

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: THE RHETORIC OF MULTILINGUAL
ACTIVISM IN THE FACE OF CITIZENSHIP
EXCESS

Dara Liling, Master of Arts, 2018

Thesis Co-Directed By: Dr. Scott Wible, Professional Writing Program
Dr. Jessica Enoch, Academic Writing Program

This project investigates the visual rhetoric of multilingual activism campaigns (2016-present) that advocate for more inclusive citizenship. Specifically, it examines how multilingual movements can increase cross-cultural identification, alter expectations of public spaces, and link previously unconnected community members. Looking at lawn signs, pins, and public art, this project supports a framework that erasure and negative identity construction work together to exclude minority groups from obtaining and enacting cultural citizenship; campaigns that introduce non-dominant languages into linguistic landscapes and construct positive cultural identities through identification can mitigate the threats of cultural citizenship excess.

THE RHETORIC OF MULTILINGUAL ACTIVISM IN THE FACE OF
CITIZENSHIP EXCESS

by

Dara Liling

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2018

Advisory Committee:
Professor Scott Wible, Co-Chair
Professor Jessica Enoch, Co-Chair
Professor Chanon Adsanatham

© Copyright by
Dara Liling
2018

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | II |
| LIST OF FIGURES | III |
| INTRODUCTION: AQUÍ ESTAMOS | 1 |
| Issues of Citizenship | 5 |
| Language as Culture, Culture as Citizenship..... | 9 |
| Linguistic Landscapes..... | 14 |
| Identification..... | 17 |
| Conclusion | 21 |
| CHAPTER 1: THE NEIGHBOR SIGN AS MULTILINGUAL PRINT-VERBAL ACTIVISM..... | 24 |
| The Neighborhood: Conceptualizing the Landscape..... | 27 |
| Combating Erasure to Alter the Linguistic Landscape..... | 31 |
| Constructing Identities that Spur Identification..... | 32 |
| Conclusion | 34 |
| CHAPTER 2: THE FRIEND PIN A MULTILINGUAL MOBILE ACTIVISM | 37 |
| Identification..... | 40 |
| Linguistic Landscape | 42 |
| Cross-Cultural Discourse | 43 |
| Conclusion | 44 |
| CHAPTER 3: <i>SUEÑOS</i> AS MULTILINGUAL PUBLIC ARTIVISM..... | 46 |
| Latinx Artivism..... | 47 |
| Artivism Ecologies..... | 50 |
| Time and Space..... | 55 |
| Critical Dialogue Through Linguistic Confrontation | 60 |
| Celebration..... | 63 |
| Conclusion | 67 |
| CONCLUSION: NO NOS VAMOS | 71 |
| Key Takeaways..... | 71 |
| Expanding the Linguistic Landscape..... | 74 |
| Additions to Identification..... | 77 |
| Further Research Opportunities | 79 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 82 |

This Table of Contents is automatically generated by MS Word, linked to the Heading formats used within the Chapter text.

List of Figures

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1: Neighbor Sign..... | 24 |
| Figure 2: Friend Pin..... | 39 |
| Figure 3: Sueños by Edgar Reyes..... | 47 |

Introduction: Aquí Estamos

It is a November night in Baltimore. Donald Trump has just been named the president-elect and the streets are flooded with protestors and their passionate outrage. As the mass pushes forward, chants confronting an array of political and social issues ring throughout the streets. The majority of the chants verbalize English slogans, such as “Black Lives Matter.” But then the group picks up a chant that many of the English-speaking protestors must pause to translate: “Aquí estamos. No nos vamos” (“*We are here. We are not leaving*”), advocating for Latinx rights, which had taken great heat during the president-elect’s campaign. Charles Stewart and his colleagues note that protest slogans are sometimes affirmative, that they assert characteristics inherent to the group’s self-worth, such as the gay rights slogan “I am your worst fear, I am your best fantasy” (177). The force of declaring oneself a “worst fear” or a “best fantasy” is undeniable. These labels radiate with power and intrigue. But what are the implications of declaring oneself *here*, a label that may not seem immediately jarring, especially compared to those affirmed by other groups?

But when considering this seemingly straightforward Spanish slogan in conjunction with analyses of Latinx citizenship, the some of its significance comes to light. Despite being the largest minority group in the United States, Latinxs have historically been both inadvertently and systematically excluded from public and political spheres. So while simply being present and not leaving is not as striking as being a best fantasy, it might be a necessary starting point for a group that has largely been ignored – or made invisible – in their fight for human rights.

Beyond the message itself, the protestors' language usage was also a notable move. The choice to introduce Spanish, a marked language, into the otherwise English monolingual public space indicates a push against harmful societal constructs reflective of the protest's overall purpose. Using marked language in public spaces often displays an attempt to change the status quo (Pavlenko & Blackledge). If we accept the premise that activism uses persuasive means to change (or maintain) the status quo, then the use of Spanish in the traditionally English public sphere can be interpreted as activism combatting the status quo that bounded into visibility with Trump's victory: discrimination against and denial of cultural citizenship for ethnic minorities who are marked by non-dominant languages. So when Latinx protestors publicly declare that they are here to stay, they are directly opposing harmful agendas that brought the new political leaders to power: closed borders, deportation, and general acts of discrimination against ethnic minorities that prevent Latinx individuals from living *here*. When they make this declaration in Spanish, they are dictating the terms on which they will remain here, terms that preserve their culture, despite efforts to erase it from society.

These potential in-group functions of multilingual activism – opposing out-group bigotry, displaying agency in overcoming oppression, and celebrating culture – are often only one aspect of resistance. Another involves persuading out-groups to share in the cause. A core premise of activism is its reliance on persuasion, and persuasion typically rests in identification, “to persuade a man by identifying your cause with his interests” (Burke, 24). In a traditional conceptualization of identification, a shared language between the two parties seems to be an assumed

precursor, and necessity. When the persuader and their audience share an actual language, the former can more readily utilize that lingo appeals to the latter. A shared language also creates a more immediately perceivable façade of shared values and experience. Burke says, “You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your ways with his” (55). While Burke means “language” as diction rather than lexicon (i.e. Arabic, English, etc.), this unquestioned usage reveals an ignored facet of persuasive communication; the orator cannot advance to the other aforementioned modes of persuasion (order, attitude, idea) without a shared lexicon.

If a shared language is the assumed starting point for identification and therefore persuasion, how can activism – using available means of persuasion to publicly alter undesirable status quo – unfold between multiple linguistic communities? How can multilingual activism campaigns advance in a seemingly monolingual society and how do altering public spaces via these campaigns forward group aims?

The Spanish protest chants offer one possibility for cross-linguistic identification in activism; this was in part evidenced when monolingual English-speakers began to join in despite not personally belonging to the Spanish-speaking in-group of this chant. The chants served as a genre that allowed members of multiple linguistic communities to form a larger coalition for Latinx rights, an act of identification. But the question still remains of how identification can occur outside of these moments of cross-cultural contact that in-the-streets protests afford, when

chanting is no longer a primary rhetorical genre and messages must be spread through other mediums.

To begin to answer this lingering question, I turn to multilingual activism campaigns from 2016 to present that are grounded in visual and print-verbal rhetoric. The choice to focus on visual and verbal rhetoric is due to such rhetoric's (semi)permanence, compared to the fleeting nature of an oral exchange. By contrast, multilingual verbal and visual rhetoric alters public spaces for sustained periods of time. Additionally, visual and print-verbal rhetoric permeates a wider array of spaces, beyond busy streets and town centers. To solidify the value in altering public spaces, I turn to linguistic landscape scholarship, which is valuable in conveying how observable language depictions symbolize power structures, accepted paradigms, and community values. I pair this scholarship with Krista Ratcliffe's work on rhetorical listening. Designated as a mode of cross-cultural identification, rhetorical listening helps conceive how communities are formed across cultural boundaries in these newly altered landscapes. By pairing linguistic landscape scholarship with scholarship on cultural citizenship and cross-cultural identification, I arrive at a cohesive framework that suggests how altering linguistic landscapes via multilingual visual and print-verbal activism campaigns forwards essential aims of linguistic minority communities.

In the remainder of this introduction, I provide an overview of scholarship on cultural citizenship, identification, and linguistic landscapes in order to lend form to the citizenship excess that linguistic minorities face, a key concern of many multilingual activism campaigns. Then, I explicate how altering linguistic landscapes

can promote identifications and support other aims of activists fighting citizenship excess. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 then put this theoretical framework into action as I turn to specific multilingual activism campaigns. Chapter 2 focuses on a multilingual verbal campaign, a neighborhood lawn sign that has altered the linguistic landscape of residential spaces. Chapter 3, a short sister chapter to its predecessor, investigates the affordances of multilingual verbal campaigns that are mobile: pins that circulated throughout an Idaho campus. Chapter 4 shifts our attention to the combined visual and verbal rhetoric of multilingual art activism, honing in on an installation, *Sueños* by Edgar Reyes, erected at a Baltimore community art event. Overall, these chapters extend the value in using linguistic landscape and rhetorical listening frameworks to investigate public spaces that allow for community agency (neighborhoods, universities, and community art events). They also strengthen the connection between linguistic landscapes and conceptions of citizenship.

Issues of Citizenship

Citizenship is a fundamental backdrop of multilingual activism, though not in the legal sense that one might assume when discussing contemporary activism. Rather, the campaigns I investigate fight for increased qualitative citizenship. When citizenship is confined to the legal realm, it is a binary; an individual is either documented or undocumented. This is a life-changing distinction for those involved in legal battles over immigration status. Advocating for increased avenues to legal citizenship is inarguably a goal of many multilingual activism campaigns. However, this legal binary does not explain widespread discrimination against speakers of non-dominant languages who are documented immigrants or U.S. natives.

Scholarship in the social sciences and humanities argues for more fluid, interpretive, and qualitative concepts of citizenship, employing labels such as cultural citizenship or a discourse theory of citizenship. A term first introduced by Renato Rosaldo, cultural citizenship refers to “a range of social practices which, taken together, claim and establish a distinct social space for Latinos in this country” (Flores & Benmayor, 1). A common example would be participating in Spanish Language Media. While the term cultural citizenship has been most widely adopted by the Latinx community of scholars, its core principles appear in other scholarship, as well. Robert Asen, who also looks to more “fluid, multimodal, and quotidian” (203) concepts of citizenship without any focus on particular population sectors, proposes constituting citizenship as a range of practices as well. He envisions a discourse theory of citizenship grounded in civic engagement as “a process that may encompass a number of different activities” and “redirects our attention from acts to action” (191). For example, when these actions lead to more voices entering public discourse, they may be considered acts of citizenship. Through this framework, we can perceive protestors creating opportunities for Spanish chants to dominant U.S. streets as an act of citizenship. Other scholarship on qualitative citizenship also epitomizes civic engagement, participation in community groups and public discourse (Rosaldo; Flores & Benmayor; Schildkraut). Through this brief survey of qualitative notions of citizenship, we see how citizenship is not always grounded in a legal binary at the mercy of institutions. Such cultural or discursive conceptions are valuable for all marginalized cultural groups, not just Latinx communities, because they deemphasize dominant notions of citizenship controlled by majority groups in

power. They also show how acts that hinder voices and identities from entering public discourse violate citizenship.

As qualitative notions of citizenship suggest, even outside of the legal realm not everyone has equal access to modes of citizenship. Hector Amaya outlines the concept of citizenship excess to counter a “generous” (19) idea of egalitarian cultural citizenships. Citizenship excess captures how “some cultural and political currencies are worth more than others, and this worth is dependent on the elevation of the value of these currencies at the expense of others” (Amaya, 20). In other words, unified, all-inclusive modes do not exist, and those that align with dominant structures are privileged above those that are marked by non-dominant attributes, such as minority languages. For example, while contributing to media publications may be deemed an act of citizenship, contributing to Spanish Language Media may hold less stature (less valued currency) than contributing to a mainstream English publication. Citizenship excess also captures the inherent benefits of being a citizen in the qualitative sense. Amaya postulates some intrinsic benefits of citizenship: “the possibility of equality, the powerful feelings of national membership and togetherness, the wonderful sense of duty and responsibility that is part of civics, and the optimistic view that we can change citizenship, expand it to include the have-nots, and open our borders as if they were the open arms of a welcoming nation” (19). Though he ultimately deems these benefits unrealistic, they capture the pride and empowerment that can come with citizenship. Citizenship excess hinders an individual or group from achieving these intrinsic benefits. Renato Rosaldo identifies three extrinsic values of citizenship, ways that the citizen intersects with the state: redistribution of resources, recognition, and

responsiveness. Citizenship excess may result in deficits of resources (such as employment opportunities), recognition (such as positive media coverage), and responsiveness (such as that from political representatives or law enforcement). In all, we see that citizenship, even in the qualitative sense, offers intrinsic and extrinsic benefits and when avenues toward citizenship are hindered, opportunities to reap these benefits become detrimentally obstructed.

As Amaya and other scholars who contemplate qualitative notions of citizenship suggest, citizenship excess holds deep-seated roots in U.S. society. Amaya goes as far as to assert that “Latina/o erasure is so common in mainstream ways of imagining the nation, the state, and the national community that it is possible to argue that ethnonationalism is the basis of most U.S. ways of imagining politics and citizenship” (Amaya, 31). Excess of minority voices is a status quo. Deborah Schildkraut, who adds richness to understandings of U.S. citizenship ideologies, found through focus groups that about 16% of participants grounded notions of what it means to be American in ethnoculturalism, that citizenship is based on immutable characteristics, typically being white, male, Protestant, and of Northern European decent. While other conceptions of citizenship proved more prevalent than ethnoculturalism in Schildkraut’s study, this portion is too extensive to disregard. This finding implies that citizenship excess does not only plague Latinx communities, but other minority groups who do not fit this ethnocultural construct.

So if we accept the premise of activism being attempts to change the status quo through available means of persuasion, and citizenship excess is a norm in portions of United States society, then we can reason that attempts to combat this excess and alter

dominant perceptions of citizenship should be considered activism. But how can citizenship excess be combatted and how does this connect with my initial inquiry into language diversity? To answer these questions, we must look more closely at how citizenship excess proliferates in society. In the upcoming section, I will investigate how citizenship excess prevails through a reciprocal process of negative identity construction and erasure. I will also explicate how through this process language, cultural identity, citizenship, and legal/political functions become nearly inseparable, implying that campaigns grounded in multilingual activism also impact these other major issues.

Language as Culture, Culture as Citizenship

I assert that citizenship excess occurs through a twofold process of negative identity construction and erasure. Given the makeup of U.S. society, this process is often linked to language, specifically those that do not conform to English norms of communication. As the previous research indicates, notions of citizenship are frequently attached to cultural markers that are perceived to create an identity worthy of citizenship. Therefore, to remove people holding certain cultural identities from the label of citizen, these identities must be deemed unworthy or undesirable. Though not the only attribute that gets attacked in this process, non-dominant languages often take the heat. A highly publicized and consequential instance of this comes from the third presidential debate of the 2016 election cycle, when then-candidate Donald Trump campaigned that he would deport the “bad hombres” living in the United States as part of his initiative to close U.S. borders. Trump’s use of the Spanish word

“hombre” in an otherwise monolingual campaign is a marked choice that demonizes Spanish speakers. In the larger context of this debate response, Trump links Spanish speakers with illegal drug activity, projecting an identity of Spanish speakers as at-odds with American conceptions of a worthy citizen. This constructed identity then justifies his claim that they are deserving of deportation.

A second example can be observed on the nationalist grassroots organization Help Save Maryland’s website. Help Save Maryland is an organization with the mission “to eliminate the use of our tax-dollars on programs and services for illegal aliens in Maryland.” Their mission statement contains an eight-point bulleted list including “expedite removal of illegal alien gang members, criminals and immigration law violators,” “[e]nhance and enforce housing, parking and loitering code violations,” and “[e]nd school overcrowding and hospital financial burdens.” The final bullet on this list of core initiatives is to “Make English the Official Language of Maryland,” a point which holds minor, if any, discernable link to their overall mission of diverting tax dollars from undocumented immigrants. Linguist Norman Fairclough asserts, ““Where one has lists, one has things placed in connection, but without any indication of the precise nature of the connection”” (qtd. Blackledge, 79). The ambiguous connection leaves audience members to form one themselves, a space in which negative or inaccurate, though perhaps intended, associations can rise. Applying this concept to Help Save Maryland’s mission points, we see how the group constructs an identity of speakers of other languages as problematic to English-speaking U.S. citizens. They associate non-dominant languages with the other anxieties on the list – gang violence, law breaking, and

overcrowding. By extension, speakers of other languages are gang members, criminals, and financial burdens. Through these examples, we see how cultural identity constructs collide with official policies and legal initiatives, including English-only legislation and strict immigration laws.

English-only policies tend to surge during times of increased ethnic diversity in the United States, the earliest example being the suppression of slaves' native languages (Borden, 229). Debates around this ideology grew in the late 1980's and 1990's when state laws were passed declaring English the only official language. Legal suppression of multilingualism has persisted into the turn of the 21st century with laws like California Proposition 227 of 1998 and Arizona Proposition 203 of 2000, both which restricted schools from implementing bilingual instruction and instead required English immersion for English Language Learners (Padilla et. al 120). In response to such initiatives, a 2010 position statement titled "Position Statement on Racism, Anti-Immigration, and Linguistic Intolerance" by the International Writing Center Association (IWCA) states that the organization is "deeply distressed" by legislation including Oklahoma's declaration of English as the official language, which they link to "a rising tide of implicit and explicit racism expressed as anti-immigration fervor and linguistic intolerance." IWCA's concerns of implicit and explicit racism at play are hard to mitigate when looking closely at some of this legislation. For instance, when Carbon County, Pennsylvania enacted an official-English resolution in 1997, the county had "very few non-English speakers and did not print any bilingual materials" (Schildkraut, 3). This suggests that the resolution was more a testament to community values of citizenship that exclude speakers of

non-dominant languages, rather than a push for changes that were perceived to improve the community's ability to efficiently operate. We might extend this conclusion to the other English-only legislation, as well. When minority identities are constructed as not belonging or being unworthy of various privileges, initiative that hinder their ability to exist in society can be enacted with less resistance.

These pieces of English-only legislation are all grounded in erasure, the second component of citizenship excess. Erasure can be defined as removing cultural capital from public discourse and spaces. The previous examples display erasure of cultural capital, language, from tangible and intangible public exchanges. For instance, Spanish will no longer be spoken in classrooms and government documents or business signs will no longer be printed in Spanish. We can even observe erasure in recent actions of the national government through the Trump Administration's removal of Spanish from the White House website in 2017. While this is not an official policy, it is still a clear administrative statement about who the government should serve and who should have access to government – English speakers. It makes an implicit statement about Spanish speakers' identities, that they are not deserving of inclusion in political deliberation. That they should not be *here*.

Through these examples, we see how identity construction and erasure form a reciprocal process and how they make implicit or explicit statements about citizenship. Use of non-dominant languages becomes equivocated to negative qualities of entire linguistic groups. These perceived negative identities then justify denial of cultural citizenship (and often legal citizenship) and erasure from public spaces. In turn, the erasure from public spaces makes a statement about the merit of

their character and deservingness of citizenship and its benefits, including redistribution of resources, recognition, and responsiveness. In addition to showing how citizenship excess proliferates through means that create hostile environments for speakers of non-dominant languages, it also points us toward possibilities for combatting citizenship excess through multilingual activism – limiting or amending negative identity construction and erasure in public spaces. These goals can be supported by altering linguistic landscapes and finding opportunities for cross-linguistic identification, themes that will be central to the campaigns I investigate.

However, before diving into these specific goals, I must clarify some overarching aims of much multilingual activism. Firstly, it is important to note that multilingual activism campaigns serve both out-group and in-group functions – out-groups being monolingual English speakers (particularly those who support English-only initiatives as a step toward citizenship excess) and in-groups being speakers of other languages. (While language is inherently connected to cultural identity so that we might say the in-group consists of cultural or ethnic minorities, the multilingual focus of my project compels me to adopt the classification linguistic minority instead.) When considering the in-group aims of multilingual activism, we must be cognizant of both the intrinsic and the extrinsic. Intrinsically, multilingual activism that alters linguistic landscapes and identity constructions empowers traditionally marginalized groups and celebrates mixed identities. In fact, research on linguistic landscapes discussed in the upcoming section emphasizes that seeing one’s language in public spaces affirms positive self-identities. Extrinsically, multilingual activism may seek to gain benefits of citizenship, outlined by Rosaldo as redistribution of resources, recognition, and

responsiveness. This can also be considered an out-group function as it entails interaction with institutions. Out-group functions, those that result in out-group change, include altering linguistic expectations of public spaces and perceptions of citizenship that exclude speakers of languages other than English. We should not assume causation between in-group and out-group aims. In other words, linguistic minorities' self-affirmation and empowerment does not depend on recognition or acceptance from dominant out-groups. It is also important to note that while multilingual activism may elicit distinct in-group and out-group functions we cannot extend this distinction to the activists themselves. Activists who engage in multilingual campaigns to achieve these aforementioned aims are not exclusively multilingual individuals. In addition to speakers of non-dominant languages, they also include monolingual English-speaking allies and those who believe in more inclusive notions of citizenship.

Linguistic Landscapes

As it becomes apparent how dominant groups promote power inequalities connected to linguistic identity, linguistic landscapes scholarship arises as a logical framework for further investigating how these power dynamics unfold. Linguistic landscape scholarship, a topic of interest to rhetoricians and sociolinguists, uncovers how larger power dynamics play out in observable verbal markers in public spaces. It has expanded from theorizing how the language choices on public signs depict top-down power impositions to the broader study of language and visual markers, such as

graffiti, in public and private environments (Kasanga). It is widely accepted within linguistic landscape scholarship that artifacts that form linguistic landscapes shape subjective interpretations of the spaces in which they exist, reciprocally constructing meaning between the thing and the space (Rubdy). Additionally, signs, other media, and the languages they display hold symbolic significance and tangibly manifest ideologies and values held within the community, including notions of power and prestige. Or as Rubdy puts it in the introduction to his collection *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*, linguistic landscape work “helps create affordances that allow us to forge links between landscape and identity, social order and power” (2). These truisms help explain why, in multilingual societies, seeing one’s language reflected in the linguistic landscape “affects an individual’s positive feelings of membership in the relevant society, whereas the absence provokes a sense of alienation and exclusion” (Kasanga, 124).

When ruminating on these core tenants of linguistic landscape scholarship, it becomes apparent how it is a valuable field for framing my project. It prompts us to look for power structures and ideologies projected in tangible, yet symbolic, ways. It holds true that identities are reflected and shaped within this process. It clarifies that we should be cognizant of an array of artifacts when scoping public linguistic landscapes, and that public can include traditionally private places that are publicly visible (such as a front-facing window). It distinguishes between place, the physical area, and space, subjective interpretations and meanings awarded to a place based on its semiotic features. Finally, it highlights the agency of grassroots groups and individuals, not just ruling bodies, to alter public spaces.

In the upcoming body chapters, I carry on the current trend of qualitative investigation in linguistic landscape scholarship. I will use a qualitative linguistic landscape framework to examine how specific multilingual artifacts alter public spaces and forward the aforementioned aims of multilingual activism. Throughout this investigation, we must keep in mind some general principles of multilingual activism as it intersects with the linguistic landscape, specifically by introducing non-dominant languages into public spaces. I previously posed that citizenship excess arises from two functions: negative identity construction and erasure. As I will argue in the upcoming chapters, introducing non-dominant languages into a linguistic landscape constructs positive identities around their speakers and combats erasure. The previously mentioned English-only legislation and campaigns strive to erase non-dominant languages from public visibility and orality and have been demonstrated to correspond with other detrimental facets of citizenship excess. Additional research has shown that less exposure to non-dominant languages (Spanish in this particular case) correlates to greater support for English-only legislation, which in turn correlates to other nativist preferences, such as stricter immigration laws and denial of benefits to undocumented immigrants (Barker & Giles, 2002). Therefore, introducing non-dominant languages into linguistic landscapes is a form of activism that combats linguistic erasure and its negative consequences. It works toward intrinsic, in-group aims, such as encouraging “positive feelings of membership” (Kasanga). It also works toward out-group aims, including exposing English speakers to non-dominant languages, which makes the language seem less “threatening” (Barker & Giles, 365) and presumably decreases nativist inclinations.

Identification

The final concept to tackle before shifting to specific sites of multilingual activism is the one that starts this investigation: identification. As previously quoted, Burke describes identification as “to persuade a man by identifying your cause with his interests” (Burke, 24). It is a valuable concept for framing persuasion in the public sphere and can readily transfer to qualitative studies of activism. However, in Burke’s incarnation, it does not adequately address issues of linguistic or cultural diversity necessary for studying multilingual protests. This is evidenced in an excerpt he draws from Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* to exemplify “the simplest case of persuasion”: “‘It is not hard,’ says Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric*, quoting Socrates, ‘to praise Athenians among Athenians’” (55). Aristotle has catalogued what traits Athenians value and detest and uses this knowledge to identify with them, utilizing their values (interests) to persuade them of the quality of an individual’s character (his cause). This formative quote highlights that cultural homogeneity drastically aids identification. Burke does cite difference as a catalyst for identification, as “[i]dentification is compensatory to division” (22), but does not address all differences a persuader may encounter, particularly those relevant to this project, nor provide sufficient courses of action for working with differences. In terms of types of difference, he notes that Aristotle discussed employing different commonplaces depending on the age of his audience, but acknowledges that Aristotle’s consideration of audience difference lacks “systematic thoroughness” (64), which may account for some of Burke’s own oversights. When he does tackle audience difference, his insights favor emphasizing

similarities and amputating differences; this may unfold via carving out narrowed audiences or rejecting disagreeable claims in favor of those appealing to the whole. These insights fall short in instances when we do not want to abbreviate our message or segregate our audience, or in matters when ethnic and linguistic diversity is key to our message. However, facilitating identification remains important in activism poised to combat negative identity construction, a factor of citizenship excess, because relating to other humanizes differences and creates shared values and goals that dissimilar individuals can work toward together.

Feminist scholar Krista Ratcliffe pinpoints similar shortcomings in Burke's analysis of identification, and for this reason her work with identification in her 2005 book *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, and Whiteness* proves valuable to my project in the ways it amends the traditional concept of identification to embrace cultural differences. Ratcliffe classifies her theory of rhetorical listening as "a code of cross-cultural conduct" (1). While "cross-cultural conduct" in Ratcliffe's book refers to cross-gender differences or differences that arise along a black-white racial binary, I believe Ratcliffe's work is also useful in matters of linguistic or ethnic diversity.

At the onset of her introduction, Ratcliffe presents Burke's claim that "identification must precede persuasion," and then goes on to probe deeper into the implications and omissions of this claim. She says, "But identifications, especially cross-cultural identifications, are sometimes difficult to achieve. Such identifications may be troubled by history, uneven power dynamics, and ignorance" (1-2). Here Ratcliffe constructively prompts readers to consider how identification might unfold contrarily to traditional expectations in exchanges with diverse actors. When troubled

histories show themselves in today's power dynamics between political, public, and counterpublic spheres, identification is not a one-to-one transaction. One party is giving up more than the other or stretching themselves further to achieve this cross-cultural identification. Ratcliffe proposes a perceptiveness to power structures and unbalanced give-and-take that recalls tenants from linguistic landscape literature, which I will carry through my upcoming analysis.

In addition to the overarching call to observe power difference and resulting unbalanced give-and-take, there are two pieces from Ratcliffe's work on rhetorical listening that are particularly constructive for considering how multilingual activism can spur cross-cultural identification to combat negative identity construction: "locating identifications across commonalities and differences" (32) and listening for the "exiled excess" that falls away in "dysfunctional silence." (25). There is some overlap between these pieces from Ratcliffe's work, the work previously outlined on citizenship by scholars such as Amaya and Rosaldo, and linguistic landscape scholarship by figures including Kasanga and Rubdy. A few positives are brought to light by this overlap. First, it supports the move to meld Ratcliffe's rhetorical listening into a theoretical ecology with citizenship and linguistic landscape scholarship, transferring it from its original diversity focuses to matters of linguistic and ethnic diversity. Second, it reflects the reciprocal nature of the factors that lead to citizenship excess (negative identity construction and erasure) and the interventions (identifications and altering the linguistic landscape). In an oversimplification of the research to follow, if altering the linguistic landscape combats erasure, and identification as imaged by Ratcliffe combats negative identity construction, and as

shown in previous sections erasure and identity construction are interrelated in their causes and effects, it is only logical for the interventions to be related as well.

Negative identity construction and erasure work reciprocally to proliferate citizenship excess. Therefore, we can postulate that identification and altering linguistic landscapes form a reciprocal relationship that guides activism fighting against the status quo of citizenship excess.

Ratcliffe drives us to identify across both commonalities and differences.

When we only identify across commonalities, as traditional identification falls victim, differences inherent to our identities become “displaced and mystified” (53).

Identifying in this way is problematic because it selects and ignores various facets of an individual’s or group’s identity and insinuates that similarities are the only good starting points for communication and persuasion. Identification does not fully occur when we pick and choose which qualities to identify with in others. This is particularly detrimental to multilingual campaigns, in which diversity and difference are motivating factors to be accommodated and celebrated, rather than cast aside or rejected. On the other hand, when we get hung up on only differences, as may occur in a post-modern concept of identification, commonalities seem “impossible or impossibly naïve” (Ratcliffe, 32). We may forget that common ground can be found amidst extensive difference. Instead, identification to the rhetorical listener is a space to “analyze discursive convergences and divergences” which flux in and out and stand in juxtaposition to one another (Ratcliffe, 33). Identification that embraces convergences and divergences is valuable for constructing positive identities in

multilingual activism campaigns and fighting against restrictive notions of citizenship.

Ratcliffe also urges her readers to look for the “exiled excess” in public discourse, a second tenant of rhetorical listening valuable for framing how we interpret the work of multilingual activism. According to Ratcliffe, the “exiled excess” falls away in “dysfunctional silence.” Dysfunctional silence is both a cause and effect of cross-cultural identification failures when actors discourse in an either/or vacuum, only focusing on either commonalities or differences. Ratcliffe’s call to look for the exiled excess aligns with the previous discussion of citizenship excess embedded in erasure of non-dominant languages in public spaces. Listening for the exiled excess is a productive action we can take to begin to combat erasure.

Conclusion

This introduction serves to create a cohesive framework for the driving forces behind multilingual activism campaigns. As research has shown, citizenship excess – excluding groups from qualitative, cultural conceptions of citizenship and the benefits that come along with this label – is a detrimental norm for many linguistic minorities in the United States. Government, grassroots organizations, and individuals may support citizenship excess by constructing negative identities around speakers of non-dominant languages and by erasing these languages and associated identities from public spaces. Spurring identification across commonalities and differences is one key element of accomplishing positive identity construction and inclusive notions of citizenship. Another key element is to be listen for the exiled excess in matters of

linguistic diversity and combat erasures by inserting excessed or exiled languages and identities into linguistic landscapes. Therefore, it stands to reason that multilingual activism that challenges citizenship excess can make strides by publicizing positive identities around speakers of non-dominant languages through identification and alterations to linguistic landscapes. This framework will hold central as we now turn to specific campaigns that set out to accomplish this.

Chapter 1: The Neighbor Sign as Multilingual Print-Verbal Activism

In the aftermath of the 2016 presidential election, many of the signs supporting candidates were removed from their spots on lawns and replaced with variations of another sign, this one reading “No matter where you are from, we are glad you’re our neighbor” in three languages. The English phrase sits in the middle, sandwiched between the same message in two other languages, typically Spanish and Arabic. While the signs usually on display around an election season express the owner’s alliance with a public figure, this multilingual sign, which I will refer to as the Neighbor Sign from here on, expresses a more intimate yet widespread alliance; they express an alliance with all who live in the neighborhood. Despite its local intimacy, this sign has garnered national attention, making appearances in nearly every U.S. region.



Figure 1: Neighbor Sign

The Neighbor Sign originated in Harrisonburg, Virginia, when Pastor Matthew Bucher of the Emmanuel Mennonite Church, became angered by the intolerant rhetoric of the 2016 presidential election, particularly Trump's call for a *Muslim ban* and U.S.-Mexico border wall (Mertens, 2016). Bucher, who is fluent in Arabic after spending four years in Egypt, called on congregant Melissa Howard to paint the message of neighborly love, which resonates with Mennonite values (EMU, 2017). The original black-and-white sign stood outside of the church. Six months later, members of the church began manufacturing the distributable tri-colored prints. Copies of the Neighbor Sign print have traveled to an array of states, including Indiana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Mississippi and California (Mertens, 2016). As demand for these prints continued to grow, the congregation established a "sign team" to field comments and requests, including language substitutions to better reflect various communities' demographics (EMU, 2017).

The Neighbor Sign, a flourishing 2016-2017 multilingual activism campaign, serves as a prime example of community-level, rather than top-down, efforts to alter linguistic landscapes. It also exemplifies how multilingual campaigns can spur identification and advocate for more inclusive notions of citizenships. In examining how the Neighbor Sign alters neighborhood linguistic landscapes in this chapter, I carry on rising trends in linguistic landscape scholarship: investigating grassroots campaigns as deserving of scholarly attention and carrying out such investigations through qualitative research methods that focus on the ecologies that contribute to the sign's rhetoric and vice versa.

In addition to carrying on existing trends, my research extends common scopes of linguistic landscape scholarship. The linguistic landscape canon spawned from studies of commercial or consumerist spaces. While the field is now more comprehensive in terms of spaces deemed worthy of investigation, a large portion of scholarship still centers on commercial landscapes. Yes, there is now a significant library of scholarship that extends this inclination; for example, David Hanauer and Sonia Shiri study signs in public protests (in Baltimore and Tunisia, respectively) and Robert Troyer et. al are noted for their pioneering focus on a small town rather than a metro hub. However, this scholarship (including Troyer et. al's article that mainly discusses small town businesses) still unfolds in places traditionally deemed public. Little linguistic landscape scholarship focuses on spaces traditionally considered private, such as home and lawns. And though some scholars (i.e. Kasanga) acknowledge that these *private* spaces should be part of the linguistic landscape repertoire, they rarely include extensive exploration of specific sites or artifacts that fall into this category. This chapter fills this gap, questioning the traditional division between private residences and public spaces and illuminating why examining these traditionally private spaces productively adds to the field. It argues that publics can be constructed from shared iconography that connects *private* spaces. Finally, this chapter is significant in adding form to the theoretical work of the introduction, which melds linguistic landscape scholarship with matters of identification and citizenship.

The Neighborhood: Conceptualizing the Landscape

Predictably, the neighborhood serves as the backdrop, the landscape, for the Neighbor Sign. The Neighbor Sign exists in many different neighborhoods across the United States, though each one resides in *the neighborhood*. It is vital that we recognize *the neighborhood* as not a place, but a space, signifying that there are widely accepted, culturally-ingrained interpretations of what a neighborhood in the United State is. While specific semiotic markers within *a* neighborhood create a unique *spaceness* for that particular location, such as architecture, there are also less tangible markers that inform nationwide understandings of neighborhoods.

Common conceptions of *the neighborhood* paint it as an area of residence that envelops families and households sharing similar characteristics. These similarities might include class, race, or ethnicity. In envisioning the stereotypical suburban neighborhood, the pride of mid-twentieth century America, it is common to elicit clichéd images of white picket fences and residents whose skins share a homogenous white hue. When specific neighborhoods are associated with ethnic minorities, they are generally still conceptualized as dominated by one uniform culture. If these neighborhoods are to be viewed in an attractive light by the ethnic majority, it is often by virtue of their commercial industries, such as Little Italy or Chinatown. Visitors might exploit a particular neighborhood for its food or its commerce, industries that come to iconize the neighborhood and the culture associated with it as a whole. These conceptions detach ethnic (linguistic) minorities

from purely residential spaces, characterizing them as service providers, but not as residents or neighbors.

This exclusionary and homogenous conception of the neighborhood becomes verbalized in the saying, “There goes the neighborhood,” which spiked in printed usage after the Civil Rights Movements and desegregation. The saying generally denotes one’s exacerbation over what they perceive as their neighborhood’s decreasing quality. As suggested by its sharp increase in popularity after desegregation, this perceived diminished quality is commonly linked to an influx of racial or ethnic minorities. Before the demographic shift, it was a place where people of dominant groups belonged. It was not a space for cross-cultural interaction.

The exclusionary intention of this saying has been noted and sarcastically reclaimed by minority groups and allies in contemporary media. Ali Noorani of the National Immigration Forum published a widely acclaimed book in 2017 titled *There Goes the Neighborhood: How Communities Overcome Prejudice and Meet the Challenge of American Immigration*. He wraps up the book’s first chapter, in which he laments the DREAM Act’s failure to pass the 2002 senate vote, by reflecting, “Right now, too many Americans – and media – assume, ‘There goes the neighborhood’ when immigrants become a part of their communities. Until conservative white America sees the cultural (and demographic) changes to their neighborhoods as a net positive to their lives, this will remain the assumption and the identity wars will only worsen” (37). Here Noorani outlines the xenophobia captured by this saying and follows it with a plea for white Americans to embrace, rather than repel, cultural diversity in neighborhoods. In another incarnation of the saying, the

anti-nativist research and advocacy organization Center for New Community publishes a weekly online segment called “There Goes the Neighborhood.” In this publication, members announce upcoming nativist events, both to alert those living in the area who might be endangered and to broadcast to the larger public that these events are coming to fruition and need to be confronted. In a personal interview, Center for New Community Executive Director Terri Johnson spoke to the segment’s ironic title:

[“There Goes the Neighborhood” is] turning an old racist saying on its head. There was this notion for a lot of people, probably still is, that when people move in, the neighborhood is changed for the worst because you’ve got brown people or people who speak different languages or people who worship differently or any number of the ways we separate ourselves. And [we are] calling that out – that neighborhood change is not bad and neither is the idea that the country is becoming more and more diverse. The idea that sameness and separation is better than the alternative has to be challenged all the time because we don’t do well, as a country, with change.

Echoing Johnson’s statement of challenging racism, much of Center for New Community’s website echoes a mission of improving neighborhoods and communities by combatting nativism. For example, their About page indicates that they strive to “defeat anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim hate,” “dismantle racism,” and “expose the architects of contemporary organized racism.” Other initiatives are phrased in the affirmative and identify actions that can counteract these negative forces, such as “mak[ing] real the vision and promise of a truly democratic, open and just society.” This vision of a truly democratic society implies a call for more inclusive notions of citizenship, as this vision likely refers to democracy in a discursive, civic sense, rather than purely political.

Noorani's and Johnson's discussions around the phrase "there goes the neighborhood," as well as Center from New Community's website, exemplify the limiting dominant ideologies that conceptualize the neighborhood. The neighborhood or community is widely viewed as a space under the jurisdiction of cultural majority members; it is a space resistant to change, especially in matters of ethnic, religious, or linguistic diversity, and to immigration in general; it is a space where differences are perceived as "foreignness" in a way harmful to those marked as different. This neighborhood conception is riddled with citizenship excess – erasure and negative identity construction. When defining *the neighborhood*, we are also defining *the neighbor*. By extension, the neighbor is also a member of the cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic majority. When we craft ideas of who is a neighbor, we inherently define who is not a neighbor, those who do not fit this singular identity. We erase those who do not fit from the neighbor narrative. When we make a statement about who belongs in neighborhood spaces and erase those who do not, we simultaneously construct a negative identity of un-neighborhoodness. It constructs these erased identities as mutually exclusive with qualities commonly associated with neighbors, such as kindness, compassion, and responsibility. If citizenship includes, among other affordances, civic engagement and discourse with the community, as well as responsiveness and recognition from the community, then neighbor excess is a form of citizenship excess. So what actions have been taken to combat this neighbor/citizenship excess? I argue that placing the multilingual Neighbor Sign on one's lawn is a starting action that alters the linguistic landscape, opposes erasure and

negative identity construction, and prompts cross-cultural identification, which lays the groundwork to start combatting citizenship excess.

Combatting Erasure to Alter the Linguistic Landscape

On the most tangible level, the Neighbor Sign introduces diverse languages into public view in the linguistic landscape of the neighborhood. In doing so, it serves in-group, out-group, and inter-group functions (though we cannot isolate one outcome as definitively only affecting one group, given the inherent connectedness of community members, as well as individuals' abilities to identify with different groups in some various capacities). As previously mentioned, seeing one's language represented in public spaces fosters senses of empowerment and belonging. Therefore, the Neighbor Sign can empower speakers of non-dominant languages by publicly representing them. In displaying (most frequently) Arabic, Spanish, and English, the Neighbor Sign creates a new multicultural narrative of the neighborhood, one that resists the white, culturally-homogenous, English-only myth of the neighborhood and its detrimental impact of erasure. It represents that the neighborhood can and should be a multilingual space where speakers of different languages coexist. In fact, the language choices on the original Neighbor Sign were made to reflect the most widely spoken languages in the Harrisonburg community (EMU, 2017). As the signs became more popular in other communities, other language options became available to accommodate neighborhoods with other prominent linguistic communities. These design choices indicate that the Neighbor

Sign is intended to resonate on with actual communities and their residents and to reflect their diverse populations through customization.

In addition to empowering those who form and support multilingual neighborhoods, the Neighbor Sign also counters harmful notions of English-only, homogenous neighborhoods. It impels those who take comfort in English-only myths of the neighborhood see a counter-narrative. It serves as perceivable evidence to the contrary and pushes such individuals to, in Ratcliffe's terms, listen for the exiled excess. Listening is a choice that one must consciously make. It is unlikely that a supporter of linguistic and cultural homogeneity would choose to listen for the exiled excess – for who and what gets left out of dominant neighborhood narratives and ideologies. So by displaying non-dominant languages in public neighborhood spaces, it makes this counter-narrative less hidden or ignorable. It has also been noted that more exposure to non-dominant languages correlates with less support of English-only initiatives (Barker & Giles, 2002). While encountering the Neighbor Sign is unlikely to invert an English-only supporter's values, it may be a starting point to acknowledge and eventually accept linguistic diversity within the neighborhood.

Constructing Identities that Spur Identification

In a closely related function, the Neighbor Sign makes use of its visual rhetoric to construct positive identities that lay the foundation for cross-cultural identification. We have learned that embracing both commonalities and differences is key to cross-cultural identification. In displaying the same message in three languages contained within the same artifact, the Neighbor Sign physically symbolizes this

value. The same message represents the shared neighbor identity while the multiple languages maintain the uniqueness within these neighbor identities. The languages' juxtaposition within one sign represents how these different identities share the neighborhood space. If qualities such as kindness, compassion, and responsibility are connected with neighbor identity, then associating members of multiple linguistic communities with neighbor identity also associates them with these related positive qualities. By conveying this identity in multiple languages, the message is accessible to many community members. Those that speak English can read the message in English and then associate it with speakers of the other represented languages, even if he or she cannot actually read the other iterations. The Neighbor Sign tells us that we should publicly embrace the diverse yet shared identities that together create the neighborhood.

The shared identity of neighbor, with its multiple possibilities of enactment, constructs avenues for identification. Schildkraut discusses what she calls the incorporationist civic myth, an ideology through which many Americans conceive Americanness. As Schildkraut explains: "in the incorporationist civic myth...an Irish-American is neither solely Irish nor solely American. The commonality among citizens is the hyphenation. Everyone has a hyphenation where the first term indicates an ethnicity that should, on some level, be preserved and cherished, and everyone shares the 'American' half of his or her particular label with everyone else" (53). We can imagine the Neighbor Sign to be creating the hyphenation, but with neighbor being the common denominator. As Schildkraut's work shows, *American* is a colossal concept that invites extensive disagreement in its definition. Identifying with others as

neighbors is a less elusive version of the hyphen's common denominator. It encourages individuals to identify locally, rather than nationally, which may be a more concrete and humanizing site of identification.

Conclusion

My investigation of the Neighbor Sign that has become a fixture on U.S. lawns displays how multilingual print-verbal and visual rhetoric can function as activism against citizenship excess in multilingual societies. Linguistic minorities traditionally have been excluded from dominant notions of qualitative citizenship and the benefits that come along with this identity. Intervening in this excess should be considered activism in how it fights against this status quo and lays a foundation for a better society in the future. The Neighbor Sign falls under this domain of activism by inserting multiple languages into neighborhoods' linguistic landscapes, promoting a linguistically-inclusive concept of the neighborhood that simultaneously fights against English-only domination of this space. The mere act of publicly displaying diverse languages helps combat the erasure that contributes to citizenship excess, whereas the actual message the languages communicate helps initiate cross-cultural identification. It publicly recognizes speakers of non-dominant and dominant languages as neighbors, representing the commonalities and differences across cultures that we must accept for productive identification. It constructs neighborhood spaces where linguistically-diverse peoples can civically engage, a component of citizenship.

This investigation also lends insight to the field of linguistic landscape scholarship. Firstly, it demonstrates merit in considering societal ideologies of citizenship through a linguistic landscape lens – that presences and absences in linguistic landscapes reflect such ideologies and efforts by groups or individuals to alter them. Secondly, through this investigation I push us to value traditionally *private* spaces, specifically residential property, as sites deserving of linguistic landscape study and as sites where activism can take place. Most frequently, activism is considered a mode of civic engagement that unfolds in traditionally public spaces, such as town squares. However, my work demonstrates that people can carry out activism in residential spaces, warranting scholarly attention. It also questions the line between private and public, as campaigns unfolding on private spaces send public messages and alter public spheres.

Following this line of thought, I strive to support that campaigns carried out individually on *private* spaces create (counter)publics. In the case of the Neighbor Sign, families or individuals that may not have any in-person connection become connected through the shared iconography they choose to display. A counterpublic within a given place forms around the shared ideology. While ideally the next step would be convening as a counterpublic and developing further campaigns to permeate their shared inclusive ideology of citizenship into larger public spheres, the creation of this counterpublic may productively serve as visible opposition to English-only citizenship excess or as an untapped safety network for those in threat of discrimination or violence from opposing factions.

Despite the promising potential to create publics from common iconography on private spaces, one shortcoming of the Neighbor Sign, and similar artifacts, is that it does not fully breakdown the barrier to person-to-person discourse. While there is great benefit to physically marking a space as one in which cross-cultural discourse belongs, this does not guarantee that this discourse will actually occur. This may be in part due to the fact that these signs are fixed to places that have been increasingly valued for the solidarity they provide, as people are less prone to cultivate strong connections with their neighbors as they were during the neighborhood's heyday. Interaction is less expected in residential sectors nowadays. In my next chapter, I turn to a multilingual activism campaign that holds promise for actual person-to-person cross-cultural discourse. In comparison, these two chapters bring to light the affordances and limits of mobile versus immobile multilingual additions to the linguistic landscape.

Chapter 2: The Friend Pin a Multilingual Mobile Activism

Chapter 1 considers valuable effects of multilingual verbal activism in the form of lawn signs that alter neighborhood linguistic landscapes. This campaign forwards the theoretical work laid out in the introduction, which poses that altering linguistic landscapes and creating opportunities for cross-cultural identification are two modes for pushing against citizenship excess of linguistic minorities. Through this investigation, a potential limit came to light; though promising avenues for identification, person-to-person discourse may be limited when the activism artifacts are not directly attached to displayer. Chapter 2 extends this inquiry, and the work of linguistic landscape scholarship generally, by investigating how a particular pin, a mobile multilingual activism campaign, affords increased opportunities for cross-cultural discourse while maintaining the benefits of immobile campaigns.

Some linguistic landscape scholarship that I have encountered does tackle this person-to-person discourse, mainly in two sectors. The first is in matters of public, in-the-streets protests where interaction with society members is a necessary component of the intended activism. For example, Hanauer discusses how protestors choose to display verbal and visual activism rhetoric in places with high pedestrian traffic as a way to garner public interaction. While these protests may incite interaction, it is not necessarily intentional or reflective in the way Ratcliffe imagines, limiting the interactions' capacities for identification and productive discourse. Troyer et. al's work deals with intentional person-to-person interaction in business sectors spurred by multilingual linguistic landscapes. In their study of a small Oregon town, they find

that Anglo-American local business owners and franchise managers report increased cross-cultural interaction from displaying Spanish signs. They note both functional and intrinsic benefits experienced by Spanish speakers – greater ease when shopping and feeling welcomed in the establishment. Troyer et. al’s study is important in understanding the affordances of multilingual verbal rhetoric for cross-cultural discourse; however, unfolding in commercial spaces, the interaction is necessary to a degree rather than an act with social intentions of promoting more inclusive citizenship. The multilingual pin I investigate in this chapter circulates on a college campus, allowing us to examine a multilingual activism campaign that incites intentional person-to-person interaction in its mobility throughout a non-commercial space.

This investigation rests on the claim that mobile artifacts attached to the rhetors, such as a pin, should be considered part of the linguistic landscape to the same extent as stationary signs, which have traditionally been accepted in this canon. I am not the first to consider clothing or accessories as part of the linguistic landscape. Corrine Seals, for example, includes t-shirts in her linguistic landscape analysis of Occupy Movement protests. But beyond the scholarly tradition that backs up this underlying claim, counting mobile apparel as part of the linguistic landscape is justified in the qualities these items share with traditional linguistic landscape artifacts – their abilities to reflect values and power structures and to change the semiotic qualities of a space. We might also ask ourselves, if we were to discount mobile artifacts attached to the rhetor from a linguistic landscape framework, then

how can we justify our inclusion of protest signs, which are equally mobile and attached to the individual rhetor?

In this article, I turn to a multilingual verbal activism campaign that makes strides in encouraging cross-cultural discourse outside of places of business or public protest. This campaign is the Friend Pin, which circulated around Idaho State University's (ISU's) campus in 2016 and 2017. The Friend Pin is a round, green pin that reads "friend" in both Arabic and English. It was designed by Diantha Smith,



Figure 2: Friend Pin

who at the time of its composition was a Graduate Teaching Instructor in ISU's English department. Smith chose green and white because both colors are often associated with peace and green is an important color to Islam. ISU partners with universities in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, and therefore boasts a large Arab-Muslim population. After hate

acts directed at this community in 2016 – including a string of 50 robberies of homes of Middle Eastern students and hate speech scrawled on Middle Eastern students' cars – Smith created the Friend Pin as a tangible way for students and other university community members to ally with ISU's Arab-Muslim population. The Friend Pin received support from multiple population sectors, as it was worn by international and American students, Muslim and non-Muslim students. To expound the Friend Pin's

work as a multilingual activism campaign, I will first depict how the Friend Pin rises to the other affordances previously discussed of multilingual activism rhetoric. Then, I will dive into the additional affordance of the Friend Pin as a mobile campaign.

Identification

The Friend Pin's simple, yet universal, theme of friendship lays the groundwork for identification between ISU students. Smith indirectly notes this function in a personal interview: "I chose the word 'friend' because of its association with kindness, and because friendship is general enough to apply across boundaries of gender, race, religion, sexuality, etc." Here, we can apply the previously discussed principles of positive identity construction and cross-cultural identification. We see Smith striving for positive identity construction through the positive quality of kindness universally associated with friendship. Like the Neighbor Sign, a chain of associations is enacted through the verbal rhetoric. The Arabic depiction of the word friend extends to the association of Arabic speakers as friends, an identity that also entail positive qualities, such as kindness. This resists negative identity construction, efforts by community members to cast the Arab-Muslim population as threats to the university and therefore unworthy of cultural citizenship in this space.

One's ability to embody this identity is meant to extend across "gender, race, religion, sexuality, etc.," indicating that it is meant to intersect with other diverse identities. It embraces commonalities and differences, asserting that people that identify with dissimilar linguistic and cultural groups can all share the identity of friend. This sentiment is also captured in its multilingual verbal and visual rhetoric.

The same message in multiple languages – English and Arabic – is contained within one artifact. So beyond combatting negative identity construction, the Friend Pin opposes notions of Arab-speaking students as innately, irreconcilably different from the American student population in ways that would deem them unworthy of campus citizenship.

In addition to constructing shared friend identities, the Friend Pin constructs visually-linked publics of wearers with shared values and ideologies. They link wearers under a network of university community members who support a multilingual, culturally-diverse campus and either belong to or stand in solidarity with the University's Arab-Muslim population. This public can serve both practical and rhetorical purposes. On the practical level, they serve as markers of safety for international Arabic-speaking students who need to be able to recognize campus allies. On a rhetorical level, they create an opposition against those responsible for or complicit in the racist events that inspired the pins, visually displaying a united front against them. Smith reported, "I know that my American friends really appreciated having a simple way to show that they cared about Arabs and Muslims in their communities. I also know that many of my Arab/Muslim friends appreciated the efforts made to show support for them."

The pins succeed not only in uniting White allies, but also in creating a cross-cultural and cross-linguistic public. Smith reflects, "I also gave the pins to Arab students and explained what they were for so that they could not only recognize what they were, but also wear them to show their own commitment to integrate into the community and build friendships." The pins communicate solidarity between

international Arabic speakers and English speakers. The former communicates that they are friends – dedicated to building positive relationships. The latter also communicates that they are friends – dedicated to supporting multilingual students and spaces. They are united through a shared campaign with common goals, while maintaining that they are entering the movement from different circumstances and goals.

Linguistic Landscape

The Friend Pins also alter the linguistic landscape of ISU. They introduce more Arabic into the campus, creating spaces that better represent the international student population. They also make the statement that the campus is space where the Arabic language and Arabic-speaking students belong, not a monolingual space only for English-speaking Americans.

From the Arabic-speakers' point of view, altering the linguistic landscape is a means to claim space on their campus, to assert their presence as part of the university community in a way that does not necessitate giving up their culture, integrating with the American population without needing to reject their language and culture to do so. From the English-speakers' perspective, altering the linguistic landscape is a way to support this standpoint and relinquish their hold over university culture. Both groups can alter the linguistic landscape to affirm that their campus is a space that belongs to multiple linguistic groups. In doing so, they fight against erasure that excludes international students from the university community.

Cross-Cultural Discourse

Altering the linguistic landscape to more prominently include Arabic also creates a space that invites greater participation, civic engagement, with the university community. When students see their language displayed in the landscape and embraced by their peers, they feel more welcomed and empowered to participate within the community. This is a key outcome of the Friend Pins. As it was designed to support the international student population, legal citizenship is generally beyond this campaign's goals. While I have previously established that cultural citizenship, not legal citizenship, is of primary concern to this project and the campaigns it investigates, this is even more true for campaigns surrounding populations on student visas. However, cultural citizenship within their communities is still vital for those with student visas. We might consider the university a subset nation and citizenship within this nation as important for the same reasons noted when looking at cultural citizenship within the United States. These reasons include distribution of resources, recognition, and responsiveness from the university and its other student citizens. Cultural citizenship may be enacted through participation in community activities and discourse, which becomes more attainable and less threatening when tangible support is showed toward population in danger of excess.

Aside from public participation, the Friend Pin has initiated person-to-person cross-cultural discourse. Smith reports that many American students wanted to know how to pronounce the Arabic word for friend, which then opened up cross-cultural discourse between Arabic-speaking and monolingual English-speaking students.

Conclusion

ISU's Friend Pin captures the value of multilingual activism campaigns on college campuses. They have the potential to embrace speakers of non-dominant languages – particularly international students – within the campus community. By introducing non-dominant languages in the linguistic landscape, the Friend Pin works towards aims comparable to other previously discussed multilingual campaigns: better representing diverse populations, empowering linguistic minorities, marking spaces as multilingual, and opposing harmful English-only ideologies. It combats the erasure that occurs when students' languages are obscured from public view, excluding their speakers from campus citizenship. It also enables cross-cultural identification as students of all backgrounds can connect with one another as friends, while still acknowledging the different challenges or privileges different students face to be friends in the given space. Positive qualities of friendship are then incorporated into participating students' identities.

What my investigation of the Friend Pins adds to the previous scholarship is the focus on mobile multilingual activism artifacts and their additional affordances. Unlike the Neighbor Signs, the Friend Pins are attached to the campaign participants and move around campus, rather than remaining stationary in a given space. I push us to accept that mobile artifacts are components of the linguistic landscape and worthy of examination through this lens. The languages and messages on mobile artifacts permeate the spaces they encounter and communicate values and power structures. In fact, mobile artifacts have the added affordance of entering more spaces and reaching more audience members. A pin worn by one student may at various times exist in the

classroom, the student union, or a campus pathway, whereas a stationary artifact will likely only inhabit one of these spaces. Additionally, mobile artifacts allow for more personal, immediate cross-cultural discourse and identification. This is not to downplay the work accomplished by stationary artifacts; I stand by my claims in the previous chapter that lawn signs productively alter the linguistic landscape and form a promising starting point for identification and cross-cultural discourse. However, they contain an extra layer between the displayer and the observer. For instance, the observer may have a dissimilar schedule to their neighbor who displays the sign, so even though they intend to discourse with their neighbor, they never see them and therefore do not have the opportunity. Or, since the sign is attached to the lawn, the neighbor feels less approachable. These limits are absent from artifacts attached to the displayer, such as the pin.

Chapter 3: *Sueños* as Multilingual Public Artivism

In March, I return to the place where my interest in this project sparked, Baltimore, less than half a year after the initial protest. I roam the same streets that months earlier had been taken over by vocal protestors, and while my route is still abuzz with an unusual quantity of pedestrians, today's circumstances are quite different. It is now spring, and the city is hosting its second annual Light City celebration, a 10-day event drawing almost a half million people. Light City Baltimore has turned the Inner Harbor into a glowing spectacle of luminescent 3D art installations. One piece in particular, a massive octagonal structure featuring images of Latinx youth alongside a bit of text on each of the eight sides catches my attention. This piece is *Sueños*.

Sueños is the artistic offspring of Edgar Reyes, a multimodal artist and educator. Made in collaboration with Latinx students from Baltimore City and Langley Park, *Sueños*'s eight banners each display a photo of one of the student collaborators against backgrounds of indigenous patterns, as well as a statement or phrases quoted from the featured boy or girl in Spanish, English, Spanglish, Ketchua, or a combination of these languages.



Figure 3: *Sueños* by Edgar Reyes

With all the mesmerizing installations flooding Baltimore's waterfront, it would be easy to indiscriminately group *Sueños* in as merely a visually-appealing, artistic structure. However, we miss the mark if we fail to view it as a piece of multilingual art activism, an intention Reyes himself reports. In fact, we gain valuable insight into the activism potential of this multilingual protest art by examining *Sueños* within the larger ecologies that lend form to this genre.

Latinx Artivism

With this project, I set out to examine activist efforts to alter linguistic landscapes, to promote cross-cultural identification and linguistic diversity, and to better represent and therefore empower the diverse cultures that form this country. I could not successfully accomplish this goal without probing into recent feats of artistic activism, or *artivism*. Activism through art has been a longstanding tactic of immigrants' rights groups and individual activists, especially within the Latinx

community. Evidence can be seen in a range of efforts, from Chicana/o murals, which have been an enduring feature of shared public spaces, to more recent efforts from West Coast Latinx *artists*, such as Faviana Rodriguez and Julio Salgado. Art has served many key roles in Chicana/o and Latinx communities, as visual rhetoric scholars and the artists themselves widely discuss. Margaret La Ware recounts how art has been used to affirm unique cultural identities and tangibly represent possibilities for the future. Muralist Judy Baca contends that Chicana/o art reflects community identities in spaces where these identities were otherwise unrepresented (qtd. in LaWare). Latinx artist Favianna Rodriguez connects the personal to the public values of art, boasting that “art and culture have always shaped policy” and that equal access to artistic representation in the public sphere is key to social justice. Villarrubia-Mendoza and Vélez-Vélez trace these trends into contemporary activism, showcasing how DREAMer art has evolved with the movement’s mission and shapes Latinx identity perceptions. In all, we can see Latinx artists and groups using art to affirm diverse identities within their communities and forward missions beyond their communities.

My investigation into how multilingual artifacts – specifically art activism that combines image with text in multiple languages – can spur cross-cultural identification and empower linguistic-minorities contributes to this conversation about Latinx art and art activism. By considering *Sueños*, a post-2016 election activism piece, I synthesize Latinx art activism with linguistic landscape and citizenship frameworks. Citizenship (both cultural and legal) has historically been a central concern for Latinx art activists; however, my work contributes to this

established trend by investigating how multilingual art elicits cross-cultural identification and alters seemingly monolingual, or even seemingly apolitical, linguistic landscapes to aid these citizenship aims. In doing so, I extend art activism scholarship, linguistic landscape scholarship, and discussions of cross-cultural identification.

In this third chapter, I investigate the how multilingual activism (visual rhetoric) can advocate for immigrants' rights within and across cultures, maintaining and extending the affordances of multilingual verbal rhetoric. Such pieces of rhetoric, I assert, maintain the capabilities of the multilingual verbal rhetoric previously examined in relation to the Neighbor Sign and Friend Pin – initiating cross-cultural identification, affirming positive identities, and altering the linguistic landscape – while enhancing these capabilities with the additional affordances of visual rhetoric and activism art. These additional affordances include increased evocative power, the creation of time and space for dialogue, and increased access to spaces and audiences. In all, art activism can capitalize on these additional affordances to act against citizenship excess. Centering on Edgar Reyes's multilingual art installation, *Sueños*, I start by providing an overview of the scholarship surrounding the genres of visual rhetoric, public art, and protest art, identifying common threads that epitomize the accomplishments of visual protest rhetoric in the public sphere. Then, I turn back to *Sueños*, putting this cohesive framework into action. Finally, I conclude by resituating *Sueños* and the work of art activism within my overarching investigation of multilingual verbal and visual protest rhetoric as a means to advocate for more inclusive citizenship.

Artivism Ecologies

To present a strong background on the subject, I must dive into multiple schools of thought – visual rhetoric, protest art (aka resistance art, art activism, or artivism), and public art – to identify moments of overlap as well as divergence. Visual rhetoric focuses on the ways that visual images interact with viewers and vice versa. Art activism takes this knowledge of visual rhetoric and applies it to create change in society via its viewers. Public art, a close cousin of art activism, questions how certain genres of art interact with communities, while constructing, promoting or breaking down notions of citizenship. From Randy Martin, whose work astutely overviews varying conceptions of public art, we glean how advancing a definition grounded in space rather than place or content proves most valuable for probing into the intersecting identities of art as both public and activist in nature. The value of such a definition comes to light when compared with Rika Allen’s investigation of South African AIDS art, which highlights the overlap of public art and art activism. Finally, visual rhetorician Anthony Blair productively contributes by elucidating how visual rhetoric influences audiences. This in-depth analysis of visual rhetoric adds richness our understanding of how public protest art interacts with audience.

Activism art must be public to some extent, or else it cannot affect change beyond the personal. Randy Martin proposes three ways in which art may be public: 1) art can be deemed public solely because it inhabits a public space; 2) art can be deemed public because it embodies civic ideals, as is often the case with government-commissioned art; 3) or art can be deemed public when it acts “as an occasion for people to gather to engage in critical reflection” (3). This third definition, which

Martin seems to favor, theorizes art's publicness beyond the physical (its location or visual qualities) but rather in the actions and social processes it prompts. To reimagine Asen's core tenants, we might consider this a discourse theory of public art, in focusing on the actions and aims it works towards. Public art might create spaces for multiple society members to convene, spaces in which they are prompted to reexamine norms, traditions, or truisms. As my previous work has shown, these are also aims shared by multilingual activism campaigns that strive for more inclusive notions of citizenship.

Rika Allen, who investigates trends in art activism in South Africa, notes comparable civic attributes of art activism. She says of resistance art, "the status of the artwork transcends itself and becomes an event which offers artists a platform from which to engage with difficult issues, and challenge public opinion and action" (403). In "transcending itself," protest art by Allen's definition also extends beyond place and becomes a space. Within this space, critical reflection occurs when the piece (often as a proxy for the artist) "engage[s] with difficult issues" and "challenge[s] public opinion and action." The similarities between Martin's favored definition of public art and Allen's analysis of art activism, help us understand how activism art interacts with public viewers.

Martin and Allen valuably conceptualize public protest art as shared times, spaces, and actions, valuing the non-physical qualities and capacities of activism art. While many pieces of activism art maintain a definable, physical space, they create and alter other realms. They may create spaces in which critical conversations can start or alter widely-held expectations for the physical spaces they inhabit. These

accomplishments may start in the physical but ultimately unfold beyond. One type of non-physical accomplishment allowed for by these definitions is exemplified by *Visions from the Inside*, an activism campaign on Tumblr in which artists illustrate letters from ICE detainees. It exists online and therefore does not claim a physical public space in the way Martin's first, most basic definition demands. Alternately, individuals who likely do not share a physical community connect through shared experiences, epitomized by the visual images. The pieces of art become events for convening and reflecting. Even when space is vital to a piece of activism, its purpose is not tethered to the purely physical. As we will see with *Sueños*, it is not purely the physical space that determines its capacities, but rather how *Sueños* "transcends itself" to become a mechanism for altering what the space represents, the intangible ideologies that the space embodies to visitors. Here the art becomes "an occasion" (Martin) or "an event" (Allen) to reflect on and challenge social constructs. Through their propensity for using the visual to alter non-physical realities, pieces of art activism spur actions from viewers. These actions are often first born from a reaction.

Anthony Blair provides an insightful look into how visual rhetoric produces reactions, particularly reactions strong enough to inspire action. Contributing factors include affective capacity and audiences' onus in supplying enthymemes. The first factor Blair notes is visual rhetoric's affective capacity, or in his words its "evocative power" (51). He contends that this evocative power stems from visual rhetoric's realism over the verbal. Blair exemplifies this with a 1964 television ad against presidential candidate Barry Goldwater. In the ad, a little girl playing outside suddenly falling victim to a nuclear attack. The argument is that Goldwater is

dangerously rash. Blair verbally lays out the premises of this ad: “Goldwater might...launch a nuclear holocaust”; “Such a holocaust would cause unspeakable horror for everyone, including innocent children”; “Hence, it would endanger the national interest to elect Goldwater” (50). While Blair preserves the ad’s argument, it is significantly less evocative in this verbal iteration than in the original visual ad. In the verbal representation, the claims seem more cut-and-dry, more stagnant and fixed. By contrast, the visual ad leaves space for the viewer’s mind to run wild with doomsday scenarios that *may* unfold after Goldwater’s election. Here we see Blair’s second function of visual rhetoric, audience members creating meaning by supplying enthymemes. In imagining the catastrophes that *may* unravel should Goldwater be elected, the audience constructs the ad’s claims themselves, employing their imagination to reason through the issue at hand. Not only might their imagination conjure more vivid possibilities than the original artifact, but they are now actively engaged in making meaning, and therefore more invested in the message.

Part of the evocative power of visual rhetoric also results from the human faces art can add to an issue. With the Goldwater ad, the visual representation depicts an innocent little girl as the face of the less tangible issue of political instability, which is absent in the verbal unpacking. Allen notes a similar phenomenon in South African AIDS art, which she asserts is “issue-based” in its emphasis on the subject rather than the style. Referring to artist Gideon Mendel’s photograph series, Allen says the issue-based art gave the AIDS epidemic a “human face” and “human stories” (404). Moreover, the human faces may prompt viewers to imagine the “human stories” that are not explicitly narrated, envisioning interpretations of the subject’s

experience that are inspired by the compassion of the “human face.” This is an example of the inquisitive moment and dialectical space Martin and Allen imagine for public activism art. We see how art’s evocative power – stemming from its realism, ability to feature human subjects, and propensity for audience interaction – sets a starting point for activism. When the viewer is moved by the art’s subject, they are poised to act.

Stephen Duncombe of Center for Art Activism succinctly connects viewers’ interactions with social or political issues via art to the resulting potential for activism with the term *æffect*, which combines the emotion of *affect* with the action of *effect*: “Activism moves the material world, while art moves a person’s heart, body, and soul” (118). He elaborates, “before we act in the world, we must be moved to act” (119). Therefore, activism art functions as an *æffective* genre by capitalizing on the visual elements’ evocative powers to spur viewer action. We can also see elements of *æffect* in Allen’s analysis, as she claims the photography exhibition “combin[ed] an identity-centred approach with a resource mobilisation approach” (405). Here we perceive the art’s evocative power in highlighting human identities to support a call to action. Art activist Favianna Rodriguez echoes this sentiment when reflecting on her own work, stressing that the public must appreciate “the role of art in challenging structures of systemic injustice — the power of art in transforming the imagination, and in building true, lasting social change.”

Public art and art activism scholarship elucidate that public art activism is a moment of contact with visual creations that prompts action. Visual rhetoric scholarship helps answer the subsequent question of this process: what happens in

this moment of contact that spurs change? In other words, why is art activism so *æffective*? After covering much ground, I arrive at a framework for situating the work of multilingual art activism that synthesizes visual rhetoric, public art, and art activism. Activism art can best be theorized as a public occasion (a time and place) that draws together members of various publics for critical dialogue and imagining alternative realities for the self or society. It draws on its evocative power, commonly by centering human identities, to perpetuate this dialogue. Space is also vital to this dialogue, not in its fixed, physical reality, but in how the art changes or questions the rhetoric of the space. Capitalizing on the genre affordances of art activism, this type of visual rhetoric spurs positive identity construction and alters the linguistic landscape in ways that brings into question exiled excesses and causes viewers to critically reflect on their own expectations of the space.

Holding on to this framework of art activism, I will now turn to *Sueños* to investigate how this framework adds meaning to the work specific pieces of multilingual art activism accomplish. Since the multilingual features work together with the visual images, I will analyze both as elements that contribute to the end effect.

Time and Space

As the initial framework emphasizes, space and time are crucial contributors to public art activism. This section investigates how *Sueños* interacts with its environment, creating and altering spaces. Compared to the other examined pieces of rhetoric, signs and pins, *Sueños*, a large installation, has the least mobility and is most

tethered to place. While signs and pins proliferate in a multitude of locations beyond the creators' control, the location of an art installation is singular at any given moment and intentional on the artist's behalf. Therefore, space becomes a key consideration for the artist. They must create a dialogic relationship with the space, its intangible qualities, in order to spur the critical thinking of social structures that is characteristic of much public protest art. *Sueños* inhabited Baltimore's Inner Harbor (the place and space) during the Light City Festival (the kairotic moment). Artist Edgar Reyes leverages *Sueños*'s status as art to gain access to this relevant space at a kairotic moment, which then forwards the public protest aims of the piece.

Public art activism has a history of leveraging its art status to transcend special boundaries. For example, artist Gideon Mendel, whose exhibition *A Broken Landscape* drew attention to the relatively taboo topic of living with HIV/AIDS in South Africa, found a welcomed venue for his art at Museum Africa. Mendel noted that "the status of the national art museum and its location near the South African parliament offered a remarkable opportunity to create a radical, stimulating and newsworthy project" (Allen, 406). *Visions from the Inside*, a CultureStrike art activism project in which artists illustrate letters from ICE detainees, also worked its way into a noteworthy physical space: the United Nations Palais des Nations in Geneva during the Human Rights Council. The visual art components of the CultureStrike project gained access to this noteworthy event as an "exhibit [that] compliments a panel event on child migrants taking place during the Human Rights Council" (End Child Detention). Both of these art activism projects gain entry to reputable venues under the status of art, as pieces that will visually appeal to

museum visitors or conference participants. Once in these venues, the art can spread its political or social messages.

Sueños, in its residency in Baltimore's Inner Harbor during the Light City Festival, adds to the lineage of art activism that leverages its status as art to extend its activism to otherwise guarded or inaccessible spaces. Taking advantage of a such an affordance, *Sueños*'s status as a Light City Baltimore-sanctioned piece of art enables its message to broadcast in Baltimore's Inner Harbor. This is significant in both space and time. The Inner Harbor represents certain dominant ideals, which *Sueños* can push against. With an activism goal of serving as "a counter narrative to the Trump agenda" (Reyes), *Sueños*'s message benefits from its juxtaposition to the dominant ideals that lend meaning in the Inner Harbor.

Baltimore's Inner Harbor is a center for middle-class tourism, consumerism, and commerce. The space immediately surrounding the Patapsco River is built up with an array of waterfront dining options, bars, and venues, as well as museums and other tourist attractions, such as the famous National Aquarium. Dispersed within and just beyond this cultural nucleus are markers of Baltimore's main financial district, a hub of white collar business. It would likely be the first stop on a visitor's itinerary, indicating its mainstream appeal above other sections of the city with less *respectable* reputations. David Hanauer analyzes how these factors make the Inner Harbor a prime site for activism as he utilizes a linguistic landscape methodology to study the Occupy Baltimore faction of the Occupy Wall Street Movement. This protest took place in McKeldin Square, adjacent to the Inner Harbor. Hanauer asserts that this space was productive in its lure to tourists and central location to businesspeople who

traffic the area. As a result, the protest was highly visible, increasing its impact. Considering Occupy Baltimore in the context of the larger Occupy movement, we can see how the Inner Harbor area symbolizes dominant power structures for many residents, as Occupy protests sought to disrupt such locations. In other words, its association with white-collar business and financial institutions made it the ideal space to protest the power abuse of dominant groups. The Inner Harbor's draw as an area of protest, due to its high pedestrian traffic and embodiment of white-collar characteristics, have led to legal controversies between the city and protestors regarding First Amendment Rights. After negotiations with the ACLU, the city named McKeldin Square an official Free Speech Zone, where protestors can convene without legal consequence. However, this liberty does not extend to the rest of the Inner Harbor, suggesting that maintaining peace and order within this space is a priority to the city, likely to protect tourism and economic exchange.

Sueños is able to break these legal boundaries by placing itself in the genre of art rather than only defining itself as protest rhetoric. Under this categorization, it is not confined to the Free Speech Zone in McKeldin Square where the Light City layout did not direct attendees. Instead, it can join the festival, gaining an audience of up to 470,000 Light City attendees. This would not have been possible without its primary label of *art*. Once *Sueños* gained access to the desirable, highly-visible Inner Harbor space during the Light City festival, it enacted a reflexive process between the non-physical elements of the space and the art's rhetoric. It pushes against the narrative of the Inner Harbor as a space only for dominant ideals and interactions that

are accepted by dominant, ruling bodies, interactions that do not upset the peace and status quo of the space.

One way that *Sueños* accomplishes this is by introducing non-dominant languages into the Inner Harbor, altering the its symbolic nature. *Sueños* proudly presents Spanish, Ketchua, and other non-dominant languages into a space previously unrepresentative of Latinx identities. It turns the Inner Harbor from a space meant only for celebratory fun, commerce, or business – activities which generally benefit members of the cultural majority and ignore unsavory social and political issues – to a space where minority voices interject the status quo, speaking in non-dominant languages. This interjection also forwards one sub-goal of Reyes’s aim to counter the Trump agenda, “to show us [Latinx immigrants] in a very public forum. That our voices should be heard” (Reyes). (In other words, *we are here and we are not leaving*.) In the Inner Harbor, Reyes is able to further his activist aim of making marginalized Latinx voices public. The fact that he is making these voices heard in a space in which this is especially uncommon (evidenced by the ban on protesting) adds to this accomplishment. *Sueños* disrupts a space that upholds dominant ideals by penetrating it under the guise of art during the Light City Art and Music Festival.

The Light City Festival is a kairotic moment for Reyes to premiere his public art activism. Not only does it present *Sueños* with an opportunity to take residency in the Inner Harbor amidst other sanctioned artwork, it also does so at a time with maximum audience exposure. Light City drew in over 470,000 attendees in 2017 from the city and surrounding areas, about two-thirds of the city’s total population. Nearly half-a-million people had the opportunity to see *Sueños*, more visitors than it

would likely receive in another venue. Beyond sheer quantity, this event allows *Sueños* to reach audience members that may not be inclined to view political art or engage in critical consideration of immigrant rights. Light City is marketed as “a free festival of light, music and innovation” with “attractions including illuminated sculptures, projections, interactive technologies, performances, concerts, food vendors and a children’s area” (Light City). This is description does not indicate any political or activism components to the festival – and granted, the majority of exhibits did not have a political component. Therefore, the event could draw in individuals and families regardless of their propensity for critical political and social engagement. This enables *Sueños* and its messages against citizenship excess of Latinx communities to reach not only those already invested in the issue, but also those who are either ambivalent or downright adverse to it. As part of the larger Light City landscape of flashy art installation, *Sueños* is likely to first be perceived as just another piece of art. Spectators who generally avoid sites of political activism may approach it and begin to take it in as an appealing visual. The displayed voices and faces, and the message they convey, get recognition and some level of consideration from Light City attendees regardless of the political leaning or inclinations.

Critical Dialogue Through Linguistic Confrontation

To reiterate this chapter’s guiding framework, public art activism creates a time and space for publics to come together and engage in critical reflection and discourse around societal issues. It gains meaning from space and viewer (re)action. So far, we have examined how Edgar Reyes’s *Sueños* creates, or alters, a space. It

capitalizes on a time when people are already poised to convene at the Inner Harbor, but then creates a space for the artistic activism work to unfold around the installation itself. So now that *Sueños*'s aptitude for creating time and space has been established, the next question is what actions does it prompt and how?

One action is pushing viewers to reconsider what identities and languages are expected and welcomed in public spaces, such as the Inner Harbor. This action is largely aimed at out-group viewers, or those who consciously or subconsciously support English-only paradigms. Reyes says, "I think a lot of people in this country are not comfortable seeing...other languages. So it [*Sueños*] is adding to that conversation. That if you see something in Spanish, it's not a bad thing." By publicly displaying languages that are often excluded from public visibility, Reyes challenges the English-only paradigm and the resulting discomfort when this paradigm is breeched. The discomfort a viewer may feel brings to light the problematic societal norms that lead to non-dominant languages being jarring additions to public spaces. This unease is an intentional part of *Sueños*'s activism. Reyes says, "Part of growing and learning is being uncomfortable. So when people see my piece, not everybody, but at least some people, hopefully felt some sort of discomfort or questions." With its high capacity for affect, art can poke at a viewer's prejudices, acknowledged or unacknowledged. Reyes hopes to capitalize on the affective capacity of art to create discomfort in viewers, which in some cases is a necessary first step in disarming prejudices. Reyes asserts that eliciting and then challenging these prejudices is sometimes a vital part of activism, and one that shapes the work of *Sueños*. Monolingual, English-speaking viewers may experience this discomfort from

observing unexpected languages in an unexpected place – and displayed so prominently. Spanish, Spanglish, and Ketchua (as perceived by some members of the dominant cultural group) do not belong in public spaces. When these expectations of public places are upset, a productive discomfort is sparked in those that find comfort in those hegemonic expectations.

Within the space of discomfort created by *Sueños*, English speakers are in the disadvantaged role, needing resources to understand the piece's meaning. In regards to interpreting the non-dominant languages' meanings, Reyes says, "Look it up. Find out what it means." He does not include English translation to ease the English-speakers' viewing experience. In this moment, they inhabit the role many speakers of other languages are forced to navigate on a day-to-day basis living in the United State and interacting in English to complete daily tasks and interactions. While viewing a multilingual piece of art cannot come close to emulating the immigrant experience, being temporarily put in this disadvantaged role can lay the initial groundwork for cross-cultural identification. Reyes acknowledges that the initial opening of dialogue between viewers of the linguistic majority and *Sueños* may not be agreeable, but it is a necessary step forward. It is productive in how it can plant the roots for new expectations by prompting critical questionings, especially when the viewer did not anticipate feeling this discomfort in linguistic confrontation.

We see how *Sueños*, a piece of public art activism, creates a multilingual space for the public to convene, altering the typically hegemonic space the average person may expect of the Inner Harbor. Within this created space, *Sueños* pushes viewers to engage in critical reflection of societal norms and their own prejudices

through the surprise or discomfort they may encounter in this space. Whether consciously (the more hopeful option) or unconsciously (a starting point, at least) their expectations for U.S. linguistic landscapes may arise. They may also take small steps toward eradicating English-only paradigms, such as appreciating public art that features non-dominant languages or learning small phrases with an online dictionary to better understand the art's message.

Celebration

While this confrontation with members of the dominant cultural and linguistic groups is an important part of the activism of *Sueños* as multilingual art, *Sueños* serves important in-group functions, as well. Another main goal of *Sueños* is to empower undocumented immigrants and linguistic minorities through self-affirmation of vibrant, mixed Latinx identities. As Reyes clarifies, “The piece was not just to highlight that we are here and part of the community, but also reflecting on that we are mixed – that we are indigenous, black, and European. And [we are] reconnecting with that and people recognizing that someone who may look black – African American quote unquote – is actually sometimes Latino.” The images of these youth, large-scale and luminescent, conjure an ethos of pride. In fact, *Sueños* is very much poised for large-scale broadcast in its design. It physically towers over viewers, making it nearly impossible to ignore. Reyes also chose *Sueños*'s materials specifically so that it could exist in public spaces and not be confined to studios or other spaces without community interaction. Its panels are waterproof and can last outside for up to two years. The large size, grand visibility, and beauty of *Sueños*

extends to the identities it depicts. It sends the message that these identities should be revered, not hidden.

Additionally, the images add human faces to the topics of immigration and navigating mixed cultural identities. We can recall Blair's assertion that visual rhetoric has great affective capacity from its ability to attach human faces to a seemingly distant or intangible issue. *Sueños* attaches faces to the undocumented immigration in a way that is more likely to evoke kindness and understanding from out-group viewers than talking about immigration in the abstract or in the demonizing ways some media sources or nativist groups do; it also prominently projects identities relatable and empowering to in-group viewers. Latinx youth can take pride in their faces and languages being displayed on such a striking and prodigious installation. This public display is further amplified by its tenure in the Inner Harbor, a place that is respected though often devoid of minority voices, during the Light City Festival, a celebrated event that draws people from around the region.

The multilingual text that accompanies the images are also empowering to Latina/o communities. In the creation process, the student collaborators had opportunities to reflect on their mixed identities. The words that appear on *Sueños* are quotes Reyes extracted from organic conversations he held with them, representing their true inner worlds, concerns, and values. When asked about the language choices Reyes made when crafting the panels, he clarified that there really weren't any on his end. The youth spoke in whichever language(s) they were most comfortable with. Therefore, the multilingual text is not orchestrated, but rather empowering to the speakers in its organic creation.

Such empowerment of marginalized identities is a trope that arises in collaborative activism projects, such as *Sueños*, as collaboration between subject and artist is key in many of these projects. Allen comments on the power of subject-artist collaboration, as she analyzes the vast influence of resistance art in South African AIDS activism. In the shift toward issue-based art that places greater emphasis on the subject rather than the style, collaborating with the represented communities is a logical and necessary step. This collaboration often takes the form of visually depicting images drawn from first-person testimonies, a tactic which *Sueños* replicates through photographs and text. Gregory Sholette, in his 2011 article on collaboration in activist art, mentions other benefits of collaboration for the collaborators and the art itself. These include the possibility of larger-scale projects, an amalgam of ideas that leads to “more diversity and complexity,” and a promotion of shared social responsibility rather than individualism (43). We see all these benefits from *Sueños*’s collaborative process, as well. In addition to its literal large-scale, *Sueños* also represents a larger scale of ethnicities, identities, and perspectives thanks to its collaborative creation. As a result, it features for more diverse language, identities, and ideas, which leads to more complexity within the project. Finally, *Sueños* invokes a sentiment of shared yet distinct experiences among the featured identities, which is communicated to members of dominant cultures through its dialogic confrontation, as previously discussed. This final quality also recalls Ratcliffe’s call to identify across both commonalities and differences.

A related effect of collaborative art activism is giving a voice to marginalized peoples. However, Allen is careful to note that this is not a *speaking for* the subjects,

but rather utilizing the public affordances of the art as venues for the subjects “to tell their own stories” and to create networks of shared experience between community members (411). *Sueños* creates a similar experience as the students featured in the installation get to project their identities in a public space that is likely to reach other individuals that are undocumented or have mixed ethnicities, empowering members of the community with shared experiences whom they likely would not have reached otherwise. Therefore, this collaborative art is both empowering for the subjects actually featured as well as for others who resonate with the featured subjects.

The visual and verbal elements of *Sueños* augment one another. The images promote the affordance of visual rhetoric – evocative power, humanizing complex issues, showcasing empowering identities – while the verbal elements resist English-only linguistic landscapes. Both of these elements spur critical questioning of problematic societal norms through inward- and outward-directed dialogues and hopefully inspire future action. Neither text nor image is prescriptive in meaning, just as seeing or speaking with another human being never reveals a full, explicit view of their identity. Rather the visual and verbal snippets create the same fleeting exposure of identity that mirrors person-to-person interactions. This exposure is empowering yet safer than publicly exposing oneself to a live audience. *Suenos*’s large-scale, luminescent, artistic-appeal makes it an inspiring medium throughout which to display typically unrealized, ignored, or unvalued mixed identities of Latina/o immigrants.

Conclusion

Drawing on Martin's and Allen's work on public art and art activism, respectively, I have carried through this chapter a framework that public art activism is an occasion, a time to convene for critical reflection. Further synthesizing Blair and Duncombe, on visual rhetoric and art activism respectively, we learn that this critical reflection may be spurred or heightened by visual rhetoric's affective capacity resulting from audience agency and people-centered images. Wrapping this framework in a linguistic landscape package is valuable for examining the relationship between the piece of art and the space it inhabits. If public art activism creates spaces for critical reflection, fully understanding the newly-created space requires discerning the nature of the place and space the piece initially enters, including the power dynamics and symbolic connotations it embodies. This becomes even more pertinent when looking at multilingual art activism that advocates for inclusive citizenship. For these pieces, the languages and underlying power expectations that exist in a given space lay the foundation for their *affective* aims of critical reflection. Surveying these characteristics through a linguistic landscape lens adds meaning to how introducing new languages in artistic mediums pushes against spaces of citizen excess.

When applying this synthesized framework to *Sueños*, it is easy to view the work as public multilingual art activism that creates space and time for critical reflection against the linguistic landscape of Baltimore's Inner Harbor. By adding to the Harbor's landscape, *Sueños* pushes against perceptions that this prominent Baltimore area is a place for the enjoyment of the dominant cultural and linguistic

majority. Instead, it creates a space for critical reflection in which minority voices are meant to be heard. Given *Sueños*'s grand scale and luminescent appearance, these voices and identities dominate this space, lending temporary ownership to those traditionally excluded from spaces run by the cultural majority. This function of *Sueños* adds insight to an overarching question of this project – how sites of activism can alter linguistic landscapes to combat erasure. Multilingual art activism introduces languages into space to combat erasure, but also displays human images to visually stand for erased or ignored bodies. This all contributes to the space for critical reflection *Sueños* creates – a space where minority identities are not erased or ignored, but captivate attention with pride.

Capitalizing on the *art* of art activism, *Sueños* readily gains access to a location generally guarded by dominant forces, which have gone to lengths to keep the space unpolitical and free of dissent. Activism messages on protestors' signs would likely be removed from the Inner Harbor during Light City, but such messages on art installations are acceptable within this event. *Sueños* also creates a time for critical reflection within the kairotic moment of Light City. Drawing in a mass of viewers under the guise of a fun night of art of music, *Sueños* alters the purpose of this time. Some viewers may be shocked or uncomfortable seeing non-dominant languages and identities in a seemingly unpoliticized festival, and in this unexpected shift of time-use, a critical reflection might unfold regarding expectations and prejudices.

Therefore, *Sueños* creates a time and space for critical reflection. This time and space stands at odds, to an extent, with the status quo of its surroundings, which

catalyzes the reflection. For audience members jarred or offended when entering the altered time and space that has been created, the critical dialogue might revolve around their expectations and prejudices. Regardless of how extensive this reflection becomes, even acknowledging these feelings is a promising first step. Audience members who resonate with the bodies and languages displayed in *Sueños* may engage in critical reflection on their belonging and empowerment in public spaces. Seeing resonant images and languages shining in public spaces may help these audience members reflect on past instances of excess and feel empowered to proudly exist in spaces that previously seemed inaccessible.

Ultimately, the work surrounding public multilingual art activism in this chapter adds to the overarching questions of citizenship excess discussed throughout this project. Citizenship excess is grounded in negative identity construction and erasure. Campaigns that take steps to reverse these processes constitute activism toward inclusive citizenship. *Sueños*, representative of the possibilities of multilingual art activism as a genre, rises to these activism criteria. In displaying non-dominant bodies and languages within the splendor of the art, *Sueños* captures the beautiful, mixed identities of the Latinx population and asserts that these identities deserve recognition and responsiveness in popular public spaces, such as the Inner Harbor. This is also a move to alter the linguistic landscape and combat erasure.

Cross-cultural identification, a step toward an inclusive citizenship paradigm, is also a possible affordance of multilingual art activism. The evocative power of the images in the shared public space may lead out-group members to critically consider immigrant identities that they previously perceived as totally unrelatable. This in-

group/out-group identification has been the focus of my previous discussions of cross-cultural identification. However, *Sueños* also illuminates the possibilities of activism campaigns leading to identification between multiple Latinx communities. Scholars who look for opportunities to subvert dominant white male paradigms frequently urge marginalized groups not to divide themselves according to marginalized identity (i.e. Lorde; Collins; Racliffe), but to seek solidarity through cross-cultural identification without giving up unique group experiences. In uniting various Latinx communities in one captivating art installation, *Sueños* strives for unity and identification between multiple linguistic-minority communities. However, by showcasing the various languages spoken by members of these communities, *Sueños* resists essentializing them as one cultural group.

Conclusion: No Nos Vamos

Key Takeaways

This investigation sprung to life in the wake of the 2016 Presidential election, driven by a few exigent questions: how can we form communities cross-linguistically to forward activism initiatives?; what would be the goal of such initiatives?; how would achieving these goals impact American society? To seek answers to these questions, I turned to multilingual activism campaigns already in effect. Given my interest in community formation, I focused on visual and print-verbal campaigns for their added ability to establish and maintain community in a sustained capacity (as opposed to the significant yet arguably fleeting effects of individual protests that may incorporate multiple languages through oral chants). A second reason for directing attention to visual and verbal campaigns rested in a curiosity of how spaces are impacted by such campaigns, and in turn how transforming spaces changes community values and norms. With these aims in mind, I centered my investigation on multilingual lawn signs, pins, and art.

These three campaigns also all happened to be initiated and carried out by community members or groups, rather than previously-organized grassroots groups founded on the expectation of forwarding political missions. The Neighbor Sign was created by the Emmanuel Mennonite Church of Harrisonburg, Virginia and expanded to residential lawns nationwide that had been previously unconnected; the Friend Pin was designed by a university educator and embraced by the student body across boundaries of club affiliation, area of study, etc.; the art installation *Sueños* was crafted by artist Edgar Reyes in combination with local youth and view by otherwise

unconnected audience members from the Baltimore area. Focusing on artifacts created and distributed outside of organized political groups is valuable in showcasing how the aims and means of activism campaigns can be embraced by society members at-large, and that campaigns do proliferate beyond previously-organized movements. In other words, the campaigns may at times construct the movement, rather than the more typical inverse.

But before considering what multilingual activism campaigns accomplish and how, my investigation probed into what they were fighting against. The answer presented itself in the form of citizenship excess, described by Renato Rosaldo as denial of recognition, responsiveness, and redistribution of resources. Synthesizing Rosaldo with others who carry on his framework, such as Hector Amaya, and applying this framework to contemporary political and social circumstances, I strove to lend more form to the processes that create and maintain citizenship excess, arriving at erasure and negative identity construction as two such processes. Specifically, I theorize that American organizations and individuals against a citizenship inclusive of ethnic and linguistic minorities employ these two reciprocal processes – limiting or removing non-dominant language use in public spaces and characterizing speakers of non-dominant languages as holding qualities incompatible with citizenship. Therefore, if an aim of multilingual activism campaigns is to push for more inclusive citizenship, they might make strides by inverting these processes.

Linguistic landscape scholarship proved valuable in reasoning through the first of the two processes, erasure. It inspired me to consider the space, not the place, in which the campaigns unfolded. Not only did I get a feel for how power structures

and cultural ideals manifest in these spaces through observable linguistic markers, but also how these structures and ideals form through intangible expectations of who and what belongs in the spaces.

Part of what hinders ubiquitous belonging are ideals of culturally valued identities – such as neighbors, friends, and citizens – and negative stereotypes around immigrants, Spanish-speakers, or Arabic-speakers. When these identity traits stand at odds, erasing the *negative* identities becomes more justifiable. In addition to being detrimental to immigrants and speakers of non-dominant languages in their access to resources controlled by dominant groups, it is also harmful to their empowerment and feelings of self-worth. Therefore, positive identity construction serves vital in-groups functions that may be experienced individually or through cross-cultural interactions.

The campaigns I investigated combatted erasure and negative identity construction through a combination of tactics. The most obvious employed by all three is introducing non-dominant languages into public spaces, with *Sueños* having an added affordance of visually showcasing the faces of speakers of these languages for even greater affect. Collectively, these campaigns positioned these languages and identities in both everyday places (neighborhood homes and university campuses) and esteemed locations (the Baltimore Inner Harbor), in both instances positively reimagining who these spaces belong to and the values they enforce. Some of these campaigns spurred cross-cultural identification by uniting English speakers and speakers of other languages under a shared identity. Others accomplish this by opening up opportunities and spaces for cross-cultural discourse. Finally, others took steps toward this aim by creating times and spaces for critical reflection. While this

last process of critical reflection was brought to light through a framework of public protest art informed by Randy Martin and Rika Allen, and then specifically applied to Reyes's *Sueños*, I believe the framework can be applied to other visual and print-verbal activism campaigns, even those not intended as public art. For instance, the Friend Pin creates opportunities within the campus space for students of different cultures to engage in discourse. This time and space is underwritten with opportunities to critically reflect on the circumstances of prejudice that led to the Pin's demand. Similarly, the Neighbor Sign alters the neighborhood into a space meant for increased cross-cultural exchange. This increased opportunity is itself a critical question of the limits the Sign is resisting. We see how the public protest art definition productively transfers to other activism genres, lending form to how they push against undesirable norms through critical reflection and cross-cultural identification.

Expanding the Linguistic Landscape

In addition to posing answers to the questions that initially inspired this project, my investigation contributes insights to the conversations it draws from. First, it creates new possibilities for the linguistic landscape field, providing models for how its tenants can be productively applied in novel ways to unconventional sites. Much linguistic landscape scholarship focuses on commercial sectors, largely populated by businesses. Another significant subgroup considers in-the-street protests, moments of direct action that are not sustained beyond the protestors disbanding. My work turns the linguistic landscape lens toward places outside of

these traditional scopes – to residential neighborhoods, college campuses, and community arts events. Through the analysis that then unfolds, we learn that the linguistic landscape framework allows us to see the rhetorical work at play in these sites, sites that are often considered outside the concern of language issues.

Redirecting the linguistic landscape lens to sustained multilingual activism campaigns in neighborhoods, campuses, and arts events also reveals new knowledge about the nature of activism when it introduces multilingual rhetoric into these spaces. Most basically, it supports that altering linguistic landscapes should be considered a form of activism against English-only ideals and citizenship excess, and that this activism can and does take place outside of stereotypical public spaces, such as town squares. Additionally, in the case of the Pin, we perceive how mobile items alter the linguistic landscapes in which they circulate. When we use a linguistic landscape framework to see that lawn signs, pins distributed on college campuses, and public art are forms of activism in how they change the status quo of linguistic expectations and identity construction, we also expand our expectations of who can participate in this activism. By altering linguistic landscapes through semi-permanent visual and verbal mediums, people who belong to these everyday spaces alter status quos and promote more inclusive notions of citizenship that challenge the dominant narrative.

As a final addition to the linguistic field, we also learn more about the affordances of multilingual print campaigns in changing the status quo. Existing research has thoroughly shown how in-the-street protests gain significance from the spaces they inhabit and in turn alter the meaning of the space for a time. When we

refocus this framework on sites of sustained activism, we observe that multilingual rhetoric can indefinitely change the nature of a space and societal norms within the space – such as who belongs in it, what types of actions are permitted within it, and what values it embodies. Consistent pushes to change the meaning of spaces in these three ways lays promising groundwork for the overarching issues at hand: who can reap the benefits of cultural citizen.

Utilizing linguistic landscape scholarship to identify the sustained nature of these forms of activism also helps to reconfigure a common criticism of these campaigns, which can be summed up with the term “slacktivism.” Slacktivism names the concept of feeling that non-confrontational tasks, like wearing a pin, are ineffective toward the overall movement they reference and are more for the ego of the actors than the wellbeing of those affected by the issue at hand. Some may argue that planting a lawn sign, wearing a pin, or (to a lesser degree) creating art pieces are ineffective acts of slacktivism in that they do not produce tangible policy advances. However, reframing the intended work and potential affordances of sustained multilingual visual and print-verbal campaigns through a linguistic landscape lens enables us to see how they accomplish more than those in the slacktivism camp would believe. This project has already thoroughly established how erasing non-dominant languages from public spaces is harmful for cultural citizenship in how it deems the associated identities as not being worthy of existing there. By introducing non-dominant languages into these spaces over sustained periods of time, something intangible is gradually accomplished. Linguistic expectations for shared spaces are reimagined, marginalized linguistic identities receive more recognition and

responsiveness, and cultural citizens gradually become less excessed. So if we view these multilingual campaigns as attempts to change national legislation, say, then they are bound to fall short. But if we acknowledge their role in diversifying linguistic landscapes, a function with significant in-group and out-group functions, values that supersede slacktivism become apparent. That being said, I also agree with authors like Vox's Alex Abad-Santo who assert that these non-confrontational campaigns ideally should not be the only forms of activism in which one engages, and that multiple activism strategies are necessary for tangible policy change on a state or national level.

Additions to Identification

The construction of communities – a process widely accepted as a facet of cultural citizenship – is another core focus on this project. Once establishing that the aforementioned campaigns constitute shared modes of activism, we can perceive the new communities that they create. Counterpublics are formed through shared iconography, which ultimately convey shared values. Residents who live in the same neighborhood and would not interact or find connections under other circumstances now have a starting point for identification through the shared iconography of the lawn sign. Students who would otherwise feel unrelated to their classmates find a door opened for interaction, identifying themselves as part of a counterpublic of students wearing the same pin. Those who find themselves in moments of critical reflection in the space of a public art piece are newly united in critical reflection. We

can even say that all three of these campaigns create spaces for critical reflection in which seemingly unrelated community members can be connected.

These newly created counterpublics also speak to the questions of identification this project grapples with. Starting from a Burkean definition of identification, I pondered if and how it could apply when there is no shared language – be it an idiomatic language like Spanish, Arabic or English, or a language of culture. I then turned to Krista Ratcliffe whose rhetorical listening theory has already probed into means of cross-cultural identification. Applying her work to examine how counterpublics are created through shared iconography, spaces, and constructed identities adds to the scholarly work in this field, as well. First, it proves that Ratcliffe’s theory of rhetorical listening as a mode of cross-cultural identification, which she focuses on racial and gender diversity, applies to matters of linguistic and ethnic diversity, as well. This knowledge allows us to apply her valuable additions to traditional identification theories to a broader range of sites and interactions. It also illuminates that cross-cultural identification and rhetorical listening are sometimes components of activism, another new site for applying this theory. The campaigns discussed in this project provide tangible examples of opportunities to apply Ratcliffe’s work to sites of public discourse. Ratcliffe’s text is often considered to contain challenging and elusive, though wildly insightful, theories and claims. Thinking of them in terms of multilingual visual and print-verbal campaigns – like the Neighbor Sign, Friend Pin, or *Sueños* – may introduce tangible places cross-cultural identification can occur, making the theories more graspable for scholars and students.

Further Research Opportunities

While the contributions to these fields and theories expand how we use them to understand multilingual activism rhetoric, they also bring to light opportunities for further inquiry. First, this project draws on theories to hypothesize the work of multilingual activism, supplemented with interviews with their creators (when possible) and other invested parties. However, the claims drawn from these rhetorical analyses could be strengthened with additional qualitative and quantitative research into the effects of these campaigns. For example, interviews with residents who display the Neighbor Sign could lend more primary evidence to the reasons people participate in such campaigns. Interviews with multilingual residents in these neighborhoods can clarify if they succeed in improving the quality of life or feelings of belonging within these spaces. Additional research into political debates and new legislation in these areas can clarify if the campaigns have had out-group effects in the political sphere. Similar avenues of investigation relating to the other campaigns could round out what we know about their impact within the communities. While this investigation is beneficial in theorizing the new possibilities for citizenship access, cross-cultural identification, and spatial semiotics, more work could be done through interviews and other modes of primary investigation to confirm the extent to which these possibilities unfold in reality.

Secondly, it is likely there are more components of citizenship excess that should be investigated in order to construct a complete view of how it unfolds, and in turn what multilingual activism campaigns must accomplish to combat it. While my

project is valuable in pinpointing two processes that contribute to citizenship excess, erasure and negative identity construction, this can hardly be an exhaustive list. Considering additional processes that contribute to citizenship excess can open up further lines of productive inquiry into additional work successful multilingual activism campaigns complete.

Bibliography

- Abad-Santos, Alex. "The Backlash Over Safety Pins and Allies, Explained." *Vox Media*. 17 Nov. 2016. Web. Accessed 27 Feb. 2018.
- Allen, Rika. "Art activism in South Africa and the ethics of representation in a time of AIDS." *Critical Arts*, vol. 23 no. 3, 2009, pp. 396-415.
- Amaya, Hector. "Toward a Latino Critique of Public Sphere Theory." *Citizenship Excess: Latino/as, Media, and the Nation*. New York UP, 2013.
- Asen, Robert. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, vol. 90 no. 2, 2004, pp. 189-211.
- Barker, Valerie & Howard Giles. "Who Supports the English-Only Movement?: Evidence of Misconceptions about Latino Group Vitality." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 23 no. 5, 2002, pp. 353-370.
- Blackledge, Adrian. "Constructions of Identity in Political Discourse in Multilingual Britain." *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Edited by Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge, Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2004.
- Blair, Anthony. "The Rhetoric of Visual Arguments." *Defining Visual Rhetorics*. Edited by Charles A. Hill & Marguerite Helmers, LEA Publishers, 2004, pp. 41-61.
- Borden, Rebecca. "The English Only Movement: Revisiting Cultural Hegemony." *Multicultural Perspectives*, vol. 16 no. 4, 2014, pp. 229-233.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. 1950. University of California Press, 1969.
- Center for New Community. 2017, www.newcomm.org. Accessed 26 Aug. 2017.
- Collins, Patricia. "Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection." *Sex & Class*, Vol. 1 No. 1, 1993, pp. 25-45.
- Duncombe, Stephen. "Does It Work? The Effect of Activist Art." *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, vol. 83, no. 1, Johns Hopkins UP, 2016, pp. 115-134.
- Eastern Mennonite University (EMU). "'Welcome Your Neighbor' Sign Continues to Spread Around the Nation, to the Delight of its Creators at Immanuel Mennonite Church." *EMUstories*. 31 Jan. 2017. Web. Accessed 27 Feb. 2018.
- End Immigration Detention of Children. "Child Detention Exhibit at the United Nations." 28 Aug. 2015. Web. Accessed 10 Dec. 2017.
- Flores, William & Rina Benmayor. "Constructing Cultural Citizenship." *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*. Beacon Press, 1997, pp. 1-23.
- Hanauer, David. "Occupy Baltimore: A Linguistic Landscape Analysis of Participatory Social Contestation in an American City." *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave MacMillan, 2015, pp. 207-222.
- Help Save Maryland, www.helpsavemaryland.org. Accessed 26 June 2017.
- International Writing Center Association. "Position Statement on Racism, Anti-Immigration, and Linguistic Intolerance." 9 Nov. 2010. www.writingcenters.org. Accessed 17 Jan. 2018.
- Johnson, Terri. Personal Interview. 10 July 2017.

- Kasanga, Luanga A. "Semiotic Landscape, Code Choice and Exclusion." *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave MacMillan, 2015, pp. 123-169.
- Latorre, Guisela. "Gender, Indigenism, and Chicana Muralists." *Walls of Empowerment*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2008. 176-2010.
- LaWare, Margaret. "Encountering Visions of Aztlan: Arguments for Ethnic Pride, Community Activism and Cultural Revitalization in Chicano Murals." *Visual Rhetoric: A Reader in Communication and American Culture*. Edited by Lester Olson et al., SAGE Publications, 1998, pp. 227-239.
- Lorde, Audrey. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, Crossing Press, 2007, pp. 110-114.
- Martin, Randy. "Artistic Citizenship." *Artistic Citizenship: A Public Voice for the Arts*. Edited by Mary Schmidt Campbell and Randy Martin, Routledge, 2006, pp. 1-22.
- Mertens, Shelby. "A Warm Welcome: Signs by Church Become Popular in City Yards." *Crossroads*, Eastern Mennonite University. 6 Dec. 2016.
- Noorani, Ali. *There Goes the Neighborhood: How Communities Overcome Prejudice and Meet the Challenge of American Immigration*. Prometheus Books, 2017.
- Padilla, Amado et. al. "The English-Only Movement: Myths, Reality, and Implications for Psychology." *American Psychological Association*, vol. 46 no. 2, 1991, pp. 120-130.
- Pavlenko, Aneta & Adrian Blackledge. "Introduction: New Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts." *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Edited by Aneta Pavlenko and Adrian Blackledge, Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2004.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Southern Illinois UP, 2005.
- Reyes, Edgar. Personal Interview. 31 May 2017.
- Rodriguez, Favianna. "On the Power of Art and Challenging Cultural Inequality." *Art21 Magazine*. 17 Jan. 2017. Web. Accessed 10 Dec. 2017.
- Rosaldo, Renato. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism." *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*. Beacon Press, 1997, pp. 27-38.
- Rubdy, Rani "Conflict and Exclusion: The Linguistic Landscape as an Arena of Contestation." *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave MacMillan, 2015, pp. 1-24.
- Saul, Stephanie. "Muslim Students Report Burglaries and Hate Literature at Idaho State." *New York Times*. 14 Apr. 2016. Web. Accessed 30 Jan. 2018.
- Schildkraut, Deborah. *Press One for English*. Princeton UP, 2005.
- Seals, Corrine. "Overcoming Erasure: Reappropriation of Space in the Linguistic Landscape of Mass-Scale Protests." *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave MacMillan, 2015, pp. 223-238.
- Shiri, Sonia. "Co-Constructing Dissent in the Transient Linguistic Landscape: Multilingual Protest Signs of the Tunisian Revolution." *Conflict Exclusion and*

- Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave McMillan, 2015, pp. 239-259.
- Sholette, Gregory. "Counting On Your Collective Silence: Notes on Activist Art as Collaborative Practice." *Culture and Contestation in the New Century*. Edited by Marc Leger, Intellect Ltd., 2011, pp. 41-56.
- Smith, Diantha. Personal Interview. 17 Aug. 2017.
- Stewart, Charles J., et al. *Persuasion and Social Movements*. 4th ed., Waveland Press, Inc., 2001.
- Troyer, Robert et. al. "Unseen Spanish in Small-America: A Minority Language in the Linguistic Landscape." *Conflict Exclusion and Dissent in the Linguistic Landscape*. Edited by Rani Rubdy & Selim Ben Said, Palgrave McMillan, 2015, pp. 52-76.
- Villarrubia-Mendoza, Jacqueline & Roberto Vélez-Vélez. "Iconoclastic Dreams: Interpreting Art in the DREAMers Movement." *Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 58 No. 3, 2017, pp. 350-372.

