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Abstract

This dissertation examines how language policymakers in the United States write, discuss, and resist local English-only policies. By tracing the trajectories of four interconnected, local campaigns to make English the official language, I show that such policies are not static texts or abstract impositions, but rather a kind of writing, one that emerges through local action, collaboration, revision, uptake, and other literate activities. As one of the few studies to examine how politicians and other policymakers write, and the first to focus on the writing practices of people in the English-only movement, this dissertation sheds light on the broader question of how people create and change policies, particularly ones that reflect and affect people’s understandings of language and communication. In order to analyze how and why people enact such policies, I conducted audio- and video-recorded interviews with 24 activists, writers, and politicians; analyzed public government records, videos, and digital discourse; and visited the archives of John Tanton (who founded the organizations ProEnglish and U.S. English), former US Senator Paul Simon, and the National Council of Teachers of English. I argue that local policies in schools, workplaces, and, increasingly, governments have played a crucial role in shaping how people learn, use, and view language. At the same time, the local scale is an ideological, discursive concept that is constantly open to further entrenchment or renegotiation, and it is always still connected to other scales. Local language policies thus provide opportunities for people to (re)write not only their stances towards language, but also their definitions of community. The opening chapter, “Local Language Policy,” introduces these arguments; provides a history of such policies in the US; introduces an analytical framework that combines work on language policy, situated studies of writing, and research on local language practices; and describes the stakes of this project for writing studies and related fields. In Chapter 2, I move
into the “Methodology and Methods” of the study. Chapter 3, “Networked Localism,” focuses on how people write and circulate local English-only policies, through text histories of four policies that were based on the same template. In Chapter 4, “Upscaling and Downscaling,” I turn from writing practices to language ideologies, in order to show that, rather than adhere to a “one nation-one language” ideal, people in the English-only movement flexibly align across, and distance themselves from, various scales. The fifth chapter, “Resisting and Rewriting,” focuses on the experiences and strategies of people opposed to the English-only movement. Through a case study of a group of participants who successfully repealed their county’s language policy, this analysis offers a model for future language advocacy by showing the possibilities of meshing multilingual, translingual, and raciolinguistic orientations towards language. Ultimately, this dissertation opens up the worlds of policymaking, prescriptivism, and English-only activism to more situated, discursive analysis, and the field of writing studies to a kind of writing that has significantly shaped American identity, education, and citizenship.
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Chapter 1
Local Language Policy

In a March 18, 1982 thank you letter to a donor, activist John Tanton began with an update on his recent work:

I’ve just returned from 11 days on the road in California, trying to get people organized at the grass roots. People are really hot on the immigration issue out there! And bilingualism too.

Tanton learned two lessons during this period, both of which helped make him one of the leading figures in what would become the modern English-only movement. First, he realized that there was significant overlap among people who viewed “the immigration issue” as a problem, and people who viewed “bilingualism [as a problem] too.” He was used to framing immigration as a threat to the natural environment or to racial purity (the thank-you letter was to someone at the Pioneer Fund, a eugenics organization). Now, though, he was encountering people who saw immigration as a threat to communication and the purity of the English language as well.

Second, he recognized that language and immigration were already “hot,” so he did not need to manufacture interest, just try to organize it. In fact, local governments around the country were already starting to write new policies making English the official language, to the point that Tanton and his employees had trouble keeping track of all of them.¹ In the years since, more than 80 cities and counties have proposed English-only policies (Figure 1, Appendix A).

Most of these local governments had the help of at least one of Tanton’s organizations, U.S. English or ProEnglish, and of other local governments in their region, but what that help looked like, how welcome it was, and how public it was, has varied significantly.

¹ Ten days after Tanton’s letter, one of his employees wrote to the staff of California Senator S.I. Hayakawa to ask if they had a list of the “school boards, city councils and other bodies which have adopted resolutions” on making English the official language, since Hayakawa was the most nationally known supporter of these policies at the time (Bikales, 1982 March 28).
Figure 1. Map of city- and county-level English-only policies in the United States since 1980. Black markers represent policies that are still in effect. Gray markers represent policies that were withdrawn, failed to pass, were rescinded, were repealed, or were ruled unconstitutional. The data corresponds to that of Appendix A.
Ultimately, the dynamics that Tanton experienced on his 1982 trip, between language and other politicized issues, and between local governments and professional activists, would continue to animate the English-only movement into the 21st century.

***

In an interview three decades later, in 2015, I asked Kirby Delauter, a county politician, how he thought people in his position could and should navigate these issues:

Flowers: *What advice would you give to someone in another community (.) who’s considering trying to make English their official language?*

Delauter: You know, it all boils down to, ‘do you have the votes to do it?’ You can make it the official language (.) anyway you want, but I would do that same thing that we did. I would get (.) outside input, you know, for (.) people that (.) have been in through the court system before, that’s had it challenged, and get your legal team together, and get something written that’s not going to be challenged in court, and explain exactly why (.) you’re doing it. And, you know, if you have the votes, do it.

Delauter identifies many of the strategies that have made local English-only policies so successful: assessing the amount of local support (“the votes”), getting “outside input” (ProEnglish, in his county’s case), writing a policy that is forceful but not illegal, and giving reasons for “exactly why you’re doing it.” There is also a certain opacity to this account, most notably in phrases like “get something written” that elide who exactly is doing the writing.

Through these kinds of discourse strategies, writing practices, and coordination between local government, legal counsel, and English-only organizations, Delauter’s county government in

---

2 See Appendix B for transcription conventions.
Frederick, Maryland not only passed an English-only ordinance in 2012, but inspired three other Maryland counties to try and do the same. In next-door Carroll County, for example, Commissioner Haven Shoemaker said at a public government meeting later that year that “this isn’t a radical notion, English as the Official Language, by any stretch of the imagination,” and cited the fact that “two counties in Maryland thus far, Queen Anne’s and Frederick County” had made English official already.

***

At first glance, the language policy model described and enacted by the people above can seem like a well-oiled machine: write, pitch, vote, circulate, repeat. Among people in these communities, however, there is significant debate over whether, how, and why to take this approach. Consider the following statements from other people involved in language policy in the area:

- “Language is the primary unifying force in a good community.” – online written statement, C. Paul Smith, County Commissioner, February 24, 2012

- “This is truly a business decision. You guys are missing the point. This is about dollars and protecting taxpayer dollars. When it costs $170 to translate an 8 ½ x 11 memo, we have to be sure that we’re doing the right thing with taxpayer dollars.” – comment at a public meeting, Billy Shreve, County Commissioner, February 21, 2012

- “If there was an organization behind it, a national organization, I don’t like that. At all. I’m sorry, I’m getting a little agitated. […] I don’t like the groups where the people who parachute themselves into a locale (. ) get people worked up (. ) to
fulfill their own agenda, and then leave. And they leave the people fighting each other.” – Hayden Duke, activist, interview, October 10, 2015

As these statements reveal, there is no real consensus about whether English-only laws are culturally or economically-driven (or both), and about whether organizations like ProEnglish are full of helpful consultants or unhelpful “parachute[rs],” even among people who are open to English being the official language. In fact, Frederick’s English-only policy became so fraught that activists and newly elected politicians managed to repeal it in 2015.

***

What Tanton’s letter, Delauter’s advice, and Shoemaker’s, Smith’s, Shreve’s, and Duke’s statements all point to is the importance of the local scale in language policy. Language policymakers write locally, for their organizations, cities, counties, schools, or workplaces. Language activists work locally, to support, protest, interpret, or change policies in their communities. And policymakers and activists alike frame their actions locally, by appealing to local conditions and concerns. At the same time, people involved in language policy are not just acting locally, but are negotiating (and disputing) what it means to be local in relation to other scales. There can be conflict over who should write the policy; who should take credit; what it should say; whether to pitch it as a continuation of local traditions or as a new idea; and whether it could or should function as a stepping stone, filter, or barrier towards the outside world. All these concerns over the “local” are at once material, ideological, and discursive: they are about who can do what in specific environments, what values and beliefs are connected to those spaces, and how communication remediates those material and ideological elements. I argue that the local scale is central to the ways people write, discuss, and resist language policies, which in turn are crucial to understanding how people use and view language. Local language policy
matters both because the policy texts and decisions that affect people most are in their schools, workplaces, and communities, certainly in the US (Johnson, 2013) and to some extent in other parts of the world (Amit, 2014; Pietikäinen, 2013), and because even language policies that affect large numbers of people still emerge out of localized literate activity (Pennycook, 2010).

While local, governmental English-only policies have been catalogued and historicized (Baron, 1990; Bailey, 2012; Crawford, 1992; Wiley, 1998), and occasionally studied individually (Dick, 2011; Peters, 2013; Flowers, 2016), there has been little research on how people create and circulate these policies, how people in the English-only movement view these local actions, or how people in these communities strategically promote or resist such policies. For example, after describing how varied the participants in, and motivations for, local language policy are, Spolsky (2009) laments, “We have few studies of this, unfortunately, and so are forced to speak about an undefined ‘they’ who constitute ‘government’” (p. 184). One of the aims of my study is to illuminate who is involved and why, and why distinguishing between people in and out of the government is sometimes impossible. Spolsky adds, “unfortunately, few studies enable us to see behind generalizations about government policy to identify the actual agents and agencies” (p. 257). Understanding these issues is important because supporters of English-only policies are some of “the most successful US language activist groups” (Spolsky, 2009, p. 198). So, Spolsky points to some of the objects of the inquiry that are not yet understood: the people, the groups, the motives, and the strategies, in addition to the policy texts.

Another study that begins to analyze the same phenomena is Schildkraut’s (2005) focus groups with Americans about language policy. She found that language is “a contentious issue on a more local level […], causing a stir in cities and towns across the country” (Schildkraut, 2005, p. 16). She also found that in addition to geographic patterns in people’s views, the more
abstract idea of community is also important, in part because people tend to define it so broadly. For some of her participants, not using English only was a sign that someone did not belong in their community, while for others, printing voting ballots in multiple languages was desirable because it would allow more people to participate in “community governance” (p. 195).

Interestingly, Schildkraut also had participants who valued local language policies over more national ones. She quotes one focus group participant in New Jersey, who complained about the prospect of yet “another federal mandate coming down from Trenton, or coming down from Washington” (p. 146). In a different focus group, another participant also preferred the local level to the national level, but defined local loosely, when she said, “Let each region, state, county, whatever decide where to draw the line” (pp. 146–7). Thus, another concern guiding this study is how people draw on local ideologies, discourse, and resources to redefine the local, and work towards a range of policy ends.

The specific research questions that guide this study are:

• How do people navigate the material, discursive, and ideological aspects of what it means to be local?
• How do people write local English-only policies?
• How do language ideologies about scale vary within the English-only movement?
• How do people resist and rewrite local English-only policies, and to what effects?

In the sections that follow, I begin by discussing the theoretical interventions of this study for writing studies. In making the case for local language policy’s presence, significance, and complexity, this project contributes to several areas of research within writing studies, particularly work on writing practices, local language and literacy, and language policy and
ideology. In this section I review existing work in these areas, and argue for how this study takes an innovative approach, and why. I then turn to a discussion of how previous language policy research has conceptualized US policy, and a history of language policy in the US, in order to show that the local scale has always been relevant to policymakers, even if not always recognized by researchers. In other words, the contemporary language policies at the heart of this study are not notable because they are new or special, but because they are representative of how language policy tends to work in the US. I also show that in many ways, the local English-only movement, the field of language policy studies, and the focus on language rights and resources within writing studies, all developed in relation to one another. They are not so much separate spheres, in other words, as part of the same historical process that made English and monolingualism seem inevitable. Finally, I conclude with a note on terminology, and summaries of the chapters to come.

Contributions to Writing Studies

Writing Practices

To begin, I shed light on kinds of writers and genres that have not been a primary focus in the field, but which are increasingly important as more people write for a living and for social change (Brandt, 2015). Specifically, this study offers an in-depth account of networked, collaborative writing practices spanning more than 30 years and several local governments, organizations, and activist groups. The experiences of people I interviewed, and the texts I collected, resemble some aspects of academic (Lillis and Curry, 2010), bureaucratic (Iedema, 2003), and activist writing (Sheridan-Rabideau, 2008), but the particularities of local lawmakers present different opportunities and challenges for writers. My participants’ writing tends to be
collaborative; anonymous; digital; constrained by the constant threat of lawsuits, unemployment, losing a future election, or losing future funding; and potentially quite consequential for people in and beyond their local communities. Most of the language policies themselves are based on one common template, which is a phenomenon that has been touched on in the context of digital rhetoric (Gallagher, 2015) and through literacy history interviews (Brandt, 2015), but not examined ethnographically. For writing studies, then, a key insight of this study is that people are writing, revising, and circulating legal and political texts in ways that are effective in achieving their goals, but which do not resemble the kinds of writing practiced in most schools, anticipated by the law (Brandt, 2015), or featured in literacy myths and metaphors (Eubanks, 2010; Guerra, 1998).

For language policy research, the significance of my study’s focus on writing is somewhat different. There, writing is more likely to appear as a product than an activity. Language policy research’s product-oriented approach to writing stems from the fact that language policy research started in sociolinguistics (Haugen, 1966), a discipline that has historically treated writing as “something rigid rather than dynamic,” or as something that only happens in “single moments and sites of production” (Lillis and McKinney, 2013, p. 429, 415). Writing may seem rigid and beside the point because some linguists still consider it secondary to speech, and therefore less worth examining (Andrsroutsopoulos, 2007, p. 209). My study, in contrast, treats all modes and sites of communication as situated and potentially relevant, and looks at how the participants view the writing they produce and encounter.
This study also extends emerging work on writing, space, and place (Yancey, 2014; Lamos, 2016), scale (Blommaert, 2010; Carr and Lempert, 2016), community literacy (Long, 2008), and language as a local practice (Pennycook, 2010). These bodies of work have offered valuable insights into the ways that language practices are not universal or even necessarily widespread at all, even in the context of globalization, technology, and other phenomena that have a reputation for flattening and homogenizing the world (Johnstone, 2013). Furthermore, it has become clear that people construct the local; it is not a static backdrop: people are constantly doing the work of “taking up a particular stance” towards the local, as well as the “active making and shaping of the locality” (Kang, 2015). Finally, the term “local” has also proved to be more open-ended and therefore more analytically useful than a term like “community” which has such positive connotations (Barton and Hamilton, 1998).

However, there is still a tendency in this work to treat the local as either fundamentally material, or fundamentally ideological, whereas I treat the local as simultaneously material, discursive, and ideological. I develop this approach to the local through case studies of local language policy in action. In addition, existing scholarship tends to use “local” only in certain social, cultural, and political contexts. Essentially, a small space becomes a metaphor for a small amount of power. This problem appears in work that uses the local interchangeably with the peripheral (Canagarajah, 2002, p. 135), the marginalized (Gold, 2008, p. 7; Donahue and Moon, 2007, p. 7), and the progressive (Canagarajah, 2005; Horner and Kopelson, 2014). Blommaert (2010) treats the local in a similar way, as something that people have to discursively transcend in order to gain authority. Long (2008) is a notable exception, in that she explains that in fact, the local may oppose, intersect with, or rely on powerful institutions (p. 7). I would add that “local”
and “powerful institutions” can be synonymous in the case of local governments. In other words, “local” is seldom a neutral term, but instead seems overburdened with assumptions. I argue that the term cannot a priori be assumed to have any particular meaning; what matters is how the people and texts under study understand and negotiate the concept.

Another intervention I make is to include language policy as a kind of local language and literacy practice. In other words, while writing studies has long devoted attention to language policy (Parks, 2000), and to local practices, these two areas have seldom overlapped (with the notable exceptions of Canagarajah [2005] and Tardy [2011]). Treating language policy as a local practice is important because “a focus on local action is a useful corrective to the bland work on language planning that has held sway for too long, doing little more than describing national policies” (Pennycook, 2010, p. 54). Although it may not be obvious in that quote, Pennycook goes on to make clear that he is not suggesting that the national level is not important, but rather that all studies, even of national policies, could be less “bland” if they focused on action situated in localized spaces, rather than pretending language policy is a lofty enough enterprise to exist outside of context. When language policy studies treat policymakers and policy texts as if they were voices from nowhere, it limits every aspect of the research. The “corrective” Pennycook mentions is necessary because, according to Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008), “local issues of language planning” have been “ignored,” “suppressed,” or “not considered at all” (p. 3) and this kind of research “is currently quite constrained” and “ad hoc” when it does happen (p. 12). These calls for more local research tend to be in the form of theoretical or methodological arguments, or of surveys of the field. In contrast, my project reports on a study of actual local language policy.
Language Ideologies and Policies

Finally, by focusing on the English-only movement’s local actions and writing practices (and not just any social movement or area of professional writing), I contribute to work on how language policies and ideologies develop and change. By describing and analyzing how varied language ideologies are within the English-only movement, as well as the range of language ideologies and strategies used by their opponents, I intervene in conversations that all too often take the English-only stance (singular) for granted, and ask which alternative orientation (again, singular) to language would be best. My study, in contrast, reveals that the most influential language policymakers are actually the ones that take a range of approaches to language, and not the ones that aim for ideological purity. On the other hand, I also document cases when language ideologies conflict to the point that language policies become jeopardized. In Chapter 4, especially, I discuss upscaling and downscaling as ideology-laden discourse strategies that can either be complementary or dissonant.

Language ideologies and policies are particularly relevant to writing studies because monolingual language ideologies are so influential in how students approach language and literacy education (Guerra, 2016; Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur, 2011; Canagarajah, 2013; Davila, 2012). Specifically, English-only policies can depict English as a superior language, and, perhaps even more consequentially, they can depict languages as stable, discrete entities. Both of these ideologies can make multilingualism, code switching, bivalency, translingual practices, and even variations in style, register, and genre, seem like problems, rather than rights or resources. So, it is important to examine case studies of how people write and adopt English-only policies, as well as a case study of how they resisted and rewrote one. I now move from the theoretical contributions of this study to how it fits into the history of US language policy.
Language Policy in the United States

Globally, the United States has not been a primary site of language policy research, which I attribute to the fact that the field of language policy studies has prioritized the national scale, while US language policymakers have not.³ Language policy in the United States has been so localized, uneven, and inconsistent that it can appear laissez-faire or nonexistent when viewed through a national lens. For example, in the opening pages of his book about Norwegian language policy (one of the first in the field), Haugen (1966) warned Anglophone readers that “the ideas and motivations underlying a program of language planning are so remote from the experience of educated Americans or Englishmen that they may find it difficult even to understand them” (p. 2). In other words, he expected that language policy would literally be a foreign concept to scholars in the US and England, because the definition and status of English had never been subject to this kind of governmental intervention. In part, this assumption about the US not having language policy may have been due to timing: at the same time that Haugen, Rubin and Jernudd (1971) and others were forming the field, the US was in a mid-century language policy lull, when almost no new policies were emerging or being enforced. In part, the lull was related to the fact that immigration restrictions had been so tight after World War I that the US was more monolingual and monocultural than ever. The more significant reason, however, is that US language policies have always been more influential at the state and local levels. Nationally, the US has never had an official language.

This is not to say that Americans and their elected leaders do not care about language, but rather that their concern is more likely to be about local conceptions of community or culture, than about the nation, per se. For example, in an analysis of 1,030 written public reactions to the

³ There are alternate theories for why the US confounds language policy research. Lo Bianco (1999), for example, suggests that the blatantly ideological nature of the English-only movement thwarts some researchers’ desire to make the field into a science focused on rational deliberation and “efficacy” (p. 49).
2014 multilingual Super Bowl Coca-Cola ad, Marlow (2015) found that just 4% of people critiquing the ad used a strategy of “national glorification” (p. 630). In fact, there were 11 discourse strategies that were more common than that one (p. 630). Marlow does describe other comments that mention America or the United States to establish context or set up a contrast between the US and other countries, but the point is that “glorification” was negligible; commenters seemed not so much surprised that this ad would exist, as resigned to and upset about the fact that US and the world are not monolingual.

Because US language policies tend to be so varied and decentralized, and often more *de facto* than *de jure*, Schiffman (1996) suggested that “nothing can be more challenging to the language-policy analyst, I think, than to try to make sense of US language policy” (p. 211). In contrast, the most-studied policies around the world are about national leaders proclaiming how people should use and learn one or more official languages. Some of the national policies stem from former colonies that gained independence, particularly Commonwealth countries, like India (Pennycook, 1998), Singapore (Wee, 2010), and Canada (Heller, 2011). Indigenous nations have also developed national language policies, whether for a reservation in the US (McCarty, 2013), or in conjunction with a surrounding nation, like the Maori in New Zealand (May, 2001). Aside from postcolonial and indigenous contexts, scholars have also studied national language policies in countries where English has become popular through more recent globalization, like South Korea (Park, 2009⁴). However, studies that focus more locally are less common, though of course there are exceptions, such as Schiffman (1996), which examines the linguistic cultures and language policies of three nations (France, India, and the US) as well as one region within each nation; and Tardy’s (2011) study of a university writing program. Baron (1990), Crawford

---

⁴ Interestingly, Park uses the word “local” in the title of his book, *The local construction of a global language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*, but it’s almost as a synonym for “national.” In other words, when he discusses the local, he often is referring to all of South Korea.
(1992), and Kibbee (2016) also address local policies in their histories of US language policy. Overall, though, there has still been scant research on local language policy in the US, especially in connection to the English-only movement. I now turn to the history of local language policy in the US, both to establish its ubiquity and to show how it emerged and why.

**History, pre–1890**

Language policy in the United States has always been primarily local, in all senses of the word. In terms of physical spaces, official policies have been most successful in classrooms, schools, workplaces, churches, cities, and counties, rather than states or the nation (Schmidt, 2000, p. 28). In terms of writing language policies, much of that work happens in the same communities that will later have to live with the effects, and “in reaction to local circumstances” (Baron, 1990, p. 185). In terms of discourse and ideology, US policymakers tend to value and highlight the local scale, either as a model for, a haven from, or an authentic counterpart to some larger scale. In other words, it is not as though people usually work locally, but frame their work as national, nor is it the other way around. Instead, US language policy is local all the way down, even as it is inevitably connected to other scales, too. At the same time, there have also been stretches and branches of US history with no official language policies, no matter the scale.

Nothing resembling the English-only movement existed in the US until the 19th century, and that term did not emerge until the late 20th century. There were precursors to English-only policies, of course: by the 18th century, some people in the US were aware of the Enlightenment theory of societal monolingualism as a path towards more efficient, rational communication (Bauman and Briggs, 2003), British ideologies about the English language and the law (Pennycook, 1998; Schiffman, 1996), and anti-German sentiments (Baron, 1990; Kibbee, 2016).
Furthermore, by the 19th century, most government discourse was already in English, and many immigrants, enslaved or formerly enslaved people, and indigenous people had already or were in the process of learning English, either under duress or for social or economic opportunities. These phenomena did not rise to the level of official English-only policy, however.

Until the late 1800s, multilingualism or monolingualism in a language other than English was common and unproblematic in education, journalism, publishing, religion, politics, and other aspects of life (Heath, 1977; Kloss, 1977). Prescriptivism regarding English was more likely to focus on distinguishing American English from British English, than on distinguishing English from other languages (Heath, 1977, p. 24). In universities, Latin and Greek were more prominent than English (Miller, 2011; Horner and Trimbur, 2002, p. 594). If there was any official language policy through the mid-1800s, it was to prevent or dissuade marginalized people from learning the most prestigious language varieties. For example, missionaries would often insist on learning indigenous languages to facilitate their evangelism, while trying to stop indigenous people from learning European languages (Heath, 1972). As late as the 1860s, American missionaries and teachers at the school that would later become the American University of Beirut were hesitant to use English as a medium of instruction, and instead “upheld the view that education should be conducted in vernacular Arabic” (Arnold, 2014, p. 280). The institution only shifted its language policy because Syrian students “demanded” more “exposure to the Western languages” in use by Americans and Europeans (p. 280). Of course, it was not only European-Americans creating US language policies. For example, within the Cherokee Tribe, new, community-driven policies and initiatives emerged in the 19th century to promote both Cherokee literacy (Cushman, 2011) and higher education in English (Legg, 2014). Language policy during this time was, then, laissez-faire, uneven, or, if it did exist in a consistent form, it was about making standardized forms of
language inaccessible, rather than mandatory. This approach was not unique to the US: in the British Empire, for example, many people in colonial governments only wanted colonial subjects to receive education in a regional language, such as Sanskrit in India (Pennycook, 1998).

**History, 1890–1924**

However, just as Macaulay’s *Minute on Indian Education* (1835) helped popularize the idea that more people could and should learn and use English in the British empire, US language policies also began to promote English, particularly during the span of 1890–1924 (Pavlenko, 2002). Eradicating indigenous languages became part of the mission of Native American boarding schools (Spack, 2002; Lomawaima and McCarty, 2006). In American colonies like the Philippines, US colonialism began to include English-only policies (Trimbur, 2006, p. 584).

Near the turn of the 20th century, as part of the Americanization movement, the descendants of earlier waves of European immigration began to criticize the language practices of newer waves of Southern and Eastern European immigrants, often on anti-Catholic or anti-Semitic grounds (Pavlenko, 2002; Bonfiglio, 2002), and to reject even more harshly the practices and even the existence of Asian immigrants and Asian Americans (Hoang, 2015, p. 10). English was becoming a marker of American identity for the first time, such that not even European Americans could pass as American, or even necessarily white, unless they used English only (Dayton-Wood, 2008). The sort of literal and figurative “borderland subjectivity” that groups like the francophone Acadians had previously enjoyed was becoming illegal (Peters, 2013, p. 578). Peters (2013) points to laws like Rhode Island’s 1922 Peck Act, which “required parochial schools to make English the primary language of instruction” (p. 570). The new value of English was so strong that even sign language and deaf people came under attack (Pavlenko, 2002, p.
176). By the start of World War I, the tenor and scope of US language policy had already changed significantly.

During World War I, the focus of language policy shifted from all immigrants and heritage languages towards Germans and German. Although German had once been “the most prestigious modern language” in the US, by 1917 that status had changed (Crawford, 2000, p. 21). During and even after World War I, city and county governments passed ordinances “prohibiting German instruction” (Pavlenko, 2002, p. 179) and “forbidding the use of German” more generally (Baron, 1990, p. 110). Aside from such governmental language policies, businesses, churches, and telephone communication also became more monolingual in English, through some combination of choice and outside pressure (Bailey, 2012, p. 151). These local language policies were not enforced for long after the War, as people stopped learning and using European heritage languages, immigration restrictions tightened, and the idea of English-only communities became taken for granted. Americanization was so successful that for the descendants of the European immigrants most affected, memories of these events have “been forgotten or repressed,” such that some “third- and fourth-generation descendants have come to assume that their grandparents and great-grandparents all willingly deserted their ancestral tongues” (Wiley, 1998, p. 236).

History, 1924–1980

Although the modern English-only movement may have seemed to “come out of nowhere in the 1980s” (Crawford, 2000, p. 4), there were actually several events that made having an official language seem feasible and desirable once again. Paradoxically, the main catalyst may have been a string of legal victories for language and literacy rights during the 1950s, 60s and
70s. Before this period, there had never been any federal support for languages other than
English (Baron, 1990, p. 87), but new laws like the Bilingual Education Act (1968) and the
amended Voting Rights Act (1975) inadvertently created an occasion for Americans to debate anew the appropriate role for language policy in their communities. In Miami, for example, “the first modern bilingual public school” opened in 1963 (Provenzo, 1990, p. xi) and a 1973 ordinance made Dade County officially bilingual and bicultural. Meanwhile, court decisions in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), MLK Children v. Ann Arbor (1979), and Lau v. Nichols (1974) suggested that students of all races and linguistic backgrounds should have access to an equal education, although those rulings were never completely put into practice. Schiffman (1996) notes that although Lau in particular was decided by the US Supreme Court (unlike the Ann Arbor case’s lower court decision), it did not include anything resembling Brown’s “with all deliberate speed” mandate, and other school districts therefore felt little need to implement the ruling (p. 270). At the university level, more colleges adopted open admissions policies, and in 1974 the Conference on College Composition and Communication declared “Students’ Right to their Own Language” (see Parks, 2000; Wible, 2013). Meanwhile, for working adults, laws like the Economic Opportunity Act and the Adult Education Act were redefining the meaning and purpose of literacy (Bannon, 2016). Rather than treat literacy as a general skill, a set of sociocultural practices, or a moral good, these laws defined literacy narrowly as “an individual’s ability to read and write in English” (italics added) and as a cure for “social and economic ills” (Bannon, 2016, p. 318). The paradoxical upshot was that English was legally becoming more associated with American identity and economic success, but there were also increased legal rights for people who used other languages.
Just at the moment that federal law stressed the value of English, then, it also forwarded the somewhat contradictory idea that people did not have to use English. What I perceive as pragmatism, fairness, or minor inconsistency in the law, others saw as a crisis of contradictions and undeserved handouts, especially given that the US students and citizens who might benefit the most from these new rights were not the European immigrants of a previous era, but rather people of color and immigrants from Asia and Latin America. Of course, 100 years ago, lumping all “European immigrants” together would have been impossible, but by the 1970s, the cultural memory of discrimination against Catholic, Jewish, German, Irish, Southern European, and Eastern European immigrants had started to fade. Some members of the English-only movement critique the fact that people who are not monolingual and/or literate in English have more legal rights than they would have had a century ago. While they are correct that this is the case, it is also true that such people face more linguistic discrimination and economic consequences as well.

Starting the English-Only Movement

While that historical narrative of people coming to the US, becoming monolingual, and then expecting others to do the same is important for many people who support English-only policies, it was not actually the motivating factor for the English-only movement’s founders. For example, the first county-level English-only policy in more than 50 years was the brainchild of Emmy Shafer, a multilingual (six languages, reportedly [Rimer, 1980]) woman who had immigrated from the Soviet Union to Miami. In addition to stressing her multilingualism, one article also described Shafer as “the ultimate immigrant,” and as someone who had learned
English within “six months,” and attained citizenship soon after (Rimer, 1980). She was not so much pro-English or pro-monolingualism as she was anti-Spanish.

In 1978, Shafer began trying to undo Dade County’s 1973 Bilingualism/Biculturalism Ordinance, because she was dismayed by the fact that the people she encountered at government offices, malls, and hospitals often used Spanish more than English (Crawford, 1992; Rimer, 1980; De Lama, 1980). By 1980, she had started the organization “United Citizens of Dade,” collected thousands of signatures, and gotten a measure onto the ballot. She had her personal attorney write up a draft of an English-only policy (Foy, 1980). Her measure passed, which resulted in an English-only ordinance that Crawford (2000) calls “arguably the most draconian language law in US history” (p. 26). Unlike most other modern government language policies, there were none of the typical exceptions for public health and safety, which meant that things like multilingual “hurricane warnings” were banned (p. 26). An even harsher element of the policy, bordering on vindictive, was that it was not just about saving time and money in the future: the government removed signs and other materials that had already been translated and printed (p. 26). Even Senator S.I. Hayakawa, the first sponsor of an Official English constitutional amendment, told a reporter, “I wouldn’t go that far myself” (Nazario, 1984, May 30). John Tanton, six months after founding U.S. English, asked one of his employees to contact Shafer for advice and for her mailing list (1983, July 7). Shafer’s local language policy is thus significant because it predated Hayakawa’s congressional bill and Hayakawa and John Tanton’s organization U.S. English by several years. Furthermore, both men looked to her as an example of a particularly intense policymaker. Finally, this case was notable because she was making a nationalist defense of English, rather than a local attack on Spanish. All of these facets emphasize how important yet complex local language policies are to this movement. Shafer’s
policy lasted 13 years, before the county government chose to repeal it in 1993 (Martin, 1993, May 19).

Like Shafer, Hayakawa was also an immigrant who wanted English to be the only official language, but unlike her, he had more of a background in linguistics and education. He was a Canadian-American of Japanese descent who worked as a semanticist for many years, and whose research crossed over into English and composition studies. In Applebee’s (1974) history of English as a discipline, he suggests that Hayakawa “was especially influential in bringing the term ‘semantics’ into popular parlance; through his work semantics became a topic in its own right in the English curriculum” (p. 157). This work included the book *Language in Thought and Action* (1939), as well as journal articles, like one published in *College Composition and Communication* on “Learning to Think and to Write” (1962). He later become the president of San Francisco State University and in 1977 a one-term US Senator for California. While in office, he introduced a bill to make English the official language, via constitutional amendment.

When Hayakawa’s career was winding down, he happened to meet a physician and activist named John Tanton, whose career was ramping up.

By the time Tanton and Hayakawa met, the former had become interested in language policy through his work in other social movements and activist organizations, going back to the 1950s. All of his earlier causes were about resource management and border control in some way, but it was not until 1980 that he started applying these concepts to the goal of preserving the English language in particular places. He began working on environmental conservation through local organizations in Petoskey, Michigan, as well as through chapters of the Audubon Society and Sierra Club (Tanton, 1976, November). Out of a belief that overpopulation was one of primary threats to the natural environment, in 1965 he opened a Planned Parenthood office in
Petoskey. In 1969, he wrote to a professor of medicine at the University of Michigan to inquire about the existence of “any legislation which would allow a court to order sterilization” of local women who were having children out of wedlock (1969, March 10). According to his CV, he started chairing a new Population Committee in the Sierra Club’s Mackinac chapter that year (Tanton, 1976, November). He went on to chair a similar Sierra Club committee at the national level in 1971 (Berry, 1971, March 24).

As his interest in population issues grew, he left his leadership roles in environmentalist organizations and devoted more time to a new organization, Zero Population Growth, starting in 1973 (Tanton, 1976, November). The confluence of environmentalism and eugenics may seem unusual in the 21st century, in a moment when the two are associated with very different segments of the political spectrum. However, during this period his set of interests was not uncommon (Robertson, 2012). Jonathan Franzen’s novel Freedom (2007) even features a Tanton-esque protagonist who is a staunchly environmentalist, “annually renewing Student-level member of Zero Population Growth” in college in the 1970s (p. 119), who later goes on to promote population control (p. 223). Well before Tanton was focusing on language at all, then, he was concerned with land use and ownership, and how to conserve limited resources, both of which would become important components of local language policy discourse.

Eventually, however, his focus started to diverge away from ZPG’s: while that organization primarily focused on worldwide sterilization and family planning initiatives, Tanton began to consider immigration to be the more problematic and more solvable source of new people in the United States. ZPG allowed Tanton to study the possibility of adding immigration reform to their agenda in the future, but their lack of enthusiasm for this project ultimately

---

5 The professor wrote back, and discouraged the practice of involuntary sterilization, while acknowledging that it was legal in some cases (Eliot, 1969, March 17).
spurred him to form the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) in 1978. In these early roles, Tanton was testing out some of the genres and strategies that he would later incorporate into the English-only movement. He once proposed a county ordinance that would ban mobile homes outside of designated areas (Tanton, 1974, June 14), for example, and under his leadership, FAIR introduced a fill-in-the-blank resolution template that businesses could use to express their disapproval of immigration (1985, April). Throughout this period, he had still been in private practice as an ophthalmologist, and only done activism on the side.

In 1980, however, he decided to take a nine-month-long “sabbatical” to work on activism full time, and it was during this time when he became interested in language policy. His plan was to move to Washington, D.C., work as a lobbyist for his causes, and tour the country to drum up additional supporters and donors (“Dr Tanton”, 1981, July). This was also the first year his archive includes writing about “bilingualism,” in a grant application for FAIR (1980, July 1), and about “language policy,” in a letter to a colleague about driver’s license tests in multiple languages (1980, November 5). This 1981–2 sabbatical was not originally focused on language, but three things happened that changed his trajectory. First, his children enrolled in public school in a Washington, D.C. suburb. An article in the Petoskey News-Review reported that the Tantons “had some experience with the problems immigration brings to a community as well. They lived in Arlington, Va., which has a heavy Vietnamese concentration and often received notices from [one daughter’s] school which were written in five languages” (Holmes-Greeley, 1982, July 27). He (and the Petoskey journalist, it seems) considered linguistic pluralism to be one of “the problems immigration brings to a community.” Elsewhere, Tanton referred to the D.C. area as “the urban wasteland” (1981, November 3). This sabbatical appears to have been his
first sustained experience in a multilingual, urban environment, and the experience was not a positive one.

Second, at work in D.C. and on lobbying and fundraising trips around the country, Tanton described meeting people who were not all that sympathetic to his anti-immigration lobbying, until the question of language came up. Through these conversations, he realized that English-only policies could be a way to drum up interest for his broader agenda. In one letter, for instance, he wrote

I travelled the country a good deal. I repeatedly ran into people who were uncertain about immigration, but were resolute in their feelings on the kindred issue of bilingualism. This ill-defined term means different things to different people. To some, it’s the drift toward division along language lines in our country, as manifested by extended instruction in many languages in the public schools. To others it’s the push for the provision of government services and documents in multiple languages, and ultimately, to the multilingual ballot. (1983, April 5)

In these situations, then, he gradually came to understand that many Americans were hesitant to enforce strict immigration laws, or to enact new ones, but they were much more ready to enforce and enact policies that would limit the use of the languages used by those immigrants, whether in “the public schools” or “the provision of government services and documents.” The fact that all these narratives involve multiple people, and not just Tanton coming up with the idea on his own, suggests that unlike his other causes (conservation, eugenics, immigration), he may have been less sure about language policy, both in terms of level of enthusiasm and confidence in what the right policy would be. He seems to have realized that while language was not his first

priority, other people considered it to be an important issue, and that such people could eventually be brought on board to his other causes.

Finally, during one of these business trips, he met S.I. Hayakawa on November 19, 1981 (Tanton, 1981, December 2). Initially, Tanton was interested in him for his mailing list: since Hayakawa had recently proposed an English Language Amendment, and since immigration had also been an issue during his term in the Senate, he had received lots of mail from people invested in those issues. In a memo to himself, for future reference, Tanton called this mailing list “a virtual goldmine” for activists and fundraising (1981, December 2). The next day after writing that memo, he wrote to his lawyer to ask if he could legally obtain that mailing list, but the lawyer replied that “There are ethical and election law problems in the way” (Zall, 1981, December 3). So, instead, Tanton proposed that he and Hayakawa could start a new organization together, and that they could collaborate in that way.

The planning process took a little more than a year, during which time Tanton came up with the name “U.S. English,” hired more people, decided that operations would happen in Petoskey, D.C., and San Francisco; and designed letterhead, a newsletter, pamphlets, and fundraising letters. He offered Hayakawa the position of “Honorary Chairman or Honorary President, whichever you prefer,” and assured him that either would come with “no official duties” (1982, June 9). Hayakawa became something of a figurehead; he would sign off on letters, and attend meetings, but it appears that he did not write or consult on most of those letters (Bricker, 1986, February 10), and one of Hayakawa’s employees complained about a “serious lack of communication” between the San Francisco offices (Hayakawa’s city) and the other branches (where Tanton spent more time) (Bricker, 1986, April 18).
Despite this disconnect, U.S. English’s first project was Proposition O, a successful 1983 San Francisco ballot measure that directed that the local government ask congress and the President to make ballots English-only (HoSang, 2010, p. 135; see also Woolard, 1989). U.S. English considered Proposition O to be a model for other parts of the U.S. Immediately after the proposition passed, Tanton wrote, “On to the state level now!” (1983, November 10). The following week, in another letter, he elaborated, by saying that “An isolated vote in San Francisco, if not picked up on and coordinated by a group with a larger perspective, will simply go nowhere. We are for example looking into the possibility of an initiative in Florida” (1983, November 16). In this model, local policies are a means, not an end; the point is to move up to higher scales. Tanton often quoted Justice Louis Brandeis’ description of states as laboratories of the nation (1983, April 26; HoSang, 2010, p. 130). Proposition O therefore fit Tanton’s notion that local policies were valuable as templates and test cases. In an attempt to formalize this process, U.S. English sought a “Coordinator to Secure County Chairmen,” although it is not clear whether the position ever came to fruition (Tanton, 1985, June 3). The U.S. English newsletter began to feature “the text of an ideal state level ELA,” with the intention of “invit[ing] members in states where it has not been introduced to contact their own state legislator and push it” (Tanton, 1985, March 15). Throughout the early years of U.S. English, the organization operated under the premise that language policy ideas would seem more authentic if they seemed to come from the grassroots, rather than from them.

Hayakawa, for his part, suggested to a resident of Monterey Park, California, that the town should pass an official language ordinance. Crawford (1992) interviewed that resident, Frank Arcuri, and he describes him as a man who already “relished combat on numerous local issues,” but who had not heard about the “new” idea of official language laws before 1985 (p. 7).
There the focus was not so much on ballots, but on signs in languages other than English, especially Chinese (Fong, 1994; Saito, 1998). While the details were different in Monterey Park and San Francisco, the pattern was the same: someone from U.S. English would suggest a local English-only law or a proposition, but then leave it to the people in that community to be the most visible sponsors.

Aside from donors, politicians, and activists like Frank Arcuri, the group U.S. English most wanted to appeal to during this time was English teachers and other language professionals (speech pathologists, writers, etc.). Tanton and Hayakawa either personally solicited support from, or asked their colleagues to contact, the following organizations and experts:

- National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) (Bikales, 1982, March 15)
- American Society of Geolinguistics (Bikales, 1982, March 15)
- Modern Language Association (Bikales, 1982, March 15)
- National Retired Teachers Association (Tanton, 1984, February 29)
- National School Board Association (Tanton, 1984, November 25)
- Conference on College Composition and Communication (Tanton, 1983, March 16)8
- Clarence Barnhart, dictionary editor and lexicographer (Bikales, 1982, March 15)
- Richard Rodriguez, writer (Tanton, 1982, April 22)

---

7 The policy situation in Monterey Park continues to change. The law was revised in 1989 (Horton and Calderon, 2010), and then reconsidered again in 2013. The most recent proposal was to require public signs to merely be in the Latin alphabet, rather than in the English language, but it was tabled indefinitely (Vuong, 2013, December 5).

8 Tanton did not actually mention CCCC, but did mention that Hayakawa planned to speak to “a convention of the National Council of Teachers of English” on March 17, 1983, which matches with the dates of that year’s CCCC convention, not parent organization NCTE’s fall conference.
• William Lutz, editor of the NCTE journal *Doublespeak* (Tanton, 1982, November 24)

• Ellis B. Page, Educational Testing Center (ETS), expert on computer-graded essay assessments (Tanton, 1982, November 26)

• Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers union (Tanton, 1984, February 9)

U.S. English also started publishing books by educators and linguists. For example, U.S. English published David Crystal’s book *English: The global language* (1996), which Crystal later went on to adapt into *English as a global language* for Cambridge University Press (1997). While these appeals did work in some individual cases, I have found little evidence of support from professional organizations. For example, Tanton once wrote back to an interested speech pathologist, and exclaimed, “What a boost to get your letter! It’s great to know there are people out there who are sympathetic.” He went on to ask her to “help in passing the word amongst your fellow speech pathologists and others who might be supportive,” but I never found any evidence that this request succeeded (1982, December 1). Furthermore, none of U.S. English’s books still seem to be in print.

*Debate over the English-Only Movement*

On the contrary, language and literacy organizations were actually more likely to denounce rather than support the English-only movement. The organizations that passed anti-English-only resolutions or position statements included MLA (1986), NCTE (1986), the Linguistic Society of America (1986), the Conference on College Composition and Communication (1988/1992/2015), Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
(1987/2000/2005), the American Psychology Association (1991), and the American Association for Applied Linguistics (1996). During this period, NCTE also published several critical edited collections, with titles like *Not Only English: Affirming America’s Multilingual Heritage* (Daniels, 1990), and *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement* (Gonzalez & Melis, 2001). Although the historical archive is not exhaustive, my sense is that while U.S. English did have some luck with practitioners, they had very little with those practitioners’ organizations or leaders. Furthermore, researchers in those fields were beginning to publish on more critical theories of Anglophone language policy more generally. For example, applied linguists began arguing that language policy was more about imagining problems (Ruiz, 1984), creating inequality (Tollefson, 1991), and perpetuating imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) than about fostering communication. Similar arguments had been made before about the dynamics between Standard English and African American Vernacular English (Labov, 1972; Smitherman, 1977), but not to the same extent about the relationship between English and other languages.

These gaps, between different camps in English, and between U.S. English’s expectations and reality, were part of a larger ongoing debate over the proper relationship between teaching English and promoting English. When CCCC published its Students’ Right to their Own Language policy in 1974, for example, the statement was met with “confusion and even criticism” from people who thought students needed to only learn to use standard English (Wible, 2013, p. 1). In other words, most English and writing teachers reacted to that progressive policy with indifference, skepticism, or scorn. The same year that U.S. English launched, *CCC* published an article called “IQ and Standard English,” which posited a link between African American Vernacular English and lower intelligence (Farrell, 1983). More broadly, writing
teachers had been “enshrining privileged varieties of English” over other ways of communicating (Jordan, 2012, p. 5) and “assum[ing]” a “norm” of “a monolingual, native-English speaking writer writing only in English to an audience of English-only readers” (Horner, 2010, p. 1) for decades. English classrooms were not always purely English-only, but when other languages did come up, they were often confined to readings, like Anzaldua’s “Wild Tongue” (Lu, 1994, p. 445). Meanwhile, students’ writing, class discussions, and sources for research remained overwhelmingly monolingual (Horner, NeCamp, and Donahue, 2011, p. 291; Guerra, 2016). Ruecker (2015) finds that the faculty in his study of how students transition from high school to college still had “strong English-only preferences” that alienated some of their multilingual students (pp. 163–164), and that, more generally, many in the field do not consider the English-only movement their problem, or even necessarily a problem at all (p. 4). Given a profession where monolingual discourse seemed and can still seem “inevitable” (Horner and Trimbur, 2002, p. 594), it is easy to understand why U.S. English thought English teachers might become their base.

In writing against the English-only movement, CCCC in particular tried to appease all its stakeholders. The resulting National Language Policy (1988) did not question the necessity of learning and using English, but also called for Americans to become more multilingual, not less. Aside from this conciliatory stance, the most notable feature of CCCC’s approach is the way it addresses U.S. English’s strategy of connecting different scales. Specifically, although CCCC accurately predicted that the movement would operate locally, regionally, and nationally, with some interconnections, the policy’s authors assumed that the operative process would be one of trickling down, when the opposite was actually more prevalent. For example, in a 1988 fact sheet to accompany the NLP, members of the Language Policy Committee suggest that a constitutional
amendment could “open the door for federal, state, and local governments to pass laws, ordinances, and policies eliminating a variety of legally sanctioned services to non-English speaking minorities.” In fact, it was the other way around: it was local policies that would open the door for more local, state, and national proposals.

*English-Only Organizations’ Relationship to Local Policymakers*

The people making and living with those policies, however, did not always see themselves as in service to his broader mission, nor did they always adhere to Tanton’s playbook. As the modern English-only movement became more popular, it became more difficult for U.S. English to steer the decision-making of local governments. Tanton decided against encouraging local chapters of his organizations, because they seemed too “unmanag[able]” (1985, February 6). Similarly, when he began working with English-only activists in Florida (some of whom had also worked with Emmy Shafer, described above), he took great pains to try to influence them, but also to distance himself from them, such that if they did anything embarrassing he would not share the blame. For example, after one of these activists, Robert Melby, did an NBC television interview with Bryant Gumbel to promote an English-only policy, Tanton wrote him a long letter with suggested talking points and strategies, since he had found Melby’s performance too angry and abrasive. He encouraged Melby to adopt a calmer tone, make fewer blunt pronouncements, and to ask more rhetorical questions. Tanton ended the letter by reminding Melby that “we should make every effort to keep the FEC [Florida English Campaign] and U.S. English separate in people’s minds and in fact. No one should speak for U.S. English or the Florida English campaign who has not been […] found able to perform in front of the media” (1985, February 7). This kind of exchange, in which English-only
organizations and local activists would collaborate, but not necessarily agree, or want to advertise that collaboration, became a common feature of English-only campaigns.

Despite Tanton’s worries about wild cards at the local level, this coordination strategy actually worked fairly smoothly. Ironically, the biggest obstacle to the movement came from Tanton himself, not from any of the local policymakers: in 1988, he officially left U.S. English after a memo leaked in which he had written, among other things, “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?” (Tanton, 1986). After leaving U. S. English, Tanton went on to co-found ProEnglish in 1994. U.S. English has continued to operate, and the two organizations continue to do very similar kinds of work, even if they are officially separate entities.

Before and after ProEnglish started, in the 1980s and through the 1990s, several states and dozens of cities and counties considered or passed English-only legislation. Some of these governments had U.S. English’s assistance, some had help from other emerging English-only organizations like English First and, later, ProEnglish, while some seem to have based their policies merely on word of mouth or news coverage. Geographically, there is no clear-cut pattern, but generally these policies emerged in conservative areas of liberal states, like the wealthy suburbs of Chicago, rural counties in Wisconsin, towns in Eastern Washington, and a mill town in Massachusetts. In states that already had or were making English the official language, city and county policies may not have seemed as necessary (there has been only one in Arizona, for example). In a quantitative study of local anti-immigrant policies between 1990-2000, Hopkins (2010) includes English-only policies in this category, and finds that they tend to appear in communities that are “wealthier,” “larger,” with a higher percentage of immigrant residents (Hopkins, 2010, p. 54). At the same time, these communities are also more likely to
have had “relative declines in household income from 1990 to 2000” (Hopkins, 2010, p. 54). So, while there are exceptions, the paradigmatic place for these policies is a red pocket in a blue state that used to be wealthy with few immigrants, and recently became slightly less wealthy and more ethnically diverse.

English-only organizations’ process for working with local governments seems to have been relatively ad hoc until 2000, when ProEnglish put a fill-in-the-blank policy template on their website for the first time. Although this template is not explicitly dated, it does mention the year 2000, as well as “Vice President Gore” and “President Clinton,” which suggests that it was written before the November 2000 election. In terms of form, this sample policy is one page long, with eight “Whereas…” clauses, a resolution paragraph, and a paragraph directing that a copy be sent to several other government entities (Figure 2). In contrast to the policies in Maryland, which are based on a different template (see Chapter 3), this one is clearly oriented outward and upward: it explicitly criticizes “the Department of Education,” “federally coerced bilingual education,” “statehood for territories” that use other languages (Puerto Rico, etc.), and it calls for copies to be sent to the state County Association, state representatives, senators, the state’s governors, members of congress, the Speaker of the House, and, most strikingly, Trent Lott, Al Gore, Bill Clinton, and all the living former Presidents and Vice Presidents. At this time, then, ProEnglish still viewed the local as a means to a more nationalist end, even if their members did not necessarily agree. While this model may not have been taken up widely, it did establish the practice of publishing and circulating language policy templates online in the US, and laid the groundwork for the policies I examine in the chapters to come.
RESOLUTION RE: THE LANGUAGE OF GOVERNMENT

RESOLUTION #__________
COUNTY OF ______________
STATE OF ______________

WHEREAS, we celebrate and welcome the cultural contributions of all people of the United States; and

WHEREAS, in the course of our history, the English language has been the common bond that, for more than two centuries, has held together our diverse citizenry, enabling us to become a cohesive and united nation; and

WHEREAS, English is the most common language spoken in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the use of multiple versions of government documents and services in several languages leads to misunderstandings due to mistranslation, represents an inefficient use of taxpayers' money, and promotes a sense of separation among residents; and

WHEREAS, as of January 1, 2000, 94 counties, 50 cities, and 25 States have endorsed English as their official and common language of government; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of an official language enhances unity, both locally and nationally, and honors our ancestors from all lands who learned English and immigrants today who continue that tradition; and

WHEREAS, an official language of government in no way interferes with any individual's right to maintain, use and develop other language skills; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education promotes language-based segregation in our schools and disincentives to the learning of English;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the [Name of governing body] hereby adopts English as its official language. Meetings must be conducted in English, official acts and records must be printed and maintained in English. We support abolishing federally coerced bilingual education. We oppose statehood for any territory that has not established English as its sole official language of government at least 10 years prior to petitioning for admission into the United States or whose majority of residents are not fluent in English.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Clerk is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the ____________Association of Counties, State Representative ____________, State Senator ____________, Governor ____________, U.S. Representative ____________, Speaker of the House ____________, U.S. Senators ____________, and Senate Majority Leader Lott, Vice President Gore, President Clinton, former Presidents Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush, and former Vice Presidents Mondale and Quayle.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS _____DAY OF ____, 2000.

Figure 2. ProEnglish’s template from 2000. Key features include the explicit critiques of and appeals to parts of the state and federal government, which are not at all present after 2006. This screenshot is from an Internet Archive version of the site from 2001.
A Note on Terminology

There are several terms for policies that make English the only official language. The two most common contemporary terms are “English-Only” and “Official English.” I have heard and read participants using both, and I use both in my own work. Some publications have tried to use both equally, as in a 1988 National Education Association informational booklet that uses “Official English/English Only” throughout. More commonly, though, each is associated with different times, genres, registers, organizations, and ideologies. Tanton started using the phrase “English only” in the 1980s but at first it was in an unmarked way, and not as a stand-alone concept. For example, in a 1983 letter, he wrote, “We feel bi-lingual education should be returned to a short-term transitional role, and that ballots should be produced in English only” (October 18). When he and his colleagues wanted to use a term for their work, at least in their archived writing, they used “the English language movement” or “language policy.” However, more recently, people who want to make English the official language have favored “Official English” because it sounds less exclusionary and therefore less objectionable. For example, since at least 2004, ProEnglish’s website has attempted to persuade people not to use the term “English Only” (Figure 3).

Figure 3. ProEnglish had this graphic posted on their website beginning in 2004, and has a similar notice on their website, as of 2016.

---

9 See the Internet Archive’s copy of the website from mid-2004: https://web.archive.org/web/20040824042645/http://www.proenglish.org/
Similarly, when I met with ProEnglish’s Executive Director in 2015, he took a moment to annotate my use of “English Only” by writing in “Official English” underneath (Figure 4), before signing his name at the bottom of the page. Nevertheless, my sense is that “English-only” remains the most common term, particularly in academic discourse and among people who are critical of these policies. In all these cases, the issue is not intelligibility—it is difficult to imagine a scenario where someone is familiar with “Official English” but has no idea what “English Only” means—but, instead, situation and stance.

Figure 4. Section of interview consent form, annotated by Robert Vandervoort, of the organization ProEnglish. This annotation is an example of a preference for the phrase “Official English” over “English Only.”

Chapter Summaries

The second chapter, “Methodology and Methods,” details this project’s ethnographic discourse analysis approach, which entails not just analyzing official documents but also collecting a wider range of artifacts and conducting interviews in order to see how people plan, write, and deliberate over policies. I describe how I selected four field sites, each of which is a county that passed, considered, or repealed an English-only law between 2008–2015. During fieldwork in 2015, I interviewed 24 participants; collected policy texts and other government documents, footage of government meetings, and digital media; took photographs; and wrote field notes. Because the modern English-only movement emerged in the 1980s, my data also includes archival letters, memos, and other documents from three collections: English-only activist John Tanton’s papers at the University of Michigan, former Senator Paul Simon’s papers.
at Southern Illinois University, and the National Council of Teachers of English archives at Illinois. I also discuss procedures for transcription (video and audio), before concluding with reflections on my own reflexivity as a researcher, and a discussion of the study’s limitations.

Chapter 3, “Networked Localism,” uses actor-network theory to examine how people write and circulate local language policies. I argue that while policymakers act locally, they also draw on broader networks of colleagues, source material, and talking points. I structure the chapter around the histories of five networked texts: the organization ProEnglish’s 2006 policy template and English-only laws that were proposed or passed in Frederick, Carroll, Anne Arundel, and Queen Anne’s Counties in 2012 or 2013 in Maryland. These ordinances were all influenced by ProEnglish’s template to some extent, yet were also tailored by local politicians and lawyers to fit their particular situations and goals. Ultimately, three of these campaigns succeeded, one failed, and one passed but was later repealed. I conclude by arguing that it is critical to recognize both the networked localism of the English-only movement, and the ways that local conditions and actions figure into policy writing more broadly.

The English-only movement’s views on language are just as complex and varied as its writing practices. In Chapter 4, “Upscaling and Downscaling,” I argue that within the movement, there is no consistent commitment to a “one nation-one language” ideal. Instead, members flexibly align English with or against the local, the regional, the national, the transnational, and the global. In order to analyze when, how, and why people shift their stances towards different scales, I extend Blommaert’s (2010) analysis of scale jumping to include not just “upscaling” but also downscaling, and show how people use downscaling on its own, complementary upscaling and downscaling, and, occasionally, dissonant upscaling and downscaling. While Blommaert equates larger scales with greater authority, I suggest that scale jumping in either direction can be
an attempt to gain authority: English can seem valuable as a universal voice from nowhere in particular, or as a voice from some very specific place. The local scale, I conclude, must be understood not just as a material phenomenon or an established idea, but also as an ideological, discursive concept that is constantly open to further entrenchment or renegotiation.

In the fifth chapter, “Resisting and Rewriting,” I turn my attention to the question of how people protest the English-only movement. Repealing local English-only laws is quite rare in the US, because the underlying ideologies remain so popular and the policies become so ingrained. Nevertheless, ten of my participants were involved in a successful campaign to repeal Frederick, Maryland’s ordinance in 2015. They used four main discourse strategies to argue for undoing their community’s English-only policy, each of which emerged from a particular orientation towards language: flipping the economics script, linking language to race, questioning the nature of English, and highlighting the role of collective action in their work. This campaign thus offers a model for future language advocacy, by showing the possibilities of meshing multilingual, translingual, and raciolinguistic orientations towards language.

In the conclusion, I address the implications of the study for future work on writing practices, local language and literacy, and language policy and ideology. Ultimately, this dissertation opens up the worlds of policymaking, prescriptivism, and activism to more situated, discursive analysis, and the field of writing studies to a kind of writing that has significantly shaped American identity, education, and citizenship.
Chapter 2  
Methodology and Methods

The methodology driving this study of local language policy is one of ethnographic discourse analysis. In this chapter, I will start from the premise that in order to understand how people create meaning, effect change, and relate to one another, it is crucial to analyze how they use signs, including written and spoken language as well as other ways of communicating. In this framework, language is not a system or an object, but rather a situated, semiotic activity. Furthermore, I will argue that it is important to investigate not just discourse as an artifact, but also how people develop and negotiate their perspectives on that discourse. For the purposes of this study, that means prioritizing methods that allow me to trace how a range of people write and otherwise shape the meaning of local language policies over time, both from their points of view and from mine. In other words, I consider the meaning of language policies to be emergent, fluid, and complex, rather than stable and straightforward. In this chapter, I describe this methodology in more detail, before turning to a discussion of methods. Specifically, I discuss how I collected data through digital and archival research, fieldwork, and interviews; as well as how I transcribed data and synthesized these different methods. I conclude by reflecting on my own roles as a researcher and addressing the limitations of the study. Because each body chapter involved its own units of analysis and questions, I discuss data analysis in more detail in the chapters to come.

Ethnographic Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis

Any analysis of “discourse” first must grapple with which of the varied meanings of discourse are in play. I approach discourse as dialogic and indexical, and in this section I explain
this approach and how it differs from other schools, particularly critical discourse analysis. To begin, although discourse analysis can and should focus on a number of different features, the fundamental unit of analysis is Bakhtin’s (1981) concept of utterance. What distinguishes utterances is that they are not formal features, like sentences (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 73), nor are they abstractions, like an entire language. Instead, they are stretches of semiosis that are historically and socially situated, constitutive of genres, and defined in relation to other utterances. Specifically, utterances are dialogic (p. 71), both in the sense that they respond to prior utterances and invite future ones (p. 95), and in the sense that even a single utterance is internally dialogic. By internally dialogic, I refer to the way that utterances are at once historical and creative (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 272). While Bakhtin’s theory of discourse does highlight opportunities for appropriation and improvisation, he also draws attention to the fact that some people, in some situations, have an easier time doing so than others: “many words stubbornly resist, others remain alien, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them and who now speaks them; […] it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker” (1981, p. 294). Furthermore, he identifies both “centripetal,” or standardizing, and “centrifugal,” or decentralizing, forces at work in all discourse (1981, p. 272). In this framework, then, the question is not whether some stretch of discourse is part of longer communicative chains, or whether it is implicated in history and ideology, but how.

Because discourse is dialogic, it is difficult to answer such questions without examining these chains of utterances (rather than an individual utterance in isolation). That could entail anything from analyzing interview answers in relation to the interviewer’s questions, or a piece of writing in relation to the other texts it is conversation with, or multiple interconnected events over time. At the same time, Boyd and Markarian (2015) critique the impulse to reduce the
concept of dialogism down to actual dialogue. As they argue, it is not as though discourse is only
dialogic if it takes the “interactional form” of a back-and-forth exchange between two parties (p. 272). In Bakhtin’s framework, it is more about how all discourse is a response to and
reappropriation of prior discourse, and that it anticipates response and uptake in return.

And yet, because it is neither possible nor even really desirable to pursue all these
“dialogic threads” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 276), discourse-based methodologies have to address how
to determine what threads are most relevant. Cicourel (1980) argued, presciently, that “deciding
what constitutes the broader context of relevance becomes pivotal for any analysis of discourse,
but how we choose this broader context, the levels of predication involved, and the limits of the
broader context is not always apparent” in existing schools of discourse analysis (p. 114).
Around the same time Cicourel was writing, however, Peirce’s (1897) concept of indexicality
was being taken up as a new way for discourse analysts to navigate these questions of meaning
and context, particularly in linguistic anthropology (Silverstein, 1979).

Peirce (1897) first proposed the index as the semiotic process in which signs point to
meaning in context. In other words, the meaning of signs does not just stem from some
commonly understood definition, or from some iconic resemblance to its object (Peirce, 1897, p.
107). Instead, as Wortham and Reyes (2015) argue in Discourse Analysis Beyond the Speech
Event, signs indexically “presuppose or create aspects of context” (p. 12). Unlike in Saussure’s
(1959) version of semiotics, meaning is not created out of two entities (signifier and signified)
(p. 67), but out of three, with the third being the “interpretants” in people’s minds at the time
(Peirce, 1897, p. 99). This “triadic account” of semiosis recognizes the dynamic and situated
nature of meaning-making (Prior, 2014b, p. 162). In this framework, it is not about whether
interlocutors know the same language (and therefore know the same set of signs), but about how
they negotiate the meaning of signs in interaction. These signs do not have to be linguistic, per se, but can include other modes of communication (Prior and Hengst, 2010). In this framework, the goal of discourse analysis is to trace what meanings are being presupposed and created (Silverstein, 2003), and by whom, and how those meanings evolve, and to what ends. So, an utterance that is part of long chains of utterances might presuppose some parts of those histories more than others, and might also invite some interpretations more than others, but there is no one definitive meaning. Instead, there are just multiple utterances, and multiple perspectives. At the same time, it is important to examine how some utterances get taken up more than others, and some perspectives become more pervasive than others.

***

I have gone into some detail about my approach to discourse analysis, precisely because this approach is not the most prominent one within writing studies. In 2014, for example, at a meal with a visiting scholar and other graduate students, the visitor made the customary gesture of asking everyone what their research interests were. When it was my turn, I included “discourse analysis” in my list of interests. They responded with something along the lines of, “Oh, I use CDA, too!” I realized at that point that I needed to decide on a more specific term for what I do.

That visiting scholar was not alone in their conflation of discourse analysis with CDA. In a special issue of CCC on “Research Methodologies,” Huckin, Andrus, and Clary Lemon (2012) argue for Critical Discourse Analysis as a way to “explicate abuses of power,” particularly in large swaths of text (p. 107). As in the interaction described above, the article includes no acknowledgment that CDA is just one possible approach to discourse analysis. This gap is especially surprising since elsewhere, Andrus (2009, 2015) draws heavily on concepts from
linguistic anthropology like entextualization and language ideologies. Even when she does 
mention CDA in her individual work, Andrus (2015) does not completely align with it: for 
example, she titles one of the sections in her introduction “(Critical) Discourse Analysis,” 
parentheses and all (p. 15). The problem with CDA is not just that it is limited, but that it is 
actually antithetical to my work in many ways. Blommaert (2005) details some of these issues: 
A lot of a priori contextualisation goes on in work qualified as CDA which I find 
objectionable. Thus, in much CDA work, a priori statements on power relations are being 
used as perspectives on discourse (e.g. ’power is bad’, ‘politicians are manipulators’, 
‘media are ideology-reproducing machines’), and social-theoretical concepts are being 
used in off-hand and seemingly self-evident ways (e.g. ’power’, ‘institutions’, also ‘the 
leading groups in society’, ‘business’, and so on). This leads to highly simplified models 
of social structures and patterns of action. (p. 51)

. The task for the Critical Discourse Analysis becomes uncovering hidden meaning, often 
through only examining isolated, finished texts; rather than examining how people actually 
negotiate meaning through ongoing chains of discursive events.

Ethnography

In lieu of Critical Discourse Analysis, I draw on another methodology, ethnography, that 
is more amenable to studying discourse in all its complexity and from more than one angle. 
Sheridan (2012) argues that what makes ethnography “distinctive” and relevant to writing studies 
is 
its orientation to understanding the rich visible and seemingly invisible networks 
influencing the participants in the study. Through long-term research, ethnography
highlights the impact of these networks; in the process, ethnography examines perspectives that are often misunderstood, underdeveloped, or occluded in popular understandings of an issue. (p. 73)

This definition of ethnography includes several elements that I combine with discourse analysis, including a focus on “networks,” on both the “visible and [the] seemingly invisible,” and on a variety of “perspectives.” Blommaert and Jie (2010) define ethnography even more bluntly, as “the opposite” of “simplification,” and as a methodology that treats “reality” as “kaleidoscopic, complex and complicated, often a patchwork of overlapping activities” (p. 11). While I view ethnography as a methodology and a form of “deep theorizing” (Lillis, 2008), and not a method, there are certain practices that traditionally accompany ethnographic research, including attending to etic and emic perspectives, triangulating multiple data sources, and engaging in sustained, long-term research (McCarty, 2011).

Taking an ethnographic approach to research on writing has become increasingly common (Bishop, 1999; Heath and Street, 2008; Sheridan, 2012). However, this work falls under several different banners, each with slightly different connotations. I prefer the term “Ethnographic Discourse Analysis” over others for two reasons. First, it can include, or even center writing, while also not being limited to writing. In taking this stance, I am not suggesting that writing is easily separable from other activities: “writing does not stand alone” (Prior, 1998, p. xi). Rather, I come at the issue from the other direction, in that there is discourse that is relevant to my project, but is only ever-so-tenuously connected to literacy, like Bill Simmons’ comment that people in his county are well-spoken (Chapter 3), or Hayden Duke’s description of the federal government as inept (Chapter 4), or a protester pouring paint on Roger Taney’s statue (Chapter 5). Thus, ethnographic discourse analysis is more capacious than methodologies like
Lillis and Curry’s (2010) “text-based ethnography” and Swales’ (2013) “textography.” At the same time, it avoids the connotations of approaches that rarely take writing into account, like “rhetorical ethnography” (Cintron, 1997; Lindquist, 2002) and sociolinguistics (cf. Lillis, 2013). Second, this methodology has the potential to be more transdisciplinary and transnational than terms like “linguistic anthropology,” which is associated with a particular discipline and is “a largely American intellectual tradition,” or “linguistic ethnography,” which is associated more with Europe (Bucholtz and Hall, 2008, p. 402). To summarize, ethnographic discourse analysis has the advantages of signaling its difference from CDA, including but not limiting itself to writing, and not being tied to any one discipline or region. I turn now to the study’s methods, beginning with how I collected digital discourse.

**Digital Research**

The first kind of data I collected was publicly available, online writing and video. Because contemporary language policy campaigns tend to be sources of controversy and matters of public record, they have a significant online presence. This discourse includes government records, organizations’ websites, news coverage, and social media. Unlike the fieldwork and archival research, which took place over a few months in 2015–2016, this part of data collection lasted from 2011–2017, and sparked many of the questions driving this project.

In terms of government records, I collected rough and final drafts of policies, meeting minutes and agendas, budget documents, and press releases. I also watched, took notes on, took screenshots of, and transcribed videos of government meetings and hearings. Unlike the interviews, I did not record these videos myself; they are filmed and shown on local television, and posted as streaming videos on local governments’ websites. Although each government
operates in its own way, in a typical scenario, one person would float the idea of an English-only policy at a meeting, then the rest of the council or board would spend a half hour discussing and revising a draft at another meeting the next month, then there would be a 2–3 hour public hearing after another month, and then a final deliberation and vote soon after. So, there is a significant amount of public data for each campaign. In cases where a key file was not available on a government’s website, I sent a request over email, or I used the Internet Archive to locate it on an older version of the website. The non-profit Internet Archive (at http://archive.org) does not pinpoint when a web site or a version of a site first appears online, but its automated web crawler has periodically collected and archived snapshots of public websites since 1996. So, this tool can be used both to find older versions of sites, and to approximate when an older version was the current one. I took a similar approach to studying the websites of ProEnglish and U.S. English, in that I downloaded files, took screenshots, and used the Internet Archive.

I also collected relevant news articles and social media posts. Because my focus is on policymakers and activists, rather than on the general public’s opinions or impressions, per se, I used these sources sparingly. In other words, while there have been illuminating studies of language policy discourse in newspaper articles (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2008; Tardy, 2009) and online comments sections (Marlow, 2015), that was not my aim. Rather, I generally focused on articles that were by or about my participants. However, there were also moments when I analyzed a text from news or social media in its own right. For example, I started to conceptualize Chapter 4 after reading a Frederick News-Post editorial (2012, February 26) about the English-only movement’s “conflicting messages,” and I first came across the Human Relations Commission’s Resolution on Facebook (Chapter 5). Finally, media discourse played a
more important role in my analysis of people who did not participate in interviews, but whose discourse had appeared in online venues in the past.

To conclude this section, I want to briefly discuss the role of an undergraduate research assistant during this phase. In contrast to the more solitary nature of the archival and human subjects research, this part of the process was more collaborative. During Spring 2016, through a grant from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign’s Undergraduate Research Apprenticeship Program, Shelby Gordon located many of the news articles and video segments that I later included in my analysis. She was particularly instrumental in finding examples of local language policies outside Maryland, and in collecting news sources for Chapter 5.

Archival Research

As I was collecting public and digital materials, I also visited three university archives. I anticipated finding distinctions between contemporary and more historical US language policies, and hoped to be able to identify the moment of what I was then thinking of as “the local turn” (i.e., some moment of transition from national to local-level English-only activity). However, I gradually realized that my assumptions had been wrong, and that this archive was going to function more as a throughline than an exception to the rest of my research. In this section, I discuss how archival methods fit into my methodology of ethnographic discourse analysis, then turn to the details of how I selected my archives, how these archives are organized and connected, and how I selected and analyzed particular archival documents.
Ethnographic Discourse Analysis and Archives

Ethnographic research, whether discourse-focused or not, does not usually incorporate archival research, despite the fact that archival materials readily lend themselves to two of the key components of ethnography: foregrounding people’s perspectives on their own activities, and triangulating multiple kinds of data. Part of the reason why is that the kinds of people whose papers make it into archives, and the kinds of people ethnographers study can be different: archives lean towards the mainstream, the official, and the historical, while ethnography often focuses on the marginalized, the unofficial, and the contemporary. These distinctions about what counts as mainstream, official, and historical are ideological and fluid, of course, but I refer here to the perspectives of professional archivists who only solicit and accept certain collections.

Another reason why archival methods may be rare in ethnographic research is that archives are almost by definition comprised of written texts, while, as I discussed above, ethnography tends to focus more on talk (whether observed in the field or elicited in interviews).

Combining archival methods with discourse analysis is more common, especially within historical and critical discourse analysis. At the same time, some of the same divides exist between history/the present, and writing/talk. The organization of Wortham and Reyes’ (2015) *Discourse Analysis beyond the Speech Event* reflects some of these tenuous relationships. The book’s chapters revolve around three areas of discourse analysis: “ethnographic data,” “archival data,” and “new media data.” On one hand, this organizational scheme makes it seem as though each topic is distinct from the others, as though ethnography is a method rather than a methodology, and as though there is no such thing as new media ethnography (Black, 2008), or digital archives (Enoch and VanHaitsma, 2015), or historical ethnography (Inoue, 2006). On the other hand, the fact that these three approaches all appear in the same discourse analysis methods...
book suggests that there is a common thread. Indeed, Wortham and Reyes (2015) include a lengthy discussion of Inoue’s (2006) work on Japanese women’s language from the 19th century into the present. The common thread is a concern for how people use language “beyond the speech event,” over longer periods of time and in more kinds of interactions. Within writing studies, a number of ethnographic studies have taken a similar approach to including archives, particularly in studies of phenomena that involve multiple people over several decades: institutions and writing programs (Lamos, 2011), organizations (Wible, 2013), and language shift (Prendergast, 2008; Cushman, 2011). As in these studies, I consider archival research to be fully compatible with other methods. At the same time, archives do pose some particular challenges and opportunities, which I turn to in the next sections.

*John Tanton’s Papers*

The main archive I examined was John Tanton’s papers at the Bentley Historical Library at the University of Michigan. At the time of my visit in 2015, the collection included materials from the 1950s through 2013. In contrast to collections that are donated all at once around the end of someone’s life, Tanton has been curating his own archive since at least 1982. In a letter from that year, he wrote, “my papers have been spoken for by the University of Michigan,” and encouraged his addressee to consider donating his own papers (Tanton, 1982, February 22). There are also several letters in the archive between Tanton, his long-time employee Kathy Bricker, and a Bentley librarian named Kenneth Scheffel. For example, in one letter, Bricker informed Scheffel that they were about to send copies of Tanton’s correspondence from the past few years (1984, July 30), and in another from the following month, she confirmed that another shipment of five boxes was forthcoming (1984, August 28). On the other hand, Tanton did not
donate everything: Bricker dismissed some things as being “of no historic interest!” (1984, August 28), and Tanton wrote that there were certain things he would only donate after “I shuffle on” (1991, March 4). So, like any archive, this one is not a transparent window into someone’s life and work, but rather a carefully cultivated collection that foregrounds some things more than others.

To add another layer of complexity, after an unflattering memo from the archive was leaked to the press in 1988, Tanton decided to place about half of the collection under an embargo until 2035. Since then, he continued to donate materials, including correspondence through 2006, but they are not accessible. In addition to correspondence since 1991, the official folders for U.S., Inc. (the umbrella organization that includes U.S. English) were included in the embargo. As a result, my analysis of Tanton’s work on language policy relied heavily on older and more indirect evidence than if the collection were completely publicly accessible.

I focused most on four overlapping slices of this archive: early correspondence, notes for a memoir, papers from anti-immigration organizations, and pieces of scratch paper. First, because Tanton started organizing against immigration in the 1970s, and for English as the official language around 1980, his pre-1991 correspondence files include letters to people in organizations like Zero Population Growth (ZPG), the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), and U.S. English, as well as with politicians and other activists working on these issues. Second, the files for a planned memoir (which was never written, to my knowledge) include a wider range of news clippings and notes on Tanton’s career, as well as materials like his CV and his annual Christmas newsletters. Third, I studied the designated folders for ZPG and FAIR, which covered genres other than formal correspondence, like meeting minutes and agendas, internal memos, handwritten notes, and grant applications. Fourth, and finally, I
examined pieces of scratch paper. Tanton often used both sides of pieces of paper, apparently for environmental reasons: he often ink stamped his papers in the upper-right corner with messages like “SAVE A TREE, USE BOTH SIDES.” This practice resulted in pieces of paper that contain two unrelated texts, one on each side. For example, there might be a letter to a friend on one side, and meeting minutes from U.S. English on the other. Such documents confound the filing system and subvert the embargo, since each piece of paper can only go in one folder in one box.

Throughout the research process, I considered the ethics of using these materials.

The ethics of archival research are different from that of interview- or observation-based fieldwork, in that the donor has already granted the library permission to make materials available to researchers. At the same time, I still felt a responsibility to be conscientious, especially since Tanton is not the only writer whose work has been included in this archive: in donating his papers, Tanton also donated the work of more than a hundred colleagues, few of whom probably knew that their writing would end up in a public library. Shipka (2016) addresses a similar issue in her own archival research, by acknowledging that people “might be discomforted by issues related to consent or permission, something that is often difficult, if not impossible, to obtain when working with found, abandoned, or orphaned artifacts” (p. 11). At the same time, Shipka argues, and I agree, that overly cautious self-censorship has its own problems, in that it severely limits the kinds of stories that get told (Shipka, 2012). This tension, in which researchers “us[e] archival materials in ways that perhaps weren’t intended by the collector” is not necessarily something to resolve, but rather something to continually consider and reflect on (Gaillet, 2012, p. 40). For example, I elected not to quote from passages that include things like people’s social security numbers and medical histories, but I am comfortable quoting from the
pieces of scratch paper, especially given the evidence that Tanton played such an active role in deciding what to make public.

_The Paul Simon Papers and the National Council of Teachers of English_

Tanton wrote to and about several colleagues who have had their own papers archived at other institutions and universities. This correspondence was my impetus for seeking out other archives, beginning with National Council of Teachers of English’s papers at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Senator Paul Simon’s papers at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. These collections did not raise the same kinds of ethical questions as Tanton’s: all of Simon’s papers on language policy were either by him or his staff, or they had been publicly published elsewhere. Similarly, NCTE’s papers on language policy only include committee work and correspondence on that topic (not on personal matters or other initiatives within NCTE or CCCC). Generally, however, I approached these collections the same as I approached Tanton’s.

I sought out NCTE’s papers after finding a letter Tanton sent to John C. Maxwell, who was NCTE’s Executive Director at the time. Soon after forming U.S. English, Tanton (1983, December 9) inquired about the possibilities of “running an advertisement in your three professional journals,” and sending “the enclosed direct mail membership solicitation to your members.” In other words, Tanton wanted to advertise U.S. English to NCTE members, both in the pages of journals and through the mail (although I am not sure which three journals Tanton was referring to, specifically). I sought out Paul Simon’s papers after reading another letter from a couple years later. When a married couple wrote to John Tanton to ask about U.S. English’s stance on teaching foreign languages, as part of his reply, he wrote, “You might want to write to Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, the main advocate in Congress of teaching of foreign languages”
(1985, March 8). I never found evidence of that couple taking Tanton’s advice and writing to Simon, nor did I find any reply to Tanton from Maxwell. In Maxwell’s case, I suspect there never was a receptive reply, given that just one day before Tanton wrote to him, Maxwell had written a memo to “CCCC Officers” arguing that “Somebody should do something before the advances created by the Students’ Right statement are crushed by the new conservative wave” (1985, March 7). Tanton was part of that “new conservative wave,” which made any alliance between U.S. English and NCTE unlikely. The materials I did find in these two collections, though, did steer the project in new directions, particularly in terms of my approach to Chapter 5. Overall, however, these collections did not include much material on local language policy, so I do not draw on them as heavily in this project as I draw on Tanton’s papers. Instead, predictably enough for a US Senator and a National Council of Teachers of English, they frame language policy more as a national issue.

Archival Data Collection

Having introduced my general approach to archival research, and introduced the three archives, I will briefly describe my approach to collecting and preparing to analyze these documents. For each document that touched on issues of scale, the local, and/or language policy, I took a photograph of the relevant pages and took notes, which included the item number, title, author, date, genre, file, box, some preliminary coding, a summary or key quotes, and the number of photographs. The following entry, for a document cited earlier in this section, is an example of this method:

Item: 532
Title: Letter to Kenneth P. Scheffel
Author: Kathy Bricker
Date: 7/30/1984
"You will soon receive the first package: Dr. Tanton’s ‘Chronological Communications’ file for 1982 and 1983. We started in 1982 keeping a copy of every letter and many of the memos that go out of this office. We file the good, Xeroxed copy, in the topic or individual’s file, and file the carbon copy (which often doesn’t look very presentable) in the Chron file. It as come in handy many times when we can remember the month a letter was written, but can’t locate it in the regular files.”

Some of the tags focus on meta-level issues. This entry, for example, is tagged “archive” because it discusses how the archive was constructed. Along these lines, I also used tags like “handwriting,” “scratch paper,” and “pages missing.” For most sources, however, the tags focused on certain themes (“local,” “economics”), places (“California,” “D.C.”), organizations (“U.S. English,” “NCTE”), people (“Hayakawa”), discourse features (“narrative,” “reported speech,” “downscaling”), and genres (“note,” “itinerary,” “news clipping”). I also made note of documents that were clearly intertextual or in dialogue, like a letter and its reply, or a first and a final draft of an agenda. The purpose of this coding was not to make any quantitative arguments or to draw any definitive conclusions, but rather to aid in future interpretive analysis. Later, I also reformatted the photographs into OCR’d PDFs, although I still rely on the original photographs and notes. In all, I collected 722 documents: 650 from Tanton’s papers, 14 from Paul Simon’s, and 58 from NCTE. The average document length was 1.7 pages, which reflects the fact that the vast majority were 1-page letters or notes, with a few longer documents interspersed.
**Fieldwork and Interviews**

*Site Selection*

Over the course of October 2015, I conducted fieldwork in Washington, D.C. and four Maryland counties: Anne Arundel, Queen Anne’s, Carroll, and Frederick. I chose this region for four reasons, and it also had an unanticipated fifth advantage. First, there had been local language policy campaigns in all four counties in recent years, particularly 2012–2013. Second, these campaigns had had a variety of outcomes. Anne Arundel’s policy had been withdrawn before coming to a vote, Frederick’s had been controversial, and Queen Anne’s and Carroll’s passed more easily. Third, these counties were clustered together in a relatively small state, which made fieldwork more logistically possible. Towards the beginning of my trip, I tried to spend several days at a time in each county, but towards the end, there were days when I would travel to two or three different parts of the state for interviews. Fourth, these counties were close to Washington, D.C., which meant that I could contact employees of national English-only organizations during the same trip. Finally, after I had already planned the fieldwork’s location and timing, Frederick County repealed its English-only policy. This serendipitous development became the case study for Chapter 5. In the chapters to come, I describe each county in more detail as it comes up, using interview excerpts from my participants and information about demographics and economics when relevant.

*Interviews*

My primary objective during fieldwork was to conduct interviews with people involved in shaping the language policies of their local governments. Because I was interested in both the most public faces of these policies, as well as people who played more behind-the-scenes roles, I
recruited participants in a few different ways. I contacted all the elected officials who had voted on these counties’ policies, whether for or against, in order to briefly describe the study and provide my consent forms with more details. Similarly, I requested interviews from people who had spoken at public hearings or written relevant blog posts or news articles. I was aware that this approach of cold-contacting people would only allow me to reach so many people. So, I also distributed a flyer that asked, “Have you been involved in supporting or challenging a campaign to make English the official language of a town or county? If so I am interested in interviewing you…” (Appendix D). The flyer included my name, university affiliation, email address, and phone number. I gave copies of the flyer to people I met, and also posted several in coffee shops, libraries, and bookstores in all four counties. Once someone contacted me after seeing a flyer, I would send them copies of the consent forms to review before agreeing to an interview (Appendix E). Finally, towards the end of most interviews, I asked the participant if there was anyone else they would recommend I interview. Sometimes, they gave me a name, sometimes an email address, and sometimes they would offer to contact the person on my behalf. Participants had a high degree of control over whether their interview was connected to their real name or a pseudonym, if and how I could record the interview, and if and how I could share the contents of their interview with other participants or in future publications.

The interviews were all semi-structured, and the questions were highly tailored to each person’s role, stance on English-only policies, and public discourse on the topic; as well as the particular nature of their county’s language policy (Appendix F). For example, my questions for a libertarian activist in Queen Anne’s County were nearly all different from my questions for a Democratic politician in Anne Arundel County. However, there were certain common threads: I always asked how long someone had lived in their current county, how they would describe that
county, how they first learned about their county’s language policy, what surprised them the most, if they ever changed their mind on some aspect of language policy, if there is anything they would do differently next time, and what advice they would offer to someone in their position. For each person, I would also ask several more text-based questions, either focused on policy texts from their county, policies from ProEnglish, or materials they themselves had published or discussed at a public hearing.

The question about “advice” proved to be particularly illuminating, and is an example of how interviews, like other discourse, involve multiple “activity footings” (Prior, 1998, p. 251). At first, I worried that asking about what participants would do differently in the future, or if they could do it over, would seem to similar to asking what advice they would offer someone in a similar position. However, this was not what happened. Although in both cases I was the one asking the question, and they were the ones answering, their responses to the advice question were much different, and usually much more detailed. I suspect this happened because the question invited them to consider an interlocutor besides myself. For example, when I asked Kirby Delauter what he might do differently, he only answered that he would “campaign harder” for different people to have been elected. However, when I asked what advice he might give someone in his position, he made a much more in-depth statement, so much so that it is the interview excerpt I quote in the introduction. Of course, Delauter and the other participants were still aware of the interview context; they just laminated another kind of situation (giving advice to someone else), onto that of the interview.

Sometimes, participants were the ones to initiate a new kind of footing. For example, during one interview, I was listening to a participant, Angela Spencer, tell a story about teaching ESL, only to have my ears perk up when she used “tea cup” as an example of a phrase she would
teach her students. At first, I thought that was an oddly specific example to use, until I looked down and saw she was pointing at my tea cup. So, she was bringing my cup and me into the fold of her narrative. While the tea cup example may have been relatively inconsequential, it did serve as a reminder to be mindful of different kinds of indexicality as I analyzed interview transcripts. For example, when someone said “we,” I had to consider, given the surrounding discourse, their tone, and my own memory of the interview, whether they meant “you and me” or “my colleagues and I” or “Americans” or “English speakers” or what. After all, interviews are not just about discourse; they are instances of discourse, and therefore dialogic, indexical, semiotic, and connected to other events (Koven, 2014).

Fieldnotes

As I conducted interviews from October 2015 through January 2016, I also wrote fieldnotes. These notes were not as extensive as they might be in a more observation-focused ethnographic study, but they were nevertheless instrumental in documenting my impressions of the communities I visited, the events I attended, the people I interacted with, the discourse I encountered, and the research methods I used. Because recruiting participants proved to be the most consuming part of this phase of research, much of the fieldnotes focus on who I met, and how, and to what end, especially when we met in person or on the phone, rather than over email. I also took photographs throughout my fieldwork, to aid in later descriptions of public places and events.
Participants

I interviewed 24 people (Table 1). Roughly half of them are in favor of making English the official language, and the other half are against, although this designation will become so blurry in the chapters to come that I have chosen not to officially categorize each person’s stance here. As detailed in the table, though, they have played a variety of roles in shaping language policy in different communities, and their interviews took a number of different forms. Eleven participants have held elected office, one was ProEnglish’s Executive Director, and the rest were activists and/or bloggers. I define “activist” broadly, in order to include everything from speaking at public hearings, to participating in protests, to signing petitions, to writing editorials to letters to the editor, to taking on more formal roles in organizations or commissions. Similarly, under the banner of “blogger,” I include both people who run their own blog on their own website, as well as someone who runs a Facebook page. I would not characterize all Facebook accounts as blogs, but in this case, the page features frequent posts that are several paragraphs long. The descriptions of each person’s role are not meant to be exhaustive, but are merely aimed at giving a sense of the breadth of participants’ experiences. For example, most of the elected officials could also qualify as activists, blogging can be a form of activism, and so on.

In terms of identifiability, seventeen people chose to have me use their real names. The four bloggers requested that I not use their real names, but that I do use the real names of their blogs. In both scenarios, their decisions meant that I could associate the interview with their published writing. Three participants requested pseudonyms, which means that I kept their interview separate from any analysis of their public activities, to maintain confidentiality.
Table 1. A list of interview participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Recording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hayden Duke</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>10/10/15</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Farrell Keough</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>10/12/15</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C. Paul Smith</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/14/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jay Mason</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>10/20/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frederick Local Yokel Writer</td>
<td>Blogger</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/22/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frederick Local Yokel Writer</td>
<td>Blogger</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/22/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Occupy Frederick Writer</td>
<td>Blogger/Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Facebook message</td>
<td>10/22/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jerry Donald</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/22/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Angela Spencer</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/22/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nicanor Diaz</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/23/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Diane Lockhart (pseudonym)</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/24/15</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Chuck Jenkins(^{10})</td>
<td>Elected Official (Sheriff)</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/26/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M.C. Keegan-Ayer</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/26/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>David Lee (pseudonym)</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/26/15</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Robert Vandervoort</td>
<td>Executive Director of ProEnglish</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/28/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bob Simmons</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/28/15</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kevin Waterman</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>Facebook message</td>
<td>10/29/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jessica Fitzwater</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/30/15</td>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kirby Delauter</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10/30/15</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Phil Dumenil</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>11/6/15</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Charles Jenkins</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>11/10/15</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chris Trumbauer</td>
<td>Elected Official</td>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>11/12/15</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Will Gardner (pseudonym)</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Flyer</td>
<td>1/30/16</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Audio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) The Sheriff and the former Commissioner are both named Charles Jenkins, but are not related. Sheriff Jenkins tends to go by “Chuck,” and I follow that convention for clarity.
Participants chose their own interview settings, although I usually offered a few possible options. I met seven people at their offices, eight at coffee shops, two at their homes, one at a public library, and one at a restaurant that his family owned. The remaining five interviews took place over the phone. When interviews were in someone’s home or office, I asked if I could video record; in more public places or over the phone I only asked if I could record the audio. Overall, four people opted for video, 18 for audio only, and two for no recording. There are 17 hours of recordings in total, with interviews lasting an average of 45 minutes. In cases where I did not record, I took copious notes, but did not attempt to quote anything longer than a phrase. For example, I transcribed things like Chuck Jenkins’ description of language policymakers in different communities playing off of “the same sheet of music” (in Chapter 3), but for anything longer, I was only able to paraphrase or summarize. There were several advantages to having so many possible interview configurations: people could choose a setting where they felt comfortable, I learned more about my participants by seeing the spaces they chose, and some people may not have agreed to an interview under stricter conditions. On the other hand, there were limitations: if I had had a designated private space to hold interviews, the audio quality would be better on average, and I might have done more video interviews.

From my perspective, the phone interviews posed the most challenges. These challenges were not about the medium, per se: I do not mind the lack of eye contact, the technology, the sound quality, or anything along those lines. The issues were more about genre, in that some people perceived a phone conversation to be just that: a conversation. For example, when I called one participant at our prearranged time, I checked to make sure this was “still a good time,” and he replied with something like, ‘Yes, this is a perfect time, because I’m just about to get in the car!’ My heart sank as I realized that we had different definitions of what counted as a “good”
time for an interview. Given that he was going to be driving, I quickly crossed out all the interview questions I had written down that involved him looking at the policy documents I’d attached to our last email exchange. The interview still turned out to be illuminating and thorough, but it was not what I had planned for. It was also easier to discuss and review consent forms in person, rather than on the phone. In the future, I plan to maintain some degree of flexibility, while also offering Google Hangouts or Skype as options, since they are designed with video in mind.

Of the 24 participants, I only included 23 in my analysis. One participant, Diane Lockhart (a pseudonym), agreed to my interview request, filled out and signed the interview consent form and the release for the recording of an event form, and did the interview with me over the phone. However, when I got home from Maryland, I realized that while she had checked “Yes” to audio recording on both forms, she had checked “No” to the statement, “I agree that my verbal comments may be played, quoted, or paraphrased in publications or presentations.” I interpreted this to mean that I could not use the interview. From our other interactions, and from the way she filled out the rest of the forms, I was relatively sure her objection was to the “played” aspect, because she did not want to be identifiable. I emailed her to clarify, but she did not reply. I take responsibility for this missed opportunity, because I do not think it would have happened had I divided that statement up in to two separate questions, one about whether the recording could be played, and a separate one about whether it could be quoted or paraphrased.

Transcription

Once I had completed an interview or located some public video recording, the next step was transcription. Transcription is an inherently paradoxical task, because on one hand, the goal
is to remediate a face-to-face (or over the phone) interaction into something different, something on a page. The goal of this remediation is to make the discourse easier to read, search through, analyze, and compare. On the other hand, though, the act of remediation makes it difficult to represent some of the most salient features of speech, including prosody, laughter, and gestures.

In transcribing audio and video data, I aimed to balance these two impulses—transforming and preserving—by marking paralinguistic features that might change my interpretations. For example, my analysis might depend on whether someone paused in the middle of an utterance, or if they used a gesture while talking, or if they said one word particularly loudly, or if two people were talking at the same time, so I marked those features. In terms of video, I transcribed gestures when they affected my interpretation, like when C. Paul Smith throws up his hands in Chapter 3, or when M.C. Keegan-Ayer acts out picking and choosing different parts of different texts in Chapter 5.

Because I am interested in discourse across events, I also made a point to mark instances of reported speech when possible, and, furthermore, to distinguish between reported thought, reported talk, reported writing, and reading aloud from a text at hand. Of course, reported speech is often more imagined than real (Agha, 2007, p. 20), but it is nevertheless illuminating to see how people construct, remember, or anticipate discourse beyond the here-and-now, as well as what kinds of past events people think are most “tellable” (Ochs and Capps, 2001, p. 20). On a very practical level, it is also important to note when someone is speaking off the cuff or from memory, versus when they are reading a text aloud. While I aimed to represent those non-lexical discourse features as accurately as possible, I did take the liberty of adding punctuation. Given that some utterances went on for several minutes, and are difficult to consume in written form
without punctuation, I elected to add in things like commas and periods where I felt they were appropriate.

As I moved from data collection and analysis into chapter writing, sometimes I kept the original transcription, while in other cases I transformed it even further so that it would fit more seamlessly into the rest of the text. My approach depended on why I was including that stretch of discourse. If I am just quoting a participant on a fact, or if I seek to assemble multiple examples at once, then fine-grained transcription becomes less important, and might even detract from the point. On the other hand, if I am analyzing how a participant responded to one of my questions, or told a longer narrative, or vacillated between multiple perspectives, then I retain the original transcription.

**Synthesizing Methods**

In an attempt at one kind of clarity, I have so far discussed my methods in three parts: digital research, archival research, and fieldwork. Furthermore, I have treated these methods as relatively separate from, and prior to, my writing process. In part, these divisions reflect the very real, and very different, affordances and constraints of different kinds of research: my digital research depended in part on what people choose to post online; archives are shaped by the actions of archivists and donors; and my fieldwork unfolded according to IRB guidelines. At the same time, though, making these divisions between methods is relatively artificial, and risks obscuring the complex, “interwoven and recursive” nature of writing and research (Dyson, 2013, p. 183). To conclude this section on methods, then, I offer a different kind of clarity, by giving a more transparent account of how my writing and research unfolded.
Some connections between and laminations of different research practices are easier to trace than others. As an example of a more direct link, my initial fieldnotes about preparing for my interview with Farrell Keough, and about having my first conversation with Jay Mason, appear in only slightly-revised form in Chapters 4 and 5, respectively. In other cases, however, working on one thread of a project spurred me to pursue other threads that were not as obviously connected. For example, when Roger Vandervoort mentioned the lawyer Barnaby Zall in our interview, I returned to my notes and photographs of John Tanton’s papers, to analyze a few sources that were either written by or addressed to Zall in the early 1980s. Initially, I had not expected to find any direct connections between that interview and my archival research, since so many decades separated the two. There were also moments when an archival source led me to a more recent one. In Paul Simon’s papers, for example, I found printed out emails from the National Institute for Literacy’s listserv, nifl-esl@literacy.nifl.gov, which led me to look up that listserv’s digital archive, which gave me leads on several of the local policies listed in Chapter 1, Figure 1 (Belanger, 1996, February 24). There were also occasions when a written and/or digital source led me to an interview. For example, I invited some people to participate in interviews only after reading their public writing, like the writer for the Occupy Frederick Facebook page; or watching them participate in a government meeting, like Kevin Waterman. Conversely, whenever anyone contacted me based on my flyer, my first step in writing their interview questions would be to see if they had written or appeared in any of my existing data.

Usually, these kinds of links propelled the project forward, by providing new leads to pursue and new evidence to cite. Occasionally, however, different pieces of data would contradict each other so much that they were difficult to reconcile. For example, as I was drafting Chapter 3, I came across a news article that disrupted all of the Maryland text histories I had
pieced together. Up until that point, I had argued that local English-only policies emerged in Maryland in 2008 due to the debut of ProEnglish’s template in nearby Hazleton, Pennsylvania in 2006. In my notes from that day, however, I wrote:

Today I found out that Maryland delegate Pat McDonough began introducing bills in 2006 to make English the official language of Baltimore and Harford Counties, and that someone commissioned a poll in 2005 about attitudes towards official English in Maryland. At first, I was excited: the Maryland story that I thought started in 2008 actually began much earlier, in 2006, and probably even earlier. I was also surprised; why didn’t anyone bring him up during our interviews? I don’t remember anyone mentioning him, or describing someone doing what he did. Finally, though, I felt overwhelmed and frustrated. Hazleton is not the real point of origin. From people’s perspectives in the interviews, McDonough was not salient, yet to me his role seems huge. This narrative is getting so convoluted and complicated.

Of course, it is not uncommon for a researcher to have a different perspective on what is salient than her participants, especially when the events in question happened almost ten years before the interviews. What is notable about moments like this one, though, is that if I had done a purely interview-based study, or one purely focused on public discourse, I would not have been able to pick up on the fact that people’s perspectives on and narratives about language policies vary so widely. Ultimately, I did include Pat McDonough’s bills in the chapter, but did not make them central, both because none of my participants had brought him up, and because I quickly surmised that his state-level bills did not share any of the wording of the ProEnglish template. At the same time, reading about his proposed policies did spur me to include a discussion of how there is no single source or explanation for Maryland’s local English-only policies.
In addition to these cases of data directly pointing to or away from each other, there were also more ephemeral connections. In other words, while the vignettes above involve varying perspectives on the same people, texts, or trajectories, sometimes the common thread was more conceptual. For example, my archival research on NCTE and Senator Paul Simon had a significant impact on how I frame my argument in Chapter 5, despite the fact that the two might seem to have little in common. Unlike in Chapters 3 and 4, the people at the heart of that chapter are not affiliated with the English-only movement, and their language policy writing and resistance only began in 2012, or later. Because I was initially considering the case study in Chapter 5, Frederick County’s campaign to repeal their English-only ordinance only on its own, in early iterations of that chapter, I was quite critical of the campaign. I even went so far as to argue that “critics and supporters of monolingual policies actually use many of the same strategies and express many of the same ideologies about language and literacy.” In other words, I was arguing that Frederick’s repeal was something of a failure, because it did not go far enough. However, once I returned back to my archival sources, I realized that I was not giving my participants enough credit. In fact, their discourse marked much more of a departure from English-only discourse than Simon’s and NCTE’s approaches. Simon, for example, was only really interested in promoting foreign language education to aid the military, and, to a lesser extent, global business (Simon, 1981). For its part, NCTE tried to disrupt the English-only movement with its 1988 National Language Policy, but nevertheless clung to the goal of “enable[ing] native and nonnative speakers to achieve oral and literate competence in English, the language of wider communication.” In comparison to these attempts to offer an alternative to English-only policies, Frederick’s repeal campaign started to look much more innovative, and I changed my argument accordingly. These archives and this 2015 repeal campaign shared no
people, texts, or places in common, yet the former shaped how I approached the latter, in a way that would not have been possible if I had divided my chapters strictly by method, space, or time.

The moments discussed in this section are not unusual; they were a routine part of the work. Together, they point to the affordances of including multiple kinds of data. As methodologies, discourse analysis and ethnography have always been open to such a range of methods, but not always to this extent. In studies of writing that involve so many people, organizations, and years, including not just language policy but professional writing and social movements more generally, it is particularly important to incorporate a range of methods when possible.

The Roles of the Researcher

For someone interested in studying the local, I certainly selected research sites and other data sources in which I was decidedly non-local. In this respect, my study differs from ones that focus on one of the researcher’s own local communities, like Lindquist’s (2002) study of rhetoric in the working-class bar where she worked, or Sheridan-Rabideau’s (2008) study of an organization where she volunteered, or Tardy’s (2011) study of local language policy in her own writing program. To some degree, all ethnographic studies involve making the familiar strange, and the strange familiar, but I do think that my particular level of unfamiliarity with my research sites shapes my findings in significant ways. The one exception was my research on NCTE, which I am a member and part-time employee of, and which has its headquarters and archives in Champaign-Urbana. Otherwise, however, I feel not just geographically, but also professionally and personally, quite removed from the people and places I research. I had never spent time in
Maryland (except Baltimore) or Washington, D.C. before this study. I do not support English-only policies. I am not a politician, and I am not much of an activist.

I was not a complete outsider, of course. Like most of my participants (and here, I include the people whose archived papers I read), I am a white, US-born, middle class, college-educated person who uses relatively unmarked varieties of English, and who writes professionally. Also like most of my participants, I have experienced the dynamic of living in a mostly white, mostly monolingual town within driving distance of a more racially and linguistically diverse city. None of the political discourse I encountered during the course of this study would have seemed out of place at a Flowers family reunion, or in my K–12 language arts and social studies curriculum, or on the Fox News shows I grew up watching.

Nevertheless, I realized that I still stuck out like a sore thumb to most people I encountered during my fieldwork. This outsider position was not necessarily a problem. Instead, most of my most illuminating experiences came about precisely because I seemed like a conspicuous, clueless, or innocuous outsider. By the end, I started to accept this role, even if it was often uncomfortable for me. To illustrate this point, I share two examples. The first is a moment when I felt particularly conspicuous, when I was hailed as an English teacher from across a crowded room; and the second is about how I vacillated between approaches to recruiting interview participants over time.

***

After our interview, Angela Spencer invited me to a Health Fair happening at the Frederick County fairgrounds later that week. I was interested, both because I trusted her recommendation that I go, and because I had been to similar events growing up, when my mother was working as a pediatrician for the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe. Because such events
tend to include not just medical information and services, but also social services, non-profits, and political organizations, I thought I might be able to learn more about the linguistic and cultural landscape of the community. So, that Saturday, I drove over, found the correct warehouse, and walked in. I immediately realized that I was one of the few white people not behind a booth. I also realized that I was overdressed compared to almost everyone else, whether they were behind a booth or not. I did not think much of either observation, though, and resolved to make a lap of the warehouse, say hi to Spencer or any other participants I saw, and to give out my flyer to anyone who seemed interested in my study.

As I was walking, I flinched all of a sudden because a man was calling out to me from a booth several feet away. He had exclaimed, “Hey, you look smart!” and then something along the lines of “Would you be interested in tutoring for us?” I read the banner on the booth: “Frederick Literacy Council.” I walked closer and replied with something like “I might be…what would that involve?” and we started talking about their tutoring services, which focus on teaching adults to read and write in English. At one point, he asked if I was an English teacher or student, and I said I was both, and we started to discuss my study. I wrote down my contact information on their volunteer sign-up sheet, in case they ever wanted someone to do tutoring or editing online, and kept walking.

In part, this interaction served as a reminder of how assumptions about language and identity are so intertwined—out of the hundreds of people in that warehouse, I was the one who got invited to be an English literacy tutor, without ever saying or writing a single word of English. In my notes from that day, I wrote, “I guess it was just a reminder that it’s impossible to move around the world and seem ‘neutral.’ He pegged me as an outsider in general but a potential ally for himself immediately, even with no language or literacy cues.” Our interaction

---

11 I was not recording this conversation, and am only certain about the precise wording of “You look smart!”
gave me some ideas for new sources to look up and new people to ask for interviews, which I
would not have come up with on my own. While this experience was more heightened than most,
that general feeling of not being able to blend in was a part of my daily experience. Also, while I
was abruptly caught off guard by this experience, in other domains of my research I had more
time to recognize this dynamic, and think about how to react.

***

By the end of my first day of fieldwork, I sensed that my ways of communicating were
out of place, and might be hindering my research. Specifically, I had not anticipated the fact that
politicians have administrative assistants, chiefs of staff, “public information officers,” and a
whole host of other people that mediate between them and the public. In my two previous
ethnographic research experiences—interviewing professors and lecturers who teach online
courses, and observing a college writing course, I had communicated one-on-one with my
participants, never through an intermediary. In terms of modes of communication, I also sensed
that politicians are more likely to use the phone than I was accustomed to. In my prior research, I
had communicated with my participants in person (at a pre-scheduled time) or over email, but
never over the phone or through an impromptu visit.

There were two particular events from my first day in Maryland that made me realize I
had to decide how to handle this issue. First, I received a reply to my first interview request, but
it was not from the politician I had emailed, but from his assistant. It was a clear rejection, but I
had no idea if the politician had ever seen my email or not. Second, an Airbnb host I stayed with
for the first few days of my trip suggested that I might have better luck if I contacted a Public
Information Officer first. She went a step farther, too, by Facebook messaging the PIO for
Frederick County, to let her know she might hear from me. I started to wonder if I was
approaching participants all wrong, but I also worried about the ethical implications of getting too many intermediaries involved in what was supposed to be a potentially confidential interview. In other words, how could I claim to offer confidentiality when someone’s staff runs their email account, screens their calls, or greets everyone who visits their office? In my notes from that day, I wrote:

This is an angle I hadn’t really considered, but sort of makes sense. I sort of assumed that any PR person would purely be interested in shielding the county’s actual employees from any interviews, but she made it seem like they act more as a liaison. She also kept suggesting calling people or just “dropping by.” That is something I am not really enthusiastic about, both because I am more articulate over email and because I want to have a paper trail of everything. [...] I think today was hard partly because I am realizing that there are more cultural, social, and interactional differences between me and the people I want to talk to than I expected. I feel out of my depth about what is considered appropriate.

After a few more seemingly failed attempts at inviting interview participants over email, I tried it my host’s recommended way, and made some phone calls to some more general local government numbers and email addresses. I got no replies. In the end, I never made any headway by trying to adapt to what I and my host thought might be the government’s communicative norms.

Gradually, however, I started to make progress, but it was not because I got better at adapting to any sort of local or politics-specific ways of communicating. Instead, I simply doubled down on my original approach of contacting people personally, in writing. I distributed more of my flyers, I emailed more people, and people responded to my flyers or messages over
the course of days, weeks, or, in one case, months. Furthermore, once I began interviewing people, I heard about more potential participants to contact. It is important to emphasize that people did not necessarily adapt to my approach either. There were moments when I emailed someone, for example, and one of their employees would call me back on the phone to schedule the date and time of the meeting. My point is that there is no need for interlocutors to agree in advance on communicative norms, or for one person to necessarily adhere to the other’s way of communicating. Instead, my participants and I were flexible, and elected to communicate in particular ways depending on our own inclinations and on the situation at hand. As with my experience at the Health Fair, then, I was clearly an outsider relative to my participants in some ways, but that did not necessarily hinder data collection.

Limitations

In this section, I discuss this study’s limitations. My focus is on highlighting the particular nature of particular phenomena in some slice of human activity, and so, as with any study, this study’s findings may not hold true for other kinds of writing practices, local action, or language policies. Of course, I suspect that the arguments I make about the roles of networked localism and downscaling in the English-only movement, and about the interplay between multiple strategies for resisting and rewriting local English-only policies, can illuminate how language and literacy operate in other situations, from public and professional writing, to the rhetoric of social movements, to language policies and ideologies, to discourse and interaction. Indeed, I situate my findings in relation to other emerging research and theories along the way and in the conclusion. At the same time, how the ideas I develop in this project map onto other kinds of phenomena remains an open question for future research.
Even within my own body of work, I am struck by how differently local English-only policy campaigns play out in different times and places. Flowers (2016), for example, focuses on the chronotopes involved in a case in Minnesota that shared many of the same dynamics as the Maryland cases, but always in a different form or with a different outcome. For example, all of these cases involved discussions over what genre to adapt ProEnglish’s template into (ordinance vs. resolution), appeals to local history, and arguments for valuing the local scale over higher scales. However, while the people involved in Lino Lakes, Minnesota’s campaign opted for a resolution, appealed to the local history of Native Americans and Scandinavian immigrants, and only criticized the federal government’s waste and excess; my participants in this study leaned more towards ordinances, appealed more to the local history of black and white native English users, and were more critical of both their state and federal government. Across these cases, people share a concern for local spaces, times, and writing practices, but how that concern manifests can vary significantly.

There were also additional data sources that could have bolstered this study. Because my research focused exclusively on policy campaigns that had happened in the past, rather than ones that were unfolding during my fieldwork, I did not do the kinds of observations, interviews, and document collection that are more typical of situated studies of writing. New language policies, while common, are not as ubiquitous or perennial as other, more common sites of writing research, like writing in schools. Furthermore, it is difficult to predict when language policies will emerge and change, especially given that so much funding and time for research has to be approved months in advance. For this reason, as I was beginning this study I decided to focus on recently passed policies, rather than wait for new ones to emerge.
For both my participants and me, the language policies in question were already settled: either they had passed, or failed, or been repealed. To be sure, they had not been settled for too long, which meant that most if not all the people involved are still alive and remember the campaigns in some detail, including what it felt like when the policies were not yet settled. Prior (2014a) raises this issue in a critical discussion of Deborah Brandt’s shift from more “phenomenological” research to more “systematic, life-history interviews” (p. 167). In her early work, Brandt (1990) herself compared studying writing after the fact to “coming upon the scene of a party after it is over” (p. 76, qtd. in Prior, 2014a, p. 166). If Brandt moved from “situated studies of live parties” to “accounts of parties long past” (Prior, 2014a, p. 167), I would categorize my own approach in this study as somewhere in the middle, as “situated studies of parties recently past.” I was able to collect a range of texts and other discourse from the campaigns, sometimes even as they were unfolding, and I was able to conduct interviews a few months or years later. Nevertheless, I wish I could have asked more questions or heard more people discuss amongst themselves questions like, “what do you think will happen next?” “how do you think this draft should be revised?” “what did you think about what happened yesterday?” or “could you send me the next draft when you finish it?” Because I was not in a position to ask questions like that, I suspect that my accounts of local language policymaking are clouded by hindsight, and by a false sense of inevitability, as though these campaigns could not have unfolded otherwise. This is not to say that a more observation-based study, happening at the same time as a policy campaign, could or should replace my approach. Rather, I am advocating for studies that begin during some instance of writing but also extend well after that text(s) in question seem settled, because “situated study of live action and historical inquiry can be understood as complementary” (Prior, 2014a, p. 168).
Aside from precluding much observation of “live action,” the timing of the study also meant that collecting documents and other artifacts was not always possible. The most official discourse lives on, but drafts, informal interactions, and activist texts are less likely to be archived, put online, or offered to a researcher. Even for the most recent campaign I studied—Frederick’s repeal—which only went in to effect during my fieldwork, a lot of material had already become less accessible. For example, several people brought up a petition that had circulated, which I argue in Chapter 5 functioned both to reflect existing and generate new support. This petition also came up in the minutes from the Human Relations Commission, and made an appearance in the video of a public hearing. At the end of these interviews, often after I turned my recorder off, I would ask if they had a copy of the language at the top of, the petition, or if they knew where I might find it. In other words, I was curious how the question or statement was framed—did it say “Do you support repealing Ordinance No. 12-03-598?” or “Please sign if you support people using languages other than English.” or something else altogether? In response, everyone said they would check their office or check their email or check their Facebook. These participants all helped me in a variety of ways, by agreeing to a lengthy interview in the first place, referring me to new participants, and sometimes even writing to other potential participants on my behalf, but I never got a copy of the petition. I suspect that the situation would have been different if I had been there a few months earlier, and could have more easily traced the petition’s circulation in real time, either by interviewing someone who was in the midst of collecting signatures; observing people collecting signatures at public events; or being at that meeting where someone held up the completed petition in the air during their statement to the county council. I view these consequences of the study’s timing as the most significant limitation of the project, as a gap I hope to address in my own future work on
language policy, and as an area for future research more generally. I will return to these possibilities for future research in Chapter 6. Now, however, I turn to the findings of the study, beginning with Chapter 3, which argues for the role of networked localism in how people write and circulate local language policies.
Chapter 3  
Networked Localism

Local language policies emerge out of local governments, but they also tend to closely resemble each other. This chapter examines this phenomenon, in which texts that seem independent and localized are also quite interconnected and mobile. I use the concept of networked localism to describe how people draw on complex, far-reaching networks of people, texts, discourse, and other components to work towards their policy goals, while at the same they frame those goals as local. Materiality and ideology both come into play, although the ideological component, the “-ism” in “localism,” is what really distinguishes this phenomenon from others.  

By that, I mean that most semiotic activities are materially networked (Latour, 2005) and local (Pennycook, 2010). For example, anyone writing something in English is acting in a particular time and place while also participating in some very long trajectories of communication, language, literacy, and technology. There is nothing necessarily noteworthy about that scenario.

However, when people combine local networked actions with local language ideologies, they engage in a phenomenon that is more common in activism, social movements, and political discourse. In contrast to other approaches to the English-only movement, this framework does not categorize political action in terms of dichotomies like grassroots activism/astroturfing, top-down/bottom-up, or micro/macro. For example, in an otherwise nuanced account of language policy in various domains, Spolsky (2009) dismisses “local governments which are more easily manipulated by activist groups than are higher levels” (p. 173). This model of a three-layered

---

12 I first encountered the term “localism” in Mendoza-Denton’s (2008) discussion of “hemispheric localism,” although we use the term somewhat differently. She conceives of the local as the more material and fundamental scale, while the hemispheric scale only becomes relevant to her participants through subsequent discursive processes of “projection,” “symbolic analogy and metonymy” (p. 87). In contrast, I view the local scale as no more or less discursive than any other scale.
system of “activist groups,” “local governments,” and then “higher levels,” and this notion of one group easily manipulating another, is more rigid than what tends to happen in practice. Instead, people usually play a variety of roles, and have a range of goals, and some texts have more impact than others, but there is no sense that any one person or group is really in control of another, or that one person or group is acting more genuinely than others. Instead, like most people, language policymakers are constantly navigating between various collaborations, tensions, opportunities, and constraints.

Texts are a crucial part of language policymaking, not just in the sense that policies are written documents, but also in terms of how people draft, revise, communicate about, circulate, and respond to policies. Their role in local language policies in the US is particularly important because so many now use language from the same written template, which the English-only organization ProEnglish created. In other words, while other networks may be more reliant on certain people, strategies, or other materials, in the contemporary English-only movement the most consequential components are one particular template and its iterations.

In this chapter, I examine the text histories of that template and several of the policies that incorporated that template’s discourse, in order to see how these texts emerged, and how they repeat and transform in new environments. I argue that the people who helped create and circulate these texts participated in regional and nation-wide networks of people, discourse, and resources, while simultaneously emphasizing their local relevance. In other words, local language policies are not purely local, nor are they just distributed, ready-made, from some sort of national hub. While this strategy of networked localism has been influential and consequential in many situations, it has also faltered or even backfired in others.
By focusing on the material network that makes local English-only policies possible, I also show that language policies are not merely manifestations of language ideologies. Instead, policies are connected to personal and professional experiences, to genres, to systems of government, to technologies, to histories, to geographies, and to all other aspects of people’s lives. For these reasons, language policy shifts are difficult to predict, or even plan. A corollary of this argument is that changing language policies requires much more than just changing language ideologies. In other words, it may be neither sufficient nor necessary to convince people of a particular perspective on language, languages, and language users. Policy campaigns can fail even with widespread community support, and they can succeed even if the majority of the policymakers are apathetic or even contemptuous towards the text they are sponsoring. These observations are not meant to evoke a sense of hopeless relativism, but rather to show that there are countless opportunities in the network for negotiation, intervention, and serendipity.

To develop this argument, I begin by explaining what I mean by network and text history, and why I use those as my units of analysis in this chapter. I also introduce some ways that text histories depend in large part on policymakers’ particular circumstances and ideologies about writing and writers. I then turn to the text histories themselves, which I present in four parts. First, I discuss the origins of the ProEnglish template in Hazleton, Pennsylvania’s 2006 Illegal Immigration Relief Act. Next, I move to one of the first efforts to emulate Hazleton’s example, which met with mixed results: Frederick, Maryland’s 2008 Official Language Resolution. In the following section, I analyze how Frederick switched from a resolution to an ordinance in 2012, in a campaign that deployed networked localism so brazenly that it led to success but also subsequent backlash. I then expand the scope to consider three other counties in Maryland that drew on templates and strategies from Hazleton, Frederick, and each other in 2012–2013, two of
which ultimately succeeded in passing English-only policies and one of which did not. I conclude by synthesizing the many networked components that shaped these text histories, and by posing some new questions raised by these findings.

**Networks and Text Histories**

*Networks*

Language policies are more than just “stand-alone documents” (Wible, 2013, p. 169). Policymakers know they need to marshal support and supporters in order to enact something new, to shape people’s perceptions, and to maintain or even extend a policy’s reach. Accordingly, understanding and researching language policies requires grasping these different components, examining how they are connected, and considering which ones are most consequential in a given moment. This combination of components, connections, and actions comprises a network. This term has a number of different contemporary meanings and associations, ranging from technological systems to groups of friends and beyond, so I want to briefly define what tracing networks means in my work. To do so, I draw on actor-network-theory.

Networks are intersecting series of actions carried out by various actors, where an actor is anything that makes a difference, whether it be a person, utterance, text, tool, object, environment, or something else (Latour, 2005). In his ethnography of the administrative branch of the French legal system, for example, Latour (2010) includes not just people and documents, but also “opinions,” “suggestions,” “pieces of advice and nudges,” as well as filing systems and mailboxes, because those things all proved to be consequential in practice (p. 91). By considering actors besides just people, my intention is not to claim that such components care
about the outcome of policy campaigns, but rather to point out that they *shape* them, whether by helping, hindering, or redirecting people’s actions and goals.

In an early description of networks, Latour (1993) describes the concept as “more supple than the notion of system, more historical than the notion of structure, more empirical than the notion of complexity” (3). This flexibility and attention to historical detail make it a useful method for studying complex phenomena like English-only language policies, which, in my experience, can seem alternately inevitable, inexplicable, or random at first glance. Networks are also more in flux and therefore more traceable during moments of controversy, disruption, and innovation. While English-only policies seem perennially controversial, they are even more so during campaigns, compared with after they pass, which is a major reason why I focus on policies “in the making” (Latour, 1987, p. 13). On the other hand, it can be difficult to trace many parts of policy networks, since many aspects are relatively private, or contested. Networks are also ephemeral: actions and links are material in the moment but they are not “durable” forever (Latour, 2005, p. 132). In other words, the kinds of networks I am interested in are not necessarily out there, waiting to be found, but rather need to be re-constructed and co-constructed through research. 13 Definitively pinning down how a policy develops, much less an ideology or discourse strategy, is not possible, because networks never really end. Instead, the goal is to follow the actors and events that seem most salient, to document the process along the way, and to acknowledge the parts that still remain unclear or unknown.

---

13 This approach is consistent with existing work in discourse analysis in many ways. Agha (2007), for example, notes that “[C]ultural formations are reproduced over social groups through communicative processes that unfold one participation framework at a time” (p. 9). The distinction, I think, is that Agha and others (Wortham and Reyes (2015), for example) focus more on chains of events involving people and some other objects like texts or technologies, but not as much on how those chains might intersect and involve a broader range of actors.
Written texts are one of the most, if not the most, salient component of policy networks. For that reason, I focus my network analysis on what Lillis and Curry (2010) call the “text history” (p. 4). For their long-term study of global academic publishing, they “developed” this unit of analysis “for exploring the trajectories of texts toward publication. The goal is to collect as much information as possible about the history of a text, including the drafts produced, the different people involved—including authors, reviewers, translators, editors, and academic colleagues—the chronology of involvement and the nature of their impact on the text and its trajectory” (p. 4). The “history” part gets at the fact that texts change over time as they change hands, change form, and create new meanings and in new situations. A text history includes not just drafts, feedback, and revision; but also broader practices of intertextuality, interdiscursivity, entextualization, and recontextualization (Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Silverstein and Urban, 1996; Oddo, 2014; Andrus, 2015; see also, Wirtz, 2014, p. 266 on “discourse histories”). For example, in Grabill and Blythe’s (2010) account of local environmental policy activism, meetings function as “moments of invention” even though not all the discourse gets “textualized” (p. 190, 194). The entextualization process is also not just about moving from talk to writing: Iedema (2010) argues that “thanks to rising technological capabilities and increased social networking, policy reform has become a more complex and multisemiotic endeavor” (p. 155). In other words, extracting, discussing, citing, copying, remediating, and recontextualizing stretches of discourse are at least as important as the final “product” (Prior and Thorne, 2014).

There are several ways that language policies can vary from other kinds of texts, and I have adapted the text history method to try to address those differences, in ways that may be

---

14 In this discussion of text histories, I define text fairly narrowly, as written documents, in order to focus on how people write official language policies. In Chapters 4 and 5, I take a more expansive view of what might constitute a
useful for other studies of public, professional, legal, and political writing. My approach took into account my participants’ views on writing and writers, as well as and Brandt’s (2015) recent work on the rise of professional writers in the United States. One aspect of policy texts that shapes their histories is the fact that they are highly “shareable” (Urban, 1996, 24). Any elected official can copy or otherwise emulate any policy without explicit citation or attribution, and it is not generally considered problematic or suspect. Similarly, it is commonplace for organizations to post legal templates for anyone interested in or willing to use them. In other words, policy plagiarism is almost an oxymoron. Of course, copied legislation can still fail, be amended, be superseded, or be deemed unconstitutional, but it is always on grounds other than the policy’s originality or lack thereof.

Another way that policy text histories are distinct is that while policies are a part of an organization’s literate system, they are not necessarily included in the domain of authorship. People who help shape language policies in the United States are what Brandt (2015) calls “everyday” writers, or those who may write prolifically, influentially, and profitably, but who do not expect or even necessarily desire authorship credit for that writing (p. 12). They are professionals who may write as a routine part of their work, whose pay depends to some degree on their writing literacy, who often write anonymously and ephemerally, and who may not necessarily feel the designation of writer is even appropriate to their situation, given their place in a culture where that term is usually reserved for published professionals associated with a few, highly regarded genres. (p. 12)

“text,” in keeping with other work that defines the term not in terms of a particular mode or material, but as any collection of signs that has been entextualized and recontextualized (Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Silverstein and Urban, 1996).
In other words, while they may technically be “published professionals,” they are not writing in genres where can expect to have their names publicly attached to their work. So, while Lillis and Curry (2010) found that some of their academic writer-participants were reticent about “report[ing] the involvement of others in their text production” (p. 5), writers outside academia may hesitate to even report their own involvement in writing texts. On one occasion, for example, I contacted a county employee because his supervisor had told me that he had helped craft the first draft of a proposed policy. After I emailed him to introduce my study and ask if he would be available for an interview, he replied that his role “was limited to assisting […] with the wording,” and then referred me to several other county committees and offices. Of course, he may simply not have been interested in participating, but the point is that it is difficult to imagine an academic or creative writer demurring by saying they merely helped “with the wording.” To some extent, writing routinely while eschewing “the designation of writer” is ubiquitous, because the connotations of “to write” are so much more capacious than the connotations of “writer” (Eubanks, 2011, p. 40). People who write a lot of text messages, diary entries, recipe cards, emails, or post-its often do not identify as “writers.” The writers I am focusing on, however, have additional cultural and legal motivations for their stances on their writing.

Most US workers have effectively no copyright claims over the texts they create. “Copyright turns inside out,” such that while an employee may receive some internal recognition (whether positive or negative) within an organization for what they produce, legally and officially they are usually not the author or the owner (Brandt, 2015, p. 20). This system reaches its logical conclusion in ghostwriting, where writers agree not to divulge their role in the writing process, in exchange for pay and some shelter from public scrutiny. Another common scenario is writing something that the entire team organization then takes credit for. So, coming up with a
policy idea, conducting legal research, finding an appropriate template, tailoring the template, composing new sentences, publicizing the policy, revising the text, and voting on the actual bill or ordinance may all be done by different or overlapping groups of people.

While some of the practices differ between academic writing and policy writing, the timespans, numbers of people, technologies, and drafting processes are quite similar, which is why the text history is an apt unit of analysis for exploring how people create and circulate local language policies. In other words, text histories may not be as illuminating for studying a single writer over their lifespan, or a single significant event, or an entire social movement, but they are well-suited for studying a few texts that emerge over a few years with the participation of a few dozen people. Like Lillis and Curry, I have conducted interviews with writers, brokers, and sponsors, collected “as many drafts as available,” and gathered evidence of “correspondence” among writers and with their audiences, through news coverage, government meetings and hearings, and other public discourse (p. 4).

The aim of this chapter is to explore how such a network can enable and rely on local language policymaking. In focusing more on texts in this chapter, and on the language ideologies in and around those texts in the following chapter, I aim not to reinscribe tired dichotomies between text/context, writing/talk about writing, action/thought, or truth/ideology. Rather, part of my argument is that language policies, like any other kind of writing, are not *merely* manifestations of language ideologies.

**Building a Network**

ProEnglish’s model ordinance emerged out of a 2006 series of local policy reforms and lawsuits in Hazleton, Pennsylvania (see Table 2, for a list of policies discussed in this chapter).
Table 2.
Timeline of the key language policies discussed in this chapter. Information includes date when passed/failed/withdrawn, sponsors, names, outcome, and whether the policy incorporated language from the organization ProEnglish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Official Sponsor</th>
<th>Full Policy Name</th>
<th>Shorthand Name</th>
<th>Initial Outcome</th>
<th>Still in Effect?</th>
<th>ProEnglish Template?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2006</td>
<td>Hazleton, PA</td>
<td>Official English Ordinance, 2006-19</td>
<td>Hazleton English Ordinance</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ProEnglish</td>
<td>Model Municipal Official English Ordinance</td>
<td>ProEnglish Template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/15/2008</td>
<td>Frederick County, MD</td>
<td>An Ordinance by the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, Maryland to Enact a New 1-1-9 to the Code to Provide that English is the Official Language of the Frederick County Government</td>
<td>Jenkins' Proposed Ordinance</td>
<td>Failed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
<td>Frederick County, MD</td>
<td>Resolution 'Proclaiming English as the Official, Primary and Common Language', 08-13</td>
<td>Frederick Resolution</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>No; superseded in 2012</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Frederick County, MD</td>
<td>Frederick County Official English Ordinance, 12-03-598</td>
<td>Frederick Ordinance</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>No; repealed in 2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5/2012</td>
<td>Anne Arundel, MD</td>
<td>Official Language, Bill 13-12</td>
<td>Anne Arundel Bill</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/2012</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s County, MD</td>
<td>An Act Concerning Recognition of English as the Official Language of Queen Anne’s County</td>
<td>Queen Anne’s Ordinance</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/2013</td>
<td>Carroll County, MD</td>
<td>An Ordinance adopting amendments to the Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances of Carroll County, Maryland, 2013-01</td>
<td>Carroll Ordinance</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the same time, national organizations like the ACLU and ProEnglish itself, federal law and legal precedent, and nationally circulating discourse about language, race, and immigration played influential roles as well. In fact, Hazleton’s first attempt at a language policy was itself a close copy of one that the government of San Bernardino, California had considered but ultimately rejected earlier that year (Dick, 2011, pp. 46–7). From the beginning, then, the template has shaped and been shaped by a variety of scales and actors. It has always been a hybrid, even as people over the past decade have continued to recontextualize it in different local governments. I begin with Hazleton, though, and not San Bernardino, because Hazleton was the point when the template became more formalized.

Hazleton is an industrial town of roughly 20,000 residents, although its population and economic landscape have fluctuated significantly in recent years. Like many communities in the US, Hazleton’s migrant population was negligible for several decades, due in large part to restrictive federal immigration quotas and a struggling, coal-based economy (Dick, 2011; Wortham and Rhodes, 2012). More immigrants began to move to Hazleton in the 1990s, and while this shift bolstered the town’s economy, many existing residents resented the demographic shift. According to Hazleton mayor Lou Barletta, the “straw that broke the camel’s back” and inspired him to sponsor formal anti-immigrant legislation was a murder case where the alleged perpetrators were undocumented immigrants (although those charges were later dropped) (Associated Press, 2007, July 7).

In addition to these local demographic shifts and events, Spring 2006 was a period of heightened national discussion about immigration reform and language policy, both in the federal government, nation-wide news coverage, and protests in several large US cities (Tardy, 15 Another version of the story appeared in the Hazleton Standard-Speaker, where the writer describes how Mayor Lou Barletta “contacted Kansas attorney Kris Kobach, who wrote IIRA,” so it’s possible that Kobach also wrote the San Bernardino bill. See Tarone (2015, October 18).
The city’s mayor, Lou Barletta, initiated a long series of events when he enacted the original “Illegal Immigration Relief Act.” This policy transformed and expanded local governmental authority in a number of ways, from introducing fines for landlords who rent to undocumented immigrants, to restricting employers’ hiring practices, to establishing the city as “English Only.” Later, the original policy was split into two, one covering language policy and the other covering everything else.

In an interview with Robert Vandervoort, the former executive director of ProEnglish, we discussed how the language ordinance went from law to legal template. I began by asking about the template:

Flowers: About the-, the model (.), um, municipal or local ordinance.
Vandervoort: Mhmm.
Flowers: Um, that’s on the website. Do you (. ) know who wrote it?
Vandervoort: I believe (. ) and (. ) I’d have to double-check to make sure, but I believe it was written by an attorney named Barnaby Zall. I believe that-
Flowers: Oh.
Vandervoort: It was, uh (. ) I believe-, he had helped (. ) for many years, um (. ) on these issues. And (. ) my understanding is that this was the- (. ) when Hazleton, Pennsylvania introduced their language (. )
Flowers: Mhmm.
Vandervoort: I believe the ACLU tried to challenge it, and so Barnaby Zall (. ) went back and (. ) and I believe he (. ) tried to correct some of the things that (. ) were at issue, and (. ) and it was-, I believe it was resubmitted with the changes that-, the changes that he had helped create, and that was (. ) you know, the-, the changes that he made in that legislation, or that (. ) you know, for the (. ), the official law, (. ) were-, were pretty air tight, to the point where the ACLU actually dropped [their]
Flowers: [Mhmm].
Vandervoort: challenge on (. ) the official English (. ) ordinance at Hazleton, although they did go forward with their (. ) challenge on the immigration ordinance, in that [town.]
Flowers: [Mhmm].
Vandervoort: So (. ) that’s-, that (. ) language we’ve been using and promoting ever since.
This exchange suggests that a lawyer for ProEnglish named Barnaby Zall authored the new Official Language ordinance, and this ordinance in turn became the basis for ProEnglish’s model ordinance. His role appears multi-faceted: Vandervoort describes him as having “written,” “helped,” “tried to correct” things, and “creat[ed]” changes. Vandervoort emphasizes the fact that the new text was “pretty air tight,” even from the ACLU’s perspective. The trajectories between the two halves of the original law also began to diverge at this point: the housing and employment parts were the subject of the lawsuit Lozano v. Hazleton through 2014, and were ultimately ruled unconstitutional, while the Official Language policy survived intact.

When Vandervoort mentioned Zall, I recognized the name from my archival research on the 1980s English-only movement, but I did not know about his more recent work. In retrospect I should not have been so surprised to hear about Zall’s role in Hazleton: he had been involved in similar kinds of writing for at least 25 years. In 1981, he began working with John Tanton as a lobbyist for the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) while he was still in law school, and he went on to work as legal counsel for FAIR, U.S. English, and ProEnglish. A 1983 biographical note in a law review article described him as the “Director of Government Relations” for FAIR (LeMaster and Zall, 1983). A Los Angeles Times article described him as an attorney for both FAIR and U.S. English (Trombley, 1986, October 20). In a 1990 article he co-wrote on “the English Language movement,”18 his bio stated that he was “the author of California’s Proposition 63 and several other official language provisions,” as well as “the

16 In addition to citing examples from ProEnglish and U.S. English, I also include examples from the Federation for American Immigration Reform, in part because all three were founded by John Tanton, but even more so because U.S. English and FAIR have shared resources and employees. Tanton (1982, December 7), for example, announced early on that “U.S. English will be sharing offices and overhead with FAIR, and will draw strongly on FAIR’s management people and experience.”

17 Two books suggest that he started working with Tanton in 1981, even before U.S. English’s founding: see Graham (2008, p. 73) and Rohe (2002, p. 45). The earliest correspondence between Tanton and Zall in Tanton’s archives corroborates this year (Tanton, 1981, December 2).

18 Elsewhere in the article they call it “the official language movement” (Zall and Stein, 1990, p. 268).
general counsel to U.S. English and other official language organizations” (Zall and Stein, p. 268). Proposition 63 was the policy that made English the official language of California in 1986.\(^\text{19}\) In a special issue of Tanton’s journal *The Social Contract* on the theme of “The Battle for Official English,” an article by the chairman of English Language Advocates described how Zall “worked with the legislature’s lawyers to craft an initiative amending Arizona’s constitution to declare English the official language” (Park, 1996, p. 245).\(^\text{20}\) In describing this process, Park describes Zall as U.S. English’s “top lawyer,” someone “who performed miracles time and time again” (p. 248). In a 2007 newsletter, ProEnglish described Hazleton’s ordinance as having “dr[awn] heavily on the legal expertise and work of ProEnglish’s general counsel, Barnaby Zall” (p. 4). To summarize, Zall has a long history of writing language policies that become law, and of mediating between organizations and legislators. He also continued this kind of work after Hazleton. In 2009, for example, he wrote an amicus curiae brief on behalf of ProEnglish and other organizations in the Arizona bilingual education case *Horne v. Flores*.\(^\text{21}\)

The way people describe Zall’s role depends heavily on the audience and the venue. The sources that identify him as a policy writer (cited above) are aimed at two particular (although overlapping) audiences. The first is scholars, as in the chapter in Adams and Brink’s (1990) edited collection on language policy (published by Mouton de Gruyter), and in Vandervoort’s interview with me. The second audience is members of the English-only movement, as in parts of Tanton’s archives; Rohe’s hagiographic biography of the Tantons; a book by Tanton’s friend

---

\(^\text{19}\) California’s 1986 official English law is still intact, although it was the subject of a somewhat backhanded decision in *Gutiérrez v. Municipal Court* in 1988. The decision upheld the state’s law, but only because it was deemed “primarily a symbolic statement.” The case was later vacated (and therefore does not count as legal precedent) on procedural grounds.

\(^\text{20}\) This proposition held for 10 years (1988–1998), but was ultimately ruled unconstitutional in *Ruiz v. Hull*. However, in 2006, Arizonans voted on a similar proposition that passed, and is still in tact. Tellingly, the 1988 proposition only passed very narrowly, 51%–49%, while the 2006 proposition passed overwhelmingly, 74%–26%, which suggests that English-only policies became more popular in Arizona over time (*Ruiz v. Hull*, 1998, p. 5; Arizona Secretary of State, 2006).

\(^\text{21}\) See Zall (2009) for ProEnglish and others’ amicus curiae brief for *Horne v. Flores*. 
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and colleague, historian Otis L. Graham, Jr.; the special issue of Tanton’s journal, and ProEnglish’s newsletter.

In contrast, news coverage and elected officials tend to be less specific about Zall and about writing. For example, in a piece about Jackson, New York’s proposed “English law,” the journalist describes ProEnglish as “the organization that helped draft Hazleton, Pa.’s [sic] English ordinance” (Taube, 2010, August 4). This kind of coverage mentions the organization, but not individual people; and uses more general terms like help and assist rather than writing-specific terms. These two different kinds of description suggest that having a policy writer who can write for different jurisdictions around the country is an asset for an organization and for the overall social movement, but that ProEnglish and elected officials usually prefer to emphasize the role of local actors more, particularly while the policy campaign is still unfolding. Zall’s work is thus key to the broader language policy network, and his discretion is key to the localism permeating that network. Yet while Zall’s role was important, the collaboration between ProEnglish and a local government was by no means unprecedented or even exceptional. Copying, ghostwriting, and templates have been ubiquitous in Tanton’s organizations, both in internal writing for colleagues and for writing meant for wider audiences. Zall’s focus on actually writing government policy texts is therefore in keeping with ProEnglish’s and U.S. English’s broader prioritization of networked writing.

After hearing Vandervoort’s account of how this template started, I was still curious about the precise nature of Zall’s collaboration with Hazleton’s elected officials, and between the account I was hearing and the account on the ProEnglish website, so I continued:

Flowers: Mhmm. Yeah, that-, OK, that helps me fill in a gap. Because on the website under, um, “court cases”

---

22 In one early example of ghostwriting, staffer Kathy Bricker offered Senator S. I. Hayakawa some sample language he could use for an “endorsement” of U.S. English (1986, February 10).
Vandervoort: Mhmm.
Flowers: It says, (.) ProEnglish assisted the city (.) of Hazleton by drafting its amended English ordinance.
Vandervoort: Mhmm.
Flowers: So Hazleton did (.)
Vandervoort: They had-
Flowers: The original
Vandervoort: They had-
Flowers: They wrote one of their own, but.
Vandervoort: They wrote one of their own, and then the ACLU challenged it.
Flowers: Mhmm.
Vandervoort: And then they contacted us for some help and assistance, and Barnaby Zall, who at the time was working (.) with us on these issues.
Flowers: Mhmm.
Vandervoort: Looked at it, made the changes and corrections that (.) based-, I believe, on what the ACLU had found as problematic, and that [was]
Flowers: [Mhmm].
Vandervoort: Resolved and resubmitted and then the ACLU dropped the challenge to the-, to that ordinance.

In terms of the interview interaction, I think this is a particularly clear example of how the nature of my questioning shaped Vandervoort’s response. Twice, he starts to say “They had-,” twice, I interjected, and then he eventually echoes my own construction of “They wrote one of their own.” In the rest of his statement, he reemphasizes how multifaceted ProEnglish’s role was in the writing process: there were “changes,” “corrections,” and the new policy was “resolved and resubmitted.”

Once I knew where to look for the origins of ProEnglish’s template, I pieced together the sequence of events and the various participants in Hazleton. In the initial, pre-ProEnglish ordinance, race and legal immigration were absent on the surface, but they were implicitly quite relevant. As Dick (2011) meticulously describes, these absences allowed “[c]hampions of local immigration restrictions” to claim that there was nothing unjust about the policy: the law applied equally to everyone, and did not discriminate against any particular race(s) (Dick, 2011, p. 50).23

---

23 The original Illegal Immigration Relief Act does explicitly discriminate against undocumented immigrants, of course.
On the other hand, the policy’s meaning is not just in its referential language but also in what other discourse and texts it indexes. The policy cites and resembles federal laws that disproportionately harm people of color, whether they are immigrants or not. Furthermore, Dick (2011) notes that because terms like “Mexican immigrant” and “illegal alien” are so “conflated” in US discourse, the policy does not have to directly mention latino/as in order to send harmful messages to and about them. Amidst local public outcry against the Illegal Immigration Relief Act, local landlords and employers began filing lawsuits against the city, and the ACLU filed a lawsuit of its own (Tarone, 2015, October 8).

In response, the government took a number of steps immunize the policy against legal complaints. First, and perhaps most significantly, they split the ordinance into two: no longer was the official language provision fused to the other provisions about housing, employment, and law enforcement. An article in Hazleton’s newspaper, The Standard-Speaker, hinted that the soon-to-be-passed “revisions are fairly substantive” (Tarone, 2006, September 8). The article paraphrases Mayor Barletta as saying that “if he’d had to do it over, he’d have introduced it [the language policy] as a separate bill” from the beginning, but that “the group ProEnglish, […] has volunteered its help in defending that bill if it is challenged in court.” However, the revisions were also “designed to make the bills more likely to withstand the court challenge filed by” the ACLU and Latino/a advocacy organizations, thereby obviating the need for further legal help (Tarone, 2006, September 8). Specifically, they revised the official language policy. Somewhat counterintuitively, making the language component more palatable involved not trimming it down, but actually adding much more content.

Barnaby Zall made Hazleton’s new language policy different from the original in almost every way. The first one was two sentences; this revised one is three pages. New sections include
an “Official English Declaration,” “Exceptions,” “Private Use Protected,” and “Interpretation.”

There are two innovations in this policy that may have made it more difficult to legally challenge, for the ACLU and other plaintiffs and activists, and more appealing to other local governments. The first major innovation is that the revised text describes spatial and political scales with more nuance. The scope of the policy is more explicitly local; the City is mentioned fourteen times, while the state and federal government only appear three times. Furthermore, unlike in ProEnglish’s 2000 model policy (Chapter 1, Figure 2), here the point of mentioning those other government scales is to acknowledge exceptions and limitations, not to ask for higher offices to adopt the same language policy. Paradoxically, then, this more locally-oriented policy became the more mobile, translocal, long-lived template.

The second key difference is that this ordinance depicts English as an at-risk language, and English speakers as an at-risk group. This theme was not at all present in the initial ordinance, and it is an odd addition, given that English is the world’s most commonly used language, and the number of English users is rising, not falling (Van Parijs, 2011). There are four specific clauses that create this sense of vulnerability. On the first page, the policy states that “In today’s modern society, the City of Hazleton may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain government programs and benefits.” The opening phrase suggests that English speakers may have been safe in the past, but not necessarily anymore. Later on, the policy elaborates on these protections for monolingual English speakers by establishing that they are “eligible to participate in all programs, benefits and opportunities, including employment,” and that no local government agent or policy “shall penalize or impair [their] rights, obligations, or opportunities.” Finally, there is one clause that focuses on the language itself (not just its users): the government “shall make no policy that
diminishes or ignores the role of English.” This new stance makes the policy sound less like an imperialist or evangelical attempt to spread English, and more like an innocent plea for mercy (a theme I return to in Chapter 4).

When ProEnglish adopted Hazleton’s paper ordinance as its online template, there were few revisions, other than the step of removing all mentions of Hazleton and replacing them with blank stretches in brackets (Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The People of the City of Hazleton find and declare:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> That the English language is the common language of the City of Hazleton, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> That the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of City of Hazleton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The people of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] find and declare that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the English language is the common language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION], of the State/Commonwealth of [NAME OF STATE] and of the United States;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of [NAME OF JURISDICTION], this State and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. A comparison of excerpts from Hazleton’s Official English Ordinance (top) and the template based on that ordinance (bottom), both written in mid-2006. The two are identical except for place names.

There are some minor changes: The ProEnglish version does not have a “Title” section, the punctuation on the numbered/lettered lists is slightly different, and there are two instances of “that” that were changed to “which.” The most substantive change in wording was in a phrase
that went from “a government of the people” to “a government accountable to the people,”
although it is difficult to say how that might substantively change the meaning. Once ProEnglish
had extracted the template’s language from its original Hazleton context, and recontextualized it
on its website, it quickly began to circulate to more sites and more geographic locations.
According to the Internet Archive, the template had appeared on Barletta’s website
smalltowndefenders.com by July 14, 2006, and on anti-undocumented-immigrant site
illegalaliens.us no later than October 4, 2006. Dick (2011) also reports that Barletta advertised
the policy on talk radio (pp. 12–13).

The template did not circulate alone or just with casual commentary; people both within
and beyond English-only organizations emphasized that legal consulting was crucial in order for
a new policy to succeed. Internally, ProEnglish posted an offer of free consulting and their
contact information on the same page as the template, which is still there as of 2016 (Figure 6).
At the time, the more general site illegalaliens.us warned that it was “essential” that a local
attorney representing the government” (style in original) reach out to ProEnglish “as far in
advance as possible, to discuss critical technical issues in confidence,” so as to avoid “legal
liability, including civil rights claims” (Model Ordinances, 2006). ProEnglish’s offer and this
site’s warning highlight the fact that circulating and copying a policy text is not enough; the
growing network also needed to involve introductions, conversations, legal expertise, “technical”
troubleshooting, and tailoring by local lawyers for local governments.
In the months and years to come, other communities emulated Hazleton’s policy. In some ways, those communities were following Hazleton just like Hazleton had followed San Bernardino. The differences, though, were that now ProEnglish was involved, now the policy was “air tight” (Vandervoort), now the template was available on multiple websites, and now Hazleton was getting significant news coverage due to the multi-year-long lawsuit \textit{Lozano v. Hazleton}. The earliest example of uptake that I found was from one of Hazleton’s neighboring communities, Shenandoah, in summer 2006. In a balancing act that other city- and county-level elected officials would also attempt in the upcoming years, Shenandoah representative Joseph Palubinsky said to a reporter, “I don’t want to come out and say that we’re going to copy Hazleton’s ordinance, but we’re going to use it as a guideline” (Light, 2006, June 19).
Extending the Network

As he helped me piece together the people and events involved in Frederick County’s three different recent language policies, activist Hayden Duke brought up the subject of his county’s first foray into this area:

Duke: If I recall correctly, under Jan Gardner, who's now the County Executive, there had been (. ) some type of English-only something.

Flowers: There was a resolution.

Duke: Yes!

I followed up, by asking if he remembered what that resolution passed, in 2008. “Vaguely,” he replied. In this section, I piece together the history of this “vaguely” remembered 2008 policy, which was fraught at the time it passed, and fuzzy in most people’s memories today, not least because it was sponsored by a Democrat who went on to support the repeal of a newer English Only policy in 2015. It was an uptake of Hazleton’s discourse more than its precise template, but it nevertheless laid the local groundwork for future policies.

In 2006, a newly elected Frederick County Commissioner named Charles Jenkins started considering the idea of making English the official language. While language policy had not come up during his campaign, a combination of budget issues, law enforcement developments, and media coverage of immigration debates came together soon after he entered office. During his first budget session, Jenkins and his colleagues received requests “asking for more money for translators and interpreters” from approximately 13 out of 17 county divisions. He also recalled how the Board of Education “came across the street”24 to request about $250,000 to hire four new instructors for “ELLs” (English Language Learners). He considered these requests unreasonable.

---

24 The two government offices are a few blocks apart in downtown Frederick City.
Meanwhile, Jenkins was also serving as the liaison to the Sheriff’s Department. This was an eventful time to be in this position, as Sheriff Chuck Jenkins was in the process of rolling out a new program called 287(g). This ongoing program facilitates closer collaboration between local law enforcement and US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). According to Jenkins (2016), he and his office have helped detain and/or depart more than 1,400 undocumented immigrants. These encounters with law enforcement have taken place under circumstances ranging from murder cases, to traffic stops to, and, in one woman’s case, eating a sandwich on a street curb (Santos v. Frederick County Board of Commissioners). The Sheriff had made 287(g) part of his 2006 campaign, in an effort to combat any reputation Maryland might have for being a “magnet state” full of “sanctuary cities” for undocumented immigrants. For some of the people I spoke with, 287(g) was evidence that immigration was a problem; for others its existence was a sign that treatment of immigrants was a problem. While there is not an inherent link between language and immigration (many immigrants use English fluently, and many people born in the US use languages other than English), the link was very salient in this time and place. For example, the last interview question I usually asked was if there was anyone else in the community they would recommend that I contact for my research (which was explicitly about language policy). The most common suggestion I received was Sheriff Jenkins.

In addition to the budget session and the liaison work, Charles Jenkins also mentioned hearing about the language and immigration debates happening in Hazleton and other places, including Farmers Branch, Texas, and Prince William County, Virginia. In fact, his first policy ideas closely reflected Hazleton’s initial Illegal Immigration Relief Act. His initial goal was to “deny services” to people who could not prove their legal residence. His motion to move forward with this proposal failed, and it was at that point that, as in Hazleton, he turned to a separate

25 My interview with Chuck Jenkins was not recorded, so any quotes are from my notes.
language policy instead. In other words, he went through a sort of accelerated, streamlined version of what had taken Hazleton’s government years and lawsuits to decide. His English-only policy was “born out of” concern over potential future requests for government documents in other languages (Jenkins).

In addition to local government issues and awareness of Hazleton and other communities with similar policies, there were also several other ways that language policy was becoming a more salient issue in Maryland at the time. These are factors that my participants did not mention directly, but which local and regional media covered in detail at the time. First, Maryland’s legislature had considered making English the state’s official language in the 1990s. A *Baltimore Sun* article called the bill “a perennial loser in the General Assembly,” which neatly sums up the bill’s supporters’ persistence yet lack of success (Bock, 1994, March 23). Later that same year, the bill actually passed in the legislature. In a news article twelve years later, Tim Schultz, U.S. English’s government relations director, attributed its passage to his organization, saying that “[o]rganizationally, we were the driving force when it passed” (Brewington, 2006, March 5). Governor William Schaefer vetoed the bill at the time, but years later became a supporter of English-only policies when he was serving as Maryland’s comptroller. After a 2004 interaction at a McDonald’s in Anne Arundel County where he witnessed employees speaking Spanish, and where his to-go bag had messages in multiple languages printed on it, he told the story at a public government meeting and then remarked, “I don’t want to adjust to another language. This is the United States.” 26 Maryland’s governor at the time, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., voiced his support for Schaefer by commenting that multiculturalism was “bunk” and that “with regard to this culture, English is the language” (Nitkin, 2004, May 9). In the years leading up to

---

Maryland’s local language policies, then, the governor and a former governor were both keeping the issue in state news.

State delegates were also trying to make English the official language at the state and local levels around the same time. Delegate Patrick McDonough, also known for his opposition to Maryland’s DREAM Act, co-sponsored many bills over the years that would have made English the official language of Maryland, both before and after the local policies passed. In 2006, he began sponsoring bills that would make English the official language of the counties in his district: first Baltimore County and later Harford County. McDonough has also attended political events with Blaine Young and Chuck Jenkins, who were involved with Frederick’s 2012 ordinance. Taneytown, MD, had already passed an English-only resolution (Malik, 2006, November 3; Malik, 2006, November 15). Locally, a blogger for the Frederick-News Post had called for English to be the official language (Soule, 2005, March 3).

According to county records, Jenkins introduced an ordinance, and a resolution that would “initiate” that ordinance, in April 2008. I believe Jenkins put this package together on his own, or at least without direct help from any English-only organization. The language of the proposal does not resemble ProEnglish’s policy or any other policy that I have found. While there are a few paragraphs of paratext, the substantive part of his ordinance is brief: “English is the official language of County government. All county government documents shall be written in English.” I asked about the authorship of his proposed policy from a couple of angles, to see how his answers would compare to my reading. First, I asked if anyone from ProEnglish had ever been in contact with him, and he said, emphatically, “no.” Then, I asked if he had ever had a

27 See McDonough et al. (2006, February 10), McDonough (2007, February 9), McDonough et al. (2008, February 6), McDonough et al. (2010, February 10), and McDonough et al. (2010, February 15).
28 For example, McDonough, Young, and Chuck Jenkins headlined a petition-signing event together at a Shell station in Frederick in 2013. This is the same gas station that I discuss again later in the chapter, although a different event. See OnTarget (2013, May 22).
chance to speak with elected officials in places like Hazleton, and he again replied, “no,” and went on to say that he had just followed those other cases through the news. He described himself as a committed writer, and added that “I enjoy writing; once I get started, it’s hard to stop it.” As a testament to his penchant for writing, since leaving office he has been a newspaper columnist for the past four years.

As Jenkins was preparing to introduce his legislative package, one of his colleagues, Democratic Commissioner Jan Gardner, learned of his plan and quickly put together a different, competing language policy proposal (Jenkins). Her policy, which Jenkins referred to as a “watered down resolution,” was the one that ultimately passed on a 3-2 vote. Much to Jenkins’ chagrin, Gardner’s policy sent a more mild message—hers “promotes proficiency in the English language” while Jenkins’ declared that “all County government documents shall be written in English” (Figure 7).
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED AND ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND THAT:

§4. Addition of New §1-1-9 to the Code – A new §1-1-9 is added to the Code and shall read as follows:

"1-1-9. ENGLISH IS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

English is the official language of County government. All County government documents shall be written in English."

§7 Effective Date. - This Ordinance shall be effective on the ____ day of __________, 2008

THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS RESOLUTION IS APRIL 24, 2008

RESOLUTION NO. 08-13

RESOLUTION OF
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

Re: Proclaiming English as the Official, Primary and Common Language

WHEREAS, the English language is the primary language and common form of communication in Frederick County; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland promotes proficiency in the English language to encourage full economic and civic participation of all its citizens; and,

WHEREAS, the community benefits from acknowledging and embracing the rich and varied cultural heritage in our community.

Figure 7. A comparison of Commissioner Charles Jenkins’ 2008 proposed language ordinance (top), and the resolution that actually passed the following week, sponsored by Jenkins’ colleague Jan Gardner (bottom). The texts share little in common, and neither policy incorporates any of the ProEnglish template. These policies are an example of similar discourse, but not a shared template.
Genre was also part of the dispute: the government can enforce an ordinance, while a resolution “of course has no force of law,” and Charles Jenkins wanted force of law.

Vandervoort had a similar perspective when we discussed the question of genre in a more general sense. I began by asking him what he would advise someone trying to decide between the two options:

Flowers: If someone asks you, ‘Should we do a resolution that’s maybe (.) um, less controversial but also less (.) official, [maybe?]’

Vandervoort: [Mhmm].
Flowers: ‘Versus an ordinance’
Vandervoort: Hmm.
Flowers: Which- (.), how do you help them (.) sort of resolve that?
Vandervoort: Well, I would definitely-, we would definitely lean on the side of-, of an (.) ordinance.
Flowers: Mhmm.
Vandervoort: Something that has some teeth in it, something that can be enforced (.) uh, as opposed to a resolution, because a resolution doesn’t really (.) do anything, (.) I mean, (.) I suppose (.) it would be better than nothing, if, if that’s all you could get, but I mean, at the same- ( ), but at the same time (.), you know, it’s like a resolution saying (.) you know, “The cardinal will be our county bird.” You know, or the (.) “The marigold is our county-. We have a resolution that the marigold is our county flower,” you know, [or]

Flowers: [Mhmm]
Vandervoort: “Our state flower,” or something, and that’s nice (.) but it doesn’t (.) ((sighs)) it-, in matters of governance, it doesn’t (.) prohibit a government from (.) mul-, from printing in multiple languages, you [know].

Flowers: [Mhmm]

Vandervoort: ... so that’s why (.) an ordinance (.) or a state law that-, that actually directs government to (.) operate in English (.) would be preferable to just saying, ‘Oh, we really like English.’

“Oh, we really like English” is a pretty accurate encapsulation of Frederick’s 2008 Resolution, both in terms of the stance towards English, and the construction of an English-using “we.”

While Vandervoort suggested that a resolution “would be better than nothing,” Jenkins felt differently, and ultimately voted against Gardner’s Resolution. His refusal to endorse this policy demonstrates how different a common language resolution can feel compared with an official
language ordinance. When I asked Jenkins if he had had a hard time deciding how to vote, he replied, “No, I was pretty disgusted with it. So, I didn’t have a problem voting against it.”

That Jenkins voted against the resolution may seem odd, and, indeed, I was surprised when I learned about this turn of events. He wanted English to be the official language, and he had the opportunity to vote ‘yes’ on a government declaration of that concept, so why didn’t he? Vandervoort’s analogies to a “county bird” and a “state flower” are helpful for understanding Jenkins’ perspective. For people genuinely concerned about the status of the English language, the situation was akin to if one politician had tried to introduce a law to protect an endangered species, and another introduced a concurrent proposal to merely make the species the county’s mascot. In doing so, that second politician could effectively make a mockery of the whole issue, while still being able to claim that they had taken action on it. Despite the discord surrounding this Resolution at the time, now residents tend to remember it less as a compromise and more as the opening gambit in the county’s English-only movement. In the next section, I turn to how ProEnglish went from distant inspiration for Jenkins’ proposal in 2008, to active participant in 2012, and how this collaboration exemplifies networked localism.

**Expanding the Network**

The composition of the Board of County Commissioners changed significantly in 2010, which in turn made a change in language policy possible. A group of conservative candidates ran together “as a slate,” and won handily (Delauter). Like Charles Jenkins before them, they considered a range of potential policies to discourage undocumented immigrants from living in the area, and they included an English-only ordinance in this package. In fact, Jenkins said that he met with the new Commissioner President, Blaine Young, to share his ideas for immigration-
related policy reform during the transition period. Blaine Young was open to the concept, as were the other new commissioners to some extent. One of the other commissioners, C. Paul Smith, described the different local, state, and national phenomena that prompted them to consider such policies around 2012:

Smith: Now one of the things that’s going on at this time is, not only what we just talked about, of the Maryland law that(.) that provides tuition f-, it can provide for-, for illegal aliens. But, locally (.). a lot of-, a lot of the funds that the county has to (.). raise and-, and use are to educate (.). illegal aliens.

Flowers: Mhmm.

Smith: And so there’s a lot of discussion at that time about (.). asking the public schools to identify how many illegal aliens are in the school. And the public schools would not tell us.

Flowers: Mmm.

Smith: They said, ‘Oh, that’s private. We can’t tell you that.’ And they-, they go back to a Supreme Court that said, uh, that we have to educate (.). whoever lives-, (.). whether they’re illegal or not, in-, in our

Flowers: [Mhmm]

Smith: [county].

Flowers: Mhmm.

Smith: And-, and so, the (.). Commissioner Young ( ) would say, ‘That, that may be so, but still, we want to know how many they are, because this illegal alien problem, though we’re not next to the border is affecting us,’ and it-, and remember, 2010 is right after the 2008 crash, and (.). we who were elected-, one of the big issues was (.). reigning in government so that government expenses are controlled so that people’s taxes don’t go-, don’t go up.

In one interview response, he synthesizes the state DREAM Act (“the Maryland law that provides tuition for illegal aliens”) the national “2008 crash” that affected the local economy, as well as the local school district’s practice of educating students regardless of immigration status, which shows how many scales were relevant at once. This policy did not simply arise as a micro reaction to a macro context, in other words. Through reported speech (‘we want to know how many there are’), Smith suggests that Blaine Young was the most outspoken and visible sponsor of these immigration-related proposals. Everyone I talked to about this policy shared Smith’s assessment of Young’s role at the time.
Blaine Young’s official government title does not begin to capture his influential role in and beyond his community. He has described himself as Maryland’s “youngest good ol’ boy,” and is part of a Maryland political dynasty (Blaine Young Biography, 2008; Cox, 2014, May 26). In addition to holding office, he also ran advertising and taxi businesses and hosted a daily talk radio show on WFMD. One resident I interviewed, Will Gardner (a pseudonym), stated that he had first heard about language policy as a local issue on Young’s radio show. Gardner recalled that Young announced an upcoming petition signing event that would take place at a local Route 40 Shell gas station, and that one of the petitions was aimed at making English the official language of the state of Maryland. While I have not found other references to that language policy petition, Young has hosted a number of other events at that gas station, including a petition signing co-hosted by conservative organization MDPetitions.29 The proprietor of the Shell station, Joe Parsley, is so closely associated with Young that in 2013 some residents boycotted his business as part of a wider protest of Young’s actions (Frederick Editorial Board, 2013, July 5).

While Young was undoubtedly the main sponsor, it is less clear who else was involved in crafting the policy, especially the first public draft. Duke suggested that it may have been several people, because “Blaine, Billy, Kirby, and Paul [the aforementioned “slate”] worked very closely together,” and they may also have had “the county attorney write it up.” A memo from January 2012 (a month before the ordinance passed) corroborates the point about the attorney being the one to “write it up.” County Attorney John Mathias wrote to the Commissioners to say that, “In reviewing similar legislation from other jurisdictions, a Model Municipal English Language Ordinance was located. This model ordinance was on the website for ProEnglish. […]

29 See Cooper (2012, April 25) for the petition-signing event. See Williams (2008, November 1) for an earlier, different example of a kind of event hosted by Young at the Shell Station.
A draft ordinance for Frederick County, very similar to this model ordinance, has been prepared.” The passive voice in those sentences leaves the precise identity of the person or group doing the locating and preparing unclear. Sheriff Chuck Jenkins, who has remained in office, guessed that ProEnglish “monitors” places that they could “interject in,” while Delauter pointed to Young himself as the one who “put a lot of this together.” Regardless of the exact directionality, the attorney clearly mediated between ProEnglish and the Commissioners, and between the template and Frederick’s eventual ordinance.

The other Commissioners, however, do not seem to have participated until the later stages. Delauter explained that he gave his input once the draft was “on the agenda,” and Smith said he was not “the mover” on this issue. Delauter recalled that he advised Young to frame the policy as “a fiscal decision,” as a step towards “consistency,” especially when it came to “written” documents. When I raised the question of Mathias’s and ProEnglish’s role, Delauter explained that they “wanted a version that was tested in court.” In other words, Delauter and his colleagues realized an English-only policy might attract legal challenges, and they wanted a text that would both be specific to Frederick yet be relatively risk-free, because it had already been developed elsewhere in the network.

While Delauter entered the policymaking process without major reservations, Smith entered it with concerns. In the course of laying out a long, thorough account of the policy’s history, he described his initial reaction to the idea of an official language policy and threw up his hands in the air, as if remembering his mild frustration at the time (Figure 8):

**Smith:** When the issue came up (.), ((exhales and raises hands)), it-, I was kind of saying, ‘Oh, brother, do we have to deal with this?’ Now, now, I voted for it, and I am in favor of it, ((leans forward)) but (.) there are so many people that, for totally (.) irrational reasons and for reasons connected with all sorts of issues, just feel like, if you pass an English (.) only ordinance, you are (.), you know, it’s because you don’t like (.) th-, the (.) people from another country.
You-, it’s unfair to them, and it’s an indication that you don’t like them ((pushes hands away)) and

Flowers:  Mhmm=
Smith:   =And just all sorts of negative things. I don’t have-, don’t have any of-, of that in my heart (.) but-, but I do-, I am concerned about the ec-, economics of it. I don’t want us to have to ((chops hand up and down)) (.) publish everything in more than one language.

Figure 8. C. Paul Smith talking about Frederick’s 2012 ordinance. Each image represents one of the gestures transcribed in the text. Clockwise from top left, these are “exhales and raises hands,” “leans forward,” “pushes hands away,” and “chops hand up and down.” The image is a screenshot from a video-recorded interview.

His “Oh, brother,” hands-up reaction and subsequent forward motion gives a sense of his conflicting feelings on the issue. His narrative captures how he was initially skeptical, but eventually leaned in and supported his colleagues. He also voices two possible motivations for supporting a policy like this, one more about disliking people from other countries and wanting to literally or figuratively push them away, and the other, which he identifies with, more about fiscal responsibility and properly portioning out the budget. This multifaceted statement suggests
that policy campaigns do not necessarily require everyone involved to be wholeheartedly enthusiastic.

On the contrary, his skepticism and experience as a lawyer may also have helped make the policy more robust. At the Frederick County Commissioners meeting the night the ordinance passed, Smith suggested a few revisions that made the policy more flexible (Figure 9). He advised adding a clause that allowed for the local government to carry out “any other worthy, justifiable, or appropriate” action in other languages. In the video of the meeting, his colleagues seem more nonchalant about the wording, but willing to listen and agree to his recommendations. The official minutes did not record the fact that it was Smith who introduced these changes, and in our interview, he did not recall having made the suggestions. However, he did describe himself as “the type of person that would look at details and say, ‘Wait a minute, why don’t you change this word or that,’” and that he would not be surprised if he had in fact taken the lead on these revisions. Immediately after they approved these changes, the ordinance passed, 4-1.

In some ways, Young was highly effective at effecting change, persuading people, and circulating new ideas, not just in language policy but in other areas of politics, too. At the same time, there was backlash. When speaking at government meetings or with reporters, he said things about language, race, and immigration that my participants considered blunt or even shameless. For example, he expressed a desire to make Frederick “the most unfriendly county in the state of Maryland to illegal aliens” (Anderson, 2011, November 13). He was also quite open about his relationships with people at ProEnglish, including inviting them on to his talk radio show at least twice.
Figure 9. A page from the official minutes from the public hearing where Frederick County enacted its 2012 ordinance. The list at the top is some of the people who testified, including a representative from ProEnglish. The middle section describes the three revisions that Paul Smith suggested and Blaine Young approved, each of which make the policy more open-ended and flexible. Finally, the bottom section records the 4-1 vote.
Young was also open about trying to help other counties take similar kinds of measures, in part through a tour he and Sheriff Jenkins did in late 2012 “to present an anti-illegal immigrant film throughout the state” (Watcher, 2012, December 5). At the same time, he also framed the 2012 ordinance as his local touchstone during his 2014 run for governor. Even people who greatly respected his work are willing to acknowledge that Young’s bold approach had its drawbacks. For example, Smith remarked, “Blaine overplayed his hand on a number of things.” Duke said that people got “Young fatigue” after a while, in large part because he “governed as if he was not going to run again.” This fatigue would eventually turn into a backlash so strong that Frederick County actually repealed this policy in 2015 (see Chapter 5). At the time, though, Young’s coordination between ProEnglish, the other commissioners, and county staff made it the most successful use of the ProEnglish template thus far, in terms of how easily the policy passed, and how large of a county Frederick is (much bigger than Shenandoah, for example).

**Possibilities and Limits**

In the year after Frederick County’s ordinance passed, three other Maryland counties considered similar legislation. When I brought up this pattern, and asked Robert Vandervoort about it, he posed a few possible ways this series of events could have happened:

| Flowers: | Do you have a sense of how that (.) mini-domino effect maybe took place? |
| Vandervoort: | Well, Carroll County’s right next door to Frederick County, um (.) and I believe (.) you know, they probably are-, I think all of them, really, it was something where they read about it in the news, in Maryland, and someone said, ‘Hey, that’s a good idea, let’s do that.’ |
| Flowers: | Mhm. |
| Vandervoort: | So, I don’t think it was really a-, I don’t think-, and I could be wrong, I mean, maybe the officials (.) in Frederick or the officials at that time have a different recollection, maybe they were (.) unbeknownst to us (.) telling their friends in other counties who were officials (to do)-, you know, ‘hey, we did this, you ought to try-, take a look at it,’ but my understand-, my belief is that (.) it was, uh (..) the fact that there was (.) so much news |
about it, meant that Frederick and then Carroll and then Queen Anne’s and even Anne Arundel, for a while was

Flowers: [Mhmm].
Vandervoort: [looking] at it (. ) so.

As he suggests, there are a number of channels for sharing information and learning about local language policies, any of which could lead to the light bulb moment of “Hey, that’s a good idea, let’s do that.” Throughout 2012, there was substantial news coverage in local newspapers as well as more regional sources like the Baltimore Sun, the Washington Post, and talk radio.30

Vandervoort also raises the point that many elected officials communicate across districts, both on a personal level, for professional networking purposes, and to reach potential new supporters and donors. Ultimately, Vandervoort points to the media coverage as the most likely avenue for policy awareness and circulation. The local lawmakers I interviewed identified these possibilities as well as others, like people reaching out to ProEnglish directly, or ProEnglish contacting elected officials directly. Sheriff Chuck Jenkins described the situation as ProEnglish and local governments all playing off “the same sheet of music,” although it is not clear in this metaphor who initiates or leads this activity. While I would certainly like to know how exactly each policy came into being, it is valuable in itself to recognize that a) nearly everyone identified multiple possible channels of communication and b) there is no consensus about the most important channel(s). In particular, people hold varying, at times conflicting, perspectives on whether these counties worked closely or intermittently with ProEnglish and with each other, which I see as evidence of how situated each person’s experiences are, as well as the role of a localist ideology at play. In other words, people in this network tend to frame networked local activities as chiefly local, and only somewhat networked.

30 For example, Young interviewed a representative from ProEnglish on his Frederick-based radio show about the Carroll County campaign (One Frederick Many Voices, 2012, October 5).
In this section, I examine how these three interrelated text histories unfolded through a number of known and unknown mechanisms, and how some the policymakers in each community viewed each one. The text histories of these three policies are each complex in their own way, and together they suggest that networked localism is an effective yet imperfect strategy for creating new policies. Or, to put it another way, networks can help or hinder English-only policy campaigns, even among actors that are generally enthusiastic about the concept of making English the official language.

First, I turn to Anne Arundel County, where a policy was proposed but ultimately withdrawn for a variety of reasons. This case shows why English-only discourse is not enough on its own; there were overriding problems with the bill’s form and the policymakers’ ethos. I then turn to an overlapping campaign in Queen Anne’s County, where a commissioner started off by replicating Anne Arundel’s doomed policy, but two months later revised his policy to be more like ProEnglish’s template. This case exemplifies the way that governments copy each other in addition to organizations. Finally, I consider the most recent local English-only policy in Maryland, in Carroll County, where the policy emerged relatively smoothly except for when nature intervened.

Anne Arundel County

While it took Frederick four years to introduce a new language policy, it took Anne Arundel County just two weeks. A few days after Blaine Young started talking publicly about his ordinance, Kirby Delauter, one of the other Frederick Commissioners, remembered receiving a “brief” phone call from another local lawmaker seeking advice. When I listed some of the possible counties the call could have come from, his hunch was that it was from Anne Arundel,
which may explain the quick uptake. Due to the county seat of Annapolis, and the close proximity to both Baltimore and Washington, D.C., Anne Arundel County is a more moderate and developed part of the state.

Despite the quicker rollout, however, the sponsor in Anne Arundel, Jerry Walker, had a difficult time selling his bill, until he ultimately withdrew it a month later, before it ever came to a vote. According to an article published the day before the formal introduction, “the bill is the first in a series he plans to press that will attempt to stem illegal immigration locally,” and was being “co-sponsored” by three other council members (Fuller, 2012, February 5). In an interview with one of the Anne Arundel politicians who supported this bill, David Lee (a pseudonym) pointed to national immigration rates as one of his primary motivations for supporting the bill. Specifically, he was concerned about the prospect of immigrants insisting on using languages other than English for legal proceedings. While his focus was specifically on Muslim immigrants and the specter of “Sharia law,” his colleagues were more oriented towards undocumented immigrants.

Lee’s fellow council member Chris Trumbauer, who was critical of the bill from the beginning, noted that the Maryland DREAM Act had recently passed, narrowly, which was a contributing factor to “this English-only movement,” particularly in Anne Arundel County, where the vote on the ballot measure had been split more than in most other parts of Maryland. Trumbauer also remarked that the language policy might have seemed like a stepping stone to higher office or at least more recognition for the co-sponsors: “I think that some people were trying to (. . .) beef up their, you know, conservative bonafides.” In other words, despite Walker’s framing of the issue as purely about addressing pressing local immigration and language issues, the co-sponsors could have had a range of incentives for supporting the bill. Trumbauer said he
never considered being one of the co-sponsors, because he viewed “the whole movement” to make English an official language at the local level as “spurious,” and “ridiculous,” and said he had a certain “wonderment” at the whole phenomenon.

While Walker’s framing of the bill is impossible to separate from the bill itself, the text does not mention immigration, and only consisted of prefatory boilerplate and one, brief paragraph. Importantly, the policy bore no resemblance to ProEnglish’s template. Here is the content that the ordinance would have added to the county’s code (the all-caps format is from the original):

**ENGLISH SHALL BE THE OFFICIAL AND COMMON LANGUAGE OF THE COUNTY. ALL OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, COMMUNICATION AND AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY SHALL BE IN ENGLISH UNLESS MANDATED BY FEDERAL OR STATE LAW OR AS NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS, TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, TO TEACH ENGLISH TO NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS, OR TO PROMOTE TRADE AND TOURISM IN THE COUNTY.**

While the concepts and goals are certainly similar—English is official and documents are in English, with many exceptions—none of the precise wording is the same except for brief stock phrases. Like Jenkins’ proposed ordinance in Frederick County in 2008, this is a case of interdiscursivity but not of using a template: the topics and purposes are largely the same but there are almost no formal features in common. The stand-alone text mirrored the overall policy campaign, which included minimal input from ProEnglish or U.S. English. Representatives from both organizations were quoted in news stories on the topic, but I found no evidence of their
working directly with any of the lawmakers involved, or even testifying at any government hearings (for example, Mujica, 2012, February 13). For his part, Trumbauer did not recall any significant “advocacy around this on the pro side” other than “1-2” emails from constituents calling him “an idiot” for not supporting the bill.

Soon after Walker introduced the policy, however, the language policy campaign was eclipsed by two other unfolding local crises. During this stretch of early 2012, the council was also trying to fill a vacancy on the county council. The vacancy stemmed from the fact that one of the council members had been convicted of some tax-related crimes, and had gone to prison. At that point, his remaining colleagues were looking for a replacement to appoint. So, the local government was under more scrutiny than usual, both because of the circumstances surrounding the vacancy as well as the public process of interviewing potential replacements.

The second crisis began during one of these interviews, which were held during open government meetings. One of the interviewers, Dick Ladd, asked a candidate about his military service, which led to the two swapping Vietnam and Korean War stories. At one point in the exchange, Ladd used a racial slur against Asian people as he described how “we thought the gooks were coming over the perimeter” (Schuh, 2012, February 17). Trumbauer and Walker both pointed to this gaffe as the reason. Unsurprisingly, the comment was “deemed offensive” by the other council members and many of their constituents, and so the “sponsors felt that the timing would be bad” to move forward with a bill so associated with immigration (Trumbauer).

Similarly, Walker told a local newspaper that “due to the atmosphere created by some of my colleagues, the bill was being perceived as racist,” and he went on to clarify that he was referring to Ladd’s comment (Bourg, 2012, March 7). In the same article, Walker expressed a desire to reintroduce the bill sometime in the future, but that has not happened so far, despite the fact that
one of his colleagues, John Grasso, had already created a sign that announced, “English: Anne Arundel’s official language,” and despite the fact that Walker is still in office as of 2016. This case demonstrates that just writing an English-only policy is not sufficient grounds to enact it. Anne Arundel’s bill was blunt, with few of the usual exceptions or disclaimers, which meant that when one of the bill’s supporters went off script, there was nothing the other supporters could point to in the bill to neutralize public scrutiny. For example, recall that the ProEnglish template frames the problem as one of protecting at-risk English users, rather than discriminating against multilingual people or immigrants. I suspect that if one or more English-only organizations had been involved, they would have helped steer the council members towards a more cautious policy text, and a more circumspect strategy for talking about immigration and race.

Furthermore, it’s possible that nothing could have salvaged the policy campaign after Ladd’s comment, which shows that even discourse in seemingly distinct events, like a public job interview, can make a difference.

On one hand, Anne Arundel’s policy was the least successful of any discussed in this account. On the other hand, even failed or unresolved policy campaigns can aid the English-only movement. In a prescient 1986 article, U.S. English’s Executive Director at the time describes how failure can be helpful. Gerda Bikales’ piece was an invited response to an article in The International Journal of the Sociology of Language on a proposed English Language Amendment to the US Constitution, making it a rare example of someone articulating an English-only argument for an academic publication. She explains that while her organization “does not expect it to become law in the near future,” nevertheless “it is hardly necessary to pass the ELA for it to have enormously beneficial results” (Bikales, 1986, p. 81). These results include heightened awareness of language policy as an issue, increased support for English as an
official language, and higher membership numbers for the organization (Bikales, 1986, p. 82). In other words, a policy campaign can be politically and financially advantageous whether the policy actually passes or not.

Bikales is describing a situation in which failures are salvageable, but opposition can actually even be preferable in some cases. For example, in a memo from the same year and the same organization, staffer Kathy Bricker lamented the fact that the ACLU, MALDEF (the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund), LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens), and the Chinese American Society “have not sued us yet” (1986, August 23). Bricker goes on to explain: “That was actually a disappointment in a way, since we held a fund-raising letter based on the lawsuit. I suspect we will get to use it later, however.” Here, U.S. English is actively hoping to be sued, because the fund-raising and publicity possibilities would outweigh legal costs. To be clear, the question of policy failure is one area where lobbyists and activists tend to feel differently than elected officials, even if they share views on language policy in general. I have never heard or read about a local lawmaker hoping that their policy would fail, or that it would be the subject of a lawsuit. In the end, Anne Arundel’s withdrawn policy did contribute to the English-only movement in its own way: it resurfaced a few weeks later, a few miles away, in the next county over.

Queen Anne’s County

If Anne Arundel was the most cosmopolitan, developed county in the group, Queen Anne’s was the most rural. When I asked former County Commissioner Bob Simmons how he would describe Queen Anne’s County, he compared it to his home state of North Carolina, and stated emphatically that it was “much more Southern than North Carolina ever thought about
being.” He had moved to this Delmarva Peninsula county from the Piedmont in 1998, and had served a four-year term from 2010-2014. Whereas the Piedmont had been more “industrial,” Queen Anne’s was more of “a plantation environment,” with “very much the Deep South orientation.” At the same time, Simmons also commented on the community’s “good education,” advanced literacy skills, and ability to “speak pretty darn good English.” Phil Dumenil, who held the same office during the same term as Simmons, also described the county as quiet and agricultural.31

Simmons and Dumenil both voted for their local government’s English-only policy, despite some ambivalence about its origins and purpose. The primary sponsor of Queen Anne’s County’s ordinance was a commissioner named David Olds, who had a reputation for being the most “fiscally conservative” commissioner (Dumenil). Olds was the kind of lawmaker who, when a county office would ask for “two new trucks,” might be the one to ask if they were getting the best possible deal, if they really needed two, and how old the existing trucks were (Dumenil). Olds introduced the policy during a routine roundtable discussion in February 2012.

Dumenil explained to me that roundtables were a common feature of government meetings, and function as an opportunity for Commissioners to make announcements, report on recent events in the community, or propose new ideas. As he described the scene for me, Dumenil laughed. While I mentally debated whether to ask what was so funny, he continued, saying, “I chuckle now,” because “on the grand scale” of things, language seemed like such a trivial issue to spend time addressing.

Curiously, Olds’ first public draft was identical to Anne Arundel’s bill, except for a couple of small differences: it mentioned Queen Anne’s County, and it had a misspelled word (promot for promote, Figure 10). There were about three weeks in between when it appeared in

31 My interview with Dumenil was not recorded, so any paraphrases and brief quotes are based on my notes.
the two counties, and it is unclear how this text made the trip. Perhaps in response to the bill being withdrawn in Anne Arundel County, or perhaps because of some other factor(s), Olds introduced a revised version of the policy two months later that matched the ProEnglish template instead.

---

**Figure 10.** A comparison of Anne Arundel’s bill (top) and Queen Anne’s County’s marked-up ordinance (bottom). The two all-caps paragraphs are identical except for the spelling change of “PROMOTE” to “PROMOT.” The Queen Anne’s earlier draft (the crossed-out section) is a close copy of the Anne Arundel bill, while the final wording (the in-tact sections) is a close copy of the ProEnglish template. In other words, this is a case of one county copying from two different sources, first another county and then an organization.
ProEnglish (2012, August) explicitly noted in their newsletter that “ProEnglish recommended that the Queen Anne’s Commissioners amend the proposed ordinance to reflect the ProEnglish model,” and that when Olds “offered the ProEnglish model language as a substitute,” his colleagues “agreed to adopt” it (p. 4). When I floated the question of who else besides Olds had been involved in writing either draft of the policy, Dumenil responded that the policy was Olds’ “baby,” and that he did not know of anyone else who had worked on it locally. At the same time, he did think it was very possible that someone had “put a bug in his ear,” and he did recall receiving emails from ProEnglish offering more information about the issue if he was interested. He said he never responded or interacted directly with anyone from ProEnglish, however, and that he had not paid much attention to the emails because the issue was “so far down his radar.” Furthermore, Simmons and Olds said they had not communicated with anyone in other counties about the policies, either to give or get advice.

I asked Dumenil if he had ever considered voting against the ordinance, if he was so skeptical. To my surprise, he said yes, because “if it’s not broken, don’t fix it.” He may have meant that language was not a problem in need of fixing, or that the local government’s set of laws was already functional, and not in need of an additional law. So, the ordinance did not pass out of some shared ideological commitment. Instead, it was part of the give and take of policymaking, where lawmakers tend to support each other’s proposals unless they consider it completely incompatible with their political party or other commitments. In other words, if they are skeptical or on the fence, there are many more incentives to pass a bill than to question it. Perhaps impatient with the fact that I kept naively trying to ask about his views on language, Dumenil finally said, “Kathy, it’s politics!” and explained that he needed Olds’ support for other bills in the future. Simmons made a similar point.
Perhaps partly due to the fact that most of the commissioners were willing to let the ordinance go through, Queen Anne’s County’s policy received relatively little scrutiny. At the public hearing on May 9, 2012, the only two people to speak were Asgar Asgarov, a Board Member from ProEnglish, and Kevin Waterman, who criticized the policy on libertarian grounds (although he went on to run for Register of Wills as a Republican in 2013). Waterman read from a prepared statement during his testimony, which I learned during our interview was later published as an op-ed on a local website (Waterman, 2012, April 24). In the published version of his remarks, Waterman said that he had talked to several of the commissioners about the bill before the hearing, and former Commissioner Simmons recalled that meeting warmly. At that public event, however, Waterman delivered a scathing critique of the bill for its overreach (“nanny statism,” and “In a limited government society, language is simply not a concern of government”), its economic implications (“there is no meaningful fiscal savings”), and its message that “foreigners need not apply” for local jobs or other opportunities. In his conclusion, he described it as “a bad bill, responding to a non-existent threat, that sends the wrong message about our county.” This criticism points both to the political atmosphere in Queen Anne’s County (where the most cogent critique came from the right, not the left), and to the degree of disagreement among people on the right about if official language policies should even exist, much less in what form. Ultimately, however, the Commissioners made no new revisions that night, and the ordinance passed easily, 4-1, and is still in effect today.

Carroll County

A few months later, a writer for the Carroll County Times wrote that “English has been the unofficial language of Carroll County since it was formed in 1837, but the Carroll County
Board of Commissioners is looking to make things official” (Alexandersen, 2012, September 27). The article’s breezy tone foreshadowed the fact that Maryland’s most recent English-only policy campaign seemed the smoothest in many ways. There were no significant revisions between the first and second draft, as in Frederick and Queen Anne’s, no crises of credibility like in Anne Arundel, and, for the only time in this entire study, the policy passed unanimously with the support of all five county commissioners.

By the time of the first public meeting on the issue, Commissioner Haven Shoemaker had already assembled the county attorney, Suzanne Bibby from ProEnglish (who also testified in Frederick), and a set of talking points about the popularity and affordances of making English the official language (Figure 11).

Shoemaker stated explicitly that the attorney had already drafted an ordinance that was “patterned” off of Frederick’s, and that he was also aware of similar policies in Hazleton and Queen Anne’s County. As in the other counties, it is unclear how the government and ProEnglish
initiated a relationship; the local paper described the situation as “Shoemaker received backing from Suzanne Bibby, director of government relations for ProEnglish” (Alexandersen, 2012, September 27). Blaine Young later arranged to interview her on his radio show about Carroll’s policy, around the time of Carroll County’s public hearing, which exemplifies the way that people in different counties and with different roles can coordinate a policy’s trajectory, while still foregrounding the policy’s local scale.

The only significant obstacle to the ordinance passing turned out to be a hurricane that delayed the process for several months, making this campaign the longest one in Maryland. Weather and damage from Hurricane Sandy pushed back the public hearing from October to December, and then the final vote to after the holidays, at the very end of January. I highlight this point because it represents my more general finding that there is little correlation between the length of a policy campaign and its outcome or tenor. Brief text histories can lead to failure, withdrawal, or success, just as drawn-out histories can exist for a number of different reasons, ranging from disruptions, to careful deliberation, to irreconcilable tensions. Despite the delay, the policy passed in early 2013, thereby joining the other policies that stem from Hazleton’s example and ProEnglish’s template. Hazleton, Frederick, Queen Anne’s, and Carroll Counties all passed laws that are largely identical to each and to the template on ProEnglish’s website (Figure 12).

Conclusion

I have no reason to believe that there is a single person or event responsible for introducing local English-only policies into these Maryland counties. Similarly, I have no reason to believe that there is a single explanation for the ProEnglish template’s rapid circulation and uptake in these local governments. Instead, my participants highlighted a number of different points of connection and actors that made a difference. Former Frederick County Commissioner
Charles Jenkins echoed the view of many of the people involved when he remarked, “things were kind of (.) happening all over the place.” These “things” included political events, economic developments, ideologies, face-to-face interactions between politicians, activists, and lobbyists, and digital communication and circulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of the City of Hazleton or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Frederick County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Queen Anne’s County or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Carroll County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations, or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. A comparison of the same section across the language policies in Hazleton, the ProEnglish site, Frederick, Queen Anne’s, and Carroll (in that order). There are slight differences: some mention “subdivisions,” one uses an Oxford comma after “obligations,” and some use an alphabetic rather than a numerical listing scheme.

Specifically, Frederick and Carroll County share a border, as do Queen Anne’s and Anne Arundel; all are near ProEnglish’s headquarters in Washington, D.C., Maryland borders Pennsylvania, and all the policies in question are located in and superseded by state and federal laws. For some, transnational and global scales are also relevant to their work. As I discuss in the
next chapter, many people fear the United States becoming like Canada or the European Union, or wish that the United States had a more explicit policy, as in France or Israel.

By tracing this network, I have shown how people create language policies through complex, material, discursive practices and trajectories. These components draw on, anticipate, and produce a variety of spatial and temporal scales, from brief office interactions with colleagues, to year-long policy campaigns, to the decade-long trajectory of the ProEnglish template around the country, to the national reporting of one person’s utterance. I still am curious, however, about how the people who make, debate, and live with these policies view the local and other scales. What do they foreground or value, what do they downplay or deride, and how do they work towards consensus or handle differences, especially when it comes to the issue of scale (Chapter 4)? And how does it happen that occasionally people don’t just reframe or refine these policies, but actually repeal them (Chapter 5)? I address these questions in the next two chapters.
Chapter 4
Upscaling and Downscaling

People who want English to be the official language do not necessarily agree on anything except that English should be the official language. Questions about where English should be official, and how, and why, and whether such a policy would be continuing an old tradition or beginning a new one, are all up for debate. Individual people change their minds and shift their strategies as well. Even individual policy texts can express divergent language ideologies.

Nevertheless, the English-only movement has been quite successful in writing and passing legislation, raising money, and winning support. The English-only movement thrives not through consistency, but through variety. In this chapter, I analyze one particular discourse practice that people use to support English-only policies: scaling.

Scale is one of the most significant sources of tension in discourse about language, both from the emic perspectives of my participants, and the etic perspectives of scholars in writing studies, sociolinguistics, and linguistic anthropology. I sensed scale was important to the people involved in the Maryland campaigns well before I started my fieldwork in 2015: from the movement’s origins in 1980 onward, much of the public and archival discourse around English-only policies—news media, social media, public hearings, government documents, and Tanton’s papers—focused on the issue. Scale featured prominently in my interviews as well, both because I brought it up, and because people would bring it up on their own when I would ask what they generally thought of their community’s policy, and what strategies they remembered from the campaign.

What became clear is that within the English-only movement, there is no consensus over whether local language practices are more or less authoritative or valuable than ones that seem more regional, national, transnational, or global. As a result, there was no consensus about how
to promote any given local language policy, because people disagree over whether local policies should reflect, shape, or protect against policies at higher scales. For example, if the national scale seems most important, then the purpose of a local policy might be to show solidarity with the nation’s de facto English-only policy. Alternatively, the purpose might be to offer a model for the rest of the nation, so that the nation could catch on. On the other hand, for people who view the nation as hopelessly multilingual already, the local policy could function more as a shield or sanctuary. To add to the complexity, people make similar judgments about the relationship between the local and the region, the state, and the globe, as well as smaller spatial scales (the neighborhood, the family, the classroom, the interaction), and temporal scales.

In a parallel development to these language policy campaigns, scale has become a key concept in sociolinguistics, writing studies and related fields, due in large part to Blommaert’s (2010) theory of scale jumping. However, my participants did not share Blommaert’s focus on upward scale jumping, or “upscaleing” (p. 35). While Blommaert highlights instances in which people try to make their discourse seem more timeless, universal, and objective, I argue that “downscaleing” is at least as important to how people negotiate language ideologies and policies. This is not to say that downscaleing should replace upscaleing as the key to understanding scale. Rather, I am suggesting that downscaleing and upscaleing often coexist in the same utterances and interactions, in ways that are usually complementary but occasionally dissonant (from the perspective of other people who want English to be the official language).

The experience of one of my participants, Farrell Keough, illustrates how upscaleing and downscaleing can operate in concert. He lives in Frederick, Maryland, and he has worked in business and as a writer. For several years, he ran a site called engagedcitizen.com, and he still occasionally writes for local news sites, like The Tentacle. He supported his county’s 2012
English-only ordinance. I first met Keough in 2015, after he saw one of my fliers and sent me an email. In preparation for our interview, I found and watched a televised appearance he had made at a public hearing earlier in the year, on July 21, 2015, when his government was considering repealing the ordinance. In this appearance, he talked about why he wanted the government to keep the existing English-only policy.

To my surprise, he started his statement by talking about an argument with his wife. He dryly explained, “Before coming here, I decided to consult with an expert. I happen to live with her. We had a rigorous debate. She won. Which is common in our household.” Keough went on to spend a few minutes discussing why having English be the official language could save the local government money, and could make communication more efficient. His opening sentences had been somewhat cryptic, and I initially assumed that this was an example of a couple in which one half was in favor of an English-only policy, and the other was against it, and they had hashed it out, and the English-only argument had won. I started to mentally add this example to my collection for Chapter 5, which I already anticipated would be about how people argue against the English-only movement.

When I interviewed Keough, however, I realized I had been wrong. He told me that their argument was not about whether to support the 2012 language policy, but about why. He had been treating the issue as one of national culture, pride, and sovereignty, whereas she was thinking more in terms of local economic savings and efficiency. So, their argument was not so much about language as about scale. Specifically, they were debating whether the issue was primarily local, or national. As we kept talking, he even made fun of himself for initially focusing so much on the national. He explained that he realized he needed to “step back from all the politics” around national language and immigration issues. Then he jokingly did an
impression of people who say, “foreigners are coming in and taking our jobs,” in an uncharacteristically Southern accent. At first, I thought he was doing an impression of people he knew, or of some local stereotype like the “Fredneck” (discussed in more detail in Chapter 5), but he quickly added, “as they say on South Park.” Keough decided to “step back” from these large-scale questions of immigration and economics, and instead highlight what was going on locally.

This sort of “step[ping] back” is an example of downscaling. In his public statement, he talked about his own business experiences. Later, during our interview, he went into more detail, and talked about what it was like to get a government permit, and how much worse he thought that experience would have been if the people involved had not all used the same language. Notably, although he and his wife initially differed in their approach, her strategy of downscaling ultimately eclipsed his initial impulse to upscale the issue. Over the course of this study, I experienced many similar moments of surprise, in which people who ostensibly agreed with each other actually diverged in significant ways, especially when it came to the way they treated English as a local, regional, national, or global language. I often felt like the only person struck by this phenomenon: my participants seemed to experience variation with the movement as thoroughly unmarked. While downscaling does not necessarily have to involve the local, and vice versa, prioritizing the local scale through downscaling is particularly common in English-only discourse.

These findings are different than what one might expect, in light of the way scale is currently being theorized. Blommaert (2010) has argued that scale, both spatial and temporal, is inherently discursive and ideological, and that upscaling is an important discourse practice worth tracing. The problem is that in analyzing connections between power and scale, Blommaert
(2010) only emphasizes the phenomenon of “upscaling,” or scale jumping in which people respond to a more localized utterance with one that seems situated in a larger and more rhetorically powerful scale. He defines upscaling as “the jump from one scale to another: from the individual to the collective, the temporally situated to the trans-temporal, the unique to the common, the token to the type, the specific to the general” (p. 33). He suggests that people often engage in “upscaling” as a “power tactic” (p. 35). Blommaert has a point, in that people do sometimes use this kind of discourse.

In my study, for example, I interviewed one politician who was quite adept at upscaling. David Lee, an Anne Arundel County politician, supported the local English-only policy that was ultimately withdrawn before it came to a vote. Throughout our interview, I would ask him a question that I thought was fairly localized, and he would respond with something much broader about the nation or the globe. For example, when I brought out a copy of the bill, and asked a question about “it,” he ultimately interpreted the question as being about transnational language policy, rather than about his county’s particular policy (“it” is bolded below, for emphasis):

Lee: ((reading the bill))
Flowers: There’s four names on it
Lee: Walker
Flowers: So, you think it was, like, 100% his idea?
Lee: There were seven of us. Those four names are the Republicans on the council. Uh, I don’t know why-, you’d have to ask the others why they did that. […] I don’t know why they did. I know why I thought it’s important.
Flowers: Why did you think it was important?
Lee: (.) I think the roots come out of my (.) views on Europe.
Flowers: Hmm.
Lee: If you look at a country-, if you look at Europe, you look at the size of it, the population, and you look at how many sovereign entities there are there, and how many different languages there are, and how many different media outlets there are, and you, um, I come away from it with an appreciation that (.) Europe would be (.) a-, a better place, a more representative place, if they had one language, which everybody could hear, that you would get, the regional differences wouldn’t be cloaked in language, it would be a way for the community to be more broadly
defined, and the chances of getting a more representative, homogeneous set of policies and government practices and services.

In this excerpt, “it” started off referring to a piece of paper with four names from Anne Arundel county on it, then shifts to meaning “a country-,” then finally ends up referring to the language policy of all of Europe. He is taking my question about his county’s policy and framing his answer in much more transnational terms. As Blommaert suggests, this sort of upscaling is not just about shifting scales but about establishing the linguistic authority to be able to weigh in on how language should work more broadly. When I showed Lee this interview excerpt during my writing process, he also noted that he was expanding the focus from just language, to questions of media, culture, communication, and assimilation more broadly. Deictic words, including “it,” are particularly effective avenues for shifting scales, because their meaning already relies almost completely on the situation as it is unfolding. In the moment, for example, I did not notice the changing meaning of “it” at all, because the shift was so seamless. Lee is embodying Blommaert’s theory of upscaling perfectly.

At the same time, Lee’s brand of discourse was rare, and Blommaert’s theory of upscaling does not account for discourse like Farrell Keough’s. Keough was not trying to upscale, nor was he trying to seem mobile, nor was he trying to make English seem like a national, or global, or growing language. He was arguing that in his local community, in the rooms where he has to get permits for his work, he did not want to deal with languages other than English.

In light of Keough’s, Lee’s, and other participants’ varied scaling practices, I introduce in this chapter a theoretical framework for understanding how and why people discursively move between, align, and distance themselves from different scales. Contrary to much of the existing work on scale, not everyone wants to view themselves, their communities, or their languages as
mobile or global. In this study specifically, not everyone who is in favor of local English-only policies sees them as stepping stones to higher-scale policies. I argue that any theory of scaling must be capacious enough to account for both upscaling and downscaling, and for utterances that combine the two. Understanding how people situate their discourse in different scales is significant because it has implications for the study of language ideologies, mobility, and globalization. Furthermore, analyzing scaling practices offers a more fine-grained understanding of what other researchers have referred to as the “heteroglossic ideologies” (Jenks and Lee, 2016, p. 389), the “cacophony” (Johnson, 2013, p. 113), and the “shifting and dynamic juxtaposition” (Bauman and Briggs, 2003, p. 303) of practices and ideologies in discourse about language.

In the following section, I analyze the evolution and limitations of Blommaert’s approach to scale in more depth, as well as how other scholars have begun to take up and revise that approach. I then turn back to the discourse of the English-only movement, in order to discuss three kinds of downscaling practices: *downscaling on its own, complementary upscaling and downscaling, and dissonant upscaling and downscaling*. As Keough’s example makes clear, it is difficult to separate these categories out: one could argue that over the course of his discussion with his wife, his change of mind, and his public statement at the hearing, he voiced all three kinds of scaling. At the same time, I do think it is worth separating them out, at least for a time, in order to give a more detailed account of what scaling can look like in practice. I conclude by discussing the implications of the roles of downscaling in the English-only movement and identifying areas for future inquiry.
Approaches to Scale

Blommaert (2003) introduced scale as a key concept in sociolinguistics in a special issue on globalization, and later went on to elaborate in a 2007 article and a 2010 book. However, beginning this genealogy in 2003 would obscure the fact that scale is contributing to some much longer debates over concepts like context, contextualization, the event, and interdiscursivity (Koven, 2015, p. 20; Bauman and Briggs, 1990; Gumperz, 1982); the micro/macro dichotomy (Wortham, 2012); the local/global dichotomy (Johnstone, 2016); language ideologies (Irvine, 2016); linguistic authority (Woolard, 2016); and chronotopes (Bakhtin, 1981; Prior, 1998).

Across all this work, the issue is one of indexicality, since in any interaction, multiple histories, identities, and meanings can and do become relevant. While Blommaert has always treated scale as almost entirely a discursive phenomenon, Lemke (2000) had recently called attention to scales as both discursive and non-discursive. Specifically, Lemke (2000) identifies 22 timescales relevant to understanding human activity, from the time required for chemical reactions, to the school day, to the lifespan, to geological eras (p. 277). Lemke argues that while scales are not merely discursive, determining and negotiating what scales are relevant are also meaning-making practices, for both researchers and participants. Despite these preexisting bodies of work, I do not see Blommaert’s treatment of scale as just a way to reinvent the wheel of indexicality. In an era of heightened awareness of globalization and localization (Johnstone, 2016), it makes sense to pay particular attention to how people situate their discourse and themselves in hierarchical spaces and times.

Furthermore, Blommaert’s work may have caught on because it recognizes, confirms, and gives a vocabulary to describe patterns that ring true to many teachers and researchers. For example, in her response to Rebecca Lorimer Leonard and Carmen Kynard’s 2016 Watson
Conference keynotes, Laura Matravers notes that in both pieces, students experience a world in which how “literate” they are “is tied to their ability to mobilize and to ‘jump’ scales” (p. 4). While Lorimer Leonard is focused more on geographic mobility in the lives of transnational students, and Kynard frames scale more in representational terms, as a matter of linguistic authority, they both, like Blommaert, find connections between physical and ideological scale. Lorimer Leonard and Kynard’s ethnographic work, in other words, is in keeping with the composite scenario Blommaert (2007) describes between a student and a tutor:

S: I’ll start my dissertation with a chapter reporting on my fieldwork
T: We start our dissertations with a literature review chapter here. (p. 6)

In this interaction, Blommaert suggests that the tutor is “invoking practices that have validity beyond the here-and-now—normative validity” (p. 6). I would agree in the case of this scenario, but the problem is that for some people in some situations, they may not want to be part of the norm, or they may not agree on what the norm is or should be. In the case of English-only policymakers, they may see the norm as multiculturalism, multilingualism, racial diversity, new economies, or transnational publics. Furthermore, this theory of upscaling assumes that short time scales, small spatial scales, and the individual scale all go together. Conversely, longer temporal scales, wider spatial scales, and more collective scales go together, too. This model is adequate for explaining why someone might want to claim their limited experience as more universal, but it cannot explain situations where scaling is not so simple or unidirectional.

Problems with Blommaert’s Approach

There are several problems with this theory of scale jumping, each of which I seek to address. First, in identifying dominant linguistic hierarchies, Blommaert risks reinforcing and naturalizing them. He and his co-authors often give voice to these hierarchies without making it
clear that they are ideological, and therefore open to change, challenge, rejection, and interpretation. Instead, Blommaert’s writing on scale tends to treat these hierarchies as statements of universal, ontological fact, rather than as “ideological projects” (Irvine, 2016, p. 223). This first problem may stem from a second one: several key pieces of evidence of scale jumping are hypothetical scenarios rather than actual data. The student-tutor example, discussed above, illustrates both problems. Blommaert (2007) begins the example by writing, “Imagine, by way of illustration, the following bit of interaction…” (p. 5). The imagined dialogue begins plausibly enough, with a student suggesting one approach, and the tutor saying that things are done differently “here,” but the dialogue ends there. I suspect that no actual conversation between a student or teacher would be that tidy, nor would the conversation wrap up so abruptly, with each person only taking one turn at talking. Furthermore, there is no acknowledgment of the fact that the tutor’s blanket statement would be inaccurate at any university in the world. Within universities, departments, and even disciplines, genre conventions and writing styles are not that standardized (Prior, 1998; Olinger, 2014). In other words, a tutor (or any other educator) might say something like “We start our dissertations with a literature review chapter here,” but that does not make it true, nor does it mean that the student could not respond, or disagree, or find some third way (either in the moment or later, either through other conversations, or writing, or reading actual dissertations from that institution). The way this example appears in Blommaert (2007), however, depicts scaling as a straightforward, case-closed way of asserting power.

Interestingly, the same example appears in Blommaert (2010), except that instead of writing “Imagine, by way of illustration,” he writes, “Consider, by way of illustration,” which may reflect an uneasiness with the idea of resting an argument on an imagined situation (p. 35).
These kinds of abstract examples are not limited to educational contexts: they also appear in discussions of scale and mobility more broadly. For example, Blommaert, Collins, and Stembrough (2005) write that “A move from Kenya to the UK is a move from the periphery of the world to one of its centers” (p. 202). In the next sentence, they add, even more bluntly, that “some spaces are affluent and prestigious, others are not” (p. 203). With any two places, however, whether the UK and Kenya or, in the case of my study, rural Maryland and Washington, D.C., what counts as central or peripheral, affluent or not, prestigious or not, will be highly subjective. Scales may be hierarchical, in other words, but those hierarchies are ideological, perspectival, and contingent.

Canagarajah (2013) critiques Blommaert’s approach on similar grounds, by describing Blommaert’s (2010) model of scale as “static,” “rigid,” and limited because it “doesn’t leave room for agency and maneuver” (p. 156). To address these problems, he argues, “rather than scales shaping people, we have to consider how people invoke scales for their communicative and social objectives” (p. 158). Examining people’s actual discourse is important because their “objectives” are not always going to revolve around upscaling. In Canagarajah’s (2013) fieldwork with transnational migrant workers, for example, he found that his participants did not perceive scale in this way. When two groups as different as multilingual, transnational migrants in the Global South, on one hand, and people in the US English-only movement, on the other, both treat scale in in a more dynamic way, it suggests that scaling must be treated as a more open-ended, complex phenomenon. More recently, Canagarajah and De Costa (2016) edited a special issue on scale, and in their introduction they turn from theoretical critique to a methodological call. They write
The specificity of strategies of scaling/rescaling practice needs more analysis. To explore these practices, we need a more negotiated and interactional orientation to data. Such a research orientation could help bring out the contested nature of scales. (p. 8)

In my own work, I too find that “a more negotiated and interactional orientation to data” leads to more insight into “the contested nature of scales.” For the workers in Canagarajah (2013), the students in Canagarajah and de Costa’s (2016) special issue, and the people constrained by the English-only policies in my study, the problem is that whatever scale they or their language(s) may be situated in at a given moment, that scale can still be devalued by others. In an effort to highlight inequality, however, Blommaert elides this kind of discursive flexibility. It is this flexibility that allows policymakers and other people with linguistic authority to align or distance themselves with the local, the regional, the national, the transnational, or the global scale at will, in whatever way will make their discourse seem most effective in the moment, even if that means taking a different approach than other people in their same social movement. Inequality can thrive through contradictory discourse, not just in spite of it.

In addition to making assumptions about the relative meanings and values of geographic locations (like Kenya and the UK), Blommaert makes similarly rigid ideological distinctions between different language varieties. These two lines of thinking, about places and languages, come together in his discussion of language policies. In a rare mention of “downscaling,” Blommaert (2007) associates the term with the ways that “State” language policies can make certain language varieties seem “substandard,” “disqualification,” “not appropriate, valid, or acceptable” (p. 12). This is true to some extent, but again, in practice, it would inevitably be contested. In other words, who gets to decide what counts as substandard, not qualified, inappropriate, invalid, or unacceptable, and for long, and how, and why, and to what ends?
Those are the kinds of questions that this body of work has not really addressed. This account of how language policies operate also fits into the pattern discussed in Chapter 1, in which the local is associated with the peripheral and the marginalized, language policy is assumed to be inherently non-local, and therefore the idea of a powerful local language policy seems like an oxymoron.

This language policy example also points to a third and final problem with Blommaert’s approach to scale: not only are the examples unusually abstract for a linguistic ethnographer, and not only are language ideologies unusually taken for granted, but the treatment of downscaling is even thinner than that of upscaling. Aside from the discussion of State policies in Blommaert (2007), and two brief mentions in (2010, p. 95, 99), downscaling is not the focus.

In contrast, in the work that takes up his theories, the idea that upscaling must be accompanied by downscaling is apparently so intuitive that several scholars developed the concept independently. Around the same time, the term “downscaling” appeared in work ranging from Flowers (2016), to Stornaiuolo and LeBlanc’s (2016) article on literacy education in Research in the Teaching of English, to Bauman’s (2016) chapter in the linguistic anthropology edited collection Scale: Discourse and Dimensions of Social Life. I argued in Flowers (2016) that not everyone aims to upscale their linguistic authority and identity. Upscaling only happens if people believe that discourse “from nowhere” is more valuable than the token, the contextualized, the local, the situated. […] However, competing language ideologies create an atmosphere where downscaling can be just as powerful as upscaling. (pp. 470–471)

In an article about literacy education in schools, Stornaiuolo and LeBlanc (2016) make a similar argument about the need to recognize both downscaling and the language ideologies that make
downscaling desirable. They define downscaling as

the inverse of upscaling by invoking the local to rescale the encounter. Downscaling involves the move from a higher-scale rationale to a lower-scale one and can be an effective way of redistributing authority or reframing an issue in different spatial or temporal relations. (pp. 272–273)

While I would not conflate ‘downscaling’ and ‘local’ to that extent, I do think the “redistributing authority” part of their definition is key. Whether the issue is governmental language policy or literacy education, it is not necessarily a sign of a lack of authority to “rescale the encounter” downwards. Rather, downscaling can be a way to alter what counts as authority, and who counts as authoritative. Although these pieces have begun to explore downscaling, none of them take downscaling as their main focus: Flowers (2016) primarily addresses chronotopes, Stornaiuolo and LeBlanc (2016) cover upscaling, “aligning,” “contesting,” “anchoring,” and “embedding,” in addition to downscaling (p. 263), and Bauman (2016) makes an argument about presence and performance in interactions. In contrast, in this chapter I take a more sustained look at downscaling.

Blommaert’s Evolution

While I have purposefully set up a contrast between Blommaert’s most widely-cited work on scale (2007, 2010) and the critiques of that work leveled by others, including myself, it is also important to acknowledge that Blommaert himself has questioned and criticized his own work. For example, in his first piece on scale (2003), he admits that “it is hard to determine which scale would hierarchically dominate the others” (p. 608). Later, in a discussion of Heller’s (2003) article in the same special issue, about the local commodification of French in Canadian tourist
sites and call centers, he acknowledges that “the direction of value changes again appears to be unpredictable” (p. 613). In Heller’s study, this unpredictability stems from the fact that more localized language can take on heightened economic cachet in the context of globalization, not in spite of being local, but because it is considered local. Blommaert (2003) even concludes that, “we shall need more ethnography” going forward (p. 615). There is a disconnect, though, between the complexity represented in this special issue and the neat model that appears in Blommaert’s later work. In a recent co-authored piece, Blommaert, Westinen, and Leppänen (2015) even suggest that “The 2007 paper was a clumsy and altogether unsuccessful attempt,” especially in light of Westinen’s research on the discourse of rappers in Finland (p. 121). Perhaps unsurprisingly, the rap artists she interviewed and studied are not interested in simply upscaling towards universal relevance as much as possible. Instead, while scale does matter to the participants, their scaling practices, and their views on what would even count as high/low, center/periphery are quite dynamic. Accordingly, Blommaert, Westinen, and Leppänen (2015) call for a more “polycentric” theory of scaling (p. 119). Even this shift, from one center to multiple centers, does not go far enough (who gets to define ‘center’?), but it is an acknowledgment of complexity. In conducting my own analysis of upscaling and downscaling, then, my aim is not so much to offer evidence to counter Blommaert’s approach but rather to build on its most productive components: an attention to a multitude of scaling practices, an acknowledgment that scaling connects to language ideology and authority, and an interest in how scaling functions as a discourse strategy that allows people to frame themselves, their communities, and their language(s).
A New Approach to Upscaling and Downscaling

In the rest of this chapter, I seek to answer the following research question: How do scaling practices vary within the English-only movement? I find that there have not been clear changes over time: upscaling and downscaling have been part of the English-only movement from the beginning. What does vary, however, is how different scaling practices fit together and function. Specifically, I identify three kinds of scaling: downscaling alone, complementary upscaling and downscaling, and dissonant upscaling and downscaling. Designating certain kinds of discourse as “complementary” or “dissonant” in this chapter is not about my own personal views, nor is it from the perspective of the people who protested some of these policies. Rather, in categorizing my findings in this way, I seek to represent the perspectives of the people who are in favor of making English the official language. So, when I describe an utterance in positive terms, I am pointing to the way that utterance has been praised, emulated, or treated as unmarked by other people in the English-only movement. Conversely, when I describe an utterance in more negative terms, I refer to the ways it has been criticized by the people involved. In the following section, I report the findings in more depth.

Scaling in Practice

Over time and across campaigns, organizations, people, and texts, downscaling is common and performs a range of functions, both on its own and in conjunction with upscaling. I begin by examining instances of downscaling from 1980 through 2016, in order to show how this practice can make English-only policies seem more meaningful and more desirable. I then turn to two examples of complementary upscaling and downscaling within the same utterance, to demonstrate how these two discourse strategies can work effectively together. I conclude by
addressing two instances in which upscaling and downscaling clashed, in order to consider the limits of scale jumping.

*Downscaling Alone*

The founders and employees of the organizations U.S. and ProEnglish have used discourse about scale throughout their history. Even before he started U.S. English in 1983, John Tanton explicitly called for moving from global to local. In a letter to a colleague, Dr. Harry Haines, of Petoskey, Michigan’s Bay View Association, Tanton wrote:

> If I can offer anything in return, it’s a word of caution against depicting mankind’s problems in a global context where local terms will do. I’ll let my friend and colleague Garrett Hardin carry the burden of the argument in his enclosed writings. The higher up the scale of a dilemma, the easier it is to lose most of us local folks! (Tanton, 1981, June 30)

While it is unclear which of “mankind’s problems” they are discussing, or what the favor “in return” is for, what is significant is the general advice to frame issues in “local terms,” because “the higher up the scale […], the easier it is to lose most of us local folks!” This letter is also notable because Tanton had already worked for years with organizations like the Sierra Club, Zero Population Growth, and the Federation for American Immigration Reform, all of which had members in and shaped the politics of every state in the US and, in some cases, other nations. So, it is not obvious that Tanton would count himself as one of “us local folks.” Tanton may have been purposefully presenting himself as someone with local credibility, or trying to establish common ground with Haines as a fellow Petoskey resident. Either way, Tanton is both calling for and performing downscaling.
The other significant aspect of this letter is the reference to Tanton’s “friend and colleague,” Garrett Hardin. Hardin was a professor of ecology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and is most known for popularizing the interdisciplinary theory of “The Tragedy of the Commons” (Hardin, 1968). This theory has been taken up in biology, environmental studies, economics, and philosophy, and social movements ranging from environmentalism to anti-immigration activism. Hardin wrote to Tanton at least as early as 1971, initially in the context of the Sierra Club (1971, March 6). There are only a few letters to or from Hardin in Tanton’s public archive, but in Hardin’s own archived papers at the University of California Santa Barbara, there are “400+ pages” of correspondence between the two up through Hardin’s death in 2003 (Special Collections staff, personal communication, September 10, 2015). This long period of correspondence, coupled with the fact that Tanton leans on Hardin to “carry the burden of the argument” for localism, makes it worth briefly examining the nature of those “enclosed writings.”

While the particular texts sent to Haines were not included or named in Tanton’s archived papers, I suspect that they consisted of Hardin’s work on the topic of framing issues locally vs. globally. For example, the year before Tanton’s letter, Hardin had published an editorial in an academic journal titled “What is a ‘global’ problem?” In this editorial, he argues against global framing using examples of disease:

We never speak of the ‘global mosquito problem’ or the ‘global dysentery problem.’

Why not? Because we recognize that these problems have to be dealt with locally, e.g., by adding Gambusia to local ponds to ingest mosquito larvae or by chlorinating local waters to kill local bacteria. Malaria and dysentery may be ubiquitous problems, but it
does no good to label them ‘global,’ because that might discourage local action (Hardin, 1980, p. 136).

The premise of this argument seems flawed or at least dated, since in the 21st century it is not at all uncommon to read and hear about global health or global climate change. Nevertheless, the broader points about how “problems have to be dealt with locally” and how global framing might “discourage local action” seem to have resonated with Tanton. Neither Hardin nor Tanton are arguing over whether certain phenomena are local or not, but rather about the relative advantages and disadvantages of describing those phenomena as local. For example, Hardin talks about how to “label,” and how people “speak,” and Tanton talks about the “terms” of debate, and about the risk of “losing” an audience. This attention to discourse, or language about scales, complements the practices discussed in Chapter 3, which hinged more on the material composition and circulation of texts between and around several cities and counties. Both kinds of shifting scales are important to the English-only movement.

Tanton and Hardin continued to develop this strategy of downscaling over time, both separately and in their collaborative work on language policy. Hardin, for his part, articulated his stance even more pointedly in a journal article about population control, where he wrote, “never globalize a problem if it can possibly be solved locally,” and “local governments are the agents best prepared to choose local means” (1989, p. 32). At the same time as he was publishing on that topic for academic journals, he was also consulting for U.S. English. For example, in 1982 Tanton wrote a letter to Hardin thanking him for his “comments to Gerda [Bikales] on the U.S. English brochure,” although neither the brochure nor those “comments” were included in the archive (Tanton, 1982, November 11). However, there are clues as to how U.S. English’s promotional materials evolved during this time. In a memo to that same employee, Gerda
Bikales, Tanton wrote, “I felt it would be very useful to have a third pamphlet, or actually a series of pamphlets, reducing the question down to a state level where it would have more meaning to people than does the national scope of the first pamphlet or the regional view of the second” (Tanton, 1984, March 29). This memo is representative of an ongoing pattern in the archive, in which Tanton’s colleagues try to frame language policy nationally, only to have him urge them to keep “reducing the question down” to a smaller scale. Downscaling can, in his words, “have more meaning to people” who might be open to supporting English-only policies.

Tanton’s localist discourse from the 1980s continues to appear in contemporary English-only policies. Queen Anne’s County’s 2012 policy, for example, includes these clauses:

(5) in today’s society, Queen Anne’s County may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits; and

(6) the government of Queen Anne’s County can reduce costs and promote efficiency, in its roles as employer and a government accountable to the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.

These clauses have nothing to do with promoting the rise and spread of English around the nation, much less around the world. Instead, the focus is squarely on the need to “protect and preserve” monolingual English users’ access to “governmental programs and benefits” in the context of the “County.” The second clause elaborates, by addressing the ways the “County” might benefit financially in its capacity as “employer” and “government.” This policy fits perfectly into Hardin’s and Tanton’s advice for writers and activists. Furthermore, this policy successfully passed, is still in effect, and shares most of this content with both the ProEnglish template and with the policies from Carroll County and Frederick County (Chapter 3). In part,
this through-line may exist because the person who wrote ProEnglish’s template in 2006, Barnaby Zall, had worked with Tanton and his organizations since 1981.

Perhaps more importantly, though, even activists and writers who have never heard of Tanton and Hardin have long been aware that people care about the local scale, especially what they perceive to be their local scale. So, my aim is not to make a causal argument about why downscaling emerged and persists in the English-only movement, or to suggest that contemporary policymakers are reading Garrett Hardin’s theories of the commons, but rather to show that this strategy has featured prominently in the movement over decades; across people, places, and policies; and that it is not limited to discourse about language policy.

The above examples of downscaling have all centered on what people find most meaningful, but there are other instances that are more about value. In other words, sometimes the issue is not how the local scale seems more relevant than higher scales, but about how it seems better than higher scales. Hayden Duke exemplified this kind of downscaling in our interview. This interview was relatively unstructured, with Duke initiating several of the topics and topic shifts. During this particular stretch, he had been talking about attending an annual Latino Festival, hosted by Frederick Community College, before he turned back to the question of why local governments create language policies, which I had raised in our conversation before the interview officially started:

Duke: OK, you had mentioned, uh, localities, and I [think]
Flowers: [Mhmm.]
Duke: The reason (. ) Frederick County-, and other localities are doing what they're doing.
Flowers: Mhmm.
Duke: Not to justify or otherwise, but just, I think (. ) they're doing what they're doing as a sense of frustration is that there's absolutely no leadership coming out of Washington. It's that (. )
Flowers: Mhmm.
Duke: The, uh, federal government is both inept and incompetent and (. ) would be more dangerous if they could actually get stuff done.

Duke suggests that local governments, including not just his own but also “other” ones as well, create language policies out of a sense of “frustration” with higher levels of government. From this perspective, the “federal government” is “inept,” “incompetent,” and potentially “dangerous.” Interestingly, he does not necessarily endorse this perspective, as he makes clear by repeatedly saying “they’re” (instead of “we’re”), and by emphasizing that he is not trying to “justify” this approach. Nevertheless, he does give voice to a certain kind of downscaling, one that situates English in the local scale not because people do not care about higher scales, but because they do not like them.

Complementary Upscaling and Downscaling

While upscaling and downscaling can appear on their own, they can also function together, in a single utterance. Examples of the same person or text deploying upscaling and downscaling in quick succession are especially common in the most official, public, and legal aspects of English-only discourse. In this section, I discuss two examples, one from the ProEnglish template and one from a public hearing. The first clause in the local policy template reads as follows (again, using an excerpt from Queen Anne’s County’s policy as an example):

(1) the English language is the common language of Queen Anne’s County, of the State of Maryland and of the United States

This section of the policy sets up a synergy between the local government, the state, and the nation. In other words, the policy suggests that English is rightfully county-wide, statewide, and national. The distinction between English and other languages maps onto multiple levels (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 38). I see this clause as an example of scale jumping in both directions because
the goal is not just to make English seem more local, or more widespread, but to make it seem official at a range of levels. Of course, it is worth noting that the scale jumping only goes so far: there is no attempt here to make English the official language of the school, classroom, workplace, home, neighborhood, or street. Downscaling to that degree would invite lawsuits, and may not even seem desirable to the policy’s sponsors. Conversely, there is no attempt to frame English as a transnational, global, or spreading language, again probably due to some combination of legal and ideological reasons.

Situating the English language and the English-only movement in several different scales is not limited to policy texts, but also happens in other kinds of discourse. At Carroll County’s December 2012 public hearing, Jesse Tyler of U.S. English made a similar move in his speech. In his public statement, he addressed the county’s board of commissioners, as well as a room full of local constituents and a representative of ProEnglish. Tyler began by introducing himself, then introduced U.S. English as “the nation's oldest and largest non-partisan citizen's action group dedicated to preserving the unifying role of the English language in the United States. Our organization currently has 1.8 million members nationwide, including 2,500 active members from Maryland and 98 active members from Carroll County.” Again, I see this statement as an example of upscaling and downscaling because he is not just citing local membership, and not just national membership, but rather listing multiple levels. He argues that U.S. English has an established presence, and is therefore a stakeholder, in the county, the state of Maryland, and the US. He also emphasizes more than one temporal scale, by highlighting U.S. English’s status as the “oldest” organization of its kind, on one hand, and its current number of “active members” on the other hand. Of course, it is not clear what counts as “active,” or how precise those “2,500”
and “1.8 million” numbers are, but he seems less focused on the details than on making his organization and the broader movement seem ubiquitous and inevitable across scales.

These policy and public hearing examples of upscaling and downscaling contrast quite sharply with the earlier examples of downscaling alone. From Keough’s wife persuading him to think in terms of local management, to Tanton’s advice to avoid “a global context when local terms will do,” and his request to keep “reducing the question down,” to the section of the policy template that talks about the need to “protect and preserve the rights” of local monolingual English users, to, finally, Duke’s description of the federal government as “inept” at best and “dangerous” at worst, the effect was to make the local an exception to higher scales. When people combine upscaling and downscaling, however, the effect is to make the local seem consistent with higher scales. They are both ways of bolstering the credibility of local English-only policies, but they each rest on a different language ideology about where a language’s authority comes from. English, and its monolingual users, can seem authoritative by seeming authentically local, or by seeming national.

While I perceive these two language ideologies as at odds with each other, my sense is that the people most immersed in shaping local language policies have a different take. All the examples in this chapter are from the same social movement, the same small set of counties, the same geographic region, and the same kind of “networked localism” that relies so heavily on the organizations Tanton started. Furthermore, two of the examples are from different pages of the same policy text (Queen Anne’s County’s ordinance). These different approaches to scaling do not seem jarring to most of my participants, most of the time. So, upscaling and downscaling can not only coexist, but can mutually thrive. Even people who are critical of English-only policies, ranging from Kevin Waterman and his libertarian public statement and editorial, to everyone
involved in Frederick County’s repeal campaign, did not focus their critiques on questions of scale. Across all my data, no one expressed anything along the lines of, “I can’t figure out if this policy is supposed to be in harmony with or in contrast with state and federal law.”

In retrospect, I even realize that I unsuccessfully fished for such statements in my interviews. I was curious to see what my participants would make of the scaling strategies at work in things like the policy texts and public hearings, and so I asked some version of the following questions in most of the interviews:

• Did you get the sense that the people supporting the ordinance were all on the same page about why they supported it, or were there multiple reasons?

• Was there ever a time when you disagreed with people who also [supported/were critical of] the ordinance, over the details, or the right way to promote it?

While people answered the questions, often in great detail, no one answered in terms of scale. Generally, then, combining upscaling and downscaling is effective enough to be a common discourse strategy, but not so remarkable that it draws attention to itself. Occasionally, however, people do notice scale jumping, and it does bother them. In order to address the full range of constraints as well as the affordances of downscaling, in the next section I discuss two moments where people explicitly problematized the practice.

Dissonant Upscaling and Downscaling

Taking a flexible approach to scaling the English language has been largely successful, but that flexibility can occasionally seem more like dissonance, especially when it comes to the organizations and laws involved. In other words, the idea that English would be a local language, or the idea that English would be at once local, statewide, and national, are both more popular
than the idea that outside activists and lobbyists would shape local laws. In Frederick County, in particular, some people resented the idea that their Official English policy existed due in large part to ProEnglish’s and U.S. English’s help. To be sure, some of this resentment came from people who were already against English-only laws: for example, the Frederick Local Yokel writers (2015, August 13) wrote a post addressing ProEnglish directly as “you ProEnglish carpetbaggers.” However, even people who were open in theory to the idea of English being the official language made this kind of criticism. Robert Vandervoort highlighted this issue during our interview. He recalled:

Vandervoort: I mean, we were attacked as being like this outside group, ‘They’re not even from Frederick,’ it’s like, ‘Well, we’re a national organization, you know, we’re going to support this wherever it comes up,’ you know, it’d

Flowers: [Mhmm]

Vandervoort: [Be] like telling (.) you know, the American Red Cross, ‘Oh, well you shouldn’t do a blood drive in (.) Wichita, Kansas, because you’re a Washington, D.C.-based organization.’ Well, of course the Red Cross is going to be- (phone rings)

Mid-sentence, his office phone rang, and I turned off the recorder as he answered it, and then after the phone call we moved on to other topics. Nevertheless, before he was cut off, he voices the kind of thing he heard from his critics in Frederick, which hinged on the fact that ProEnglish was not “even from Frederick.” To point out the potential problems with this kind of attack, he lays out a hypothetical situation in which people make similar complaints about the Red Cross. The point is that not everything can or should be local—few people would argue that the Red Cross should stick to the D.C. city limits. Interestingly, Vandervoort seems to use “national” and “Washington, D.C.-based” interchangeably, or at least he imagines them being used interchangeably in the bits of reported speech. I think part of the tension stems from the fact that people in Frederick, and Maryland more generally, do not see them as synonymous. In the
region, D.C. is not so much a symbol of the nation as it is a big, urban city an hour’s drive away. So, people have multiple possible reasons to oppose ProEnglish’s involvement: it can either be because the organization is a symbol of the federal government, or because it is a symbol of a relatively unpopular, nearby city.

Such conflicts were not limited to ProEnglish; there was also tension between some local politicians and U.S. English. Just after Frederick’s ordinance passed, a February 26, 2012 editorial in the Frederick News-Post argued that while the law had passed, “We have conflicting messages here about what this English-only ruling is meant to achieve.” The article goes on to unpack this conflict in more detail, beginning with the perspective of a county official: “On the one hand, Commissioners President Blaine Young has said the ordinance will discourage illegal immigrants from coming to Frederick County. ‘It sets the tone,’ he said.” By connecting English to federal immigration law, Young is shifting the scale from local to national. However, the editorial continues:

On the other, we have what Mauro E. Mujica, chairman and CEO of U. S. English, wrote in a letter responding to an editorial in The [Baltimore] Sun: ‘Making English the official language of the county, state, or national government will not have a significant effect on illegal immigration. Granted such legislation may have an impact on immigrants, but the issue of illegal immigration does not belong in the context of the English as official language debate.

The contrast is stark: while Young, a local politician, is framing English-only as a national issue, the national organization is framing it as local, as disconnected from and “not belong[ing]” to the issue of immigration across national borders.
What the editorial writer(s) have noticed is that while Young was upscaling, by arguing that a local law would have an impact on transnational migration, the national organization was downscaling, by trying to separate the two issues. If Young’s discourse plays up the law’s reach, Mujica’s discourse downplays it. There are affordances to either strategy, of course: the former makes the law seem impressive, while the latter makes it seem innocuous. Most of the time, the fact that these two strategies coexist is not a problem for the English-only movement, but actually an advantage, which allows the movement to seem nimble, with an argument ready to go for any audience. Occasionally, however, people like Vandervoort and texts like the editorial draw attention to the risks involved in using multiple strategies. Given that these two examples of scaling-related tensions both concern Frederick County (and they were two of the most pointed moments in my data set), it is perhaps not surprising that this county was the one to eventually repeal their policy, while Carroll’s and Queen Anne’s County’s policies remain comfortably in place. I will take up that repeal campaign in depth in Chapter 5, but first, I conclude this chapter by considering some implications of and remaining questions about downscaling as a common discursive practice.

Conclusion

There are several implications of the important roles of upscaling and downscaling in the English-only movement. In this section, I examine the implications for future work on scale and language policy. In terms of scale, this study has illuminated one kind of downscaling: from the global or the national scale down to the local scale, in situations where the local scale seems more relatable, innocuous, or valuable. Moving forward, however, it will be important not to conflate the local level with downscaling, because there are cases when aligning with the local
could be a form of upscaling. For example, if someone in a particular organization, classroom, or school attempted to scale jump up to the level of the city, that would be upscaling to the local level. Furthermore, it is important not to essentialize any of these concepts: people’s perspectives on what counts as local, and what counts as moving up or down in scale, will vary over time and by situation.

At the same time, one of the challenges of studying scale in discourse is to not treat the concept as purely ideological. This challenge is not specific to scale, of course, but is a broader, ongoing issue for how to study writing and other discourse. Often, people situate themselves and their discourse in ways that are different from how their audiences might, or how a researcher might. There may be little correlation between the ways people view or discuss scale and mobility, and the way they live the rest of their lives, and the way their writing circulates. Many, if not all, of my participants who deploy very localist discourse were born elsewhere, have lived elsewhere, gone away to college, traveled for work, traveled for fun, written news articles or social media posts that had a national or international audience, or helped write laws that were taken up and copied by other lawmakers in other parts of the country. Furthermore, even if they have not done those kinds of activities, people can still be mobile and mobilized even within a relatively small space. Everyone moves through the world to some extent. At the same time, it is generally unproductive to treat one aspect of scale as more real than others. Future research is needed in order to better understand how people use “the local” and other scales as material, discursive, and ideological resources, and to note convergences or divergences. Those divergences do not necessarily need to be resolved, but they are worth addressing, documenting, and theorizing.
In addition to contributing to discussions of scale, this chapter also has implications for future work on language policy. In particular, scaling proves to be both an asset and a liability to the English-only movement, in that upscaling and downscaling usually complement one another, but they can occasionally seem dissonant. At the same time, the English-only movement’s penchant for both upscaling and downscaling means that there is no simple way to counter their scaling practices with alternative ones. In light of this chapter’s findings, I am increasingly skeptical of attempts to advocate for certain kinds of language policies by advocating for certain kinds of scales. With the exception of Pennycook (2010), calls for studying the local more than other scales tend to slide into calls for valuing the local more than other scales. For example, Canagarajah (2002) edited a special issue in the Journal of Language, Identity, and Education on “Celebrating local knowledge on language and education,” which then led to a 2005 edited collection, Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice. In the foreword to the edited collection, the series editor writes, “The enormous forces of the global tidal wave highlighted in the volume underscore the importance of preserving the local, be it in the cases of language hybridity, loss, and discoursal multimodality” (Hinkel, 2005, p. ix). As the rest of the foreword makes clear, “global” is a stand-in for English and dominant language ideologies, and “local” is a stand-in for other ways of communicating: the hybrid, the at-risk, the multimodal. In the introduction, Canagarajah makes a similar move, by stating, “It is the view of the authors in this volume that the local is getting short-changed by the social processes and intellectual discourses of contemporary globalization” (p. xiv). The actions in these quotes, “Celebrating,” “Reclaiming,” and “preserving” in the face of how “the local is getting short-changed,” make a certain sense in the context of the collections, which feature pieces on languages like Cajun French and Spanish in New York City. After all, researchers have seldom celebrated or claimed,
much less reclaimed, the legitimacy of these ways of communicating, and so these publications fill an important gap.

Because applied linguistics theory and research extends into other situations (including government language policy), however, it is risky to conflate the local with the valuable. The aforementioned quotes, for example, could have easily come from supporters of local English-only policies. Because the English-only movement has succeeded to some extent in “making English local” (Flowers, 2016), people who support that movement may have no problem endorsing “celebrating local knowledge on language and education” and “preserving the local,” just as many would agree that “the local is getting short-changed.” Of course, I do not think that any of the researchers in Canagarajah’s collections actually have the English-only movement in mind when they wax poetic about the local. Nevertheless, I would maintain that valuing the local scale (or any other scale) is not the most effective way to value marginalized language varieties. There are opportunities for researchers to clarify where they stand. To put it another way, when I read scholarship on local languages, literacies, or policies, I often find myself wishing that the authors would state more precisely what practices and ideologies they are advocating for, rather than using “local” as a proxy for those practices and ideologies.

There may be problems with English-only policies, but none of those problems would be alleviated if the policies were more or less local. Scaling practices are important to the English-only movement, but not in the sense that if the scaling practices changed, the movement’s overarching goal of elevating English and English users would necessarily change. Upscaling and downscaling may be effective strategies, but they are still just means to an end. In the next Chapter, I examine a case study of people tackling that end more directly, by resisting and rewriting their local English-only policy.
Chapter 5
Resisting and Rewriting

English-only policies may be difficult to enact, but they can be even more difficult to undo. While governments may start to neglect such policies over time, or reverse them due to external legal rulings or threats, actively repealing them from the inside is quite rare. Before Frederick County repealed its policy in 2015, the most recent case of a community-driven repeal was the 1993 repeal of Emmy Shafer’s policy in Miami-Dade County (New York Times, 1993, May 19). Of course, there are political explanations that have little to do with language: once policymakers enter office, they tend to stay in office, and most do not want to risk the charge of being a “flip-flopper” (Lempert and Silverstein, 2012, p. 27). Furthermore, changing language policies requires significant labor and good will (Tardy, 2011; Wible, 2013). However, as in the case of passing such policies, repealing and amending them also brings language ideologies into play.

Many people and institutions remain committed to a monolingual orientation towards language, and this commitment grants English-only policies a certain inertia (Horner and Trimbur, 2002). In a book that reflects on the same era as my project, Guerra (2016) writes that over his 40 years of teaching working class and middle class students, the “most salient” pattern has been “the degree to which an overwhelming majority of the students in both groups have bought into the rigid ideologies of monolingualism” (p. 118). These ideologies can make English seem natural, normal, correct, efficient, local, patriotic, and/or cosmopolitan, even in spite of experiences to the contrary. In a particularly striking example, Guerra profiles one student, Mina,

32 This pressure could come from the state government or from other groups. For example, the town of Jackson, New York, rescinded their English-only policy after receiving a stern email from the state’s Attorney General (Wright, 2011, June 3). In the case of Pahrump, Nevada, it was not the government but the ACLU who threatened to sue (Eicheldkraut, 2007, February 16).
33 In the English-only movement, it would be impossible to distinguish so cleanly between inside and outside actors. However, there is no national (or even regional), coordinated anti-English-only movement, and so when it comes to repealing these policies, governments act more independently.
who knew bits of seven languages, and had taught English in several countries, but nevertheless decided to devote her midterm essay to defending a monolingual approach to teaching English as a second language (p. 136). The point is not that Mina’s stance is right or wrong, but rather that students like her “have good reason to hold tightly to these ideological beliefs,” because they are so pervasive (p. 118).

For people who do find monolingual ideologies lacking or even harmful, there are several alternatives, which scholars have begun to describe and assess. One possibility is a more multilingual orientation, which emphasizes the existence and the value of using multiple different languages. That orientation is foundational to bilingual education and other additive programs, like English Plus in the US, the 1+2 policy in the European Union\(^{34}\), and academic fields like second language writing, but it carries the risk of over-commodifying and re-essentializing the languages involved (Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur, 2011). A more translingual approach offers a way to reconcile some of the issues with both monolingual and multilingual ideologies (Canagarajah, 2013). Communication in this framework is about drawing on a range of semiotic resources that transcend tidy categories, which, depending on one’s disposition, can seem either liberating and compelling (Horner, 2016) or unsettling and impractical (Atkinson et al., 2015). To add one last layer of complexity, neither multilingual nor translingual approaches seem to adequately account for identity and inequality, which is why some scholars call for preserving language rights (CCCC, 1974; Kinloch, 2010; Kynard, 2013), or developing a new kind of “raciolinguistic” inquiry into how language and race shape each other (Flores and Rosa, 2015; Alim, Rickford, and Ball, 2016). Arguments about alternatives to monolingualism are difficult to resolve, which may be due to the fact that they usually take one of two limited forms: either a judgment of one orientation (whether positive or critical), or a

\(^{34}\) See Gyorffy (2016) on the EU’s expectation that students study one native language and two additional languages.
desire for some future in which multiple orientations can thrive. As examples of the latter, Haddix (2008) calls for a mixture of sociolinguistics and critical race theory, Guerra (2016) wants to see a combination of multilingual and translingual orientations, and Gilyard (2016) hopes that people will be able to reconcile translingual and rights-based approaches. However, there has not yet been an in-depth account of a case in which three of these key orientations—multilingual, translingual, and raciolinguistic—actually do coexist and lead to concrete changes in language ideology and policy. This gap reflects a problematic assumption that new policy ideas need to come from scholars, when in fact, there are plenty of cases of policymakers already developing their own innovative approaches.

In this chapter, I examine just such a case: the campaign to repeal Frederick County’s 2012 English-only ordinance. In Chapter 3, this local policy represented networked localism at its height; in Chapter 4, some of that policy’s supporters exemplified the English-only movement’s penchant for “upscale and downscaling,” but by the end of 2015, things had changed. Activists, writers, and newly elected politicians worked in concert to dismantle the ordinance, both in terms of actually voting it down and marshaling community support more broadly. I share my participants’ and my experiences of how this campaign unfolded, and why, in order to make three interrelated claims. First, the people involved used several discourse strategies to argue for undoing their community’s English-only policy, each of which emerged from a particular orientation towards language: flipping the economics script (multilingual), linking language to race (raciolinguistic), questioning the nature of English (translingual), and highlighting the role of collective action in their work (all of the above) (Table 3).

---

35 I use the term “strategies” to describe how people negotiate meaning, achieve goals, and highlight differences in the course of interaction, in the manner of Gumperz (1982, p. 6) and other sociolinguists. Work on social movement discourse, particularly in rhetorical studies, often draws on de Certeau’s (1984) different definition of “strategies” (as the more structurally powerful version of insurgent “tactics”), but the kinds of discourse and participants in my study do not fall into two camps of that sort (see Chavez, 2013, p. 99; Pezzullo, 2007 p. 173).
Table 3. The four main discursive strategies used in the repeal campaign, with the kinds of criticisms stemming from each one, and each strategy’s underlying orientation towards language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discursive Strategy</th>
<th>Criticisms of the English-only Policy</th>
<th>Orientation towards Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flipping the Economics Script</td>
<td>➢ not a cost-saver</td>
<td>Multilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ harming the local STEM economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Language to Race</td>
<td>➢ racist</td>
<td>Raciolinguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ xenophobic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ paints white people as rednecks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning the Nature of English</td>
<td>➢ oversimplified</td>
<td>Translingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ unenforceable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting the Role of Collective Action</td>
<td>➢ unpopular</td>
<td>All of the Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ undemocratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, these strategies appeared unevenly across events, genres, and organizations, with the end result that the policy text itself and the public discourse of the bill’s two co-sponsors offered a more limited vision of language policy than the ones offered in the rest of the campaign and in interviews. Specifically, the most official policy discourse focused on flipping the economics script, certain prestigious forms of immigration, and collective action, and much less on race, more marginalized forms of immigration, or the nature of English. Third, and most broadly, this case shows that there are many affordances as well as occasional difficulties in cultivating and meshing multilingual, translingual, and raciolinguistic orientations towards language. This campaign thus offers a critical window into how language ideologies emerge and change in practice, and a possible model for future language advocacy. In terms of local English-only policies, this repeal is also significant because it is one of the few to succeed in US history, and the first one to be the subject of an ethnographic account.

Before developing these arguments further, I begin by introducing the participants and general timeline of events involved. Then, I examine each of the four strategies in turn. The section on flipping the economics script focuses on the repeal bill itself, why some sectors of the
economy were so locally relevant, and why this strategy partially eclipsed the others. I turn next
to the ways people situated the English-only policy in the area’s long history of segregation and
civil rights activism, recent rise in anti-Latino/a xenophobia, and growing controversy over their
“Fredneck” reputation. After these two prominent strategies, I analyze one that was more rare yet
also better-received by bloggers and activists: one council member’s decision to focus on the
unruliness of English, and how that fluidity made the English-only policy untenable. By
emphasizing collaboration and cooperation, the people involved wove the other strategies
together into a multifaceted yet coherent campaign, and I conclude by discussing how that
strategy shaped my interview questioning and resulted in multiple coauthored documents, from a
community-wide petition to the new policy text. In the final discussion, I consider the
implications of this case study for theories of language ideologies and policies.

**Participants and Timeline**

In contrast with earlier chapters, here I narrow in on one policy, one community, and a
few of the actors. They all play a number of roles, as activists, writers, public speakers,
employees, and volunteers, but for the purposes of this study, I focus on three as current elected
officials, three as community activists, and three as bloggers (see list of participants in Table 4).
They were all were confident about their decision to support repealing the English-only policy:
As one elected official put it, “there wasn’t a whole lot of, you know, inner struggle” (Keegan-
Ayer).
Table 4. Participants in the study who were involved in supporting a bill to repeal the local English-only law in Frederick County. They are listed in order of appearance in the chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Role(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Fitzwater</td>
<td>County Council member; sponsor of repeal bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C. Keegan-Ayer</td>
<td>County Council Vice-President; co-sponsor of repeal bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Local Yokel Writers</td>
<td>Bloggers offering “a humorous yet informative look at politics in Frederick County, Maryland”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Mason</td>
<td>Speaker at public hearing; Community Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupy Frederick Writer/Activist</td>
<td>Speaker at public hearings; blogger for Occupy Frederick Facebook Page (“Organizing for a better Frederick and a better World”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Spencer</td>
<td>Chair of County Human Relations Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Donald</td>
<td>County Council member; voted for repeal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2013, where Chapters 3 and 4 left off, Frederick was an English-only county; now it is not. What changed? While my interest is primarily in the people who shaped the new language policy in 2015, there was also a structural transformation of the county government that facilitated their work (see timeline in Table 5). Voters approved this transformation by referendum in late 2012 (9 months after the English-ordinance passed). The new form of government involved both new kinds of office and new voting districts. Before, five commissioners were elected by the whole county (not by districts); now, seven council members and a county executive are elected by a combination of district-specific and county-wide elections. During the 2014 election cycle, one effect of the new system was that there were no true incumbent candidates: districts were electing their first-ever representatives, and even people running at large still had to shift their political identities from commissioners (an administrative and legislative office) to council members (a purely legislative office).

36 See https://fredericklocalyokel.com/
37 See https://www.facebook.com/occupyfrederick/
Table 5. A 3.5-year timeline of events between the English-only ordinance’s passage and repeal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2012</td>
<td>English-only ordinance passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2012</td>
<td>Referendum approving new form of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Voting guide raises possibility of repeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2014</td>
<td>Election (Jessica Fitzwater, M.C. Keegan-Ayer, Jerry Donald, and others win office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2014</td>
<td>Inauguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January–February, 2015</td>
<td>Initial meetings to plan repeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February–August, 2015</td>
<td>Human Relations Commission (HRC) discusses resolution, petition, and repeal at meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 2015</td>
<td>HRC Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2015</td>
<td>Repeal bill introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21, 2015</td>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18, 2015</td>
<td>Final Meeting and Vote; Ordinance is repealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2015</td>
<td>Repeal is in effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another effect was that the city had two districts of its own, and was no longer as overshadowed by the county’s rural majority. In one fell swoop, and in the absence of major demographic or ideological changes, the government went from five male Republicans to four Democrats and four Republicans, three of whom are women and four of whom are new to elected office.

Jessica Fitzwater won of one of those more urban districts, and went on to sponsor the repeal bill. She told me that “this was a great time for a candidate like myself to jump” in. Fitzwater has worked as an elementary music teacher for the local school district for eleven years (and continues to do so). Before running for office, she was “very active” in the local teachers association and the state and National Education Association, which included “attend[ing] local budget hearings,” lobbying in Annapolis, and winning the 2014 NEA award for “Political Activist of the Year.” In an article describing her initial nomination for that award, she brought up her support of Maryland’s recently-passed DREAM Act (Nuñez and Flaherty, 2014, June 25). In 2013, she completed a seven-month-long program called “Emerge Maryland,” which aims to “chang[e] the face of Maryland politics by identifying, training and encouraging women to run
for office, get elected and to seek higher office” (Emerge Maryland, 2012). Many people I talked
to in Frederick went out of their way, unsolicited, to praise her work, whether they were
colleagues or constituents, Democrat or not, an official participant or not. They described her as
“a prime mover,” “very impressive,” “very intelligent,” “excellent,” “serious,” with “the best
work ethic,” and as someone who is “going some place.”

Fitzwater’s colleague M.C. Keegan-Ayer won the other district in Frederick city, became
the council’s Vice President, and eventually co-sponsored the repeal bill. She ran for office after
an earlier career as a lobbyist on Capitol Hill and after more than 20 years as a local activist.
While she sees national and local politics as similar—“local isn’t that different”—the move from
constituent to politician was more significant. She recalled thinking, “I’m always out there
yelling at them, it’s time for me to step up and take the heat for a while.” In a 2014 voting guide,
she stated that if she were elected, “The first thing I will do is to repeal the English as the official
language ordinance.” She learned how to craft and move legislation when she was working in
Washington, D.C., and this experience helped her put together the repeal bill.

In November 2014, these two, along with five other people, became the first cohort of
county council members, and plans to engineer a repeal started in earnest. In early 2015, Jessica
Fitzwater discussed the issue with M.C. Keegan-Ayer and the county’s Human Relations
Commission, as part of her role as HRC government liaison (see Human Relations Commission,
2015, February-August). Other community activists also started talking about the issue, well
before any bill was formally introduced. In April, the HRC put out a resolution calling for a
repeal. In June, Fitzwater publicly introduced the bill, in July, the council held a public hearing,
and in August, they voted. During this summer stretch, ProEnglish and U.S. English defended
the original ordinance and worked to sway some of the council members. People also debated the

38 The first four quotes are from Duke, and the last three are from the Occupy Frederick writer.
policy online, in the media, and, as a few participants recalled, in church. Within the county council, two Republican members floated ideas for amendments (as an alternative to an all-out repeal). In the end, the bill passed 4-3, with three Democrats and one Republican voting for the repeal. In striking contrast to the English-only policy case studies, I never found any evidence that these people ever received support from any non-Frederick-based advocacy organizations, or any other lawmakers who had gone through a similar process. The repeal went into effect in October, while I was conducting interviews. This chronology describes what happened, and now I turn to the question of how it happened, beginning with the first of four strategies.

**Flipping the Economics Script**

When Jessica Fitzwater introduced her co-sponsored bill at a June 2015 public meeting, she read the first section aloud to the audience. According to the preamble (Figure 13), the purpose of the bill was to:

Repeal Ordinance No 12-03-598 [the Official English policy], for the purpose of promoting a competitive business climate for Frederick County’s existing 6200 businesses which employ 79000 workers; attracting new life science businesses and jobs that will move Frederick County closer to becoming the State’s bio-tech hub; ensuring that non-English language speakers are not deterred from reporting crimes, seeking medical care or other human services; and generally relating to Frederick County’s encouragement of multi-linguistic acceptance, tolerance and multi-cultural diversity in an increasingly global economy.

---

39 Immediately after Jessica Fitzwater introduced the bill, fellow council member Billy Shreve said to her, “I think we can just modify it to include the things that you’re looking for.” Fitzwater replied that if he sent her a draft in writing, she would “be happy to look at it” (Council Meeting, June 16, 2015). Later in the summer, Council Member Tony Chmelik drafted an actual amendment but it never passed.
Figure 13. The beginning of the bill to repeal Frederick’s English-only policy. This text is an example of the “flipping the economics script” strategy.

There are several themes here, from crime, to language, to multiculturalism. The overarching strategy, however, is to frame language as an economic resource. Specifically, the bill argues that repealing the English-only policy matters to the county’s thousands of businesses and tens of thousands of employees, and hinders the county’s ability to become “the State’s bio-tech hub.” Even the concepts of “acceptance,” “tolerance,” and “diversity” only appear in the immediate context of “an increasingly global economy.” Importantly, the preamble does not focus on all economic activities equally: it is primarily about science, technology, engineering, and medicine.

In other words, lower-paying jobs and other kinds of industries are not the priority. Finally, the focus on the “increasingly global” has a significant temporal and spatial component, and frames multilingualism as a new incoming factor, in contrast to English Only, which comes to seem
more traditional and more local by comparison. This axis of differentiation (Gal, 2012), with English-only tradition on one end and emerging multilingualism on the other, elides histories of local multilingualism, heritage languages, and indigenous languages. This bill is actually similar to English-only policies in a number of ways: the strategy of linking the fate of the economy to new multilingualism permeates both.

At the same time, this policy also has a twist: its authors used the possibility of multilingual people moving in to argue against an English-only policy, rather than for it. They flipped the script. I asked Jessica Fitzwater how she and her colleagues decided to take this approach:

Flowers: How did you all decide to, like, foreground (.) like, the business community (. . ) and different industries that (. )
Fitzwater: So, we really felt (. ) that (. ) for (. ) some of our (. ) more (. ) um (. ) conservative colleagues, whereas for me, this is the right thing to do, and that’s (. ) enough of an argument for me, um (. ) making the economic argument-, and it is a-, (. ) it’s a powerful
Flowers: Yeah
Fitzwater: Valid argument, so.

In this exchange, she answers carefully, by explaining that although “for me, this is the right thing to do, and that’s enough,” economic arguments offered a more “powerful” rationale for the repeal for her “more […] conservative colleagues.” Just as importantly, this strategy was “valid”; she could marshal substantial quantitative and qualitative evidence to support this argument. In other words, flipping the economics script was the rare, possibly the only, strategy that she, her supporters, and her skeptics could all find persuasive.

I begin with flipping the economics script, because it was both the most prominent strategy and because it was the most direct response to some of the English-only discourse discussed in earlier chapters. Specifically, the ProEnglish template and, in turn, Frederick’s ordinance both state that the policy would allow the local government to “reduce costs and
promote efficiency.” Beyond the text itself, supporters of the original ordinance had argued that a monolingual government would be best for the local economy, by saving money on translation and interpreter services, and discouraging all but the most self-sufficient and assimilated immigrants from staying in or moving to the area. Those who wanted to repeal the ordinance also evoked the local economy, but they argued that accepting multilingualism was actually a more lucrative plan than protecting monolingualism. This move is an example of flipping the script, or taking a relatively established kind of discourse, reproducing some of the formal features, but doing so with a different goal (Roberts, Bell, and Murphy, 2008; Summerson Carr, 2011). In this case, they used the same kinds of economic terms and sources, but with a more multilingual orientation towards language, in order to advance their goal of repealing the English-only policy.

Economic arguments for individual or societal multilingualism are neither new nor rare (Grin, 2003; Duchêne and Heller, 2012; Park and Wee, 2012). According to Flores (2013), “the desire for flexible workers and lifelong learners to serve service-oriented and technological jobs” has become the top policy justification for promoting multilingualism, ahead of cognitive, social, cultural, or historical reasons (p. 500). However, while the scholars above tend to approach the economics of language policy by focusing on “acquisition planning,” otherwise known as teaching and learning, in Frederick the focus was more on “status planning” (Spolsky, 2004, p. 11). The worst case scenario here was not Americans lacking the language skills to secure jobs and contracts, but rather multinational corporations skipping over Frederick for being too

---

40 Definitions of flipping the script vary, from a general term for any sort of discursive appropriation, modification, or “inversion” (Roberts, Bell, and Murphy, 2008, p. 337, 346), to a more specific term that connotes cynical acts of appeasement, often in the face of extreme power imbalances. Summerson Carr (2006), for example, uses it to encompass “spinning a convincingly personalized narrative […] so as to camouflage” (p. 642). Roberts et al.’s more capacious definition is more apt in my study.

41 Flores uses the term plurilingualism instead of multilingualism, in keeping with the preferred terminology of the European Union (the specific topic of his article). Among US policymakers, multilingualism is the more common term. When applied to individuals, I view multilingualism and plurilingualism as interchangeable.
English-oriented, and instead planting their new offices in some other part of Maryland, or, even worse, Virginia.

Concerns over the local economic landscape had been brewing for several years, not so much because the economy was struggling, but because it was finally succeeding. As far back as 2008, Charles Jenkins cited rising school district costs as one reason why he wanted an English-only policy (Chapter 3). On the other side of the political spectrum, one of the bloggers for the site Frederick Local Yokel remembered how much shabbier the area seemed when she first moved there. At the time of our interview, the three women who founded and continue to run this site had lived in Frederick for 10, 16, and 29 years, respectively, and had just started blogging a few months beforehand. As the blog’s title suggests, their style is tongue in cheek. They were inspired by both the D.C. blog Wonkette and the spectacle of county politics to write about nearly every council meeting, as well as other local events. They started their blog in response to Blaine Young’s actions (in this case, his comments towards a local female politician). Over Facebook one night, they recalled deciding, “We need to do something about this, so this guy doesn’t get elected again.” They initially considered writing a book on the topic, but they decided to start with a blog instead. They wrote several posts about the repeal both in terms of county council events and ProEnglish’s attempts to sway the council members. As one of the writers described what Frederick was like when she first moved here, she explained how the downtown area, which surrounds a creek, used to be “all concrete,” with just “plywood bridges” and “blank” storefronts, while today it is “much, much different.” Her tableau was difficult for me to picture, since by the time I visited, the area was a sparkling hub of stone bridges and bustling businesses.
She connected this shift to the local influx of biomedical and biotech businesses and military initiatives. For example, Fort Detrich is a longtime employer in the county, but the army base’s cancer research center became elevated in 2012 to a “Federally Funded Research and Development Center” (National Cancer Institute, 2015). Other top local employers include Leidos Biomedical Research, AstraZeneca (pharmaceuticals), Lonza Walkersville (“Biological media, cultures & reagents”), and Life Technologies (Maryland Department of Commerce, 2015). People wanted these businesses to stay and thrive, and more businesses like them to move in, but they worried that the English-only policy was a repellent to more cosmopolitan corporations and employees, and so they developed a two-pronged approach to flipping the economics script. First, I briefly discuss how the bill’s co-sponsors undermined the idea that the ordinance was saving the government money. Next, I turn to how a variety of participants forwarded the alternate theory that a repeal could actually make the government and the community money. Finally, I explain how and why this strategy started to eclipse some of the others.

Assessing the “Fiscal Impact”

One way to yoke economic success to multilingualism is to unyoke it from monolingualism. Fitzwater, Keegan-Ayer, and others all did so by critiquing the original promise of the English-only policy to reduce government costs. Crucially, they did not just make this claim and move on; they also cited county budget data and a fiscal report to support the idea. The county’s Finance Director prepared the fiscal report, which asserted that repealing the English-only policy would result in “No fiscal impact.” In other words, whether the policy were in place
or not, it would not make any difference to how the government operates. Once this report came out in July, council members brought it up during council meetings, media interviews, and to me.

In addition to the report, they also turned to actual raw budget data. For example, an article in the local newspaper featured a table with the county’s interpretation services budget over the past decade, as well as interpretations of that table from six out of the seven council members (Loos, 2015, August 7). The table offers information that could be interpreted any number of ways. Some years, costs go up; other years, they go down, and of course there is no agreement about what numbers would be appropriate, or what annual variation could be normal, for a community with a given demographic makeup and population size. Overall, though, the county spends much more on interpreting services now than it did 10 years ago—from $8,183 back then to $59,084 in 2015. However, it is hard to tell what role the English-only policy played in that trajectory. For example, I could imagine many of my participants from earlier chapters suggesting that the cost might have risen to $100,000 or more if it were not for policy’s deterrent effect. Everyone offered a slightly different reading about why costs had risen, not gone down. The article quotes Keegan-Ayer as saying, “I’m looking for a precipitous drop from when the ordinance went into effect, […] and I don’t see that drop,” except for a brief one-year decline from 2012–2013. In our interview, she added that she had decided to “track how much money is actually being saved,” and had found that much of the budget went to ASL interpreters, which the English-only policy does not officially affect (following the ProEnglish template, it included an exception for anything relating to the Americans with Disabilities Act). All together, these acts of providing, citing, and interpreting budget numbers are examples of flipping the economics script. At no point did anyone suggest that money does not matter, or that language rights are priceless, or anything like that. Instead, granting that money does matter to nearly

\[42\] But see Croft (2015, July 3) for a disability rights critique of the English-only policy.
everyone, they concluded that the most effective way to criticize the English-only policy’s economic discourse would be to offer their own. Their rejection of the efficiency argument set the stage for moving beyond arguments over monolingualism in the government, and onto arguments for multilingualism in the community.

“Promoting a Competitive Business Climate”

Making the connection between economic development and accepting multilingualism became central to the repeal campaign. If two of the key figures in English-only discourse are the local taxpaying citizen and the incoming troublemaker, the key figures here were the international entrepreneur and the multilingual STEM expert, who in some cases could be the same person. Keegan-Ayer, for example, explained to me that one of her relatives, a physician originally from India, had considered the idea of setting up his practice in Frederick, but that based on the area’s “image,” he was “afraid to move his family here for fear of what his girls would encounter.” Of course, this fear was probably not just about the language policy situation, as I will return to in the next section on the role of race, but the point for Keegan-Ayer was that the policy functioned as a generally hostile sign to prospective workers. More often, though, the narratives involved at least two kinds of people, business owners and employees.

Again and again, I encountered descriptions of entrepreneurs being nervous to come to Frederick, out of fear that their employees would either quit, be miserable, or never take a job there in the first place. Some of these narratives focused on interactions beyond the county’s borders. For example, Jessica Fitzwater told me that when the county’s “economic development staff” traveled to “trade shows,” many recruitment attempts would be met with a skeptical
question: “Aren’t you guys the ones that just did this English-only [sic]?” The policy was not a selling point.

Most of the time, however, these narratives between the government and businesses took place within the county. For example, in the midst of a longer explanation of why they thought the repeal happened, one of the Frederick Local Yokel writers explained:

FLY Writer: I think an unintended consequence of-, I mean, I think this [the English-only policy] was specifically targeted at-, at Hispanics.
Flowers: Mhmm.
Other FLY Writer: Right.
FLY Writer: But, I think a lot of the biomedical (. ) firms up here are upset because they have a lot of Asian workers, and
Flowers: Mhmm.
FLY Writer: They have a lot of Indians, and, um, Chinese who come up here, and this looks unwelcoming.
Other FLY Writer: Right
FLYW: They don’t know the history
Other FLY Writer: [Right]
FLY Writer: [Behind] why they did this, not that it’s justifiable on any level, but here you have (. ) you know, these biotech firms who hire a lot of Asians who don’t speak the language and they’re going to come to a place where it has this (. ) ‘Get out!’ kind of ((laughs)) you know,
Other FLY Writer: Right
FLY Writer: Feeling to it. I think that was part of the reason, like, the business side of it, why they wanted it repealed.
Other FLY Writer: Right.
Other FLY Writer: Right.
Flowers: Mhmm.

The misunderstanding she describes here is painful to contemplate: that “biomedical firms” might not care about the English-only policy if only they understood that it was really targeted at “Hispanics,” and not their own “Asians.” She laughs at the idea of the businesses mistakenly thinking the symbolic “Get out!” message was meant for their employees, because in fact it was meant for a different race altogether. Furthermore, this story only makes sense if one recognizes a dichotomy between Latino/a people, on one hand, and people who contribute to the economy, on the other. This dichotomy is flawed, of course (Pimentel, 2015). Perhaps for that reason, as
she fleshed out this awkward narrative, she also distanced herself from all the parties involved by emphasizing that for her, “it’s not justifiable on any level.” After all, her account flatters no one: in this telling, the English-only policy is racist, and the business owners are naive and selfish.

Her caveat reminded me of Fitzwater’s aside at the beginning of this section, where she stressed that “whereas for me, this is the right thing to do.” Both are conveying that they comprehend English-only discourse, but do not endorse it. I interpret such statements as acknowledgments of the difficulty of flipping the script. On one hand, they knew the economic arguments were important and evidence-based: the English-only policy did not result in obvious government savings, there are large companies who consider moving to Frederick because of its proximity to military bases and bigger cities, those companies do tend to employ a more transnational and multilingual workforce than currently exists in Frederick, some of these potential transplants were openly expressing fear of the English-only policy, and repelling potential STEM workers could harm the area’s fragile economic success. Furthermore, treating multilingualism as an economic resource is certainly more justifiable than many other ways people have historically treated the concept of using more than one language variety: as a problem (Ruiz, 1984; Heller, 2007), an aberration (Pavlenko, 2014, p. 12), a deficit (Dyson, 2015; Shapiro, 2014), or a “destructive” force (May, 2001, p. 205). And yet, for all the promise of economic arguments, the repeal’s supporters knew that there were other facets of the policy that mattered, too.

*Economy over Emotions*

Jessica Fitzwater encapsulated up some of these other facets as the more “emotional side of it.” When I asked if there were ever any disagreements over how to frame the repeal bill, she
responded by saying that while they did not disagree, per se, she did have “discussions” with activists and non-profits about how much to emphasize the emotions surrounding the English-only policy:

Flowers: Was there any time when you disagreed (.) amongst yourselves about how to exactly to frame it, or how to publicize it or anything?
Fitzwater: I think-, I don’t want to say disagree, but (.) mmm some-
Flowers: discuss?=
Fitzwater: =discussions, yeah, I mean, (.) one of the things that came up is when this first- (.), the-, in 2012, when it was first passed, there was, um (.) a big push by (.) Casa de Maryland and the Frederick Immigration Coalition locally, which works a lot with Casa, that (.) they had a lot of (.) um (.) a lot of signs, and kind of, like, a big rally before, and it- (.), they- (.), sort of-, it ended up kind of feeding into it being an emotional issue, and-, and rather than trying to make it (.) more of an issue of (.) you know (..) economic development for the county, the county moving, you know, into the 21st century, which is what we tried to talk about, like. ‘What kind of workers and (.) businesses do we want to attract? What kind of, um, what do we want our tourism to be, who do we want to be (.) coming to (.) visit or live or work in Frederick County? Um (.) and what does this-, this-, kind of say about (.) or-, or how is this impacting people’s willingness to do that,’ basically, um, and so, we did have, kind of, discussions about (.) trying to-, you know, not-, ‘let’s not-, we’re not going to have a rally beforehand, we’re not going to have (.) like, signs,’ we didn’t want anybody-, we didn’t want it to be that-, feed into the potential kind of, like, emotional side of it, even though, obviously, emotions came out at the hearing, because it is emotional for people on both sides, but, we didn’t want to (.) add fuel to that fire, basically. I’d say that’s maybe one of the things that came up.

In this excerpt, she sets up several dichotomies and positions herself in relation to each one. She distinguishes between “we” and “they” throughout, although the meaning of each of those words changes. Sometimes it’s “we” the politicians vs. “they” the activists, other times it’s rational vs. emotional people, people who care about the economy and tourism vs. people who care about immigrant rights, and even people who are vs. are not into making signs. Over the course of her answer, all these axes of differentiation seem to meld together. This kind of melding makes it seem like on one hand, there are reasonable, linguistically tolerant white people just looking out for the economy, and on the other, and there are immigrants and people of color who are too
emotional. This example shows how tempting it is for policymakers to pit rights and resources, race and the economy, affect and logic against each other. Of course, people can be quite emotional about their economic prospects, they can tackle xenophobia and racism with reason, and there is nothing inherently mutually exclusive about emotion and reason. Still, the question remains: what local conditions might have made some people so eager to protest in the streets with signs in the first place?

**Connecting Language to Race**

*Whites Only and English Only*

A community activist drove home for me one of the other reasons why people wanted to repeal the English-only policy: its racist reputation. This participant, Jay Mason, is head of the education organization “Eliminating Achievement Gaps” and is involved in a number of other local causes. He contacted me after seeing a flyer I gave to a friend of a friend. After saying he was calling about my study, the next thing he asked was what I thought about English-only policies. I had heard that his friend was relatively conservative, and based on that information, I assumed that Mason would have similar views, and I was worried about alienating him if I answered too bluntly. So, I said something about how I probably would not pass a law like that if it were up to me, but I was trying to keep an open mind. I quickly realized that I had misread him, however, and regretted responding so breezily. He was very critical of the policy, found it to be racist, and said the term “English-only” reminded him of the Jim Crow era. Mason spoke at the public hearing about the repeal bill, at the suggestion of Jessica Fitzwater. In his statement there, he described what his parents used to experience in Frederick (Figure 14), before connecting that history to the present situation:
They had to walk around and see a lot of signs that said “whites only” *makes sign-sized rectangular gesture*. That word “only” speaks (. ) unacceptance. “English-only” speaks (. ) unacceptance.

Figure 14. Jay Mason gestures in the shape of street sign while comparing Jim Crow-era “Whites Only” signs to English-only policies. He is facing the county council, with audience members in the background. The image is an edited screenshot from the televised broadcast of the public hearing.

As he spoke the phrase “whites only,” Mason raised his hands to shoulder level and moved them in unison in a rectangle, as if to trace one of the signs that characterized so many businesses and institutions before and during the 1960s civil rights movement. He then tied that phrase to the one at hand, “English-only,” not just by listing both, but by emphasizing the word in common—“only”—and by repeating the words and the rhythm in the rest of the sentence (the pause is after “speaks” both times). Later, during our interview, he said that during the public hearing, he had “felt like we were back in 1950 all over again.” In response, I asked him why he thought people felt more comfortable speaking about language-based exclusion, than about “explicitly” racist
exclusion. He laughed, sighed, and paused in quick succession, as though I had already assumed too much in the way I asked the question. I tried again: “Although maybe there was some explicitly racist stuff?” This time, he did reply, by saying, “I felt like they were explicit.”

Mason’s strategy of connecting language to race in the context of racism proved to be quite common. When the people involved in the repeal mentioned any political action in the area from more than 10 years ago, it was much more likely to be related to the civil rights movement than to language or immigration, per se. A lot of local politics continues to revolve around racism, anti-racism and, most recently, the Black Lives Matter movement.43

This strategy did not involve any claims about inherent biological or even social connections between language and race, as though race determines one’s language practices, potential, or rights, or anything along those lines. Rather, the point was to show how ideologies and histories of language and race have shaped each other in ways that have consequences for people of color as well as for white people. Mason’s and other local activists’ approach reflects the fact that race is a social construction, but it nevertheless plays an important role in people’s lives (Roberts, 2011). Although there is debate over just how durable or fluid ethnic and racial identities are, I tend to agree with May (2001), who argues that they are “situational,” but that some situations last for centuries (p. 10), and with Guerra (2016), who similarly argues that identity is about both fixity and flux. People’s experiences with and beliefs about language and race unfold in complex ways: while people can certainly use language and literacy to challenge racism, scholars who take a “raciolinguistic” approach have argued that in practice, entrenched language ideologies continue to associate people of color with language deficits and a lack of language rights (Flores and Rosa, 2015). These kinds of complexities appear across case studies of people (Smitherman & Alim, 2012), popular culture (Rosa, 2016), social movements (Hoang, 43 On local BLM activity, see Loos (2016, July 17). On the rhetoric of BLM more generally, see Ramos (2016).
2015), schools (Rampton, 2005; Young, 2002), government initiatives (Leeman, 2004), and writing (Davila, 2012), as well as in this language policy campaign.

While Jim Crow policies like the ones Mason describes were common around the US, their legacy in this area is particularly potent in conjunction with local histories of slavery and, into the present, Ku Klux Klan activity. While the Klan peaked in 1920s in some parts of the country (Rawlings, 2016), Maryland and a few other states saw a resurgence in the late 1970s (Sims, 1996, pp. 267). Sims draws particular attention to Klan activity in Gamber, Maryland, a few miles from the Frederick County border. In the 1990s, the Klan was so well-established in the town of Thurmont, in northern Frederick County, that a resident could identity a business “known as the local Klan bar,” where one could find members “there every Saturday night and most others” in two specially reserved booths (Davis, 1998, p. 33). Several participants either remembered the Klan’s most recent heyday first hand, or through their parents’ experiences.

These phenomena are not just rooted in history but are continuing to unfold. During my first week in the county, I attended a protest against the KKK in the town of Braddock Heights. The Klan had raised enough publicity about the event that by the time I heard about it from a participant, there was already a Facebook event for people planning a silent walk around the proposed cross burning site. (Ultimately, they failed to get the correct kind of fire permit in time, so there was no actual cross burning). The same week, someone poured a can of red paint over a bust of Justice Roger Taney to call attention to the statue’s continued, controversial display in downtown Frederick (Fifield, 2015, October 11). Taney was a one-time resident who later wrote the 1857 opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, which prioritized slave owners’ property rights over black Americans’ citizenship rights. One of his former local properties has been made into a museum, complete with slave quarters (Historical Society of Frederick, 2012). The city (not
county) government had vacillated over what to do with the bust for years, and before the paint incident people had poured motor oil on and wrapped fabric around the statue on various occasions (Fifield, 2015, October 11). Towards the end of my visit, the city reiterated its commitment to moving the bust in a resolution, but it was not removed until March 2017 (Masters, 2017, March 18). Of course, these contemporary events are at least as much about people trying to move on, away from the Klan and Taney, as about the Klan and Taney themselves, but it is still striking to see slavery and segregation be a topic of genuine debate, and makes Mason’s public hearing statement all the more resonant.

Racism and Xenophobia

At the same time as these anti-black-racism-related issues continued to play out, the past decade had also been a time of heightened local xenophobia and immigrant rights activism, particularly in the context of Latino/a and Asian immigrants. As I touched on in earlier chapters, there many reasons why immigrants were the center of attention in recent years: there had been immigrant rights protests around the country in 2006, Maryland had narrowly passed its version of the DREAM Act in 2012, county law enforcement was partnering with federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement through the 287(g) program, and former County Commissioner Blaine Young had explicitly expressed a desire to make his county “the most unfriendly county in the state of Maryland to illegal aliens” (Anderson, 2011, November 13). Among local activists, I never sensed any real tension between civil rights, immigrant rights, or economic activism, perhaps because so many of them felt that the English-only policy was an attack on all three.
A member of Occupy Frederick exemplified this holistic approach. After reading a few posts about the English-only ordinance on the Occupy Frederick Facebook page, I messaged the account, and eventually interviewed the writer who maintains and updates the site. He is a “long-time activist” who also studied economics in college and later worked as a union organizer. He got interested in Occupy Wall Street when it started in 2011, around the same time that County Commissioner Blaine Young was introducing a number of new initiatives. This writer saw parallels between “the big bankers” in New York City and “the local Tea Party.” In fact, at the public hearing in 2012 about the original ordinance, most of the protesters were affiliated with Occupy Frederick. In addition to writing for the Facebook page, he also spoke at the same public hearing as Jay Mason. Throughout summer 2015, he wrote several posts about his own views on the issue, linked to posts by Jessica Fitzwater (2015, July 9), summarized what happened at county council meetings (2015, August 18), and drafted a “sample email” message that people could send to the government in support of the repeal (2015, July 21).

In these posts, he often made a point of connecting the English-only policy to its official sponsor, by describing it as “Blaine Young’s English-Only Ordinance” or “Mr. Young’s opinion.” On the surface, he was just stating a fact about sponsorship, but I also sensed that he was trying to convey some additional information to his local readers. When I asked him about why he decided to write about the issue, he answered irreverently, but nevertheless representatively of what I heard from other participants. First, he identified the English-only policy as part of the local Tea Party agenda, and then he continued:

Occupy Frederick Writer: The county has always had a problem with race, OK. Blaine Young’s an opportunist. He’s also a racist. But he sees an enormous political opportunity for himself here. So he immediately moves into this English-only (...) stuff, which (...) you’ve read (...) is meaningless on the surface, but it’s like a
In this moment, he connects Young to the policy, to racism, to opportunism, to opposition to undocumented immigrants, all in one utterance. (Elsewhere in the interview, he explained that he called the policy “meaningless” because it was likely unenforceable.) He also suggests that the policy was a “check box” for Young to mark off to prove his Republican ethos. In his framework, all these concepts are nearly synonymous, and they all point to each other, so that by denouncing “Young’s opinion,” he is also denouncing racism and xenophobia, and his target audience knows it. This part of our interview struck me for a couple of reasons, the first of which was how deftly he untangled this web of English-only discourse. Second, given Occupy Wall Street’s white-washed reputation (Milkman, Luce, and Lewis, 2013, p. 5), I was not expecting to see Occupy Frederick focus on racism to this extent. This example, as well as the fact that Jessica Fitzwater invited Jay Mason to talk at the public hearing (despite the fact that she herself favored more economic arguments), both showed me that while certain people might have favored some strategies over others in certain situations, they also all embraced multiple strategies and worked with and on behalf of others. I will return to this theme in the second half of the chapter, in the context of the Occupy Frederick writer’s praise of the third strategy, and in the final section on highlighting collective action.

In the early stages of researching this case, I mistakenly assumed that race would be an absent presence. By “absent presence,” I mean that race would be relevant, but either unmentioned or perceptible only through oblique references (Prendergast, 1998). If I wrote about race at all, I imagined I would have to do a lot of reading between the lines, or, in more technical terms, analyzing multiple indexical orders (Dick, 2011; Eckert, 2008; Silverstein, 2003). As Jay
Mason’s and the Occupy Frederick writer’s experiences show, however, race was actually quite an explicit and central part of the repeal campaign’s discourse, even if it was more of an absent presence in the text of the bill itself.

In fact, what I consider to be the second-most influential document in this case study (besides the actual bill) was a resolution from a group focused on civil rights. Soon after she entered office, Jessica Fitzwater started serving as the government liaison to a group called the Human Relations Commission (known as the HRC). Like many similar commissions around the US, this HRC emerged out of the 1960s Civil Rights Movement, first as the “Inter-Racial Committee,” and then later in its current form. Over time, the HRC has expanded its scope to include transnational issues: they organize an annual Naturalization Ceremony, work on “Human Rights” (Human Relations Commission, 2016), and weigh in on the county’s 287(g) program (which authorizes local law enforcement to help deport undocumented immigrants) (Human Relations Commission, 2014, June 24). After Fitzwater had been going for a few months, she asked them to “create a package to present to the council in the future” about repealing the English-only policy, and the resolution was a response to that request (Human Relations Commission, 2015, February 24).

The chair of the HRC, Angela Spencer, was one of many who worked on the resolution (I discuss her stance on collaboration more in the section on collective action). Spencer is from Texas, grew up using English and Spanglish, and has taught ESL in adult education and prison contexts. She currently works as an instructor teaching classes like “Cultural Diversity” to law enforcement and correctional officers for the state, and had recently won a statewide teaching award when I interviewed her. She joined the Human Relations Commission in 2008, after

---

44 On the phenomenon of Human Relations Commissions, see Schill (1995), Grattet and Jenness (2008), and Downey (2009).
seeing an ad in the newspaper, and so had been a member for about seven years. During our
interview, she told me about a particularly unsettling ice breaker experience, in which when she
had attended a local event where she was “the only minority in the room of about 200 non-
minority people,” and someone approached her and remarked, “I’m sure you feel like you’re at a
KKK meeting!” Whether despite such experiences, or because of them, she is dedicated to her
volunteer work on the HRC: she puts in enough hours that her acquaintances wonder, “Aren’t
you employed with them?!” She and her colleagues called for a repeal on several grounds.

The two-page resolution touches on race, rights, language, the economy, and history. In a
series of “Whereas” clauses, the authors contend that the English-only policy is inconsistent with
their mission “to monitor and recommend civil rights policy,” and with the “belie[f] that one of
the most vital and valuable aspects of daily life in Frederick County is its diversity and cultural
heritage where all races, religions, ages, and cultures are welcome, as should be all languages.”
The history of European immigrants also gets a mention, in a clause recognizing the county’s
“long history of multiple languages over the last three centuries, including our rich German
heritage.” 45 Finally, the text includes a description of the local economy that seems both more
accurate and more elegant than most: “governments, businesses, and individuals in Frederick
County communicate freely and openly, most often in English but in many other languages as
well.” This document suggests that there is no inherent need to pit economic, social, cultural,
political, or anti-racist arguments against each other. Audiences seemed to appreciate the
resolution, both out in public, by reposting it on several social media pages, and within the
county council, by copying select passages directly into the repeal bill (I discuss the details of the
copying in a later section).

And yet, while some parts of the resolution did reappear in the bill, the parts about racism and civil rights did not. Ultimately, race played an important role in the discourse of public hearing, social media and blogs, and the HRC’s Resolution, but not as much in the bill itself, or in the discourse of the bill’s sponsors at the time. To return to Jessica Fitzwater’s discussion of why she did not want the situation to become too emotional, she and her council colleagues may have considered racism and rights to be too risky of topics to include in the most official aspects of the campaign. At first, I interpreted this divide in terms of the absence or presence of race. However, that was not quite right, as I explain in the last part of this section.

_The Role of Whiteness: Unwelcoming Rednecks and Welcoming Hosts_

What was actually happening was that some parts of the campaign focused on the perspectives of people of color, whereas the other parts focused on those of white people. In other words, it was not so much a question of race but of which race(s). While connections between language and race receive the most attention in the context of people of color and marginalized language varieties, the same kinds of tenuous connections also exist between white people and English, particularly in the United States (Bucholtz, 2011; Trainor, 2008; NeCamp, 2014; Peters, 2013; Zenger, 2004). I did not pick up on the importance of whiteness at first because it manifested primarily through a discourse pattern that I initially deemed negligible, both because it was just one or two words, and because it appeared most often around the edges of people’s more developed arguments: in their opening lines, joking asides, or closing remarks. Namely, white people kept mentioning that they did not want to be seen as unwelcoming rednecks. For example, a Frederick Local Yokel blog post briefly mentioned that the policy “makes us look like uneducated, backwoods rednecks” (2015, July 21) and in our interview, after
a longer discussion of local economic conditions, one of the writers noted, “this looks unwelcoming.” Very similarly, when I asked Keegan-Ayer how she decided to support the repeal, she talked about the economic problems with the old policy and concluded her answer by saying:

Keegan-Ayer: And, I thought, *So, this is basically, in my opinion, just-, just (..) an-, an (..) unwelcoming image for Frederick County, and is that really (.) what I want my county to-, to-, is that clearly the way I want it to appear*

Flowers: Mhmm
Keegan-Ayer: And, I just decided, no. And so, we repealed it.

In both situations, they flip the economics script, but they punctuate their statement by drawing attention to how it makes them look, literally: “look like,” “image,” “appear.” In other words, it’s not just about materially fewer dollars in the local economy; it’s also about the perception of “us,” or “my county.”

This kind of discourse was not just internal to the group of people working against the English-only policy. Supporters of the original law were well aware of it, and the issue has been salient since well before either local language policy existed. For example, I asked Hayden Duke (a conservative community activist discussed in Chapters 3 and 4) about his sense of the pro-repeal side’s tactics, and he immediately brought up the unwelcoming redneck phenomenon:

Flowers: Did you have the sense that they had sort of (.) a unified (.) argument they were making? Or, even within a side, was there lots of variation?
Duke: I think for the (.) pro-repeal side, was-, ‘You’re making it unwelcoming, you’re making us look like a bunch of hicks, you’re making Frederick look like a backwater.’

As Duke emphasizes through a list of three rhythmic, similarly structured reported utterances, there was a strategy of drawing connections between acting “unwelcoming” to being “hicks” in a “backwater.” As Duke’s comment demonstrates, the figure of the unwelcoming redneck was legible to people across the ideological spectrum.
When I watched the video of the public hearing, I realized that the figure was not just locally recognizable but locally familiar. During one man’s statement, he described how outside corporations would not want to come there if it meant dealing with “Frednecks.” People in the audience laughed, and I initially wondered if their reaction was out of recognition of a known term or shock at a new one. The word turns out to be well-established. In fact, “Fredneck” has been a word on Urban Dictionary since 2006, with the definition: “The inhabitants of Frederick, Maryland, who are mostly hicks and rednecks” (Vizzue, 2006, April 25). A secondary definition of the same word elaborates on the meaning, and offers 23 different defining characteristics of a Fredneck, from “talks like a hick,” to “doesn’t know manners,” to “brags to everybody about guns.” The level of detail here suggests the figure of the Fredneck is relatively durable, not just an offhand part of the conversation.

Ultimately, this campaign turned out to be partially, but crucially, a struggle over the meaning of white identity. The two only two viable options for white identity here appear to be the unwelcoming redneck and their polar opposite, the welcoming host. One result is that arguments over white identity saturated discussions about language policy. Another outcome is that white people only had two entrenched figures of personhood to align with, both of which seem to unilaterally control property and other people’s mobility (the only difference is whether they bring people in or keep them out.) Finally, I note that in this discourse about welcoming whiteness, people of color only appear as people to invite in, whether as poor, undocumented immigrants; or as cosmopolitan, STEM moneymakers. The centuries-long presence of indigenous people, black people, and European immigrants does not fit into this framework.

The New York Times once quoted a Hmong activist saying that local English-only policies are like an “unwelcome mat” (Wilgoren, 2002, July 19). I have appreciated and quoted
that phrase for years. I used to think the point was that a welcome mat would be better, and perhaps that was the original speaker’s point. There are other options, though. The limitation is with the mat, not the precise message on the mat. To be sure, deciding to be welcoming rather than unwelcoming can be powerful: this move in Frederick towards redefining whiteness contributed to one of the few repeals of an English-only policy in US history, ever. However, further change may remain difficult unless more people of color, transnational migrants, and multilingual people control that metaphorical house, or unless the house metaphor stops seeming relevant at all.

This kind of concern over how English-only policies might make white people look is why I consider the orientation underlying this strategy to be “raciolinguistic,” rather than more narrowly “anti-racist.” A raciolinguistic perspective is broadly about examining connections people make between language and race, akin to how sociolinguistics is about language and society; the term is not meant to denote any particular stance on those connections (N. Flores, personal communication, 2016). Everyone in this section is calling attention to connections between language and race, but that could mean anything from criticizing racism to trying to recuperate white identity. I now turn to a strategy focused not on the economy, or on race, but on language itself.

**Questioning the Nature of English**

Of the four strategies, interrogating English itself was the least common; many more people looked to the links between English, economics, race, immigration, and policy, than to the nature of English itself. However, I still include this strategy because a few participants prioritized it themselves or admired its use by others. In other words, the first two strategies were
common yet controversial, while questioning the nature of English was rare, yet popular when it
did happen. Unlike the discourse about economics, which argued for the value of multiple
different languages (each associated with different nations around the world), this move was
more about articulating the problems with taking such categories and boundaries for granted. The
difference is between the multilingual theory that communication happens in multiple languages,
and the translingual theory that “communication transcends individual languages” (Canagarajah,
2013, p. 6).

County council member Jerry Donald exemplified this strategy in his interactions with
the county attorney. In addition to holding office, Donald also teaches high school social studies,
and in his public statements and in our interview he brought his historical, cultural, and linguistic
knowledge to bear on the issue. Perhaps because his vote may have seemed more up in the air
(he was not one of the main sponsors), or because his district is more conservative than
Fitzwater’s or Keegan-Ayers’, ProEnglish used social media to call on Donald to uphold the
original ordinance. As a result, his office received many critical phone calls and emails from
those organizations’ members and supporters. To explain what this time in his life was like,
Donald compared the experience to an earlier experience where he had made an unpopular call
as a football referee and had thousands of people yell at him at once. By the night of the final
vote, he had decided to interrogate the English-only policy’s underpinnings by framing his public
comments as a sort of dialogue.

The same night as the vote, he asked the attorney (who had helped draft the original
English-only ordinance) a number of questions about how the policy was defining the English
language. In other words, while other people had focused on the “Only” half of the law, he was
asking about the “English” part. At one point, he asked, “How are we defining this? Oxford
Dictionary? Webster’s Dictionary?” Before the attorney responded, he added that the ordinance did even not specify any one dialect of English, like “American English.” The county attorney responded that they have used a 2007 edition of Webster’s Dictionary to clarify definitions in the past. Donald wondered aloud how the government was supposed to handle words that had come into use after 2007. Through these questions, he was taking advantage of the fact that people in the English-only movement generally “fail to define English” (Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur, 2011, p. 309). After some more exchanges back and forth, the attorney grumbled that he did not “appreciate” being singled out for questioning. He may have been frustrated because Donald was asking questions that he already knew the answers to: the government did not have a perfect definition of what English was, because there is no perfect definition. Donald backed off, but he continued to lay out his issues with the ordinance.

He made a case that English is not really controllable by anyone or anything, and that therefore an English-only policy is untenable on practical grounds. He described how English is “a complete free market,” where “things come and go and move on” beyond our control. “English moves,” he argued, and trying to legislate language is like “trying to nail currant jelly to a wall.”46 Using the example of the word “burrito,” he suggested that it is not clear what is and is not English. Later, in our interview, he made it clear that he was not just describing a contemporary phenomenon of globalization; he cited the way Middle English grew out of Old English and French, and the long history of language contact in the United States between English, Yiddish, Spanish, and other languages. When I asked how he developed this perspective, he mentioned his general knowledge of US and world history, as well as Bill Bryson’s book Made in America: An Informal History of the English Language in the United

46 In our interview, Donald attributed this simile to President Theodore Roosevelt. See (Decker, 1986, March 9).
States, which devotes a chapter to language contact among indigenous people, enslaved people, and early immigrants.

His description of English’s impurity rang true to other participants, and reflects several increasingly accepted linguistic theories about English and communication (Makoni and Pennycook, 2006). English shares many features in common with other languages, and has always been translingual (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 57), a creole (Mufwene, 2008, p. 107), an assemblage of resources (Nero, 2001; Pennycook, 2010, p. 68), and a site of code-meshing and code-switching (Martinez, 2010; Young, Barrett, Young-Rivera, & Lovejoy, 2014). Furthermore, contemporary registers of English, like legal, medical, and academic discourse, feature terms from Latin and Greek as a matter of course. Historically, English has never been unitary: Old, Middle, and Modern varieties of English are different enough that they are only considered to be all the same language because of nationalist ideologies (Calvet, 1998, p. 101; Milroy, 2001, p. 549). His strategy also echoed ones used to question the purity of languages other than English or outside the US, like “de-essentializing” indigenous languages (Lyons, 2010, p. xii), “defanging” English in Canada (Heller, 2011, p. 183), and framing Catalan as a “playful” language in Spain (Woolard, 2016, p. 78). Not only did Donald’s arguments resonate with listeners, but they also seemed to complement the arguments some of his colleagues and constituents were making about the policy being racist and xenophobic, and harmful to the local economy. In other words, there was no claim that a translingual orientation was better than or a replacement for a multilingual or raciolinguistic one, but rather that it, too, was legitimate.

Other people in the community welcomed Donald’s discourse. The bloggers I interviewed singled out his performance as particularly persuasive. Towards the end of my interview with the Occupy Frederick writer, I asked if there were anyone else he would
recommend that I contact, and he mentioned Jerry Donald immediately. He explained that the way he “broke this thing down” was “beautiful” and “the most compelling argument against this English-only law that I have ever heard.” This compliment is an example of how open people were to different strategies: the Occupy Frederick writer focused mostly on economics, race, and immigration in his own discourse, but went out of his way to bring up and endorse Donald’s angle, too. The bloggers for Frederick Local Yokel also singled Jerry Donald’s performance. In a post from the night of the repeal vote, they attributed his rhetorical abilities in part to his background in education. They wrote, “Props to Jerry Donald for pointing out that the English-Only ordinance was a loser from the right hand side, in that it created unnecessary and meaningless legislation to govern a free-market and constantly evolving language environment. Leave it to a teacher to go all debate team on it and show us he can rock it from the other angle” (2015, August 18). I initially considered including this quote in my discussion of flipping the economics script, because of how they describe the power of being able to “rock it from the other angle.” However, upon closer inspection, the hyphenation of “free-market” makes me interpret the term “free-market” as modifying “language environment.” In other words, the compliment is less about finances and more about treating language as a resource. The way they identify him as a teacher, capable of going “all debate team on it,” is also notable. At their best, these two figures, the teacher and the debate team member, share a reputation for engaging in dialogue, introducing new knowledge, and being flexible. I think it is these qualities, in addition to the language-specific discourse, that resonated with people.

The language component was important, though. At the start of my interview with the Frederick Local Yokel writers, they raised the issue as soon as I asked how they decided to write
about the repeal in the first place. I was expecting them to answer in terms of county politics, or the amount of news coverage it was getting, but instead, we had the following exchange:

FLY Writer: As an issue for me, I’m really interested in just the idea that you can (. ) regulate language, like it’s super weird, right?
Flowers: Yes [((laughs))]  
Other FLY Writers: [((laughs))]  
FLY Writer: English is so heavily inf-, it’s a Germanic language. It’s got heavily French vocabulary from  
Flowers: [Mhmm]  
FLY Writer: [1066]? ((laughs))  
Flowers: Yeah.  
FLY Writer: And just that (. ) alone, like, kind of motivated me to, to  
Flowers: Mhmm.  
FLY Writer: think about it (. ) in a certain light, too, just.

By enunciating the word “language,” she suggests that of all the things to regulate, targeting language seems “super weird,” and goes on to situate the current debate in the history of English in Britain. Furthermore, for her these were not side issues, but the primary reason (“that alone”) she wanted to write about the issue. At that point, her fellow writers chimed in to add the history of multilingualism and language mixing in the United States, too, including in the context of the Acadian and French Creole communities in the Northeast and Louisiana.

This kind of discourse about language even started to extend beyond the immediate context of the language policy debate, into discussions of other topics. For example, in a post from the same night the repeal took place, the Frederick Local Yokel writers were covering a completely separate issue. The county council had disagreed about how to handle the issue, and in the blog post they described the ensuing “kerfuffle” (August 18). Then, in an aside punctuated by dashes, they asked, “is that an English word??? Who cares! Yay!” They are drawing attention to and then making fun of the question of what counts as an English word. In doing so, I see them participating in the same kind of discourse as Jerry Donald: they are all showing that there is no pure, natural version of English. Just as Phil Dumenil reminded me in Chapter 3 that
“Kathy, it’s politics!” Jerry Donald and these bloggers reminded me that it’s still about language, too.

**Highlighting the Role of Collective Action**

As I have tried to emphasize, this was not a campaign associated with just one person, one group, or one origin story. Instead, the people involved highlighted the role of collective action in their work, and this practice of highlighting is the fourth and final discourse strategy of the campaign I want to examine. This strategy functioned as a sort of harmonizing mechanism, by depicting the repeal as a group effort, but also as something that a lot of different people and groups conceived of independently. These two facets of the strategy may seem contradictory, but the common thread is that there was never a sense of one author or one inspiration for the bill. As a result, there was very little pressure on the bill’s sponsors to seem like they had all the power or all the answers. Instead, by the end of the campaign, they could point to many different sources of inspiration and requests that they take action. This strategy also framed the English-only policy as unpopular and undemocratic, given how much community support there was for a repeal. The practice of highlighting is important here. As discussed in Chapter 3, there is nothing notable about laws *being* coauthored or cosponsored. What is notable, however, is what parts of the policymaking process people choose to make most visible.

More than the other strategies, which seemed to ebb and flow, this one seemed ever-present, including in interviews. My interview with Angela Spencer (the chair of the HRC), offers one of the clearest examples. We had just started talking about the 2012 English-only ordinance, and I was asking what she thought of it:

Flowers: What did you think? at the time?
Spencer: Well, initially, I was, um, honestly-, well, first, let me tell about the
Flowers: That’s fine.
Spencer: So, our ultimate goal is to speak with one voice, so even if we disagree with some things, we agree to disagree. OK? So that, as a body, we speak with one voice, so, we all discuss everything and have open conversations.

In this interaction, after I asked the question about 2012, she started to answer, but then switched gears and asked me to let her talk about the HRC instead. I was confused at what seemed to be a non sequitur, but I was also curious, so I said, “that’s fine.” I quickly realized that she was actually gently steering me away from framing the issue in terms of individual perspectives, and inviting me to focus on her group instead. After describing how the HRC’s “goal is to speak with one voice,” she did go on to explain how they had interpreted the policy. As the interview went on, I tried to adapt to her framing, with some slip-ups. For example, I self-corrected in the middle of asking a question about something she had co-written:

Flowers: And how did you-, and how did the HRC get involved in writing (. ) the resolution supporting the repeal?

I was starting to ask about her actions, then changed tack and rephrased the question to be about the group, and put extra emphasis on the word “HRC” to try to emphasize my correction. I do want to note that I did not completely ignore the role of the individual, and that none of my participants were unilaterally opposed to discussing their own motives or actions. Instead, I just realized that I tended to get more detailed answers if I asked about groups actions first, then followed up with questions about who exactly was involved and in what capacity and why, rather than the other way around. While I have introduced this strategy through an interview example, in the rest of this section I want to focus on two key texts that resulted from this strategy: a petition in favor of the repeal, and the text of the repeal bill itself. Both texts grew out of collaborative writing and were taken up due to purposeful highlighting of that collaboration.
The Petition

One of the first topics people discussed at early planning meetings was the possibility of a petition (Fitzwater; Spencer). In Spring 2015, Angela Spencer told me members of the Human Relations Commission started collecting signatures in support of repealing the English-only ordinance, both on their own and by sharing the petition with “civic groups, faith-based groups, community and neighborhood” groups. According to minutes from one HRC meeting, “everyone was asked to fill at least a page and bring them to the next meeting” (April 28, 2015). So, this was a collective effort to show community support. The petition soon started to appear around town: M.C. Keegan-Ayer, for example, recalled coming out of church one day and seeing the petition out in front, along with people who “explained” to parishioners leaving the building “what it was for, and what it was all about.” This moment shows that the goal was not merely to collect signatures from people who already wanted a repeal (although those signatures did become important later). Rather, the petition helped build what Keegan-Ayer called the “groundswell of support” for the repeal in different ways at different stages of the campaign.

In moments like the after-church event, the petition created an occasion to discuss language policy. Angela Spencer got even more specific, and explained to me that it allowed people to “have that conversation, to say, ‘How do you feel about this? And would you like to sign?’” As her two-part question suggests, the goal was to raise the issue and, if possible, also get a signature. Floating the idea of a repeal was particularly important because while many people were aware of the 2012 policy, it had not been a very visible issue in the years since. These interactions were not just informative to the people being asked to sign, but also for the people seeking signatures, in that they had more opportunities to hear people’s own arguments and experiences regarding the language policy.
While it began as a conversation starter, by the end the petition functioned more like physical evidence. Specifically, it became an entextualization of public opinion (literally) that could be contextualized in subsequent events (Andrus, 2015; Oddo, 2014; Silverstein and Urban, 1996). In other words, people could take the petition into new situations and offer it as concrete proof that the English-only ordinance was controversial, or even unpopular, and that the democratic thing to do might be to repeal it. For example, at the public hearing, a community activist came up to the podium and held up the petition so that the council and the audience could all see it. She said the petition had 1,000 signatures, and as she lifted it up, she asked anyone in the room who had signed to stand up (Figure 15). In her statement, she also talked about the ordinance’s potential to harm local businesses, dissuade new business from moving to town, and its lack of potential to save the county money. So, she meshed two strategies: she argued for the repeal by flipping the economics script, and by emphasizing the collective action behind this position, as manifested by the thick stack of paper and at least three people coming to their feet.

Figure 15. A community activist holds up the petition with about “1,000” signatures (see black arrow at the top left). She had also just asked people who signed or collected signatures to stand, and three audience members were in the midst of standing up. This image is an edited screenshot from the televised broadcast of the public hearing.
While the prior example hinged on the numbers of people who signed, Jessica Fitzwater used the petition’s list of addresses to make a slightly different point in a public interaction with her colleague Kirby Delauter. Delauter had just argued that they should keep the original ordinance because his district was generally fine with it, and his office had received many phone calls and emails in favor of keeping the ordinance intact. I suspect both of his claims were true. However, the petition’s existence allowed Fitzwater to respond skeptically. She asked how he knew his district’s opinion, and, more pointedly, if he knew if all those calls and emails were really coming from within Frederick County, much less from his district. After all, ProEnglish had sent out social media and email alerts about the upcoming vote, which included the phone and email contact information for the county council. The issue had also been in the national news. Although it never quite came to this point, because Delauter moved on, Fitzwater told me later that she was prepared to use the addresses in the petition to “show how many people [who signed] were actually in his district.” In other words, she could show that a certain number of people in his district were on her side, while he could not necessarily do the same with his office’s phone calls and emails. Both council members were citing their constituency, but Fitzwater had the written addresses at her fingertips. Over time and across different situations, then, the petition helped build grassroots support, demonstrate that support, and, finally, bolster the other strategies.

**The Repeal Bill**

Like the petition, the bill was both a result and an emblem of collective action. Rather than highlighting public support, however, the collective action involved in writing the repeal bill was more contained to the county government. Even within the government, there was a
certain amount of winnowing, sifting, and sorting, so that some kinds of discourse made it into the final bill more than other kinds. In other words, if compiling the petition was about collecting as much evidence of community support as possible, writing the bill itself was about collecting and then filtering. In a number of ways, then, the collective action strategy played out very differently in the process of creating the petition vs. the bill.

When I asked the bill’s two sponsors who wrote the bill, they both listed many people and sources. A “county attorney” (Keegan-Ayer) and “some county staff” helped write the bill, both by expanding on “bullet points” that Fitzwater provided, and by doing additional “research” on what the “typical arguments” against English-only policies might be (Fitzwater). Keegan-Ayer also talked about getting the idea for the bill’s structure—a long series of clauses—from texts she had encountered in her former career on Capitol Hill. Over time, she had developed genre knowledge about the multiple functions and affordances of policies, which she drew on in this situation when confronted with people who only wanted the bill to accomplish the bare minimum. Specifically, he recalled that the county attorney initially just wanted to bluntly convey something along the lines of, “we want to repeal it,” which reminded me of Charles Jenkins’ goal in 2006 to pass an English-only policy that simply stated “English is the official language of County government” (see Chapter 3). However, once again, a longer version won out. Keegan-Ayer remembered countering the attorney with, “No, we want, we want there to be reasons why we’re repealing it.” The opportunity to lay out the many reasons for the repeal was one appeal of this structure, but a related reason was genre: she was drawing on the kinds of policy texts—resolutions, bills, proposals, briefs, reports—she had worked with before to create something innovative (Tardy, 2016). During our interview, as we both looked over and read aloud from copies of the repeal bill, she animatedly showed how she tweaked the resolution
genre to finalize parts of the bill:

Keegan-Ayer: So, basically, what I did was I, I dr-, drafted the language similar to what you would do from-, on Capitol Hill, as a Resolution ((drags hand down the page)). And then we just took out the “whereas” ((drags hand down the page)) clauses. Like, you know=

Flowers: Oh, OK.
Keegan-Ayer: =“Whereas [this]=
Flowers: [([(laughs)])]
Keegan-Ayer: =and whereas that, and whereas this, and whereas that, therefore be it resolved that” ((punctuates each phrase by pointing to a different spot on her desk)).
Flowers: Mhmm.
Keegan-Ayer: OK. So, instead ( ) we took out the “Whereases” and we just said “this, and this, and this, and this” ((punctuates each phrase by dragging hand down the page)) Um, therefore, for that reason=
Flowers: =Be it enacted.
Keegan-Ayer: Right. That we’re repealing it, yes.
Flowers: OK.
Keegan-Ayer: So it’s more (. ) ((looks up)) in line with what you’d see on Capitol Hill

On one level, she is just conveying that she started with the resolution genre from Washington, D.C., dropped the “whereas” bits, and made it into a local bill. On another level, though, her rhythmic repetition of “this” and “that” and the way she pointed to different parts of the page and her desk made me realize that much of the writing process was about pulling together disparate elements. When I laughed while she was speaking, I think it was because her description and gestures reminded me as much of someone picking out paint swatches, or ordering off of a menu, as someone compiling a document. This moment also reminded me that collective action is not just about people, as I noticed how similarly she talked about drawing on texts, genres, and facts, too.

Just as Keegan-Ayer drew on inspiration for the policy’s structure, Jessica Fitzwater played a comparable role in collecting material for the policy’s content. Her position as government liaison to the Human Relations Commission was key. Early on, Fitzwater had suggested that the HRC propose something about the possibility of a repeal to the council. Then,
the HRC and she had sustained “conversation about the document [and] what exactly our statement would be,” and then the text was “compiled together” (Spencer). As I discussed in the section on race, this resolution made a very holistic argument against the English-only policy, by deftly weaving together subarguments about the economy, race, diversity, culture, tolerance, and general quality of life in the community. Afterwards, Fitzwater, Keegan-Ayer, and county staff used this resolution as source material for the final draft of the bill. In other words, Fitzwater created a sort of policy loop by encouraging them to write the resolution, then incorporating some of it back into her bill.

As content moved through this loop, though, its meaning changed and narrowed significantly. For example, both documents share the following statement, except for one word in the middle, marked by brackets: the English-only “Ordinance, and the perception it has created, [is/constitute] a barrier…” (Figure 16). The difference between whether the ordinance “is” a barrier (according to the HRC), or whether it “constitute[s]” a barrier (according to the bill), seems to merely mark a register shift to a more formal or legal lexicon. However, the sentences also end differently, which is not just about register but about orientations towards language. In the Resolution, the barrier is “to making Frederick County the very best place to live, work, and

```
WHEREAS, we believe that this Ordinance, and the perception it has created, is a barrier to making Frederick County the very best place to live, work, and raise a family.
```

```
The County Council of Frederick County, Maryland, (Council) finds that the Ordinance, and the perception it has created, constitutes a barrier to good business and impedes the growth and development of business and commercial endeavors in Frederick County.
```

Figure 16. An example of discourse that appears in both the HRC’s more holistic resolution and the more economics-focused repeal bill. The top image is from the earlier resolution, the bottom image is from the eventual bill, and the underlined text is in both.
raise a family.” Although that may sound vague, in the context of the whole document, each of those three terms, *live, work,* and *raise a family,* calls back to other parts of the text: “live” points to the parts on multiculturalism and civil rights, “work” points to those parts plus the ones on the local economy, and “raise a family” points to all of the above as well as the parts about education. So, the resolution is talking about a social, cultural, educational, and economic barrier. The meaning of “barrier” is much more specific in the bill, however. There, the sentence ends with “a barrier to good business and impedes the growth and development of business and commercial endeavors in Frederick County.” In this version of the clause, the focus is purely on the economy. Of course, there are other clauses in the bill that are less business-oriented. The point is that while the bill is transparently intertextual and coauthored, it is not just a more concise, or more polished version of the HRC resolution, or any of the other discourse from the campaign. Rather, flipping the economics script clearly became the most enshrined strategy. The robust local discourse about race and rights appears only obliquely, in words like “tolerance,” “diversity,” and “multi-linguistic acceptance,” and there is no mention whatsoever of questioning the nature of English. Collective action, then, is not the same as a united front.

**Conclusion**

As I was writing this chapter, one of my colleagues attending the American Association of Applied Linguistics conference live-tweeted a question from a panel session about how we, as scholars, could more effectively inform and influence policymakers on language issues. I had two mental reactions to this. First, I slyly thought about all the ways English-only activists have successfully informed and influenced policymakers over the years, although I knew that was not the kind of response he had in mind. Second, and more seriously, I mentally flipped the question
around to one that I think may be more pressing: How could the actual experiences of language policymakers, in all their complexity, inform and influence how we understand language? I want to conclude this chapter by addressing that question. Specifically, I want to consider what this case study might mean for the broader conversation in writing studies and related fields about whether and how people change their orientations towards language.

The first and most basic insight is that plenty of people have already moved away from a monolingual approach, if they ever were there in the first place. This finding echoes those of many other teachers and researchers (groups which overlap, of course) (Canagarajah, 2013; Nordstrom, 2015; Rymes, 2014). What I want to emphasize, though, is that multilingual and translingular approaches to language are not just the purview of people who are already multilingual, multidialectal, transnational, or people studying, teaching, or researching language and literacy. It is not just about cosmopolitans, English language learners, immigrants, people outside the US, marked or marginalized dialects, marginalized identities, heritage languages, digital literacies, or any of the other sites where people often look for evidence of complex language practices and ideologies. My participants all used what many Americans (including myself) would consider standard English, yet they nevertheless grappled with the knowledge that a) no language is pure, including English, b) still, how people use and view ‘English’ and other languages has significant economic, social, cultural, and political effects, and c) these effects tend to be racialized. As I discussed above, no one emphasizes all of the above equally: the policy itself and its sponsors highlighted the economic benefits of multilingualism, Jerry Donald and the bloggers stressed the impurity of English, and Jay Mason, Occupy Frederick, and the HRC kept race and rights in the conversation. Nonetheless, nearly everyone expressed all three, even if it was just in our interview, or just at one point in the campaign. Although they would not
use the following terms, I consider these three orientations to be translingual, multilingual, and raciolinguistic.

Before and even during this project, it has been so tempting to point to one of these orientations as ‘the best,’ whether that means the most accurate, the most persuasive, or the most just. I could have written, “Translingualism captures the way people actually communicate in practice, while multilingualism just multiplies all the myths of monolingualism, and identity is too fluid to pin down.” Or, “Multilingualism is accessible and meaningful to people in a way that translingual and theories of race may never be.” Or, “Neither multilingual nor translingual approaches do much to shed light on race or racism.” The truth is that all these perspectives are valuable. The second insight, then, is that meshing these approaches is ultimately more effective than trying to purify and deploy any one in isolation. We are all translingual, multilingualism affects everyone, and language cannot be separated from race in the United States. There is very little to gain from striving for ideological purity. The English-only movement learned this lesson a long time ago—recall all the different, sometimes even contradictory, strategies described in Chapter 4—and it appears that people working against English-only policies understand this concept, too.

The last insight is that meshing orientations does not necessarily have to be an individual undertaking, or something that happens in one communicative event. In other words, there is no need for the language policy text itself to cover all possible bases, there is no need for one person to stand up and weave together all these approaches in one definitive speech or editorial, and there is no need for a group of like-minded people to present a united front. In Frederick, people unevenly distributed their discourse strategies across genres, audiences, and situations, which may be more likely to lead to policy change than any steady drumbeat of talking points.
In the following conclusion chapter, I briefly synthesize these findings with those from earlier chapters, in order to consider what they all might mean for future scholarship and policymaking.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

The preceding chapters have examined the nature of local language policy in the United States. In doing so, they have opened up the field of writing studies to a new approach to the local, and a deeper understanding of writing in the English-only movement. In particular, I have argued that the local is at once material, discursive, and ideological, and that local language policies emerge through networked localism, upscaling and downscaling, and resistance and rewriting. Ultimately, the project’s subtitle, “Shifting Scales in the English-Only Movement,” has a dual meaning. The English-only movement has been adept at shifting scales for a long time, particularly towards the local scale, and now I am calling for researchers to shift the scales of their own analysis accordingly. In this chapter, I begin by reviewing the key findings from this study, before turning to the broader implications.

Review of Findings

Chapter 1, “Local Language Policy,” argued for the importance of the local scale in language policy, while also offering a more flexible definition of the local than in previous work on language as a local practice, local literacy, and language policy. Not only do people in the English-only movement act locally—in places like schools, workplaces, cities, and counties—but they actively negotiate what it means to be local. Furthermore, this sort of local action is not new to language policy. Even before organizations like U.S. English and ProEnglish started supporting local English-only policies, there had been a long history of such policies in the Americanization movement, World War I, public schools, and in local governments like Miami-Dade County. Once John Tanton founded these two organizations, however, local policies became more networked, and localist discourse became more prominent. This chapter also
establishes the stakes of local English-only policies, both in terms of how they can affect people, and in terms of how implicated fields like English, writing studies, and applied linguistics are in their success. In Chapter 2, I argued for ethnographic discourse analysis as a way to examine language policy in the making. Building on similar approaches in linguistic anthropology and writing studies, this methodology foregrounds people’s situated perspectives on and uses of discourse; and treats discourse as dialogic and indexical. This chapter also detailed the study’s methods, including collection and analysis of archives, digital discourse, interviews, public hearings and meetings, and field notes. This methodology and set of methods allows for writing research that goes beyond single texts, dominant languages ideologies, and official sponsors or authors.

From these introductory chapters, I moved into three body chapters, each of which analyzed a different facet of local language policy, from writing, to scaling, to resisting. Chapter 3 examined how people write local English-only policies, and argued for the role of “networked localism.” Policymakers engage texts, discourse, people, and other resources from within and beyond their local government. At the same time, they tend to frame their policymaking activity as local. So, in all four Maryland counties, there are interdiscursive, and usually even intertextual, connections between the local language policies and ProEnglish’s template, which itself came out of ProEnglish’s work in Hazleton, Pennsylvania. Copying, ghostwriting, and collaborating are ubiquitous. At the same time, neither ProEnglish nor the official sponsors of these policies tend to foreground the networked nature of their work. ProEnglish, and in some cases, U.S. English, will speak at public hearings, give supportive quotes to journalists, and offer consulting and templates on their websites, but they do not publicly claim much credit. Ultimately, it makes sense for local policymakers to take most of the credit for practical and
ideological reasons. Practically, local governments do have to customize templates for their particular legal and political situation. Furthermore, politicians are the ones to actually vote on these resolutions and ordinances. Ideologically, framing English-only as a local phenomenon can make it seem more relevant and more desirable. The concept of “networked localism,” captures this phenomenon in a way that prior work on networked writing (Latour, 2005; Swarts, 2016), local publics (Long, 2008), local rhetoric (Asen, 2015), and language as a local practice (Pennycook, 2010) has not.

In Chapter 4, I turned from how people write policies, to how they discursively situate those policies in space and time. I argue that people in the English-only movement discuss the scale of language and language policy quite differently than Blommaert’s (2010) leading theory of scaling might predict. Rather than perpetually upscaling, in order to seem more timeless and universal, people who support these policies often seem to find more traction in making them seem like a local trend. Downscaling is not new: Tanton made it a key component of the English-only movement from the beginning, including by citing and seeking input from ecologist Garrett Hardin. More recently, people at ProEnglish, U.S. English, and in local governments often deploy downscaling, either on its own or in conjunction with upscaling. Importantly, I find that this strategy exists across genres, modes, people, communities, and times: it truly permeates the English-only movement, even if it can occasionally backfire. This chapter thus offers a new understanding of scaling, as an ideological and flexible strategy, as well as a revised account of the English-only movement, as not necessarily reliant on nationalism. Rather, this language policy movement can thrive even or especially at more localized scales. For that reason, English-only policies are relatively impervious to scale-based critiques. In other words, for people who
view such policies as problematic, the solution cannot just be for policies to become even more local, or, conversely, more national, transnational, or cosmopolitan.

As Chapter 5 argues, however, there are certain strategies and orientations that can offer viable alternatives to English as the only official language. In Frederick County’s repeal campaign, politicians and activists countered their local English-only policy’s monolingual orientation by adopting multilingual, raciolinguistic, and translingual orientations to language. They enacted these alternate orientations through four discourse strategies: flipping the economics script (multilingual), linking language to race (raciolinguistic), questioning the nature of English (translingual), and highlighting the role of collective action in their work, in order to synthesize the first three strategies. People like Jessica Fitzwater and M.C. Keegan-Ayer flipped the economics script, by arguing that the English-only policy was actually hurting, rather than helping, the local economy. Others, like Jay Mason and the writer for Occupy Frederick’s Facebook page, argued against the original ordinance on the grounds that it is racist and otherwise unjust. Jerry Donald and the bloggers for Frederick Local Yokel took a more translingual approach, by questioning the very premise of English-only policies, which rests on assumptions about English being completely unitary and separate from other languages. And yet, these different strategies seldom seemed at odds with each other, either from people in Frederick’s or my own perspective: instead, collective texts like the petition and the Human Relations Commission’s Resolution, and actions like complimenting someone with a different approach than one’s own, created a sense that the campaign was eclectic, but not contradictory. At the same time, flipping the economics script eclipsed the other strategies in the repeal bill and in the public discourse of the bill’s two sponsors. This case study suggests that, just as the English-only movement draws on a variety of resources and strategies, so too can their critics.
For writing studies in particular, this chapter calls into question the premise of recent debates over which orientation towards language is most valuable (Atkinson et al., 2015), not just because of their focus on prioritizing one single orientation, but because they ignore the possibilities of meshing different orientations in complementary ways.

**Future Research on Local Language Policy**

There are several avenues for future research on local language policy. In terms of my own work on this project, there are additional people to interview, texts to collect and analyze, and archives to examine. In terms of people, I plan to contact or re-contact people who might address gaps in my account, especially more politicians in Carroll County and in Hazleton, people who protested or organized against their community’s policies, and people who have worked for U.S. English and ProEnglish. In terms of policies, while I am interested in continuing to examine a small number of communities in depth (rather than try to catalogue every possible case), I will finish collecting copies of all the local government policies listed in Appendix A, in order to see how template-based (or not) the policies were before ProEnglish’s 2006 template emerged. In terms of archives, there are several that include materials on the English-only movement, including S.I. Hayakawa’s papers at the Hoover Library, La Raza’s papers at Stanford, Marie Koenig’s papers at the Huntington Library, Garrett Hardin’s papers at University of California, Santa Barbara, Eldon Rudd’s and Robert Reveles’ papers at the University of Arizona, and the Federation for American Immigration Reform papers at George Washington University. Longer term, the embargo on the latter half of Tanton’s papers lifts in 2035. This archival research will be open-ended in some ways, but also aimed at collecting some specific texts that Tanton or one of his colleagues mentions in another text. These texts include letters,
newsletters, and campaign materials, as well as a “180-page” white paper on language policy that helped Tanton decide to start U.S. English (Graham, 1989, p. 57). These lines of inquiry will allow for a more comprehensive account of local language policy and the English-only movement.

Another issue for future iterations of this project is the changing political circumstances in the US. I completed almost all of the research and the writing of this dissertation before the 2016 election. It is possible that this election will prompt a rise in English-only policies. In late 2016, ProEnglish sent out an email to members of their email list announcing, “We have never seen a greater opportunity to make English our official language than now. Not only do Republicans control Congress and the White House, President-elect Donald Trump and Mike Pence have both been outspoken supporters of English language policies” (S. Pimm, email, 2016, November 30). Of course, political organizations are likely to find a silver lining in any election outcome (a Clinton win would probably have been better for fundraising), but it does seem like English-only policies face fewer barriers than they did before the election. Alternatively, though, language policies may seem beside the point in a situation when policymakers have renewed latitude to marginalize people through more drastic means, like deportation and travel bans. Either way, I will continue tracing developments in US language policy.

In addition to my own immediate work, I also identify three broader questions about local language policy for future researchers to address. First, how do local language policies in governments compare to ones in other sites, including classes, schools, programs, departments, organizations, and workplaces? In asking this question, the goal is not to invite taxonomies. After all, most of my participants are serving in leadership roles outside government, whether as
school teachers, business owners, or volunteers. So, it is not as though government language policymakers have no ties to other policy domains. At the same time, because language policy studies have focused so heavily on governments, much less is known about how people write and negotiate other kinds of local language policies. More research is needed on how these kinds of policies develop and play out, within and across institutions, and over time.

Second, how do contemporary local language policies compare to historical examples? In Chapter 1, I argued that these policies are not new, although they have changed in some ways. For example, the earliest colonial policies were more about preventing people from learning English (or other European languages, like Spanish). Similarly, I mentioned that the World War I-era laws were more German-oriented and more restrictive than contemporary ones, by extending into domains like church and telephone conversations. However, with the exception of Peters (2013), there are few in-depth studies of local language policies in the US before 1980. Future research could shed light on the prevalence of local language policies throughout US history, what those policies dictated, and how people interpreted, enforced (or not), reacted to, and either abandoned or maintained them.

Third, how do US policies compare to ones outside the US? I consider this issue to be the most significant gap in understandings of local language policies. While this question is beyond the scope of my present study, it is crucial that language policy researchers not center on the US, or treat the US as the default. It is also important to note that even within and across US borders, there are indigenous nations, many of which are actively engaged in language maintenance and revitalization, and in bilingual education (McCarty, 2013). Some of the questions may be the same across borders, like what counts as ‘local’; whether language is a problem, right, or a resource; and who gets to shape language policy, but the answers will vary considerably. Outside
the US, the legal systems, economies, language ideologies, language practices, and histories involved tend to be different. For example, the English-only movement’s framing of English as an at-risk language is a largely American phenomenon. Furthermore, multilingualism, funding for translation services, and recognition of language rights are more common outside the US, as exemplified by Perrin’s (2011) analysis of how a Swiss public television station presents news in four languages. As US writing studies scholars become increasingly aware that people outside the US are already researching language and literacy (Donahue, 2009), and works like You (2010), and book series like Parlor Press’ *International Exchanges on the Study of Writing* proliferate, local language policy research can be an opportunity for more transnational engagement between writing researchers. For example, future studies could compare Tardy’s (2011) portrait of DePaul’s writing program to ones of writing programs outside the US, or Perrin’s (2011) Swiss workplace to an American one, or the sites I studied to local governments in other countries.

**Implications for Writing Studies**

I turn now from the details of this study and the concept of local language policy to its broader implications for the field of writing studies, both in terms of theories of writing and areas for future writing research. While there are of course implications for other fields, like sociolinguistics, discourse studies, applied linguistics, linguistic anthropology, and rhetoric, part of my argument in this chapter is that these other fields have much to gain from a writing studies approach. In order to even begin understanding how language policies work, it is crucial to recognize that they are usually a *kind of writing*, that they are locally created, circulated, and
changed by everyday writers, and that they can shape how people understand and view writing and other discourse.

Studies that only discuss language policies or ideologies in the abstract, look only at final drafts, rely on interviews or surveys alone, or include a very limited version of artifact collection in their qualitative methods, can only offer so much insight. For example, Johnson (2009), in an article about the Philadelphia school district that helped popularize the “Ethnography of Language Policy,” describes recording classroom and meeting interactions, and conducting “critical discourse analyses (CDA) of federal, state, and local language policy” (p. 143). These methods are limited: from this data, there is no way to know who wrote those language policies, how, and why; or to know what the teachers, administrators, and students are writing, how, and why. I suspect that this approach, in which writing only comes in when there is an official policy text to be CDA’d, may be why the article ultimately upholds an overly simplified micro/macro framework, in which teachers are only “implementers” (p. 156). To be fair, Johnson is arguing against an older theory of language policy, in which “creators” matter and “implementers” do not (p. 156). I would agree with this critical impulse, but the solution is not to elevate implementers to some separate but equal category in a taxonomy, just as the solution is not to elevate policy readers to some separate but equal category in relation to policy writers. Rather, if the study had been more focused on writing practices of participants, and the text histories of the texts involved, the findings might show that all the participants are actively shaping the language policies that enable and constrain their discourse. I point to Johnson’s (2009) article as an example not because it is particularly problematic, but rather because its ethnographic methodology and its methods were innovative in so many other ways. In that article, Johnson (2009) rightfully argues that “[b]ecause a lot of language policy analysis is, essentially, discourse
analysis, it behooves the field to establish more disciplined forms of language policy discourse analysis (Johnson, 2009, p. 151). I agree, and suggest that one way to develop these “more disciplined forms of language policy discourse analysis” is to adopt an ethnographic methodology that centers writing as a practice, not just a set of static texts that people talk read or talk about.

In addition to making a general call for language policy research to incorporate insights from writing studies, I also argue that there are implications for writing studies that go beyond language policy concerns. I address these implications in the rest of this section. Although there is overlap, I divide this section roughly into three parts: implications for theories of writing practices, local language and literacy, and language ideologies and policy.

Writing Practices

One implication of this study is that public and professional writing is highly collaborative and often anonymous. Brandt (2015) documents the rise of everyday professional writers who write for a living or for fun, but do not necessarily identify as authors, receive public credit, or have intellectual property rights over their work. At the same time, her study relied exclusively on interviews, whereas I combined interviews with other methods, including analysis of some of those co-authored, anonymous texts. These texts included resolutions, ordinances, bills, templates, websites, letters, and memos. In light of these texts’ complex, often multi-year histories, it is clear that some longitudinal studies of academic writing (Prior, 1998; Lillis and Curry, 2010) are more relevant to work on non-academic writing than has been acknowledged. The politicians and activists I studied face challenges similar to those of academic writers, in terms of genre, argument, enculturation, revision, and working with sponsors, brokers, co-
authors, and readers. At the same time, the issue of authorship is significantly different for my participants. In academic writing, there is very little incentive to not have your name attached to your writing. In contrast, policymakers and activists are much more likely to point to public interest, community support, or grassroots activism as the real driver behind their writing. In other words, they are more likely to depict themselves as mere conduits or scribes for pre-existing ideas. A potential participant, for example, declined my interview request on the grounds that he was only involved in “assisting […] with the wording” (Chapter 3). Even when they do take some credit for a policy or other text, it is more likely to be as a representative of a group, rather than as an individual. For example, in Chapter 5, Angela Spencer answered my questions in terms of the Human Relations Commission’s stance rather than her own.

If language policy writing is characterized by so much copying, ghostwriting, and collective action, that raises questions about other arenas of professional writing. Future research is necessary in order to see just how common, consistent, or longstanding these kinds of writing practices are in other kinds of policymaking, social movements, legal and political discourse, workplaces, and digital spaces. For example, conservative policymakers have adapted the American Legislative Exchange Council’s collection of templates into a variety of new laws. Furthermore, by early 2017, very similar “sanctuary city” policies had passed in “at least 633 counties” in the US (Lee, Omri, and Preston, 2017, February 6). Another example from legal discourse is the way that judges are the official authors of legal opinions, even though they can only complete these texts “[w]ith lots and lots of help from their law clerks” (Wickman, 2012, June 26). These writing practices are not limited to extracurricular writing; some kinds of academic discourse fit these patterns as well. Teachers copy each other’s syllabi and other materials, often without permission or attribution, universities copy each others’ honor codes.
(Nizza, 2008, March 31), committees collaboratively write documents, researchers co-author articles, no one claims credit for content on departmental websites, and students work and study together. As with language policies, these academic examples are not necessarily problematic, but they are worth analyzing in more depth.

Local Language and Literacy

The second implication of this study is that writing studies and related fields need to rethink the ‘local’ in local language and literacy practices. I use the term “rethink” because it is not as though this scale has not been included in previous work. From Canagarajah’s (2005) collection *Reclaiming the Local*, to Tardy’s (2011) argument that “we need to act locally” (p. 635), to Long’s (2008) *Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Local Publics*, to, most recently, Asen’s (2015) study of local education policy rhetoric, there has been an awareness that the local scale is important. In some literacy studies circles, looking locally had become so common that Brandt and Clinton (2002) pushed back with a pointed article on the “limits of the local.” This article warns against “exaggerating the power of local contexts to set or reveal the forms and meanings that literacy takes” (p. 338). To some extent, this article just marks a divide between literacy studies and language policy studies. Work on language policy has never had to dismantle the “orthodoxy” of focusing solely on “situated social practice,” because that has never been a common approach to language policy research, much less an “orthodoxy” (p. 337). At the same time, this often-cited piece is not just about different strands of writing studies. Instead, it points to what I see as a misunderstanding of the local. At one point, the article suggests that everything is local (p. 347), but other passages suggest that researchers must choose to either look locally, or not. For an article that draws so heavily on actor-network theory, there is a
surprising tendency to treat the local as something already settled, as though things are either local, or they are “elsewhere” (p. 338). But what exactly does it mean to be local? And how do some things come to seem more local than others?

Studies like the ones listed above do not sufficiently address these questions. Instead, there is a tendency to define the local in narrow terms. Tardy (2011) writes that “a local view can afford us a way to imagine possibilities for bottom-up change,” in the form of local language policies that place more value on multilingual writers’ linguistic resources (p. 638). And yet, there is no acknowledgment that the more monolingual policy under critique also emerged locally. Although Blommaert (2010) does not view the local as optimistically, he can also be too quick to associate the local with non-dominant discourse and ideologies. In other words, across work on the local scale, there is a sense that “local” and things like “English-only” are antithetical, when in fact they can be quite compatible. Instead of taking for granted the ideological valences of the local, future research must approach the concept in a more open-ended way.

Pennycook (2010) offers a possible solution: rather than making artificial distinctions between local/non-local, he simply argues that language is always a local practice (p. 7; see also Latour, 2005, p. 176). Everything is local. As a guideline for research methods, this argument is a helpful reminder that every interaction happens in a particular place: even events construed as national or global still take place somewhere that can be defined more precisely. As a theory of the local, however, this approach risks lapsing into hopeless relativism. To put it another way, it ignores people’s perspectives, by making it seem like it does not matter whether people think they or others are acting locally or not. In contrast, I have shown that local research is most illuminating when it focuses on multiple material, discursive, and ideological elements, from
both etic and emic perspectives. It is important to represent people’s discourse, and to trace the networks they participate in.

In addition to these questions about what it means to be local, more research is also needed on how some things come to seem more local than others. One recurring theme in this study is how both the English language and policies about English start to seem more and more local over time. This phenomenon is not just the purview of the English-only movement: the people who undid Frederick County’s Official English ordinance also succeeded in making multilingualism, multinational corporations, social justice, and a translingual orientation seem more local. Importantly, though, none of these processes were inevitable. It takes a lot of work, both discursive and non-discursive, to make something seem local. Furthermore, nothing is ever localized for good. For example, people in the English-only movement have never stopped debating whether ProEnglish (and their policy template) merely assists local policymakers with their local goals, or meddles in local communities where they do not belong. The point of these examples is that “is this local?” or “how do local things connect to larger context?” are less compelling questions than “how did people come to treat this as local, and to what effect?”

To illustrate this distinction, I consider Asen’s (2015) recent book on how three Wisconsin school boards make policy decisions. As with the other examples in this chapter, I point to this work not because it is particularly problematic, but because it is otherwise so effective. I also look to this book because it is similar to my own study in some ways: I asked Asen questions about his IRB experience as I was designing my own proposal to study local politicians, and during a recent presentation of my work, someone asked me point-blank how my work was any different from this book. Each chapter in the book focuses on one policy issue in one community, which Asen analyzes as cases of “local deliberation and policymaking” (p. 1).
Each of the case studies illuminates different strategies and issues, from appeals to economic scarcity, to arguments over what counts as expertise. Throughout, Asen puts these cases into context by situating them in the context of things like No Child Left Behind and “a national network of GSAs [Gay-Straight Alliances]” (p. 40). However, there is little attention to how contextualization and networking actually happens. In practice, people do not just act locally against a static national backdrop. To be specific, I suspect that the elected officials in Asen’s study are involved in a similar kind of networked localism as my participants, in which they draw on a range of resources, and perhaps even offer resources to other communities, while at the same time framing the resulting texts and ideas as local. By the time the school boards’ issues come up for a vote, they have probably already gone through a series of revisions and reframings. Furthermore, these processes are likely traceable, if the researchers (the single-author book is part of a larger, collaborative research project) had examined the text histories of the policies under deliberation. Instead, each case study just focuses on the most visible parts of the policymaking process: the way people talk about a policy proposal during public meetings, and how they reflect on those proceedings in interviews. More research is necessary in order to understand how people shape and perceive local discourse.

Language Ideologies and Policy

In addition to shaping how writing studies approaches writing practices and the local scale, this study also has implications for how the field approaches language policies and ideologies. In terms of the English-only movement, this study confirms and extends previous work on the roles of racism, xenophobia, and deficit language ideologies in this movement (Gonzalez and Melis, 2001). Several of my participants and their colleagues wanted to pass
English-only policies because they thought they might discourage or disadvantage undocumented immigrants. As Dick (2011) argues in her study of Hazleton, Pennsylvania’s Illegal Immigration Relief Act and Official English ordinance, citizenship, race, and language are so closely associated that these policies do not need to mention race or immigration by name (Dick, 2011). For example, the Occupy Frederick writer saw connections between “this English-only stuff,” “oppos[ing] illegal immigrants,” and being “racist,” and he described these three things as being “code” or a “check box” for each other (Chapter 5). Furthermore, most participants’ tepid attitude towards the nation suggests that the movement cannot be explained as a simple byproduct of patriotism.

In some ways, this finding may seem like the least surprising one to writing studies scholars. For decades, the field has studied the real and potential harm of English-only policies. At the same time, my study is distinct in documenting how the policymakers themselves express these views, and how those views come part of government policy. Furthermore, it is useful to know that these views are not necessarily waning over time: more than 100 years since the Americanization movement, and more than 25 years after in-depth studies like Baron (1990) and Crawford (1992), the motives for making English the official language remain much the same. Sustained inquiry is therefore necessary into how these policies continue to affect people as they learn and use language.

At the same time, I have also argued throughout that the English-only movement is neither cohesive nor consistent. People who support English-only policies often disagree about how to write, support, and frame them. These points of disagreement can make the movement more flexible. If someone says a policy is racist, someone else can point to economic scarcity. If someone does not want an ordinance, someone can draft a resolution instead. If someone finds
upscaled unconvincing, they might be more receptive to downscaled discourse, and so on. Sometimes, of course, this flexibility goes so far that it turns into more of a liability, as when Charles Jenkins decided to vote against an English-only policy because it had become too watered down (Chapter 3), or when Hayden Duke remarked that ProEnglish had gone too far by “parachute[ing] themselves into a locale” (Chapter 5). This is why I think a methodology of ethnographic discourse analysis is useful: it is easy to dismiss language policies as one-dimensional unless there is attention to the details of how the people involved actually interact over time and across situations. The discourse in question does not need to be contemporary or in the form of interviews, as I demonstrated in my analysis of the English-only movement’s earlier years and archived papers, but it important to consider etic and emic perspectives through multiple sources of data, and to analyze language policies before they become sedimented or taken for granted.

Finally, it is important to recognize that some of the language policies that are most ripe for analysis are the ones that scholars develop themselves, in the course of teaching, researching, writing, publishing, and serving in professional organizations. In other words, the implications of this study are not just for how local language policies operate out there. In light of my findings, for example, I developed a new language policy for my own writing courses:

**Language Policy**

This is a course in rhetoric, writing, and research, all of which can be done in any language and any medium. In your work for this course, you have the right and you are welcome to use the language varieties and styles that best fit your own goals and audiences. You are also encouraged to cite sources in languages other than English. I
know English and can read Spanish; if you are using a language other than those two, please provide an English translation so I can fairly assess your work.

Like other local language policies, this text’s history involves multiple other texts, ideologies, people, and experiences, even as I frame it as my particular policy for my particular courses. Teachers and researchers often resist taking on this role, and for understandable reasons (Calvet, 1987, p. 203). Language policies have a bad reputation, either for being too oppressive or too ineffective. Although much of the earliest work on language policy was by practitioners (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971), over time this kind of applied work has become less common and less respected. For example, in the first issue of the *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Milroy (1997) included the following sentence in a negative review of Cameron’s *Verbal Hygiene* (1995): “Most linguists would not get their hands dirty by indulging as professionals in any form of prescription or language planning” (p. 131). The field of writing studies is similarly divided, between people who are interested in shaping language policy (or who think it is inevitable, whether they are interested or not), and people who are not.

Professional organizations like NCTE and CCCC play a role in this issue: Wible (2013) discusses how even though CCCC’s Language Policy Committee developed Students’ Right to their Own Language (1974) and the National Language Policy (1988), these policies “have rarely been included in the professional training of either the present or future generations of composition scholars” (p. 3). This lack of engagement is problematic for two reasons. First, both of these policies offer alternatives to a monolingual orientation towards language: SRTOL advocates for language rights on anti-racist grounds, while the NLP argues for multilingualism. Second, by not incorporating these policies into contemporary practice, the field misses opportunities to continue to refine our approaches to language. For example, neither policy
acknowledges the existence of international students, or the recent insights into translingual practice (Canagarajah, 2013), transliteracy (You, 2016), and transnationalism (Pennycook, 2007). Furthermore, even though the NLP was updated in 2015, it still calls English “our common language.” This framing might be understandable for NCTE (since the “E” stands for “English”), but there is no reason why the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) would need to single out one language. Furthermore, if the phrase “common language” sounds familiar, it is because it also appears in ProEnglish template. This similarly is especially striking given that the NLP’s authors meant to write it as a rebuke of the English-only movement (Wible, 2013, p. 88). Ultimately, these glacial shifts point to the fact that language policy change is always partial. That incompleteness is not necessarily a problem, but it does mean that researchers, writers, teachers, and activists continue to have a role to play in understanding and shaping local language policy.
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# Appendix A
## Policy List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City or County</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albertville</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boaz</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Ruled Unconstitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Park</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentersville</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itasca</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestwood</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Ridge</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osborne</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingman</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Anne's</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taneytown</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurmont</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkersville</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Park</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lino Lakes</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Park</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahrump</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogota</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rejected by court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood Bluffs</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Repealed due to attorney general letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landis</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint Hill</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlesville</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conyngham Borough</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilberton</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahonoy City</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hazleton</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty Fort</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAdoo</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeland</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazle</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Mahanoy</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon County</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Vetoed, then also defeated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksville</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Point</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Repealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Branch</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennnewick</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Rescinded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown County</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>City or County</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Current Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Failed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oconto</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinette</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Still in Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B

## Transcription Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbols</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underlined</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>()</td>
<td>Inaudible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(guess)</td>
<td>Transcriber’s best guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“reported writing”</td>
<td>Reported speech from writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘reported talk’</td>
<td>Reported speech from talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>reported thought</em></td>
<td>Reported speech from thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>Reading out loud from a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((laughs))</td>
<td>Description of non-verbal activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[overlapping]</td>
<td>Simultaneous or overlapping utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[talk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes=</td>
<td>No pause between utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.</td>
<td>Short pause (less than one second)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.</td>
<td>Medium pause (1-4 seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>Long pause (4+ seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If-, when</td>
<td>Self-correction or restart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Policy Texts

This appendix includes copies of the policies I discuss in detail.

Hazleton English Ordinance, 2006 (3 pages)
ProEnglish Template (3 pages)
Jenkins’ Proposed Ordinance, 2008 (5 pages)
Frederick Resolution, 2008 (1 page)
Frederick Ordinance, Draft, 2012 (5 pages)
Frederick Ordinance, Final Version, 2012 (5 pages)
Anne Arundel Bill, Final Version, 2012 (1 page)
Queen Anne’s Ordinance, Final Version with Mark Up, 2012 (4 pages)
Carroll Ordinance, Draft, 2012 (8 pages)
Carroll Ordinance, Final Version, 2013 (5 pages)
Frederick Human Relations Commission Resolution, 2015 (2 pages)
Frederick Repeal Bill, 2015 (3 pages)
ORDINANCE 2006-19
OFFICIAL ENGLISH ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HAZLETON AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. TITLE

This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the "City of Hazleton Official English Ordinance."

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The People of the City of Hazleton find and declare:

A. That the English language is the common language of the City of Hazleton, of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and of the United States.

B. That the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of City of Hazleton, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language.

C. That proficiency in the English language, as well as in languages other than the English language, benefits the City of Hazleton both economically and culturally and should be encouraged.

D. That, in addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the government of the City of Hazleton can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities.

E. That in today's modern society, the City of Hazleton may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits.

F. That the government of the City of Hazleton can reduce costs and promote efficiency in its roles as employer and as a government of the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.

SECTION 3. OFFICIAL ENGLISH DECLARATION

A. The English language is the official language of the City of Hazleton.
B. The City Council, Mayor, and officials of the City of Hazleton shall take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of the City of Hazleton is preserved and enhanced.

C. The government City of Hazleton shall make no policy that diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of the City of Hazleton.

D. Official actions of the City of Hazleton that bind or commit the City of Hazleton or that give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of the City of Hazleton shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labeled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action; unless otherwise required by federal law or the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, no person has a right to such an unofficial or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of the City of Hazleton shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

E. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of the City of Hazleton or any of its subdivisions shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in Section 4.

F. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits and opportunities, including employment, provided by the City of Hazleton and its subdivisions, except when required to speak another language as provided in Section 4.

G. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of the City of Hazleton or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

SECTION 4. EXCEPTIONS

The City of Hazleton and its subdivisions may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

A. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English.

B. To protect the public health or safety.

C. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language.

D. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal law or law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
E. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime.

F. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism.

G. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English.

H. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English.

SECTION 5. PRIVATE USE PROTECTED

The declaration and use of English as the official language of the City of Hazleton should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials (including elected officials) to communicate with others while not performing official actions of the City of Hazleton.

SECTION 6. INTERPRETATION

Nothing in this ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the statutes of the United States, or the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

SECTION 7. SEVERABILITY

If any part or provision of this Chapter, or the applicability of any provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Chapter shall not be affected thereby and shall be given effect to the fullest extent practicable.

ORDAINED by Council this 12th day of September, 2006.

/s/ Joseph Yannuzzi, Council President

I, Lisa A. Shema, Council Clerk of the City of Hazleton, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of Ordinance 2006-19, which was adopted by City Council on the 12th day of September, 2006.

Given under my hand and the Seal of the City of Hazleton, County of Luzerne, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this 11th day of October, 2006.

Lisa A. Shema, Council Clerk
Model Municipal Official English Ordinance

Section 1. Findings

The people of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] find and declare that:

1. the English language is the common language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION], of the State/Commonwealth of [NAME OF STATE] and of the United States;
2. the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of [NAME OF JURISDICTION], this State and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;
3. proficiency in the English language, as well as in languages other than the English language, benefits [NAME OF JURISDICTION] both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;
4. in addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the government of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;
5. in today's society, [NAME OF JURISDICTION] may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits; and
6. the government of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] can reduce costs and promote efficiency, in its roles as employer and a government accountable to the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.

Section 2. Official English Declaration

1. The English language is the official language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION],
2. The [COUNCIL/OTHER LEGISLATIVE BODY], [EXECUTIVE] and officials of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] shall take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] is preserved and enhanced.
3. The [COUNCIL/LEGISLATIVE BODY] of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] shall make no [ORDINANCE/POLICY] which diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION].
4. Official actions of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] which bind or commit [NAME OF JURISDICTION] or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labeled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action; unless otherwise required by federal or [STATE/COMMONWEALTH] law, no person has a right to such an unofficial or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] shall be based on such a translation or explanation.
5. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] or any of its subdivisions, shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in Section 3.
6. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all
6. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits and opportunities, including employment, provided by [NAME OF JURISDICTION] and its subdivisions, except when required to speak another language as provided in Section 3.

7. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

Section 3. Exceptions

[NAME OF JURISDICTION] and its subdivisions may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

1. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;
2. To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;
3. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;
4. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or [STATE/COMMONWEALTH] law;
5. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;
6. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;
7. To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to the [MUNICIPALITY];
8. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;
9. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English; and
10. Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this resolution and not otherwise excepted in this Section 3 shall not be discarded or reprinted solely in English at the addition cost or expense of the taxpayers of the [MUNICIPALITY] until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete.

Section 4. Rules of Construction

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in section 3 of this chapter, nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the state or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English (as long as official functions are performed in English).

Section 5. Private Use Protected

The declaration and use of English as the official language of [NAME OF JURISDICTION] should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials (including elected officials) to communicate with others while not performing official actions of [NAME OF JURISDICTION].
Section 6. Severability

If any provision of this ordinance, or the applicability of any provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected and shall be given effect to the fullest extent practicable.

Section 7. FEDERAL AND [STATE/COMMONWEALTH] PREEMPTION

Nothing in this ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the statutes of the United States, or the laws of this [STATE/COMMONWEALTH].
TO: Joyce M. Grossnickle, Administrative Officer
FROM: Commissioner Charles A. Jenkins
DATE: April 17, 2008

Subject: English as the Official Language of the Frederick County Government

Presenter (Name & Title): Commissioner Charles A. Jenkins
Requested Date: Thursday, 4/24/08

Type of Briefing: (Click box to select)
- [ ] Administrative Business
- [ ] Worksession
- [x] Closed Session
- [ ] BOCC/BOE Mtg
- [ ] County/Municipal Mtg
- [ ] Public Hearing

Board Action Desired: [x] Decision
- [ ] Guidance
- [ ] Information
- [ ] PowerPoint Presentation

Staff Coordination: This topic has been thoroughly coordinated with the following Division/Department Directors, and they will have representatives at the presentation. (click to place a check mark in the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Rescue Services Dir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitting &amp; Development Review Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and Solid Waste Management Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments: [x] Yes

PLEASE NOTE: The original and 10 copies of all attachments (including the coordination sheet) are required for the Board of County Commissioners’ meetings, which includes the Joint BOCC/BOE Meeting and the County/Municipal Meeting.

If you are scheduled for a Closed Session, then you only need to submit the original and nine (9) copies of the back-up material. Backup materials are due to the Administrative Officer ONE WEEK IN ADVANCE of the meeting. If materials are not received in a timely manner, you will be asked to reschedule your item.

Revised January 2004
TO	Board of County Commissioners ("BOCC")

FROM	Commissioner Charles A Jenkins

RE:	English as the Official Language of the Frederick County Government

ISSUE	Should the BOCC enact an Ordinance providing that English is the official language of the Frederick County government?

Your proponent believes the BOCC should adopt English as the official language of the County government and provide that all County documents shall be written in English. A proposed Resolution to initiate a draft Ordinance to that effect is attached hereto.

Your proponent recommends that the BOCC adopt the attached Resolution

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles A Jenkins, Commissioner
RESOLUTION #

A RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND TO INITIATE AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE THAT ENGLISH IS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

§1 Definitions. In this Resolution, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated

"BOCC" shall mean the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, Maryland

"Code" shall mean the Frederick County Code, 2004

§2 Background. The BOCC desires to initiate the attached draft Ordinance that would, if enacted, provide that English is the official language of County government and that County government documents shall be written in English

§3 Initiation of Ordinance. The BOCC initiates the attached draft Ordinance to add a new §1-1-9 to the Code

§4 Procedural Requirements.
The County Manager shall schedule a BOCC public hearing on the draft Ordinance. The County Manager shall cause a notice of a BOCC public hearing, together with a summary of the attached draft Ordinance, to be published in a newspaper of general circulation in Frederick County at least fourteen (14) days prior to the hearing.

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, Maryland approved and adopted the foregoing Resolution on the _____ day of ______________, 2008

ATTEST

BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS
FOR FREDERICK COUNTY,
MARYLAND

By

Ronald A. Hart,
County Manager

Jan H. Gardner, President
ORDINANCE #____________________

AN ORDINANCE BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND TO ENACT A NEW §1-1-9 TO THE CODE TO PROVIDE THAT ENGLISH IS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE FREDERICK COUNTY GOVERNMENT

§1 Definitions. - In this Ordinance, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated:

"BOCC" shall mean the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, Maryland.

"Code" shall mean the Frederick County Code, 2004

§2 Background. - The BOCC desires to make English the official language of County government and provide that all County government documents shall be written in English

§3. Procedural Requirements.

On _____________, 2008 the BOCC initiated this Ordinance by adopting Resolution # 08- ________________

The BOCC held an advertised public hearing on this Ordinance on the _____ day of ______________, 2008, at which time the public had a reasonable opportunity to comment on this Ordinance
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED AND ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND THAT:

§4. Addition of New §1-1-9 to the Code. — A new §1-1-9 is added to the Code and shall read as follows:

"1-1-9. ENGLISH IS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT

English is the official language of County government. All County government documents shall be written in English."

§7 Effective Date. - This Ordinance shall be effective on the ____ day of ____________, 2008

The undersigned hereby certifies that the Board of County Commissioners for Frederick County, Maryland approved and adopted the foregoing Ordinance on the ____ day of ____________, 2008

ATTEST

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

By,

__________________________
Ronald A. Hart,
County Manager

__________________________
Jan H. Gardner, President

DRAFT
THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS RESOLUTION IS APRIL 24, 2008

RESOLUTION NO. 08.13

RESOLUTION OF
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF
FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

Re: Proclaiming English as the Official, Primary and Common Language

WHEREAS, the English language is the primary language and common
form of communication in Frederick County; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Frederick County,
Maryland promotes proficiency in the English language to encourage full
economic and civic participation of all its citizens; and,

WHEREAS, the community benefits from acknowledging and embracing
the rich and varied cultural heritage in our community.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND that
the Board hereby proclaims that the English language is the official, primary and
common language of Frederick County Government.

The undersigned hereby certifies that this Resolution was approved and
adopted on the 24th day of April, 2008.

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Ronald A. Hart
County Manager

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

[Signature]
Jan H. Gardner, President
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THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE IS ____________

ORDINANCE NO. ____________

RE: Frederick County Official English Ordinance

The English language is the common language of Frederick County, Maryland and of the United States;

The use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of Frederick County, this State and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;

Proficiency in the English language, as well as in languages other than the English language, benefits Frederick County both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;

In addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the Board of County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland (BOCC) can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;

In today's society, Frederick County may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits; and

The BOCC can reduce costs and promote efficiency, in its roles as employer and a government accountable to the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.
The BOCC held a duly advertised public hearing on this proposed Ordinance on February 21, 2012. The public had an opportunity to comment at this public hearing.

**Section 1. Official English Declaration**

A. The English language is the official language of Frederick County.

B. The BOCC and officials of Frederick County shall take all steps necessary to ensure that the role of English as the common language of Frederick County is preserved and enhanced.

C. The BOCC shall make no Ordinance which diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of Frederick County.

D. Official actions of Frederick County which bind or commit Frederick County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of Frederick County shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labelled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action; unless otherwise required by federal or state law, no person has a right to such an unofficial or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of Frederick County shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

E. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Frederick County shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in Section 2.
F. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits and opportunities, including employment, provided by Frederick County (providing all other eligibility requirements are satisfied), except when required to speak another language as provided in Section 2.

G. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Frederick County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

Section 2. Exceptions

Frederick County may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

A. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;

B. To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;

C. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;

D. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or state law;

E. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;

F. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;

G. To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to Frederick County;

H. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;
I. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English; and

J. Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of Frederick County printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this resolution and not otherwise excepted in this Section 2 shall not be discarded or reprinted solely in English at the addition cost or expense of the taxpayers of Frederick County until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete.

Section 3. Official Functions

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in section 2 of this Ordinance, nothing in this Ordinance shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the state or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English (as long as official functions are performed in English).

Section 4. Private Use Protected

The declaration and use of English as the official language of Frederick County should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials (including elected officials) to communicate with others while not performing official actions of Frederick County.

Section 5. Federal and State Preemption

Nothing in this Ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the laws of the United States, or of the laws of the State of Maryland.
Section 6. No Cause of Action Created

This Ordinance is not intended to create any cause of action or authorize any legal proceedings to enforce or interpret this Ordinance.

Section 7. Repeal of Prior Resolution.

This Ordinance replaces and supersedes Resolution No. 08-13 “Proclaiming English as the Official, Primary and Common Language” and therefore Resolution No. 08-13 is hereby repealed.

Section 8. Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall take effect on ____________, 2012.

The undersigned hereby certifies that this Ordinance was approved and adopted on the ___ day of ____________, 2012.

ATTEST: BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

David B. Dunn Blaine R. Young, President
County Manager
THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ORDINANCE IS FEBRUARY 22, 2012

ORDINANCE NO. 12-03-598

RE: Frederick County Official English Ordinance

The English language is the common language of Frederick County, Maryland and of the United States;

The use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of Frederick County, this State and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;

Proficiency in the English language, as well as in languages other than the English language, benefits Frederick County both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;

In addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the Board of County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland (BOCC) can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;

In today's society, Frederick County may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits; and

The BOCC can reduce costs and promote efficiency, in its roles as employer and a government accountable to the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.
The BOCC held a duly advertised public hearing on this proposed Ordinance on February 21, 2012. The public had an opportunity to comment at this public hearing.

Section 1. Official English Declaration

A. The English language is the official language of Frederick County.

B. The BOCC and officials of Frederick County shall take all steps necessary to ensure that the role of English as the common language of Frederick County is preserved and enhanced.

C. The BOCC shall make no Ordinance which diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of Frederick County.

D. Official actions of Frederick County which bind or commit Frederick County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of Frederick County shall be taken in the English language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labelled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action; unless otherwise required by federal or state law, no person has a right to such an unofficial or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of Frederick County shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

E. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Frederick County shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in Section 2.
F. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Frederick County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

Section 2. Exceptions

Frederick County may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

A. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;
B. To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;
C. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;
D. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or state law;
E. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;
F. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;
G. To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to Frederick County;
H. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;
I. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English;
J. Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of Frederick County printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this ordinance and not otherwise excepted in this Section 2 shall not be discarded or reprinted
solely in English at the addition cost or expense of the taxpayers of Frederick County until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete;

K. For any other worthy, justifiable or appropriate action approved by the Board of County Commissioners.

Section 3. Official Functions

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in section 2 of this Ordinance, nothing in this Ordinance shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the state or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English (as long as official functions are performed in English).

Section 4. Private Use Protected

The declaration and use of English as the official language of Frederick County should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials (including elected officials) to communicate with others while not performing official actions of Frederick County.

Section 5. Federal and State Preemption

Nothing in this Ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the laws of the United States, or of the laws of the State of Maryland.

Section 6. No Cause of Action Created

This Ordinance is not intended to create any cause of action or authorize any legal proceedings to enforce or interpret this Ordinance.
Section 7. Repeal of Prior Resolution.

This Ordinance replaces and supersedes Resolution No. 08-13 “Proclaiming English as the Official, Primary and Common Language” and therefore Resolution No. 08-13 is hereby repealed.

Section 8. Effective Date.

This Ordinance shall take effect on February 22, 2012.

The undersigned hereby certifies that this Ordinance was approved and adopted on the 21st day of February, 2012.

ATTEST:

David B. Dunn
County Manager

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF FREDERICK COUNTY, MARYLAND

Blaine R. Young, President
COUNTY COUNCIL OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND

Legislative Session 2012, Legislative Day No. 3

Bill No. 13-12

Introduced by Mr. Walker, Mr. Grasso, Mr. Fink and Mr. Ladd

By the County Council, February 6, 2012

Introduced and first read on February 6, 2012
Public Hearing set for March 5, 2012
Bill Expires May 11, 2012

By Order: Elizabeth E. Jones, Administrative Officer

A BILL ENTITLED


FOR the purpose of establishing English as the official language of Anne Arundel County; and generally related to County government.

BY adding: § 1-9-105
Anne Arundel County Code (2005, as amended)

ARTICLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

TITLE 9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

1-9-105. Official Language

ENGLISH SHALL BE THE OFFICIAL AND COMMON LANGUAGE OF THE COUNTY. ALL OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, COMMUNICATION AND AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY SHALL BE IN ENGLISH UNLESS MANDATED BY FEDERAL OR STATE LAW OR AS NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS, TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, TO TEACH ENGLISH TO NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS, OR TO PROMOTE TRADE AND TOURISM IN THE COUNTY.

SECTION 2. And be it further enacted, That this Ordinance shall take effect 45 days from the date it becomes law.

EXPLANATION: CAPITALS indicate new matter added to existing law.
[Brackets] indicate matter stricken from existing law.
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
COUNTY ORDINANCE NO. 12-06

AN AMENDMENT TO
A BILL ENTITLED

AN ACT CONCERNING Recognition of English as the Official Language of Queen Anne’s County.

FOR THE PURPOSE of amending pending County Ordinance No. 12-06 to clarify the provisions regarding the declaration and recognition of English as the official language of Queen Anne’s County.

BY AMENDING the proposed new Section 4-14 of the Code of Public Local Laws of Queen Anne’s County, Maryland.

SECTION I

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF QUEEN ANNE’S COUNTY, MARYLAND that pending County Ordinance No. 12-06 be amended so that the new Section 4-14 of the Code of Public Local Laws shall read as follows:

§4-14. Official Language of Queen Anne’s County.

ENGLISH SHALL BE THE OFFICIAL AND COMMON LANGUAGE OF QUEEN ANNE’S COUNTY. ALL OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, COMMUNICATION AND AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY SHALL BE IN ENGLISH UNLESS MANDATED BY FEDERAL OR STATE LAW OR AS NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF VICTIMS OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS, TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, TO TEACH ENGLISH TO NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS, OR TO PROMOTE TRADE AND TOURISM IN THE COUNTY.

A. Findings.

The people of Queen Anne’s County, Maryland find and declare that:

(1) the English language is the common language of Queen Anne’s County, of the State of Maryland and of the United States;
(2) the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the people of Queen Anne’s County, this State and the United States, and helps to enable the full economic and civil participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest
exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;

(3) proficiency in the English language, as well as in languages other than the English language, benefits Queen Anne’s County both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;

(4) in addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the government of Queen Anne’s County can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;

(5) in today’s society, Queen Anne’s County may also need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs and benefits; and

(6) the government of Queen Anne’s County can reduce costs and promote efficiency, in its roles as employer and a government accountable to the people, by using the English language in its official actions and activities.

B. Official English Declaration.

(1) The English language is the official language of Queen Anne’s County.

(2) The County Commissioners and officials of Queen Anne’s County shall take all steps necessary to insure that the role of English as the common language of Queen Anne’s County is preserved and enhanced.

(3) The County Commissioners of Queen Anne’s County shall make no Ordinance which diminishes or ignores the role of English as the common language of Queen Anne’s County.

(4) Official actions of Queen Anne’s County which bind or commit Queen Anne’s County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of Queen Anne’s County shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labeled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action; unless otherwise required by federal or State law, no person has a right to such an unofficial or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of Queen Anne’s County shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

(5) No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Queen Anne’s County or any of its subdivisions, shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in Section C.

(6) A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits and opportunities, including
employment, provided by Queen Anne’s County and its subdivisions, except when required to speak another language as provided in Section C.

(7) No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Queen Anne’s County or any of its subdivisions shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

C. Exceptions.

Queen Anne’s County and its subdivisions may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

(1) To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;
(2) To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;
(3) To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;
(4) To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or State law;
(5) To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;
(6) To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;
(7) To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to the Court;
(8) To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;
(9) To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English; and
(10) Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of Queen Anne’s County printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this Ordinance and not otherwise excepted in this Section C shall not be discarded or reprinted solely in English at the addition cost or expense of the taxpayers of the County until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete.

D. Rules of Construction.

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in Section C of this chapter, nothing in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the state or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English (as long as official functions are performed in English).
E. Private Use Protected.

The declaration and use of English as the official language of Queen Anne’s County should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials (including elected officials) to communicate with others while not performing official’s actions of Queen Anne’s County.

F. Severability.

If any provision of this ordinance, or the applicability of any provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this ordinance shall not be affected and shall be given effect to the fullest extent practicable.

G. FEDERAL AND STATE PREEMPTION.

Nothing in this Ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the statutes of the United States, or the laws of the State of Maryland.

SECTION II

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED that this Amendment shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

INTRODUCED BY: Commissioner Olds

DATE: April 10, 2012

VOTE: 4 Yea 1 Nay (Commissioner Dunmyer opposed)

DATE OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT: May 8, 2012
English as the Official Language -- 2012

ORDINANCE NO. 2012-___

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF PUBLIC LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES OF CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

WHEREAS, The Board of Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, has enacted and codified the "Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances of Carroll County, Maryland";

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, has determined that amendments to certain sections of the Code are necessary to advance the public health, safety, and welfare;

WHEREAS, the English language is the common language of Carroll County, Maryland and of the United States of America;

WHEREAS, the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the citizens of Carroll County, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race, or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;

WHEREAS, proficiency in the English language, as well as other languages, benefits Carroll County both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;

WHEREAS, in addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;
WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County recognizes the need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs, services, and benefits;

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County can reduce costs and promote efficiency in its roles as employer and as a government accountable to its citizens by using the English language in its official actions and activities; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, desires to designate the English language as the official language of Carroll County, and for that purpose, it is necessary to adopt an ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland:

ARTICLE I. AMENDMENTS

The Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances of Carroll County, Chapter 10 (Reserved), is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:

Chapter 10, OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF CARROLL COUNTY

§ 10-1. Official English Declaration.

A. The English language is the official language of Carroll County, Maryland.
B. The Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County shall take all steps necessary to ensure that the role of English as the common language of Carroll County is preserved and enhanced.

C. The Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County shall take no official action which would diminish or ignore the role of English as the common language of Carroll County.

D. Official actions of Carroll County Government which bind or commit Carroll County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of Carroll County shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labeled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action. Unless otherwise required by federal or state law, no person has a right to such an official or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of Carroll County shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

E. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Carroll County shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in § 10-2.
F. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits, and opportunities, including employment provided by Carroll County provided all other eligibility requirements are satisfied, except when required to speak another language as provided in § 10-2.

G. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Carroll County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations, or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.

§ 10-2. Exceptions.

Carroll County may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

A. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;

B. To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;

C. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;
D. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or state law;

E. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;

F. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;

G. To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to Carroll County;

H. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;

I. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English; and

J. Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of Carroll County printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this ordinance and not otherwise excepted in this section shall not be discarded or reprinted solely in English at the additional cost or expense of the taxpayers of Carroll County until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete.
§ 10-3. Official Functions.

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in § 10-2 of this ordinance, nothing in this ordinance shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the County or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English, provided that all official functions are performed only in English.

§ 10-4. Private Use Protected.

The declaration and use of English as the official language of Carroll County should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials, including elected officials, to communicate with others while not performing official actions of Carroll County.

§ 10-5. Federal and State Preemption.

Nothing in this ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the laws of the United States of America or the laws of the State of Maryland.

§ 10-6. No Cause of Action Created.
This ordinance is not intended to create any cause of action or authorize any legal proceedings to enforce or interpret this ordinance.

ARTICLE II. SEVERABILITY.

Should any provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph of this Ordinance, including any code or text adopted hereby, be declared null and void, illegal, unconstitutional, or otherwise determined to be unenforceable by a court having jurisdiction; the same shall not effect the validity, legality, or enforceability of any other provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph hereof, including any code or text adopted hereby. Each such provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph is expressly declared to be and is deemed severable.

ARTICLE III. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Ordinance shall become effective on ___________________________, 2012.

ADOPTED this ________ day of _________________, 2012.

THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND, a body corporate and politic of the State of Maryland

ATTEST:

Shawn D. Reese, County Clerk

_________________________(SEAL)

J. Douglas Howard, President

_________________________(SEAL)

Richard S. Rothschild, Vice President

_________________________(SEAL)

David H. Roush, Secretary

_________________________(SEAL)

Robin Bartlett Frazier, Commissioner

_________________________(SEAL)

Haven N. Shoemaker, Jr., Commissioner
Approved for legal sufficiency:

__________________________________________
Timothy C. Burke
County Attorney

Notice of Public Hearing published: ________________________________
Public Hearing held: ________________________________
Public Meeting to adopt Ordinance: ________________________________
Notice of Adoption of Ordinance published: ________________________________
Ordinance filed with Clerk of Court: ________________________________

I hereby certify that the actions described above took place on the dates referred to above and that this Ordinance is effective as of the ______ of ______________, 2012.

__________________________________________
Timothy C. Burke, County Attorney
ORDINANCE NO. 2013-01

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF PUBLIC LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES OF CARROLL COUNTY, MARYLAND

WHEREAS, The Board of Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, has enacted and codified the "Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances of Carroll County, Maryland";

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, has determined that amendments to certain sections of the Code are necessary to advance the public health, safety, and welfare;

WHEREAS, the English language is the common language of Carroll County, Maryland and of the United States of America;

WHEREAS, the use of a common language removes barriers of misunderstanding and helps to unify the citizens of Carroll County, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America, and helps to enable the full economic and civic participation of all its citizens, regardless of national origin, creed, race, or other characteristics, and thus a compelling governmental interest exists in promoting, preserving, and strengthening the use of the English language;

WHEREAS, proficiency in the English language, as well as other languages, benefits Carroll County both economically and culturally and should be encouraged;

WHEREAS, in addition to any other ways to promote proficiency in the English language, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County can promote proficiency in English by using the English language in its official actions and activities;

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County recognizes the need to protect and preserve the rights of those who speak only the English language to use or obtain governmental programs, services, and benefits;

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County can reduce costs and promote efficiency in its roles as employer and as a government accountable to its citizens by using the English language in its official actions and activities; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland, desires to designate the English language as the official language of Carroll County, and for that purpose, it is necessary to adopt an ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County, Maryland:
ARTICLE I. AMENDMENTS.

The Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances of Carroll County, Chapter 10 (Reserved), is deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:

Chapter 10, OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF CARROLL COUNTY

§ 10-1. Official English Declaration.

A. The English language is the official language of Carroll County, Maryland.

B. The Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County shall take all steps necessary to ensure that the role of English as the common language of Carroll County is preserved and enhanced.

C. The Board of County Commissioners of Carroll County shall take no official action which would diminish or ignore the role of English as the common language of Carroll County.

D. Official actions of Carroll County Government which bind or commit Carroll County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or position of Carroll County shall be taken in the English language, and in no other language. Unofficial or non-binding translations or explanations of official actions may be provided separately in languages other than English, if they are appropriately labeled as such and reference is made to a method to obtain the official action. Unless otherwise required by federal or state law, no person has a right to such an official or non-binding translation or explanation, and no liability or commitment of Carroll County shall be based on such a translation or explanation.

E. No ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Carroll County shall require the use of any language other than English for any documents, regulations, orders, transactions, proceedings, meetings, programs, or publications, except as provided in § 10-2.

F. A person who speaks only the English language shall be eligible to participate in all programs, benefits, and opportunities, including employment provided by Carroll County provided all other eligibility requirements are satisfied, except when required to speak another language as provided in § 10-2.

G. No law, ordinance, decree, program, or policy of Carroll County shall penalize or impair the rights, obligations, or opportunities available to any person solely because a person speaks only the English language.
§ 10-2. Exceptions.

Carroll County may use a language other than English for any of the following purposes, whether or not the use would be considered part of an official action:

A. To teach or encourage the learning of languages other than English;
B. To protect the public health, sanitation, and public safety;
C. To teach English to those who are not fluent in the language;
D. To comply with the Native American Languages Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Voting Rights Act, or any other federal or state law;
E. To protect the rights of criminal defendants and victims of crime;
F. To promote trade, commerce, and tourism;
G. To collect payments, fines, or other financial obligations due and payable to Carroll County;
H. To create or promote mottos or designations, inscribe public monuments, and perform other acts involving the customary use of a language other than English;
I. To utilize terms of art or terms or phrases from other languages which are commonly used in communications otherwise in English; and
J. Printed materials, signage, or other materials or documents of Carroll County printed in languages other than English at the time of the adoption of this ordinance and not otherwise excepted in this section shall not be discarded or reprinted solely in English at the additional cost or expense of the taxpayers of Carroll County until they are exhausted or become otherwise obsolete.

§ 10-3. Official Functions.

Notwithstanding any other state law and except as provided in § 10-2 of this ordinance, nothing in this ordinance shall be construed to prohibit any elected official, officer, agent, employee of the County or a political subdivision, while performing official functions, from communicating unofficially through any medium with another person in a language other than English, provided that all official functions are performed only in English.
§ 10-4. Private Use Protected.

The declaration and use of English as the official language of Carroll County should not be construed as infringing upon the rights of any person to use a language other than English in private communications or actions, including the right of government officials, including elected officials, to communicate with others while not performing official actions of Carroll County.

§ 10-5. Federal and State Preemption.

Nothing in this ordinance shall be interpreted as conflicting with the laws of the United States of America or the laws of the State of Maryland.

§ 10-6. No Cause of Action Created.

This ordinance is not intended to create any cause of action or authorize any legal proceedings to enforce or interpret this ordinance.

ARTICLE II. SEVERABILITY.

Should any provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph of this Ordinance, including any code or text adopted hereby, be declared null and void, illegal, unconstitutional, or otherwise determined to be unenforceable by a court having jurisdiction; the same shall not affect the validity, legality, or enforceability of any other provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph hereof, including any code or text adopted hereby. Each such provision, section, paragraph or subparagraph is expressly declared to be and is deemed severable.

ARTICLE III. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Ordinance shall become effective on January 30, 2013.

ADOPTED this 24th day of January, 2013.
ATTEST:

Shawn D. Reese, County Clerk

J. Douglas Howard, President

(SEAL)

David H. Roish, Vice President

(SEAL)

Haven N. Shoemaker, Jr., Secretary

(SEAL)

Robin Bartlett Frazier, Commissioner

(SEAL)

Richard S. Rothschild, Commissioner

Approved for legal sufficiency:

Timothy C. Burke
County Attorney

Notice of Public Hearing published: 10/15/12; 10/29/12; 11/27/12; 12/04/12
Public Hearing held: 12/11/12
Public Meeting to adopt Ordinance: 01/24/13
Notice of Adoption of Ordinance published: 01/30/13
Ordinance filed with Clerk of Court: 01/30/13

I hereby certify that the actions described above took place on the dates referred to above and that this Ordinance is effective as of the 30th of January, 2013.

Timothy C. Burke, County Attorney

RETURN RECORDED ORIGINAL ORDINANCE TO County Attorney, 225 North Center Street, Westminster, Maryland, 21157
Repeal of the Frederick County Official English Ordinance
Human Relations Commission
HRC Resolution 2014-15A

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2012, Frederick County adopted Ordinance Number 12-03-598 that declared English to be the official language in Frederick County, Maryland after one public hearing without significant public contribution or discussion,

WHEREAS, the apparent purpose of this Ordinance is the denigration of people who speak languages other than English and has come to symbolize intolerance, narrow-mindedness and discrimination.

WHEREAS, under the Regulations of the Frederick County Human Relations Commission, this Commission is charged with the responsibility to “foster and encourage the elimination of discriminatory practices within Frederick County so that all persons in Frederick County are provided with an equal opportunity to be free from discrimination.” [Section 16(A)], and

WHEREAS, The Commission is also required to monitor and recommend civil rights policy to the County. [Section 4(A)].

WHEREAS, Frederick County has a long history of multiple languages over the last three centuries, including our rich German heritage to which we owe our founding,

WHEREAS, governments, businesses, and individuals in Frederick County communicate freely and openly, most often in English but in many other languages as well,

WHEREAS, Frederick County has many employers who participate in minority recruitment and hiring and recognize that embracing diversity is critical to recruiting and retaining the best and brightest to their respective fields.

Our Mission:
To pursue and promote equal opportunity for everyone; raise public awareness about human justice issues; and foster the positive aspects of multiculturalism and its impact on the community.
WHEREAS, we believe that one of the most vital and valuable aspects of daily life in Frederick County is its diversity and cultural heritage where all races, religions, ages, and cultures are welcome, as should be all languages,

WHEREAS, we believe that this Ordinance, and the perception it has created, is a barrier to making Frederick County the very best place to live, work, and raise a family.

THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED on this 28th day of April, 2015, that the Human Relations Commission of Frederick County recommends to the Frederick County Council that Ordinance Number 12-03-598 be repealed.

[Signatures]

Angel W. Spencer
Chair

Tonya Amerson
Vice-Chair
AN ACT to: Repeal Ordinance No. 12-03-598, for the purpose of promoting a competitive business climate for Frederick County's existing 6,200 businesses which employ 79,000 workers; attracting new life science businesses and jobs that will move Frederick County closer to becoming the State's bio-tech hub; ensuring that non-English language speakers are not deterred from reporting crimes, seeking medical care or other human services; and generally relating to Frederick County's encouragement of multi-linguistic acceptance, tolerance and multi-cultural diversity in an increasingly global economy.

By amending:
Frederick County Code, Chapter N/A, Section(s) ____________________________
Other:

| Boldface | Heading or defined term. |
| Underlining | Added to existing law by original bill. |
| [Single boldface brackets] | Deleted from existing law by original bill. |
| Double underlining | Added by amendment. |
| [[Double boldface brackets]] | Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment. |
| *** | Existing law unaffected by bill. |
The Board of County Commissioners of Frederick County, Maryland, enacted Ordinance No. 12-03-598, titled “Frederick County Official English Ordinance” (Ordinance), effective February 22, 2012.

The Ordinance proclaimed English as the official language of Frederick County. The Ordinance required that official actions which bind or commit Frederick County or which give the appearance of presenting the official views or positions of Frederick County be taken in the English language.

The County Council of Frederick County, Maryland, (Council) finds that the Ordinance, and the perception it has created, constitutes a barrier to good business and impedes the growth and development of business and commercial endeavors in Frederick County.

The Council has determined that in order to broaden the appeal of Frederick County to the business community, and to attract and retain businesses and employees in the biotech and life science segments of the commercial economy, Frederick County must and does embrace diversity.

The Council determines and believes that Frederick County is, and should be, a welcoming community to all, with pride in the diversity of cultures and individuals who participate in and promote the well-being and growth of the County.
The Council finds that there are numerous federal and Maryland State laws and regulations that currently exist which require translation and interpretation to facilitate and recognize the increasing diversity of persons residing in Frederick County.

The Council further finds and determines that the Ordinance impedes the integration of diverse culture and values into our community and is contrary to the tolerance and acceptance of all individuals which is a hallmark of the community which is Frederick County.

In light of these circumstances, the Council has determined that it is necessary and proper, and in the best interest of the residents of Frederick County, that the Ordinance be repealed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED, that Ordinance No. 12-03-598, attached hereto as Exhibit A, be, and the same is hereby, REPEALED.

Harold F. (Bad) Otis, President
County Council of Frederick County, Maryland
Appendix D
Recruitment Flyer

Research Study on English as the Official Language

Have you been involved in supporting or challenging a campaign to make English the official language of a town or county?

If so, I am interested in interviewing you for a study on language policy at the local level. Interviews will last 45–90 minutes, and you may be eligible to participate in subsequent other research activities.

The objectives of the study are to better understand:
◆ why local language policies are becoming more common
◆ how people make and debate this type of policy
◆ how language policies relate to attitudes towards and uses of language and literacy

If you are interested in participating or for more information, please contact Katherine Flowers by email at ksflowe2@illinois.edu or phone at 360-477-9231.
Appendix E
Consent Forms

Informed Consent for Interviews
Local Language Policy: Shifting Scales in the English Only Movement

Purpose of the study
You are invited to participate in a study that I (Katherine Flowers, a PhD student in English at the University of Illinois) am conducting. This research is part of my dissertation project, directed by Dr. Paul Prior. I am conducting research to further understand the recent rise of local policies to make English the official language of a town or county. I am interested in how people write, speak, and otherwise communicate as they formulate and debate these policies as well as in the ideas expressed in the policies themselves. The goal of this research is to enrich our understandings of how local language policies relate to ways of using language, to ideas about language and society, and to attitudes toward language and literacy.

What the study involves
I will ask you to participate in at least one interview (with possible follow-ups if you agree). Interviews will typically last 45-90 minutes, and will focus on your involvement in one or more recent language policy campaign(s). We will negotiate if and how interviews are recorded (e.g., audio, video) and documented (e.g., photographs) and how many interviews will be involved. I may also request copies or photographs of texts that you refer to during this interview. Finally, I may ask you to participate in additional research activities. Specifically:

- I may ask you if it’s possible to observe you in other activities (e.g., meetings, public events). You would also receive a separate informed consent document if you agree to participate in this part of the study.
- I may ask you if I can contact other people you have worked with on language policy issues, to see if they would like to participate in the study in some capacity. My contacting any of your colleagues about your work together would depend on your written consent.
- After the interviews have been completed, I may invite you to give me feedback on my analysis of the interview data.

Publication and Identifiability
The results of this research may be published in conference presentations, a dissertation, and print or electronic academic publications. With your permission, I may quote from or describe recorded activities or interactions, any texts you have written that you have made available for the research, and any interview comments you have made. With your permission, I may also use photographs, still images from videotapes, or excerpts from videos in publications or presentations. It is likely that you could be recognized by people who know you if they hear or read such reports of the researcher.

To somewhat limit your identifiability, I can use a pseudonym for your name in all of my drafts and final reports of this research. (However, if some of the texts that you provide for the research are published texts, then I would need to secure permission to use your real name in order to quote from or represent these texts in relation to your interview comments.) In addition, I can transform still images from video recordings into “line drawings” that would limit identifiability, and I can play “x-ray” versions of videos that do the same. If you elect to use a pseudonym, your study-related information will generally be kept confidential.

Regardless of whether you are referred to by a pseudonym or your real name, to safeguard your privacy, I will keep any identifying data (recordings, copies of your writing, interview transcripts) in a private office, and I will not share this raw data with anyone other than my director (Paul Prior). However, there may be occasions when the University of Illinois may need access to records to ensure that university approved procedures and protocols are being followed.

Your Rights, Benefits, and Concerns
You may benefit from the opportunities this research offers to reflect on your participation in local politics and language policy. However, the primary benefit of this research is to increase our basic understanding how language policies are created and debated, and how they connect to people’s attitudes towards and use of different ways of communicating.

The most likely risk of participating in this research would come from loss of privacy and potential to be identifiable to others in research reports. However, the safeguards described above in the section, “Publication and Identifiability” minimize these risks, and throughout the process you will have a high level of control over what data you make available and about how that data can be used.
Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision to participate, decline, or withdraw from participation will have no effect on your status or future relations with the University of Illinois. You may withdraw at any time after signing this form by contacting Katherine Flowers or Paul Prior should you choose to discontinue participation. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any data collected on you during this research be erased, in which case that data would be erased.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me, Katherine Flowers (360-477-9231, kisflow@illinois.edu), or Dr. Paul Prior (217-333-3024; ppprior@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you can contact the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Institutional Review Board (528 E. Green Street, suite 203, 217-333-2670; irb@illinois.edu). You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

Please review and check off the options below to ensure that I know how your data may be used. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask me.

Use of my name:
In general, as an author, you have the right to claim authorship or request a pseudonym be used for this research. If some of the texts you provide are public, I would need to use your real name to be able to quote from or refer to them in relation to interview or other data.

I would like to be identified by my real name in relation to any of the data collected. (Yes No)

OR

I would prefer to use a pseudonym. (Yes No)

Written texts I may provide the researcher:
I agree that unless I have otherwise specified, any texts that I have written and have provided for this research may be quoted, paraphrased, or represented as images in publications or presentations. (Yes No)

Audio-recordings, video-recordings, or photographs:
I understand that I may be asked to give permission for audio- or video-recording of interviews or other interactions and for specific uses of those recordings (scripted reenactment of tapes, excerpting of still images). I understand that the researcher will allow me to review these permissions in advance. (Yes No)

Use of my face/image:
The researcher may disseminate images of me from research video recordings (Yes No) and/or from still or photographic images taken as part of the research (Yes No). [Note: this permission does not apply to already public video recordings or images.]

If "yes" to the above:
   I give permission for the researcher to disseminate unaltered images of my face.
      (Yes No)

   OR

   I give permission for the researcher to disseminate images of my face that have been altered by a video-editing program, so that I am not recognizable. (Yes No)

I have read this informed consent form, am 18 years of age or older, have checked answers to the questions above, and agree voluntarily to participate in this research.

(signature) ________________________________ (date) ________________________________

(print name) ________________________________
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Release for the Recording of an Event

Local Language Policy: Shifting Scales in the English Only Movement

As part of the research I agreed to participate in, I am agreeing to allow audio-recording (Yes____ No____) and/or video-recording (Yes____ No____) and/or photographing (Yes____ No____) to be used for this research interview or observation.

If you checked yes in any case above, then this recording was made on ____________________________ at ____________________________. It is an interaction where you were (brief description of interaction) ____________________________________________________________

Specifically, I agree
• that my verbal comments may be played, quoted, or paraphrased in publications or presentations (Yes____ No____)
• that the videotaped record may be excerpted as still photographs in publications or presentations (Yes____ No____) and may be selectively replayed in electronic publications or presentations (Yes____ No____)
• that any photographs permitted may be described (Yes____ No____) or presented (Yes____ No____) in publications or presentations.
• that any data from this event may be shared and discussed with other participants in later interviews (Yes____ No____)
• that I may be identified by my real name in relation to any of the data on this tape (Yes____ No____).

__________________________
(signature)

__________________________
(print name)

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me, Katherine Flowers (360-477-9231, ksflowe2@illinois.edu), or Dr. Paul Prior (217-333-3024; pprior@illinois.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you can contact the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Institutional Review Board (528 E. Green Street, suite 203, 217-333-2670; irb@illinois.edu).
Appendix F
Sample Interview Questions

Sample Questions for a Politician
November 12, 2015
Interview with Chris Trumbauer

☐ How long have you lived in the area?

☐ How would you describe Anne Arundel County?

☐ How did you get involved in county government?

☐ Do you remember how you first heard about or thought about the idea of making English the Official Language?

☐ How did you hear about the proposed language ordinance?

☐ How did you decide not to co-sponsor the ordinance in early 2012?

☐ Why do you think the ordinance emerged when it did?

☐ According to what I read on the County’s website, the bill (13-12) was introduced on February 6, 2012, a few weeks after a similar ordinance had been introduced in Frederick County. And later in 2012 and 2013, Queen Anne’s County and Carroll County also made English their official language. Do you have a sense of how the different county governments communicated with each other?

☐ How would you describe your role in developing the ordinance?

☐ How many drafts were there? What was the process for making revisions?

☐ Did you get the sense that all the sponsors were on the same page about why they wanted English to be the official language, or were there a variety of reasons?

☐ Did you and the other council members opposed to the ordinance all agree on your reasons, or did everyone have different reasons?

☐ What was the public’s response to the proposed ordinance?

☐ On your Facebook page, “Councilman Chris Trumbauer,” the morning after the hearing on this bill, you made a post. You linked to a story about the winner of the county spelling bee, and you added the sentence, “Well, at least we did one productive thing at the County Council meeting last night…” What seemed unproductive about the deliberation process?

☐ Were you surprised that the bill was withdrawn?
☐ Do you think it’ll ever be reintroduced?

☐ What about that whole process surprised you the most?

☐ What would you do differently next time, or if you could do it over?

☐ What advice would you give to someone in another community considering making English the official language?

☐ How do the policies from the last few years fit into the community’s history? End of an era, the norm, an exception?

☐ Do you wish Maryland or the United States had an official language? In addition to or instead of decisions on the local level?

☐ Do you think there’s anything particular about the English language that makes it particularly well-suited to being a common or official language?

☐ Is there anything else you think I should have asked you?

☐ Aside from the elected officials involved, is there anyone else in particular that you think I should talk to for my project?
Sample Questions for an Activist
October 22, 2015
Interview with Blogger from Occupy Frederick

☐ How long have you lived in Frederick?

☐ How would you describe Frederick County?

☐ How did you get involved with Occupy Frederick?

☐ How do you decide what to post on the Occupy Frederick Facebook page?

☐ In 2008, do you remember hearing about the County’s 2008 Resolution to make English the official language? What did you think? (see copy of resolution)

☐ Do you remember the moment when you first heard that Frederick County might consider an Official Language ordinance?

☐ In a Facebook post, you wrote that from the beginning, “Occupy Frederick has opposed Blaine Young’s Official English Ordinance.” What were your reasons for opposing it? You describe it as Blaine Young’s—how so? (see copy of post)

☐ How do you see the issue of English Only as related to the other concerns of the Occupy Movement?

☐ Did you testify at the February 2012 public hearing? If so, what was that like?

☐ I read that part of the ordinance was drawn from a model ordinance written by ProEnglish. Do you have a sense of that organization’s role in 2012? How about in 2015—ads, mail, robocalls? (see copy of ordinance)

☐ Do you remember when you first heard that the ordinance might be repealed? What did you think? (see copy of repeal bill)

☐ Why do you think the repeal bill was introduced and eventually passed?

☐ I saw an Occupy Frederick Facebook post with a sample email supporting the repeal bill. Did you write it? How did you decide how to frame it? (see copy of post)

☐ Was there ever a time when you disagreed with people who were also critical of English Only, over the details, or the right way to frame the argument?

☐ Did you get the sense that the people supporting English Only in Frederick were all on the same page about why they supported it, or were there multiple reasons?
What about that whole process surprised you the most?

Was there ever a moment during all this when you changed your mind about some aspect of the issue?

What would you do differently next time, or if you could do it over?

What advice would you give to someone in another community who wants to help protest or repeal their local English Only language?

How do the policies from the last few years fit into the community’s history? End of an era, the norm, an exception?

Ideally, what do you think the government’s policy towards language issues would be? Would it be local, state, national?

Do you think there’s anything particular about the English language that makes people want to make it the official language?

Is there anything else you think I should have asked you?

Aside from the elected officials involved, is there anyone else in particular that you think I should talk to for my project?