

The Global Context for Modern Language Education

Katsuhiro Ohashi

I do not think that many people wish to see a uniform, cosmopolitan society in which national characteristics have been completely obliterated. Such a world would be very monotonous and unexciting.

– Yasushi Akashi

I am not persuaded that older ideas about place, time, history, and national cultures should be too lightly dismissed. Most people continue to feel the need for ongoing links with forms of culture and identity rooted in a particular country's past. This will not vanish, even in an age of economic globalization.

– Philip Resnick

ABSTRACT

In the process of modern state formation, the governments of one nation-state after another, including those that had recently achieved independence, adopted the policy of unilingualism, giving official recognition to a single language – usually the dominant majority's language in democracies. The force of that process has been so far-reaching that currently 75% of approximately 200 sovereign states on the globe are officially unilingual. This situation led one political linguist to generalize that “[m]ultilingualism is the norm in pre-industrial, oral civilizations; unilingualism is the norm in industrial, urban, literate civilizations.”¹ While the adoption of a unilingual policy may be commended in terms of governance efficiencies, the fact remains that the same policy has deprived minorities of the right to their own language and culture; as well as blocking their access to social, economic and political equality. The logical and, in a way, expected consequence is the growing tide of ethnic nationalism across the world that has kept posing a serious threat to world peace in recent decades.

Today more than ever before, a language policy premised solely on a functionalist view of language is in need of a radical change if only for the world to escape becoming hopelessly enmeshed in ever more terrifying conflicts. A coercive imposition of a standardized language does not fit modern conditions, nor is it in accord with today's legal conventions on human and minority rights as recognized by the international community. Despite this, unilingual language policies have constrained the aspirations of individuals in several pluralistic societies. This should be the concern germane to the language teaching policy for an international university about to be born out of necessity for the twenty-first century and beyond. Those responsible for designing the language teaching curriculum of Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University need to stretch their minds to transcend a purely instrumental approach to language.

KEY WORDS: bilingual education, content-based instruction, nation-state, globalization, identity

Introduction

To the degree that 50% of its faculty and students alike will be international, to the degree that it will be charged with a self-proclaimed mission to turn out graduates capable of contributing to the international world, to the degree that put simply, it is designed as an international university, to that degree language is bound to play a crucial role in Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University (APU). Hence the paramount importance of language

teaching/learning at APU. The purpose of this paper is, first, to outline APU's language teaching curriculum in minimum detail. Rather than without comment as in a disinterested handbook, this will be done with occasional analytical or interpretive comments on the salient features of the curriculum design. Further, the paper will attempt to place APU's language curriculum in a global context and, to that end, touch on the human situation at the dawn of a new century in so far as it bears and impacts on APU's language education as it is laid out. Accordingly, the discussion is organized into two main parts. Part One, which in turn is subdivided into four sections, gives an overview of the language teaching component of APU's curriculum. Part Two, which is devoted to reflecting on the relevance of APU's language education to the world and era we live in, is split into three sections.

1. Language Teaching Curriculum

APU's curriculum, including its language teaching component, does not differentiate Japanese from non-Japanese students. Nor is it deemed necessary or appropriate for an international university to separate study programs in terms of such a boundary. A distinction is, however, drawn between "English-based entrants" and "Japanese-based entrants" determined by students' entry-level competence in either of the two languages, and this identificational demarcation signifies where the language curriculum is concerned. Even so, it should be noted, such a grouping does not correspond to a Japanese/non-Japanese differentiation since no small number of incoming non-Japanese students are expected to be Japanese-based, for one thing, and not a few Japanese incoming students, such as "returnees," are likely to be English-based, for another. Elaboration on how the two contingents of students are supposed to learn language respectively must be saved for I.I. And so must the account of the slightly different demands made of the students at each College.

APU operates on a two-semester system: the spring semester runs from April to July and the fall semester from October to January. Admission of new students happens twice a year – in April and October. Whichever month they may be admitted, all the regular students have to spend four years (or longer) in residency and obtain a minimum of 124 credits in total for graduation. Since APU assesses tuition fees on a per course basis as do most North American universities, the more courses students take, the more it costs.

1.1. English and Japanese

Table 1 English-Language Course Offerings

| | Semesters* | Course Titles | TOEFL | Credits |
|---|------------|---------------------------------|-------|---------|
| U | 4(5) | Media English | 550+ | 2 |
| P | 4(5) | Business English | 550+ | 2 |
| P | 5(6) | Consecutive Interpretation: | 600 | 2 |
| E | | English as a Source Language II | | |
| R | 4(5) | Consecutive Interpretation: | 550+ | 2 |
| | | English as a Source Language I | | |
| L | | | | |
| O | 3(4) | English III: Adjunct English | 550 | 4 |
| w | 2(3) | English II: Adjunct English | 500 | 4 |
| E | 1(2) | English I | 450 | 4 |
| R | | | | |

*Numbers in parentheses apply to the October entrants.

Table 2 Japanese-Language Course Offerings

| | Semesters | Course Titles | JLPT* | Credits |
|---|-----------|--|-------------|---------|
| | 5(6) | Media Japanese | 340/Level 1 | 2 |
| U | 5(6) | Business Japanese | 340/Level 1 | 2 |
| P | 5(6) | Teaching Japanese as a Second Language | 340/Level 1 | 2 |
| P | 6(7) | Consecutive Interpretation: | | |
| E | | Japanese as a Source Language II | 360/Level 1 | 2 |
| R | 5(6) | Consecutive Interpretation: | | |
| | | Japanese as a Source Language I | 340/Level 1 | 2 |
| L | 4(5) | Japanese IV: Adjunct Japanese | 320/Level 1 | 4 |
| O | 3(4) | Japanese III: Adjunct Japanese | 280/Level 1 | 4 |
| w | 2(3) | Japanese II | 240/Level 2 | 4 |
| E | 1(2) | Japanese I | 240/Level 3 | 4 |
| R | 1(2) | Introduction to Japanese** | 240/Level 4 | 4 |

*JLPT = Japanese Language Proficiency Test for Foreign Nationals, a standard international test of non-native speakers' proficiency in Japanese administered by the Association of International Education, Japan (AIEJ) on behalf of the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.

**This course is prepared for absolute beginners. Students classified as such must take both Introduction to Japanese and Japanese I in the same semester. Other students have only to take Japanese I in the starting semester.

Table 1 sets out the makeup of the English-language course offerings. English I, English II and English III are designed to prepare the students for effective participation in discipline course lectures taught through the medium of English. English I is a theme-specific course and based on the use of an array of topics drawn from the range of global issues on the verge of a new millennium. Building on their experiences in English I, the students move on to a second way of learning academic English. English II and English III are adjunct models that link up with English-taught discipline courses: English II goes with "Languages and Cultures of the Asia-Pacific" and "Society and Law," while English III is tied up with "Traditions and Societies of the Asia-Pacific" and "Social Structure of Japan." Much the same applies to the Japanese-language program (see Table 2), where Introduction to Japanese, Japanese I and Japanese II are autonomous theme-based courses, while Japanese III and Japanese IV are adjunct models joined to Japanese-taught discipline courses. Digitally videotaped lectures of content courses are available for use in the adjunct language classes, which are held in the CALL-sensitive rooms replete with state-of-the-art computer facilities. Table 3 illustrates how each adjunct model is arranged on the timetable, exemplifying it with English II. For each of its partner content course lectures, English II is repeated four times a week, one class preceding and previewing the lecture and the remaining three following it up:

Table 3 Timetable Arrangement of English II

| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI |
|------------|---|------------|-------------|------------|
| English II | Languages and Cultures of the Asia-Pacific | English II | English II | English II |
| (45 min) | (95 min) | (45 min) | (45 min) | (45 min) |
| Preview | Lecture | Review | Discussion* | Discussion |

| MON | TUE | WED | THU | FRI |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| English II (45 min) | Society and Law (95 min) | English II (45 min) | English II (45 min) | English II (45 min) |
| Preview | Lecture | Review | Discussion | Discussion |

*Both preview/review sessions and discussion sessions are taught by one and the same language faculty member.

Whereas the lower-division courses are intended to enhance academic language skills of the students, the upper divisions of Tables 1 and 2 enumerate courses tailored to accommodate their occupational interests. Successful completion of English II is a prerequisite for taking the upper-division English courses. That is to say, those careerist ESP courses are open for TOEFL 500 (or above) students to enroll in. As the TOEFL scores on Table 1 indicate, lower-division courses are devised to cover three distinct levels of difficulty, so that one may get better at English as one climbs to a higher course level. This is not always the case with the upper-division, in which three courses are supposed to be at an equal level of difficulty.

It should be noted that the TOEFL scores shown on Table 1 are intended to give a rough idea of the goals those courses aim to attain respectively. It is not that an ITP (TOEFL) test is given to assess the students' achievements at the conclusion of each course. The appearance of JLPT and its scores/levels on Table 2 may be similarly interpreted. Those students who submit the score report of TOEFL with 450 or above, obtained no more than two years prior to the date of course enrolment, will be exempted from English I, 500 or above will exempt them from English II, and 550 or above from English III. Such students are entitled to credits for those courses all the same. This exemption principle does not apply to the upper-division English courses, since taking the upper courses is not mandated. Similarly, students will be excused from taking any of the lower-division Japanese courses on submission of the JLPT score report with an achievement equivalent to or higher than the achieved-to-be goal of that course.

Enrolees in the lower-division English and Japanese courses are streamed into three levels of ability. To place the new entrants in the proper streams of English I, Introduction to Japanese, and Japanese I, English and Japanese placement tests will be conducted during the university orientation week. For streaming the students into appropriate levels of English II, English III, Japanese II, Japanese III and Japanese IV, their linguistic achievements in the preceding semester are to be taken into account.

One ground-breaking innovation at APU is its student admission policy. Departing radically from the status quo at Japanese universities to which international regular students can only be admitted if they satisfy the university-set Japanese-language criterion, APU will accept international students with little or no Japanese-language background provided they are good enough in the use of English. Linguistically, APU's admission criterion is either English as measured by TOEFL (500 or above taken within two years) or Japanese as measured by JLPT (240 or above in Level 1 or 280 or above in Level 2 taken within two years), and not both. Students will be admitted even if they initially know nothing about the Japanese language. However, this will not excuse the English-based entrants for remaining ignorant of the Japanese language throughout their university life. After being admitted, they will be pressed to learn considerable skills in Japanese. Likewise, on the assumption that Japanese-based entrants are under-prepared in English, they will be required to learn more English than Japanese. Table 4 shows how different types of entrants are supposed to proceed to obtain credits for language courses required for graduation:

Table 4 Sources and Numbers of Required Credits for Language Courses by Types of Entrants

| THE COLLEGE OF ASIA PACIFIC STUDIES | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------|
| Types of Entrants | Sources of Credits (No. of Credits) | |
| | Total No. of Required Credits | |
| Japanese-based | English (8)+A/P Language*(8)+Any Language**(4) | |
| Japanese Entrants | 20 | |
| Japanese-based | English (8)+Any Language (12) | C/D*** (16) |
| International Entrants | 20 | |
| English-based Entrants | Japanese (20) | |
| | 20 | |

*A/P = Asia-Pacific. 'A/P Language' refers to Chinese, Korean, Malay/Indonesian, Spanish, Thai, or Vietnamese.

**'Any Language' excludes the students' first language.

***C/D = Cross-Divisional. C/D credits can be used for any subjects regardless of the categorical divisions of Language, Foundation and Specialization subjects.

| THE COLLEGE OF ASIA PACIFIC MANAGEMENT | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Types of Entrants | Sources of Credits (No. of Credits) | |
| | Total No. of Required Credits | |
| Japanese-based Entrants | English (12)+Any Language (4) | |
| | 16 | C/D (20) |
| English-based Entrants | Japanese (20) | |
| | 20 | C/D (16) |

To recap, students ought to collect 20 or 16 credits for language subjects towards graduation. But that does not exhaust the credits usable for language learning. For there is a special package of 16 or 20 credits that are "Cross-Divisional (C/D)" in the sense that students may cut across the divisional lines to use up these credits. If a student wishes to allot all the C/D credits to the Language Division, he or she can do so and end up learning languages to a total of 36 credits, thereby acquiring close to 30% of the mandatory 124 credits from language. C/D crediting is found to be especially meaningful for an international university such as APU, composed as it is of students with widely differing academic needs and expectations. Theoretically, a varying degree of utilization of C/D credits for the purpose of learning language would create a wide spectrum of options, from learning a single language at one end to learning eight at the other, with all the credits gained therein to be counted towards graduation.

Classes are limited to 20 students and consist of a mix of students with various national, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. They attend eight 45-minute class periods weekly to earn four credits, and four 45-minute class periods for two credits. All the courses last one semester or 14 weeks. Final exams prepared by the course coordinators will be given for the lower-division courses in the 14th week. As for the upper-division courses, it is left up to each instructor whether to give the final exam or not. If given, it should be scheduled for the last class (or next-to-last class, if the instructor plans to return the test papers) in principle.

If a student fails English I, Introduction to Japanese, Japanese I, or Japanese II, he or she can reclaim the lost credits by taking an intensive language course set at an equivalent level and credit value to the failed term-course. This must be taken before the next semester begins because enrolment in a higher-level course is conditional on

successful completion of a lower-level course. Such an intensive make-up course, offered as part of the summer and winter sessions during the long vacations, is available for an extra fee. A fail in any other course should be made up for by repeating the same course the following semester.

1.2. Bilingual Education

Joshua Fishman asserts that school alone cannot guarantee linguistic competence. If we may take it to suggest that language acquisition builds on situated language practice as well as on classroom-based language learning, his remark is still relevant. Most language courses as such will be offered at APU only as first- and second-year courses, as is usually the case with universities in Japan. Additionally, only up to 20 out of the mandatory 124 credits being accounted for by the language portion, APU cannot boast a significant increase in the number and weight of the required credits for language subjects. The types of content-based instruction adopted by APU, i.e. theme-based language instruction and adjunct language instruction, are also nothing new to Japanese campuses in the late 1990s. Admittedly, there will be no sea-change for APU's language teaching/learning to undergo as far as it takes place in language classrooms. It is the abundance of opportunities for practice on and off its campus that is likely to make APU unique. First and most importantly, English and Japanese are designated as instructional languages in all academic courses, and thus opportunities for students to practice using these two languages will be maximized. Students at APU are supposed to be fairly good at one of these two languages of instruction at entry. In their first and second years, they will be allowed for the most part to attend lectures given in their stronger language since core Foundation courses will be offered in both English and Japanese. To illustrate, while attending Japanese-taught first and second year content lectures, Japanese-based students will be encouraged during the same period to enhance their proficiency in English up to a level that will enable them to take academic studies conducted in it in their third and fourth years.

APU's curriculum is so laid out that all its students are encouraged to carry out academic studies in their additional language for at least two years during the later undergraduate stage. Those students whose native language is neither English nor Japanese will have no choice but to conduct academic studies in their additional languages from start to finish. The specific situation at APU necessitates a unique approach to English and Japanese as additional languages for academic purposes. Potential of English, and Japanese in particular, as such languages is indeed both under-exploited and under-studied in this corner of the world. Is this a high-risk experiment? APU takes the position that the experiment is as worthwhile as challenging and that it will have to be done as the Asia-Pacific's investment in the future. After its inception – scheduled for April 2000 – the APU-affiliated Centre for Modern Language Education will assume duties to take a long hard look at the experiment, monitor its progress and disseminate information about APU's experience.²

As stated above, the study of English and Japanese will focus on language for academic and specific purposes in the expectation that acquisition of skill in language for general purposes will find sufficient support in the multiple social and applied environments to be made available. That brings us to the second way in which opportunity for practice is maximized.

1.3. Environments

One of APU's strengths lies in the advanced information processing capabilities and cutting-edge communications technology it will be equipped with. Drawing on this extensive information infrastructure, state-of-the-art multimedia facilities and access to the latest information resources, APU will be well able to provide every

conceivable tool and service for new modes of communication. It will be possible to construct extremely rich, virtual environments for student work. (Virtual Environments) The pluralistic texture of its campus on which students from great many different cultures will meet is conceived to be the most salient feature of APU. Far from being a mere catchy phrase, its multicultural campus can be a significant source of stimulation where cross-cultural communication is concerned. With the spirit of co-existence of different peoples and values permeating all corners of its community, APU will be a seriously exciting experience for those eager to communicate beyond cultural boundaries. (On-campus Environments) On top of all that, APU campus is located in close proximity to a local Japanese-speaking community where the students can easily be submerged. As we count down to the day APU comes into existence, both its host municipalities, namely Oita prefectural government and Beppu city government, and their well-wishing inhabitants are readying themselves to interact with APU students in a variety of ways. (Off-campus Environments) This is indeed a rare combination of factors conducive to the development of practical day-to-day communication skills. We will be wise to be consciously aware and avail ourselves of such an assemblage of naturally-occurring, learner-friendly environments. To meet the communicational, socializational and recreational needs of the students, APU will furnish itself with an internet cafe, English-speaking and Japanese-speaking, as well as A/P language-speaking lounges, an on-campus residence, while offering such off-campus activities as home-visit and homestay programs.

1.4. Other Languages

Table 5 A/P-Language Course Offerings

| Semesters | Course | Titles | Credits |
|-----------|-------------|------------|---------|
| 5 | Chinese IV | Korean IV | 4 |
| 4 | Chinese III | Korean III | 4 |
| 3 | Chinese II | Korean II | 4 |
| 2 | Chinese I | Korean I | 4 |

| Semesters | Course | Titles | Credits |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| 4 | Malay/Indonesian III | Spanish III Thai III Vietnamese III | 4 |
| 3 | Malay/Indonesian II | Spanish II Thai II Vietnamese II | 4 |
| 2 | Malay/Indonesian I | Spanish I Thai I Vietnamese I | 4 |

Hardly anyone would disagree that APU as a confluence of many linguistic and cultural streams would lose the better part of its lustre were languages other than English and Japanese not taught and learned there. In keeping with its commitment to “[contributing] to sustainable development and peaceful coexistence in the Asia-Pacific region and other areas of the world,”³ APU will offer Chinese, Korean, Malay/Indonesian, Spanish, Thai and Vietnamese as required languages for some students and non-required languages for the others. April and October entrants are brought together to meet in the same classes because all A/P language courses start in the fall semester of their first year. I, II, III (and IV) of each A/P language cover increasing levels of difficulty. Each course consists of eight 45-minute class periods per week, lasts one semester, and counts as four credits. The maximum number of students per class is 20. Final exams, if given, should be scheduled for the last class (or next-to-last class, if the test papers are to be returned.) If a student fails a course, he or she should make up for the loss

by taking an intensive language course offered as part of the summer and winter sessions during the long vacations: A/P Languages I and III are available for an extra fee during the winter vacation; and A/P Languages II during the summer vacation. A fail in Chinese/Korean IV should be redeemed by repeating them the following year.

We could observe that in most countries of the world those languages in existence closest to their inhabitants – domestic languages and languages of the near abroad – receive high priority in their educational policy-making.⁴ Thus, French is one of the most learned languages in Canada, Belgium and Britain, Spanish in the U.S., Japanese in China and Korea, Arabic in Israel. Injecting a local touch into the offerings appears the universally approved practice. Modern Japan has been something of an exception to the rule in this respect, so little heed has it paid to the languages of its adjacent neighbours, let alone domestic languages, while favouring geographically distant European languages. It is noteworthy that with APU – concentrating as it does on languages in use across the Asia-Pacific region – the pendulum is swinging to the global norm. APU likely will receive much comment from Japanese experts on its bold step to not offer French and German despite the fact that these remain among the most popular languages with both administration and students at Japanese universities. The on-campus presence of the native speakers of A/P languages will certainly mean a great deal to learners of those neighbourhood languages anxious to reinforce what has been taught in classrooms. Here again, we can ensure the conditions under which language learning and language practice go hand in hand.

2. The Global Context for APU's Language Education

2.1. Nationalism and Globalism

Former United Nations Undersecretary-General Dr. Yasushi Akashi – who happens to be Honorary Advisor for APU – portrays the world in the concluding years of this century as struggling with the seemingly contradictory forces of nationalism and globalism.⁵ There is the continuing presence of nationalism at both sub-state and state levels found throughout the globe. At the same time, the world is clearly strengthening transnational ties. These are primarily economic arrangements, but they include political and cultural linkages as well. We are caught between two contrastive forces at work simultaneously.

Given that unsettling polarity, Akashi is both realistic and creative in coming up with this viable attitude towards the world on the eve of a new century: instead of speaking about the two forces as mutually incompatible, he is convinced that nationalism and globalism can and should coexist – on condition that the former remains neutral nationalism. This translates into his advocacy of “internationalism” that allows the sentiment of national allegiance and global consciousness to blend in an organic way. He observes that the nation-state is and will remain for years to come a persistent basic unit of the political order in international society; to expect that its inhabitants will submerge their sense of national identity within some cosmopolitan ensemble is not realistic. Thus, cosmopolitanism that obscures national roots and displaces national identities is untenable. On the other hand, no sober observer could question the fact that we are in ever-increasing need of cooperation across national boundaries. We have peacekeeping, human rights issues, environmental conservation, overpopulation, depletion of energy and many more problems that need to be addressed in global terms. The best we can hope for, according to Akashi, is a form of internationalism that respects the inherently heterogeneous nature of the global community.

Akashi's position provides a broad, social context that informs our attempt to shape APU's perspective on language learning and instruction. However, a more delimited, specifically linguistic exploration of context also is needed.

2.2. Functionalist and Counter-Functionalist Approaches to Language

There are any number of countries that have disintegrated along linguistic lines. Look at the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Ottoman empire, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, to name but a few.⁶ The list could go on, but that much would suffice for one to feel inclined to a conclusion that unilingualism is a superior organizing principle of a unified country. It might be more plausible to say that unilingualism is not just superior or preferable to multilingualism as a ruling principle but a functional requirement of a modern state and that modernization involves the diffusion of a common language throughout a society. Indeed, it was this realization that led the political leaders of several modern states to adopt the policy of official unilingualism.⁷ The example of early modern France as the very first civilization to adopt policies of official unilingualism springs to mind. The same occurred in Britain, Italy and Germany in rapid succession. Modern Japan provides still another example inasmuch as she too, in an effort to establish herself as a nation-state, implemented official unilingualism based on the model of those civilizations of the west. Scores of ex-colonies of Asia and Africa after independence similarly recognized only one official language. Such was the unilingual momentum that currently 75% of the approximately 200 sovereign states have only one language with official status.

As previously suggested, the policy of official unilingualism is to be lauded from a functionalist viewpoint. The flip side of the story is that it is destructive of minority languages, which is what is happening in many officially unilingual nation-states, principally because the single official language – either de jure or de facto – of such a country, especially when it is a democracy, belongs to the dominant majority of that society. This situation is captured by J. A. Laponce when he says: “[T]he modern state... is ‘glossophagic.’”⁸ From a political-linguistic perspective, the modern state as we generally know it could be defined as a political system for safeguarding the majority rights and denying the minorities access to political, economic and social equality. What will result in eventuality if such functionalism prevails? Far from being a hypothetical question, that has been a real issue facing us for decades now. Since the 1960s, we have witnessed the emergence of minority struggles for recognition. At some important level, what we have been seeing are struggles by the oppressed or deprived for recognition of the significance of their own languages. This is bespoken by the fact that many minority groups, when they cry for secession or autonomy, stress their ownership of a language unique to them. Examples are legion and include such an extreme case where blacks in the U.S. strove for public recognition of “Black English” as a language of their own during the course of the civil rights movement.⁹ Minority problems, therefore, are in large part minority language problems. The inescapable conclusion must be drawn that the strong revival of nationalism in the contemporary era points to serious limits to what the functionalist approach to language can attain. This is a second morsel of realization on which APU’s attitude towards language should be formed.

2.3. Juxtaposition of Two Approaches to Language

To the extent that functionalist, unilingual language policies reinforce narrow nationalist tendencies, a creative response to language instruction is necessary. This is where we should get down to the core of our language teaching policy. On the strength of Dr. Akashi’s theorization and the perceived correlation between functionalism and unilingualism, we may advance the following discussion pertaining to our attitude towards language as it ought to be. The heart of Akashi’s argument could be paraphrased by saying that an “internationalist” as defined by him needs to bear dual identities to say the least – national for certain purposes and supra-national where international coordination is called for. In logical and realistic terms, dual identities should entail dual linguistic

performance. A functional global language will be in greater demand as we assume a broader identity as, say, Asians or global citizens and behave in that newly-defined capacity. Simultaneously, we will continue to need a language with which our heart identifies into the twenty-first century for the purpose of expressing our nationally-bound individuality.

APU will value English and Japanese as functional auxiliary languages in academic and other settings. Its policy option is more functionalist than otherwise when it comes to the role to be played on campus by English and Japanese, the primary importance of these two languages being that of languages of instruction and common use. To borrow a distinction made by a certain commentator on language between language as a "technical accomplishment" and language as the "main support for a distinct cultural identity,"¹⁰ English and Japanese should be taught and learned more as the former than the latter. This is especially so with regard to English. On the other hand, both the language as a technical accomplishment and the language as an essential component of cultural identity will find expression in the syllabi of A/P languages; Chinese, Korean, Malay/Indonesian, Spanish, Thai and Vietnamese will be taught not just as means of intercultural communication but also as mediums of cultural identities. To put it another way, APU's language teaching policy honours A/P languages as an inclusionary counter to the exclusionary tendencies of the functionalist view of language.

One might wonder if the functionalist/instrumental and counter-functionalist/integrative approaches to language would not impinge one on the other and ask if the special status to be accorded to English and Japanese would not serve to eventually reduce the importance of learning A/P languages and their background cultures in the consciousness of students, with the conceivable result that they would cease to be motivated to learn those languages and cultures in favour of languages of wider communication. This describes our concern, especially as instrumentalist thinking in language learning is a major trend in the contemporary period even to the extent that it appears the order of the day. Every now and then, we should be reminded – and should remind our students – that English and Japanese are chiefly *lingua francas* within the APU community and that "[any] *lingua franca*," whose use presupposes the existence of separate cultures, "is a way of coping with linguistic and cultural differences, not a way of eliminating them."¹¹

APU's goal of reconciling the instrumental and integrative approaches to language is expected to carry with it no small implications as we prepare for the twenty-first century with its need for a global ensemble on the one hand and for the defense of traditional cultural heritages on the other. In order to make thus conceptualized reconciliation a working principle, one could hardly think of a better setting than APU: history and contemporary evidence support the view that the East Asia in which APU will find itself continues to be a unique civilization in the sense that it is devoid of absolutist ways of interpreting the world and is, therefore, capable of juxtaposing various values in symbiosis with one another – an indispensable precondition for a genuine multiculturalism and multilingualism. At the risk of sounding somewhat like a wishful thinker, I wish to conclude my discussion on a hopeful tone by holding out the prospect of an APU campus as a miniaturized version of a congenial planetary society in the new millennium where our efforts to streamline communication acknowledge, honour, and complement our emphasis on multiple means of understanding.

Notes:

1 . J. A. Laponce (1987), Page 25.

2 . The Centre for Modern Language Education has been in place since December 1998. It is temporarily affiliated with

- Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan. Concomitantly with APU's establishment in April 2000, the Centre will relocate to the campus of APU with which it is to be affiliated thenceforward.
3. Ritsumeikan (1998), Page 21. Ritsumeikan is the English-language version of the bulletin of Ritsumeikan University and its feeder high schools published by the Centre for Global Education and Research, Ritsumeikan University. Pages 20 - 23 of the bulletin are devoted to profiling APU.
 4. According to M. Ohtani's survey of language teaching situation at primary and secondary levels in all the continents but Africa, a geographically close language – a domestic language or the language of a neighbouring country – belongs among the most learned three languages in 30 of the 39 countries surveyed. See M. Ohtani (1996).
 5. Y. Akashi (1993), Part V.
 6. J. A. Laponce (1995), Page 3.
 7. See W. Kymlicka (1998), Page 70 et passim.
 8. J. A. Laponce (1987), Page 4.
 9. For another extreme but still relevant example, it might be interesting to call to mind Zamenhof's ulterior motives when he invented Esperanto. In the words of U. Eco (1995) : "Instead of thinking of the end of the Diaspora as a return to Hebrew, Zamenhof hoped that all the Jews could be, one day, reunited in an entirely new language." See U. Eco (1995), Pages 324-5.
 10. F. Clarke (1934), Quebec and South Africa: A Study in Cultural Adjustment. London: Oxford University Press. Cited in W. Kymlicka (1997), Page 212.
 11. S. Huntington (1997), Page 61.

References:

- Akashi, Yasushi. 1993. *An Agenda for Hope: The UN in a New Era*. Tokyo: Simul Press.
- _____. 1996. *Heiwa e no Kakehashi (Building Bridges for Peace)*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Eco, Umberto. 1995. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1997. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1998. *The Future of the Nation-State*. Paper presented at The Fifth Kobe Lectures held at the University of Tokyo and Doshisha University. December 13th and 19th.
- Laponce, J. A. 1987. *Languages and Their Territories*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 1995. *The Language System and the Language Policies of Canada: Functionalities and Dysfunctionalities*. Draft prepared for the Budapest Conference of 9-12 September.
- Ohtani, Masateru. 1996. *Facts about ELT across the World*. Paper presented at the Seminar on English Language Teaching held at Ohtani University. December 14th.
- Resnick, Philip. 1997. *Twenty-First Century Democracy*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- _____. 1998. Global Democracy: Ideals and Reality. *Globalization and Europe: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, ed. by R. Axtmann, Pages 126-143. London: Pinter.

