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28.0 UPDATE ON THE SAN DIEGO MEETING

The joint meeting of SSILA and the Linguistic Society of America will be held at the Sheraton San Diego Hotel and Marina (formerly called the Sheraton Harbor Island), January 4-7, 1996. Also meeting concurrently will be the North American Diachrony Society, the North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences (NAAL), and the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics. The times, locations, and details of all events included in this edition of SSILA are the ones that will be of greatest interest to most SSILA members.

Thursday, January 4:
* The opening session of the LSA meeting will convene on Thursday evening, January 4, at 7:00 pm in Grand Ballroom B. It will be a colloquium on "Lessons from the Field: A Retrospective," organized by Margaret Langdon. The discussants will be Ken Hale, Leanne Hinton, and Pam Munro.

Friday, January 5:
* An open meeting of the SSILA Atlas Committee will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 8:00-10:00 am, in Marina III. (The time given in the October LSA Bulletin is incorrect.)
* SSILA SESSION 1: Algonquian & Muskogean (Friday, Jan. 5, 9:00 am to 12 noon).
  * The first LSA session on Field Reports/Endangered Languages will be held on Friday morning, Jan. 5, and will feature papers on: Tsez (B. M. Oakland); Dublin Irish (J. Cotter); Native speaker intuitions and the phonetics of stress placement (D. Everett; P. Ladehoff); and Nguni & Guatamalan sign languages (A. Guerra, A. Mijerichte, & G. Mirus); Scottish Gaelic (P. Morgan); Java (F. Hunt); Quechua (I. A. Shroyer); and the laryngeal specification of fricatives (B. Vaux).
* "A Field Methods Course on Ingush (North Caucasian)", organized by Johanna Nichols, will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 12 noon to 2:00 pm, in Marina III.
* SSILA SESSION 2: Athabaskan & Tlingit (Friday, Jan. 5, 2:00 to 5:00 pm)
* The SSILA Executive Committee will meet on Friday, Jan. 5, 5:00 pm, in Room 514.
* The LSA Business Meeting will be held on Friday, Jan. 5, 5:30 to 7:00 pm in Grand Ballroom B.
* SSILA SESSION 3: Mesoamerican Languages (Friday, Jan. 5, 8:00 to 11:00 pm)

Saturday, January 6:
* SSILA SESSION 4-A: Northwest & Eskimo-Aleut (Saturday, Jan. 6, 9:00 am to 12 noon)
* SSILA SESSION 4-B: South American Languages (Saturday, Jan. 6,
9:00 am to 12 noon.
* The LSA Committee on Endangered Languages will hold an open meeting on Saturday, Jan. 6, 12 noon-2:00 pm, in Marina III
* The LSA Presidential Address will be delivered by Emmon Bach on Saturday, Jan. 6, from 2:00 to 3:30 pm, in Grand Ballroom B. His topic will be "The Politics of Universal Grammar.
* SISLA SESSION 5: Languages of the Southwest (Saturday, Jan. 6, 3:30 to 4:40 pm)
* The SISLA Business Meeting will be held Saturday, Jan. 6, 5:00-6:00 pm, in the Spinnaker Room.
* Colette Craig will provide an update on the Bolivia Documentation Project on Saturday, Jan. 6, 6:00-7:00 pm in Room 514.
* SISLA SESSION 6: General Session (Saturday, Jan. 6, 8:00 to 11:00 pm).

Sunday, January 7:
* SISLA SESSION 7: Siouan and Mayan (Sunday, Jan. 7, 9:00 am to 12 noon)
* The second LSA session on Field Reports/Endangered Languages will be held on Sunday morning Jan. 7, and will feature papers on: Romani (P. Bakker); Itelmen (J. Babalik); Ndumo (H. Mopho); Francoprovenceil (N. Haig); Mohave (S. Penfield & J. Connelos); and Palestinian Arabic (K. Shahin).

Reminder from the LSA: If you plan to attend the San Diego meeting, please preregister for the meeting and make your hotel reservations. For more information and/or forms, please contact the LSA Secretariat: tel: 202/235-1784; e-mail: <zis@allus.gallaudet.edu> Hotel reservations may also be made by phone at (800) 999-2266 and (800) 325-3535. The special rates for the meeting are $79 single, $89 double. Reservations are subject to availability if received after December 14.

28.1 CORRESPONDENCE
Archiving Sensitive Materials
>From William Poser, 30 Nov 1995:
I endorse Joel Sheer's recommendation for archiving field materials and commend him for his almost heroic efforts in the case of Kunga. However, I think that sometimes it is not so simple, because raw field materials may contain information that cannot be freely distributed. Although most of my tapes are innocuous (except for the embarrassment I might suffer from the revelation of poor technique or pronunciation), a fair number contain:

(a) personal, political, or religious remarks that the informant would not want publicized. These include such things as allusions to sexual impropriety and criminal activity that, if published, would be defamatory and potentially libellous;

(b) information about shamanism that is not public knowledge;
(c) traditional stories which I have not been authorized to publish.

I also have notes that contain information on matters that are not inherently secret but that cannot at present be distributed for political and legal reasons.

This is probably a fairly common problem. If such materials are to be archived by more than keeping one copy at home and another at the office, there must be a system for controlling (and in some cases severely restricting) access to archival material. Can anyone summarize for us the sorts of access restriction that can be imposed by various archives? In some cases, the most appropriate solution might be to edit out the problematic material and to destroy the original tapes.

First Nations Studies
U of Northern British Columbia
Prince George, British Columbia, V2N 4Z9, Canada
poser@unbc.edu

Catavaba Tapes?
>From Sheila Shigley, 30 Nov 1995:
We are trying to track down copies of the Catavaba language tapes recorded by Frank Speck. We have heard they are housed at the University of Pennsylvania Museum. If there are any other known recordings of Catavaba, we would be very interested in them as well.

Hocak Nazijaci Language Program
1-800-492-5765
shigley@mac.wisc.edu

Language & Violence
>From: MJ Hardman, 9 Dec 1995:
I will be teaching a course on Language and Violence next semester and am posting this in search of any ongoing, completed research or other information that I may be unaware of. I am not interested in mal- dicta. I will be focusing on the way English is constructed and used in everyday contexts to make violence the normal environment and even a good. I will be using the work of Suzanne Salkind, Ann Lockner, my own work on Derivational Thinking, and the work of Taylor and Miller on Gender and violence. I also have the excellent bibliography of Bill Gay of UNBC. I will be considering all levels of language structure: grammar, discourse, metaphor, etc.

I am especially in need of materials that show a nonviolent construction within a language and correlatively within a culture to use as contrast to English, for example, if I understand correctly, Navajo healing is the reestablishment of harmony, while in English we 'fight' on illness until we 'conquer' it. The material I have does not fully explicate the way in which this world view is realized in the structure of the language, except, of course, for the word _hohzoh_.

I am not looking for a specifically pacifist world view; rather where
28.2 BOOK EXCHANGE

[If you are interested in obtaining one or more of the books listed below, send a message directly to the person who is offering it, indicating what you would be willing to trade.]

From: Tom Solomon <solomon@ccf.cc.ucf.am>

I'm a cultural anthropologist and ethnomusicologist working in the Andean area, so I am interested in trading these for materials in Quechua or Aymara, or for "classic" ethnographic texts on the Andes (Eschol, Labarre, etc.)

Haas, Mary R. Language, culture, and history: essays by Mary R. Haas. 1978 cloth, 382 pp. 128 essays, mostly on Native American topics, with a few on Thai, Burmese, etc.

Kachru, Raji B., et al., eds. Issues in linguistics: papers in honor of Henry and Renee Kachru. 1973 cloth, 933 pp. 184 papers on a variety of topics, only 2 on Native American languages.


From: Stephen G. Murray <stephen@fsa.ucsf.edu>

I'd like to find a "good home" for my copy of Mary Haas's Tunica presentation copy to "Professor Kroeber! I wish I could say that this book belonged to me, but the Berkeley anthropology library didn't accession it after her death and I got it)."

From: Leslie Saxton <lsaxton@umw.virginia.edu>

I have a duplicate of Li Fang-Kuei's Chipewyan Texts.

From: Lyle Campbell <lloyd@cst.cs.slu.edu>

I have an extra copy of Boas' Handbook of American Indian Languages. Part 2 (1922), which contains Sapir's Takelma, Fraenhagen's Coos and Suskwan, and Bogoras' Chukchee. I'd be happy to trade this for something I don't have.

From: Vicki Gillis <gillis@csu.fullerton.edu>

I have some spare copies of a number of publications on California languages. I'd be particularly interested in exchanging these:

P.E. Goddard, Morphology of the Hupa Language (UCPLA 9, 1906)

Geoffrey Gambio, Miwuk Grammar (UCPL 89, 1976)

Harvey Pittkin, Miwuk Grammar (UCPL 90, 1976)

Harvey Pittkin, Miwok Texts (Mouton-Kâr), 1984)

I also have a slightly defective extra copy of Geoff Kimball's Kosatki Dictionary, and several similar defective copies (2 pages missing) of my own book. Hunter S. Spradley, Letters Between Tokiko Sapir and A.L. Kroeber, 1905-1925 (1984). I'd be willing to exchange these defective copies for just about anything, or even give them to interested people for the cost of postage.

Finally, I have a spare copy of Harry Hoier et al., Linguistic Structures of Native America (Viking Fund publs. in Anthropology 6, 1946). This is in photographic reprint, but looks very much like the original. Included in this classic volume are sketches of Greenlandic (Sawedj), Chippewa (Kiiwer), (Comparative Salishan (Bigonfield), Delaware (Vdge-In), Hopi (Hupf), Tsoo (Tagger), Yavapai (Yewman), Yuma (Holpe), Tonkawa (Holpe), Chisholm (Sawedj, Tunica (Haas), Nahua (Moro), and Chipewyan (Lj). I'll need something special in trade for this — a nicely bound copy of Part I of Boas' Handbook, for instance.

28.3 LATEST ON "ENGLISH-ONLY": A SEPARATE PEACE WITH NATIVE AMERICANS?

[Our Washington correspondent, James Crawfor, sends us another update on the progress of legislation in the U.S. Congress that would establish English as the official national language. As the debate goes forward, Jim is more pessimistic about its outcome. He writes: "If my report leads you to the sense that the English-only threat looms larger than at any time in the past decade — congratulations — you've gotten the message. Unfortunately, not many others have."
The chances for passage of English-only legislation were apparently given a significant boost by the Dec. 6 hearing before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. Chances also seem enhanced for amendments that would exempt Native American languages from some of the bill's restrictions, unfortunately fostering a divide-and-conquer strategy against the legislation's opponents.

The committee heard testimony from eight witnesses in favor of S.256, the measure that would declare English the nation's official language and severely restrict the federal government's use of other languages for public business. Opposing witnesses were invited to testify. Senator Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), chair of the committee, announced his intention to convene a second hearing at an unspecified date early next year when other views might be heard.

Advocates for language-minority groups protested their exclusion from the hearing, arguing it as part of a troubling pattern. Paul Yuges, president of the National Council of La Raza, noted that when a House adjourned, the committee heard testimony on similar "Language of Government" bills last month, the Republican majority allowed seven witnesses in, and only one against. "What are proponents of English-only so afraid of?" he asked. "That balanced hearing will reveal the inherent flaws of this legislation?"

As the U.S. role in Bosnia held the attention of most senators, the proposal attracted only three members of the Governmental Affairs committee. Besides Stevens, two Democrats were present for part of the proceedings, and only one of them, Senator Daniel Akaka (D-Hawaii), expressed reservations about S.256. Akaka began by agreeing with the proponents of "promoting linguistic unity," but said he worried that an English-only mandate might be discriminatory and ethically divisive. He announced his plan to introduce amendments that would limit the legislation's impact on Native American languages.

Sen. Stevens expressed his sympathy for the latter idea, noting his earlier support for the Native American Languages Act and the Alaska Native Land Claim Act. These "rushes endorse, among other things, the policy goal of preserving indigenous languages and authorize small grants for education."

First, some of the latter now believe that they might be wise to make a separate peace with language restrictionists, it is tempting to argue that indigenous languages, which predate English on American soil, have a prior moral claim that immigration restrictions do not have, and that federal programs for Native Americans should therefore be exempted from any English-only mandate.

Sen. Stevens appears to be receptive to this logic and it is possible that other Western Republicans may be as well — e.g., Senators McCain, Domenici, Campbell, Murkowski, and Hatch. Because these senators have previously voted against English-only measures, opponents had felt that chances for defeating the legislation were better in the Senate than in the House, where one bill, H.R.123, was passed with 191 co-sponsors, only 27 shy of the 218 votes needed to pass legislation.

For more than a decade, language-minority advocates have maintained a vigil against the English-only movement. While it is widely acknowledged that immigrants are the primary target of this campaign, Native American groups are also often excluded from their legal and political fallout. This year, for the first time, some of the latter now believe that they might be wise to make a separate peace with language restrictionists, it is tempting to argue that indigenous languages, which predate English on American soil, have a prior moral claim that immigration restrictions do not have, and that federal programs for Native Americans should therefore be exempted from any English-only mandate.

"English Plus" advocates argue that such a deal would be short-sighted. First, there would be no practical way to exempt indigenous languages from all the legal effects of the English-only bills now under consideration. While it might be possible to shield some Native American programs, S.123 would (despite their sponsors' denials) seem implicitly to repeal the Bilingual Education Act. This could prove devastating to Native and Alaska Native schools, which rarely have alternative sources of support for Native-language programs. At present, children in more than 100 Native American language groups are being served by federal bilingual education grants. When these grants are terminated, the programs are usually terminated as well.

Second, there would be no way to exempt Native Americans from the political impact of an English-only law. Xenophobes tend not to make fine distinctions. For many not all English-only advocates, the intent is to harm "those people who look, sound, and live differently from members of the dominant culture. Native peoples meet these criteria as well as any other group, including Asian immigrants. Even if enacted in a purely symbolic form, with no legal teeth, an English-only law would legitimate and encourage chauvinism toward Native languages — e.g., "when it comes time for Congress or state legislatures to appropriate money for language preservation programs. Public attitudes, now largely indifferent to the fate of endangered tongues, would likely be harder to change or even become more hostile."

On other issues, the Senate hearing featured familiar arguments by family members of Indians, including Sen. Shelby, Reps. Toby Moffit of Kansas (R-Mo.), and Bill Emerson (R-Mo.) and Mauro Mujica, president of U.S. English, all of whom have previously testified before the House subcommittee on El Paso-Hill, Dade County, Florida, and New York. The House hearing, proponents recruited an array of first-generation immigrants to testify before the House subcommittee on early childhood, youth, and families. As it is the case, proponents have recruited an array of first-generation immigrants to testify before the House subcommittee on early childhood, youth, and families. As it is the case.
Shahab Garmi, a Pakistani told senators that, as a world language, English was the only thing that helped him survive when stranded in various foreign airports. Sayyid Syed, a Kashmiri linguist, testified that learning English is now a Muslim "religious duty" since it has become the language of the Koran for non-Arabic speakers. Miroslava Yukelich, a Serbian immigrant, also described English as "spiritually uplifting" and argued that making it official would "empower Americans to communicate and interact with one another and [avoid] the problems that confront the country of my birth, Yugoslavia." (She neglected to mention that most parties to the Bosnian conflict speak dialects of a single language, Serbo-Croatian.)

Few challenges were raised to the witnesses' testimony, except by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.), in the matter of demographic claims being advanced by U.S. English. Citing census projections, Wykica said that the number of non-English-speakers is expected to reach 43 million, or 11.2 percent of the U.S. population, by the year 2005. But Dorgan referred to a letter from the Census Bureau, which reported there were 1.8 million non-English speakers (0.8 percent of U.S. residents) in 1990 and denied making any projections about future language use. Challanged to explain where he got his estimate, Wykica responded, "books and articles. Pressed harder, he conceded, "I couldn't tell you.

Without being challenged, Rep. Roth earlier made a more extravagant claim: that one in seven Americans do not speak English. Roth cited as his source the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. In fact, according to the census, approximately one in seven U.S. residents spoke a language other than English in the home in 1990.

(The latter population increased substantially between 1980 and 1990, as shown by an analysis of census data by Dorothy Maggner, in her Numbers and Needs newsletter, Nov. 1995. For a copy, write Maggner at Box 8/3, 5000 Watson Place, Washington, DC 20016. But among foreign-born residents who speak other languages at home, the percentage who speak English "very well" increased more rapidly — i.e., they are becoming more bilingual.)

--James Crawford
JMCRAFORD@delphi.com
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