

AUTHOR: ROSEMARY HENZE, KATHRYN A. DAVIS
TITLE: Authenticity and Identity: Lessons from Indigenous Language Education
SOURCE: Anthropology & Education Quarterly 30 no1 3-21 Mr '99

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited.

ABSTRACT

This essay introduces this theme issue, which examines how notions of identity and authenticity are defined and negotiated in different contexts of indigenous language education in Alaska, California, Hawai'i, and the Solomon Islands. The introductory article situates these case studies within the larger context of other language/culture-minority groups who are attempting to maintain or revitalize their heritage languages, language varieties, and cultural practices through educational endeavors.

As the 20th century draws to a close, the languages of the world's indigenous people are increasingly threatened. The proportions of this loss, as reported in recent scholarly and popular articles, are staggering. Although we now have approximately 6,000 languages in the world, it is estimated that all but 200 to 250 will perish or come very close to perishing in the next century (Diamond 1993; Krauss 1992). To some of us, this depletion of the world's linguistic resources represents a tragedy on the same scale as the loss of biological diversity through the destruction of rain forests and other natural resources. To others, especially indigenous people, the imminent loss is much more personal, for with the language goes the intricacy of culture, worldview, and the indigenous identity that was best expressed through that language. Others still see the loss as merely a fact of life, another form of Darwinian "survival of the fittest." Even some indigenous people feel that "progress" in the modern sense requires giving up some old ways, including language, and that efforts to save a dying language are not the best use of time when there are so many issues at stake that seem more pressing, not the least of which are physical and economic survival.

Ultimately, however, the decision to maintain or renew a threatened language must be made by the speakers of that language, not by outsiders such as linguists or anthropologists, no matter how well intentioned. Without this ownership by speakers themselves or their descendants, attempts at revitalization are destined to flounder and ultimately fail. As the consciousness of impending or past loss takes hold, more and more indigenous people around the world are taking action for their communities and for their languages, and it is to these proactive efforts that we dedicate this theme issue of Anthropology and Education Quarterly. Our intent is to explore, through the lenses of educational anthropology and language planning, some exciting new developments and struggles taking place in indigenous language revitalization efforts.(FN1)

This exploration of indigenous language revitalization speaks to those indigenous peoples engaged in struggles ranging from the near death to the healthy maintenance of their languages across educational, social, and economic institutions. However, its relevance does not stop here, for the dilemmas faced in indigenous language revitalization are similar to those faced by other language minorities in communities and schools worldwide. Although nonindigenous language minorities may not experience the devastating threat of their heritage language being lost for all time as do many indigenous groups,(FN2) they nonetheless often suffer loss on an individual and community basis as dominant forces conspire to "assimilate" them into mainstream ways of speaking and behaving. As Fishman states,

RLS [Reverse Language Shift] appeals to many because it is part of the process of re-establishing local options, local control, local hope and local meaning to life. It basically reveals a humanistic and positive outlook vis-à-vis intragroup life, rather than a mechanistic and fatalistic one. It espouses the right and the ability of small cultures to live and to inform life for their own members as well as to contribute thereby to the enrichment of humankind as a whole. [1991:35]

Within the continental United States, efforts on the part of minorities to establish "local options, local control, local hope, and local meaning" are evident in bilingual education and Afrocentric schools, as well as some schools in indigenous communities. Yet despite common goals such as local decision making, the issues confronting immigrants, indigenous groups, and African Americans are often viewed as separate and drastically different from each other (see, for example, Ogbu 1988). Our intent is to acknowledge the differences but also to emphasize the similarities in order to both foster learning and encourage solidarity among apparently disparate groups as they face common problems associated with oppression.

THE KNOWLEDGE BASE

To date, indigenous language revitalization efforts have been sparsely documented. The most thorough treatment appeared in 1991, with Joshua Fishman's book *Reversing Language Shift*. Fishman's volume chronicles a number of case studies of efforts to reverse the shift from a minority language to a dominant language, including the cases of Maori, Navajo, Irish indigenous languages, and the aboriginal languages in Australia. Fishman also provides a framework for understanding the stages of reversing language shift (reproduced later in this article). Other documentation and research that focus on indigenous renewal efforts include Hinton 1994, on California native languages and renewal efforts; Cantoni 1996, which documents two symposia in which indigenous educators and linguists shared information about language renewal efforts; Zepeda and McCarty 1995, which contains descriptions of programs and practices for language restoration; and Hornberger 1996, which provides 16 case studies including Yup'ik, Navajo, Hualapai, and Cochiti, as well as studies of Meso- and South American languages. The early years of efforts to save the Hawaiian language are documented in Shutz 1994 and in a brief program description by Kaponono (1994). Zia and Karuk community efforts to preserve native languages are described by Sims (1996). In addition, individual articles appear from time to time in journals such as the *Bilingual Research Journal*, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *Language in Society*, *Language*, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, and others.

It is likely that with the recent funding for indigenous language enhancement programs authorized by the Native American Languages Act (1992), there will be more documentation. Language renewal also now has a presence on the World Wide Web and various list servers. The above publications, however, represent only a small proportion of language revitalization activity, much of which has not been documented or published in scholarly journals. When we think of the knowledge base in this area, therefore, we must not discount the knowledge that is held in small communities and schools.

Contrary to the indigenous literature, publications about other language-minority groups, including immigrants, refugees, and, in Europe, guest workers, are extensive. This vast literature generally portrays one or more of the following philosophical perspectives. The "language as

problem" perspective views different languages as "a social problem to be identified operationally and resolved through treatments like transitional bilingual education" (Ruiz 1988:17). The "language as right" orientation includes "the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of language" and "the right to use your own language(s) in the activities of communal life" (Macias 1979:88-89, quoted in Ruiz 1988:11). The "language as resource" orientation "start[s] with the assumption that language is a resource to be managed, developed, and conserved" (Ruiz 1988:17).

Those involved in language revitalization tend to view use and maintenance of heritage languages as both a right and a resource. For example, Fishman (1991) provides case studies of immigrant communities in the United States seeking to reverse the shift of Spanish and Yiddish to English monolingualism based on the assumption of their right to do so and the perceived need to maintain their language and cultural resources. Fishman also examines what is required to effect a reversal of language shift and why some cases have been more successful than others. From this examination, he developed a framework of eight stages that are necessary to safeguard the future of a threatened language (see Table 1).

In this table, X represents the indigenous or minority language and Y represents the dominant language community. Fishman points out that the first steps in RLS for languages that have no or few living speakers (stage 8) are to reconstruct the language so that it meets current interactional needs (corpus planning) and to promote adult second-language acquisition of the minority language.

While the scale has been extremely helpful in viewing language revitalization as a process with discernable focal points, it has also raised a number of questions. For example, if we read the scale as an ascending movement toward increasing vitality of the minority language, why is schooling under dominant-group control the next step after schooling under indigenous-group control? Is it really necessary to proceed sequentially through the eight stages, or can RLS occur as well when several stages are under development simultaneously, as many indigenous groups are in fact doing? Some have questioned how the scale can account for all the political work that must be done if resources and support are to be generated. Though Fishman does address this point (1991:102), it is not evident in the scale itself. Other concerns that have been voiced about the scale come from indigenous groups who find that its hierarchical frame imputes negative meanings to those whose language situation appears to be at the "bottom of the scale." They prefer to define their own level of success, not to have it defined for them by outside, theoretical interpretations. Last, although we agree with Fishman that the home/community/neighborhood maintenance of the indigenous language is of primary importance, we have also noted that some educators have used this position to justify not implementing maintenance (or even transitional) bilingual education. This last point is a substantive concern not so much with the scale itself but, rather, with the way it is interpreted and used. Fishman's own commentary at the end of this issue responds in part to these concerns.

A HOLISTIC PERSPECTIVE

There has been a strong tendency in the past to view language shift as the domain of linguists or linguistic anthropologists only, because of their visibility in developing dictionaries and grammars. Often they follow on the heels of an earlier generation of missionaries, who in many cases also tried to document the language and use it to facilitate conversion. As a series of articles in *Language* made evident, active intervention in language politics has become a subject of much disagreement among linguists (for example, Hale 1992). Many are shedding the

objectivist positions of the past and taking on more politically active roles in language renewal. But others argue that this, too, is colonial thinking: "We should not assume that we know what is best for them" (Ladefoged 1992:810).

When, for whatever reasons, linguistic description turns toward activism and intervention, a whole new range of questions and issues arises, and this is where educational anthropology and language planning become important and, we argue, underutilized resources. To intervene in the decline of a language requires education, and we mean education in its broadest, most generous definition. School programs, community-based programs, consciousness raising, child socialization practices in the home, informal apprenticeships--all are implicated. Successful intervention also requires language planning and policy changes at the local as well as state or national level so that the indigenous or minority language can be supported. And finally, intervention means conscious cultural change as well as language change. Through the forms of education that are documented in this issue, we see that it is much more than language that is being transmitted and acquired; community members, teachers, and students are questioning the very nature of culture and identity. In bilingual education programs, one often hears phrases such as "walking in two worlds" or "the best of both worlds," but such images imply a static, bounded view of culture and gloss over the complexities involved in negotiating more than one cultural identity (Henze and Vanett 1993). In indigenous efforts to recapture a language and culture that has almost been lost, educators grapple with an added layer of complexity, in that the reference point for the minority language and culture no longer exists. What, then, is the nature of the culture and language to be acquired by the new generation? A processual approach to culture, as described by Rosaldo (1989), helps to explain the ever moving, creative activity of developing new cultural forms that nonetheless have strong ties to an earlier community of native speakers. Rosaldo's image of people who are "crisscrossed by multiple identities" is also apt because the societies in which language revitalization is taking place are, for the most part, not merely bicultural (1989:216). Many native people have multiethnic backgrounds and must negotiate these identities as well as their native and dominant culture "selves."

Because indigenous language revitalization involves cultural change, language change, education, political and economic coalition building, and language planning, it cannot be viewed in a piecemeal fashion. The inadequacy of such an approach is eloquently expressed in a poem by Richard Littlebear in which he describes the litany of remedies that native groups have tried in their efforts to restore their languages: from creating dictionaries, to training indigenous people as linguists, to applying for federal bilingual education grants, to creating culturally relevant materials, and so forth, all ending with the refrain, "and still our native American languages kept on dying" (1996:xiii).(FN3)

In describing indigenous language revitalization efforts, Littlebear not only suggests that this cannot be done in piecemeal fashion but also questions the purpose behind these efforts. Is the purpose to keep the language alive? Or is it to maintain or recapture language as a vibrant and central component of culture, as it embodies the cultural worldview and identity of an indigenous people? Littlebear also points out that language revitalization efforts have tended to focus on literacy and schooling in the form of bilingual education (using the dominant societal and indigenous languages as media of instruction) or immersion education (using the indigenous language as medium of instruction). Although schooling is an important part of reversing language shift, it often serves to avert our attention from what Fishman believes is an even more pivotal stage--intergenerational transmission of the language in the home and community: "If

this stage is not satisfied, all else can amount to little more than biding time, at best generation by generation" (1991:399).

Securing the intergenerational transmission of a language, however, requires that we take a holistic approach, an approach that recognizes the interconnections among language, culture, politics, economics, and education (Davis 1994). Watson-Gegeo and Gegeo have argued that understanding language and power as they relate to schooling and educational intervention requires an integration "of micro and macro levels of contextual data, collected and analyzed in a qualitative, ethnographic framework" (1995:59-60). This theme issue attempts to illustrate the macro- and microaspects of language planning endeavors. Taken as a whole, the articles not only cover descriptions of what native language communities are doing to ensure the survival of their languages but also include analyses of the social and political contexts that surround these efforts. While two of the articles in this issue report on empirical studies (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo, Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore), the others report on observations and understandings gained through long-term involvement in local efforts at language revitalization.

ESSENTIALISM AND CONSTRUCTIVISM: A DICHOTOMY IN NEED OF REPAIR?

In the process of assembling and editing the articles for this special issue, we have come face to face with an important issue currently confronting any ethnic group attempting to determine its own destiny within the context of a dominant society. In its theoretical form, the question is, To what extent is language tied to ethnicity? A more practice-oriented form of the question might be, To what extent does one's ethnicity matter in working toward the revitalization of a particular language? The positions held by those concerned with these relationships of language and ethnicity can be viewed along a continuum between essentialist and constructivist. The essentialist position holds that there is a natural relationship between an ethnic group and its ancestral language. The constructivist position considers language to be a part of culture and therefore a human, social construction. In this view, because language is a social construction, there is no such thing as a "natural" relationship between a group of people and their language. Turner, for example, warns of

identity politics, in which the concept of culture becomes merged with that of ethnic identity. From an anthropological standpoint, at least in its more simplistic ideological forms, it is fraught with dangers both theoretical and practical. It risks essentializing the idea of culture as the property of an ethnic group or race; it risks reifying cultures as separate entities by overemphasizing their boundedness and mutual distinctness; it risks overemphasizing the internal homogeneity of cultures in terms that potentially legitimize repressive demands for communal conformity. [1993:411-412]

However, we find that this dichotomy oversimplifies the variety of reasons why people might be likely to espouse a close connection between language and ethnicity. As we see it, the constructivist argument fails to recognize that there is not simply one essentialist position. We have identified at least three that posit strong linkages between language and ethnicity, and there may be more. At the furthest extreme is the biological essentialist--by now, we hope, a dying breed--who literally casts language as a biologically inherited feature of particular ethnic groups. We still hear traces of this position in everyday speech--in claims like "English is the birthright of all Americans" and so on. Then there is a spiritual argument, espoused by many current native language activists, which claims that there is a natural relationship between ethnicity and

language based not on biology but on native cosmologies, which in many cases identify language as a gift of the creator to that specific group of people. Because of its divine origin, the people of that specific group have the duty of protecting and nurturing their language, and uninvited intervention or control of language maintenance by outsiders may be viewed as a violation of the spiritual relationship between people and language.

A third type of connection between language and ethnicity flows from the desire to achieve social justice. In this view, there is a historical relationship between people of a certain ethnic group and their ancestral language. The language, as Fishman (1996) notes, is related to the culture in such a way that it is also associated with kinship, intimacy, and connection--the language that was heard on grandfather's knee. The "social justice" position, as we call it, advocates that certain rights be accorded to those whose ancestral languages are now dying, endangered, or threatened. These rights would include not only the right to speak and use the ancestral language but also the right to determine whether they want a dying or endangered language to be revitalized, or whether a currently healthy but threatened language is to be maintained, and the right to be the media spokespeople for that language group if they choose to do so. Peter Keegan, a Maori language activist, argues that "we 'own' our culture and language. We also 'own' the right to define how the rest of the world sees us" (1997). The Western legal basis for such rights is still being worked out, but progress has been made in the form of the 1993 United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The declaration states, "Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop, and transmit to future generations their languages, oral traditions, writing systems, and literatures" (United Nations Commission on Human Rights 1993:6). In Western legal terms, these cultural attributes are considered "intellectual property rights" (Greaves 1994:ix).

The reason those of the "social justice" persuasion can claim these rights is that there has been a history of colonialism and suppression of the native language such that, in the past, it was mostly nonnative people who determined the fate of the language and culture. Now, in salvaging what is left and reasserting a group's self-determination, social justice demands that minority-group voices be heard. As Warner (this issue) points out, this does not exclude nonnative voices. However, he wants nonnative supporters to recognize that when they are the primary spokespeople for native groups, they reinforce previous patterns in which white people spoke for native people and determined much of what ensued in the past 100 years. This is not to deny that some ethnic groups have adopted and made uniquely their own a language other than their heritage language, such as the Irish and Scots have done with English. However, we are specifically concerned here with those indigenous languages that are threatened, endangered, or dying and that the speakers of those language wish to maintain or revitalize.

In this issue, none of the authors make any claims for biological essentialism, nor do we hear references to a spiritual relationship between ethnicity and language. We do hear arguments for a close link between culture and language from all of the authors in this issue. We also hear arguments for historical connections between language and ethnicity, which, in the context of past colonial control and oppression, lead to a political stance that requires correcting the injustices of the past through concerted action that empowers the minority group (Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore this issue; Warner this issue).

There seems to be a new examination taking place in anthropology that looks critically at the rejection of essentialism. In a paper presented at the 1997 American Anthropological Association Presidential Panel, for example, Harrison points out that "among those of us who jettison essentialist concepts of race, and recognize the problematic biological status of the concept, there

are cultural anthropologists who have taken the no-races-exist position a bit too far" (1997:6). She goes on to say that it remains critical to theorize how a "history and present as privileged or disprivileged" has shaped the social consequences of race and ethnicity (1997:6). Harrison's comments and others in the January 1998 issue of the Anthropology Newsletter lead us to wonder whether anthropological theorizing about race, ethnicity, and culture is in the process of a spiraling movement. Where Montagu's (1997) rejection of the biological construct of race once served to free us of the notion that there were separate origins of separate races and helped to disconnect culture from biology, the new examination of race, ethnicity, and culture may help us to probe more deeply the various social and political reasons for reconnecting ethnicity and culture.

INDIGENOUS AUTHORS

In this issue, we have made a concerted effort to find authors who are themselves members of the indigenous groups highlighted here. We have done so in order to begin to redress the overwhelming absence of indigenous people writing about indigenous issues in scholarly journals. Fine warns against the tendency among qualitative researchers to reproduce a "colonizing discourse of the 'Other'" (1994:70). What is needed are the voices of indigenous peoples in both ethnographic research reports and position papers on issues of such central interest to them as language renewal. Of course, there is also the danger that in representing some indigenous voices, assumptions may be made that all indigenous people of a certain group share similar views. We hope readers understand that the indigenous authors in this issue do not "represent" all their people any more than the European American authors "represent" European American views in general.

This kind of critical look at who is involved and why must also be applied to our own positions as nonindigenous coeditors of this issue. When is it appropriate for nonindigenous researchers to step aside and make room for indigenous scholars, and what roles are the most important ones for indigenous people to assume at a given point? In conceiving the idea for this theme issue, it was our intent to create a forum for work that we knew had significant messages that all of us who study and practice education need to be exposed to. Our goal was to highlight their contributions but also to point out, through this introduction and the editorial work, that advocacy for change can and does come from many places and people. As Warner points out (this issue), the question is not whether others can provide support but, rather, that indigenous people should be the ones who define what kind of support is needed.

The need for indigenous voices to be heard suggests other questions vital to conducting research and making decisions about language and cultural revitalization. These questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Who decides language and educational policies at the national and local levels?
2. How and by whom are language and educational policies implemented?
3. What are the interrelationships among top-down and bottom-up (grassroots) efforts toward language and cultural revitalization, and how are these relationships influenced by social, political, and economic factors?

Not only are these types of questions central to research and decisionmaking efforts on the part of indigenous peoples, they are also relevant to language and cultural minorities worldwide. A poignant example of power differentials in decision making involving immigrants in the United States is revealed in the book *Language, Culture, and Power: Bilingual Families and the Struggle for Quality Education* by Lourdes Diaz Soto (1996). In her ethnographic study of a

Pennsylvania school district, Soto describes how the school board and superintendent disregarded the pro-bilingualism demonstrations, petitions, and oral statements of local Latino parents, students, and community members and closed down its nationally recognized, 20-year-old bilingual (Spanish/English) program. In this case, it was a small group of European American school board members who made a decision that was contrary to the wishes of those parents, students, and community members throughout the school district who were affected by it.

IDENTITY AND AUTHENTICITY

Underlying and central to language renewal efforts are issues of identity and authenticity. In indigenous people's talk about revitalizing or maintaining their languages, these two issues surface repeatedly. For example, in Hawai'i, the question of who should learn and speak Hawaiian arises frequently. While there are many Hawaiians currently learning and speaking Hawaiian as a second language, there are also many non-Hawaiians enrolled in the same classes. Is this a problem or an asset? Who and what is language revitalization for? If the Hawaiian language is not fundamentally for Hawaiians, then why save it? Several of the authors in this issue (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo, Wong, Warner) remind us that language has to be seen as part of the living essence of a community; it is not a "thing" to preserve apart from people. These and other issues suggest that Hawaiian identity and, we suspect, other indigenous identities as well have become highly contested commodities in the cultural marketplace, and language renewal efforts are a primary site for these struggles. In a similar way, the proposition to end bilingual education in California and the controversy over the Ebonics Resolution by the Oakland School Board have become sites for political struggles over who has the right to shape education.(FN4)

In addition to the political struggles for recognition and ownership, individuals within indigenous communities grapple with definitions of self within societies crisscrossed with a variety of cultural influences. Given exposure to one or more languages and cultural entities besides the traditional heritage language and culture, teachers and parents struggle over decisions involving the attitudes, values, and beliefs children are to be socialized into, and students experience conflict over competing cultural models. The authors in this issue contribute to a growing body of literature concerning the complexity of curricular decision making in indigenous education (e.g., Lipka and Stairs 1994). The depth and breadth of this exploration not only speaks to the education of language-minority students but also questions standard assumptions in multicultural education for students of all sociocultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, genders, and sexual orientations.

For example, given the history of separate and inferior education for African American children in the United States, the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision was a landmark step, allowing African American students for the first time to attend schools with white children, the assumption being that this would provide African American students with educational opportunities equal to those of white students. Unfortunately, given tracking and a host of other unequal practices inside schools, the achievement of equal educational opportunity turned out to be much more complex. The *Lau v. Nichols* decision (1974) extended the equality of opportunity principle to children who are not yet proficient in English, asserting that there can be no equality of opportunity when children cannot comprehend the teacher and the materials because of language difference. Thus, being exposed to the same teachers and the same materials is not enough to assure "opportunity." These children must also have access to the materials through use of the first language and through second-language teaching that is comprehensible.(FN5)

For many parents who see their children marginalized in school, equity and access to the mainstream curriculum are still the main goals. Others, however, seek something even more difficult to achieve--that is, representation of their language, history, culture, worldview, and learning styles in the curriculum. Multicultural education, often conflated as though it were a single approach, actually encompasses a range of at least five different approaches (Banks 1991; Sleeter and Grant 1988). A key difference among these approaches is the degree to which mainstream assumptions about education are accepted or challenged.

It may well be that statehood or nationhood and the number of languages within a given political structure make a difference in the degree to which indigenous groups challenge mainstream educational structures. The Hawaiians and the Maori, for example, do not have to contend with multiple other indigenous languages in Hawai'i or New Zealand; whatever resources are available for native language and cultural purposes through the government or other sources can legitimately be claimed for Maori or Hawaiian purposes, and attempts to reform education along indigenous lines have a better chance of being supported because there is only one indigenous group in each case (albeit with many different subgroups). In Alaska and California, on the other hand, multiple indigenous groups complicate the prospects for political action. If resources from the state or federal government are to be allocated for indigenous purposes, equitable distribution becomes problematic. Given scarce resources, indigenous groups may lean more toward building their own communities and less toward challenging the larger structures of education (see Hinton and Ahlers, this issue, for more discussion of this point).

The indigenous communities represented in this issue grapple with authenticity as well, not only as a linguistic issue but also as a cultural and educational one. First, there is the issue of modernization. Given that language do evolve and must develop new words for new technologies, concepts, and so on, how are these new coinages developed and by whom? Second, authenticity implies a standard. This matter arises in part because no living language ever stands still, yet there is a strong tendency to regard some varieties as more "pure" or authentic than others. When several different varieties or regional dialects exist, past or current practices tend to favor selecting one variety as the standard--but that means promoting one variety over others. These aspects of authenticity are also controversial issues for, among others, African Americans concerned with African American Vernacular English or what is also known as Ebonics, speakers of Hawai'i Creole English in Hawai'i, Latinos in the United States who speak a variety other than Castilian or Mexican Spanish, and speakers of regional dialects of English such as Appalachian English.

Along similar lines, cultural authenticity can become an issue. If indigenous groups desire to teach children earlier traditions and culture, they, like African Americans, Latinos, and other minorities, face difficult decisions as to what to teach that can best represent an earlier ancestral culture or indeed a present-day one. For African Americans, whose regional roots in Africa have in most cases been lost because of slavery and family separations, cultural authenticity is especially problematic. In many cases, anything African has had to suffice for more precise identification of tribe or region. The often-cited frustration of minority parents over superficial, ill-informed, and short-lived celebrations of their culture in the schools (e.g., African American History Month, Cinco de Mayo, etc.) highlights the difficulty of representing something as elusive, varied, and ever changing as culture. The tendency is to reduce culture to something tangible such as rituals, songs, dances, and food. Hinton and Ahlers (this issue) and Wong (this issue) make the point that there can be no absolute authenticity, that it is a social construction. But if this is so, then who decides what language and cultural forms are to be taught to children

in school? What happens to those forms of cultural expression that are not selected for transmission, and how do such choices impact children's understandings of culture and their own or other people's origins? The language, culture, and power dilemmas explored through questions about indigenous authenticity in this issue can contribute to deepening and refining our approaches to language and cultural inclusion wherever children are being educated.

Authenticity and identity are closely intertwined in language renewal efforts. But they are merely ideals until they take shape in language teaching and school-based cultural transmission as well as in families and apprenticeships in which the indigenous language is used. It is teachers and students, parents, uncles and aunts, and children who give form to these ideals, constructing or deconstructing them to suit their own needs and contexts. In this issue, we read some of the stories of how people negotiate new and old identities and how they struggle to identify what authenticity means in their languages and cultures today. These stories will undoubtedly resonate not only with those concerned with indigenous issues but also with researchers and teachers working with language minorities across educational, institutional, and community settings.

A FOCUS ON THE PACIFIC RIM

We have chosen to focus on indigenous languages of the Pacific Rim because there has already been some attention to American Indian language renewal in the continental United States (e.g., Cantoni 1996; Hornberger 1996; Sims 1996) and some attention to Meso- and South American languages (Hornberger 1996). We wanted to enlarge the knowledge base to another geographic area and to highlight some of the learning to be found in the situations described here. The articles in this issue examine four language areas: Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands); Athabaskan (Alaska); native California languages; and Hawaiian.

Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo focus attention on a language that is not yet dying and consider what the Kwara'ae situation in the Solomon Islands can teach us about why language is so important to people's identity, their sense of authenticity, and the survival of their culture. In this article, one gets a sense of what language loss means: it is not only the loss of widespread use of the language but also the loss of the indigenous worldview embedded in the language. The authors also draw attention to ways in which the educational system is undermining Kwara'ae language teaching and learning processes. In reminding us of the complexity of indigenous knowledge systems, this article draws attention to what may be lost when indigenous languages are not maintained.

We then turn to Dementi-Leonard and Gilmore's article, which takes us to interior Alaska and an Athabaskan language planning process. At the time of writing, there was no program yet for revitalization, but various plans were being discussed and, as Fishman puts it, "ideological clarification" was taking place (1991:395). That is, before programs can be devised, community members need to come to some consensus that language renewal is desired and to determine what the specific goals are and how they can best be achieved within their own local context. Because all of the other language revitalization efforts have at some point traversed this planning stage, we believe this close look at one such process can provide insights into this critical juncture in language revitalization. In addition, we believe that ideological clarification is probably a theme that continues even when programs are being implemented, for the need to clarify and build consensus among one's own ethnic group does not end.

Hinton and Ahlers discuss authenticity in the context of California native languages, which, like the Athabaskan languages and like Hawaiian 12 years ago, have few if any remaining native speakers, most of whom are elderly. However, in contrast to the Athabaskan situation, California

native languages already have two programs in place, one of which is designed to teach adults the ancestral language as a second language through a unique "master-apprentice" program, and the other to train California Indians who have no remaining native speakers of the language in the use of archival materials to reconstruct the language. (Both efforts thus address Fishman's stage 8, reconstruction and adult acquisition of the language.) What is unique about the California programs is that neither of them relies on schooling as the primary means of change, and in fact, as the authors note, the informal nature of the master-apprentice program has allowed considerable flexibility and avoided the dilemmas of teaching the ancestral language in a Western institution.

We have highlighted the Hawaiian situation with two articles because there is very little published material available on Hawaiian language renewal, yet it is in many ways very advanced in terms of program spread and historical depth. Largely through Punana Leo ("language nests") preschools and Kula Kaiapuni (Hawaiian immersion schools) that now serve children in grades K-12, over one thousand people have become fluent Hawaiian-as-second-language speakers. Almost silenced 12 years ago, Hawaiian can now be heard in Honolulu supermarkets as mothers shop with children. While the bulk of the effort in Hawai'i has gone to schooling in Hawaiian (Fishman's stages 4a and 4b), programs are now in place to extend this learning beyond the schools into community-based language-learning activities, thus addressing Fishman's requirement that use of the language reach beyond the school into the family and community (stage 6). A number of families have also been raising their children using Hawaiian, even though this is a second language for the parents. The articles by Warner and Wong examine their work in schools, universities, and communities on O'ahu. Warner's article sets the context for the Hawaiian immersion situation. He demonstrates the injustices and educational problems inherent in outsiders making decisions for and on behalf of others. Wong discusses the difficulty of revitalizing a dying language, including tendencies toward hegemonic practices, prescriptivism, and adoption of Western rather than indigenous worldviews in word formation and second-language learning and use. The issue closes with a commentary by Joshua Fishman, the author of *Reversing Language Shift* and a scholar for nearly fifty years of the sociology of language.

Indigenous educators are constantly challenged by the conflict and compromise associated with developing curriculum that reflects indigenous worldview while attending to those Western forms of knowledge that students may need for future economic survival. This special issue speaks to indigenous educators, parents, students, and community members who struggle to maintain or revive their native languages and cultures within a language and cultural environment other than their own. However, it also has profound implications for the education of language and cultural minorities worldwide. In a global environment that is more often than not hegemonic (that is, one culture is given status above all others), questions of what count as authentic languages, literacies, and cultures as well as what are validated in the schools permeate educational endeavors.

Much of the indigenous language and cultural revitalization efforts concern avoiding the errors of the past while planning for the present and the future. Although mainstream educators can all too easily take for granted current educational expectations and practices, indigenous peoples committed to revitalization cannot afford to do so. Thus, indigenous educators more often than others engage in in-depth exploration of the meanings of cultural authenticity, identity, and hegemony. The discussions presented here, while providing a window on the struggles and

successes of indigenous peoples, can also mirror the meanings these discussions may have for both multicultural and mainstream schools.

ADDED MATERIAL

Rosemary Henze is a senior research associate at ARC Associates in Oakland, California. Kathryn A. Davis is an associate professor in the Department of English as a Second Language/Second Language Acquisition at the University of Hawai'i.

Table 1. Fishman's Stages of Reversing Language Shift: Severity of Intergenerational Dislocation [read from the bottom up]

1. Education, work sphere, mass media, and governmental operations at higher and nationwide levels
2. Local/regional mass media and governmental services
3. The local/regional (i.e., nonneighborhood) work sphere, both among Xians and among Yians
- 4b. Public schools for Xish children, offering some instruction via Xish, but substantially under Yish curricular and staffing control
- 4a. Schools in lieu of compulsory education and substantially under Xish curricular and staffing control
- II. RLS to Transcend Diglossia, Subsequent to Its Attainment
5. Schools for literacy acquisition, for the old and for the young, and not in lieu of compulsory education
6. The intergenerational and demographically concentrated home/family/neighborhood: the basis of mother tongue transmission
7. Cultural interaction in Xish primarily involving the community-based older generation
8. Reconstructing Xish and adult acquisition of XSL [X as a second language]
- I. RLS to Attain Diglossia (Assuming Prior Ideological Clarification)

Note: Adapted from Fishman 1991:395. "Xians," called "Xmen" in the original, are "members of the community ... with which the language [X] has been historically associated" (Fishman 1991:11).

FOOTNOTES

1. There are a number of terms in use to refer to the work of creating more speakers and wider use of a minority language. Some of these are Reverse Language Shift or RLS (Fishman 1991), language regeneration, language renewal, language revitalization, language maintenance, and language preservation. While some terms are governed by certain conditions (e.g., maintenance is an inappropriate term for a language that is no longer in use, and preservation may bring to mind mothballs and museums rather than a living language), other terms may simply be a matter of preference. We have not attempted to control this varying terminology in this issue.
2. The distinction between indigenous and nonindigenous minorities is sometimes a blurry one, as acknowledged in Kaapcke 1994. However, the International Labor Organization's Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries states that indigenous refers to those

peoples in independent countries who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country or geographical region ... at the time of conquest or colonization, or the establishment of present state boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions. [quoted in Kaapcke 1994:66]

3. With apologies to Littlebear, we were not able to reproduce the entire poem because of space limitations.
4. Proposition 227, passed by a majority of California voters in June 1998, dismantles the state's bilingual education system and replaces it with all-English instruction for language-minority children. For a section-by-section analysis, see Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund 1997. The Ebonics Resolution adopted by the Oakland School Board in California attempted to recognize the language variety spoken by many African American students as a distinct language in order to direct more funding and programmatic attention to the language issues of African American students. See Linguistic Society of America 1997.
5. Proposition 227 in California conflicts with the federal Lau decision on the use of children's primary languages in instruction. Where the Lau decision states that use of the primary language is one way to provide access to education (though it falls short of mandating bilingual education), Proposition 227 states that only English should be used in instruction.

REFERENCES CITED

- Banks, James
1991 Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies. 5th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cantoni, Gina, ed.
1996 Stabilizing Indigenous Languages. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Center for Excellence in Education.
- Davis, Kathryn A.
1994 Language Planning in Multilingual Contexts: Policies, Communities, and Schools in Luxembourg. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Diamond, Jared
1993 Speaking with a Single Tongue. Discover Magazine 14:78-85.
- Fine, Michelle
1994 Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research. In Handbook of Qualitative Research. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, eds. Pp. 70-82. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fishman, Joshua
1991 Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- 1996 What Do You Lose When You Lose Your Language? In Stabilizing Indigenous Languages. Gina Cantoni, ed. Pp. 80-92. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Center for Excellence in Education.
- Greaves, Tom, ed.
1994 Intellectual Property Rights for Indigenous Peoples: A Sourcebook. Oklahoma City: Society for Applied Anthropology.
- Hale, Kenneth
1992 On Endangered Languages and the Safeguarding of Diversity. Language 68(1):1-3.

- Harrison, Faye
1997 Cultural Anthropologists in the Conversation on Race. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Presidential Panel, "If Race Doesn't Exist....A Conversation among the Subdisciplines." Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.
- Henze, Rosemary, and Lauren Vanett
1993 To Walk in Two Worlds--or More? Challenging a Common Metaphor of Native Education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 24:116-134.
- Hinton, Leanne
1994 *Flutes of Fire: Essays on California Indian Languages*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
- Hornberger, Nancy, ed.
1996 *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Kaapcke, Gretchen
1994 Indigenous Identity Transition in Russia: An International Legal Perspective. *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 39 (Summer/Fall):62-68.
- Kapono, Eric
1994 Hawaiian Language Revitalization and Immersion Education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 112:121-135.
- Keegan, Peter
1997 Fieldwork Today or Cultural Theft? E-mail communication posted on the Endangered Languages List, February 7.
- Krauss, Michael
1992 The World's Languages in Crisis. *Language* 68(1):4-10.
- Ladefoged, Peter
1992 Another View of Endangered Languages. *Language* 68(4):809-811.
Linguistic Society of America (LSA)
1997 LSA Resolution on the Oakland "Ebonics" Issue. Chicago: LSA.
- Lipka, Jerry, and Arlene Stairs, eds.
1994 Negotiating the Culture of Indigenous Schools. Special issue. *Peabody Journal of Education* 69(2).
- Littlebear, Richard
1996 Preface. In *Stabilizing Indigenous Languages*. Gina Cantoni, ed. Pp. xiii-xv. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University Center for Excellence in Education.
- Macias, Reynaldo
1979 Language Choice and Human Rights in the United States. In *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*. James Alatis, ed. Pp. 86-101. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF)
1997 Preliminary Section-by-Section Analysis of the Unz Initiative. San Francisco: MALDEF.
- Montagu, Ashley
1997[1942] *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Ogbu, John
1988 Class Stratification, Racial Stratification, and Schooling. In *Class, Race, and Gender in American Education*. Lois Weis, ed. Pp. 163-182. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato

- 1989 Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis. Boston: Beacon.
- Ruiz, Richard
- 1988 Orientations in Language Planning. In Language Diversity: Problem or Resource? Sandra McKay and Sau Ling Wong, eds. Pp. 3-25. New York: Newbury House.
- Shutz, Albert
- 1994 The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Sims, Christine
- 1996 Native Language Communities: A Descriptive Study of Two Community Efforts to Preserve their Native Languages. Washington, DC: George Washington University National Indian Policy Center.
- Sleeter, Christine, and Carl Grant
- 1988 Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender. New York: Macmillan.
- Soto, Lourdes Diaz
- 1996 Language, Culture, and Power: Bilingual Families and the Struggle for Quality Education. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Turner, Terence
- 1993 Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology that Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It? Cultural Anthropology 8:411-429.
- United Nations Commission on Human Rights
- 1993 United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. New York: United Nations.
- Watson-Gegeo, Karen, and David Gegeo
- 1995 Understanding Language and Power in the Solomon Islands: Methodological Lessons for Educational Intervention. In Power and Inequality in Language Education. Jocelyn Tollefson, ed. Pp. 59-72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zepeda, Ofelia, and Teresa McCarty, eds.
- 1995 Indigenous Language Education and Literacy. Special issue. Bilingual Research Journal 19(1).