

Preface

In 1995 I received my MA in English, Composition and Rhetoric, from Eastern Washington University (EWU) in Cheney, Washington near Spokane. This was a teaching degree designed to train me for teaching writing at the community college level, but I initially had no intention of teaching. I had come into the program almost 14 years after receiving my BFA in Communication Arts (primarily Speech and Theatre) from Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) in Tacoma, Washington, to improve my own writing, intending to work primarily as a socio-political writer.

The dilemma early in this program was that halfway through my first quarter, in the spring of 1993, sitting in a traditional grammar course taught Dr. Marc Lester, I realized I couldn't possibly do the rhetoric aspect of my degree any justice without comparing and contrasting the rhetorical standards of English and those of other languages; there were just too many first-language speakers of other languages in this country to expect every person coming to a piece of my future writing to automatically understand the thrust of whatever my topic might be. By that time, too, I had realized that I might also enjoy teaching, and the inter-language, inter-cultural rhetoric problem was going to be even more pronounced in the classroom. I felt I needed a background in bridging the gaps, and the only way to get that at EWU was to take the four core classes of the English as a Second Language (ESL) MA teaching degree as my electives for my composition and rhetoric degree. This turned into five classes, as the director of the ESL master's program, Dr. LaVona Reeves, and a colleague of hers in anthropology put together an experimental course in psycholinguistics.

By the time of the psycholinguistics course I had determined to make the comparative rhetoric and linguistics the basis of my professional paper (my program's equivalent of a thesis) and had named Reeves to direct my project, despite the fact that she was going into her tenure year when I would be in the bulk of the writing. This turned out to be a boon to my study and research, however, as LaVona and I disagreed on some matters of basic language-learning theory, such as Critical Age Theory (now commonly referred to as Critical Period Hypothesis), plus we had to use some interesting rhetoric methods ourselves just to accomplish all the necessary conferences on my project.

These decisions had come out of a five-week professional seminar for teachers generally already in the classroom that I took as my second quarter during the summer of 1993. Reeves had come in for a two-day demonstration of working with foreign languages and their speakers. At one point, she instructed us each to write for ten minutes in any language other than English that we knew, or in English for those who were monolingual (which was one teacher in the class). We were to write whatever came off our pens, essentially without stopping for correction, just to see what came out. This was a process we learned later in my program, called "free writing" (a tool for dealing with, among other things, "writer's block"), but which Reeves tended to call "mind spill" whenever teaching it.

During that ten minutes I wrote in German, my known but unused second language, and discovered that words I hadn't used in over ten years came flowing off my pen properly constructed and in proper syntax. This was an immediate lesson in what the mind retains of language and language learning, and it did two things for me: it triggered memories of my own early language learning and that of my two sons, and this subsequently made me aware of

some flaws in language-learning theory and education that later became painfully clear in my disagreements with Reeves over Critical Age Theory and with some of the concepts presented in the psycholinguistics course.

I won't be discussing these extensively here, because the groundwork of my actual professional paper must be laid, after which I will publish a subsequent book based upon my further observations, research, and conclusions since receiving my MA in 1995. In this second book I shall discuss the further development of my ideas and ideals regarding language learning and instruction, social and instructional languages, and the rhetoric involved. I will demonstrate the practical experience of why I have become even more adamant against such fallacies as Critical Age Theory and their application (at least regarding second-language acquisition), as well as why I now challenge some of my own earlier thinking as equally limited and why I support now more than ever a fully multilingual society and educational system.

The foundation, however, is my professional paper from 1995, which is presented here unaltered from its original form, except for formatting concerns relating to consistency in reading and spacing for the 2013 reader. I have double justified the text margins, though the APA standard of the day was to justify the left margin only, as this is what people are used to reading in trade books. I have standardized longer quotes so they are more consistently set apart from the main text, rather than some being buried within the text (as was the APA standard of the day). Additionally, I originally used the standard of the day of double-spacing between sentences, but have noticed that everything I now read is single-spaced between sentences, so I have shifted the text to this standard. I have refigured the pagination in the Table of Contents to reflect the actual pagination of the current edition, rather than that of the original, so as to avoid confusing the current reader.

I, also, have corrected a few typographical errors in the original text.

Also, it needs to be noted that as this Essay was presented originally in 1995, the references in it are dated. This, however, can be overlooked in context, particularly given the continuing debate which has transpired since and become even more divided and virulent at times, both regarding English as a primary or official language in this country and regarding immigration laws. It also should be considered that I shall be following this project in the not-too-distant future with the additional book mentioned above, which shall include much more recent references.

Finally, in regards to the two original case studies included in the current volume, it should be noted that I have recorded them as they occurred, with interrupted thoughts and sentences, vocalized pauses, grammatical mis-speak in context, and the like. Thus, they are filled with ellipses, particularly in the case of the conversation with Celia. I believe this more clearly demonstrates the actual conversational use of language by my two subjects, as well as some of my own, and this should help demonstrate some of my points.

David Trotter
Seattle, Washington, USA
January, 2017

Abstract

Over the past 500 years, a debate has raged in America over whether immigrants' cultures and languages should be allowed to exist alongside the "native" culture and language of the "host" country to which the immigrants have emigrated, whether they should be subordinated or replaced by the "host" culture and language, or whether they should be allowed to dominate and replace the "native" culture and language.

Growing out of this debate, this essay deals with the cultural, linguistic, and social alienation that occurs when one is set aside, ostracized, or made an outsider because of one's culture, language, or skin color. Specifically, it covers multilingual education and the surrounding social issues in terms of cultural identity versus assimilation.

This essay takes a position sometimes politically correct; sometimes politically unpopular; sometimes in agreement with past writers, researchers, and autobiographers; sometimes at odds with these same people.

Throughout this document, I take issue with the avid assimilationists and with the Official English/English Only movement.

After an extensive historical review, I focus on the work of Richard Rodriguez, who is openly opposed to bilingual education and suggests that assimilation is the only viable option, and on the writing of Gloria Anzaldúa, who advocates full multilingualism and multiculturalism.

I then move into two original cases studies which, along with Anzaldúa's experience, demonstrate that it is possible to maintain one's native language and culture even while learning and using the common language (in this case Standard American English) in school.

Finally, I suggest a balance between the common language and comparative rhetoric in education, a balance

between monolingual education and a multilingual society. This balance is founded in the results of the two case studies, as compared with the experiences of Anzaldúa and Rodriguez, and is closely tied to the National Language Policy of the Conference on College Composition and Communication to the English Plus movement.

Acknowledgments

As with any work, only the author's name appears on this one. but along the way there have been contributions by a few people whom I wish to acknowledge.

Initially, this Professional Essay would not have been completed as it is without the constant prodding and questioning of Dr. LaVona Reeves, Assistant Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, as my Committee Chair. She has challenged me not only through the preparation of this document, but in several classes where my whole concept of language learning has been tested and reformed.

Secondly, Dr. Dana Elder, Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, as the director of my program, has challenged and encouraged me in my pursuit of contrastive and comparative rhetoric and, as the second reader for this Essay, has guided me through an academic administrative system which I often found foreign.

Dr. Larry Beason, Assistant Professor of English at Eastern Washington University, also has guided my interest in contrastive and comparative rhetoric, as well as placing high demands on my sometimes untamed writing style.

I am particularly grateful to Dr. Golie Jansen, Assistant Professor of Social Work at Eastern Washington University, who recommended Gloria Anzaldúa's work, and to Heather Clemens, a fellow graduate student, who directed me toward Richard Rodriguez's *Days of Obligation: An Argument with My Mexican Father* and the Postrel and Gilesapie interview with Rodriguez.

Lynda Booth, another fellow graduate student, has especially encouraged my pursuit of the topic of this Essay, teases me about my love of research, and is looking forward to reading the final product.

I am additionally indebted to the staff of the Eastern Washington University Writers' Center, for tolerating my

somewhat obsessive use of the computers early in the writing of this document, and to the staff of JFK Memorial Library, who have endured massive book checkouts, unmentionable overdues and the resulting computer hassles, and endless copy requests.

Without any one of these people, this document would be far less than it is.

Statement of Language Background and Educational Philosophy

My linguistic, cultural, and educational philosophies are founded initially in my having grown up with a mother who believed and taught the diversity of religious views in the world as so many different faces of a larger structure, as parts of a complete whole, each having its place and contributing to that whole.

This thinking led me ultimately to explore general metaphysics, storytelling, Native American Shamanism, Tibetan Buddhism, and a reading knowledge of Wicca, Zoroastrianism, and the Indo-European goddess religions as alternate faces of the greater structure I had come to know through thirty years of Christian reading, learning, and teaching.

It also carried over into my learning of German in high school and in my undergraduate work, where I came one course short of a Bachelor of Arts degree in German, as well as the study of Tibetan (with a smattering of Sanskrit) in my late thirties.

Along the way, I have come to value the diverse cultures, beliefs, and languages of the world and of the American melting pot (discussed at length herein) as immeasurably rich and intrinsically linked and inseparable.

Thus, I come to an understanding of rhetoric and of education as an exploration of possibilities and as a comparison/contrast – primarily comparison – of diverse experiences. It is not my intention in this exploration and comparison to separate the inseparable into distinct, untouching, isolated entities, but to further the blending, with distinction, of which Rodriguez and Anzaldúa write.

Introduction

There are many forms of rhetoric and almost as many uses, but one thing is consistent across all rhetoric: its persuasive nature. Rhetoric can be simply defined as the use of words, gestures, facial expressions, body language, and media by one person or group of people to influence another person or group of people. Rhetoric exists for the purpose of molding and shaping others' ideas, actions, and world in order to maintain control of one's own world.

The uses of rhetoric are no more apparent than in the formation, development, and maintenance of social and cultural values, structures, practices, and norms. People use rhetoric to establish in each others' minds what is acceptable behavior and to ensure that such behavior is, in fact, what is practiced between people.

But communication often breaks down, and struggle for understanding or outright conflict results. This is particularly true when the parties involved in a given communication come from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds. Often different cultures have varying rhetorical expectations, such as the directness of American argumentation versus the circumspect narrative style of the Japanese. Such conflicts can occur either on a one-to-one basis or at much larger societal levels: in government, in business, in religion, in social contacts, and in the classroom.

Often in such cases, one party or the other attempts to enforce its own rhetorical style, or simply fails to understand the other party's. Of course, either can attempt to understand the other with the intention of adopting at least some of the other's rhetorical methods and of adapting at least some of their own rhetorical methods to those of the other, in order to bridge the gap, explain the difference between the two, and use that difference as a unifying element. But any teacher who has tried to explain Standard

American English rhetoric to Asian, Arab, or ghetto students, or who has attempted to understand these students, knows how difficult such a task can be.

The choices that people make, of course, will vary, and how people choose has very real ramifications, indicating the need for practical applications of intercultural, interlinguistic, international, and interphilosophic understanding and tolerance.

To understand these ramifications and applications, we can look at the history of the United States over the past five centuries, filled as it is with racism, challenges to religious freedom, interlinguistic animosity, and “gender wars.”

And this is the starting point for this essay: the conflicts which arise between cultures and languages, how these conflicts relate to politics and society, and ultimately how they influence our methods of education.

So I need to say at the beginning that this essay is about alienation. Specifically, it is about cultural, linguistic, and social alienation. It is about the alienation that occurs when one is not allowed to be one’s self, when one is made to feel unacceptable or inferior because one is different. It is specifically about the alienation that occurs when one is set aside, ostracized, or made an outsider because of one’s culture, language, or skin.

This essay takes a position sometimes politically correct; sometimes politically unpopular; sometimes in agreement with past writers, researchers, and autobiographers; sometimes at odds with these same people.

Mannes (1968) asks,

Who are you? You singly, not you together. When did you start – that long day's journey into self? When do you really begin to know what you believe and where you're going? When do you know that

you are unique – separate – alone? (reprinted in Hoopes, 1969, p. 3)

She suggests that each of us stands alone, separate from each and every other person. Yet Western – or at least U.S. – society does not necessarily view things in quite this way. While we speak of individuality, we are a society, in fact, built on conformity. While we speak of individual freedom and uniqueness, we as a society prefer people who fit the melting pot concept popularized by Roosevelt (1917): those who blend into the crowd. When we find someone who truly is unique – who thinks for one’s self, who is culturally, linguistically, or philosophically different or who lives a different lifestyle – we don’t honor that uniqueness; we push the person into isolation and are willing to accept her/him “back into the fold” only when s/he becomes like everyone else.

But Mannes (1968) offers a different perspective.

The time of discovery is different for everybody....I suggest that the first recognition comes when others try to tell you what you are. (reprinted in Hoopes, 1969, p. 3)

With this in mind, we need to enter this examination of cultural, linguistic, and personal alienation, specifically as it occurs in education, and what it does to the human identity and spirit.

My objective in addressing this hypothesis is multifaceted.

First, I conduct a threefold historical and literature review. This review begins with the dominance by conquering cultures through the annihilation of existing governments, religions, and languages and through the forced adoption of the conquerors’ governments, religions,

and languages. It then proceeds to consider how the centuries-old debate over multilingualism and multiculturalism, capped by the Official English/English Only movement, has resulted in numerous laws directly relating to the governance of this continent and the education of both our children and our university students. Finally, it concludes with commentary and autobiographical material from several authors on how the bifurcation (defined below) of multiculturalism and multilingualism affects individuals' identities.

Next, by supplementing this research and autobiographical material with two original case studies, I add to the knowledge of how this can directly affect the education and lives of multilinguals in very different ways. In particular, I explore the identity issues which develop around the difference between the language and culture of the home and the language and culture of education. I define this difference not in terms of grammar and syntax or in terms of national and ethnic cultures, but in terms of uses, modes, and manners of communication, as well as the social/cultural identity implications of those uses, modes, and manners.

But this essay would be incomplete were it to conclude at such a point, since this debate must be seen in its larger historical context – touched upon in the historical and literature review, in the autobiographies, and in the case studies – when it is realized that English is not the original language of these continents and “middle-class”, white, male-dominated America is not the natural norm of society; Spanish was here prior to English (Castellanos, 1983), the indigenous tongues were here prior to either the modern European or the modern Asian tongues (as opposed to the ancient Asian antecedents of the indigenous languages), and non-whites and women have been driving forces on this planet and in the Americas for millennia.

Thus, I have had to approach this research with an understanding that we are not, in reality, looking simply at a question of cultural and linguistic coexistence between a host culture/language and one or more immigrant culture/languages, but rather at an extended history of conquering and dominance of “home” or “native” culture/languages by invading, outside, emigrating culture/languages. I show that this invasion and dominance has occurred not only in terms of intercultural, international, and inter-religious war, but also in the inference of governments and educational systems into the privacy of citizens’ homes and family lives.

Consideration of all the historical and prehistoric ramifications of this antithesis, however, would require several volumes. Therefore, for the purposes of this document, I follow from the case studies to a discussion and comparison of their results and implications for educational rhetoric and multilingual education.

I conclude this treatise with recommendations for further study, action, and social programming, particularly as relates to the inextricable elements of education and governance.

The Problem

Concern about culture, debate over cultural purity vs. cultural pluralism (including animosity between religions and conflict between the sexes), and debate over multilingualism have swung between extremes for over 500 years on these two continents alone, ever since Columbus set foot on these shores (Zinn, 1980). The conflict over such issues is itself, however, much older than the Europeans' influence on what is now known as North and South America.

The central focus of the debate has been and continues to be whether immigrants' cultures and languages should be allowed to exist alongside the native culture and language of the "host" country to which the immigrants come, whether they should be subordinated or replaced by the "host" culture and language, or whether they should be allowed to dominate and replace the "native" culture and language. This question has been particularly debated in our public schools and in the academie.

The Context of the Research

This central question is also the focus of the current document. My initial understanding in attempting to answer this question is that such a debate directly impacts governmental processes, business and social laws, and most importantly education. On the North American continent in particular, this impact has played out as religious domination by the Christian church and in terms of ongoing struggles between English and other European languages (French, Spanish, German, Italian, Russian, and Slavic variations), between English and Asian languages (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean), and between English and the languages spoken by the indigenous tribes of these continents and is exemplified by discussions over bilingual education in its many forms and in the Official English/English Only movement.

Definition of Terms

In order to proceed with this discussion, a few terms need to be identified.

Anomie refers to “personal unrest, alienation, and uncertainty that comes from a lack of purpose or ideals” (Webster’s, 1985, 1988), in which might be included feelings of social uncertainty, dissatisfaction, and homelessness. It literally translates as “without norms” (Reeves, 1994).

Bifurcation, with which this paper is largely concerned, is the dividing of a topic, situation, philosophy, thing, society, or person into two separate, often opposing elements. In this study, bifurcation will refer to a person’s cultural background/social identity/existence and its affect on the individual’s functioning within society.

Culture refers here to a given person or group’s societal norms, practices, and structures. These include, but are not limited to, language, rhetoric, philosophy/religion, and hierarchies.

Diglossia is related to bifurcation and refers to the coexistence of two language systems within an individual’s reference frame. Generally, these language systems function at or near equal status, though at varying times and in varying circumstances, one or the other system will have preference, since each generally relates to specific, separate parts of the person’s life. It also needs to be understood, as pointed out by Kenji Hakuta, that bilingualism without diglossia, that is without two fully functioning language systems, ultimately leads to monolingualism, since the dominant or sole language system takes over. I show, through the course of this document, that diglossia is also directly tied to the coexistence of two cultural patterns within an individual’s frame of reference.

Official English/English Only refers to a movement favoring official language laws which would designate

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

