

言語権 — 華麗なレトリックか磐石な基礎か？ —

Language Rights: Marvelous Rhetoric or Solid Foundation?

ホセイン, タニア HOSSAIN, Tania

● 獨協大学
Dokkyo University



言語権, 言語的マイノリティ, 少数言語, 言語的人権, 母語を用いた教育

language rights, linguistic minorities, minority language, linguistic human rights, mother tongue medium education

ABSTRACT

世界では、多くの児童が、自身の話す言語とは別の言語を使用する学校に入学している。言語権の研究におけるもっとも重要な課題の一つは、言語権への働きかけが現在の多くの言語的状況の特徴となっている言語政策や不平等な制度に変化をもたらすことが出来るのかということである。その研究活動において、Tove Skutanbb-Kangasは一貫して世界中の言語的マイノリティの教育について研究を続けてきた。その一方で、Brutt-Grifflerは見解を異にしており、その第一の関心は言語計画と政策（LPP）に関する理論の欠陥にある（Tollefson, 2004）。そこで議論の対象となっているのは、言語権が理論的に正当化されておらず、言語的マイノリティの利益を保護することが出来ないということである。ここでは、言語的人権が同時代の人々にもたらす影響がわずかなものであったため、言語政策と計画（LPP）理論の欠陥の原因とされている。本稿では、Skutanbb-KangasとBrutt-Grifflerの言語権利に関する見解の相違に焦点をあてようとするものである。

Children throughout the world enter schools which encapsulate the difference between school language and the language pupils speak. One of the most important issues in language-rights research is whether language-rights efforts can effect change in language policies and in the systems of inequality that currently characterize many language situations. Tove Skutanbb-Kangas throughout her career has worked for the education of linguistic minorities worldwide. Brutt-Griffler advances a different view. The inadequacy of theory in language planning and policy (LPP) is her primary concern (Tollefson, 2004). She argues that a focus on language rights

is not theoretically justified, and that it cannot protect the interest of the linguistic minorities. She argues that advocacy of linguistic human rights has had little impact on people's lives and at the same time offers little for language policy and planning (LPP) theory. This article will focus on Skutanbb-Kangas and Brutt-Griffler's divergent views of language rights.

One of the most important issues in language-rights research is the question of whether language-rights efforts can effect change in language policies and in the systems of inequality that currently characterize many language situations. Skutnabb-Kangas, May, and others have argued that language rights advocacy offers a reasonable framework for the protection of minority languages. In contrast, Brutt-Griffler (2004) argues that a focus on language rights is neither theoretically justified nor useful as a means for protecting the interests of linguistic minorities.

Many children enter schools where the language used in the school differs from the language children speak. When dealing with the issue of education and language, it is important to differentiate between the right to an education which is necessary for social, economic and political participation and mobility and the right to an education through the mother tongue(s). These two rights are essential for language minorities to be able to participate in broader society as well as to retain connection with home or community language (Wiley, 2002)

Tove Skutanbb-Kangas, throughout her career, has worked for the education of linguistic minorities worldwide. In her article "Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education" she raised the question: "Can a human rights (HRs) approach to language planning and policy promote educational equity for diverse student populations?" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002, p.179). She argues that most indigenous and minority education in the world meets the UN definition of linguistic genocide and the dominant language is often turned into a killer language. To her, the most

important linguistic human right (LHR) which is needed to maintain the world's linguistic diversity is unconditional mother tongue medium (MTM) education. Pedagogical reasons for the low literacy rates in the world, as well as the economic and other factors, are responsible for the denial of this right. In condition of linguistic and cultural diversity, it is presumed that children learn language from their parents as well as from their community. This occurs in societies where children do not commonly attend school. However, when most children start school, if minority and indigenous children are educated through the dominant often official language, it is unlikely that as adults they will continue to speak to their children with in their own language. Therefore, the home language is not transmitted, and children are forced to become part of another linguistic group. In Skutnabb-Kangas' opinion, schools, the media and the world's economic, military and political systems are the main agents for this linguistic genocide. Fishman has mentioned many times that languages cannot be saved by schools but they do sometimes act as an agent for killing language in one or two generations. Krauss (1995) argues that 90% of today's spoken languages may no longer be spoken or learned by children in the year 2100 (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002).

According to Skutnabb-Kangas, it is necessary for the children to learn the home language as well as the dominant language. Most minority children need to learn the dominant language along with their own language. Additional languages enrich people's lives and give them more choice, more freedom, but these additional languages should be learned additively, not subtractively. They should not

replace mother tongues. Skutnabb-Kangas believes that everyone who resides in a country where a mother tongue is not an official language has the right to become bilingual in the mother tongue and the official language. English can be one of the possibilities as it has an official status in 70 countries of the world (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2004). Subtractive formal education which teaches children a dominant language may cause the linguistic genocide and the dominant language like English, Chinese, Hindi etc turns into a killer language. Educational linguistic human rights which guarantee additive language learning is needed to prevent linguistic genocide and also for the earth's linguistic diversity to be maintained (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002).

Proponents of monolingual instruction, such as English-only, often express economic reasons to show that MTM education is impossible. She mentioned, "proponents of monolingual instruction in killer language, such as English, often use economic arguments when trying to show that MTM education is completely impossible" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002, p. 181). They often describe MTM instruction as a naïve and romantic dream which misleads linguists and educationists. They argue that Asian and African poor countries cannot afford to teach many languages. Thus, it is better to teach students one language only, preferably English. According to Skutnabb-Kangas, the economic rationale for not organizing MTM is actually a fraud. Irrational policies are adopted which fail to support multilingualism or ensure school achievement for indigenous people, national immigrants and refugee minorities. Politically dominated groups adopt these irrational language policies, particularly in many Asian and African countries. These educational policies may cause linguistic and cultural genocide. The United Nations 1948 special definition of genocide is as follows: "Article III (1) prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of

publications in the language group". Prohibition can be direct or indirect. It would be regarded as a question of linguistic genocide if in the schools there are no minority teachers, if the minority language is not used as a medium of education and if, indirectly, everyday use of minority languages in school is prohibited. The dominant language medium of education for the minority child may cause mental harm and, in future, students will start using the dominant language with their own children when adults. In this process, within two or three generations linguistically (as well as in other ways) individuals are forcibly transferred to a dominant group (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002).

Suresh Canagarajah (2004) points out that some languages can enjoy higher linguistic capital than other languages. This concept does not express the idea that the child whose mother language is suppressed by education will suffer psychological damage. Much research shows that knowledge of an additional language is needed for primary socialization (Canagarajah, 2004). For example, in Sri Lanka, Hindu reformists started an educational system different from the education system offered by the British, i.e., it includes both English and Vernacular education. The new educational system in Sri Lanka includes Tamil and local culture content in a constructive way. It ensures additive bilingualism (Canagarajah, 2004).

Language has positive rights and positive right means the rights which create obligations for the state. The state has a firm duty to ensure the rights. Negative rights prevent linguistic discrimination. Positive right is required for education through the medium of minority languages. MTM education is one of the most important demand of indigenous and minority peoples. However, in the HR approach, educational equity for the diverse students seems unpromising. Discrimination in education based on language, class and gender still exists in the world. MTM education is also linguistic human rights

(LHR) but very few people in the world enjoy this right. Skutnabb-Kangas complains that, though the UN talks about human rights and democracy, many governments spend more money on the military rather than on education and health (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002).

Tomasevki (1996) states that “the purpose of international HRs law is ...to overrule the law of supply and demand and remove price-tags from people and from necessities for their survival”(p. 104, quoted in Skutnabb –Kangas). These necessities are not only basic food and housing but also for dignified life such as civil, political and cultural rights as well as LHRs. At present, however many states refuse the human right of access to free and compulsory education by putting price tags on education. In the last two decades, several countries have introduced school fees for the basic primary education. The UN Special Rapporteur on right to education criticizes this fact. This necessary right is not being implemented or being respected by governments today. MTM education is not today human right in practice (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002).

Many governments claim that HRs can be defined according to their own cultural norms, and other governments claim that human rights must be respected by other countries. Unfortunately international and regional conventions and charters give very poor support to the LHRs education. Language is given little attention. Sometimes language is present in the preambles of HRs instruments but completely disappears when it comes to the educational document. In some cases, language may be clearly mentioned in the articles dealing with education, especially the right to MTM education, but this article may be emphasized less than other articles (ibid).

Skutnabb-Kangas highlights the worldwide linguistic human rights for minorities. At the same time, she describes the failure of states to implement education using non-dominant languages. In spite

of her frustration, she recommends adopting and implementing worldwide language rights. She believes that adopting such language policy will promote greater social justice (Tollefson, 2004).

Brutt-Griffler holds a different view. The inadequacy of theory in language planning and policy (LPP) is her primary concern (Tollefson, 2004). She argues that a focus on language rights is not theoretically justified, and that it cannot protect the interest of the linguistic minorities. She argues that linguistic human rights has had little impact on peoples' lives. At the same time, it offers little for language policy and planning (LPP) theory. She also mentions that language rights can never be effective for social change and that a focus on language rights perpetuates inadequate LPP theory. She mentions that states often adopt language policies which may not favor ethnolinguistic minorities even though these states support language rights. For example, the rationale for official-English laws and prohibition of bilingual education in the United States is that it will improve education quality, economic opportunity and equal rights for linguistic minorities (ibid).

In her article “Class, ethnicity, and language rights” (2004), Brutt-Griffler gave two examples of Lesotho and Sri Lanka- colonial contexts where a form of industrial education used the local mother tongue and restrictions blocked the teaching of English to working class people (Brutt-Griffler, 2002). Phillipson (1992) in *Linguistic Imperialism* argues that English-speaking countries have tried to impose English on the world in the colonial period and he has also argued that this notion still exists in the world. But it seems to be different in colonial Basutoland (Lesotho) and Ceylon. British colony authorities tried their best to keep English out of reach of the vast majority of the population in each colony (see Brutt-Griffler, 2002). The British took this policy to maintain the necessary linguistic conditions for the colonial exploitation of the working class. In 1920, British discovered an alarming trend in

Basutoland. The mountain habitat had gone into precipitous decline. The entire mountain ecosystem irreparably changed. The British found that the Basuto had started to use the mountain for extensive agricultural development; because Basuto people were starving in the valleys, they had moved to the mountains. This adaptation by the Basuto people was not expected by the British, who had exploited them as manual laborers working for the enrichment of colonizing European nations (ibid). Brutt-Griffler argues that the migrations to the mountain of the Basuto people is the same sort of adaptive system that led other Africans and Asian peoples subjected to colonial rule to gain access to English. Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) in her book, *Linguistic Genocide in Education-Or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights* argued that linguistic diversity like biodiversity is necessary for the existence of our planet and it is more than a matter of human interest. In some measure, the future of the planet depends on the preservation of the world's linguistic diversity and the bearers of linguistic and cultural diversity of the world are the indigenous and minority people. In such a notion, the linguistic adaptive response of the Basuto people to their socioeconomic oppression within the world economy, has relevancy for the natural environment as well as their natural migration. Like the migration of the Basuto people, people's decision around the world to learn English language is one kind of adaptive responses which is taken by people's own initiative to socioeconomic forces; their adaptation is reasonable and at times effective within the conditions they face. According to Brutt-Griffler, these underlying contexts are not addressed by the language rights. Thus, to spread and maintain one's own language does not depend only on the ideological imperatives. It also determined by complex socio-economic factors.

In many postcolonial countries English language seems to be an inseparable part of sociocultural and economic realities (Canagarajah, 1999, 2000; Kachru

& Nelson, 1996). What is the impact of language on identity? One of the problematic assumptions of language rights is that it tries to reduce the language rights to national and national minorities ethnic group affiliations (May, 2000). It is assumed that language policy should serve interests equally and uniformly for all the members of the group. May (2000) points out, "advocates of linguistic human rights tend to assume the identity of linguistic minority groups as given, the collective aims of linguistic minority groups as uniform, and the notion of collective rights as unproblematic"(pp. 371-372, quoted in Brutt-Griffler, 2002). Kontra et al (1999) mentioned that the aim of the language policy should ensure equity for all language groups (ibid). May (2000) remarks:

The question of the link between language and identity needs to be critically examined, not just assumed, while the contingent nature of linguistic identity-as one of many (sometimes) competing identities available to minority language speakers-needs to be acknowledge and accommodated (p. 372 quoted in Brutt-Griffler, 2002).

May points out that many in a society may not accept that identity is inherited or rooted in the mythological past. Rather, identity is constantly being socially or individually constructed. Self-interest of individuals in a group may differ. If the unit of analysis of the language policy is ethnicity, nationality or minority status, it would seem that all people in the group have the interest to maintain their mother tongue. On the other hand if the unit of analysis is class, the interest of some may be to maintain the dominant language. Thus, ethnic-national analysis and class analysis exist in an uneasy alliance. According to May and Brutt-Griffler, the language rights movement concentrates on the deprivation of the rights of the linguistic minorities and depends on an ethnic-national analysis. On the other hand, class perspective concentrates on the way language policy

differentially affects disempowered members of the linguistic minorities. Kontra et al. (1999) and Pennycook (1998) point out that language rights should be and are concerned with both. Thus, language policy should focus not only on language groups, minorities and ethnic affiliation but also on its impact on the disempowered socioeconomic groups within language groups (Brutt-Griffler, 2002).

Both Skutnabb-Kangas and Brutt-Griffler are not concerned with the formal declarations of language rights but with concrete language policies and practices which focus on the individual's choices about language acquisition, use, maintenance and loss. Brutt-Griffler strongly suggests that within the current global contexts English should be central to any equitable language policy. She views English education as economic capital for social mobility. However, Tollefson (2000) mentioned that when English is widely seen as a key to the success of a nation and the economic well being of individuals, the spread of English could create social, economic and political inequalities. Bruthiaux (2002) argued that many of the worlds' poor see English language education as a tool of poverty reduction deserving major layout of the public resources. In the end, it may prove to be misguided and wasteful. Grin (2001) argues that the more people learn English, the less the skill of knowing English will count. Thus, it is important to distinguish between the role of English in individually-oriented escape from poverty and class-oriented arguments about large scale poverty reduction (Pennycook, 2004).

Primarily, Skutnabb-Kangas is concerned with the activist goal of social justice and Brutt-Griffler's main concern is to develop an adequate theory of the spread of English. Tollefson (2004) mentioned that her claim about inadequate language policy theory is important as William (1992) points out that "LPP remains on the margins of social sciences" (Tollefson, 2004, p. 153). Fishman (1992) points out that it is

necessary for the LPP researcher to develop a more sophisticated social theory which draws from the advanced work of sociolinguistics. The lack of interest in LPP among the sociolinguists indicates that LPP theory has little to offer their field (Tollefson, 2004).

Both Skutnabb-Kangas and Brutt-Griffler's are frustrated with the failure and with the inadequacy of the theory LPP. In spite of this, Skutnabb-Kangas supports adopting and implementing worldwide language rights and to promote social justice adaptation of such language policy is a necessity. In contrast, Brutt-Griffler argues that focus on the language rights offers an insufficient direction of LPP theory and it cannot be an effective path towards meaningful social change.

References

- Bruthiaux, P. (2002). Hold your courses: Language education, language choice, and economic development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 275-296.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). Class, ethnicity, and language rights. *Journal of Language, identity, and Education*, 1(3), 207-234.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2000). Negotiating ideologies through English: Strategies from the periphery. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp.121-132). Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2004). Language Rights and postmodern conditions. *Journal of Language, identity, and Education*, 3(2), 141-145.
- Donahue, T.S. (2002). Language planning and the perils of ideological solipsism. In J. W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (pp. 137-164). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Fishman, J.A. (1992). Forward: What can sociology contribute to the sociolinguistic enterprise? In G. Williams, *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique* (pp.vii-ix). London: Routledge.
- Janks, H. (2000). Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review*, 52, 175-186.
- Kontra, M., Philipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Varady, T. (1999). Conceptualizing and implementing

- linguistic human rights. In M. Kontra, R. Philipson, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Varady, (Eds.), *Language: A right and a resource. Approaching linguistic human rights* (pp.1–21). New York: Central European University Press.
- Krauss, M. (1995, February 19). Paper presented at a conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reported in *Philadelphia Inquirer*, p. A15.
- Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-lesson in the reproduction or transformation of social words? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 393–412.
- May, S. (2000). Uncommon languages: The challenges and possibilities of minority language rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21, 366–385.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). The right to language: Towards a situated ethics of language possibilities. *Language Sciences*, 20, 73–87.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond mother tongue and access of English. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3(2), 145–149.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1999). Heroes, rebels, communities and states in language rights activism and litigation. In M. Kontra, R. Philipson, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & T. Varady (Eds.), *Language: A right and a resource. Approaching linguistic human rights* (pp. 28–51). New York: Central European University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education-Or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002). Marvelous human rights rhetoric and grim realities: Language rights in education. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 1(3), 179–205.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. K. Hall & W. Egginton (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (pp.7–21). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Tollefson, J. W. (2004). Theory and action in language policy and planning. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3 (2), 151–155.
- Tomasevki, k. (1996). International prospects for the future of the welfare state. In *Reconceptualizing the welfare state* (pp.100–117). Copenhagen: Danish Center For Human Rights.
- Wiley, T.G. (2002). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. contexts. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education: Critical Issues* (pp.39–64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Williams, G. (1992). *Sociolinguistics: A sociological critique*.