Racializing language, regimenting Latinas/os: Chronotope, social tense, and American raciolinguistic futures

CrossMark

Jonathan Rosa

Stanford University, 485 Lasuen Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

A R T I C L E   I N F O

A B S T R A C T

In this article, I introduce a race-based reconsideration of chronotopes that frame conceptions of language, Latinas/os, and the American future. Specifically, I argue that conceptions of the pastness and futurity of the Spanish and English languages differ depending on language users' ethnoracial positions. Focusing on a range of recent popular cultural representations of language and Latinas/os, I suggest that these space-time narratives reflect a racialized social tense that perpetuates the marginalization of Latinas/os by continually deferring their claims to societal inclusion to an unnamed future. I argue that these Latina/o-oriented time-scales characterize the contemporary political economy of racialized language and identity.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The relatively recent demographic emergence of Latinas/os[1] as the largest minoritized U.S. ethnoracial group is often invoked in popular media portrayals such as the following news headlines: "How Latinos Are Shaping the Future of American Cities,"[2] "Latino Children are this Country's Future,"[3] "The Census, English, Spanish, and the New U.S. Latino,"[4] and "The Sound of the Latino Future? It's English."[5] These popular media portrayals reflect some of the different ways that representations of Latinas/os are saturated with discourses of language and the future. While invocations of language and the future are consistent in such representations, they differ in their focus on perspectives from which Latinas/os embody a renewed American future versus those from which Latinas/os pose a unique threat to the future of American identity. For example, a December 2010 National Public Radio story titled "Latino Mayor May Be A Glimpse of Things to Come"[6] presents a relatively positive portrayal of Latinas/os:

> There's a good chance America will eventually look like San Antonio. Demographically, the Texas city is a glimpse into the American future — a majority Latino community, where English is the language of choice…The mayor of San

Antonio, Julian Castro, is young, photogenic, well-educated and barely speaks Spanish. Yet he may very well be the model of a new kind of Latino leadership.

In this story, Castro's potential for Latina/o leadership is framed in inverse relation to his Spanish language abilities.

In a more recent, less optimistic portrayal of language and Latina/o identity, widely recognized conservative political figure Linda Chavez, former President of the English-only organization U.S. English and George W. Bush's nominee for Secretary of Labor, penned an April 2012 nationally syndicated column titled "Why so few Latinos ID themselves first as 'American.'"[7] Citing a 2012 report by the Pew Hispanic Research Center, Chavez laments the finding that "only 8 percent of immigrant [Hispanics], 35 percent of second-generation Hispanics, and 48 percent of third-generation Hispanics" identify themselves first and foremost as Americans. She suggests that this unwillingness to identify as American distinguishes Latinas/os from previous immigrant groups, and attributes this shift to multicultural education gone awry and the promotion of distinctive ethnoracial identities by schools and other mainstream institutions. In contrast, she celebrates the findings that Hispanics "overwhelmingly believe in the importance of learning English" and "nearly all U.S.-born Hispanics say they read and write English well." While the NPR story and Chavez column differ in their portrayal of the status of Latinas/os vis-à-vis American identity, they both position the English language as key to Latinas'/os' current and future impact on America.

These discourses of language and national identity are commonly associated with notions of culture and ethnicity in efforts to conceptualize group identities. However, I follow Williams (1989), Goldberg (2002), and Torres-Saillant (2003) in connecting conceptions of nationality and ethnicity to race on the one hand, and Hill (1998), Dick and Wirtz (2011), and Alim and Smitherman (2012) in connecting conceptions of language and culture to race on the other. This emphasis on race highlights particular questions about power, hierarchies, and modes of exclusion. Specifically, I consider how Latinas/os are positioned as particular types of ethnoracial *others* in the U.S. context, how language is used to gauge the characteristics of this *otherness*, and how the *raciolinguistic* management of Latina/o identities is organized in relation to imagined futures.

Building on these insights and considerations, the aforementioned representations demonstrate how conceptions of Latinas/os are closely linked to ideas and anxieties about language and America's ethnoracial future. At times, Latinas/os are characterized as another in a long line of American immigrant groups possessing a range of ethnic differences that are to be celebrated in our nation's multicultural melting pot. In many ways, the NPR story about Julian Castro is an example of this characterization. That is, a conception of Latina/o identity as something that is only implicitly racialized (i.e., Latinas/os could be unmarked Americans in the future, implying that they currently occupy a marked ethnoracial status), aspirationally professional, and increasingly English-dominant, although with continued knowledge of a minimal amount of Spanish. In contrasting accounts, Latinas/os are often described as a highly racialized, stubbornly unassimilable group that must be managed carefully in order to prevent them from undoing the nation's cultural fabric. Chavez's column invokes this countervailing view by framing Latinas'/os' ethnoracial self-identification as a problem to be combatted.

Dávila (2008) and Chavez (2008) have formulated this narrative dynamic as "Latino Spin" and "Latino Threat," respectively. Dávila persuasively argues that seemingly contradictory representational tropes associated with Latinas/os, such as "illegal, tax burden, patriotic, family-oriented, hard-working, and model consumer" (2008, p. 1), should be understood as efforts to reproduce normative American ideals rather than empirical representations of Latinas'/os' fundamental character. She suggests that "Latino Spin," which involves efforts to present Latinas/os as model Americans, is a way of whitewashing Latinas/os. Meanwhile, Chavez shows how "Latino Threat" narratives racialize Latinas/os by positioning them as a problem population in need of careful management. This attention to race sheds new light on the (re)production of societal hierarchies, as well as the ways in which particular practices and groups can be alternatively ethnicized as national ideals or racialized as targets of national exclusion (Urciuoli, 1996). Language is a key practice in these dynamics. Indeed, both "Latino Spin" and "Latino Threat" narratives position language shift from Spanish to English as a sign of progress. Whereas the aforementioned examples of Castro (Latino Spin) and Chavez (Latino Threat) might appear oppose one another, a focus on language reveals the ways that these representations are linked in their positive portrayal of Spanish-English language shift.

In this article I analyze the centrality of notions of language, race, and the future in contrasting representations of U.S. Latinas/os, as well as the ways Latinas/os respond to these representations of language and identity. I suggest that this *raciolinguistic* approach to analysis (Flores and Rosa, 2015), which directs attention to the co-naturalization of language and race, can contribute new insights regarding the ways that particular populations and cultural practices – linguistic and otherwise – come to be imagined in relation to American pasts, presents, and futures. I interrogate a range of popular representational scales and contexts that frame Latina/o raciolinguistic identities, and introduce a race-based reconsideration of two recent theoretical developments in semiotic anthropology: *chronotope* and *social tense*. The Bakhtinian (1981) notion of chronotope, or chronos as in time and topos as in space, highlights the ways that space, time, and models of personhood are linked in narrative frameworks. Building from the ways that chronotopes have been theorized within linguistic anthropology (Silverstein, 2005; Agha, 2007), I am interested in how ideologies of specific Spanish and English language practices play a central role in space-time constructions that figurate Latinas/os in imagined U.S. pasts, presents, and futures. I suggest that these space-time constructions reflect forms of "social tense" (Povinelli, 2011) – the legitimation of contemporary circumstances by implicating them in relation to other past, present, and future circumstances – in which Latinas/os are continually

---

[7] http://www.dallasnews.com/opinion/latest-columns/20120405-linda-chavez-why-so-few-latinos-id-themselves-first-as-american.ece, accessed October 2015.

framed as an emergent population of future significance. This social tense, in which today's Latina/o marginalization is legitimated by imagined futures, is characteristic of the contemporary political economy of racialized language and identity. Attending to race, language, and temporality in this way reveals how seemingly hopeful narratives about the future can in fact become linked to the perpetual deferral of societal inclusion for particular populations.

Although the U.S. linguistic future is often divined as a singular communicative terrain, this future differs depending on language users' ethnoracial positions. Whereas multilingualism – framed as a process of learning Spanish and other languages – is promoted for elite Whites to maintain their privileged position across societal domains, English monolingualism – framed as a process of Spanish language loss involving perpetual designation as an English language learner – is often seen as the path to inclusion and prosperity for Latinas/os and other ethnoracially minoritized groups. These distinctive chronotopes of language learning and loss are linked to social tenses that continually defer Latina/o societal inclusion by framing them as a people of the future. Such social tenses play a crucial role in legitimating the reproduction of exclusion and inequality across societal domains. Thus, a race-based deployment of the concepts of chronotope and social tense provides a compelling theoretical framework that sheds new light on the ways that spacetime narratives (i.e. narratives invoking some "here" or "there," as well as some "now" or "then") and societal power relations are co-constituted.

2. Future chronotopes, social tense, and a raciolinguistic perspective

Recent scholarship in linguistic anthropology and related fields has reinvigorated the Bakhtinian notion of "chronotope" (e.g., Agha, 2007; Bakhtin, 1981; Perrino, 2007; Silverstein, 2005), or what some have called the "semiotics of temporality" (Parmentier, 2007). Literally "time-space," the concept of chronotope has inspired researchers to investigate event configurations between the "present" and the "past"—between the narrating here-and-now and the narrated there-and-then—that often propel imagined figures of "modernity" and "tradition" into circulation (e.g., Bauman and Briggs, 2003; Inoue, 2006; Lo and Kim, 2011; Wirtz, 2011; Woolard, 2004).

In this article I focus on a "then" that is not only of the past, but also the future (Dick, 2010). My examination of chronotopes centers on interdiscursive relationships between present contexts of telling, as well as past and future contexts being told of. At the center of inquiry is an examination of language as both the medium and object of recollection and prediction. I seek to investigate how ideas about populations and language get bundled in chronotopes that invoke anxieties and desires surrounding raciolinguistic identities. By analyzing popular representations of Latinas/os in modalities such as demographic projections, media discourses, personal narratives, and public campaigns, it becomes possible to understand the racialized ways in which particular forms of language and personhood are framed as objects of anxiety and desire. The goal is to suggest new directions for research focused on cross-chronotope alignments among raciolinguistic pasts, presents, and futures.

These raciolinguistic chronotopes are linked to the forms of "social tense" (Povinelli, 2011) that characterize the contemporary political economy of language and identity. Povinelli theorizes social tense as a set of temporal logics within contemporary liberal societies that legitimate everyday forms of suffering by interpreting disparity only through a future viewpoint that understands particular populations' abandonment as a functional necessity. She constructs a framework with which to analyze these present–future relations as social tenses, which she defines as relationships between acts of narration and the events being narrated. For the purposes of this analysis, I am interested in narrated futures in which Latinas/os are figured as an important ethnoracial population, and narrative presents in which they are understood as not yet having arrived. Specifically, I suggest that these ethnoracial narratives of the future serve to legitimate contemporary Latina/o marginalization, and I point to the ways that language emerges as a central theme in this narrative dynamic.

My race-based deployments of chronotope and social tense, which together bring spatiotemporal structures and power relations into focus, reflect a *raciolinguistic perspective* that directs attention to the co-naturalization of language and race (Flores and Rosa, 2015; Rosa, Forthcoming). A raciolinguistic vantage point makes it possible to understand how seemingly similar language practices come to be valued in highly disparate ways based on the ethnoracial positions of the populations that produce or are associated with them. For U.S. Latinas/os this often involves the stigmatization of their linguistic practices, whether English or Spanish, as incorrect, too heavily accented, and/or inappropriate for public space (Hill, 1998). Thus, Latinas/os come to embody problematic raciolinguistic pasts, presents, and futures, necessitating the careful management of their ethnoracial difference through language. The examples that follow demonstrate how Latina/o raciolinguistic difference is managed and constituted through various chrontopes and social tenses.

3. Representing American futures in English and Spanish

The dystopian summer 2013 blockbuster film, "Elysium," starring Matt Damon and Jodie Foster, contrasts a 22nd-century Los Angeles inhabited by the impoverished masses, with Elysium, a luxury resort-cum-space station in the sky inhabited by the wealthy few. With its focus on restrictions that constrain earthlings' ability to travel to Elysium and its climactic valorization of the redistribution of Elysium's resources, the film takes shape as a not-so-subtle allegorical lens through which to reflect on contemporary American immigration policy and class inequality. Based on these themes of immigration and social class, it might come as no surprise that race and language figure centrally in presenting the forms of embodiment and cultural practices that distinguish between the futuristic contexts of Los Angeles and Elysium. Phenotypically, Los Angeles is predominantly Brown and its residents speak nonstandardized varieties of Spanish and English; in contrast, Elysium is predominantly White and its residents speak standardized varieties of English and French.

In press interviews that coincided with the film's release, cast members described what they perceived as its realist portrayal of the future and speculated about the linguistic and cultural implications of impending demographic shifts. On Conan O'Brien's late-night talk show, Mexican actor Diego Luna[8] discussed his supporting role in the film and divined the nation's raciolinguistic future:

O'Brien: Okay, that's okay, so, this is, in the future they're prophesizing in this movie that everybody speaks Spanish.
Luna: Well, yeah[9]
O'Brien: Cause that's sorta the way it's going
Luna: Yeah, and it's not gonna take so long, so, do you speak Spanish? That's why I ask your producer
O'Brien: Yes, I, I, un poquito, yo hablo Español, es importante nosotros, yo creo que gente [a little, I speak Spanish, it's important we, I believe that people], but anyway, I could go on and on, but I don't
Luna: The thing is, if you, if you wanna keep your job in this network, you're gonna have to learn Spanish. You know there is like, uh
O'Brien: Yes, cause the country is all changing over, yes
Luna: 47 million people speak Spanish today, and we like having sex, so multiply that for 8 in 10 years, another 8 in another 10 years, and then you won't be sitting there
O'Brien: Sí, es verdad, es verdad, es verdad [Yes, that's right, that's right, that's right]

It is initially important to note O'Brien's brilliant, comedic use of codeswitching to parody bumbling White Americans' best efforts to make use of their high school Spanish.[10] More important for this analysis is the apparent contradiction in Luna's suggestion that O'Brien's future employment will depend upon Spanish language proficiency, since the film portrays Spanish speakers as the future underclass.[11] This ambivalence, in which Latinas/os and their language practices are alternately represented in relation to prosperous or destitute American futures, is a central feature of chronotopes that frame Latina/o language practices and identities. Specifically, in the chronotopic frame Luna creates, learning the Spanish language will be crucial if one hopes to prosper in the future U.S. However, in the film's chronotopic frame, the Spanish language is associated with extreme economic marginalization.

Luna's suggestion that Spanish speakers will prosper in the American future contrasts within chronotopes that figurate language shift from Spanish to English as the way of the future. This chronotopic framing is evident in a 2007 commercial for a hybrid Toyota Camry car that features a conversation between a Latino father and son:

Son: Papá, why do we have a hybrid?
Father: For your future.
Son: Why?
Father: It's better for the air, and we spend less because it runs on gas and electrical power. Mira, mira aquí [Look, look here] (pointing to digital screen on console). It uses both.
Son: Like you, with English and Spanish!
Father: ¡Sí! [Yes!]
Son: But why did you learn English?
Father: For your future.
Narrator: Coming soon, the all new 2007 Camry, also available with hybrid synergy drive. From Toyota, the power to move forward.

In this commercial the Latino father's Spanish-English bilingualism is analogous to a contemporary hybrid vehicle, which uses a combination of gas and electrical power. The implicit messaging here is that Spanish-dominance corresponds to non-renewable energy of the past, a metaphorical linguistic gas-guzzler, and the son's English dominance is framed as an emblem of the future, analogous to fully renewable energy. That is, Spanish is equated with gasoline power and English is equated with electric power. From the perspective of the renewable energy movement, gas is associated with the past, hybrid fuel is a contemporary transitional stage, and electric (or some other such renewable energy) is the way of the future. Based on the commercial's linguistic logic, Spanish is the language of the Latina/o past, bilingualism is the transitional language of the Latina/o present, and English is the language of the Latina/o future.

---

[8] Luna was born and continues to reside in Mexico City. He launched his acting career as a child, appearing exclusively in Spanish-speaking Mexican theater, television, and film roles. As an adult, he began taking on English-speaking roles in the U.S. and elsewhere, in addition to his ongoing Spanish-language projects in Mexico.

[9] Turns of talk that do not end in punctuation indicate interruption by the subsequent turn of talk.

[10] Later in the interview, Luna and O'Brien engaged in a spontaneous Spanish language-learning lesson in which Luna taught O'Brien the vernacular phrases "*no mames*" [quit fucking around] and *¿Qué pedo?* [What's up?].

[11] Luna's suggestion that Spanish language skills will be required for employment in the American future—as opposed to an emphasis on learning English, which is characteristic of the other examples throughout this article—should be understood in relation to his status as an elite light skinned Latin American (rather than U.S. Latina/o) actor born to British and Mexican parents. While Luna might inhabit a racially and socioeconomically privileged position in Mexico, he can also be racialized as non-White/Latino in the U.S. However, Luna's elite transnational status mitigates his potential racialization and allows him to overlook the stigmatization of U.S. Latinas'/os' Spanish language practices. This positionality informs his suggestion that Spanish is the language of a prosperous American future despite the film's depiction of a destitute future Los Angeles in which there is widespread Spanish language use.

This commercial is characteristic of chronotopes that position Spanish as an icon of the past and English as an icon of the future. However, race must be taken into account in order to understand the pastness of Spanish and futurity of English. When linked to Whiteness and forms of economic privilege, Spanish-English bilingualism and multilingualism more generally can be positioned as emblems of the future and English monolingualism can be framed as an emblem of the past. For example, multilingual U.S. language academies, whose student bodies comprise predominantly wealthy White children, have emerged as privileged educational spaces. These institutions frame bilingualism and multilingualism, often involving the Spanish and English languages, as practices of the future. Meanwhile, Latina/o children who learn Spanish before English at home (as well as other children designated as "English Language Learners"), are often positioned as second-class educational citizens because they possess abilities that would be framed as skills were it not for their ethnoracial and class positions. Whereas English monolingualism is viewed as a limitation and a sign of the past for privileged White Americans, it is often promoted as a future goal for Latinas/os and other marginalized groups. The very linguistic practices that are stigmatized and framed as backwards problems to be overcome for non-Whites undergo an ideological reconfiguration that positions them as valuable, futuristic assets so long as they are associated with normative forms of Whiteness. Silences around the limitations of normative English monolingualism frame language as a disability for students whose linguistic repertoires could be viewed as more expansive than many of the educators, administrators, and policy makers who serve them. The inability to recognize this contradiction stems from language ideologies that play a central role in reproducing forms of stigmatization that coincide with efforts to assimilate U.S. Latinas/os, as well as other marginalized groups. These ideologies also erase and/or devalue the vast linguistic heterogeneity within languages, such as the multiple Spanish*es* and English*es* in use among U.S. Latinas/os (Zentella, 2009).[12] Complex intra- and inter-linguistic and relations are elided by normative chronotopes that position Spanish as an overarching linguistic emblem of the past and English as an overarching linguistic emblem of the future for Latinas/os. These chronotopic perspectives promote a continuum in which earlier generations of Latina/os are monolingual Spanish users/Spanish-dominant, more recent generations are bilingual Spanish-English/"Spanglish" users, and future generations will be English-dominant/monolingual English users. The commercial above highlights the ways that these intergenerational processes of English language learning and Spanish language loss are promoted as the path to an emergent, prosperous Latina/o future.

It is not by chance that U.S. Latinas/os are continuously framed as an emergent population of future significance. The irony, of course, is that Latinidad, in its joint articulation alongside prevailing forms of racialized difference, namely Africanness, Asianness, and various forms of indigeneity, is about 500 or so years in the making. How is it that a population whose origins in many ways predate the very European histories in relation to which "America" is conventionally imagined, could be framed as a demographic whose value lies only in some figured future? In what ways do various demographic projections that estimate the size of the Latina/o population in 2050, 2070, and 2100 reproduce this imaginary? These framings of Latinas/os as a population of the future erase vast U.S. Latina/o histories. We must reconsider the historical erasures and appropriations that make it possible to classify Spanish as a "foreign language" in the U.S. context despite its ubiquity throughout the nation and the fact that its use in the Americas predates English language use (Hill, 2008). It is easy to forget that Montana is "*montaña*," Spanish for "mountain," and that Colorado is "*colorado*," Spanish for "reddish." How could a person not understand him/herself to be "speaking Spanish" each time s/he references these and countless other place names? Note the paradox here: Spanish is erased from U.S. history at the same time that it is framed as a language of the past for U.S. Latinas/os; in a related move, Latina/o histories are erased at the same time that Latinas/os are framed as a population of the future. These erasures demonstrate the importance of infusing chronotope and social tense with a consideration of race, which structures various linguistic timescales and the forms of marginalization to which they correspond. The following section demonstrates the ways that language practices associated with Latinas/os are not simply erased and stigmatized, but also prized or devalued based on the language users' ethnoracial positions.

4. Language, race, and chronotopic inversions

In this section I turn to two examples that illustrate the interplay among race, chronotope, and social tense in characterizations of language use in predominantly Latina/o communities. The first is a news report from Chicago, a city whose population is nearly 1/3 Latino; Chicago's Latina/o population is also the fifth largest of any U.S. city. In June 2010, Fox News Chicago broadcasted and published a story about "Chicago's language divide," titled "Inside the 'Spanish Bubble.'"[13] The report opens with the following statement:

> Within the next 20 years, one out of every three people in the Chicago-area will be of Spanish-speaking descent. In fact, there are some long-time residents in the city, at this very moment, who never speak English, because, well, they say there's not really been a need to learn it. Critics say they're living in a "Spanish bubble" – isolating themselves from mainstream American society and creating a cultural divide.

The story goes on to profile Latinas/os who claim that they do not need to speak English in "Pilsen, or Little Village, or Humboldt Park, among other areas of Chicago, and many suburbs." It also presents the perspectives of Chicagoans who are

---

[12] This erasure also extends to the many indigenous languages in use among U.S. Latinas/os.
[13] http://www.fox32chicago.com/story/17838093/inside-the-spanish-bubble-chicagos-language-divide, accessed June 2010.

"concerned they'll need to learn Spanish long before the growing Latino community learns English." In the end, though, the report assuages viewers' and readers' fears:

> The next generations of Chicago Latinos, including those who just graduated from the predominantly-Hispanic Metropolitan Leadership Institute, are breaking out of the "Spanish Bubble" with encouragement from folks like their commencement speaker, Mayor Richard M. Daley. "In Chicago, all of us respect the past. But we live in the present, and there's always a vision for the future," Daley said. "If you don't have it, that's where your city fails, that's where everybody else fails, where your family fails, where you fail."

This story succinctly presents a striking bundle of stigmatizing language ideologies that align Spanish with the past/failure and English with the future/success. English language acquisition is posed as a solution to racial segregation patterns and a broader "cultural divide," which are presented here as the result of Latinas'/os' decision to live in a "Spanish bubble" rather than structural factors that shape access to housing and cultural patterns. The promotion of English as the solution to societal ills chronotopically positions the Spanish language and its users as pasts that should be respected, as compared to the English language and its users who compose the present and the future.

Echoing countless popular portrayals of nonstandardized American English speakers as "shackled in a language prison" (Zentella, 2007, p. 34; Santa Ana, 2002; Woolard, 1989), this news story powerfully demonstrates the racialized chronotopes and social tenses that frame Latina/o identities. Whereas Spanish-dominant Latinas/os are relegated to marginalized spaces as icons of the past, Latinas/os of the future "are breaking out of the Spanish bubble." But this is not merely a racialized chronotopic figuration. The social tense of this representation legitimates the contemporary marginalization of those living inside the "Spanish bubble" by gesturing toward Latinas/os as a demographic future; tomorrow's Latina/o demographics justify today's Latina/o suffering.

As a counterpoint to this example, let us consider media coverage surrounding a recent mayoral election in Holyoke, Massachusetts. Holyoke's population is nearly 50% Latina/o; it is home to the largest concentration of Puerto Ricans in the mainland U.S. The leading candidates in the 2011 mayoral campaign were Elaine Pluta, a 67-year-old White incumbent mayor with nearly two decades of experience representing Holyoke as an elected official, and Alex Morse, a 22-year-old White Holyoke native who announced his candidacy for mayor while finishing up his undergraduate degree at Brown University. Apart from their shared White racial identities, Pluta and Morse were represented as polar opposites; local media framed the election as a choice between an older, married, mother of three with considerable experience as an elected official and a young, single, openly gay male fresh out of college.

In the end, Morse defeated Pluta by a considerable margin. Headlines such as "Old Holyoke Makes Way for New Holyoke"[14] accompanied reports of Morse's victory. But language also emerged as a powerful theme in media stories about the election. Alongside coverage highlighting differences between the candidates' age, gender, sexuality, and political experience, were reports about language and Latinas/os, including headlines such as "Alex Morse counts fluency in Spanish while incumbent Elaine Pluta cites experience in courting Hispanics in race for Holyoke Mayor."[15]

Morse's bilingualism, as demonstrated by the Spanish and English versions of his campaign website, advertisements, and literature, as well as his ability to communicate with constituents in Spanish and English, was continually highlighted as one of his primary assets. Morse's Spanish language skills were often celebrated with little or no reference to any specific things he actually communicated in Spanish. Such representations demonstrate the ways that Spanish is not simply a communicative code, but also an emblem of identity. When contextualized in relation to Morse, Spanish was chronotopically figured as an emblem of the future. Pluta's English monolingualism was devalued in relation to Morse's Spanish-English bilingualism. Whereas English monolingualism was chronotopically figured as an emblem of the past in relation to Pluta's race, age, gender, and sexuality, Spanish-English bilingualism was chronotopically figured as an emblem of the future in relation to Morse's race, age, gender, and sexuality. Note here that for all of the differences between Pluta and Morse, this was still an election between two White candidates in a largely Latina/o city in which Latinas'/os' Spanish language use is regularly stigmatized in public settings, no Latina/o has ever been elected mayor, and Latinas/os are underrepresented within or completely excluded from nearly every sector of Holyoke's power structure.

To be clear, the point is not that Morse should stop speaking Spanish. Instead, I want to draw attention to the ways that Spanish language practices are framed as unmodern linguistic handicaps that must be overcome for Latinas/os, but valuable, futuristic assets when contextualized in relation to particular forms of Whiteness. Contrast representations of Morse with the description of Julian Castro presented earlier. Whereas Morse's Spanish-English bilingualism beneficially positioned him as the candidate best capable of securing a prosperous future, Castro's embodiment of the future was linked to his English dominance over Spanish. How might a bilingual or Spanish-dominant Latina/o candidate's language abilities be understood in contexts such as Holyoke and throughout the U.S.? The social tense of the representations surrounding this election positioned the joint Whiteness and bilingualism of the future mayor, and the progressiveness associated with his range of identities, as a justification for continued Latina/o political underrepresentation and marginalization in Holyoke.

---

[14] http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2011/11/old_holyoke_makes_way_for_new_holyoke_alex_morse_defeats_elaine_pluta_for_mayor.html, accessed October 2015.
[15] http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2011/11/holyoke_mayoral_candidate_alex_1.html, accessed October 2015.

The examples of Chicago and Holyoke demonstrate the ways that seemingly similar linguistic practices come to be valued in disparate ways based on the ethnoracial positions of the language users that produce them. In the case of Chicago, Spanish language use is understood to relegate Latinas/os to a "Spanish bubble" associated with backwardness and the past. However, for an aspiring White political candidate in Holyoke, Spanish language skills became contextualized as valuable assets associated with futurity. These cases also point to the expectation that Latinas'/os' should assimilate to normative American practices at the same time that ideologies of multiculturalism produce the opportunity for Whites to derive value from the very same practices that Latinas/os are expected to reject in order to become a part of the American future. The following section analyzes the ways that ideologies of assimilation and multiculturalism are structured in relation to particular chronotopes and social tenses that operate in deceptive ways to reproduce raciolinguistic stigmatization. Specifically, it argues that seemingly opposing proponents of linguistic assimilation and multiculturalism – timescale processes linking language and race – deceptively draw on similarly stigmatizing views of Latinas/os and their language practices.

5. Syllable stress as societal stress: Between Latina/o multiculturalism and assimilation

In May 2009, President Barack Obama announced his nomination of Sonia Sotomayor to the U.S. Supreme Court. Within twenty-four hours of Obama's announcement of his nomination of Sotomayor, the first Latina/o Supreme Court nominee and now the first Latina/o Justice, commentators of varying political persuasions weighed in on a range of issues regarding her candidacy for the Supreme Court. These commentators voiced opposing viewpoints not only on Sotomayor's legal, ethical, and academic qualifications for the nation's highest court, but also on the syllable stress that should be used in the pronunciation of her surname. Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Washington-based Center for Immigration Studies, contributed postings titled "Assimilated Pronunciation"[16] and "It Sticks in My Craw,"[17] excerpted below, to "The Corner," the blog portion of the online version of the National Review, a popular biweekly conservative magazine:

> So, are we supposed to use the Spanish pronunciation, so-toe-my-OR, or the natural English pronunciation, SO-tuh-my-er, like Niedermeyer? The president pronounced it both ways, first in Spanish, then after several uses, lapsing into English.

> Most e-mailers were with me on the post on the pronunciation of Judge Sotomayor's name (and a couple griped about the whole Latina/Latino thing – English dropped gender in nouns, what, 1000 years ago?). But a couple said we should just pronounce it the way the bearer of the name prefers, including one who pronounces her name "freed" even though it's spelled "fried," like fried rice…Putting the emphasis on the final syllable of Sotomayor is unnatural in English (which is why the president stopped doing it after the first time at his press conference), unlike my correspondent's simple preference for a monophthong over a diphthong, and insisting on an unnatural pronunciation is something we shouldn't be giving in to…And there are basically two options – the newcomer adapts to us, or we adapt to him. And multiculturalism means there's a lot more of the latter going on than there should be.

For Krikorian, the assimilation of apparent non-American practices to American norms must be strongly encouraged.[18] In this case, pronouncing "Sotomayor" with final syllable stress signals the problematic assimilation of English to Spanish.[19] Whereas he regards the difference between a monophthong and a diphthong as an entirely reasonable alternation, final syllable stress crosses the linguistic line.[20] Krikorian is similarly concerned with the apparent backwardness of the gender

---

[16] http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/182339/assimilated-pronunciation-mark-krikorian, accessed October 2015.

[17] http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/182354/it-sticks-my-craw-mark-krikorian, accessed October 2015.

[18] Krikorian's views on pronunciation mirror those analyzed by Silverstein (1999) as modes of "Linguistic NIMBYism" through which anxieties about linguistic and cultural differences are articulated. Similarly, the parenthetical statement about the unmodernness of gender marking in Spanish nouns is what Silverstein calls "a language-shapes-thought Whorfianism," in which "certain people…reason that using languages other than ours could not possibly think about the world the way we speakers of English do" (2003, p. 531).

[19] While Krikorian distinguishes between English and Spanish pronunciations of the vowels in the second and fourth syllables of Sotomayor ("SO-tuh-my-er" and "so-toe-my-OR"), he directs most of his attention toward syllable stress. Interestingly, Obama's pronunciation was not particularly Hispanicized. Were he to have produced a dental as opposed to an alveolar /t/ in the second syllable (for many English speakers, this would sound roughly equivalent to the difference between So-though and So-toe) or an alveolar tap [ɾ] in the final syllable, as did Sotomayor herself when she was sworn in by Chief Justice John Roberts, this might have become even more linguistically offensive and worrisome for Krikorian. Note that one particularly interesting linguistic feature of the structure of the swearing-in ceremony is that it requires the appointee to echo the Chief Justice as s/he administers the judicial oath, including the statement of the appointee's name. When Sotomayor was sworn in on August 8, 2009, Roberts pronounced her name Sonia /soʊnjʌ/ Sotomayor /soʊtoʊmeɪɔːr/. She repeated – corrected? – Roberts: Sonia /soʊɲʌ/ Sotomayor /soʊt̪oʊmaɪˈɔːr/. Note the differences in Sotomayor's palatalized /ɲ/ in her first name, as well as the dental /t̪/, diphthong in the penultimate syllable /aɪ/, and stress on the final syllable in her surname. Surely there have been phonetic differences between the speech of the administrant and appointee in prior swearing-in ceremonies, but the indexical meanings of these differences take shape in relation to the identities that are understood to produce them. As such, anxieties surrounding the meaning of Sotomayor's Latina identity were sufficiently potent to position syllable stress as a powerful threat to the nation's character. Krikorian's linguistic imprecision in characterizing language use in this situation is not so much a reflection of his linguistic naïveté as it is evidence that ideas about personhood shape the interpretation of language use. Sotomayor's Latina identity in conjunction with this identity's imagined embodiment of the Spanish language, creates the potential for her English language use and the English language use of those identified as Latina/o to become perpetually linked to the imagined illegitimacy and backwardness of the Spanish language in the U.S. context. This reflects the joint racialization of Latina/o language practices and identities.

[20] In fact, the examples he uses of a monphthong ("freed") and a diphthong ("fried") are both diphthongs ([iy] and [ay], respectively).

marking of Spanish nouns, and the way that the use of gendered terms such as "Latina" and "Latino" poses a threat to the advancement of English beyond what he considers to be such unmodern tendencies. Above all else, he interprets these language practices as signs of multiculturalism run amuck. Thus, Latina/o differences must be managed carefully in order to prevent them from unraveling the nation's cultural fabric. For Krikorian, this management should be structured by a chronotopic view in which Latina/o difference threatens to drag the U.S. backwards and a social tense in which the imagined unwillingness to conform to this assimilationist timescale legitimates (im)migrant marginalization.

Shortly after the publication of Krikorian's comments, Andrew Leonard, author and contributing editor to Newsweek, responded directly to Krikorian on "How The World Works," a blog section of the liberal online magazine, Salon.com. Leonard's posting, titled "How to pronounce Sotomayor,"[21] presents the liberal counterpoint to Krikorian:

> Personally, I feel that pronouncing someone's name the way they would like it pronounced is a sign of courtesy and respect…But most ridiculous is the idea that something is not "natural" in *English*. In all of the world, these is no more mongrel or polyglot tongue than English; no language more gleefully willing to taint its purity. English borrows from every other language with abandon, steals "foreign" vocabulary without remorse, scoffs at any and every linguistic boundary. Such free-and-easy kaleidoscopic adaptability is English's great strength…Multiculturalism is a writer's delight! It gives us more room to play, expands the possibilities built into our minds. Krikorian appears to be suggesting that we emulate the French, who are always striving so hard to keep their language free of foreign contamination. He's either forgotten, or never understood, that what makes the language he speaks so great is that it welcomes all comers and adapts effortlessly to them, without chagrin or fear or hate.

For Leonard, the adaptability of the English language is its very strength. In fact, he ventures so far as to claim that there is no language in the world that contains more diversity than English. The English language, in Leonard's view, is uniquely capable of welcoming and incorporating linguistic difference.

At first glance, Krikorian and Leonard appear to present clearly opposing viewpoints in a now familiar debate between multiculturalism and assimilation. "Multiculturalism" (in this case signaled primarily by syllable stress in the pronunciation of one's surname) either strengthens or threatens the nation's character. Beneath this surface appearance of opposition, however, Krikorian and Leonard draw on a strikingly similar set of language ideologies that position English as (hyper-)modern, locate it atop the linguistic food chain, and suggest that it should be celebrated for its superiority. They also suggest that English is made "unnatural" or "mongrelized" by its incorporation of linguistic difference. From both multicultural and assimilationist perspectives, the English language is uniquely powerful, superior, and modern as compared to other languages. The question for Krikorian and Leonard is whether the increasing prominence of Latina/o identity, in conjunction with its ideological linkage to the Spanish language, challenges English language hegemony. Thus, they present competing timescales, yet reproduce similarly stigmatizing ideas about linguistic and ethnoracial difference.

The simultaneous stigmatization and embrace of Latina/o identity reflected in these blog postings is no coincidence. It demonstrates the aforementioned dichotomy between the "Latino Threat Narrative" (Chavez, 2008) and "Latino Spin" (Dávila, 2008). These joint discourses allow seemingly opposing characterizations of Latinas/os to circulate simultaneously. The danger is that each of these characterizations is fundamentally anchored in the stigmatization of Latina/o linguistic and ethnoracial difference. While Krikorian and Leonard disagree on whether the assimilation of Latina/o difference threatens or strengthens the nation, they both promote an orientation to Latina/o raciolinguistic difference that presumes upon the superiority of the English language and, I argue, the racially unmarked forms of Americanness with which it is iconically associated (Irvine and Gal, 2000).

These debates demonstrate how Latina/o difference is always created in close ideological proximity to a set of understandings about the relationship between language and race. Specifically, Sotomayor's ethnoracial difference, as well as that of President Obama, whose pronunciation of her name became fodder for debate, prompted a dispute linking linguistic assimilation and multiculturalism to ethnoracial assimilation and multiculturalism. As is evident in the debate between Krikorian and Leonard, minute linguistic features can signal dramatically distinct orientations to the raciolinguistic future of Americanness. Importantly, these language practices are perceived in relation to chronotopes and social tenses that alternately champion American assimilation and multiculturalism, while simultaneoulsy legitimating contemporary Latina/o marginalization. The final section explores the ways that Latina/o-focused media outlets grapple with these narratives of assimilation and multiculturalism by seeking to translate the current and future value of Latina/o raciolinguistic identities to broader American publics.

6. Translating Latinas/os

Projects of translating Latina/o raciolinguistic identities to broad U.S. publics are temporal phenomena through which particular American pasts, presents, and futures are imagined and enacted. A central site for tracking the interplay between these contrasting framings is the calibration of language practices and demographic projections in popular representations of U.S. Latinas/os. This involves analyzing the deployment of differing varieties of language (e.g., English, Spanish, Spanglish, etc.)

---

as demographically representative emblems of Latina/o identities (Zentella, 2009[2002]). In this section, I show how media outlets seeking to translate the current potential value of Latina/o identities to mainstream American audiences must grapple with questions surrounding the legitimacy of Latina/o raciolinguistic difference on the one hand, and the deferral of Latina/o societal inclusion to an unnamed future moment on the other.

To illustrate the logics of temporality and translation in relation to which contemporary U.S. Latina/o raciolinguistic identities are conceptualized, I point to two recent, contrasting media campaigns conducted by the most prominent Latina/o-focused television outlets, Univision and Telemundo. These campaigns, which were designed in response to the release of the 2010 U.S. Census statistics, are both framed as primers on Latinas/os for non-Latina/o audiences. Univision and Telemundo are primarily Spanish-language media outlets, but they both use English campaigns to translate Latina/o identity to marketers and the broader American public. While their apparent goal is to stake a claim to Latinas/os as the new American present, both of these campaigns invoke the notion that Latinas/os are a rising population of future significance. These discourses, which alternately frame Latinas/os as a population of the present and the future, reflect differing strategies for disrupting prevailing American raciolinguistic commonsense.

The Univision campaign advertisement, titled "The New American Reality,"[22] relies heavily on the imagery of Latinas/os as an increasingly important piece of a broader American puzzle. This imagery underscores the processes involved in translating Latinas/os broader U.S. publics, namely calibration and commensuration. Calibration involves strategically constructing representations of Latina/o identities that highlight Latina/o distinctiveness while also aligning it with mainstream American characteristics to point to its potential value; commensuration involves locating and transgressing the imagined boundaries between Latinas/os and other ethnoracial groups. That is, if Latinas/os are a piece of the American puzzle, then what is the precise shape of that piece and where exactly does it fit into the puzzle? The advertisement, which consists of images, sound, and first person text, begins by highlighting demographic shifts that make Latinas/os one out of every four babies born in the U.S. each year and 95% of the U.S. teen population growth through 2020. Later, Latinas/os are figured as "the 15th largest consumer economy in the world" and "the opportunity you've been missing." That is, Latinas/os are at once a population of past and future significance at the same time that they are framed as a "new American reality." These framings represent temporal figurations that alternately co-constitute and contradict one another. If Latinas/os are the Americans of the future, then what is the status of their contemporary claims to representation? If Latinas/os are a "new American reality," then how should we make sense of their longstanding history in the Americas?

The ad continues by explaining that the figurative first person narrator lives "at the intersection of my two cultures" and takes "from each." Thus, Latinas/os are "fútbol and football," "reggaeton and rock n roll," and "tamales and cheeseburgers." Latinas/os "move easily between two worlds" because they speak Spanish and English "y a veces [and sometimes]…speak both". These examples show how the advertisement becomes a semiotic project of calibration and commensuration, which involves positing a cultural boundary between Latinas/os and non-Latinas/os, identifying practices on different sides of this boundary that are understood to be equivalent to one another, and then claiming that Latinas/os are able to navigate this boundary by embracing both sets of practices. Note that Latina/o and non-Latina/o "culture" are presented in monolithic terms here, as are English and Spanish and the "two worlds" to which they are understood to correspond. Yet, this duality is collapsed at the end of the advertisement, which concludes with a call to "speak my language" and "speak my culture" because "I am here." This monolingual and monocultural representation of Latinas/os contrasts with the video's earlier portrayal of Latinas/os embodying bilingualism, biculturalism, and "two worlds." These apolitical invocations of the ideal bilingual/bicultural Latina/o obscure the complex, idiomatic practices that constitute Latina/o repertoires, many of which are potentially untranslatable or incommensurate with normative constructions of Americanness. Contrary to the claims of Krikorian and Leonard above, Latinas/os who live their lives across linguistic, political, ethnoracial, and cultural borders are not simply a population to be assimilated or incorporated into a multicultural melting pot, but rather a population that presents new ways of conceptualizing and constituting America's place within the Americas.

A related, yet distinctive, campaign is Telemundo's "The Shift: The New Face of America."[23] In contrast to Univision's emphasis on alignments between Latinidad and Americanness (e.g., aligning tamales and cheeseburgers, fútbol and football, English and Spanish, etc.), Telemundo crafts a narrative focused more on a shifting cultural terrain. Whereas for Univision, the "New American Reality" is one in which Latinas/os are becoming an increasingly large piece of an existing American cultural puzzle, Telemundo's "The Shift" suggests that Latinas/os have fundamentally transformed this puzzle. It equates the rising Latina/o population with "something big…real change," akin to seeing "mankind go from horse and buggy, to the man on the moon…from paper and ink to pixel and mouse." This shift "magically changes the world and changes ourselves in the process." Importantly, the shift ushered in by Latinas/os is presented as an all-encompassing cultural, linguistic, ethnoracial, economic, and political phenomenon. That is, it is "a shift from tricky segmentation to a new comfortable plurality…from one language to two." Moreover, "Hispanic babies being born this very minute are like knights in shining armor, riding in to save the aging American boomer, replenishing the nation with an endless source of talent, passion, hard work, and rhythm." Racially, "Hispanic is Brown and White and Black and blonde and so much more." The commercial ends by suggesting not only that the "next big American star" could be Hispanic," but invokes the notion that "one day in a not too distant future, a hard working mother's wildest dream [will] come to life right before your eyes" when we elect the first Latina/o president.

---

[22] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pQnhuj11zgI, accessed October 2015.
[23] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIPgv3dO1AA, accessed October 2015.

Like the Univision ad, which elides the complexities of Latinas/os by promoting the image of the ideal bilingual/bicultural Latina/o, Telemundo posits a comprehensive shift that elides the regime of deportation, detention, incarceration, segregation, and structural inequality across institutions that characterizes contemporary U.S. Latina/o experiences. This is to be expected based on Telemundo's efforts to forge an optimistic view of Latina/o identity and its potential value. Thus, Telemundo represents Latinas/os as multilingual and racially hybrid in order to suggest that they embody "a new comfortable plurality" capable of "replenishing the nation." As highly profitable Hispanic media outlets, Telemundo and Univision must continually promote the emergent and increasing value of the very population that has produced billions of dollars for them over several decades (Dávila, 2012[2001]). In this sense, they are like any corporate entities, which must stake a claim to their ongoing viability and profitability. However, the aspect of their efforts which interests me here is the centrality of the linguistic metaphor of translation on which they rely, as well as the various ways in which they invoke images of Latinas/os in relation to particular American pasts, presents, and futures. They attempt to forge a social tense in which Latinas/os legitimately inhabit an American here and now, whether as a piece of the existing puzzle (for Univision) or a transformation of that puzzle (for Telemundo). The mobilization of this social tense legitimates advertisers' contemporary investments. Yet, for all of the ongoing profitability of Latinas/os, there is still the felt need not simply to promote the value of this identity but also to translate cultural difference into potential capital. This involves a chronotopic framing in which Latinas/os are positioned as a population whose time is always on the cusp of arriving, but never quite here.

Telemundo and Univision mobilize notions of translation to render Latinas/os raciolinguistically intelligible as a consumer group of increasing importance regardless of the broader forms of marginalization and inequality they face. This critique of the relationship between Latina/o demographics and marginalization is captured by a 2012 Public Service Announcement that emphasizes rather than erases differences between English and Spanish use among Latinas/os and non-Latinas/os. The PSA was created by the group Movimiento Hispano, a project "aimed at increasing Latino civic engagement and voter turnout."[24] It features Lin-Manuel Miranda, a Tony Award-winning Puerto Rican composer and recent recipient of a MacArthur "genius" grant. The PSA's title, "Found in Translation,"[25] presents a subversive take on translation not simply as a practice of replicating messages in different codes but rather as a way in which to draw attention to inequalities in power and positionality. In the PSA, Miranda delivers a spoken word poetry message about the nation's shifting demographics and the importance of the Latina/o vote. The almost exclusively English language message is subtitled in Spanish, with the subtitles initially functioning as a conventional translation of Miranda's speech, but the two scripts quickly diverge:

Spoken	Subtitle	Translation
When is a minority no longer a minority?	¿Cuándo una minoría deja de ser una minoría?	–
When those in power make our issues a priority.	No soy famoso, no soy Ricky Martin ni Thalía.	I am not famous, I am neither Ricky Martin nor Thalía.
Well here's your lead story America,	Pero tenemos que votar, y todavía	But we have to vote, and still
There's already 50 million Latinos here and counting.	No entiendo por qué no votamos como si fuéramos la mayoría.	I don't understand why we don't vote as though we were the majority.
Hi Majority!	Nuestra gente representa el 12% de ejército,	Our people represent 12% of the army,
When's a majority no longer a majority?	Somos 50 millones y creciendo.	We are 50 million and growing.
It's not about supremacy, superiority.	¿Pero solo votamos el 7%	But we only vote at 7%
When you don't vote, you forfeit your authority,	por la gente que nos mandan a la Guerra? No, lo siento.	for the people who send us to war? No, I'm sorry.
your right to complain about those viejos with seniority.	Quiero cambiar como nos ven en nuestro país.	I want to change how they see us in our country.
I want Latinos to declare their independence.	El día después de la elección, quiero que los reporteros	The day after the election, I want the reporters to
I want to flood the ballot box for our descendants.	miren los numeros y digan, 'los latinos la diferencia fueron	see the numbers and say, "The Latinos made the difference
I'm sick of politicians sticking immigrant	en estas elecciones.	in these elections.
next to Latino and illegal	Cambiaron el mundo.'	They changed the world."
like they're synonyms in every sentence.	Bueno, dale "rewind" a este video.	Okay, press rewind on this video.
We've had our time being minorities now let's be seen.	Si hablas ingles, traduce lo que dije.	If you speak English, translate what I said.
Tell this country what you want and what you mean.	Pero, tienes que votar.	But you have to vote.
You have to vote, no one else can intervene on your behalf.	Por favor.	Please.
Man, they can't even read the bottom of the screen.	Para que nos entiendan.	So that they can understand us.

Whereas the spoken script, which is primarily in English, alternately addresses Latinas/os and non-Latinas/os (e.g. "Well here's your lead story America, there's already 50 million Latinas/os here and counting" vs. We've had our time being minorities now let's be seen"), the Spanish subtitles are exclusively directed toward Latinas/os. The Latina/o-oriented Spanish subtitles acknowledge that not all people who can read them are bilingual Spanish-English users (e.g., "Si hablas ingles,

---

[24] http://hispanicmovement.org/index.php/en/about-us, accessed October 2015.
[25] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WujDcO1OQu0, accessed October 2015.

traduce lo que dije." [If you speak English, translate what I said.]). Thus, this representation can be potentially understood as a quadruple voiced raciolinguistic discourse to be consumed by non-Latina/o monolingual English users, Latina/o monolingual English users, Latina/o Spanish-English bilinguals, and Latina/o monolingual Spanish users. This PSA delivers an emphatic message about the importance of the Latina/o vote while also speaking to disparate audiences whose perspectives are understood to be fundamentally distinct from one another. Crucially, it flips the script on the act of privileging English as the spoken language and relegating Spanish to the subtitles by subversively using Spanish to offer an in-group message that doubles down on and amplifies the critiques offered in English. Miranda constructs alternative chronotopes and social tenses to stake a claim to the contemporary legitimacy and power of Latina/o language practices and identities.

These various representations illustrate the precarious temporality of U.S. Latinas/os. Efforts to emphasize the value of Latina/o identities are constrained by the notion that Latinas/os are a population of future rather than present significance, as well as anxieties surrounding Latina/o raciolinguistic distinctiveness. The English and Spanish languages play a key role in Univision's efforts to render Latinas/os legible as Americans, Telemundo's efforts to highlight how Latinas/os renew the American dream, and Movimiento Hispano's efforts to contest contemporary Latina/o marginalization. These distinct approaches to translating Latina/o identities to broader American publics demonstrate how chronotopes and social tenses are central to raciolinguistic projections of American pasts, presents, and futures.

7. Conclusion

In this article I have sought to rethink demographic discourses of U.S. raciolinguistic futures by pointing to the ways that these representations racialize language and legitimate contemporary Latina/o marginalization. Whereas the Spanish language and bilingualism are framed as backwards problems to be overcome when contextualized in relation to Latinas/os, these linguistic emblems are framed as valuable contemporary and future assets when contextualized in relation to normative Whiteness. As these chronotopic constructions circulate alongside projections of the future Latina/o population, they are structured by social tenses that erase Latina/o histories and naturalize present inequalities with which Latinas/os are faced. The racialization of language that organizes these dynamics demonstrates the powerful implications of raciolinguistic models of personhood.

By infusing the concepts of chronotope and social tense with a raciolinguistic perspective, it becomes possible to understand how Latina/o language practices are stigmatized in relation to normative timescales of American assimilation and multiculturalism. Based on these normative timescales, assimilation is framed as a straightforward matter of self-identification as American across generations, and English is framed as a straightforward sign of assimilation to normative Americanness. These modes of assimilation are often represented as processes of joining an American multicultural melting pot along with previously racialized groups. Comparisons of Latinas/os with earlier waves of predominantly European immigrants overlook the ways that European immigrants came to be positioned racially as White and included in hegemonic constructions of Americanness. Thus, assimilation is not simply a matter of self-identification, but instead a reflection of structural inequalities that position populations as more or less ideally American regardless of their self-identification. For U.S. Latinas/os, these inequalities are reflected in sites such as citizenship, housing, employment, health, education, and criminal justice. Contrary to the normative assimilationist narrative, embrace of the English language has done little to guarantee equal access to these institutional settings for the millions of U.S. Latinas/os, African Americans, and other racialized peoples who might be U.S. citizens and identify as monolingual English users, yet still face profound experiences of exclusion. Thus, we must pay close attention to the racialization of U.S. Latinas'/os' Spanish *and* English language use. This involves a critique of the promotion of English language learning or access to citizenship as the magic bullets that will eradicate Latina/o societal marginalization, as well as a critique of assimilation more broadly as a racializing process that ranks groups as more and less worthy of full citizenship.

Among analysts of language and culture it is now commonplace to recognize that ideas about language are never simply about language, but we are only beginning to collectively understand the ways that ideas about language are often anchored in conceptions of race (Reyes and Lo, 2009; Alim and Reyes, 2011; Dick and Wirtz, 2011). This article is an intended contribution to this burgeoning literature, with an emphasis on the powerful role that temporality plays in organizing raciolinguistic representations, embodiments, and practices.

Acknowledgments

References

Agha, A., 2007. Recombinant selves in mass mediated spacetime. Lang. Commun. 27 (3), 320–335.

Alim, H.S., Reyes, A., 2011. Complicating race: articulating race across multiple social dimensions. Discourse Soc. 22 (4), 379–384.

Alim, H.S., Smitherman, G., 2012. Articulate While Black: Barack Obama, Language, and Race in the US. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Bakhtin, M.M., 1981. Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel. In: Holquist, M. (Ed.), The Dialogic Imagination. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX, pp. 84–258.

Bauman, R., Briggs, C., 2003. Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Chavez, L., 2008. The Latino Threat: Constructing Immigrants, Citizens, and the Nation. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Dávila, A., 2008. Latino Spin: Public Image and the Whitewashing of Race. New York University Press, New York.

Dávila. 2012[2001]. Latinos, Inc.: The Marketing and Making of a People. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Dick, H., 2010. Imagined lives and modernist chronotopes in mexican nonmigrant discourse. Am. Ethnol. 37 (2), 275–290.

Dick, H., Wirtz, K., 2011. Racializing discourses. J. Linguist. Anthropol. 21 (S1), E2–E10.

Flores, N., Rosa, J., 2015. Undoing appropriateness: raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. Harv. Educ. Rev. 85 (2), 149–171.

Goldberg, D.T. (Ed.), 2002. The Racial State. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, MA.

Hill, J., 1998. Language, race, and white public space. Am. Anthropol. 100 (3), 680–689.

Hill, J., 2008. The Everyday Language of White Racism. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA.

Inoue, M., 2006. Vicarious Language: Gender and Linguistic Modernity in Japan. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Irvine, J., Gal, S., 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Kroskrity, P. (Ed.), Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities. School of Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe, NM, pp. 35–84.

Lo, A., Kim, A., 2011. Manufacturing citizenship: metapragmatic framings of language competencies in media images of mixed race men in South Korea. Discourse Soc. 22 (4), 440–457.

Parmentier, R.J., 2007. It's about time: on the semiotics of temporality. Lang. Commun. 27 (3), 272–277.

Perrino, S., 2007. Cross-chronotope alignment in senegalese oral narrative. Lang. Commun. 27 (3), 227–244.

Povinelli, E., 2011. Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Reyes, A., Lo, A. (Eds.), 2009. Beyond Yellow English: Towards a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Rosa, J., 2015. Looking like a Language, Sounding like a Race: Inequality and Ingenuity in the Learning of Latina/o Identities. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK (Forthcoming).

Santa Ana, O., 2002. Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.

Silverstein, M., 1999. NIMBY goes linguistic: conflicted "voicings" from the culture of local language communities. In: Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society 35, Part 2, Papers from the Panels. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, pp. 101–123.

Silverstein, M., 2003. The whens and wheres – as well as hows – of ethnolinguistic recognition. Public Cult. 15 (3), 531–557.

Silverstein, M., 2005. Axes of evals: token versus type interdiscursivity. J. Linguist. Anthropol. 15 (1), 6–22.

Torres-Saillant, S., 2003. Inventing the race: Latinos and the ethnoracial pentagon. Lat. Stud. 1 (1), 123–151.

Urciuoli, B., 1996. Exposing Prejudice: Puerto Rican Experiences of Language, Race, and Class. Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Williams, B., 1989. A class act: anthropology and the race to nation across ethnic terrain. Annu. Rev. Anthropol., 401–444.

Wirtz, K., 2011. Cuban performances of blackness as the timeless past still among us. J. Linguist. Anthropol. 21 (s1), E11–E34.

Woolard, K.A., 1989. Sentences in the language prison: the rhetorical structuring of an American language policy debate. Am. Ethnol. 16, 268–278.

Woolard, K.A., 2004. Is the past a foreign country?: time, language origins, and the nation in early modern Spain. J. Linguist. Anthropol. 14 (1), 57–80.

Zentella, A.C., 2007. "Dime con quién hablas, y te diré quién eres": linguistic (in)security and Latina/o identity. In: Flores, J., Rosaldo, R. (Eds.), A Companion to Latina/o Studies. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA, pp. 25–38.

Zentella, A.C., 2009[2002]. Latin@ languages and identities. In: Suárez-Orozco, M.M., Páez, M.M. (Eds.), Latinos: Remaking America. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, pp. 21–35.