

ENGLISH CONVERSATION AS IDEOLOGY

Douglas Lummis

I never heard the expression "English conversation" (eikaiwa) until I came to Japan. Of course the combination of words is understandable. But as, it is used here, the expression "English conversation" has the quality of a slogan, in that it implies far more than speaking in the English language. The often heard sentence "I want to learn how to speak English conversation" (rather than "to speak English") is not redundant, as many English teachers naively suppose. "English conversation" offers not simply language training but a world view. Learning "English conversation" is not the same as learning how to speak English.¹

When I took my first English teaching job in Japan in 1961 I found the work embarrassing. Since then I have taught "English conversation" from time to time in language schools, company classes, and colleges, and I still find it embarrassing. I have struggled for a long time to try to understand just why the English conversation class is such an unsettling and alienating place.

This fall, on returning to Japan after an absence of three years. I visited a conversation class at a major Tokyo language school and found that it fitted the stereotype almost exactly. On the white wall was a poster of Disneyland. Five young women—all office workers; sat primly in a row and the teacher, an American woman, sat opposite them. They chanted in unison the following lesson:

A : Let's stop in this drugstore a minute.

B: OK. I'd like to go in and look around. We don't have drugstores like this in Japan. We only sell medicine.

A : Well, you can get medicine here, too. See that counter over there? That's the pharmacy department. The man who wears the white coat is the pharmacist.

B : Look at all the other things here, candy, newspapers, magazine, stationery, cosmetics. In Japan we don't see such things at the drugstore.

A : Shall we go to the soda fountain?

B : What's the soda fountain?

A: Well, most drugstores have a soda fountain where you can get ice cream, soft drinks, sandwiches and so on.

B: OK. Let's go. I'm hungry. I'd like to get a hamburger and a milkshake.

As I watched these six human beings stare earnestly at each other across what seemed to be an impenetrable wall and repeat these sentences, the whole scene took on a surrealistic quality. How many hours, I wondered, have been spent in this country examining and re-examining the fabled American Drug Store and the legendary Real American Hamburger? It is embarrassing enough to have the impoverishment of one's country's culture flaunted before people who have reason to know what true culture looks like, especially when there are so many other things in the world so much more worth talking about. But when one begins to suspect that perhaps the students are not repelled by the descriptions of America's cultural wasteland, that perhaps it is precisely these endless accounts of trips to the drugstore, the supermarket, the drive-in movie, and the hamburger stand that attract students to "English Conversation" schools, then the situation becomes truly humiliating.

Unfortunately, however, few American teachers actually feel humiliated. While English teaching does not have the reputation among the foreign community here of being especially rewarding work, it is considered to be relatively easy money. While there are a few teachers who try to do their job conscientiously, it is generally accepted this isn't necessary. All that is really required is to be present in the class and to talk about something or other. All the complex ethical problems are resolved by assuming an attitude of cultural superiority. The unspoken assumption of most of these teachers is that being in the presence of an American for an hour a week is in itself a privilege worth paying for.

In the summer of 1961, when I had been in Japan for several months and was running out of money, a friend told me that I could easily find a job teaching English. I protested that I was not qualified-I had no training or experience in language teaching, nor could I speak Japanese well enough. My friend laughed at my naivete. "You don't need training or experience to teach English here," he said. "You don't even have to know English very well. I know Italians and Germans and Frenchmen who are teaching English just from what they learned in high school. People don't go to those classes to learn language but to have a chance to meet a foreigner. All you have to do is go into the class and talk about anything you want to for an hour."

It seemed to me that he must be speaking the truth. At that time I knew

almost no Japanese, and so my acquaintances were almost entirely limited to people who could speak English. At the college where I was studying Japanese there was an ESS, and I was appalled at the obsequiousness with which most of its members approached me. I can remember listening incredulously as people told me that their "life's dream" was to become proficient at "English conversation, that the place they would most like to visit was Los Angeles, that their favorite novelist was Hawthorne, their favorite poet Longfellow, and so on. As far as I knew at the time, (and as far as most foreigners who speak no Japanese know) these attitudes were representative of Japanese culture. It was only much later that I was able to discover that the world of "English conversation" and of the ESS is only a subculture and not characteristic of Japanese university life.

I soon learned that the obsequious treatment which Americans and Europeans received from ESS members was not to be understood as simply friendliness toward foreign guests. In the first place, it was not genuinely friendly: an attitude that treats one as a specimen rather than as a fellow human being is not the stuff out of which friendship can be built. But equally important, I soon learned that it was an attitude reserved only for a certain kind of foreigner. In 1962 I moved to Kyoto, and learned that Kyodai ESS was sponsoring a club for foreign students. I went to one meeting and found that the foreign students-mostly from South-east Asia-were in a state of bitter anger. It seems that the ESS had sponsored a camping trip for foreign students at which the ESS members had followed the Americans and Europeans around like puppies (or like goldfish shit as you say in Japanese) while treating the Southeast Asians as if they were invisible. I shall never forget the expression on the ESS representative's face as he heard these angry complaints. It was clear that the ESS had never anticipated that its foreign students' club would be mostly filled with Asians. It was clear that they felt cheated, but were forced by the principles of "justice" to continue to sponsor the club. But obviously they wished nothing more than that these South-east Asians would become invisible.

Another important lesson was taught me by a Japanese teacher at the English school where I was working. This old gentleman came over to me one payday and told me gently, "There is something I think you should know. I have been working here fifteen years, and you for three months, and yet my pay is less than yours. I am not criticizing, but I just think this is

something you ought to know." He then left me alone to think it over by myself. I was shocked and confused. The man was a skilled linguist and an experienced teacher; I had been mostly getting through my class time by faking, telling jokes and stories that I thought up on the train on the way to work. Why should I get more money than he? Most of the people to whom I asked this question said that it was because foreigners (meaning white foreigners) "need more money to live on." But was this a real answer to the accusation of discrimination, or was it the essence of the discrimination itself?

To put the point as clearly as possible, the world of English conversation is racist. I do not wish to criticize the individual teachers and students of English, many of whom are serious and dedicated. I am talking about the ideology and structure of the subculture of "English conversation." It is racist in its hiring practices, racist in its pay scale, racist in its advertising, and racist in the ideology put forward in its textbooks and classrooms.

For example, the idea of the "native speaker" is mostly a fraud. Especially the language schools that are run as businesses are proud of their "native speakers" and use them in their advertisements. But the expression "native speaker" is in effect a code word for "white." As I mentioned above some of the "native speakers" come from European countries where English is not the native language. On the other hand, English is a national language in the Philippines, in Singapore, and in India, but people from those countries are not hired as native speakers. Occasionally they can find teaching jobs if they can prove their language ability, but on the whole they are rejected without examination. On the other hand, hiring is racist in that companies which specialize in hiring Americans tend to hire only white Americans. Of course in Japan the word "American" is for many people almost a synonym for "white," but as a matter of fact Americans come in all colors. Many Japanese language schools fully weed out non-white candidates.

It is well known among the foreign community that for Caucasians who come here with no job qualifications whatever, there are two kinds of work available. One is English teacher and the other is advertising model. A third possibility, for women who are willing to do it, is to become a stripper. The common point between these three forms of work is the fact that in Japan white skin itself can earn a profit. Every strip-tease house

owner knows that the customers will pay more to see a "gaijin" stripper even if she can't dance. Every department store owner knows that he can't sell Western_clothing to women without a collection of blond blue-eyed manikins that looks like a Nazi dream of paradise. Every TV advertiser knows that he can increase sales simply by making a commercial showing Caucasians using the product.² And every language school knows that it can earn better profits with "native speakers" for teachers.

(For contrast, ask yourself what kinds of jobs are available in Japan for Koreans, Chinese, and Southeast Asians who come here with no job qualifications. Ask yourself if you have ever in your life seen a Caucasian employed in any of those jobs in Japan.)

The preference for "native speakers" despite the lack of training and qualification is often defended from the standpoint of pronunciation. Southeast Asians, it is said, have bad pronunciation, as do American Blacks. It is the American Whites who speak "real" American English. But pronunciation is a relative thing. In both Britain and the U.S. there are many dialects and variations, and within each country which of these is "standard" is a question decided by power: it is the language of the ruling class. Similarly, it is impossible to say that the variety of English that has been developed in the Philippines is "incorrect." If the British could put together a new language out of Anglo-Saxon and French, 1 and if the Americans could develop a new variety of that language in North America, then there is no reason why the Philippines cannot develop their own authentic variety of the language in Southeast Asia. The decision of which pronunciation you wish to study is not linguistic but political; it is a question of who you want to talk to.

* * *

I want to make clear that I think there are excellent reasons for studying English. It is the native language in a large number of countries, and an important second language in many more. This is a fact that has a bloody history: it is the legacy of first the British, and then the American, empires. Nevertheless, it is the case that English has become a language with which one can talk to people from almost any country in the world, a language with which opens up new possibilities for international communication and solidarity at many levels.

I recognize that many Japanese people study English with the hope of being able to speak with other Asians, Africans, and Europeans, but this hope is not reflected in the English conversation textbooks or classrooms. With the exception of the sector which emphasizes British English, in the world of "English conversation" the ideal speaking partner is always a White, middle class American. A glance through any of the textbooks will confirm this. In the boring little dramas that begin each lesson, at least one of the protagonists is always an American. Moreover the location of the stories is always America if it is not Japan. Money is always in dollars, measurement is always in yards, feet, and inches, the drugstore always has a lunch counter, and the groceries are always bought at a supermarket. If studying language is in any sense a kind of vicarious travel, if it is sometimes motivated by a desire to escape at least in imagination from the confines of one's own society, the English conversation texts channel and focus that desire on the U.S.A.

It is difficult for me to judge the depth of this identification of English conversation with the USA. But I do know that when a Caucasian of whatever nationality walks down a back street anywhere in Japan and encounters a group of little children playing, the first thing they will do is shout out either "Ah, gaijin da," or "Ah, Amerikajin da." The next thing they do, if they are old enough to have been to school, is to shout, "I have a book," "I have a pencil," and so on. This little scene, which rarely varies, contains in primitive form several of the basic elements of the ideology of "English conversation." First of all (and to the endless annoyance of Europeans, Canadians, Latin Americans, Australians, etc.) to these children the words "gaijin" and "Amerikajin" are virtually synonyms. Not so much geographically as conceptually, "America" is the name for "that which is outside Japan " it is "the alternative" to Japanese culture. Moreover, it is built into the character of these "Amerigaijin" that they understand no Japanese, so that it is all right to speak loudly about them while standing a few feet away ("Hana ga takai naa," etc.). If you want to respond to them in any way, you use "English conversation": "I have a book," "I have a pencil," etc. And the point is that you say these things whether or not you have a book or a pencil: it is a fundamental characteristic of "English conversation" that content is almost entirely irrelevant. But the odd thing about someone saying "I have a book" to you when he has no book is that it is impossible to respond. Though the sentence

is in English, it is not an attempt at communication. (Children used to call out "haroo," which was real communication. Since then "I have book" has become more common, presumably as a result of the advance of public education.) And in fact if one does say anything the children usually do not respond, but shout to each other "Eeeeh, nihongo hanaseru," and sometimes run away in mock fear.

The adult world of English conversation is of course more sophisticated than this, but that only means that its ideology is more hidden. Of course all adults recognize that many countries exist, but often as little more than as stage props or background scenery (or sources of raw materials). When they are mentioned it is often out of a sense of "fairness" or to add a bit of cosmopolitan spice to the conversation. At a deeper level, cultural analysis takes the form of comparison between the two "real" countries, Japan and the U.S. Put another way, in the world of "English conversation" only Japan and the U.S. exist as categories, while all other countries exist as accidents. Of course there are many foreign countries, but the U.S. is "foreignness" itself, the historic alternative in comparison to which "Japaneseness" is defined, by imitation, contrast, or some combination of the two.

To the great majority of Americans this attitude seems only natural, since it fits quite nicely their own view of their country's position in the world. Among GIs in Asia, the slang expression for the U.S. is "the world." A letter from home is called "a letter from the world," going back to the U.S. is called "going back to world" and so on. This is an extremely interesting expression, in that it exposes the American ideological self-image with rare precision. In this view, the world outside is simply not as real as the U.S. The very existence of that world is at a lower order of intensity; the events that take place there don't matter as much. This attitude is particularly strong in Asia, where to Americans everything seems upside down, contingent, unstable, accidental. Confronted with this confusing and apparently meaningless turmoil, the American takes comfort by conjuring up in his nostalgia the clean, ordered, and rational image of home. There is the corner drug store, for example, where almost anything you would want to buy is lined up neatly on the shelves. There is something you can understand, there is something real and sensible: there is The World itself

Another way of putting this is that Americans see their own country

as "universal" and all other countries -especially in Asia; and the Third World - as "particular," Life in Japan is Japanese, life in the Philippines is Philippine, life in Vietnam is Vietnamese, but life in the U.S. is Life itself. It is not simply concrete living, it is also the idea of life, life which comes as close as this world allows to the principles of universal reason. Most Americans have a deeply rooted belief that the way of life in their country is the way all people in the world would choose to live if they had knowledge of it and the freedom to make the choice. In the 1950s, at the height of the Cold War, it was seriously proposed in the U.S. that the Air Force should fly over Eastern Europe and drop thousands of Sears and Roebuck catalogues over the cities and towns. The idea was that as soon as the Eastern Europeans saw all the wonderful things that Americans could buy they would realize that they had been lied to by their Soviet masters and rise up in revolt. The Peace Corps was in part based on a similar notion, namely that the mere appearance of an American youth in a traditional village would cause the local people to immediately start to throw off their old customs and try to learn to become like him. In American social science, this naive and arrogant assumption appears again wearing the cloak of scientific objectivity, and is called the "demonstration effect." According to these American scholars, the turmoil in the Third World was not caused by colonialism and imperialism, but by what they call the "revolution of rising expectations" which was triggered by the mere exposure to "aspects of modern life through demonstrations of machinery, buildings, installations, consumer goods, show windows, rumor, governmental, medical, or military practices, as well as through mass media of communication."⁴ And of course the vanguard of so-called "modern life" is the U.S.A.

This American attitude is particularly strong with regard to Japan because of the history of the Occupation. Even Americans who have studied nothing whatever about Japan have a vague historical memory of the Occupation. What they "remember" is that the Japanese didn't know how to run a modern, democratic country properly, and that the Americans sent MacArthur over to show them how.

As a consequence of these conditions, Americans tend to see the relation between America and Japan as that of teacher to student. This belief does not take the form of a conscious opinion but of an unconscious pre-supposition. That is, those who deny that this is their view will

continue to act as if it is. At a very deep level Americans believe that they come from a society where things are rightly ordered, and consequently as soon as they step into Japanese territory they are transformed from ordinary citizens into teachers. They are teachers not through any particular personal qualifications, but through their membership in a teacher culture. Thus it is perfectly natural to them that Americans who could never get teaching jobs at home could find them here. It is perfectly natural to them that they need no linguistic training to teach English, since they understand instinctively that their real role is not language teacher but living example of the American Way of Life. And it is perfectly natural to them that the Japanese people would be eager to hear every detail about the structure and operation of the American drug-store, supermarket, drive-in restaurant, etc., since these are aspects of life in the living Utopia of which Japan is still only an imperfect, if earnestly striving, reflection. If the contempt implied in this set of attitudes does not correspond with the general attitude of friendliness displayed by many Americans, remember that contempt is not necessarily an unfriendly attitude. One of the reasons why travel to Japan is so popular among Americans is that they can enjoy a sudden status boost and, usually for the first time in their lives, are treated as ruling class elites. "I love Japan," they say, "the service is so considerate."⁵

The ideology of English conversation was born out of these American and Japanese attitudes. It is only in this context that the endless dwelling on the trivialities of American daily life in the textbook and classroom drills is comprehensible. Readers for whom it seems strange that a language lesson could contain an ideology might recall the famous sentence from the pre-war reader "Susume susume, heitai susume" ("Advance, advance, soldier advance"). Propaganda in the form of language training has a special subtlety; since attention is focused on the language lesson the truth of the propaganda message is not discussed or questioned, but simply taken for granted. All those little conversation dramas which depict the American "way of life" as almost entirely composed of buying commodities at various stores are the very essence of American propaganda. Or consider the following "substitution drill" which I copied out of a textbook:

He is intelligent but he has no drive.

He is intelligent but he has no money.

He is handsome but he has no money.
He is handsome but he has no girlfriend.
He is young but he has no girlfriend.
He is young but he has no ambition.

Intelligence, drive, money, good looks, girlfriends, youth, ambition-a perfect profile of the conditions of success for a man in capitalist America. In effect the lesson reads, "Possess, possess, businessman possess."

* * *

To avoid misunderstanding, I should say that I think that the U.S.A. is a very interesting country and very well worth studying. The U.S.A. was an experimental country. It was a serious attempt to create in the New World a new kind of society which would provide the conditions for liberty, justice, equality and happiness that Europe had denied. The people who laid down the founding principles of this experiment were intelligent and learned, and this is all the more reason why the general failure of the society to provide the things promised should be a matter for serious study.

But you will not be able to learn about this in the world of English conversation. The "America" that is depicted in that world is not the country that exists but the country that the American English teachers wish existed, the country of their nostalgia. In the world of English conversation you will not learn why a spirit of disillusion and purposelessness pervades that land today. You will not learn why the city streets are unsafe at night, why people carry weapons for self-protection, or why the most rapidly expanding department of government is the police. You will not learn why most American workers find their jobs deadening and senseless, why alcoholism and drug addiction is widespread among housewives, or why there are suburban areas in which the divorce rate is higher than the marriage rate. You will not learn why many Americans (mostly non-White) live in bitter and hopeless poverty, or why many of the children of the poor graduate from high school without having been taught to read. You will also not learn why, in American racist mentality, Japanese are categorized as colored, not as white.

Moreover, the problem is not simply that these facts about the U.S. are not mentioned, but rather that the image of the country that is

presented in the world of English conversation makes the truth more difficult to see. Several English students who had read Honda Katsuichi's Amerika Gasshukoku have told me that his descriptions are so far removed from the America they have learned about that they think he must be lying.

* * *

It remains to describe how English conversation serves as a barrier to communication. Of course people who have studied English conversation are very good at asking directions to the station and asking the price of purchases, but that is not the kind of communication I mean. Just how English conversation serves as a barrier is difficult to describe, but it is something that one learns to sense before one begins to understand its specific content. It is best described in the form of an anecdote.

One New Year's Eve about five years ago I was standing in a temple in Kanazawa listening to the great bell being rung at midnight. It had been snowing for several hours, the first snow of the winter: the new year had appeared in the form of a whole new world, white and mysterious. As I stood listening to the magnificent sound of the bell, a man came up to me and asked, "Excuse me, may I speak to you in English?" Complex thoughts filled my mind but I could only say, "Of course." Then he began to go through the standard list of questions:

Where are you from?

How long have you been in Japan?

Are you sightseeing in Kanazawa?

Can you eat Japanese food?

Do you understand what this ceremony is about?

His questions pushed me away from the mood of the ceremony, away from the sound of the bell and the smell of the cold air, away to the other side of the impenetrable wall of sakoku. His words were no more apt to the situation than "I have a book." Nothing he said was really addressed to me, nor was he really interested in the answers. He was not speaking to me at all, but to the stereotype of the gaijin which he carried in his mind, of which my presence had only reminded him. Nor was it really he who was speaking to me. The sentences which he was reciting were in fixed and

standard form, and it was difficult to believe that there was any relation between them and his own character, thoughts, or feelings. It was rather like a conversation between two tape recorders.

Finally he moved away and another man, who had been watching my discomfort with some amusement, came over and said gently in Japanese, "Japanese who speak English like that don't know anything about Japan, so it's better not to pay them much attention." I felt tremendous gratitude, and started to laugh: the wall of sakoku had been broken down again.

Typically "English conversation" is characterized by an attitude of obsequiousness, banality, a peculiar flatness or monotone, and practically no hint as to the identity or personality of the speaker. Nakao Hajime, who has done much study in the psychology of language, has suggested to me that at least in extreme cases, "English conversation" comes to take on an obsessional quality that resembles aphasia, an abnormal condition in which the subject's speech loses the capacity to deal with experience. Nakao introduced me to a passage from Paul Goodman, in which he argues that

. . . the obsessional man . . . who speaks with excruciating correctness never modifying the common code to the situation or his purposes, is also aphasic. He does not speak the language but handles words, . . . like concrete objects. All his sentences are stereotypes from the dictionary and the manual of grammar; if they fail him, or if he gets a lively response, or if his impulsive needs are too strong for this rigid use of language, he will break down.⁶

Interestingly it is often the most diligent "English conversation" students who fit this description the most closely.

Though only a few people reach this extreme degree of alienated speech, most undergo a radical personality change-perhaps better described as a personality loss-when speaking "English Conversation." It seems to be assumed that the Japanese modes of expressing spirit, wit, anger, respect, affection, and the beauty of form cannot be communicated in the English language. The texts demand that the students take on an ill-fitting "American" personality and relate to each other in unfamiliar ways. But of course this textbook personality expresses no human character; it is a caricature of American white middle class personality, and is capable of only a kind of vague and stilted casualness. This vague casualness

expresses neither the intimacy due friends and family nor the respect due others. Adoption of this empty personality is an offense to dignity. This is one of the most important obstacles in English study: it causes many people to stay away from "English conversation" altogether for reasons of pride. Obviously it is not a difficulty that can be overcome by strictly linguistic training.

This problem is not caused simply by the fact that Japan is an island country whose people are not accustomed to dealing with foreigners. The characteristics I am talking about are a consequence of the ideology of "English conversation." The English spoken by people who learned it outside the subculture of eikaiwa - for example people who studied it before the war, people who immigrated to the U.S., working class people who picked it up on their jobs at U.S. bases or at other places where English is used-has quite different characteristics.⁷ Moreover, people who have recognized the ideology, consciously rejected it, and studied the language on a different basis also speak a much more natural and communicative form of English. The farther away one gets from the world of "English conversation," the weaker cultural barriers become. Whenever I have traveled in the country-side, for example, the place where foreigners are the most rarely seen, I have found that the people there were far more natural, open, and dignified in their attitude toward me than are people in the world of "English conversation." There I have always been treated as an equal, and since the people could observe that I was a human being they were not astounded by anything I did-for example eat Japanese food or speak in Japanese. The same is generally true among working class people. Among intellectuals and middle class people, the most natural attitude is, as I have mentioned, found among people who have stayed as far away as they could from the world of "English conversation."

I can understand that the world of "English conversation" might serve a useful function. I can see how the Japanese people might instinctively develop a wall of callus around their culture, to protect its more delicate areas from the bruising attacks of Western harshness and aggressiveness. But I wonder if many readers realize that for most English-speaking visitors, the world of "English conversation" is almost the only Japan they encounter. They live almost entirely in the subculture that speaks English without realizing that it is a sub-culture, without understanding that the culture, personality characteristics and attitudes that they take to be

those of Japan are in reality those of the ideology of "English conversation." It's something to think about.

* * *

But I don't mean this to be an appeal to improve communication with Western visitors. How the)' are treated is not important. What is important is to destroy the ideology of "English conversation", to stop thinking of English as the language of cultural domination and start thinking of it as the language of Asian and Third World solidarity.⁸ When English study is transformed from a form of toadying into a tool of liberation, all the famous "special difficulties" which the Japanese are supposed to have with English will probably vanish like the mist. Language schools which employ only Caucasian teachers should be boycotted Japanese who want to study English should form study groups with Southeast Asians, and together work out a new Asian version of English that reflects the style, culture, history, and politics of Asia. And then if the Americans who come to Asia complain that they can't understand this new variety of English, they should be sent to language school.

NOTES

1. I am also not sure whether kaiwa means exactly the same as simply speaking Japanese. Many Japanese dictionaries have as the second meaning of kaiwa, "informal speaking in a foreign language." This could simply mean that the popularity of foreign language kaiwa study has by association affected the meaning of the word kaiwa itself. Alternatively, it could mean that kaiwa is a newly created Japanese word, that it was created perhaps in the Meiji Era (like ronso and enzetsu) to stand for a mode of speech which was believed not to exist in Japanese. I am not qualified to say which of these is the case
2. The recent advertising campaign using Sammy Davis Jr.'s endorsement of Suntory whisky does not refute this general point Sammy Davis Jr. is a famous entertainer, and the effectiveness of his endorsement is based on that fact On the other hand in most cases the White people who appear in TV commercials are unknown paid models, and the effectiveness of their endorsements is based solely on the fact that they are White.
3. One child in my neighborhood used to call out "Here comes the gaikotsujin [skeleton man] again" every time I passed.

4. Karl W. Deutsch, "Social Mobilization and Political Development," American Political Science Review, v. 15, no. 3 (Sept. 1961), p.495
5. The same thing is true of Japanese tourism in Southeast Asia: I recently 'saw a TV commercial advertising travel in a Southeast Asian country, which showed a Japanese man calling out "waiter" and snapping his fingers imperiously.
6. Paul Goodman, speaking and Language: Defense of Poetry, p. 81
7. For example an increasing number of young Japanese-Americans in cities like Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles speak the Black rather than the White version of American English, since it is more appropriate to their social situation.
8. I hope it is clear that traveling to Southeast Asia as a tourist, or as a representative of Japanese business interests, has nothing to do with solidarity.