community should decide what it wants even if these decisions contradict expert notions of what is best. For example, some communities with strong oral traditions may decide they do not want a writing system.

- **A linguistic survey has been commissioned. How can it help?**
  The survey should only be used to supplement MLE programme development, not to oversee it. Each community should have the right to name its own language, and develop teaching materials and teaching methodologies based on its traditional knowledge. This material may later be incorporated into the survey as part of a national data base.

- **How does MLE relate to Nepal’s Linguistic, Cultural and Biological Diversity?**
  Nepal’s richness lies in its great diversities—from its plants, animals and resources on the one hand to its human resources, cultural and linguistic diversity on the other. Unlike foreign development “experts” who often destroy diversity in the name of poverty alleviation, progress and globalisation, indigenous peoples know how to protect and enrich their traditional environments and ecosystems in a democratic manner. Promoting linguistic and cultural diversity helps promote biological diversity and democracy. Destroying any one form of diversity destroys the others.

**Conclusion**

At the time of writing, the legislature of Bolivia is considering the adoption of UNDRIP in its entirety into its newly revised constitution. If that happens, it will be a further model to nations around the world with indigenous populations—and most nations fall into that category – to emulate. It took more than ten years for UNDRIP to be ratified by the UN General Assembly. During that period, there were many rewrites, many victories and defeats. Even the title of the document—and legalistic arguments over the use of the word “peoples” (which presupposes collective communal rights) versus “people” (which does not) – was a cause for much struggle. The following quote comes from Joaquisho-Oren Lyons, Faithkeeper of the Onandoga Nation, Haudenosaunee, Six Nations Confederacy. Lyons was one of many American Indians who were instrumental in setting up the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and the subsequent UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

*When they read and experience this Declaration on the Rights of the World’s Indigenous Peoples and experience their right to self-determination, in the full sense of the word, equal to all under law, they will think kindly of us and sing songs about us, because they will know that we loved them.*

*Dhnayto. (Now I am finished.) ✡

---

**We, the authors, are the descendants of two of the colonial powers that have oppressed Hawai‘i. Taka Okazaki is a Japanese national. Having resided in Hawai‘i for four years, he experienced the unfair privilege that many Japanese blatantly enjoy in Hawai‘i. Having grown up in the U.S., Jennifer Louise Teeter, feels responsible for the subjugation of Hawai‘i. Hawaiian history continues to be retold and shaped by the colonial powers as opposed to the Hawaiian people. The landmark United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples provides that indigenous peoples have the right to educate themselves with content and methods they deem appropriate to their own cultures. Thus, in order to provide justice for the Hawaiian people and other colonized people, the task of an outsider is to critically examine received history, to take the responsibility for eliminating the oppression their societies internalise and externalise, and most importantly to “walk behind” the oppressed in their struggles to liberate themselves.

Whose Hawaiian history is it?

Received history informs us that the Hawaiian people are believed to have migrated to Hawai‘i in the 8th century. It continues, “Hawai‘i had been discovered by the English explorer Captain James Cook...after more than a thousand years of little change” in 1778 (Fuchs, 1961:3). Come 1893, Hawai‘i is annexed to the United States. Most Hawaiians would provide a more intricate version of their own history that does not serve to showcase the heroic extravagances of their colonizers.

What happened to the Hawaiian people through the changes in political structure? Although according to some estimates, the population of Hawai‘i had
reached 1,000,000 in 1778 (Stannard, 1990)1, it was reduced to 24,000 in 1920 (Fuchs, 1961:68). This is a fairly common story. Anytime in recent history that a colonial force has dominated another people, the population is, first, underestimated at the time of the invasion, and then enigmatically, “is reduced” to an exceedingly lower number without mentioning an agent of action. If there is reference to the disease, infanticide, and mass murder, which were among the variety of means through which colonisers devastated the populations of their colonies, it is presented as if it were simply scientific data. The suffering and genocide of the colonisers on “their subjects” is completely disregarded. The colonisers in the process of recreating history to their liking eliminate their responsibility for the genocide.

And so the story goes that at the end of the 19th century, the Hawaiian language was forcibly replaced by English, as mandated by the U.S. government, to be the medium of instruction in schools as well as communication for all government business. This not only meant that the use of Hawaiian was legally prohibited in schools or administrative offices, but also forced the view that English would bring the kind of prosperity that the Hawaiian language and culture could not. Some Hawaiians reported that they were physically punished or humiliated for their use of Hawaiian in schools, ironically by other Hawaiians.2 Thus, the number of recorded native Hawaiian speakers fell to 2,000 by 1978 (Wilson 1978, cited in Warner 2001) and was mostly composed of people over 70 years old (excluding the 300 residents of the island of Ni‘ihau who separated themselves from the other islands and still continue to use the language at all ages). This kind of forced language shift, perhaps more appropriately termed, “linguistic genocide,” (see Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, and this newsletter) has been used by European nation-states to dominate conquered groups of people for centuries.

As noted above, the Hawaiian people were forcibly submerged into an English language environment where the continued use of the Hawaiian language was a detriment to their survival and their psyche. The disappearance of the indigenous language was not only a matter of the “free market economy” but was beaten out of the people, both literally and figuratively. Indigenous language holders were prohibited from passing down their language to the next generation. Describing the universality of this genocidal process among indigenous peoples, Darrell Kipp of the Piegan Institute of the Blackfoot Nation emphasises that it is not ignorance that caused indigenous peoples to forgo their languages, but a desire to protect their children from the discrimination they had faced (cited in Wilson, 2004:81). However, some governmental officials and linguists continue to blame parents for not passing on their language and some young Hawaiians now learning Hawaiian are resentful of their elders. This completely overlooks the socio-historical causality of assimilation that prevented the transmission of the Hawaiian language.

The statehood and the renaissance
Colonisation was furthered when Hawai‘i became the 50th state of the United States in 1959. This statehood is associated with the movement by nisei, second generation Japanese, to redress the past injustices where their parents had not been regarded as U.S. citizens. This did not take the interests of the Hawaiian people into consideration. It also allowed huge money makers to come into Hawai‘i and “develop” the islands as they saw fit. As a founding member of ‘Aha Pūnana Leo, a Hawaiian language and culture revitalisation organization, William Wilson writes,

> Where there had once been open beaches where Hawaiians and other local people fished, there were now hotels populated by haole [white] and Japanese tourists. Where there had once been primarily locally owned small stores, there were now large chains from the continental United States and Japan. (1998:327)

Many young locals, including Hawaiians and Japanese who were indignant at nisei, were disillusioned by this vast “development” and thus brought about the Hawaiian Renaissance in the 1970s. At the outset, this revolution focused on Hawaiians learning more traditional forms of hula and singing more traditional Hawaiian songs. The culmination of this movement was that a significant number of these young Hawaiians and other supporters won seats in the 1978 Hawai‘i State Constitutional Convention. There they proposed constitutional mandates for the teaching of the Hawaiian language, history, and culture in all public schools, and for the recognition of Hawaiian as an official language along with English. These proposals were later implemented and are considered by many Hawaiians to have been the first step in the right direction.

‘Aha Pūnana Leo
Having been inspired by Kōhanga Reo (Māori language immersion preschools), the University Hawaiian language educators and Ni‘ihau community educators who were concerned with the number of Hawaiian-speaking children being less than fifty established a non-profit organization, ‘Aha Pūnana Leo. Its original purpose was to establish and operate Pūnana Leo (“language nest”) schools with the overall goal of revitalising and perpetuating the Hawaiian language and culture through the creation of a new generation of native Hawaiian-speaking children.3 It has grown to have 11 Pūnana Leos throughout the islands of Hawai‘i at the time of writing (‘Aha Pūnana Leo, 2009).

As the parents and teachers of Pūnana Leo lobbied...
and requested that Pānana Leo children continue to be taught in Hawaiian as the medium of instruction, or otherwise face the possibility that they not be able to keep and improve their proficiency in Hawaiian, the Kula Kaipuni Hawai‘i (Hawaiian Surrounding Environment School), a K-12 public immersion school program was established. At the time of writing, there are 21 Kula Kaipuni. Annually, some 2,000 students are served from the Pānana Leo level through to the twelfth grade in Hawaiian language medium education (’Aha Pānana Leo, 2009). With the establishment of the Hawaiian-medium Ph.D. Programme in 2006, it is now possible for a student to go through all levels of education in Hawaiian language. Many people see this Hawaiian revitalisation movement as one of the most successful models of indigenous language revitalisation worldwide (Matsubara, 2006).

Two changes in public schools

Two changes were made in public school education as a result of the constitutional convention in 1978. One was a Hawai‘i public school mandate to teach a course in the modern history of Hawai‘i (from 1778 until the present), and the other was the introduction of the Kūpuna program. The kūpuna or elders visit schools and introduce the children to Hawaiian music, provide an oral history of life in Hawai‘i, and explain aspects of Hawaiian cosmology (Reed, 2008).

Hav[ing worked as a public school teacher, Julie Kaomea conducted several studies on what is happening in the classroom of Hawai‘i history as well as the Kūpuna program. She stated that “many shortcomings of the current elementary Hawaiians studies program are due in part to biased or ill-informed, non-Hawaiian textbook writers, unsupportive school administrators, and well-intended Native Hawaiian classroom elders who are unwittingly complicit in the perpetuation of colonial stereotypes of Native Hawaiians” (Kaomea 2005; 35) as well as the classroom teachers. For example, in spite of the intent that the curriculum was aimed to promote an appreciation for the Native people of Hawai‘i, the students in the classroom she observed portray Hawaiians as horrifically violent and bound by many rules. One of the most frequently used textbooks is The Hawaiians of Old, a dated, non-Hawaiian authored textbook. One chapter is titled, The Hawaiian had Many Rules. The following is an excerpt from one chapter.

The Hawaiian had many wars... They fought often with each other. The chiefs seemed to enjoy fighting... But these wars were... hard on the maka‘āinana who had not even started the war... Many of these people were killed in battle... Wars were awful for most of the Hawaiians [Dunford 1980:152]

Both Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian students cite and echo these horrific ideas as they are also supported and validated by ill-informed non-Hawaiian teachers. This is exactly how an oppressor-looking-in version of history is pressed onto the indigenous peoples. Similarly, the Kūpuna program has an oppressive nature as well. Classroom teachers (i.e. a teacher with the “proper” teaching qualifications) are given the right and responsibility to: monitor the weekly 30-minute classroom visits by Hawaiian studies elders; review and reinforce the elders’ lessons with follow-up lessons; and provide regular instruction in those aspects of the curriculum not covered by the elders. In the class on Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) holders, kūpuna are portrayed as second-class citizen teacher assistants whose curricula are dictated by the classroom teacher. As Kaomea expresses, “this Hawaiian studies curriculum, such disrespectful use (and misuse) of Native Hawaiian elders and cultural experts serves to reinforce the unequal power dynamic between Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians, and undermines our Native right to assume authority over our Native culture.”

Eliminating oppression both inside and outside

There are contentions within members of the community about the manner in which language education is to proceed and how to provide an education that will liberate the Hawaiian people from their colonial binds. For instance, the academic orientation of ’Aha Pānana Leo has created a tension within the organisation and between the organisation and the community it tries to serve (See Warner 1999 and Wilson & Kamānā 2001 for details). A founding member of ’Aha Pānana Leo, Sam L. Warner writes:

Some non-Hawaiian language educators and academics in the revitalization movement have and are actively engaged in promoting ideologies through political rhetoric and discourse to serve to legitimize, justify, and empower their own voices not only to speak and decide for Hawaiians but also to silence those less empowered voices (1999:68)

Yet, all hope is not lost. Taiaiake Alfred, a Mohawk activist for indigenous rights argues that if the indigenous voice is erased from society and replaced by another voice, indigenous people are effectively alienated from their culture and heritage. However, “being careful not to romanticize the past” a “traditional framework” can be utilised to build a more just society for all parties:

I am advocating a self-conscious traditionalism, an intellectual, social, and political movement that will reinvigorate those values, principles, and other cultural elements that are best suited to the larger contemporary political and economic reality. Not only has the indigenous voice been excluded from the larger social and political discourse, but even within our own communities it has been supplanted by other voices. The notion of traditionalism ...demands self-respect and the
confidence to build on what we know to be good and right for our own people. (1999:xviii)

Angela Cavander Wilson (2004) has found after witnessing the deterioration of a Dakota language program, that it is imperative to critically examine “how colonialism has affected our health and mindset, and thus how we might meaningfully challenge that oppression [so] we can begin to reaffirm the richness and wisdom inherent in our traditional ways.” A decolonising agenda must confront the internalised racism that has caused indigenous languages to be seen as frivolous.

Finally, outsiders must release their grips on the reins of power and accept the right of indigenous peoples to control their own destiny. More than 20 years after the original drafting in 1983, on September 13, 2007, the United Nations General Assembly passed a non-binding resolution on the rights of indigenous peoples called United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

What can outsider non-Natives do to be helpful for realising these rights, then? Kaomea suggests that outsiders should:

...work collaboratively with Native allies, listen carefully to our wisdom as well as our concerns, interrogate unearned power and privilege (including one’s own), and use this privilege to confront oppression and “stand behind” Natives, so that our voices can be heard. (2005:40)

It’s time to stop standing in front or to the side but step behind to make indigenous voices heard.
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Intercultural bilingual education: Peru’s indigenous peoples’ answer to their educational needs

Susanne J. Pérez, susanneperez@gmail.com

‘Latin America’s option for the indigenous peoples has, from the beginning of the Republican era of the 19th century until very recently (and perhaps even still) been one of cultural and linguistic homogenisation.’ 2 (López and Küper 2000: 26)

Introduction

In January 2007, a group of indigenous teachers participated in a workshop on Intercultural Bilingual Education in the city of Cusco, Peru. One day, they saw Al Gore’s documentary “An inconvenient truth” about global warming and its consequences. The video was part of a process, through which teachers slowly would recognise the dangers of neglecting indigenous language, culture and knowledge.

Research on the relationship between biodiversity and cultural and linguistic diversity proposes that indigenous peoples play an important role in the maintenance of biodiversity (Maffi 2002: 388) and that the maintenance and development of their languages are related to the maintenance and development of biodiversity.

In Peru, the reality in schools is tied to national norms which in almost all aspects are contradictory to the country’s 42 indigenous peoples’ world views, their cultural and productive practices and their language. Spanish is the dominant medium of instruction in almost all schools, regardless of the children’s language. Also, the national curriculum and work and text books sent out by the Peruvian Ministry of Education reflect very little of indigenous children’s lives. The assimilationist approach which has dominated and is still dominating schools in indigenous villages is threatening most indigenous languages and neglecting important indigenous knowledge about the maintenance of the existing biodiversity.

Since the 1970s, indigenous organisations have claimed their right to an education based on their own languages and cultures. They contributed actively to the development of an education model widely known as Intercultural Bilingual Education (IBE). In 2000, this educational model was in use in 17 Latin American countries (López and Küper 2000: 4).

In this article, I will refer mainly to an in-service teacher training programme for teachers from bilingual, rural areas around Cusco, Peru. The programme underwent significant changes in training content, methods and activities after starting to emphasise the concept of interculturality, which resulted in an appropriation of the IBE model by teachers and local villagers.

History of intercultural bilingual education in Peru: policies and practices

Peru has always been a multilingual and multi-ethnic country. Today, the country has 42 living indigenous languages, Spanish, and several immigrant languages. The biggest indigenous language, Quechua, is spoken by more than 3 million people, which is almost 17 per cent of the population. It can be found in all Peruvian regions, but is dominant in the highlands. Forty indigenous languages are spoken by 0.7 per cent of the Peruvian population, mainly in the rain forest lowlands.

Because of the power and status of Spanish and the ‘hispanification’ processes, many of these languages are in danger of extinction (Trapnell and Neira 2006: 258-262). Formal education has played a central role in the promotion of a Spanish-only policy:

[Int in Latin America, school generally came to the rural zones hand-in-hand with Spanish. This fact stood out, and still does, in the conceptions that indigenous people have about this institution and about the roles and functions that the various languages occupy in it. For many people, their language still

Endnotes

1 However, Many scholars cite 300,000 as the estimated population when the colonizers arrived, thus falling pray to the colonial version of history rather than the indigenous version (Schmitt & Zane, 1977)

2 Similarly, physical punishment and humiliation is reported for the use of Okinawan by Okinawan and instead, students were told to use the standardized version of Japanese and quite often given a hogen huda, a dialect placard (Kondo, 2008)

3 A number of difficulties that ‘Aha Punana Leo went through have been reported well (See Warner 2001; Wilson 1998; Wilson & Kamanâ 2001).