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OUTLINE OF THE BOOK

What is this book about? Here is a short description.

Languages are today being killed and linguistic diversity is disappearing at a much faster pace than ever before in human history, and relatively much faster than biodiversity. The book starts with a short expose of the present 'health' situation of the world's languages and the prospects for them during the next few generations. The conclusion is that the future looks grim— if things continue, we may kill over 90 percent of the world's oral languages in the next 100 years.

It is claimed that linguistic and cultural diversity are as necessary for the existence of our planet as biodiversity. They are correlated: where one type is high, the other one is too. There seems to be mounting evidence that the relationship between linguistic and cultural diversity on the one hand and biodiversity on the other hand is not only correlational but might be causal. Theories of human-environment coevolution have been proposed, including the assumption that cultural diversity might enhance biodiversity or vice
versa. Therefore it is argued that the preservation of the world's linguistic diversity must be an essential goal in any bioculturally oriented diversity conservation programme.

Indigenous peoples and minorities are the main bearers of linguistic and cultural diversity in the world—over 80% of the world's languages exist in one country only, and the median language has less than 5,000 speakers. Some of the direct main agents of linguistic (and cultural) genocide today are parts of what we call the consciousness industry: formal educational systems and the mass media (including television, 'cultural nerve gas' as Michael Krauss, 1992, 6, has called it). The book shows that the education of most minorities and indigenous peoples in the world is organised in ways which both counteract sound scientific principles and lead to the disappearance of linguistic and cultural diversity.

Schools are every day committing linguistic genocide. They do it according to the United Nations definition of this phenomenon, in the final draft of what in 1948 became the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. They also do it by forcibly moving children from one group (indigenous or minority) to another group (the dominant group) through linguistic and cultural forced assimilation in schools. Theories in several fields for understanding how and why this is happening are developed and discussed in some detail, including clarification of concepts like mother tongue, ethnicity, integration. Practices (including educational models) leading to linguistic genocide are described and analysed, with numerous examples from all over the world.

This inevitably includes a consideration of power relations. The book shows how the formal educational systems participate in maintaining and reproducing unequal power relations, here especially between linguistic minorities and others, but also more generally, and how the ways of doing this have changed and are constantly changing, and how control and domination are resisted and alternatives are constantly created and negotiated, managed and controlled, and recreated. The deficiency-based models that are used in most minority education invalidate the linguistic and cultural capital of minority children and their parents and communities. They make the resources of dominated groups seem handicaps or deficiencies, instead of valued and validated non-material resources, or they render them invisible and therefore not possible to convert into material resources and positions of structural power. This happens just as much in global international relations

and the McDonaldization of the world as it happens in English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms.

Through glorification, the non-material resources of the dominant groups, including the dominant languages and cultures, and maybe specifically English, are presented as better adapted to meet the needs of 'modern', technologically developed, democratic post-industrial information-driven societies—and this is what a substantial part of ESLIdeology is about. English and other dominant languages tend to be projected as the languages of modernity, science and technology, success, national 'unity', democracy, and other such positive features.

The non-material resources of the dominated groups, for instance minorities and indigenous peoples, including their languages and cultures, are stigmatised as being traditional, backward, narrow, and inferior; they are marginalised, deprived of resources for their development and use. In this way they are made invisible, or socially constructed as handicaps rather than resources.

The relationship between the dominant and the dominated, the A-team and the B-team, is rationalised so that what the dominant group and its representatives do is always presented as beneficial for the dominated. This can then serve to legitimate and reproduce the unequal access to power and resources and present those with more access as 'helping' those with less power. Processes of globalisation, the increasing insecurity and the growing gaps between haves on the one hand and have-nots and never-to-haves on the other (a 20%-80% world) are analysed in order to understand some of the macro-level factors in power relationships and contemporary changes. The 'free market' ideology, more a political dogma than an economic system, erodes democracy by shifting power from states and democratically elected bodies to transnational corporations and banks, while 'democratisation' homogenisation and killing diversity. Globalisation is a killing agent.

When the present situation in the educational system and some reasons for it have been assessed, alternatives will be looked into. One necessary tool in the remedies could be linguistic human rights (LHR). It is claimed (following Katarina Tomasevski) that the duty of human rights is to override the law of supply and demand and to remove price tags from people and from basic necessities for their survival and for a dignified life, including education and that linguistic human rights are central to this. Human rights should act as a corrective to the 'free market'. But they are powerless unless two unlikely changes happen. Firstly, major redistribution of the world's material resources and structural power is a prerequisite for implementation of human rights. Secondly, for this redistribution to happen, civil society needs to take back the control of economy which has been given away to the transnational corporations and the financial giants in the globalisation process.

---

Here is the first transdisciplinary challenge. For biologists, 'conservation' is a positive word: it is what you do to prevent nature from deteriorating, you try to get it better conditions. For sociologists and researchers on culture, 'conserving' a language or culture is pre- disciplinary concepts, combining insights from our disciplines.
LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS ARE A NECESSARY (BUT NOT SUFFICIENT) PREREQUISITE FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY. VIOLATIONS OF LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS, ESPECIALLY IN EDUCATION, LEAD TO A REDUCTION OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY ON OUR PLANET. THE HUMAN RIGHTS SYSTEM IS ANALYSED SO AS TO SEE WHICH LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS IN EDUCATION ARE PROTECTED TODAY, REGIONALLY IN EUROPE, AND GLOBALLY. AFTER A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE FORMULATIONS IN MOST OF THE CENTRAL INSTRUMENTS, THE ASSESSMENT IS THAT LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION SYSTEMATICALLY GETS A POORER TREATMENT THAN OTHER BASIC HUMAN CHARACTERISTICS. VERY FEW INTERNATIONAL OR REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS GRANT BINDING EDUCATIONAL LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS, DESPITE PIQUANT PHRASES. THE PRESENT BINDING LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS IN EDUCATION CLAUSES ARE COMPLETELY INSUFFICIENT FOR PROTECTING AND MAINTAINING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY ON OUR GLOBE, EVEN IF THERE ARE A FEW RECENT POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS.

THE LANGUAGE (AND CULTURAL) RIGHTS OF SOME LINGUISTIC MAJORITY ARE NOT BEING MET EITHER: FORMAL EDUCATION DOES NOT MAKE THE BULLETS OF THE DOMINANT-GROUP CHILDREN HIGH-LEVEL BILINGUALS, OR TRULY MULTICULTURAL, OR EVEN APPRECIATIVE OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY. EDUCATION SYSTEMS REFLECT MONOLINGUAL REDUCTIONISM OR MONOLINGUAL STUPIDITY/NAIVETY WHERE MONOLINGUALISM (POSSIBLY WITH SOME FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING) IS SEEN AS NORMAL, INEVITABLE, DESIRABLE, AND SUFFICIENT.

Finally, some very recent more positive human rights instruments are presented. Alternative educational models are described which lead to high levels of bilingualism or multilingualism for both minorities and majorities and which respect linguistic human rights.

The structure of this book is as follows. After an introduction describing some of the philosophical and methodological underpinnings and problems in the book, Part I sets the scene. Chapter 1 describes the present situation of the world's languages, problematising their fate and our lack of knowledge about them. Chapter 2 outlines parallels and links between linguistic and cultural diversity and biodiversity and the threats that all three types of diversity face. Chapter 3 defines and analyses a number of central concepts, such as mother tongue(s), culture, ethnicity, assimilation and integration, right to naming one's linguistic and ethnic identities, and the role of language for control and domination and for resistance and self-determination. Chapter 4 asks what the benefits and drawbacks of linguistic diversity are and analyses the ideology of monolingual reductionism.

Part II sets out to investigate linguistic genocide at a more societal level, analysing state policies and globalisation. Chapter 5 looks at language policies of states, more generally and specifically in education, and describes how linguistic genocide in education happens in practice. It also compares two views on how languages disappear—do they die or are they killed? Chapter 6 discusses power and control, and changes in forms of control in the present phase of globalisation, with special attention to the role of language in domination and control. It outlines how 'free markets' respond to the world's problems and to change.

Part III is about the struggle against linguistic genocide and for linguistic human rights in education. Chapter 7 discusses an alternative response to the problems outlined, namely what human rights have to offer. It scrutinizes human rights instruments to see whether and how we have sufficient linguistic human right, especially in education, to prevent linguistic genocide and to maintain linguistic diversity. The answer is a negative one—the human rights system is at present completely insufficient. Chapter 8 looks at educational models, asking how formal education should be organised in order to lead to high levels of multilingualism and to respect linguistic human rights. The concluding chapter 9 claims that present indigenous and minority education continues to forcibly transfer children of the group to another group, something that qualifies as violation of the UN Genocide Convention. Several prerequisites for the macro-level political changes which are needed to prevent this are outlined, and is claimed that they are necessary for the planet to have a future.

The losers, if the changes outlined do not happen, are not only the 80 percent of the world's population, who at present consume only 20 percent of the resources. The losers are humanity and the planet. Quoting Edward Goldsmith, I want to remind you that 'environment' means biological, linguistic, and cultural environment. In his words (1996: 91): 'there is no evidence that trade or economic development are of any great value to humanity ... The environment, on the other hand, is our greatest wealth, and to kill it, as the TNCs [transnational companies] are methodically doing, is an act of unparalleled criminality.' The only hope today seems to be that the TNC leaders might realise that it is not in the interest of their grandchildren either because 'there can be no trade and no economic development on a dead planet'.

HOW TO USE THE BOOK—SOME ADVICE TO THE READER

I have tried to make reading and referencing easier by using several kinds of Boxes for Addresses, Definitions, Reader Tasks, and exemplification of various kinds (Inserts and Info Boxes). The Boxes are numbered consecutively within each chapter and listed separately. A short description follows:

Definition Boxes give short or long definitions of central concepts. Some have been defined in lengthy mini-entries, especially in chapter 5, partly to give some of the basic tools for working with the main issues in this book, partly for conceptual clarity, and be-
Alternatives to Genocide and Dystopia

9.1. Weak forms and non-forms of 'bilingual' education amount to genocide by forcibly transferring children of the group to another group (from the UN Genocide Convention)
9.2. Minority language—both right and resource in states with civic pluralism and no ethnic state identity
9.3. Diversity or homogenisation? Localisation or globalisation?
9.4. Promoting linguistic tolerance and development?
9.5. Do arguments help?
9.6. To conclude

Figure 9.1 Alternative responses to socio-economic, techno-military, and political structural changes
Table 9.1 Diffusion of English and ecology of languages paradigms
Table 9.2 Basic tenets of the bioregional and industri-scientific paradigms

Insert 9.1 Culture of tolerance and silence
Insert 9.2 'Get off my toes, you bloody bastard!

There are three main types of distributional policies: those which envisage distribution from growth, those which plan for distribution with growth, and those which demand redistribution of the existing assets so as to promote economic growth.

Distribution from growth follows the logic of the 'trickle-down' approach—growth first, distribution later. Distribution with growth introduces a balance between promoting growth and addressing its distribution. Redistribution as a precondition for growth aims to ensure equal access to resources, hence challenging the acquired property rights. There are no human rights norms which would require countries to follow a specific distributional policy.
9. ALTERNATIVES TO GENOCIDE AND DYSTOPIA

9.1. WEAK FORMS AND NON-FORMS OF 'BILINGUAL' EDUCATION AMOUNT TO GENOCIDE BY 'FORCIBLY TRANSFERRING CHILDREN OF THE GROUP TO ANOTHER GROUP' (FROM THE UN GENOCIDE CONVENTION)

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide does not forbid linguistic (or cultural) genocide directly since the General Assembly, as we noted in 5.2.3, rejected Article III. But it does forbid in its Article II(2) 'forcibly transferring children of the group to another group'. As I said in the Introduction, this transfer can be physical (as in the case of the Australian Stolen Generation which was pronounced as genocide by the court, see Insert 5.25). But as I have shown, the same result can also be accomplished through education.

Pirjo Janulv (see Info Box 8.3), having stated that 'None of those who had been in the Swedish classes spoke Finnish with their children', concludes on the basis of her large-scale partly longitudinal study of Swedish Finnish immigrant minority students (1998):

Judging from the results of the study, attendance in Finnish classes was of great significance for the preservation of Finnish in Sweden because only this program seemed to guarantee many-aided language skills in Finnish. The number of pupils in Finnish classes has decreased sharply since 1980, and nowadays such classes exist only in a few places in Sweden. Swedish school political practices have contributed strongly to the difficulties Finnish is having and will have surviving beyond the coming two or three generations. (ibid.)

There is a lot of similar experience in other countries. You, dear reader, think of your own friends and acquaintances. How many of them had grandparents or parents who spoke other languages which your friend no more knows today? It seems that we have enough evidence, worldwide, to be able to claim that, for minorities and probably also most indigenous peoples, only proper full maintenance programmes lead to high levels of bilingualism at a group level. Submersion and transitional programmes, at least early-exit transition, lead to language shift.

This is something that the states organising the education know, and often applaud.

9.2. MINORITY LANGUAGE—BOTH RIGHT AND RESOURCE IN STATES WITH CIVIC PLURALISM AND NO ETHNIC STATE IDENTITY

Minority languages in education can be treated as a problem, a right, or a resource, with Richard Ruiz' (1984) alternatives, introduced in chapter 8. In several readings of Ruiz, all three have been seen as competing views, rather than the last two being complementary (and Ruiz himself does little to prevent this ambivalent interpretation). One result has been that some of those educationists and sociolinguists who emphasize that (minority) languages should be seen as resources, not as problems or handicaps, have dismissed "language as a right"-oriented approaches as being in contradiction to seeing languages as resources. This is to the detriment of both those seeking language rights and those who see languages as a resource. It prevents those who are interested in making languages function as parts of positive cultural-linguistic capital from making use of the human rights system in the struggles of linguistic minorities for self-empowerment. It seems that the researchers who take this view do so partially because they lack adequate knowledge about linguistic human rights and cannot see the potential a human rights oriented approach may offer.

The problem in connection with languages is not the existence of minor languages or a diversity of languages. Rather the problem is that in institutions of state (the educational system, social services, etc.) do not see the existence of linguistic diversity and all languages as resources to be cherished, maintained, and developed, or, minimally, as something not to be destroyed. Rather, many of them construct linguistic diversity and the presence of many languages and minority languages as a problem, both for the speakers themselves (who are constructed as deficient, suffering from lack of knowledge of the dominant language, rather than as owning a positive resource, another language, or multilingual skills) and for the state (which has to cater for them, offer them extra services, "help" them, etc.).

"Linguistic human rights" can in the framework of 'problem or resource' be understood in two ways which have superficially opposing but in fact complementary goals.
First, people need linguistic human rights in order to prevent their linguistic repertoire from either becoming a problem or from causing them problems. This is a defensive use of LHRs.

And second, people need to be able to exercise language rights in order for their linguistic repertoire to be treated as or to become a positive, empowering resource. This is a more assertive way of using LHRs.

A combination of these approaches is clearly visible in maintenance programmes but not in transitional programmes, despite some rhetoric in that direction.

After all, a 'minority' person is a normal human being who, from the state's point of view, may just happen to be in the 'wrong' place in the sense that her/his first language (LI) is not the LI of the majority in the state where she/he lives. And this 'wrong' place can only become 'right' when the ideology of monolingual nation states disappears.

It is only when the state and educational authorities stop being a problem that maintenance programmes become a natural human right, and minority languages a resource. What we need is Civic Pluralism. According to the Greek-Australian researcher, Mary Kalantzis (1995: 2) who herself has gone back to relearning her mother tongue, Civic Pluralism means that all people have access to political power, economic resources, social services, and, most importantly, cultural symbols regardless of their cultural affiliations and styles. This cultural symbols point is in some important respects the key to the others. The State can no longer have an 'ethnic' identity as it did in the era of traditional nationalism. Under Civic Pluralism, the nation's cultural symbols are open and inclusive. One shouldn't any longer have to take on the cultural and linguistic demeanour of the so-called mainstream in order to enjoy access to political power, economic resources, social services and the symbols of nation.

For from fostering tribalism or fragmentation, Civic Pluralism is then their only antidote. It is a means to create a postnationalist sense of common purpose. (Emphasis added)

But there are requirements for what a new generation of human rights must fulfill if a new 'social contract', with Civic Pluralism, is to result, one which can be used to support democracy and fight the tyranny of casino economy and mafia capitalism, capitalism-run-wild:

- human rights have to supplement representative democracy with mechanisms with further direct democracy. Direct democracy cannot function without linguistic human rights and support to linguistic and cultural diversity, neither in general nor in schools (see Apple 1993, Giroux 1992.

Corson (ed.) 1994, Pratté 1977)—local negotiations need to be done in local languages.

- human rights have to acknowledge the rights of future generations. These rights include the right to biodiversity and linguistic and cultural diversity in the future too. It is the only safe alternative.

- human rights have to regulate the relationship between civil society and the business world. We need a 'proper' (i.e., not neo-liberal) stakeholder economy (Wheeler & Sillanpää 1997), combined with economic democracy, in addition to political democracy. Political democracy functions today more and more as an excuse for a new type of feudalism where the transnational corporations have replaced the feudal lords. Business must serve civil society, not vice versa.

- human rights have to be implemented, not stay on paper.

If we want to use the human rights system to prevent genocide and biocide and support linguistic and cultural diversity and biodiversity, several macro-level choices are necessary. I will sketch out some.

9.3. DIVERSITY OR HOMOGENISATION?
LOCALISATION OR GLOBALISATION?

The market economy, and the creation of larger and more centralized economic, administrative, and political units has, despite a rhetoric of democracy and local participation, been the order of the day, in the 'first' and 'third' worlds. It is also emerging in the former 'second' world. The socio-economic, techno-military, and political, structural changes which have been connected with the 'modernisation' and 'globalisation' processes have caused unprecedented stress on both nature and on people, on our socio-economic condition of life, and our languages and cultures (Fig. 9.1). These processes have resulted in an accelerated environmental degradation (= nature under str and growing gaps between the haves and the never-to-haves, and in our linguistic and cultural genocide we have discussed in this book (= people under stress).

We need as humans to decide whether the choices we make are through markets and monocolonial efficiency, or through diversity. An important priority for both politics and research would be to define policies for preservation and development of environmental, linguistic and cultural, economic and political diversity (but see 'tolerance' below). This would also include studying the role of human rights in the different responses.

This is also the context in which I think we need to see the spread of certain languages at the cost of others. Subtractive language spread does not
Alternative responses to socio-economic, techno-military, and political structural changes

The diffusion of English and ecology of languages paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The diffusion of English paradigm</th>
<th>Ecology of languages paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. monolingualism and linguistic genocide</td>
<td>1. multilingualism and linguistic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. promotion of subtractive learning of dominant languages</td>
<td>2. promotion of additive foreign/second language learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. linguistic, cultural, and media imperialism</td>
<td>3. equality in communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Americanisation and homogenisation of world culture</td>
<td>4. maintenance and exchange of cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ideological globalisation and internationalisation</td>
<td>5. ideological localisation and exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Capitalism, hierarchisation</td>
<td>6. economic democratisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rationalisation based on science and technology</td>
<td>7. human rights perspective, holistic integrative values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Modernisation and economic efficiency; quantitative growth</td>
<td>8. sustainability through promotion of diversity; qualitative growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Transnationalisation</td>
<td>9. protection of local production and national sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Growing polarisation and gaps between haves and have-nots</td>
<td>10. Redistribution of the world's material resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 9.1 Alternative responses to socio-economic, techno-military, and political structural changes...

Only kill other languages, it is often connected with many of the other factors which are included in the flow chart in Fig. 9.1 but not specified. The Japanese scholar Yukio Tsuda (1994) analyses the spread of English in terms of a 'diffusion of English' paradigm where he sees several other factors related to this diffusion (Maher & Yashiro's 1995 description about Japan seems to identify similar concomitants to the spread of English in Japan; see also Honma Oda's writings). As an alternative he proposes an 'ecology of languages' paradigm which includes minimally bilingualism but hopefully multilingualism for all. Robert Phillipson and I have worked further on Tsuda's original suggestions (see our discussion in Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996b). Table 9.1 presents both paradigms in my latest version, where I have added several new dimensions to Tsuda (see also his 1998). Obviously the list is very much of a 'goodies' and 'baddies' type. Still, too often there seems to be a correlation between ideologies and practices which follow each approach. Again, it is important to remember that learning of English can be included in both paradigms.

We can compare the two end points on the diffusion of English and ecology of languages continuum with how colleagues from other disciplines conceptualise their similar worries even if they may not have linguistic diversity uppermost on their minds. In fact, the killing of diversity is not at all in pact with nature either, as some researchers would like us to believe. Bioregionalists who try to extract basic tenets for a sustainable life, both from nature and from earlier, often more balanced ways of interacting with (the rest of) nature, are sure that, in order to have a chance of saving the planet, we have to 'abandon the notion of controlling and remaking the world in the name of global monoculture' (Sale 1996: 472). Many of them advocate self-reliance at the level of bioregions. Sale (1996: 475) summarises the basic tenets of the bioregional and industrio-scientific paradigms as follows (Table 9.2):
Jared Diamond examines in the chapter 'The Golden Age That Never Was' in his 1992 book the evidence for people and cultures before us having completely ruined the prerequisites for their own life by destroying their habitats or having exterminated large numbers of species. This has happened in many places and it makes the 'supposed past Golden Age of environment' look increasingly mythical (Diamond 1992: 335). If we want to learn from it, and not make it happen on a global basis (this is our obvious risk today), we better heed his advice. Diamond claims (ibid., 335-336) that small long-established, egalitarian societies tend to evolve conservationist practices, because they've had plenty of time to get to know their local environment and to perceive their own self-interest. Instead, damage is likely to occur when people suddenly colonize an unfamiliar environment (like the first Maoris and Eastern Islanders); or when people advance along a new frontier (like the first Indians to reach America), so that they can just move beyond the frontier when they've damaged the region behind; or when people acquire a new technology whose destructive power they haven't had time to appreciate (like modern new Guineans, now devastating pigeon populations with shotguns). Damage is also likely in centralized states that concentrate wealth in the hands of rulers who are out of touch with their environment.

As we can see, we have the perfect global prerequisites for ruining our planet beyond repair. Long-established small societies are breaking up, and people encounter new environments, with urbanisation and migration. New technologies are more destructive than ever, and results of biochemical and other experiments are taken into use before we know anything about the long-term effects on nature or people. We have growing gaps and alienated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOREGIONAL PARADIGM</th>
<th>INDUSTRO-SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Nation/World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Change/Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Global Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sufficiency</td>
<td>Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polity</td>
<td>Centralisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>Hierarchies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementarity</td>
<td>Uniformity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Polarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbiosis</td>
<td>Growth/Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Salle 1996: 475.

Alternatives. And we do not have the new planets to move to when we have damaged this one...

Finally, we could relate the concerns to some parts of Anthony Giddens' comparisons between pre-modern and modern cultures on the one hand and his conceptions of post-modernity and what he calls 'radicalised modernity' on the other hand (Giddens 1990 passim—see Giddens' Tables 1 and 2, and Figures 1-7). Giddens finds questions about whether modern institutions are capitalist or industrial, reductionist. Instead he works with four 'institutional dimensions' or 'organisational clusters' (ibid., 55) of various systems, expressed differently in various phases and all influencing each other. The four are in modernity (1) surveillance (control of information and social supervision); (2) military power (control of the means of violence in the context of the industrialisation of war); (3) industrialisation (transformation of nature: development of the 'created environment'); and (4) capitalism (capital accumulation in the context of competitive labour and product markets) (ibid., 59). Correspondingly, the dimensions of globalisation are (1) nation-state system; (2) world military order; (3) international division of labour; and (4) world capitalist economy. Giddens then compares the environments of trust and risk. In 'pre-modern' cultures the sources of trust are in kinship systems, local community as a place, religious cosmologies, and tradition, whereas the risks come from nature, threat of human violence (marauding armies, local warlords, robbers, etc.), and from falling from religious grace, or of malicious magic. In 'modern' cultures, the sources of trust are personal relationships, abstract systems, future-oriented thought as a mode of connecting past and present. Threats and dangers come from the reflexivity of modernity, threat of human violence from the industrialisation of war, and threat of personal meaningfulness. (see Table 1, p. 102 and Giddens' discussion of the concepts). Most of these phenomena have already been discussed in earlier chapters. Giddens then goes on to describe the four dimensions in terms of 'high consequence risks of modernity' (ibid., 171) which correspond to the stress and disaster poles in our 'response through markets & monocultural efficiency' (Figure 9.1), the 'diffusion of English paradigm' (Table 9.1) and the 'industro-scientific paradigm' (Table 9.2). Giddens' dimensions here are (1) growth of totalitarian power; (2) nuclear conflict or large-scale war; (3) ecological decay or disaster; and (4) collapse of economic growth mechanisms. Next Giddens goes on to compare conceptions of 'post-modernity' and what he calls 'radicalised modernity' (Table 2, p. 150) in a perceptive way which has many similarities to, for instance, Harding's and Escobar's (and Galtung's 1996) analyses.

In counteracting the risks of modernity, Giddens postulates an important role for social movements which he relates to the four dimensions: (1) free speech/democratic movements; (2) peace movements; (3) ecological movements (counter-culture); and (4) labour movements (ibid., 159). These might, in the contours of a post-modern order, lead to (1) multilayered democratic partici-
pation; (3) demilitarisation; and (4) a post-scarcity system. And the dimensions of this system could be: (1) a coordinated global order; (2) transcendence of war; (3) system of planetary care; and (4) socialised economic organisation. (p. 166). And, finally, Giddens' dimensions of utopian realism are (1) life politics (politics of self-actualisation); (2) politicalisation of the global; (3) emancipatory politics (politics of inequality); and (4) politicalisation of the local.

As we can see, there are many similarities in how language and culture-oriented, biologically oriented, and sociologically oriented researchers see some of the main problems in today's world, and also possible alternatives.

Paradoxically, then, linguistic and cultural homogenising seem to be at the core of the growing spread of free market nomadism and the ensuing ideological chaos which precludes joint action and legitimises it with the help of sophisticated intellectual games...

9.4. 'Promoting Linguistic Tolerance and Development?'

There are additional caveats to be added to optimistic scenarios. There are no longer any 'bad' or 'good' solutions, only relatively better or worse solutions to the world's problems. According to Zygmunt Bauman (1997), both the bipolar possibilities (either universality—universal ideas, ideologies, solutions—or tolerance of diversity and pluralism) have certain benefits and certain dangers.

Believing in 'universal truths' (like 'communism' or 'capitalism', or 'free market') can in the worst case lead (and has led) to genocides.

On the other hand, Bauman claims, 'tolerance' can also lead to tolerating genocide without doing anything (e.g., Bosnia, Nigeria). 'Tolerance' can also be expressed in demands for autonomy of choice, in an individualistic neoliberal way, in consumer societies, where any kind of restrictions or limits are seen as negative.

This would be the WTO (World Trade Organisation) and MAI (Multilateral Agreement on Investment) line. This wrongly understood 'freedom of choice' might also include the prevention of any kind of positive intervention to achieve the 'regulated context' which Grin (1999) sees as necessary for harnessing market forces for preservation of at least some linguistic diversity, and which Tomashevski argues is a necessary counterpart for human rights to be implemented.

My critique of 'tolerance' would include still more. I have earlier criticised the 'free market' response to change as disastrous, and the human rights oriented response as completely insufficient. Likewise I have criticised the role of the state in both, for having given away the control to the TNCs and for undermining and misusing human rights.

What about states in cooperation with those NGOs which try to make states their allies? This is where 'toleration' and 'development' really rule.

In October 1993 at the Vienna Summit, the Heads of State and Government of the member states of the Council of Europe reacted to 'the increase in acts of violence, notably against migrants and people of immigrant origin...' (from the Preamble to Appendix III), by adopting a Declaration and a 'Plan of Action on combating Racism, Xenophobia, anti-Semitism and Intolerance' (emphasis added).

The same 'tolerance' also figures in the World Declaration on Education for All (to be found on UNESCO's Web-page, Address Box 7.1) from the Jomtien World Conference on Education for All in March 1990. Part 2 of Article 1, after having asked individuals (significantly not states) to have 'responsibility to respect and build upon their collective cultural, linguistic and religious heritage', asks them 'to be tolerant towards social, political and religious systems which differ from their own' (emphasis added; see Joel Spring's (1998: 190-216) and Birgit Broek-Utne's (in press) analyses of this document in relation to human rights and development—their views are similar to mine).

At an international conference, organised by the Canadian Centre for Linguistic Rights, called 'Towards a language agenda: futurist outlook on the United Nations' (see Lager, ed. 1996), the title given to my presentation by the organisers was 'Promotion of linguistic tolerance and development' (emphasis added; see my 1996c).

Even if some of the official resolutions and texts mention mutuality and the need for everybody to be tolerant, after reading the bulk of them, one is left with a strong impression that those who should be 'tolerated' are those who are 'different' in relation to an unspecified mainstream, namely minorities (national, immigrant, and refugee) and indigenous peoples. Those who are asked to do this tolerating are the majority populations, the so-called 'mainstream'. 'Promotion of tolerance' seems, for instance, in a Council of Europe interpretation, to mean 'counteracting the intolerance of majority populations in Europe and Europeanised countries towards some of their fellow citizens'. In parallel, in 'promoting linguistic tolerance', speakers of dominant languages are then tolerated to ask for tolerating linguistic diversity, the existence of smaller languages and maybe also the ways the speakers of other languages (and other varieties) use the dominant languages, in ways which do not completely tally with how the speakers of these dominant languages (or rather the formally educated middle class sections) themselves use them. Again, it is the linguistically dominant groups who are asked to tolerate that the dominated languages and groups using them exist, and are different from the dominant ones. Finally, 'development' in 'promoting linguistic development' can be understood in the same sense as in 'the developed countries' and 'the developing countries'. This is the familiar evolutionist paradigm, where it is clear who constitutes the norm, and where it is only some who need to develop (to undergo structural adjustment programmes) because they are still deficient in relation to the norm.
Does 'promoting linguistic development' imply that we also have already-developed languages which are the norm for the aspiring developing languages (or developing dialects or vernaculars), in the fashion envisaged by Alisjahbana (in section 5.4)? Are these 'underdeveloped' languages then promised more important roles in education and administration, once their linguistic development has been 'promoted' enough? Do we all have to become monolinguals (with a sprinkling of Japanese or other languages, good for trade, learned in school), in order to become 'linguistically developed'? Do we all have to 'suffer from monolingual stupidity' in order to be considered linguistically developed, instead of being 'blessed with multilingual brains'?

Is 'promotion of linguistic tolerance and development' the best way to support linguistic and cultural diversity and linguistic rights? It depends on how these concepts are defined and whose definitions of them are validated. The way they seem to be interpreted now, 'tolerance' and 'development' do not prevent but may support linguistic and cultural genocide.

In my view it is high time to start a major reversal of the questions and start asking who should tolerate whom, and who or what is developed towards what goals. These are questions I need to ask, in addition to the why-questions which have filled the pages of this book.

For how long are we multilingual and multicultural individuals and groups going to tolerate the monolingual, monocultural reductionism that characterizes the ideologies of 'nation states' and homogenising elites? For how long are we going to tolerate that the power-holders have appropriated a monopoly to define the world for us in ways which try to homogenise diversity? How long are we going to tolerate the linguistic and cultural genocide that dominant groups are committing, not only through economic and political structural policies but also, and increasingly, through the consciousness industry? How long are we going to tolerate that our languages are being stigmatised as backward and primitive, tribal and traditional, as vernaculars and patois and dialects (rather than languages), as not adapted to post-modern technological information society? How long are we going to tolerate that the richness of all our non-material resources, our norms and traditions, family patterns and institutions, our ways of living, our languages and cultures, our cultural capital, are being invalidated by the power-holders; that they are made invisible and stigmatised as handicaps and thus made non-convertible into other resources and into positions of political power? Rather than made visible and celebrated, validated as valuable resources and convertible into other resources and into positions of political power?

How long are we going to tolerate the widening gaps between the over more grim realities, with linguistic and cultural genocide for us and monolingual stupidity for many majorities? How long are we going to tolerate the post-political politics, the nice phrases about toleration and celebration of diversity?

For how long are the poor in the world (both in the North and, especially, in the South) going to tolerate the excessive exploitation which is called development, help, and aid? For how long are we ordinary people going to tolerate the grave misuse of power of most political parties and society in the world? How long are we going to tolerate the accelerating destruction of the planet? And—the most important question—how long can the planet tolerate this development?

I give a couple of examples of the reversal in Inserts 9.1 and 9.2.

**INSERT 9.1: Culture of tolerance and silence**

A research report, called "Culture of tolerance and silence" (1992) tells about peasant women in Giza, 20 km from Cairo in Egypt. Many of the women have been married off at the age of 9 or 10. They have many miscarriages and bear many children. They are afraid that the husband will take another wife unless they produce enough children. They labour in the fields and the house from early morning til late in the evening, and they tolerate these conditions in silence. The report discusses how to support the women in overcoming the 'culture of tolerance and silence' which is theirs. Maybe the women rather need to learn how to stop being tolerant and silent? Exactly the same conclusion is reached by Anees Jung in her books about women in South Asia (eg., 1987, 1994).

**INSERT 9.2: 'Get off my toes, you bloody bastard!'**

A Slami friend, Liv Östmo, once talked about the culture of tolerance. She described the situation of the Ignorance, ethnocentrism, and often unmixed racism that majority group representatives often display toward the Slami. She told how she was tired of always having to be the tolerant teacher, patiently trying to develop some awareness in the majority representatives. Tired of always needing to smile and try and explain to the clumsy intruder, stepping on her toes, that this person really is standing on the toses of the indigenous person, and if the majority representative tried to imagine herself in the same situation, she might understand that it hurts, and might consider moving a bit. Instead of Liv pushing the intruder and screaming: "get off my toes, you bloody bastard!" as she sometimes felt like doing. Liv claimed that she does not have as much tolerance left as she used to—her people have tolerated racism long enough for some to get accustomed to it. She thinks they need to learn tolerance, and to start treating the majority population as adults who should be responsible for their own learning rather than rely on indigenous peoples and minorities continuing to be their tolerant teachers, patiently waiting for a little development, decade after decade.
What has been promoted especially by some of the powerful Western states so far during this century has been their own linguistic and cultural lack of awareness, their intolerance of linguistic and cultural diversity, and a conscious underdevelopment and killing off of the world’s linguistic and cultural resources and diversity. So far, those representing the bulk of this ‘underdeveloped’ diversity have been much too patient and tolerant of the ignorance, of the attempts at linguistic and cultural genocide and its concomitant economic and political consequences.

Maybe what we really need is to learn how to stop being tolerant and silent? Maybe oppressed groups (including the women in Insert 9.1) rather need a UN Year of Tolerance or Zero Tolerance of the prevailing ideologies of monolingual reductionism.

We also need to develop two kinds of support system. One support system is for those patients who suffer from monolingual reductionism to diversity, to get rid of their illness, dangerous not only for themselves but for world peace. Education can play a major role in the cure. If you, reader, are a teacher, you can start tomorrow! The second support system needed is to protect and support those who are healthy, the multilinguals, so that we are not infected by the illness virus; so that we can stay healthy and can see clearly that we are the healthy ones. Legally binding guarantees in international and national laws, protecting basic linguistic human rights, especially in education, are part of this support system.

9.5. DO ARGUMENTS HELP?

Does it help to show, with the help of rational arguments, that the costs are lower if a country, groups of countries (like the EU or the NAFTA or the ACP) or world organisations (like UNESCO) have rational language policies which include multilingualism (and Esperanto as one part of this) and respect linguistic and cultural human rights? Is language policy going to be changed with the help of rational arguments which show that it is better for the future of the whole planet to support linguistic and cultural diversity (in addition to biodiversity) than to enhance homogenisation as one of the results of linguistic and cultural genocide?

I am afraid rational arguments have not counted so far. A summary of experience:

1. If linguistic and cultural diversity and multilingualism were to be promoted as part of a rational language policy, this would mean respecting linguistic human rights, including protecting and promoting minority languages. So far, dominant Western states have tried to prevent the acceptance of international and/or regional human rights instruments on language rights, especially language rights in education.
present-day power politics will be high for the elites themselves too in terms of constraints on their own life conditions—after all, they breathe the same air and have to eat the same polluted food as we others, and the ‘safe’ havens to barricade oneself in are shrinking. Violence breeds violence.

9.6. TO CONCLUDE

Firstly, we have to analyse the role of states and international organisations. Who controls them, and for whose benefit do they work? We cannot rely on the states, controlled by elites, to be nice and rational. Linguistic human rights arguments are true but beautiful, but futile in a negotiation situation of unequal power. Unless power relations are equalised and balanced, power holders (= representatives of monolingual reductionism) can invalidate (= socially construct as non-resources) any minority arguments. The pressure has to come from the grassroots.

Secondly, we have to relativise the question of costs. What are necessary communications? What are necessary costs for necessary communications? Physical communication costs enormous sums, pollutes the planet, transports often unnecessary things, often unnecessarily. We have to make it cheaper to produce food and commodities locally where it is possible and instead use the moneys for improved mental communication. This includes supporting linguistic and cultural diversity and the learning of languages. Physical control is also costly; ideological control is cheaper. Counterhegemonic ideas can also spread from grassroots to other grassroots, without physical revolutions necessarily needing to take place everywhere. Words are weapons. They can be used for control, or for sharing, cooperation.

Thirdly, we who are multilingual must stop being tolerant of the voluntary monolingualism of linguistic majority populations in the big dominant countries. They are the ones who cause much of the costs. But we pay, because so far we have agreed to learning their languages in order for communication to work, while many of the Brits and North Americans and French and Russians and Chinese have not learned our languages. We need mutuality. We have to start a zero tolerance campaign where we stop tolerating both monolingual reductionism and subtractive diffusion of English.

One way of forcing voluntary monolinguals to see what their monolingualism costs the rest of the world is that we multilinguals for a while give them back their own medicine. First we could have a policy whereby in all official situations nobody is allowed to use their mother tongue. Everybody has to use a second/foreign language. Nothing new in that for us who have always had to use other languages (may I remind you that I am writing this in my fifth language...). Might be more difficult for some heads of state or TNCs to formulate diplomatic lies in a foreign language. Then stop learning (or at least using with them) their languages. Learn Esperanto instead or in

addition. Maybe they might learn it too, rational and relatively easy as it is. And many of today’s monolinguals are not voluntary monolinguals—they might want to escape if they were given a chance. You, reader, if you are an involuntary monolingual, stop tolerating the educational language policies in your country!

Fourthly, we have to show the controlling elites that the world is not a zero-sum game. It is not necessarily so that if we win, they have to lose. Both can win from a rational languages policy which respects linguistic human rights. Or, at least: everybody, including the dominant elites, loses if the irrationality continues. And they may have more to lose.

Finally, it is, of course, typical of academics who write books, to believe, after all, that information at least does not harm, even if inequalities are not a result of lack of information. Linguicism does, mistakenly, ‘make sense of the world’, just like racism does:

[R]acism can successfully (although mistakenly) make sense of the world and thereby provide a strategy for political action for sections of different classes. It follows that to the extent that racism is an attempt to understand a specific combination of economic and political relations, and is therefore grounded in those relations, strategies for eliminating racism should concentrate less on trying exclusively to persuade those who articulate racism that they are ‘wrong’ and more on changing those particular economic and political relations. (Miles 1989: 82, emphasis added)

Writing books (‘trying to persuade’) is useless, unless it is combined with more overt political action (see again the Marx and Bhagavadgita reminders in the Introduction). The question then is whether the action needs to be done by the same people who do the persuading. I believe it is necessary.

NOTES

1. It is noteworthy, however, that the Draft Charter on Human and people’s rights in the Arab World demands an equitable distribution as a component of human rights: “The State shall guarantee an equitable distribution of the national income among its citizens” (Tomasevski 1996: 108).
2. Giddens relates this to the old distinction between ‘freedom from’ and ‘freedom to’, i.e., negative or positive rights in our terms, non-discrimination only or affirmative rights. Life politics necessitates both in the sense they have been discussed in this book.
3. This means liberation from inequality.
4. Giddens talks about diversity in a general way but does not discuss linguistic diversity specifically. I would like to go back to the two paradigms, ‘language death’ or ‘language murder’, and relate the two approaches to Giddens. ‘Language murder’ type theorising combines some of the sources of localised trust from the ‘pre-modern’ environment, with transcending the limitations of especially post-modernity (aesthetic-orientated post-modernity in Giddens’ terminology), into ‘radicalised modernity’.
This radicalised modernity again might offer a source of trust needed in two of Giddens' utopian scenarios, 'Utopian Realism' and even 'Post-scarcity System'. A success for these utopian scenarios presupposes linguistic and cultural diversity.

On the other hand, it seems that 'language death' type theorizing is not a source of any trust. In the worst case it can have a twofold negative influence. Under 'modernization', it can contribute to the threats in Giddens' 'environment of risk'. In the post-modernist game, this can at a group level lead to a certain apathy (which is an almost inevitable part of post-modernism). At an individual level it can become part of sceptical hedonism. At both levels it can lead to fragmented, dissolved, disempowered acceptance of the 'irreversibilities' which characterizes Giddens' 'post-modernity' (ibid., Table 2).

5. Both these are modifications of slogans on T-shirts. Some Californian teachers used to give T-shirts to their high-level bilingual students, with 'BLESSING WITH BILINGUAL BRAINS'. I have a T-shirt (given by Portuguese-American friends) with the text 'I DO NOT SUFFER FROM MONOLINGUAL STUPIDITY'.

6. Reported by Inge Schoeler, in Soldier, 18 March 1995, pp. 10–11, in an article called 'Mest Kosanen som facilitiser' ('The Qur'\an as the facilitator').

7. Mark Fettles pointed out that the concept of Zero Tolerance is not only a call to majority-dominant groups to show less tolerance towards overt and covert linguisticism (and other types of racism, sexism, xenism, chauvinism etc.). It is also a call for majority-dominant groups to show less tolerance for those among their own group who practice such misreactions (from an email letter from Mark Fettles, 16 May 1995). I fully agree.

8. See also articles in Schäffer & Wenden (eds) 1995.

9. This suggestion comes from Theo van Els, vice-chancellor of the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands. The European Union could reduce the number of working languages (now 11) to the Big Three, on the condition that nobody is allowed to use their first language.
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