" (Quoted in Huebener 1961: 14).

The apparent contradiction between increased United States participation in global affairs and the decline of interest in Spanish is explained by the attitude expressed by New York City High School students who as members of a Pan American Club request Spanish speaking pen-pals. They write: "If it is convenient, we should like them to be blondes" (Goodykoontz 1945: 385). The Air Age and the Radio Age brought us closer than ever with others, but particularly it brought to everyone's ears, and especially to the Spanish language profession in the Northeast, the U.S. Spanish of the Southwest and the Spanish of the first airborne diaspora in U.S. history, that of Puerto Ricans (See, for example, Sánchez Korrol 1983). Spanish again lost its appeal for Anglos as it was increasingly recognized as a "problem", the language of conquered or dominated people for whom there was increasingly little room in the United States depressed economy.

The open attacks against Spanish speakers in the United States were surpris-

ingly accompanied by what appeared to be Anglo efforts to help the Spanish speaking community. In the early 1940's, Texas, New Mexico, Florida and South Carolina formally introduced Spanish into some elementary classrooms (For this history, see Johnston 1943, Nichols 1945). As a result of the 1953 study, "Teaching children of Puerto Rican background in New York City schools", the Board of Education proposed that Spanish be used in the education of these children. The stage was now set for the contemporary bilingual education movement, with Spanish effectively used as an instrument of linguistic and cultural domination.

It was this language teaching profession, reluctant in promoting Spanish for effective inter-ethnic communication or even among Latinos, but comfortable in its role as agents of what was called inter-Americanism with its imperialistic overtones (for greater insight into inter-Americanism, see Grattan Doyle 1945b, Goodykoontz 1945), that was launched into the international age of Sputnik. In 1958 the National Defense and Education Act provided financial assistance for the teaching of foreign languages (For relevant sections of the NDEA, see PMLA 1958, vol. 73, iv-viii. See also, Harden 1981). The New Key and the Audio-Lingual approach were developed during this time (For this history, see, among others, Davison 1960; Dostert, Eddy, Lehmann and Marckwardt 1960; Guerra 1968; Palmer 1955; Walsh 1960a, 1960b). But by 1966 an article in *The Modern Language Journal* warns: "The syllabus is there, the teachers are there, the books are there, but where are the students? They drop it. They don't need it" (Zeldner 1966: 277). Clearly Spanish for imperialism among Anglos had lost its appeal, as Spanish increasingly was recognized as a characteristic of U.S. Latinos.

1.4. CIVIL RIGHTS: 1968-1980. SPANISH AS ETHNIC PROBLEM AND ETHNIC RESOURCE. The 1960's brought to the attention of the general U.S. public the racial and ethnic tension that had existed all along in many parts of the country. During those years, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans joined African Americans in demanding equal rights, and during this short historical period, U.S. Latinos were effective in asserting the importance that the use of Spanish had for them and for their own identity. During those years, that is, Latinos were successful in using Spanish as a tool of self-categorization.

In a 1965 article entitled "The Bilingual Mexican American as a potential teacher of Spanish" *Hispania* finally acknowledged the Spanish of Latinos, and the importance that the language had in defining their personal and professional identity (Wonder 1965). But the linguistic image of Latinos took a dramatic turn soon after that. From a people whose distinctive trait was that they spoke Spanish, Latinos quickly became a people who did not speak English. By the time the Bilingual Education Act was passed in 1968 the government chose to focus on the English of Latinos, rather than their Spanish. Spanish-speakers first became LES (Limited English speakers) and then LEP (Limited English Proficient) (for this history, see especially Lyons 1990). Spanish-speaking ability was now no longer an asset, but a problem that needed to be remediated.

This new, deficit-based, negative linguistic definition of Latinos took root and became entrenched under the prosperity brought by Civil Rights legislation and an expanded economy. Ironically, the good times served to strengthen the bad image, as Latinos were quickly co-opted into becoming agents of linguistic and cultural assimilation. Monolingual English-speaking Latinos like Richard Rodríguez and the few who made it into business and corporations became models of success. In contrast, bilingual Latino professionals who used Spanish to communicate with monolingual Spanish speakers came to be seen as nothing but expedient bridges between the reality of poverty and alienation, and the dream of success and inclusion.

As the negative linguistic image took hold, the burden of blame for the socio-educational failure of Latinos was shifted from societal factors to linguistic ones. Despite the fact that the same socio-educational failure afflicts millions of monolingual speakers of English, in the case of Latinos it turned out that the cause of their problems was seen as linguistic, and that Latinos were in the straights they were in because of their failure to rid themselves of Spanish and replace it with English (For a fuller treatment of this topic see García, 1993 and 1995).

In an attempt to counter this negative linguistic image and the role assigned to it as the cause of Latino failure, the U.S. Spanish language profession, now with many Latinos in its ranks, did much to advocate a positive view of Spanish. The point was made over and over again that Spanish was not a problem, but a resource of the community, and that Spanish had a role in public life. In 1972 the AATSP issued its recommendation for Spanish-S classes in its report "Teaching Spanish in School and College to Native Speakers of Spanish". By 1975 Guadalupe Valdés published the first newsletter on the Teaching of Spanish to Spanish speakers. The short-lived *Liga Nacional Defensora del Idioma Español* was established in 1975 with the explicit purpose of promoting Spanish in the U.S. In 1980 Lucía Elías Olivares organized the first Conference on *El español en los Estados Unidos*.

But as these efforts gave to many U.S. Latinos the Spanish voice that had gone unrecognized historically, a new problem arose, in the form of a more conservative Spanish language profession, now mostly from the Spanish-speaking world, which chose to distance itself from this native variety. And so the attack on U.S. Spanish came now from two fronts: one, from those who objected to its use in public and saw it as the cause of social and economic problems, and two, from those who objected to its form and expression, who were offended by its hybrid features and were insulted by its obvious restriction and reduction in the face of contact with a more powerful language and culture. By 1974 the *Academia norteamericana de la lengua española* was organized with the explicit purpose of bringing U.S. Spanish back to the fold.

1.5. THE LAST DECADE: 1980 TO PRESENT. SPANISH FOR COMMUNICATION WITH SPANISH-SPEAKING MONOLINGUALS. The tension created by conservative English speakers and conservative Spanish speakers in the late 1970's came to a head when

in the 1980's the English Only movement started gaining ground (For an exhaustive treatment of this movement, see Crawford 1992a, 1992b). Faced with this onslaught, the U.S. Spanish language profession started to retreat. It stopped pushing to expand the functions of U.S. Spanish; it gave up on trying to stretch out from the street to the school and the museum. The role for U.S. Spanish became limited to being an efficient instrument of communication with the monolingual Spanish-speaking Latino community who needed services (see García 1997). U.S. Spanish language professionals started to accept the restriction of Spanish as a language for the recently arrived, rather than the language of all Latinos. They gave up their role as U.S. Spanish language planners, and inadvertently played into the hands of the majority, buttressing the position that U.S. Latinos can only be fully educated in English, that U.S. Spanish can only be aired in the street for communication with the Spanish monolingual, that Spanish has no transcendental value beyond the here and now.

Nowhere is this retreat more evident than in the bilingual education movement. In the 60's and 70's, as the movement got on its way, Latino educators advocated that all Latino children be taught, in addition to English, Spanish in its full historical, cultural and literary expression, and that this be done as an explicit counterattack on the bicultural ambivalence that is responsible for much of the Latinos' educational failure (For an analysis of the role of bicultural ambivalence, see Cummins 1981). During this time, maintenance bilingual programs were developed, and existed along with transitional bilingual programs where Spanish was used only until the children learned English. Today, however, maintenance bilingual programs for Latinos are rare, and as structured English-only immersion programs where Spanish is not used gain ground, Latino educators have settled for the temporary and limited use of Spanish in transitional bilingual programs (See Casanova 1991). Under the pressure of English-only, Spanish has stopped being claimed as the resource of the Latino community, and educators who still dream of developing the Spanish of Latino children have begun to hide behind the mask of doing so also for Anglo children. As maintenance bilingual programs started retreating, dual language programs involving both Latinos and Anglos came into being (For this development see, among others, Lindholm 1992). But it is important to recognize that these dual language programs precisely destroy the link between Spanish and a Latino identity, by taking Spanish away from Latino lips and souls and spreading it thin among everybody (This view has been previously expressed in García and Otheguy 1984).

The affirmation and advocacy of U.S. Spanish for Latinos in the early discourse has been silenced by the English-Only climate of the present. In the face of attacks from English Only, the U.S. Spanish language profession adopted English Plus, knowing full well that the defense and development of U.S. Spanish for Latinos in today's depressed economy and conservative society will neither get funders nor sympathizers.

As part of this abandonment of an assertive, stand-up position on U.S. Spanish

for Latinos, the profession started to hide behind the critique of U.S. capabilities in foreign languages and started promoting Spanish-English bilingualism for all (see, President's Commission 1979). But even as this developed, U.S. Spanish professionals were blind to the fact that Spanish as a foreign language for Anglos was losing its appeal precisely because Spanish was now no longer foreign but local, no longer full of positive, distant associations but full of negative associations with failure and strife close to home (For an insightful treatment of this topic, see, Mead 1981). Fewer Anglos consider themselves "Hispanophiles" today than in earlier times, and no sense of being a "Latinophile" has developed. In reality few Anglos learn to communicate in Spanish. True, Spanish is the number one language taught in the United States (see, for example, Brod and Huber 1992, Draper 1991), more than thirty states have adopted a foreign language requirement, and Spanish has moved into elementary classrooms through FLES programs (for a history of FLES programs, see Andersson 1953, Mildenerger 1956, Rhodes and Oxford 1988) and dual language programs. But despite all this, and even though foreign language enrollment has never been higher, only about six percent of high school students leave school after having studied more than two years of foreign languages. Spanish has the lowest retention rates of all the commonly taught modern languages (Draper 1991: 3-4). English Plus, English-Spanish bilingualism for all is only an illusion.

2. TENDING OUR OWN GARDEN: THE ROLE OF THE U.S. SPANISH LANGUAGE PROFESSION IN NEGOTIATING SPANISH AS A TRANSCENDENTAL SYMBOL OF LATINO IDENTITY. Clearly, as English becomes the world's lingua franca promoted ever more so through the unification of European markets, it is English that will fill the commercial and communicative need (For an insightful analysis of how structural change in international systems affects language teaching, see Cha 1991). Spanish as an *economic resource* will not survive the 21st century, and especially not here in the United States. As Latino English varieties become identified, accepted and promoted, there may be little need for Spanish, unless, of course, U.S. Spanish can be accepted as a *symbol* of who Latinos are as people, and Latinos are willing to teach their children the history, songs, and poetry that connect them to other socio-historical contexts and other times.

In all this, the U.S. Spanish language profession has an important role. Post-Civil Rights U.S. Spanish will not be strengthened by efforts to bring back its non-ethnic character and to promote it for the enrichment of all. Its position can only be strengthened by cultivating its U.S. ethnic character with the culture, history and literature of the Spanish speaking world and by promoting it for the enrichment of U.S. Latinos. The protection of U.S. Spanish in the face of the inevitable spread of English, will not come by expanding it to the Anglo majority, but by expanding it within Latinos and their children. U.S. Latinos must then be willing to dialogue with the Spanish speaking world, insist that it includes them, and in

turn, allow themselves to partake of it. A role for Latinos not only in the history of the United States, but also in that of the Spanish-speaking world must be claimed. And in so doing, Latinos must stand ready to nourish the Spanish of their communities with that spoken in monolingual contexts, to nourish the oral tradition with written literature, folklore with poetry, the bomba and plena with the sevillana, the conga player with Plácido Domingo, the literature of the Nuyorican Tato Laviera with that of Gabriel García Márquez, the Goya beans with the Goya art. Latinos must link "La lucha continúa" not only to the 60's, but also to the history of resistance to political and economic repression of people in both Latin America and Spain throughout the centuries. Mature Latino professionals must join Candide's cry and understand how to tend our own garden, carefully balancing both traditions of Spanish while protecting our voice, and claiming both traditions for U.S. Latinos as a link to our deeper identity.

REFERENCES

- AGUIRRE, ADALBERTO (ed.) 1985. Language in the Chicano speech community. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 53. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- AMASTAE, JON AND LUCIA ELÍAS-OLIVARES (eds.) 1982. *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic aspects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ANDERSSON, THEODORE. 1953. *The Teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools*. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- ANDREU IGLESIAS (ed.) 1980. *Memorias de Bernardo Vega. Una contribución a la historia de la comunidad puertorriqueña en Nueva York*. Río Piedras, Puerto Rico: Ed. Huracán.
- BERGEN, JOHN J. (ed.) 1990. *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- BROD, RICHARD AND BETTINA J. HUBER. 1992. Foreign Language enrollments in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 1990. *ADFL Bulletin* 23.6-10.
- CASANOVA, URSULA. 1991. Bilingual education: Politics or pedagogy? *Bilingual Education. Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman*, ed. by Ofelia García, 167-182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CHA, YUM KYUNG. 1991. Effect of the global system on language instruction, 1850-1986. *Sociology of Education* 64.19-32.
- COESTER, ALFRED. 1923. Spanish for foreign trade. *Hispania* 6.214-221.
- CRAWFORD, JAMES. 1992a. *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English Only"*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- (ed.) 1992b. *Language loyalties: A Source book on the Official English controversy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- CUMMINS, JAMES. 1981. The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language*

- minority students: A Theoretical framework, 3-49. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State.
- DAO, JAMES. 1992. Angered by police killing, a neighborhood erupts. *New York Times*, July 7, 1992, page A1, column 2, B4, column 1.
- DAVISON, NED. J. 1960. Will the 'New Key' prove flat? *Modern Language Journal* 44.322-323.
- DE ONÍS, JOSÉ. 1952. *The U.S. as seen by Spanish American writers 1776-1892*. New York: Hispanic Institute.
- DOSTERT, L.E., FREDERICK D. EDDY, W. P. LEHMANN, ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT. 1960. Tradition and innovation in language teaching. *Modern Language Journal* 44.220-226.
- DRAPER, JAMIE B. 1991. Foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, Fall 1989 and Fall 1990. ACTFL Report, October 1991.
- ELÍAS-OLIVARES, LUCÍA (ed.) 1983. *Spanish in the U.S. setting. Beyond the Southwest*. Rosslyn, Va.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- ELÍAS-OLIVARES, LUCÍA, ELIZABETH A. LEONE, RENÉ CISNEROS, JOHN GUTIÉRREZ (eds.) 1985. *Spanish language use and public life in the USA*. Berlin: Mouton.
- ESPINOSA, AURELIO. 1918. The term Latin America. *Hispania* 1.135-143.
- . 1921. On the teaching of Spanish. *Hispania* 4.269-284.
- . 1923. Where is the best Spanish spoken? *Hispania* 6.244-246.
- GARCÍA, OFELIA. 1993. Understanding the societal role of the teacher in transitional bilingual education classrooms: Lessons from Sociology of language. In *Bilingual education in Friesland: Facts and prospects*, ed. by Koen Zondag, 25-37. Leeuwarden, The Netherlands: Gemeenschappelijk Centrum voor Onderwijsbegeleiding in Friesland.
- . 1995. Spanish language loss as a determinant of income among Latinos in the U.S.: A Myth. In *Language policy and language education: Critical approaches*, ed. by James W. Tollefson, 142-160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1997. World languages and their role in a U.S. city. In *The Multilingual Apple. Languages in New York City*, ed. by Ofelia García and Joshua A. Fishman, 3-50. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- AND RICARDO OTHEGUY. 1984. *Tending your own garden: An ethnic perspective on bilingual education* (Unpublished manuscript).
- GONZÁLEZ, DAVID. 1992. Events don't surprise Dominican, residents. Police harassment said to be common. *New York Times*, July 8, 1992, B2.
- GOODYKOONTZ, BESS. 1945. Why education for inter-American understanding. *Hispania* 28.383-389.
- GRATTAN DOYLE, HENRY. 1926. *Spanish studies in the United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- . 1943. Progress in the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese. *Harvard Educational Review* 13.335-341.
- . 1945a. A look at the future. In *A Handbook on the teaching of Spanish and Por-*

- tuguese with special reference to Latin America, ed. by Henry Grattan Doyle, 228-243. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.
- . 1945b. A realistic approach to practical inter-americanism. *Hispania* 28.208-209.
- . 1956. Archer Milton Huntington 1870-1955. *Modern Language Journal* 40.59-61.
- GUERRA, EMILIO L. 1968. The teaching of foreign languages in the United States of American in the past decade. *Linguistica Antverpiensia* II, 207-216. Antwerpen: Rijksuniversitair Centrum.
- HARDEN, THOMAS K. 1981. The National Defense Education Act: A turning point in federal aid. *Eric Document* 212084.
- HARRINGTON, C.P. JR. 1932. Why teach Spanish in the Secondary Schools? *Hispania* 15.357-366.
- HERNÁNDEZ-CHÁVEZ, EDUARDO, ANDREW D. COHEN AND ANTHONY F. BELTRAMO. 1975. *El Lenguaje de los Chicanos. Regional and social characteristics of language used by Mexican Americans*. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- HILLS, ELIJAH C. 1906. *New Mexican Spanish*. Modern Language Association Publications 21.706-753.
- HISPANIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA, 1938. *Handbook. Museum and library collections*. New York: Trustees of Hispanic Society of America.
- HUEBENER, THEODORE. 1961. *Why Johnny should learn foreign languages*. Philadelphia: Chilton Co.
- JOHNSTON, MAJORIE C. 1943. Teaching of Spanish in elementary schools. In *The Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese*, ed. by Stephen Pitcher, 20-23. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- KLEIN, RICHARD B. 1992. The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese: The First 75 years. *Hispania* 75.1036-1082.
- KLOSS, HEINZ. 1977. *The American bilingual tradition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- LINDHOLM, KATHRYN J. 1992. Two-way bilingual/immersion education: Theory, conceptual issues, and pedagogical implications. In *Critical Perspectives on Bilingual Education Research*, ed. by Raymond V. Padilla and Alfredo H. Benavides, 195-220. Tempe, Arizona: Bilingual Press.
- LEAVITT, STURGIS E. 1961. The teaching of Spanish in the United States. *Hispania* 44.591-625.
- LYONS, JAMES J. 1990. The past and future directions of federal bilingual-education policy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 508.66-80.
- MACÍAS, REYNALDO. 1985. Language and ideology in the United States. *Social Education* 49.97-100.
- MCCARTHY, GEORGE F. 1918. Spanish: The Language for after-war business men. *Hispania* 1.99-101.
- MEAD, ROBERT G. 1981. La imagen pública y profesional del español en Yanquilandia—y cómo mejorarla. *Hispania* 64.91-96.

- MILDENBERGER, KENNETH W. 1956. Status of foreign language study in American elementary schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare.
- NICHOLS, MADALINE WALLIS. 1945. The History of Spanish and Portuguese teaching in the United States. In *A Handbook on the teaching of Spanish and Portuguese with special reference to Latin America* ed. by Henry Grattan-Doyle, 99-146. Boston: D.C. Heath.
- ON THE THRESHOLD. 1917. *Hispania* Organizational Issue.1-10.
- ORNSTEIN-GALICIA, JACOB L., GEORGE K. GREEN AND DENNIS J. BIXLER-MARQUEZ. 1988. Research issues and problems in United States Spanish. Latin American and Southwestern varieties. Brownsville: Pan American University.
- PALMER, HAROLD E. 1955. *The Oral method of teaching languages*. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons.
- PARKER, WILLIAM R. 1961. *The National interest and foreign languages*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- PEÑALOSA, FERNANDO. 1980. *Chicano sociolinguistics. A brief introduction*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury.
- PITCHER, STEPHEN (ed.) 1943. *The Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES. 1979. *Strength through wisdom. A Critique of U.S. capability: A report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies*. Washington, D.C.: 1979.
- REVEST, DENNIS. 1992. Upper Manhattan block erupts after a man is killed in struggle with policeman. *New York Times*, July 6, 1992, B3.
- RHODES, NANCY C. AND REBECCA L. OXFORD. 1988. Foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools. *Foreign Language Annals* 21.51-69.
- ROCA, ANA AND JOHN LIPSKI (eds.) 1993. *Spanish in the United States. Linguistic contact and diversity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- RYAN WICKHAM, FLETCHER. 1935. Pan Americanism-A dream or a reality? *Hispania* 18.103-112.
- SÁNCHEZ KORROL, VIRGINIA. 1983. *From Colonia to community. The history of Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1917-1948*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- SHEPARD, JESIE. 1924. The aims and values of the teaching of Spanish in the High Schools of the United States. *Hispania* 7.215-242.
- SILVA-CORVALÁN, CARMEN. 1994. *Language contact and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SPELL, J. R. 1927. Spanish teaching in the United States. *Hispania* 10.141-159.
- TEACHING SPANISH IN SCHOOL AND COLLEGE TO NATIVE SPEAKERS OF SPANISH. 1972. *A Report of the Executive Council of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese*. *Hispania* 55.620.
- TESCHNER, RICHARD, GARLAND D. BILLS AND JERRY R. CRADDOCK. 1975. Spanish

- and English of United States Hispanos: A critical, annotated, linguistic bibliography. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- WALSH, DONALD D. 1960a. A cleaner look at the new look. *Modern Language Journal* 44.168-170.
- . 1960b. Whom does the new look threaten? *Modern Language Journal* 44: 270-271.
- WAYNE POWELL, PHILIP. 1971. *Tree of hate: Propaganda and prejudices affecting United States relations with the Hispanic world*. New York: Basic Books.
- WHERRIT, IRENE AND OFELIA GARCÍA (eds.) 1989. *U.S. Spanish: The Language of Latinos*. *The International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 79. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- WILKINS, LAWRENCE. 1918. Spanish as a substitute for German for training and culture. *Hispania* 1.205-221.
- WILKINS, LAWRENCE. 1935. A new approach to Pan Americanism. *Hispania* 18.127-131.
- WONDER, JOHN P. 1965. The bilingual Mexican-American as a potential teacher of Spanish. *Hispania* 48.97-99.
- ZELDNER, MAX. 1966. The Foreign language dropouts. *Modern Language Journal* 50.275-280.
- ZENTELLA, ANA CELIA. 1997. *Growing up bilingual: Puerto Rican children in New York City*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.