1

AFTER HISPANIC STUDIES

ON THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF SPANISH-LANGUAGE CULTURAL STUDY

In a field as wide-ranging as Spanish-language cultural study, a disproportionately large presence of one subfield in the professoriate can have unintended consequences that are damaging to the communities served.[1] After being dominated by Peninsular and what was generally termed "Spanish-American" or "Las Españas" study, a generation ago the field underwent a paradigm shift that opened a separate Latin American register. This period of transition (in which we are yet engaged) has resulted in a reduction of Peninsular specialists as a percentage of all hires in Spanish-language cultural studies, as Latin American societies were reimagined with cultural sovereignty. However, this hiring trend leveled off before a demographic balance; that is, a faculty ratio that is descriptive in terms of number of specialists per population of the cultural regions present within the passim area studies mold.[2] This chapter argues that if contemporary area-studies exigencies are to remain in place, "best practices" in hiring should transition toward a model that appoints fewer Spain specialists in favor of faculty with specializations in topics more local to each campus. Using existing area studies grammars (largely dependent upon nations and transnations), the ideas presented here should be understood as conceptual rather than binding (or even necessarily implementable); the interest is to illustrate the contemporary slant toward Eurocentric pedagogy through quantitative data sets and to foment a scholarly dialogue on how the field might reorganize in ways that lessen

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

the overwhelming Eurocentric demands that characterize contemporary faculty appointments, curricula, degree programs, study-away tendencies, and the myriad of activities realized in the academy.

After examining the development of Latin American studies as a field, my argument will scrutinize the professional demographics (by subfield specialization) and course offerings (by listed thematic emphasis) at several cohorts of US universities with two principal ends: first, to demonstrate the overwhelming overrepresentation of Peninsular themes (and thus, a Eurocentric register) in the field of Spanish-language cultural studies as a whole; and second, to pose an argument in favor of changes in faculty appointment practices that would ensure a more balanced approach to the scholarly treatment of Spanish-language cultures. The questions posed are not solely pedagogical; the cultural axes that favor European Spanish language and culture have a colonial character, one that has restabilized within the inclusion initiatives that have become common in US higher education since the civil rights movement. The present hegemonic model of cultural power enforces a presupposed Euro-colonial superiority,[3] and classrooms are thus forums of distorted and hierarchical engagements with cultural goods, such as texts, film, art, and spoken accents in the Spanish language.[4] The outcomes of the Eurocentric academic fetishization are evident when we examine the behavior of students immersed academic surroundings that are dominated by Peninsular Spanish language and culture: while less than 10 percent of Spanish-speakers worldwide reside in Iberia, US undergraduates who study away in Spanish-speaking institutions are around five times more likely to choose Spain over Latin America—a figure that roughly corresponds to faculty specializations and course themes.

Eurocentrism is the cultural residue of colonialism. In 1492, when Queen Isabella misunderstood the purpose of Antonio de Nebrija's *Gramática castellana*,[5] Hernando de Talavera explained, "Your Majesty, language is the perfect instrument of empire."[6] In the first paragraph of the prologue, Nebrija defines the purpose of the Spanish language in America as a colonial one: "Siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio" (1492, 1). And continues: "Después de que Su Alteza haya sometido a bárbaros pueblos y naciones de diversas lenguas, con la conquista vendrá la necesidad de aceptar las leyes que el conquistador impone a los conquistados, y entre ellos nuestro idioma; con esta obra mía, serán capaces de aprenderlo" (qtd. in Pons 2018, 1). In order to control resources, place

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

communities in bondage, levy taxes and realize military conscriptions, among other objectives, the politicization of conquered peoples stigmatized Indigenous social tendencies, cultures, and languages. This process disseminated the myth that the cultural systems of the Spanish crown (and later, of Creole leaders during the republican period) replaced or overtook any non-Eurocentric sociocultural realities:[7] Spanish has existed as a central dimension of this colonial matrix since it first appeared in the hemisphere.

In correspondence with civil rights movements, a new mapping reframed the discipline of Spanish-language cultural studies in the US academy: reimagining Latin America as a set of culturally sovereign entities radically reshaped the composition of the professoriate; over several decades this democratization (reducing number of specialists in Peninsular themes as a percentage of the faculty) granted perennially oppressed communities localized spheres of academic focus. However, the contraction of Peninsular appointments has ceased: across the US academy there is approximately a one-to-one ratio of cultural specialists in Peninsular-study to specialists in Latin American themes.[8] While there are ten-times more speakers of Spanish in Latin America than Spain, the cultures and languages of these imagined communities appear roughly equally in US classrooms, in continual deliverance of the colonial demands: while some notable departments have resisted this trend, the percentage of faculty who specialize in US Spanish hovers near zero, despite the number of Spanish-speakers in the United States being greater than that of Spain.[9]

The data in the below survey were taken from departmental websites. (The "Perceived Elite" cohort departments are in the *US News and World Reports* "Top 25 Modern Language Programs in the World" and/or National Research Council's Top 25 institutions in Spanish in the "viewed by faculty as top-notch" category.) The survey includes tenured or tenure-line faculty members; the subfield statistics are based on departmental or self-reported "interests," "field," "specialty," "discipline," or other related expression of academic concentration. Specialists in subnational Peninsular topics (Catalan, Basque, Galician, and others) are included in "Peninsular" cultural cohort; the "Latin American" cultural cohort includes specialists in Pre-Columbian, and indigenous (and other non-European disciplines). Faculty members whose listed specialization is in a non-area subject (such as second-language acquisition or business Spanish) were not included in these data.[10]

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

The figures confirm that, with very few exceptions, US departments hire faculty in Spanish-language cultural fields through a framework that is overwhelmingly Eurocentric. A silent internal system structures Latin American and Peninsular study with approximately equal weight, thus allotting Spain five times more specialists in cultural fields than would a number proportionate to its share of speakers, a model that largely neglects languages and cultures local to each institution. While the faculty bodies vary slightly from cohort to cohort, just one institution—Pittsburgh—has a faculty demographic that could be described as characteristic of the target subject.[11] These appointment norms have profound consequences on how departments structure curricula (number of seminars offered in each cultural topic) and on how the disciplinary canon is organized (amount of material tracts studied from each region).[12]

Since faculty design and teach courses that correspond with their personal interests and specialization, the Eurocentric hiring program has a substantial implication on the themes of courses and degree programs. The following table has been compiled from the course offerings, by cultural emphasis, listed on departmental websites. Each department chair was contacted for feedback concerning these data and for input on any possible changes and discrepancies; their contributions have been included in the table.[13] The thematic divisions are: Peninsular, Latin American, transatlantic, and US.

As Nicolas Shumway notes, the academy is "still organized with Spain at the center and everyone else in a marginalized amalgamation that recalls terms like *las colonias*" (2005, 296). While glimpsing at a department's online course listings may be misleading, the responses from department chairs shed some light on the administrative circumstances that produce these statistics. Several noted that it is very likely catalogues contain offerings that exist on paper but not in practice; the official description of a seminar may vary drastically from what is covered; the catalogue represents administrative and bureaucratic exigencies that may not align with departmental missions; the listings are like time capsules from decades ago, the remnants of degrees and minors that have since changed in focus in practice if not on paper. As Jo Labanyi, at New York University, notes, their catalogue contains "previously accumulated courses taught since the beginning of time" (email to the author, March 8, 2018).[14] The titles of courses can also be misleading: "Almost all of my classes combine regions despite the course titles," comments Ruth Hill

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Table 1. Faculty Specialties

Cohort I: Perceived Elite Institutions

(*US News and World Report* top 25; National Research Council top 25 "top notch")
Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Stanford, NYU, Pennsylvania, Duke, Indiana, Illinois, Cornell, Georgetown, Columbia, Virginia, Texas at Austin, Brown, Penn State, Purdue, Berkeley, Vanderbilt, UNC Chapel Hill, Minnesota, Ohio State, UC Irvine, UCLA, Kansas, Tulane, Indiana, UC Boulder, Pittsburgh, Wisconsin, UC Santa Barbara

Peninsular (153 faculty members)	47%
Latin American (174 faculty members)	53%
Most weighted to Peninsular:	66% Chicago, Vanderbilt, UVA, Columbia, Boulder
Most weighted to Latin America:	90% University of Pittsburgh
Equal (1–1) or within one faculty member:	47% of departments
Average Peninsular overrepresentation:	470% of democratic balance

Cohort II: Flagship Public Institutions in Southern Border States

UC Berkeley, University of Arizona, University of New Mexico, University of Texas–Austin

Peninsular (18 faculty members)	39%
Latin American (28 faculty members)	61%
Most weighted to Peninsular:	50% Berkeley
Most weighted to Latin America:	66% New Mexico
Equal (1–1) or within one faculty member:	40% of departments
Average Peninsular overrepresentation:	390% of democratic balance

Cohort III: Schools over 50% Latinx and Enrollments of 5000+

U. Puerto Rico–Mayagüez, U. Puerto Rico–Río Piedras, Florida International, U. Texas–El Paso, U. Texas–Pan American*

Peninsular (17 faculty members)	37%
Latin American (28 faculty members)	63%
Most weighted to Peninsular:	50% Florida International
Most weighted to Latin America:	74% U. Puerto Rico–Mayagüez
Equal (1–1) or within one faculty member:	20% of departments
Average Peninsular overrepresentation:	370% of democratic balance

(continued on next page)

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Cohort IV: 10 Largest US Universities by Enrollment
(online institutions excluded)
Arizona State, Central Florida, Ohio State, Minnesota, Texas–Austin, Texas A&M, Florida, Michigan State, Penn State, Florida International

Peninsular (44 faculty members)	46%
Latin American (50 faculty members)	54%
Most weighted to Peninsular:	55% Minnesota
Most weighted to Latin America:	61% Texas–Austin
Equal (1–1) or within one faculty member:	70% of departments
Average Peninsular overrepresentation:	460% of democratic balance

Total Cohort: 44 Departments

Peninsular (198 faculty members)	44%
Latin American (254 faculty members)	56%
Most weighted to Peninsular:	66% Chicago, Vanderbilt, UVA, Columbia, Boulder
Most weighted to Latin America:	90% University of Pittsburgh
Equal (1–1) or within one faculty member:	45% of departments
Average Peninsular overrepresentation:	440% of democratic balance

Note: *No data: Universidad del Este (PR), East Los Angeles College, Hartnell College (CA), Imperial Valley College (CA), Southwestern College (CA), Miami Dade College, Richard J. Daley (IL), Del Mar College (TX), South Texas College, University of Texas–Brownsville.

from Vanderbilt, "simply because the process of proposing new courses is so onerous. Many of us face this reality" (email to the author, March 1, 2018).

Many faculty, including chairs, emphasized the subtle but vital role of "Topics" courses, many of which are used as an administrative loophole to avoid the bureaucracy of creating a new course, a process that often lasts years. "What we actually teach," comments Jo Labanya, "[including] a large proportion of our undergrad and almost all our grad courses—are taught under the rubric 'Topics course,' which allows faculty to teach courses of their own choosing without a formal process of approval at university level" (email to the author). Berkeley has a similar circumstance, as M. Iarocci comments: "Most faculty prefer to teach upper division topic courses as 135s ('Topics in Hispanic Literature'), where

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Table 2. Course Themes

Cohort I: Perceived Elite Institutions

(US News and World Report top 25; National Research Council top 25 "top notch")

	Peninsular	Latin Am.	Trans-atl.	US	Total	Peninsular (%)	Latin Am. (%)	Trans-atl. (%)	US (%)
Texas–Austin	13	34	10	12	69	19	49	14	25
Duke	9	8	9	9	35	26	23	26	25
Illinois	9	9	7	5	30	30	30	23	17
Ohio State	24	31	4	10	69	35	45	6	16
UC Irvine	12	12	5	5	34	35	35	15	15
Penn State	8	12	4	3	27	30	44	15	13
Indiana	9	7	9	4	29	31	24	31	13
Minnesota	22	11	2	6	41	54	27	5	12
UNC–Chapel Hill	13	16	6	4	39	33	41	15	11
UC–Santa Barbara	23	20	10	6	59	39	34	17	10
Purdue	8	10	7	2	27	30	37	26	8
UCLA	35	20	12	7	74	47	27	16	8
Wisconsin	10	11	4	2	27	37	41	15	8
Harvard	11	17	11	2	41	27	41	27	6
Columbia	20	18	15	3	56	36	32	27	5
Stanford University	7	10	6	1	24	29	42	25	5
Pittsburgh	6	22	10	1	39	15	56	26	4
Brown	8	9	8	1	26	31	35	31	4
Cornell	16	9	4	1	30	53	30	13	3
Vanderbilt	18	14	3	1	36	50	39	8	3
Tulane	25	31	11	1	68	37	46	16	2
Princeton	25	30	24	1	80	31	38	30	1
Kansas	39	26	8	1	74	53	35	11	1
Virginia	44	25	10	1	80	55	31	13	1
Georgetown	26	26	10	0	62	42	42	16	0
University of Chicago	30	25	8	0	63	48	40	13	0
New York University	13	10	8	0	31	42	32	26	0
U. Pennsylvania	20	16	18	0	54	37	30	33	0
Yale University	35	18	9	0	62	56	29	15	0
UC–Boulder	21	10	5	0	36	58	28	14	0
Berkeley	16	6	4	0	26	62	23	15	0
Total	**575**	**523**	**261**	**89**	**1448**	**40**	**36**	**18**	**6**

(continued on next page)

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Cohort II: Flagship Public Institutions in Southern Border States

	Peninsular	Latin Am.	Trans-atl.	US	Total	Peninsular (%)	Latin Am. (%)	Trans-atl. (%)	US (%)
Texas–Austin	13	34	10	12	69	19	49	14	25
New Mexico	10	18	3	6	37	27	49	8	21
University of Arizona	10	15	7	1	33	30	45	21	4
Berkeley	16	6	4	0	26	62	23	15	0
Total	**49**	**73**	**24**	**19**	**165**	**30**	**44**	**15**	**13**

Cohort III: 10 Largest US Universities by Enrollment
(online institutions excluded)

	Peninsular	Latin Am.	Trans-atl.	US	Total	Peninsular (%)	Latin Am. (%)	Trans-atl. (%)	US (%)
Arizona State	13	23	4	13	53	25	43	8	30
Texas–Austin	13	34	10	12	69	19	49	14	25
Ohio State	24	31	4	10	69	35	45	6	16
Penn State	8	12	4	3	27	30	44	15	13
Texas A&M	4	5	19	4	32	13	16	59	13
Minnesota	22	11	2	6	41	54	27	5	12
Florida	22	17	5	2	46	48	37	11	4
Florida International	33	35	17	2	87	38	40	20	2
Michigan State	6	5	3	0	14	43	36	21	0
Central Florida	3	3	3	0	9	33	33	33	0
Total	**148**	**176**	**71**	**52**	**447**	**33**	**39**	**16**	**12**

Total Nationwide Cohort

	Peninsular	Latin Am.	Trans-atl.	US	Total	Peninsular (%)	Latin Am. (%)	Trans-atl. (%)	US (%)
Arizona State	13	23	4	13	53	25	43	8	30
Texas Austin	13	34	10	12	69	19	49	14	25
Duke	9	8	9	9	35	26	23	26	25
New Mexico	10	18	3	6	37	27	49	8	21
Illinois	9	9	7	5	30	30	30	23	17
Ohio State	24	31	4	10	69	35	45	6	16
UC–Irvine	12	12	5	5	34	35	35	15	15

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Penn State	8	12	4	3	27	30	44	15	13
Indiana	9	7	9	4	29	31	24	31	13
Texas A&M	4	5	19	4	32	13	16	59	13
Minnesota	22	11	2	6	41	54	27	5	12
UNC–Chapel Hill	13	16	6	4	39	33	41	15	11
UC–Santa Barbara	23	20	10	6	59	39	34	17	10
Purdue	8	10	7	2	27	30	37	26	8
UCLA	35	20	12	7	74	47	27	16	8
Wisconsin	10	11	4	2	27	37	41	15	8
Harvard	11	17	11	2	41	27	41	27	6
Columbia	20	18	15	3	56	36	32	27	5
Stanford University	7	10	6	1	24	29	42	25	5
Pittsburgh	6	22	10	1	39	15	56	26	4
Brown	8	9	8	1	26	31	35	31	4
Florida	22	17	5	2	46	48	37	11	4
University of Arizona	10	15	7	1	33	30	45	21	4
Cornell	16	9	4	1	30	53	30	13	3
Vanderbilt	18	14	3	1	36	50	39	8	3
Florida International	33	35	17	2	87	38	40	20	2
Tulane	25	31	11	1	68	37	46	16	2
Princeton	25	30	24	1	80	31	38	30	1
Kansas	39	26	8	1	74	53	35	11	1
Virginia	44	25	10	1	80	55	31	13	1
Georgetown	26	26	10	0	62	42	42	16	0
University of Chicago	30	25	8	0	63	48	40	13	0
Michigan State	6	5	3	0	14	43	36	21	0
New York University	13	10	8	0	31	42	32	26	0
Central Florida	3	3	3	0	9	33	33	33	0
U. Pennsylvania	20	16	18	0	54	37	30	33	0
Yale University	35	18	9	0	62	56	29	15	0
UC–Boulder	21	10	5	0	36	58	28	14	0
Berkeley	16	6	4	0	26	62	23	15	0
Total	**676**	**644**	**322**	**117**	**1759**	**38**	**37**	**18**	**7**

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

the topic varies. A 135 can be Latin American, Peninsular, US Spanish, or Hybrid. The same is true for the 200-level courses: 285 for peninsular and 280 for Latin American are 'Topics' graduate seminars that include all of the traditional subfields (colonial Latam, Modern Latam/Latino, Medieval/Early Modern Spanish, Modern Spanish)" (email to the author, March 1, 2018). While Topics courses cannot be included in the course catalogues (and consequently in these figures), they have a significant presence across undergraduate and graduate programs. In many cases, they are even *more important* than the listed courses. The themes of Topics courses, however, are implicitly tied to faculty specialization data: professors trained in Peninsular themes may teach Latin American or US topics, but what occurs in the classroom is largely correlated to faculty preparation and specialization. As nearly all tenure-stream job announcements use area-studies language (with a national or regional specialization explicitly required) these Topics courses may be varied, but they are directly related to the structural concerns in the hiring and appointment process. *Faculty are selected for tenure-line positions in order to develop knowledge in their specializations*. While the Topics courses may remap or explore new material, it is unlikely that there is a great deal of thematic distance from the United States / Latin America vis-à-vis Peninsular tendencies found in the listed specializations and interests of faculty (table 1).

There are some commonalities across the course dataset that deserve attention. While the Spanish-languages of the United States are the most common variant on the campuses of every institution surveyed, with a few noteworthy exceptions, that material is largely ignored: local topics amount to just 7 percent of all courses—and are limited to 1 percent or 0 percent of the material offered in 28 percent of departments surveyed. Trans/hybrid themes appear to be increasing in importance, though that category has a significant Eurocentric weight that reiterates many of the Peninsular–Latin American / US mythic inequalities in new ways. Pittsburgh, Duke, New Mexico, Texas, Arizona State, and Texas A&M merit specific attention, as these departments have moved beyond the Eurocentric traditions by restructuring course themes and faculty appointments toward more localized emphases. Like the University of Puerto Rico, their example represents an institutional approach with many relevancies for universities across the United States: the looming revision of Peninsular-centric missions toward Latin American and US Spanishes

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

and cultures, at least in their institutional mechanisms (among them: hiring and course/degree design), has these departments as precedents to resituate the center of the discipline.

CURRICULAR CRITICISM

While this examination of faculty demographics and course offerings is without an apparent precedent, several scholars have analyzed curricular formation in recent years. There appears to be no unified concept about an appropriate method to restructure (if indeed restructuring is necessary) the topics to be studied, and in what weighting.[15] A generation ago James Fernández of New York University noted that "Spanish is simultaneously an American and a European language. The discipline of Hispanic studies must confront head on—both intellectually, in its scholarship, and institutionally, in its departmental configurations—the history and the current implications of this double identity" (Fernández 2000, 1964). The terms "double identity" and "American" are left unclear: should American / European Spanish-language cultures be treated with equal weight, 50–50, as they essentially are now? Does "American" mean local to each university or Latin American? Are US traditions Latin American? While a shift toward Latin American themes has occurred at NYU since the 1970s, the present faculty demographic is 60 percent Latin American and 40 percent Peninsular.[16]

In "Hispanism in an Imperfect Past and an Uncertain Future," Nicolas Shumway notes that when he was a junior faculty member several decades ago at Yale and Indiana University Northwest, the new faculty members were obliged to include "sufficient material from Spain" (2005, 285). Shumway comments that the "appropriate" weight in the 1980s was 60–40 for Spain over other Spanish-speaking regions. He goes on to note that "this notion of Hispanism also meant a majority of faculty appointments in Peninsular literature" (2005, 285). Shumway mentions his general "disagreement" with such an approach and concludes with this reflection: "[Hispanism itself] is an outmoded idea based on an essentialist, ideologically driven, and Spain-centric, notions" (2005, 297).

Among the most comprehensive reports on curricular development is Joan Brown's *Confronting our Canons*, a study that examines the Spanish-language material taught across the US academy. She argues in favor of a shared graduate canon that would organize scholarship upon a com-

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

mon platform. What is most striking about her data is how profoundly literature-based and Eurocentric the Spanish-language cultural canon is: "Works on 90–99% of graduate reading lists, what I call the core canon . . . [included] nine works, all but one from Spain" ("What do Graduate Students in Spanish Need to Learn?" 2010, ix). Brown advocates for an increased presence of traditionally excluded genres but says little about moving focus away from the traditionalist Eurocentric model. In particular, she envisions a canon that incorporates more work from women and non-heterosexuals, nonprint tracts, texts in non-Castilian languages, anything from the eighteenth century, and work from those whom she terms "exiled patriots, or residents from most of the Hispanic world" (2010, 171). The reader is left to presume here that "exiled patriots" means Spaniards, though exiled Latin Americans significantly outnumber those from the Peninsula.

Brown is a specialist in Peninsular topics and perhaps her study should be understood through that lens. Indeed, the discussion of whom she terms "residents of most of the Hispanic world" is infrequent, which gives the impression that her recommendations are geared more generally toward how *Peninsular* studies could be restructured—not the field as a whole (despite the several instances in her monograph that allude to the contrary). A shortcoming of *Confronting Our Canons* is Brown's focus on a very tiny sector of the target subject—Peninsular topics. Cultural tracts from 90 percent of the Spanish-speaking world are treated perfunctorily. Even if the problems that Brown cites were remedied through application of her model, which is perhaps acceptable within a Peninsular studies frame, if the slant is not democratized toward US / Latin America, the supermajority of the target subject (which includes local cultures) would continue to be ignored.[17]

The field itself is often termed "Hispanist," "Hispanism," and "Iberian-American," each of which attempt to maintain a supposed US / Latin American relation to a Spanish center. The nomenclatures have a radial implication which both initiates and sanctions the flawed concept that all cultural materials under this heading emanate from a singular source: the Peninsula. The terms also exoticize (and therefore marginalize) speakers of Spanish in the United States into a subordinate category, one that has been institutionalized through terms such as "heritage speaker," which construct a foreignness for the tongue (and related cultural traditions)—and interpellates speakers of Spanish in the United States with being

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

"foreign in a domestic sense" (Burnett et al. 2001). While Spanish and English are "heritage" languages in the United States, the received exceptionalism myths prohibit courses in English topics receiving the label "heritage."

OVERWEIGHING FACULTIES TOWARD SPAIN

The conventional one-to-one Peninsular to Latin American faculty configuration prohibits a localized pedagogy. Spanish authors, playwrights, artists, peasants, royalty, Caudillos, and so on, from Cid through Ruiz Zafón, receive more critical and pedagogical treatment than they should, a circumstance which concomitantly subordinates the work of the unstudied demographics and enhances the perceived importance of Peninsular work in all disciplines. Peninsular-centrism also penetrates publication outlets: while *Project Muse* has a "Latin American and Caribbean Studies" subheading with twenty journals (five of which have "Hispanic" in the title), there are thirty-one periodicals under "Spanish and Portuguese Literature" and "Iberian Studies" subheadings. The MLA organizes study groups under "Romance" topics, and the Spanish-language subgroup is termed "Hispanic Literatures," a category that includes three groups with a Latin American focus and four concerning peninsular culture.[18]

Eurocentric departments are particularly misguided for US institutions and associations, as Latin American cultures, performances, languages, texts, histories and family dynamics, inform local cultures in any number of ways (that is, if one identifies the United States as an entity external to Latin America). But even if the United States were institutionalized and categorized as a Latin American nation, or group of Latin American regions (perhaps several distinct nations), or some other characterization that situates Spanish as a domestic language, the bulk of academic attention being misdirected toward an absent European Spanish-speaking community (and the histories, cultures, literatures, and languages of those societies) in these departments might best be described as a case of cultural lag.

Study away trends demonstrate the same problem in other terms: Spain receives approximately the same number of US students as all Latin American nations combined ("US Study Abroad: Leading Destination" 2007, 1). What causes students to esteem Spain so profoundly for study away? The Spain / Latin America inequality in study away corresponds

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

very closely to the course topics and the professor-specialization imbalance ratio: it would appear, students are interested most in the regions that they study. The idealization of Spain in the minds of undergraduates is a product of a broad Eurocentric aesthetic in the United States that is codified in the existing faculty demographics and the courses they teach. As many, and perhaps most, students have not been to Latin America or Spain before choosing their studying away destination, the lopsided numbers going to Iberia (including the author of this book) stem to a significant degree from what students read, study, hear and see in their Spanish language and Spanish-language culture classes.

Some may maintain that an important component of study away is visiting the neighboring countries, and for that, part of the draw to Spain (instead of a country in Latin America) is its proximity to the rich and distinct cultures of Europe. However, one could make the same case for any Latin American nation: that region is as culturally and linguistically diverse as Europe, if not significantly more so. Such is the force of the Eurocentric fetishization constructed and celebrated through formal education and other social institutions. The conceptual ideas of Spain and Latin America are constructed in classrooms (through Eurocentric scholarly approaches) and the results are clear: overweighting pedagogy with Peninsular themes has significant influence on what students imagine to be the "best" experience in Spanish-language culture. To study a text or a painting in a classroom setting is to commemorate a cultural artifact, and the first-hand experiences in Spanish-language culture that undergraduates seek are an important signifier of how the disproportionate presence of Peninsular topics in classrooms influences student behavior.

ON PENINSULAR APOLOGY

There are many reasons that current faculty and course paradigms could be portrayed as ostensibly beneficial to students and the discipline: Spain is the "home" of the language; the "classic" texts, seminal to the culture itself like *Poema del mío Cid* and *Lazarillo de Tormes* derive from that imagined community; there is a canon of important work—from Cervantes through the post-Franco period—that is foundational to Western culture and these command a close focus on Peninsular themes; and this is not to mention the transcendental work in visual arts of Velázquez, Goya, and

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Picasso; Buñuel and Almodóvar. Our current faculty demographics are structured to reflect that supposed reality: that these works are so significant, so essential to comprehending the culture of Spanish language and cultures that it is appropriate and, it seems, perhaps necessary to overweigh our curricula and our faculty appointments toward these topics.

An apologist for nondemocratic faculties might also argue that Peninsular themes form one conceptual "unit" with several dimensions (often understood as medieval, golden age, twentieth century, and so on). The focus in that context should be on how to weigh respective conceptual units and sub-units. Is it appropriate to have a department with three peninsular specialists but one (or none) who study Southern Cone, Andean, or Mexican topics? In the case of Mexico and many other regions, we could form similar Spanish-language cultural sub-units: Colonial, Independence, Contemporary, Migratory; Mexico has more Spanish-speakers than any other and approximately three times more inhabitants than Spain, but does not have a single specialist in the majority of departments surveyed in this study; meanwhile 97.7 percent of departments have *multiple* specialists in Peninsular topics.[19] The Mexican community—despite being three times as populous as Spain—and US communities—which have a larger population than Spain—are victims of the Eurocentric norm: Spain triumphs due to the traditional myths of cultural "value" and "history," if not "talent" and "beauty," along with other mechanisms of colonial apology.[20]

NEOLIBERAL DEMANDS AND WHY SPAIN REMAINS CENTRAL

Strong enrollments in conventional departments is a serious obstacle to any dissolution of the Eurocentric celebration. As neoliberal demands often supersede the ostensible—and *stated*—mission of a university or department, financial solvency is increasingly exigent: this neoliberal condition paints Spain-centrism with glowing highlights. Students arrive on campus with already-Eurocentric sensibilities which they seek to cultivate further by learning new ways to pronounce *vosotros* or to appreciate Queen Isabel, Miguel de Cervantes, or Pilar Miró, to learn the high-speed rail routes around the Peninsula, and to gain experience in a European Spanish that is celebrated both inside and outside the classroom. Many

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

carry with them the intention to study away in Spain before arriving on campus. A Spanish classroom, a Spanish minor or major, and eventually a PhD, are a path for students to realize those Eurocentric dreams.

While these are reasons to maintain Eurocentrism, in a larger view such legitimizations only redouble the urgency for decolonization of doctoral studies specifically. Those who educate future teachers are university faculty with PhD credentials: at all levels of instruction, from pre-k to graduate courses, instructors teach in relation to their interests and experience. If a conceptual shift were to occur on a large scale, localizing the centers of the disciplines (composition and rhetoric, linguistics, performance, media, DH, cultural studies, including *literature* and so on), faculty would teach and develop their interests in the same ways they do now. In primary, middle and high schools, and then at the undergraduate levels, students would develop non-Eurocentric interests in study and study away, continuing research, specialization, in ways that cannot occur in the contemporary model. Using some of the same structures that privilege Spain now, in a long view, would re-center student attention (and therefore students' knowledge-system and knowledge-production, interests and curiosity, intellectual development, and scholarly participation) toward local cultures with similar outcomes.

DECOLONIAL OBSTACLES IN SECULAR MONOTHEISM, INCUMBENCY BIAS, AND ENROLLMENTS

Secular monotheism has an important influence in the social and cultural institutions in spaces claimed by the US political body—as well as in the political body itself. When knowledge is developed in such a frame, formations tend to unify all under a single prescribed center: tacit declarations of one-beauty, one-perfection, one-language, one-certainty, one-experience-of-the-world, one-world (perhaps many worldviews), one-right / wrong, one-ethics, and so on, to which all others cannot be *worlds* but mere *worldviews* in relation. This trend appears in a pure form in Spanish language cultural studies, with Spain as the received center, the primordial, the generative force from which all other culture subordinately derives. The academy is structured in such a way that one cannot graduate without proficiency in histories, literatures, and knowledge of Spain in the way one may graduate without similar knowledge of the United States, Mexico, or any other equivalent grouping.

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

This monotheistic fetishization of one-ness allows the "secular" university to rely on "competition" as a (in fact *the*) standard hiring/admissions mechanism. It also has significant weight in precisely what occurs in classrooms. All this prescribed one-ness is present in the ways languages and cultures are studied and institutionalized: each are to be understood as one homogenous unit, scaled by one-"value" and one-"aesthetics" and one-"epoch" and one-"grammar" and one-"vocabulary" that either approach or distantiate from the presumed center and its prescriptions of one-beauty, one-correctness, one-grammaticality and so on. What is overriding in secular monotheism is the myth that mono-centers unify: the myth tells us that the "center" maps and reproduces reality in appropriate ways. While these one-informed cartographies may have evolving boundaries, they are enforced by the sole-knowledge inevitabilities of the secular monotheistic tradition. It is an organizational unit that evokes perspectives that link "us" to "them," as "they" like "us" share one-truth understandings of reality that oppose "ours." These myths legitimize the divisions of people, communities, cultures and societies into the channels that characterize Eurocentric critique. Decolonial sensibilities are anathema to secular monotheistic traditions and their institutions. They recognize and give voice to marginalized knowledges of meaning; they form new and multiple centers that are ephemeral and contingent; they undo the certainties that hold up secular monotheistic institutions, their pedagogies, and the stratified worldviews which they imagine as self-evident.

"SPANISH"-AMERICAN CULTURAL ESSENCES?

Another argument in favor of overrepresenting Peninsular topics focuses on the supposed role that Spanish culture has had in the development of Latin American authors and artists. Several significant Latin American writers, including Gómez Suárez de Figueroa (El Inca), Rosa María Britton, Gabriel García Márquez, Elena Poniatowska, Gloria Guardia, and José Martí, among many others, spent significant periods in Spain. Moreover, as these figures almost certainly were exposed to canonic Peninsular culture during their formative years, we should—according to the traditional model—address this in our curricular approach. A proponent of such a concept would argue that due to the importance of these outstanding and seminal Spanish cultural figures, and their influence on Latin America creation, we should place special attention on Peninsu-

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

lar material in order to aptly interpret and contextualize Latin American work. To this end, for instance, Brad Epps has characterized the field of Latin American studies itself as a "mode of Hispanism" (2005, 233). In such approaches, Spain must remain—today and for all time—at the center of our Latin American studies.

The supposed cultural mimicry of Peninsular norms—a concept at the center of such Eurocentric approaches to Latin American tracts—could be delinked from these myths by reframing curricula away from these historical axes of inquiry. Gabriel García Márquez lived in Spain in the 1960s and 1970s, wrote there, and returned often for visits over the years. He was the principal author of a plea to the Spanish government to reject the Schengen Agreement, which requires Latin Americans to have visas to enter Spain:

> Al entrar a España no tengo la impresión de llegar, sino la de volver. Quizás a muchos españoles les resulte extraño este sentimiento, pero les aseguramos que esa sensación es la típica del criollo, la del indiano, la del colono o del colonizado nacido en esos territorios de lo que fue el antiguo imperio de España. Si nos atrevemos a hacerle un reclamo a esa gran nación que nos enseñaron a considerar, con razón o sin ella, como nuestra Madre Patria, es por el hondo convencimiento que tenemos de no ser ajenos a España.
>
> . . . sabemos que es cierto, que nuestra imaginación, nuestra lengua mayoritaria, nuestros referentes culturales más importantes provienen de España. Aquí nos mezclamos con otros riquísimos aportes de la humanidad, en especial con el indígena y el negro, pero nunca hemos renegado, ni podríamos hacerlo, de nuestro pasado español. Nuestros clásicos son los clásicos de España, nuestros nombres y apellidos se originaron allí casi todos, nuestros sueños de justicia, y hasta algunas de nuestras furias de sangre y fanatismo, por no hablar de nuestros anticuados pundonores de hidalgo, son una herencia española. ("Protesta de intelectuales por visa a España" 1989)

García Márquez's description of what has been termed "roots tourism" forms a troubling discourse of long-distance imagined postcolonial nationalism that should be situated in the framework of what it is: a subaltern plea for independence.[21] The Schengen Agreement (like the US Visa Waiver Program) blocks European visitation rights to all but the wealthiest Latin Americans—it is a postcolonial form of political, social, cultural,

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

and economic imperialism.[22] In the face of the repression that is the visa system, there is desperation; and these are not issues that ceased to exist at some point in the distant past—Schengen was approved in 1989 and is currently active. The letter is symbolic of a subjugated and yet colonized group attempting to win favor through feigning union. Part of the decolonial process forges localized aesthetics through literature, art, and thought; and the material in the above letter is a chapter in that process: the oppressed intending to maintain a vestige of autonomy—the ability to move from place to place unencumbered.[23]

The García Márquez letter recognizes the power of states. Another of his reports on these laws focuses on individual agency—in a second declaration, García Márquez dropped the cultural subordinate tone (el hijo perdido de España, la "Madre Patria") saying: "The first Spaniards who came to America did so without visas and firing in all directions. They joined up with our women and took our gold." He also said in remonstration of the law that he would never again return to Spain (qtd. in Riding 1989, 1). Indeed, many Latin American intellectuals and authors over the centuries have been generally ambivalent toward Spain, if not openly hostile. As Nicolas Shumway points out: "Even well into the twentieth century, the obligatory youthful journey for all Spanish American elites was to France, not Spain" (2005, 288).

Conceiving "Latin America" as an entity is an attempt to connect, on an immense scale, disparate peoples through assumed cultural resemblances. The post-colonial plight unifies, and the language does somewhat—but should we insist on re-conceiving and reiterating this imagined unity? Carlos Fuentes notes that since the initial European incursions, Latin Americans have identified not with Spain but with the cultures "de sus lugares de nacimiento, con sus naciones, con su geografía, con su historia . . . distintas de la historia de España" (1997, part 3). Fuentes describes the subordinate relationship Latin Americans have had with Spain as the catalyst of a shared identity, one that derives from oppression and colonialism, and results in "una identitdad . . . común" (1997, part 4). Fuentes goes on to underscore that these are not concepts from the past; the struggle for cultural and social representation and autonomy is one that "aun no termina" (1997, part 4).

Post-national studies and post-area studies imagine their tracts to be a critical leap forward driven by the need to disentangle traditional hegemonies, particularly those related to trans/national imperialisms. But we

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

are yet in a polarized colonial period due to the controlling and imperialist power imbalance that has been codified in the Schengen Agreement and US Visa Waiver Program—and through the curricular preferences that exist at US universities, which openly treat Latin American (and US, if understood as external to Latin America) culture as less important than Peninsular.[24] If "Latin America" and "Spain" and "the United States" are to exist as conceptual units, treating Spanish-language communities through demographically stable pedagogy (moving away from one-to-one Eurocentrism) gestures toward undoing a degree of the ongoing economic, political, and cultural erasure.

TRANSATLANTIC APPROACHES

Engaging prefixes like multi- and trans- as a method to shift attention toward intellectual duality—that is, imagined connections between imagined communities—often repeats the marginalization of traditionally silenced peoples. We might describe the field of African, American, and European tracts as dedicated to a horizontalized cultural history—its fertilizations, exchanges, translations, contacts, and mixtures—but there is a looming danger of the subfields merging into an approach that results in the same dilemmas as other hyphens and prefixes. Indeed, for a "transatlantic" appointment in a Spanish-language department to be stable with respect to the cultures in question, her or his interests/studies must be 90 percent weighted in the direction of Latin America[25]—a reality that Joan Ramon Resina questions: "What else is the 'transatlantic' jargon that is currently in vogue but a recycled or merely rebaptized Hispanism" (2009, 209)?

The Spanish government finances many pan-Spanish-language initiatives that offer economic capital (often for cultural programs) in exchange for expressions of cultural unity from Latin American nations—for this reason, each of these initiatives involves the prefix "Ibero-" which, possibly indirectly, alludes to a core component of the movements: entrenching, or at the very least expressing, a desired Eurocentric identity dimension in these Spanish-speaking societies:

Iberoamérica Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura
Espacio Cultural Iberoamericano

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

Organización de Televisión Iberoamericana
Secretaría General Iberoamericana
Carta Cultural Iberoamericana
Asociación de Estados Iberoamericanos para el Desarrollo de las Bibliotecas Nacionales de Iberoamérica
Juegos Iberoamericanos
Cumbre Iberoamericana

The perceived union between Latin America and Spain, constructed often through capitalist and neoliberal/colonial—not democratic—interventions, is part of what authorizes the Eurocentric fetishization across US academic faculties. This concept should be closely examined as there are many cases in which this cultural amalgam is openly rejected in Latin America, and the reception of Latin American migrants in Spain in many ways doubly contradicts the concept of one sociocultural community.[26] The supposed union benefits the capitalist interventions for Spain, which dominates much of the banking, publishing, and media in Latin America; but the cultural reality does not correspond to what is implied in the Ibero- prefix.

A PARADIGM SHIFT

Mi corazón está en Latinoamérica . . . o sea, aquí [en Oregon].

Liliana Darwin López, "Liliana Darwin López" (2019, 1)

Using existing structural restrictions, in a new approach to the formation of a Spanish language and cultures department, 10 percent of the professoriate would be specialists in Peninsular themes. However, as Denijal Jegić argues, such "structural presumptions of equality" can often be used to mask and protect colonial power (2019, 119). In order to reorganize the arrangement of departmental disciplines, the perception of a specialist (for the case of the Peninsularist) could change—in the same way that some departments of ten faculty have one "Mexicanist" who is expected to touch all realms of that literary and cultural history—the same could be the case for Spain.[27] Such a transition would require restructuring BA, MA, and PhD programs—and this transition could occur seamlessly within the other paradigm shifts accompanying a democratization and decolonization of the field.

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.

While universities and departments ostensibly design classroom, curricular, and cultural dynamics toward the best interests of student and local populations, the Eurocentric paradigms from decades and centuries ago are fossilized in place—and they yet characterize some central dimensions of the encounter. This study adds to the growing calls for a shift in institutional stance, one that would recognize, hear, and give voice to students in non-imperial languages and ways of being. As the coming chapters develop, such a transition would allow traditional labels assigned to students (terms often weaponized to minoritize them) to be interpreted, critiqued, and at times abandoned. As the distinctions between "educational" and "home" settings dilute, and the materials of study shift away from far-off languages, cultures and histories, students will engage their own experience and voices in ways that cause their institutions to relinquish parts of the imperial narrative, and with it, conceptualizations like "native" and "standard" and "foreign" may receive new contextualization and critique. As Idelber Avelar comments, "democratization of cultural capital in the discipline not only lies in the canon and its expansion" (2005, 279), it also relies on new emphases, new sources, new voices—each of which can emerge from pedagogies imbued with critical integration of non-imperial sensibilities cultivated by students' in their own languages, communities and cultures. The analysis in this book and the solutions put forth would be a part of a complex whole, and while the Eurocentric discrimination in Spanish-language departments is reinforced by tradition, high enrollments, "beautiful" texts and a rich body of critique thereon, a new direction will be a significant gain for our students.

© 2022 University of Pittsburgh Press. All rights reserved.