

**In: DECOLONIZING FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION**  
**The Misteaching of English and Other Colonial Languages**  
**Edited by Donaldo Macedo**  
**Published by Routledge in 2019**

## FOREWORD

### **Against Apartheid in Education and in Linguistics: The Case of Haitian Creole in Neo-Colonial Haiti<sup>1</sup>**

*Michel DeGraff*  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*  
*MIT-Haiti Initiative*  
*Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen*

In Donaldo Macedo's words, this volume on *Decolonizing Foreign Language Education* instantiates "engaged and militant scholarship" against colonial methods in our classrooms. I write this Foreword firstly as a rallying call for educators throughout the world, but especially in the Global South, to join forces for the promotion of "linguistic human rights [as] instruments of decolonization opposing hegemonic aggression" (François Victor Torchon, this volume, p. 261–281). Here I write from the perspective of a linguist who has been engaged in a protracted anti-colonial struggle in my native Haiti, which is yet another post-colony where "linguicism has taken over from racism as a more subtle way of hierarchizing social groups" (cf. Phillipson, 1992, as quoted in Hatice Çelebi, this volume, p. 247).

### **Against Linguicism as the New Racism**

Reading Macedo's fiery introduction to this volume I found the perfect quotation to summarize my Foreword, namely an important reflection from bell hooks on Adrienne Rich's insights on the *colonial* uses of the English language by the

oppressed—“This is the oppressor’s language yet I need it to talk to you,” to which bell hooks added:

“. . . it is not the English language that hurts me, but what the oppressors do with it, how they shape it to become a territory that limits and defines, how they make it a weapon that can shame, humiliate, and colonize.”

*(hooks, 1994: 167, as quoted in Macedo, this volume, p. 29)*

bell hooks’ caveat brings to mind how British, then US, imperialism enlisted the English language as a weapon to control and dehumanize Native Americans, throughout North America and as far as Hawai’i, forcing them into assimilation through English-only academic programs that contributed to destroying their languages and cultures (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Wilson, 2014; Wilson and Kanamā, 2006, 2011; McCarty, 2011) while their lands were being stolen (Zinn, 1980). Like schoolchildren in Haiti and other post-colonies throughout the world, Native American children were physically and psychologically abused for speaking their home languages.

In my own experience as a speaker of Haitian Creole (known as “Kreyòl” in Haiti) and as a linguist interested in Caribbean Creole and other non-colonial languages, bell hooks’ quotation also applies to the colonial uses of European languages in the Caribbean, Latin America, Africa, etc. Taken together, these post-colonial language-related predicaments can serve as paradigmatic cases for the struggle that this volume exhorts educators to engage in throughout the world. These predicaments add urgency to Macedo’s invitation for language teachers to become “agents of history” by “engaging in critical reflection followed by knowledgeable action.”

In the particular case of my native Haiti it’s French that “limits and defines” as “a weapon that can shame, humiliate, and colonize,” starting as early as in kindergarten when Kreyòl-speaking children are often silenced through the imposition of a former colonial language that even the teachers, by and large, do not speak fluently. Even deputies and senators in Haiti’s Parliament are “shamed, humiliated and colonized,” through recurrent ridicule on social media and other public venues, for any perceived deviance in their French—or for unwittingly engaging in Kreyòl-French “translanguaging” à la García (this volume). In other words, even authority figures can be silenced and made relatively powerless<sup>2</sup> through the (self-)imposition of French as sole “legitimate” language (cf. Saint-Fort, 2014; Charles, 2015), notwithstanding the fact that since 1987 both French and Kreyòl are, by law, Haiti’s co-official languages, with Kreyòl legally recognized as our sole national language.

In effect, then, neo-colonization and class domination through French have become part and parcel of every corner of Haitian society, relegating monolingual Kreyòl speakers to second-class citizenship even though they constitute the numerical majority and should have the most influence in political matters. It is thus that the use of French in Haiti not only cements “elite closure” (à la

Myers-Scotton, 1993) but it fatally undermines the very foundations of freedom and democracy in a country that, ironically, freed itself of French colonial rule, then promised liberty and equality to its population of formerly enslaved Africans. Another dream deferred . . .

The rest of my Foreword will, then, focus on Haiti and its unfinished revolution. My plan is to highlight the formidable potential of this volume toward breaking these neo-colonial intellectual, ideological and political chains that, through language and education, still poison my native country while imprisoning it in a state of “arrested development” (Doucet, 2012) with schools that are “upside down in an upside down country” (Dejean, 2006).

### **A Key Distinction for Students in Haiti: Learning IN French vs Learning OF French**

My work as linguist and educator has convinced me that Kreyòl is an indispensable tool for deep learning, human rights, social justice and economic development in Haiti. From that perspective, bell hooks’ quotation will help me clarify that my aim is not to ban the learning *of* French in Haiti. Instead my aim is to eliminate the colonial barriers that are imposed on these millions of Kreyòl-speaking children who, generation after generation, are forced, from the earliest grades onward, to “learn” *in* French, a language that they do not speak. Such use of French as language of instruction among Kreyòl-only speakers amounts to a strategy of “élite closure” (cf. Myers-Scotton, 1993), a pedagogical mis-practice that excludes the majority of Haiti’s population (the monolingual Kreyòl speakers) from access to quality education, *including the adequate learning of French and other foreign languages.*

This issue of access warrants a crucial, but apparently ill-understood, distinction *vis-à-vis* the status of French in Haitian classrooms. Indeed, there’s a fundamental, but often neglected, difference between “the learning *of* French” vs. “learning *in* French.” The former (i.e., the learning *of* French in Haiti) is certainly a worthy academic endeavor, alongside the learning of any other language—but, especially, Spanish and English given Haiti’s location in the Americas. But failed attempts at learning *in* French from the earliest grades bring along a host of pedagogical, psychological and sociological hurdles that trap most Haitians in a persistent colonial state of “linguistic apartheid” (i.e., segregation on the basis of language, with roots in the French colonial system). This linguisticism becomes even more challenging when learning *in* French is expected without any prior learning *of* French and within a context where participation in state affairs and in formal administrative and legal matters *requires* fluency in French even though the vast majority of the population speaks Kreyòl only.

These patterns of linguistic discrimination are yet another reason why I feel so privileged to have been invited to write this Foreword to this volume on decolonizing foreign language education. Indeed, though my native Haiti has been independent for more than two centuries, it remains, more than most other

countries, in utmost need of decolonization when it comes to the fact that most Haitians are still being educated *in* what amounts to a foreign language (i.e., they are being *mis*-educated through the colonial use of the French language).

The use of French in Haitian classrooms (and beyond) is, thus, not a mere technical and neutral pedagogical endeavor. Educators in Haiti who uncritically teach French and, especially, those who uncritically teach *in* French are complicit in the reproduction of the colonial ideology that excludes millions of monolingual Kreyòl speakers from education, administration, justice, etc. In other words, French, like English in the analysis of Alastair Pennycook (this volume, p. 169–185), cannot be “disconnected from culture, politics, and its colonial history.” So teachers in Haiti too should heed Pennycook’s plea (this volume, p. 178) for the sort of activism that:

“. . . brings the notion of resourceful speakers into conversation with a longer history of critical practice, with a perspective that acknowledges the politics of language and education and seeks to address and transform social, cultural, and economic inequalities.”

### **Decolonization is Even More Urgent When the MEDIUM of Education is a Foreign Language that Disenfranchises Most of the Population**

The title of this volume is “Decolonizing Foreign Language Education”—referring to coloniality in the teaching *of* foreign languages. But the need to decolonize is even more urgent in school systems where the very *medium* of education (and of formal administration, justice, etc.) is a foreign language—or when the medium of education (for example, English among Native Americans) was purposefully chosen as a tool to annihilate Indigenous languages such as Wampanoag, Mohawk, Navajo, Ojibwe, Hawaiian, etc., and when such a medium of instruction still exerts oppressive control over the speakers of these Indigenous languages. More generally, the urgent need to decolonize formal education is a global one if we consider that 40 percent of the world’s population (more than 2 billion people, in mostly non-white communities in post-colonial nation-states in the Americas, Africa and Asia) are being “educated” in a language that is, in effect, a foreign language (Walter & Benson, 2012, UNESCO, 2016), to the detriment of these children’s intellectual and psycho-social development. As UNESCO’s (2016) white paper so aptly puts it, “If you don’t understand, how can you learn?”

Consider, again, my native Haiti. Until its independence in 1804 Haiti was France’s wealthiest colony. Though it’s been more than two centuries since Haitians liberated themselves, at least administratively, from the French empire, we yet have to break the intellectual, cultural and political chains of neo-colonialism. The imposition of French as the primary language of formal education and administration has, since colonial times, dominated and devalued most of the African-derived

and local (“Creole”) ingredients of Haitian culture, including our Creole language (hereafter, “Kreyòl”). Hence, as Albert Memmi so correctly highlighted, “[a]ll the efforts of the colonialist are directed toward maintaining this social immobility [i.e., the immutable oppression of the colonized by the colonizer], and racism is the surest weapon for this aim . . . Racism appears then, not as an incidental detail, but as a consubstantial part of colonialism” (Memmi, 1991, p. 118).

From this perspective, the role of French as a tool of linguicism in Haiti is somewhat similar to that of English in Turkey, as described by Hatice Çelebi (this volume, p. 241), to the extent that French in Haiti, like English in Turkey,

“. . . provides privileges to some people (primarily those in the ‘core’) while being harmful in both obvious and subtle ways in the social, economic, and political spheres of [ . . . ] people of the ‘periphery’ . . . ”

In Haiti the people at the outer edge of the “periphery” are the numerical majority and are typically monolingual Kreyòl speakers in rural areas, and they are often called, in Kreyòl, “moun an deyò,” which translates, literally, as “the people on the outside” (!).

Before leaving the topic of coloniality *vis-à-vis* the language of instruction, one more caveat is warranted concerning the teaching of foreign languages vs. teaching *in* foreign languages. This caveat is particularly important for the many educators (practitioners, policy-makers and researchers, including myself) who favor language-immersion and dual-language programs—*when appropriate*. We advocate these programs because we believe that, in certain well-defined contexts, teaching *in* a non-native language does contribute to the teaching of that language without incurring the sort of pedagogical, sociological and ideological pitfalls that are associated with teaching *in* French in Haiti. Here what I have in mind are these language-immersion or dual-language programs where the target non-native language is often a minority or non-colonial language (for example, Spanish or Native American languages in the US). In the US cases that I understand the best, the teaching *in/of* a non-native language as part of (one- or two-way) language immersion programs effectively promotes multilingualism and multiculturalism while boosting learning gains, including fluency in English, among recent immigrants from the Global South.

One familiar case in point, which I know first-hand, is the teaching *in/of* Haitian Creole in a recently launched English/Haitian Creole dual-language program in a Boston neighborhood with a large percentage of Haitian immigrants. This program, started in 2017–2018 with its first cohort of kindergarteners and first graders (with either Kreyòl or English or both spoken at home), offers a much-needed boost for Kreyòl-speaking children whose native language used to be treated as a deficit rather than the asset that it actually is. This program offers win-win opportunities in light of the fact that the English-speaking children, as well, will benefit from growing up bilingual and bi-cultural, thus enriching their

humanity—while Kreyòl-speaking children become fluent in English (and bi-cultural too) and retain and deepen their fluency and literacy skills in Kreyòl along with their roots in Haitian culture (García Mathewson, 2017; Vaznis, 2017).

Another case in point is Hawai‘i: the Hawaiian language is one of the many Indigenous languages previously endangered by genocidal US imperialism. Since 1978 Hawaiian has been an official language in Hawai‘i. In Hawai‘i’s language-immersion programs, Hawaiian now successfully doubles as both the *medium* of instruction and the *subject* of instruction in successful language revitalization programs (“language nests and survival schools”) that have managed to revive a language that was previously banned and threatened with extinction (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; McCarty, 2011; Wilson, 2014; Wilson & Kanamā, 2006, 2011, 2017).<sup>3</sup> These language-immersion programs are now embedded in university-based teacher education curricula promoting the Hawaiian language as the medium of education.<sup>4</sup> The University of Hawai‘i offers the first academic program in a Native American language, including a PhD in Hawaiian and Indigenous Language and Culture Revitalization. This program has been contributing innovative insights to language-immersion programs for the revitalization of Indigenous languages throughout the US.<sup>5</sup> In this vein it’s good news that recent US legislation promotes the expansion of language-immersion and dual-language education in Native American and other minority languages.<sup>6</sup>

There is another key demographic and socio-linguistic difference between the target language in such language-immersion/dual-language programs in the US (be it Haitian Creole, Hawaiian, etc.) vs. French as language of instruction in Haiti: generally the former, unlike the latter, is the native, home, community, heritage or ancestral language of a substantial proportion of the students involved in such a program. In most schools in Haiti, French is not a native or home (or even a comfortable) language for anyone in the classrooms—be they students or teachers. Recall that the vast majority in Haiti, including most teachers, are fluent in Kreyòl only. Therefore, in most Haitian schools there’s no real opportunity for any immersion in fluently spoken French. The only adequate immersion available is in Kreyòl.

Another key difference between US language-immersion programs vs. teaching in French in Haiti is that the former, unlike the latter, neither threaten the human rights and cultural integrity of, nor disenfranchise and impoverish, the majority. On the contrary, such programs honor their students’ diverse identities and cultures, contribute to the well-being of communities previously victimized by colonial dehumanizing practices, and create academic environments where both English-speakers and their non-English-speaking counterparts can equitably share their home languages and cultures to their mutual benefit. Indeed, such programs aim at positive social transformation toward equal opportunity in academic and socioeconomic terms—a far cry from elitist French-based education in Haiti where access and opportunity are denied to the disenfranchised majority. In this comparison, only the circumstances of French in Haiti instantiate “the tortures of colonial bilingualism” decried by Albert Memmi (1991, p. 150). Only in Haiti do we have one

language (French) cast as the “superior” or “pure” language, “elaborated” language, or “cultured” language” (Macedo, this volume, p. 1) against the inferior, impure, primitive and uncultured lesser language (Kreyòl) of the so-called uncouth masses.

## **Haiti as a Paradigmatic Case of Linguistic Apartheid in Utmost Need of Decolonization**

What makes this volume on *Decolonizing Foreign Language Education* at once unique and powerful is the political clarity it offers about its plea that foreign-language teachers question the assumption that the former colonizers’ languages can be used to save people from their (quasi-)colonized status. Or, as Macedo (this volume) asks in the case of English, can English-language teachers save people from their subaltern status as stigmatized non-English speakers?

It is with passion and commitment that each author in this courageous volume, through multiple strategies, unveils the colonial ideology that is hidden in foreign-language curricula, materials and methods. These contributing authors seek a much-needed paradigm shift where foreign-language teachers can be asked to challenge and eventually undermine what Memmi has called the “fundamental discrimination between colonizer and colonized,” that “*sine qua non* of colonial life [that] also lays the foundation for the immutability of this life” (Memmi, 1991, p. 118). The authors of *Decolonizing Foreign Language Education* share a common drive to “fracture [once and for all] the yoke of linguistic imperialism” in foreign-language classrooms, as the subtitle of this important volume so defiantly puts it—a defiance informed by analysis and hope.

While the arguments in my Foreword showcase mostly the ravages of “linguistic apartheid” in Haiti, I believe that my analysis applies, perhaps in more subtle or indirect fashion, to all people who have been conquered or oppressed linguistically and culturally for the economic and political advantages of the élite few against the impoverished majority. In this vein, Haiti represents a spectacular case study of a global predicament—all the more spectacular that, in Haiti, the language that is excluded from the discourse of formal education, official administration and other formal institutions is the one single language that is fluently spoken by the entire population and that is recognized as such in the country’s 1987 Constitution. Having one single well-established national language spoken by an entire population would constitute a formidable asset for any country. Yet this is an advantage that Haiti’s linguistic apartheid keeps laying to waste. Meanwhile the country is so impoverished and so dependent on foreign aid that it has become known as “the Republic of NGOs.” Such a spectacular predicament becomes all the more challenging when we consider the odds of gaining full cultural, intellectual and political autonomy when colonialism becomes neo-colonialism, and when foreign organizations such as the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) and global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank replace colonial armies. Here Haiti becomes a paradigmatic

case of the neo-colonial predicament decried by Timothy Reagan and Terry Osborn (this volume, p. 83):

“The end of the colonial era, and of formal colonial relations, did not mean the end of western imperialism. Colonialism was replaced by neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism, which, although no longer formal and somewhat less blatant, nevertheless resulted in the continuing subjugation of peoples around the world. In essence, neo-colonialism refers to the efforts of European powers (including, for the purposes of this discussion, the United States as a ‘neo-European’ power) to continue to maintain influence in and even domination of former colonial areas (as well as other developing societies) through alternative means . . .”

These “alternative means” include the use of a (former) colonial language—for example, French in Haiti—as primary language of education and administration.

### **The Yoke of Francophonie in Haiti<sup>7</sup>**

Let’s consider two recent and related events at the *Élysée* (the official residence of French presidents) involving two pairs of French and Haitian presidents: French President François Hollande and Haitian President Michel Martelly in October 2014; then, in December 2016, French President Emmanuel Macron and Haitian President Jovenel Moïse. Both events illustrate contemporary instances of “the yoke of imperialism” as a neo-colonization strategy that uses language and education for advancing the political and socio-economic advantages (the “national interests” à la Claire Kamsch, this volume, p. 57) of powerful countries over impoverished ones—and, within the latter, of the relatively privileged few over the disenfranchised majority.

Before delving into these recent language-related neo-colonial struggles at the *Élysée*, a bit of historical background is in order. The details of these struggles—on both the national and international scenes—have been documented by an unlikely source: WikiLeaks’ release of US Department of State cables, where both local and foreign authorities openly express concern over the use of Creole languages as tools for education and liberation. For example, back in 1979 confidential cables from the US Department of State, as disclosed by WikiLeaks,<sup>8</sup> discussed a popular Martinican “campaign against the growing number of metropolitan teachers coming into Martinique [. . .] the influx [of whom] poses serious learning problems for the [Martinican] students [due to] the [French] teachers having little sympathy for the Creole language and consequently the child is seriously handicapped.” Moreover, these US Department of State cables describe a “French assimilationist policy” whereby “Martinican children learn about ‘our ancestors, the Gauls’ but nothing about their African ancestry or about local Creole culture, which is denigrated.”



In the case of Haiti, we also find US cables that document the suppression of Kreyòl. These cables, too, are dated 1979 which, as it turns out, is the year when the Haitian government inaugurated a radical reform to promote Kreyòl as the language of instruction. This reform was vigorously contested by anti-democratic forces, from both within and without the government (Alexandre, 2013). So it is not surprising that US State Department cables of that same period document “the imposition of cultural censorship” against theater and radio broadcasting in Kreyòl with the potential to educate the population about the government’s “failings and abuses”—such broadcasting in Kreyòl makes the masses “less politically predictable”(!)

That the use of Kreyòl is indispensable for educating the masses about “failings and abuses” has become most evident in the current “PetroCaribe Challenge” social media campaign against state corruption in Haiti: the entire campaign, now gone viral, is being conducted in Kreyòl—an important fact that’s barely mentioned in mainstream media, both in Haiti and abroad.<sup>9</sup> Yet Gilbert Mirambeau Jr., who launched the #PetroCaribeChallenge campaign on August 14, 2018, with a single tweet in Kreyòl asking “*Kot kòb PetroCaribe a?*” (“Where is the PetroCaribe money?”), was quick to tell me that his choice of using Kreyòl on social media had been a deliberate and consistent decision coupled with a conscious and consciousness-raising act of identity and patriotism against neo-colonization and massive state-sponsored corruption—financial and intellectual (personal communication with Gilbert Mirambeau Jr. via WhatsApp, September 22nd, 2018).

As for the role of language in Haiti’s geo-political struggles with France, historian Webert Arthus’s 2014 book (pp. 109–115) has documented the French government’s persistent anti-Kreyòl and anti-development neo-colonial policies over the years, in collaboration with certain quarters of Haiti’s leadership. France’s well-entrenched neo-colonial stance against Haiti, in complicity with local Haitian élites, was revealed quite clearly on October 31, 2014, when President Hollande of France, during his meeting at the Élysée with President Martelly of Haiti, unambiguously stated that:

“the French language is a major link between France and Haiti. So we’re making sure that the high schools that are being built today in Haiti offer the most teaching in French, by French teachers when possible, otherwise by Francophones, because we do not want that Haiti lose the French language which makes its identity.”

*(cited and rebuked in DeGraff, 2015—also see DeGraff & Stump, 2018, pp. 150–151<sup>10</sup>)*

In essence, under the banner of a “do-gooder,” President Hollande proposed the reinforcement of Haiti’s elitist French-based educational system, which alienates Haitians from their own local culture and national Kreyòl language and which routinely discriminates against those who don’t speak French—which is

the vast majority of the population. Furthermore, President Hollande’s speech tendentiously makes the French language the exclusive privilege of *French* citizens, with “*Francophone*” speakers (i.e., speakers of French who are not French and who, by and large, are not white) ranked second in terms of their capacity to teach French. François Hollande’s self-serving ranking of who can best teach French is a racist rebuke to those “Francophone” writers who seem so proud of their awards from the Francophonie movement, including prestigious chairs at the Académie Française and Collège de France!<sup>11</sup>

On December 11, 2017, at the same Élysée in Paris, President Moïse of Haiti declared French to be Haiti’s “official language” (*in the singular!*) contrary to fact. This declaration was part of a meeting during which French President Macron sketched a multi-million dollar plan to help “improve” Haiti’s education system; then President Moïse (in return?) promised that he would do his utmost to promote French as a working language in CARICOM—an association of 15 Caribbean countries working toward economic development (Haiti Libre, 2017).

As it turns out, it’s *both* Kreyòl and French that are official languages in Haiti, and it’s Kreyòl, *not French*, that is constitutionally recognized as the country’s sole *national* language; that is, as the sole language that can guarantee universal access to quality education in Haiti. As for CARICOM, there are more Kreyòl speakers than French speakers in the Caribbean (Mathieu, 2005; Komite pou tabli Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen, 2013; Belfort, 2013). When President Moïse or any CARICOM leaders make speeches in French, there’s a majority of interested individuals, both in Haiti and, more generally, in the Caribbean, who are left out. In effect, making French a “working language” of CARICOM works against the national interests of Caribbean countries. Instead, such a decision serves France’s economic and political domination, to the detriment of local Caribbean needs such as those of Creole speakers in Haiti, Dominica and Saint Lucia who have long asked, unsuccessfully to date, that Kreyòl be a working language of CARICOM (Mathieu, 2006; Komite pou tabli Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen, 2013; Belfort, 2013).<sup>12</sup>

At both these meetings at the Élysée, three years apart, all four presidents converged on one objective whose implementation would further the intellectual and economic domination of France, alongside that of a small Haitian élite, over the general population of Haiti. Such meetings illustrate, at the highest levels of governance in both countries, the continuation of a practice that has, for centuries, betrayed best practice in education and respect of human rights. Indeed, one must stress, again and again, that teaching in children’s home languages—such as Kreyòl, instead of French, in Haiti—is of crucial importance for children’s rights, anti-discrimination, quality education and equal opportunity for all. Yet it also bears highlighting, again, this paradoxical fact that Haiti still stands out as one of the rare nations in which there is one single language spoken by all citizens (i.e., Kreyòl), while the school system, by and large, uses another language (i.e., French) as the main language of instruction and examination.

## Symbolic and Structural Violence in the Guise of a “Balanced Bilingualism” Chimera

In the 2010–2015 Operational Plan of Haiti’s Ministry of National Education and Professional Training (*Groupe de Travail sur l’Éducation et la Formation*, 2010), the government announced, without any realistic means for implementation, the goal of “balanced bilingualism”—whereby the whole country should become equally fluent in both French and Kreyòl. Scientific findings from language-acquisition and language-teaching research (e.g., Reagan & Osborn and Ortega, this volume) would suggest that such an objective of nation-wide balanced bilingualism is an insurmountable task, given that the country is mostly monolingual in Kreyòl and suffers from extreme forms of economic impoverishment, of the sort that excludes any possibility of giving every Haitian access to competent and fluent French teachers and high-quality language-learning equipment. Teachers themselves often do not speak French fluently, and most Haitians have no opportunity to be regularly immersed in any community that speaks fluent French, be it at home or at school—a situation that makes “balanced bilingualism” on a national scale a socially and economically costly pipe dream (a *chimera*, indeed!). So Haitian schools should heed the paradigm shift proposed by Timothy Reagan and Terry Osborn (this volume) for foreign-language education. Reagan and Osborn draw a sharp and important methodological distinction between foreign-language *study* as part of general education and the attainment of foreign-language *fluency* for a smaller subset of students (I return to their proposal below).

Meanwhile, virtually every Haitian in Haiti speaks Kreyòl as their native language, while no more than 10 percent speak French, perhaps as few as 3 percent if we only count those who effortlessly speak fluent French, having learnt French as a native language at home amongst French-speaking relatives and peers. Given such a demographic profile, the systematic use of Kreyòl at all levels of education, government, administration, justice, etc., is indispensable for ensuring fair treatment and equality of opportunity among all Haitians (DeGraff, 2016b). More broadly, the systematic use of a community’s home language by the state and by schools is an indispensable ingredient for the respect of human rights and for the most sustainable and optimal foundations to develop children’s human capacity for problem solving and socio-economic development in Haiti and everywhere else (DeGraff & Ruggles, 2014; DeGraff, 2018b; DeGraff & Stump, 2018; Devonish, 2007; Milson-Whyte, 2018; Brock-Utne, 2000).<sup>13</sup> As I argue below, any use of French in Haitian schools should, then, consider French as a language that, in effect, is *foreign* to most students. Kreyòl must, then, be given its due as the full-fledged native language at the core of Haitian identity and as a sound basis for active learning in all academic disciplines, including foreign-language education.

Such a decolonial approach to education in Haiti is deeply germane to the contributions to this volume, especially when we consider the aforementioned discussion in Reagan and Osborn (this volume, p. 83) where it is reported that,

even in the US, “less than 1 percent of American adults are proficient in the language that they studied in a US classroom.” In Reagan and Osborn’s chapter, one recommendation is for US teachers to clearly separate two objectives regarding foreign languages: (i) *studying* a language in the context of “the general enlightenment goals of education” vs. (ii) becoming *fluent* in that language “as an option to some students who are so inclined.” Fluency in a foreign language (objective ii) is more ambitious than simply studying a language (objective i) and needs not be assigned to every student studying a foreign language.

Be that as it may, despite multiple plans and documents promoting the use of Kreyòl in Haitian education, most schools and universities there continue to impose French as the primary language of instruction and examination, thus devaluing Haiti’s national language and perpetuating a long history of (neo-)colonial structural violence against the majority of the population. In many places in Haiti, official exams are offered almost exclusively in French, except the exams *on* Kreyòl. When students do have access to exams in both French and Kreyòl, many prefer to take the French version because they have already rote-memorized, often with little if any comprehension, the corresponding materials in French. Typically, students do not have access to a full range of books in Kreyòl, and especially not in science and mathematics at the more advanced levels. Worse yet, in too many Haitian classrooms students are still punished, humiliated and even expelled for speaking Kreyòl at school.

It’s as if most teachers in Haiti remain oblivious to the central role they play against equal opportunity and against human rights while they continue promoting French as the primary language of formal education—as if French could magically open the doors to Haitians who have been imprisoned in a protracted state of mis-education through the ongoing exclusion and stigmatization of their native Kreyòl. I must recall that such abuses, in schools and beyond, are not unique to Haiti. They are endemic to the Caribbean (Devonish, 2007; Milson-Whyte, 2018) and to other former European colonies in the Global South (Brock-Utne, 2000; DeGraff, 2018b). Recently we have been reminded of similar structural linguistic violence in the US, as documented in videos showing children being reprimanded for using their native Spanish in the classroom (Zehr, 2003; Benavides, 2017; Edwards, 2017).

This practice of punishing children for using their mother tongue interferes with their skills, creativity and well-being. In Haiti, among every ten children who enter first grade, only one (i.e., 10 percent) will finish school, as reported in 2010 by the state-sponsored Groupe de Travail sur l’Éducation et la Formation (2010). Interestingly, approximately 10 percent of Haitians speak French to various degrees, in addition to Kreyòl. If this 10 percent substantially overlaps with the 10 percent that finish school, Haiti’s school system could indeed be playing a very powerful role in producing and reproducing socio-economic inequalities through exclusionary linguistic practices. Such practices, coupled with a brutally unequal distribution of resources, amount to systemic discrimination and violations of

human rights—a type of “linguistic apartheid” that undermines the excluded majority’s mental health and sense of identity while blocking both academic progress and socio-economic development.

### **“A Population of Degenerate Types” Condemned to Silence and Alienation?**

The successes of school systems in countries such as Finland suggest that children are most successful at learning foreign languages, and all else at school, when they can build strong academic foundations, including literacy, in their home and community languages (Pinnock & Vijayakumar, 2009). Such comparative data add to our ongoing argument that the use of Kreyòl as the language of instruction among Haitian children is indispensable for developing literacy and other academic skills, including the learning (or the *study*, à la Reagan & Osborn, this volume) of foreign languages such as French, English, or Spanish. This is exactly what works in successful Kreyòl-based education, as in the Lekòl Kominotè Matènwa (LKM) in La Gonâve, which—partly thanks to funding from US institutions such as the National Science Foundation and World Vision—has now become a model for other schools in that area (Dizikes, 2015). The children at LKM read, on average, three times better than children in schools that still favor French-based education (DeGraff, 2016c; DeGraff & Stump, 2018).

Clearly the use of local vernacular languages in education worldwide has transformative potential (DeGraff, 2018a,b). As advocated in this volume, the teaching of foreign languages should not relegate local native languages or other home or community speech varieties to second-class status. On the contrary, foreign-language teaching should incorporate the value and history of children’s entire linguistic repertoires as determinants of students’ identities and as fundamental tools for active learning.

Indeed, I now better understand, thanks to this volume, the reasons for students’ learning gains when teachers allow “code-switching” (viewed at the level of *internal* grammars, à la Jeff McSwann, this volume) or “translanguaging” (i.e., “the deployment of a speaker’s *full linguistic repertoire* without regard for watchful adherence to the socially and politically defined boundaries of named (and usually national and state) languages,” as defined, at the level of *utterances*, by Ofelia García, this volume). In Pennycook’s analysis, teachers need to “look at translanguaging practices where communication transcends both individual languages, thus involving ‘diverse semiotic resources and ecological affordances.’”

Similar acceptance should be promoted *vis-à-vis* students’ diverse “accents” instead of using such accents to tendentiously index degrees of intelligence or humanity (see the chapters by Claire Kramsh and Theresa Austin, this volume, and related work by Smitherman, 2000; Charity Hudley & Madison, 2014; Rickford & King, 2016; and Baugh, 2018 on African American vernacular English in US schools and other institutions). In the current academic climate of Haiti,

code-switching between Kreyòl and French (and non-standard varieties of French with various degrees of Kreyòl influence) is anathema to most teachers. The latter are quick at penalizing the slightest transfer from Kreyòl into the French spoken by Haitian students. This prescriptive purism is somewhat reminiscent of Austin's (this volume) analysis of Spanish-language programs' preference for standardized Peninsular Spanish over non-Peninsular varieties.

In effect, such norms in Haiti (for example, stigmas against Kreyòl-French translanguaging and against Kreyòl-influenced varieties of French) render Kreyòl-speaking students virtually speechless, as predicted by García's indictment of "nation-states [that] have co-opted the human potential of language as a meaning-making semiotic tool, relegating many speakers to a position of speechlessness." In fact, Haitian teachers often use French as a tool of control in their classrooms, knowing very well that students, and even adults, would rather remain silent instead of running the risk of being shamed and humiliated for the slightest French mistakes. The latter are often misinterpreted, in brutally prejudiced fashion, as reflexes of stupidity or markers of the lowest rungs of the social-class hierarchy (DeGraff & Stump, 2018, p. 146).<sup>14</sup> It is thus that the Haitian school system, with French as the main language of instruction, renders Kreyòl-dominant speakers "at risk" or, worse yet, "as a population of degenerate types" (in the terminology of Hemphill & Blakely, this volume, p. 220). Here, too, Haiti becomes a paradigmatic case of this brand of "colonization [that] occurs in large part through mandating a standardized and commodified 'academic language,' and devaluing other language varieties" (again, Hemphill & Blakely, this volume, p. 224).

## **"Fracturing the Yoke of Linguistic Imperialism"—in Education, Development and Linguistics**

This volume is a loud and valiant call for institutions, educators and scholars worldwide to concretely honor linguistic diversity by enlisting it as a means of promoting equitable access to quality education and for protecting children's rights. Given the geo-politics and the social-class correlates of language- and education-related choices at both the group and individual levels (DeGraff, 2005, 2014, 2017, 2018a,b), this call should be transmitted as well to international organizations such as the United Nations, alongside their member states, which should check whether their documentation and pedagogical materials (websites, social media, memos, syllabi, textbooks, examinations, etc.) are delivered in the corresponding local languages. Such monitoring could also provide longitudinal data to evaluate progress in the use of local languages. All levels of human rights organizations should pay systematic attention to actual language and education practices on the ground.

In Haiti, for example, the vast majority of administrative, legal and educational documents are still written exclusively in French—including documents being produced by the very organizations whose official objectives include the

promotion of children’s rights and education. One UNICEF site, titled “Timoun yo! The Voice of Haiti’s Children,”<sup>15</sup> is an example of that ambivalence toward the use of Kreyòl, notwithstanding UNICEF’s pro-Kreyòl advocacy elsewhere. The site’s home page prominently displays the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, but the site itself is in French and English and not in Kreyòl—the only language spoken by most Haitian children (and adults). Worse yet, most publications by the Haitian state, including the Ministry of Culture and Communication,<sup>16</sup> the Ministry of National Education,<sup>17</sup> the State University,<sup>18</sup> and human rights institutions such as the Office de la Protection du Citoyen,<sup>19</sup> are in French, thus they routinely violate Haiti’s 1987 Constitution, which mandates the use of French and Kreyòl as co-official languages, with Kreyòl deemed the one single language that bonds the entire nation. Similar abuses are apparent in Haiti’s court system, which functions primarily in French even though judges, lawyers, audiences, etc. are, by and large, most fluent in Kreyòl while the contending parties (accusers, accused, witnesses, etc.) most often speak Kreyòl *only*. Thus most Haitians “have no real access to justice” (Carew Craft, 2015). In effect, such linguistic practices, even among local and international human-rights organizations, discriminate against the majority of the population and violate their . . . human rights!

Even the UN violates its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which grants<sup>20</sup>

“rights and freedoms . . . without distinction of any kind such as race, colour, sex, *language*, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

*[emphases added]*

The UN routinely violates such “rights and freedoms”; for example, UN authorities in Haiti have used French to conduct meetings with Haitians who speak Kreyòl only. French has even been used in UN meetings with Kreyòl-speaking communities that are being decimated by the cholera epidemic that was introduced in October 2010 by UN troops disposing of their feces in a major river and killing thousands, with nearly a million sick and the illness spreading to other countries (Frerichs *et al*, 2012), not even a year after Haiti’s catastrophic earthquake of January 12, 2010.<sup>21</sup>

Now, let’s move toward the bright side, with a more personal perspective rooted in my own work as linguist, educator and activist at MIT and in Haiti. Acknowledging the primacy of native languages as foundations for knowledge and human rights is the fundamental premise that underlies the workings of the MIT-Haiti Initiative<sup>22</sup> that I co-founded with Dr. Vijay Kumar at MIT in 2010 and that has been funded by the US National Science Foundation since 2012. By providing state-of-the-art teacher training and pedagogical resources in Kreyòl to faculty in Haiti, the Initiative is directly contributing to universal access to quality education (Miller, 2016; DeGraff, 2016a, 2018a,b; DeGraff & Stump, 2018). Furthermore,

this Initiative—which enlists the collaboration of educators, humanists, scientists, engineers, mathematicians, politicians, activists, artists, etc., both in the US and in Haiti—seems a perfect example of the sort of “transdisciplinarity” advocated by Lourdes Ortega (this volume, p. 112) whereby

“. . . scholarly communities attempt to solve complex knowledge problems with social impact by working across multiple disciplinary boundaries as well as with social actors outside academia, willing to integrate diverse and often discipline-internal perspectives into more than the sum of each discipline-specific fund of knowledge . . . Broadening knowledge bases in this way increases experts’ capacities to meet complex contemporary demands for socially useful knowledge.”

Before the MIT-Haiti Initiative began there were no substantial Kreyòl-language online materials and digital learning tools for university-level science and mathematics. The Initiative now provides resources that can help teach science and mathematics in Kreyòl beyond linguistic and social-class barriers, thus joining the still too small number of organizations that work to increase access to quality education through the use of Haiti’s national language. Since 2012 the Initiative has also provided teacher-training workshops to enhance high school and university teachers’ skills in Kreyòl-based active-learning pedagogy and in hands-on technology for education (Miller, 2016; DeGraff & Stump, 2018).

In order to succeed, this paradigm shift requires the participation of local and international institutions—governments and courts, schools and universities, research centers, telecommunication companies, funding agencies and NGOs, among other institutions and activities that create and transmit knowledge and power. It’s especially important that linguists, as well, distance themselves from the colonial foundations of subfields such as Creole studies whose very foundations were part of Europe’s *mission civilisatrice*, whereby non-Whites and their languages and cultures had to be ranked as inferior to their counterparts among European Whites (DeGraff, 2005). It is such beliefs that led to the age-old prejudices at the core of “Creole Exceptionalism” dogmas even among contemporary linguists. These dogmas (or “linguists’ most dangerous fallacies,” as described in DeGraff, 2005) have, for far too long, assumed Creoles to be developmentally or structurally “exceptional” (i.e., freakish) languages originating from mythical (and undocumented!) pidgins qua spectacularly impoverished (quasi-) languages.<sup>23</sup> It is thus that these dogmas have (directly or indirectly) contributed to excluding Creole languages both from the family of “normal” human languages and from their use in classrooms, courts, formal administration, etc. (see DeGraff, 2001, 2005 for extended surveys and critiques of Creole Exceptionalism dogmas).

DeGraff (2009) and Aboh and DeGraff (2017) present analyses of Creole formation whereby the history and structures of Creole languages are on a par with their counterparts in non-Creole languages, thus confirming Mufwene’s (2008,



pp. 40–58) argument that the notion “Creole” can only be defined in socio-historical and ethnographic terms without any specific linguistic structural traits that would define what a Creole language is. In other words, Creole languages are just . . . languages! And like any other languages, they help format their native speakers’ minds/brains from the womb and are the most adapted linguistic tools for building solid foundations for their speakers’ cognitive, social and academic needs.

## **From Colonial Alienation to Liberation**

In Haiti, like in most nations still struggling against neo-colonial powers from both within and without, social justice and equal opportunity for all will remain figments of our imagination as long as we have not decolonized our research and teaching practices, our views of ourselves and of our languages, cultures, etc., and our relationships with foreign powers. Regretfully, in the case of Haiti, like elsewhere in the Global South, there are formidable geo-political forces—which Claire Kamsch (this volume, p. 57) calls the “national interests” of foreign powers such as the US and Europe—that have historically plundered our human and natural resources, reproduced colonial dependency, and disparaged our languages and cultures. In Haiti these foreign interests, alongside internal social-class struggles with linguistic and other cultural correlates, have caused what Jean Price-Mars (1928 [1983: 8]) has called Haiti’s “collective bovarism”—the belief on the part of many educated Haitians that they are “colored Frenchmen” (sigh . . .). In a related vein, various contributions to Blanc and Madhère’s (2017) volume on Afro-Caribbean epistemology consider the possibility, à la Frantz Fanon (1967), that the tragic post-traumatic effects of colonization and slavery on the Haitian collective psyche are partly responsible for at least two pathologies: (i) the neo-colonial aspects of Haitian society, especially the predatory nature of its political apparatus, and (ii) the ongoing ambivalence of the population, especially Haitian leaders and intellectuals, vis-à-vis Haiti’s national culture and identity, including our national language of Kreyòl.

Unless Haitian political and socio-economic leaders, policy-makers and educators decolonize their minds and rid themselves of this persistent belief in the superiority of the French language and culture—a belief still being promoted by schools’ curricula, educational materials and teaching methods (see DeGraff & Stump, 2018)—they will unreflectively and uncritically perpetuate the self-debilitating myth that “it’s the French language that constitutes Haitian identity,” along the line of François Hollande’s propaganda (as discussed above—regarding “the yoke of Francophonie” in Haiti; also see notes 10 and 11). These Francophile myths concerning French superiority and Haiti’s (pseudo-) French identity are found even among the most “progressive” and “liberal” Haitian intellectuals. One most unfortunate corollary of these myths is that they turn most Haitians (i.e., those who speak Kreyòl only) into refuse of humanity who have no “identity” to

speak of and thus can be relegated and forgotten in the dustbins of academic and socio-economic progress.

This is how Haiti has become a paradigmatic case of the dangerous epistemological, pedagogical and societal defects that the contributors in this volume are trying to denounce so as to correct. These defects are rooted in the mistaken colonial belief that certain foreign languages (i.e., from Europe's neo-colonial powers) can increase the degree of humanity of those who have, for far too long, been considered lesser humans with lesser languages. US imperialism took this colonial belief to its most brutal logical conclusion, namely the genocide of North America's Indigenous peoples whose languages were decimated in the course of Native American children becoming victims of forced assimilation in English-only schools that banned the use of their ancestral languages (Grenoble & Whaley, 2006; Wilson & Kanamā, 2006, 2011; McCarty, 2011). Native Americans' cultures, overall autonomy and wellbeing were decimated as well:

Besides outright oppression, indigenous language endangerment is tied to the loss of traditional economies and autonomy based in hunting and gathering, fishing, subsistence agriculture, and herding, all of which are conducted through the indigenous languages.

*(Wilson & Kanamā, 2011, p. 37; also see Zinn, 1980 for the larger historical context around European and US imperialism)*

Fortunately the groundbreaking example traced by Hawaiian-language immersion schools in Hawai'i—"the most successful effort in language revitalization efforts in the United States" (Wilson, 2014; cf. Grenoble & Whaley, 2006)—suggests a hopeful way forward, one where a new sort of anti-colonial linguistics can reverse the effect of linguistic imperialism and play a key role in the human right to education (DeGraff, 2018a,b) as we strive for linguistic and cultural diversity to enrich our humanity.<sup>24</sup> Closer to us, in Massachusetts, the inspiring story of Jessie Little Doe Baird and her Wampanoag people reviving their ancestral language (Baird *et al*, 2010) beautifully exemplifies the role that linguistics as well can play in this anti-colonial struggle. These examples from Indigenous communities in the US, alongside this volume's case studies, show the potential of foreign-language education *and* linguistics toward social transformation (see DeGraff, 2018a for related examples among Creole speakers and in Creole studies).

It is thus crucial for our own wellbeing as scholars, educators and parents, for the wellbeing of children worldwide, for mutually respectful and enriching North-South relations and for a more just and humane world that the teaching of/ in "foreign" or "ancestral" or "heritage" or "indigenous" or "local" or "vernacular" or "native" languages—and *all* teaching for that matter—"fracture the yoke of linguistic imperialism" at long last. So let's carefully read this volume together and take its message to heart . . . and to our classrooms throughout the world.

## Notes

- 1 I am most thankful to my dear friend and colleague Donaldo Macedo for all his inspiring work helping us become better at “reading the word and the world,” for inviting me to this project, and for his generous feedback on this Foreword. And special thanks to my “chouchous” Elena and Nuriel for always sharing feedback and encouragements on so many aspects of my work (and more!). For this paper, Nuriel saved me, at the last minute, from one grossly embarrassing factual mistake.
- 2 In the US as well, stigmatized speech varieties have rendered certain populations, including authority figures, relatively speechless—even in the case of Judge Clarence Thomas on the Supreme Court who once reported suffering from linguistic insecurity due to his “having grown up speaking a kind of [Geechee/Gullah] dialect” (Thomas, 2000, cf. DeGraff, 2016b). Prejudices against vernacular varieties are an obstacle to social justice as well (Rickford & King, 2016; Baugh, 2018).
- 3 I am indebted to William “Pila” Wilson for insightful discussion of Hawai‘i and related cases that bring important nuances to the notion “teaching *in*” vs. “teaching *of*” a language, especially in decolonial language-immersion contexts. Unfortunately and unlike Hawaiian nowadays, Hawaiian Creole (known as “Pidgin” in Hawai‘i) still has no official status; it remains, by and large, stigmatized as “improper” or “broken” English. In other words, the decolonization of Hawaiian Creole is far behind that of Hawaiian. But efforts are being made on that front as well, especially among the linguists at the University of Hawai‘i. Heartfelt thanks to Jason Cabral, Scott Saft and Pila Wilson (at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo) for showing me the way forward, and in person, on both the Hawaiian and Creole anti-colonial fronts.
- 4 <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/kahuawaiola-indigenous-teacher-education-program>.
- 5 [https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/ma\\_hll](https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/ma_hll), [https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/phd\\_hilcr](https://hilo.hawaii.edu/catalog/phd_hilcr), <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/news/stories/2017/03/03/international-group-meets-at-uh-hilo/>, <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/keahou/2012/10/17/william-wilson-hawaiian-language/>.
- 6 Every Student Succeeds Act (2015): <http://www.congress.gov/amendment/114th-congress/senate-amendment/2240/text>.
- 7 The paragraphs below expand DeGraff’s (2017) plea against “linguistic apartheid” in Haiti, which was initially submitted to the United Nations’ High Commissioner for Human Rights.
- 8 <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10154805918923872>. <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10154805985218872>. <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10154805996838872>. <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10154805978543872>. <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10154805942788872>.
- 9 For example, in one *Miami Herald* article about the “PetroCaribe Challenge” campaign, all the quoted social media postings about the campaign are in Kreyòl, but the fact that this viral campaign is being waged almost exclusively in Kreyòl is not noted, even though the author (Jacqueline Charles) is a veteran Haitian journalist: <https://www.miamiherald.com/news/nation-world/world/americas/haiti/article217110220.html>. The prominence of Kreyòl on social media in Haiti is quantified in DeGraff (2016a, pp. 178–179).
- 10 President François Hollande’s speech about Haitian identity, education and development, alongside the response by President Michel Martelly, is available online at: <http://www.boursorama.com/actualites/france-haiti-martelly-evoque-un-partenariat-pour-l-education-ae69f38cb59bf8a08f286a1949fc4165>, with an English translation at <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/videos/10156132035733872/>.
- 11 Hollande’s notion that “Francophone” teachers cannot teach French as well as French-born teachers is reminiscent of this Turkish university president, in Hatice Çelebi’s paper in this volume (p. 241–281), who believes that non-native speakers of English cannot

- teach English: “As he [this university president] handed over the [English-teaching] contract for me to sign, he congratulated me on my new job and, without further comment, said he did not believe that ‘Turkish people can teach English’ . . .”
- 12 There has been one positive update since the initial writing of this Foreword. After that December 2017 meeting between Presidents Macron and Moïse, President Moïse revised his declaration at the Élysée and, instead, proposed to CARICOM that Kreyòl as well, alongside French, be made into an official language of CARICOM (Haiti Libre, 2018). As of this writing, this demand has not yet been granted.
  - 13 See Mufwene 2018 for related questions regarding the economic implications of linguistic diversity in the Global South. Mufwene constructively problematizes the “chicken-and-egg” link between formal education and economic development. One key question concerns the classroom use of regional lingua francas (e.g., Wolof, Swahili, Lingala in sub-Saharan Africa) in cases where the students speak such lingua franca(s) alongside their home/community language(s). In personal communication (September 27, 2018) Mufwene stresses the important fact that in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa these lingua francas double as home and community languages (i.e., as mother tongues) for children in these areas. Mufwene also makes the important point that highly multi-lingual ecologies make different economic and pedagogical demands on school systems as compared to ecologies with fewer languages to contend with. But, still, a caveat seems needed: if some of these lingua francas are, in effect, *second* or (quasi) *foreign* languages for many of these children (see, for example, Brock-Utne 2000, p. 200), then the initial investment that is required to produce materials in the relevant Indigenous languages may well be worth the effort, keeping in mind the now familiar risk of maintaining certain children (those less fluent in the lingua franca) in a pedagogically challenging situation with dire psycho-social and economic consequences for themselves and their communities.
  - 14 Here are social-media examples of French mistakes on the part of two Haitian senators. These senators’ French caused them to be called “ignoramus,” “stupid,” “illiterate,” etc.: <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10155588908963872> <https://www.facebook.com/michel.degraff/posts/10155589602853872>.
  - 15 <http://timounyo.com/> accessed on July 17, 2018.
  - 16 <https://www.communication.gouv.ht/>. Accessed on July 17, 2018.
  - 17 <http://menfp.gouv.ht/> accessed on July 17, 2018.
  - 18 <http://www.ueh.edu.ht/> accessed on July 17, 2018.
  - 19 <https://www.facebook.com/OPC-Ha%C3%AFti-Office-de-la-Protection-du-Citoyen-dHa%C3%AFti-217050851679230>. Accessed on July 17, 2018.
  - 20 <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>.
  - 21 Brian Concannon Jr., personal communication. See the Institute for Justice & Democracy website at <http://ijdh.org> for more details about the UN’s violations of human rights in Haiti.
  - 22 <https://haiti.mit.edu>.
  - 23 In some of the scenarios that treat Creoles as extraordinarily simple languages, such utmost simplicity is due to their hypothetical origins in structurally impoverished interlanguages in peculiar instances of second-language acquisition. Here, prejudices against Creole languages converge with what seem like prejudices against adult language learners. One such area of theoretical convergence is the hypothesis that pidgin languages, presumably because they originate in adult learners’ early interlanguages, would instantiate some sort of “basic variety” that lacks some of the fundamental design features of truly human languages. See DeGraff 2001, especially pages 249–250, for one extended critique of this “basic variety” hypothesis in the context of a long series of erroneous claims to the effect that Creole languages are among the world’s most primitive languages (also see DeGraff, 2005, 2009; and DeGraff & Aboh, 2017 for counter-arguments).

- 24 A note to foreign-language teachers among our readers: one striking fact about the Hawaiian language-immersion programs is that the average competency in English of students graduating from these programs exceeds that of their counterparts in non-immersion programs (Wilson & Kanamā, 2017).

## Bibliography

- Aboh, Enoch & Michel DeGraff (2017) "A null theory of Creole formation." In Ian Roberts (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Universal Grammar* (pp. 401–458). New York: Oxford University Press [<http://linguistics.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/aboh-and-degraff-2017-null-theory-of-creole-formation.pdf>].
- Alexandre, Guy (2013) "La politique éducative du Jean-Claudisme: Chronique de l'échec 'organisé' d'un projet de réforme". In Pierre Buteau and Lyonel Trouillot (Eds.), *Le Prix du Jean-Claudisme: Arbitraire, parodie, désocialisation*. Port-au-Prince: C3 Éditions.
- Arthus, Wien Weibert (2014) *Duvalier à l'ombre de la guerre froide: Les dessous de la politique étrangère d'Haïti (1957–1963)*. Port-au-Prince: Imprimeur S.A.
- Baird, Jessie Little Doe, Anne Makepeace, Jennifer Weston, Mary Lampson, Stephen McCarthy & Joel Goodman (2010) *Às Nutayuneân = We still live here*. Oley, PA: Bullfrog Films.
- Baugh, John (2018) *Linguistics in pursuit of justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Belfort, Jocelyn (2013) "Suze Mathieu opte pour la création d'un bloc créolophone à la CARICOM." *Le Nouvelliste*, February 19, 2013. [<http://lenouvelliste.com/article/113575/suze-mathieu-opte-pour-la-creation-dun-bloc-creolophone-a-la-caricom>]
- bell hooks (1996) *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- Benavides, Cristian (2017) "Students walk out after teacher orders 'Speak American'." *NBC News*, October 16, 2017. [<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/students-walk-out-after-teacher-tells-students-speak-american-n811256>]
- Blanc, Judith & Serge Madhère (Eds.) (2017) *Pensée afro-caribéenne et (psycho)traumatismes de l'esclavage et de la colonisation / Toubiyon twoma lesklavaj ak kolonizasyon: Dangoyaj panse afro-karayibeyen*. Port-au-Prince: Collection Ayiti. [<https://scienceetbiencommun.pressbooks.pub/psychologieafricaine/>]
- Brock-Utne, Birgit (2000) *Whose Education For All? The Recolonization of the African Mind*. New York and London: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Carew Craft, Jessica (2015). "Establishing the rule of law in a country where justice hardly exists." *The Atlantic*, April 22, 2015. [<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/04/establishing-the-rule-of-law-in-a-country-where-justice-hardly-exists/391113/>]
- Charity Hudley, Anne & Christine Mallinson (2014) *We do language: English language variation in the secondary English classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Charles, Fabian (2015) "Ki sa pale vle di ann Ayiti?" *Potomitan: Site de promotion des cultures et des langues créoles*, avril [[www.potomitan.info/ayiti/charles/pale.php](http://www.potomitan.info/ayiti/charles/pale.php)]; *AyiboPost*, avril [<http://ayibopost.com/ki-sa-pale-vle-di-ann-ayiti/>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2001) "On the Origin of Creoles: A Cartesian Critique of Neo-Darwinian Linguistics." *Linguistics Typology*, vol. 5, nos. 2 and 3, pp. 213–310. [<http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/degraff/degraff-lt-2001.pdf>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2005) "Linguists' Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism." *Language in Society*, 34.4, pp. 53–591.

- DeGraff, Michel (2009) "Language acquisition in creolization and, thus, language change: Some Cartesian–Uniformitarian boundary conditions." *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3.4, pp. 888–971. [[http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/degraff/degraff2009language\\_acquisition\\_in\\_creolization.pdf](http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/degraff/degraff2009language_acquisition_in_creolization.pdf)]
- DeGraff, Michel (2014) "The Ecology of Language Evolution in Latin America: A Haitian Postscript Toward a Postcolonial Sequel." In Salikoko Mufwene (Ed.), *Iberian Imperialism and Language Evolution in Latin America* (pp. 274–327). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. [[http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/degraff/degraff\\_2014\\_ecology\\_of\\_language\\_evolution\\_in\\_latin\\_america.pdf](http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/degraff/degraff_2014_ecology_of_language_evolution_in_latin_america.pdf)]
- DeGraff, Michel (2015) "France's *misconceived* 'Marshall Plan' for Haiti." *Le Monde Diplomatique*, May 26, 2015. [<http://mondediplo.com/blogs/france-s-misconceived-marshall-plan-for-haiti>].
- DeGraff, Michel (2016a) La langue maternelle comme fondement du savoir: L'Initiative MIT-Haiti: Vers une éducation en créole efficace et inclusive. *Revue transatlantique d'études suisses*. 6/7, 177–197. [<http://linguistics.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/degraff-2017-langue-maternelle-comme-fondement-du-savoir-MIT-Haiti.pdf>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2016a) Lang matènèl, pedagoji entèraktif, lojisyèl edikatif nan Inisyativ MIT-Ayiti : « Twa wòch dife » pou bon jan edikasyon ak inovasyon alawonnbadè ann Ayiti. *Journal of Haitian Studies*. 22.2.128–141. [<http://linguistics.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/DeGraff-20170310-JoHS-two-woch-dife.pdf>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2016b) "Linguistic equality as a condition for economic and political equality." *The Boston Review*, May 9, 2016. [<http://bostonreview.net/forum/what-education/michel-degraff-michel-degraff-responds-danielle-allen>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2016c) "Mother-tongue books in Haiti: The power of Kreyòl in learning to read and in reading to learn." *Prospects: Comparative Journal of Curriculum, Learning and Assessment*. [<http://rdcu.be/IyEG>]
- DeGraff, Michel (2017) "Haiti's 'linguistic apartheid' violates children's rights and hampers development." [<https://opendemocracy.net/openglobalrights/michel-degraff/haiti-s-linguistic-apartheid-violates-children-s-rights-and-hampers->]
- DeGraff, Michel (2018a) "Error correction and social transformation in Creole studies and among Creole speakers: The case of Haiti." *Language in Society* 47:3, pp. 354–360. [[http://lingphil.scripts.mit.edu/papers/degraff/DeGraff\\_2018\\_Error\\_correction\\_and\\_social\\_transformation\\_in\\_Haiti.pdf](http://lingphil.scripts.mit.edu/papers/degraff/DeGraff_2018_Error_correction_and_social_transformation_in_Haiti.pdf)]
- DeGraff, Michel (2018b) "Linguistics' role in the right to education." *Science Magazine* volume 360, issue 6388, p. 502, May 2018. [[http://lingphil.scripts.mit.edu/papers/degraff/DeGraff\\_in\\_Science\\_Magazine\\_20180504\\_Linguistics\\_in%20right\\_to\\_education.pdf](http://lingphil.scripts.mit.edu/papers/degraff/DeGraff_in_Science_Magazine_20180504_Linguistics_in%20right_to_education.pdf)]
- DeGraff, Michel & Molly Ruggles (2014) "A Creole solution for Haiti's woes." *New York Times*, August 1, 2014. [<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/02/opinion/a-creole-solution-for-haitis-woes.html>]
- DeGraff, Michel & Glenda S. Stump (2018) "Kreyòl, pedagogy, and technology for opening up quality education in Haiti: Changes in teachers' meta-linguistic attitudes as first steps in a paradigm shift." *Language* 94.2, 127–157. [[https://www.linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/e3\\_94.2DeGraff.pdf](https://www.linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/e3_94.2DeGraff.pdf)]
- Dejean, Yves (2006) *Yon lekòl tèt anba nan yon peyi tèt anba*. Port-au Prince: FOKAL.
- Devonish, Hubert (2007) *Language and liberation : Creole language politics in the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: Arawak.
- Dizikes, Peter (2015) "Three questions: Michel DeGraff on Haiti's new policy for teaching in Kreyòl." *MIT News*, July 20, 2015. [<http://newsoffice.mit.edu/2015/3-questions-michel-degraff-haiti-teaching-kreyol-0720>]

- Doucet, Fabienne (2012). “Arrested development: How lack of will cripples educational reform in Haiti.” *Journal of Haitian Studies* vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 120–150.
- Edwards, Breanna (2017) “NJ teacher asks students to ‘Speak American,’ but who’s gonna tell her that ‘American’ is not a language.” *The Root*, October 25, 2017. [https://www.theroot.com/nj-teacher-tells-students-to-speak-american-but-who-1819499808]
- Fanon, Frantz (1967) *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Frerichs, R.R., P.S. Keim, R. Barraix & R. Piarroux (2012) “Nepalese origin of cholera epidemic in Haiti.” *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, Volume 18, Issue 6, pp. E158–E163. [https://www.clinicalmicrobiologyandinfection.com/article/S1198-743X(14)64134-3/fulltext]
- García Mathewson, Tara (2017) “How discrimination nearly stalled a dual-language program.” *The Atlantic*, April 7, 2017. [https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/04/how-discrimination-nearly-prevented-a-dual-language-program-in-boston/522174/]
- Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley (2006) *Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Groupe de Travail sur l’Éducation et la Formation (2010) *Pour un Pacte National pour l’Éducation en Haïti*, Port-au-Prince: Bibliothèque Nationale. [http://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/planipolis/files/ressources/haiti\_pacte\_national\_education.pdf]
- Haiti Libre (2017) “Haiti—Flash: Promises of Macron to President Jovenel Moïse.” *Haiti Libre*, December 12, 2017. [http://www.haitilibre.com/en/news-22959-haiti-flash-promises-of-macron-to-president-jovenel-moise.html, accessed on July 17, 2018]
- Haiti Libre (2018) “Haiti—Politics: End of the 29th conference of heads of states of CARICOM.” *Haiti Libre*, February 28, 2018. [http://www.haitilibre.com/en/news-23684-haiti-politic-end-of-the-29th-conference-of-heads-of-state-of-caricom.html, accessed on July 17, 2018]
- Komite pou tabli Akademi Kreyòl Ayisyen (2013) “Lang kreyòl: Dezyèm lang ofisyèl CARICOM.” *Potomitan: Site de promotion des cultures et des langues créoles*. [http://www.potomitan.info/ayiti/akademi\_kreyol8.php]
- Mathieu, Suze (2005) *Depi nan Ginen nèg renmen nèg. Kreyòl ak demokrasi ann Ayiti*. Pòtoprens: Près nasyonal peyi d Ayiti.
- McCarty, Teresa. L. (2011) State of the field: The role of Native languages and cultures in American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian student achievement. Policy paper prepared for: *The Promising Practices and Partnerships in Indian Education Working Group and the U.S. Department of Education Office of Indian Education Programs under contract to Kauffman Associates, Inc. Spokane, WA. Phoenix, Ariz.* [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/52cf1070e4b048ae22d972b2/t/54aac6b3e4b0c309d027948a/1420478131256/McCarty+%282011%29.+Role+and+Impact+of+Native+Languages+and+Cultural+Context.pdf]
- Memmi, Albert (1991). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Miller, Haynes (2016) “The MIT-Haiti Initiative. An international engagement.” MIT Faculty Newsletter. Vol XXIX, No. 1, September/October 2016. [http://web.mit.edu/fnl/volume/291/miller.html]
- Milson-Whyte, Vivette (2018) “Caribbean Creole-speaking cultures, language and identities. In John Lontas (editor), Margo DelliCarpini (project editor) and Shondel Nero (volume editor), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. Volume VI, pp. 3483–3489. Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mufwene, Salikoko (2008). *Language evolution: Contact, competition and change*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Mufwene, Salikoko (2018). “Linguistic diversity, formal education, and economic development: The sub-Saharan African chicken-and-egg dilemma?” Written version of



- keynote lecture presented at the *12th International Language & Development Conference*, Senegal, December 27–29, 2017.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993) “Elite closure as a powerful language strategy: the African case.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 103.1, pp. 149–164.
- Phillipson, Robert (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Pinnock, Helen & Gowri Vijayakumar (2009) *Language and education: The missing link: How the language used in schools threatens the achievement of Education for All*. Reading, UK: CFBT Education Trust. [<http://www.unesco.org/education/EFAWG2009/Language-Education.pdf>]
- Price-Mars, Louis (1928 [1983]) *Ainsi parla l'oncle: Essais d'ethnographie*. Port-au-Prince: Imprimerie de Compiegne. Eng. ed., *So spoke the uncle*. Trans. Magdaline Shannon. Washington, DC: Three Continents.
- Rickford, John R. & Sharese King (2016) Language and linguistics on trial: Hearing Rachel Jeantel and other vernacular speakers in the courtroom and beyond. *Language* 92(4), pp. 948–988.
- Saint-Fort, Hugues (2014) “Le ‘marché linguistique’ haïtien: Fonctionnement, idéologie et avenir.” *Potomitan: Site de promotion des cultures et des langues créoles*. [<http://ww.potomitan.info/ayiti/saint-fort/marche.php>].
- Smitherman, Geneva (2000). *Talkin that talk: Language, culture, and education in African America*. New York: Routledge.
- UNESCO (2016) *If you don't understand how can you learn. Policy Paper 24*, Paris: Global Education Monitoring Report. [<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002437/243713E.pdf>]
- Vaznis, James (2017) “A Haitian Creole program arrives in Mattapan.” *Boston Globe*. September 7, 2017. [<http://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2017/09/06/mattapan-haitian-creole-program-for-preschoolers/O6PydIII1WwOaOGdqIYYZJ/story.html>]
- Walter, Stephen & Carol Benson (2012) Language policy and medium of instruction in formal education. In Bernard Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 278–300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, William (2014) “Hawaiian: A Native American language official for a State”. In Terrence G. Wiley, Joy Kreeft Peyton, Donna Christian, Sarah Catherine K. Moore and Na Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of Heritage. Research, Policy, and Educational Practice Wiley, Wiley* (pp. 219–228). New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, William H. & Kauano Kanamā (2006) “‘For the interests of the Hawaiians themselves’: Reclaiming the benefits of Hawaiian–medium education.” *Hūlilī: Multidisciplinary research on Hawaiian well-being*, Volume 3, Number 1, pp. 153–181. [[http://www.kpublishing.org/\\_assets/publishing/hulili/Hulili\\_Vol3\\_9.pdf](http://www.kpublishing.org/_assets/publishing/hulili/Hulili_Vol3_9.pdf)]
- Wilson, William H. & Kauano Kanamā (2011) “Insights from Indigenous Language Immersion in Hawai‘i: The Case of Nāwahī School.” In Diane J. Tedick, Donna Christian and Tara Williams Fortune (Eds.), *Immersion Education, Practices, Policies, Possibilities* (pp. 36–57). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Wilson, William H. & Kauano Kanamā (2017) “The Hakalama: The ‘Aha Pūnana Leo’s Syllabic Hawaiian Reading Program.” In C. McLachlan and A. Arrow (Eds.), *Literacy in the Early Years. International Perspectives on Early Childhood Education and Development*, Vol 17. Singapore: Springer.
- Zehr, Mary Ann (2003). “Classroom ban on Spanish protested.” *Education Week* October 29, 2003. [<https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/10/29/09spanish.h23.html>]
- Zinn, Howard (1980) *A People’s History of the United States, 1492–Present*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.