

論文の英文要旨

論文題目	A Critical Ethnographic Study of the Deaf Community in the Philippines -Colonization of the Senses and the Hegemony of Language
------	--

氏名	Eri Yamashita
----	---------------

This paper examines the language hegemony surrounding the Deaf Culture in the Philippines and attempts to describe this context through linking the historical description with the ethnography obtained from fieldwork.

Deaf have long been just defined as people who have defects with hearing abilities. Although, the dissemination of the concept of Deaf Culture turns the image of deaf people to ethnical minority group which use sign language as their mother tongue. The paradigm changes from “disability” to “culture” had a great impact not only on disability studies but also on each academic field.

While the origin of Deaf Culture theory is deeply linked to Western linguistic and sensualism, the concept of Deaf Culture is now widespread throughout the world. However, there are various circumstances in each country regarding sign language, which is the central concept of Deaf Culture. For example, sign language education in Asia is deeply influenced by the colonial rule. Japanese sign language became widespread in South Korea and Taiwan. In addition, Soviet sign language became widespread in Mongolia.

The introduction of post-colonial theory adequately describes the situation of linguistic colonialism towards the deaf people from hearing culture. However, little research has been conducted to show how the concept of Deaf Culture and its widespread use in other regions made local Deaf/deaf communities changed, and how to grasp the influence of the former colonial nation on the above-mentioned sign language education.

In this paper, firstly, the intricate language hegemony surrounding the Deaf Culture in the Philippines is clarified by combining historical descriptions with ethnography obtained through fieldwork.

I critically analyzed and indicate the limitations of previous research perspectives on Deaf Culture. Furthermore, to understand the uniqueness of the identity formation of Filipino Deaf people, provisions of linguistic politics and physicality regarding the ethnicity of Deaf people during the colonial and Marcos periods are analyzed.

Chapter 1 presents basic concepts related to Deaf Culture and I examined the development and showed a contradiction. Specifically, with the establishment of sign language linguistics in the 1960s, Deaf Culture theory developed in the interrelationships of various academic fields. In response to criticism which reflects essentialism, in the 2000s, the concept of Deafhood was introduced to previous research. Deafhood explains constructive identity of Deaf people and Deaf Culture strategically.

In Chapter 2 the current state of Deaf Culture in the Philippines is clarified. First, I explained the difficulties of taking statistical data of Deaf people whose mother tongue is sign language, because there are multiple definitions of demographics and disabilities. Furthermore, there exists various kinds of sign language in the Philippines, e.g., SEE (Signing Exact English), Filipino Sign Language (FSL), Pilipino Sign Language (PSL). SEE and PSL have vocal English grammar, which is almost indistinguishable from American Sign Language (ASL) and used by hearing teachers. These sign languages were introduced in the late 1970s.

In 2012, the FSL bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, officially recognizing FSL as the national language of the Deaf in the Philippines, and while summarizing the research trends in FSL since the 1990s, I cited the spread of American Sign Language under American colonial rule as the background for the existence of these multiple signs. Because of this linguistic plurality, Deaf people in the Philippines face essential criticisms that persistently question the authenticity and originality of FSL. "Is there any natural sign language used by the Philippine Deaf community that can adequately distinguish FSL from its parent sign language, ASL)?".

The Deaf Culture as advocated in Western countries is a counter-narrative to audism and linguistic colonialism. However, since Filipino Deaf Culture is strongly influenced by American Sign Language, there are certain limitations in defining Deaf Culture in terms of sign languages.

Chapters 3 and 4 focus on the acceptance of sign language and history of deaf people in the Philippines by shedding light on the transition of language hegemony. With this description of history, it become clear the factors of difficulties in pursuing original identity of FSL and Deaf Culture and its complexity.

In Chapter 3, I show how the changing relationship between the state's educational efforts and language ideology affected the image of the Deaf in the context of American colonial rule and the formation of the Philippine nation-state. As an analysis of the discourse on body and language, I used the 1903 and 1939 census descriptions and U.S. data to illustrate how the concept of "Deaf" in the Philippines changed under the U.S. welfare policy.

The Philippine census, conducted by the Philippine Commission, reflects the classification of the disabled in 19th century American society. It revealed that the deaf and hard of hearing were integrated into the rest of Philippine society as a "defective" minority. The Philippine Commission's classification of the deaf and hard-of-hearing as a "defective class" reinforces the deaf and hard-of-hearing's deviance from society as "poor" and "criminals." The formulation of the "defective" deaf is based on the deaf policies of

the American colonial government, which depicted a deviation from citizenship.

Furthermore, I analyzed the significance of the spread of sign language education during this period, focusing on Delight Rice's columns published in the *Silent Worker* from 1911 to 1927. In the U.S. during the same period, sign language education was strongly opposed as auralism grew stronger and the line between "normal" and "abnormal" in the human body was drawn more and more. Under these circumstances, a twisted situation was created. Sign language education, which was banned in the US, was conducted in the Philippines. Deaf people in the U.S. at that time entrusted their dreams and Deaf people in the world were positioned as international people.

Chapter 4 describes the developments in the post-martial law Marcos era (1972-1986), the "golden age" of the Deaf community. It summarizes the legal system on disability. During the Marcos regime, the development of laws for the disabled was stagnant. Through an analysis of the journals of the Philippine Federation of the Deaf in the 1970s published during the Marcos era, the representation of "able-bodied" employed deaf people who contribute to the concept of a "new society" advocating government-led economic development and construction is strengthened.

In Chapter 5, it is revealed that English supremacy and bilingual education, brought about by the continuation of "benevolent assimilation" as revealed in Chapters 3 and 4, have divided the language community in the Philippines and even among the Deaf. Through fieldwork, an attempt is made to dismantle the hegemony of language by switching between "interpreter" and "speaker" in real life. Furthermore, by referring to the discussion of citizenship, I have clarified how the current movement of Deaf people is trying to obtain an ideal citizenship. In conclusion, by analyzing (1) the process of accepting sign language under colonial rule and (2) the representation of Deaf people under the formation of nation-states, it became clear that Deaf Filipinos are pursuing their own identity in the complex relationship between sign language and the spoken languages, Filipino and English.

There are various regions where American Sign Language is prevalent. Even in these regions, it is necessary to pay attention to the process of sign language dissemination and the linguistic hegemony faced by the community.