

154. Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1996). Educational language choice - multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism? In Hellinger, Marlis and Ammon, Ulrich (Eds.) *Contrastive Sociolinguistics*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 175-204.

Educational language choice - multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism?¹

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

1. Introduction

There are essentially three inter-related types of language planning: **corpus planning** (to do with language form and structure), **status planning** (to do with the uses to which a language is put in various domains, and the prestige attached to the relevant languages) and **acquisition planning** (the arrangements made, generally by a Ministry of Education, for the learning of languages).

The important issues in **educational language planning** belong to both status planning and acquisition planning. The key choices which influence each other are the choice of official state languages, the choice (and status) of "national" languages, and the choice of which languages are to be used as the media of instruction and which (if any) (foreign) languages are to be obligatory or possible to study as subjects in schools.

Most Western European countries have traditionally had explicit plans for **foreign** languages to be learned in school, whereas the choice of the **medium/media of education** has often been more implicit or presented as more or less self-evident.

An explicit (educational) language policy presupposes language planning which is sensitive to a range of pressures: social, political, economic, technical, ideological, etc.. These can be seen as being generated **internally**, within a state, and **externally**, stemming from outside sources (neighbours, the region, the world). It might have been possible earlier to relate the choice of medium of education to internal pressures, and the choice of foreign languages to external pressures (trade, military interests, international cooperation, etc).

Today the borders between internal vs. external pressures, and foreign language learning vs. medium of education are increasingly blurred. On the one hand, the choice of foreign languages to be learned by majority children might in positive situations increasingly be influenced by internal factors, e.g. which immigrant minorities are present in large numbers in a country (immigrant minority mother tongues being offered as foreign languages to majority children in secondary education, as in new plans in Britain or Denmark). On the other hand, the choice of the medium of education might be influenced by (elite) concerns about "international" cooperation (e.g. immersion programmes or European or international schools being offered for majority children, with a foreign language (often English, French, so far not often German) as the medium of education for part of the time). The medium of education might also to some extent start to be influenced by trade concerns, if the former home countries of immigrated minorities appear to become possible trade partners on a larger scale - this could lead to a more tolerant view on using a minority mother tongue as the main medium of education, at least transitionally, for minority children themselves, or even for some majority children (two-way programmes through the medium of Spanish in the United States, which originally could be seen as emerging from internal pressures, might grow in this direction, with the NAFTA agreement).

It seems to me that Europe today faces choices in its educational language planning which may have repercussions also globally. In an "integrated Europe" it is imperative that many children become high level multilinguals. Many minority children are already multilingual, despite educational language policies which have often not been conducive to it. What is needed now is a policy which makes **both minority and majority** children high level multilinguals. Educational language choices are decisive if this is to succeed.

There are both positive and negative lessons to learn from elsewhere. As a contrast to Europe and Europeanised countries where official policies in most cases are negative towards linguistic diversity, there is in most other parts of the world a widespread (acceptance of) natural multilingualism. But this has, sadly, been constrained by many negative educational choices (see e.g. Brock-Utne 1993). The educational system, often modelled on inappropriate European ideas and paradigms, has often (through the (wrong) choice of a former colonial language as medium of education, especially in Africa) stifled and certainly not encouraged the natural multilingualism. On the other hand, some positive educational models leading to multilingualism or bilingualism have been developed (for instance in the United

States), despite official attitudes geared towards seeing monolingualism as "natural" and positive. The contrast here is thus that monolingually oriented countries are developing (some) educational models to support multilingualism, whereas multilingually oriented countries are practising educational models, eventually planned to lead to monolingualism.

What is needed, in my view, is a combination of the African/Asian positive **attitudes** towards multilingualism and diversity in general as a natural state of life (linguodiversity, cultural diversity, biodiversity etc), with some of the positive **educational models** developed in many parts of the world, often despite negative general attitudes towards diversity, models which are more in tune with the African/Asian attitudes but which are in many ways in contradiction with the official linguistic attitudes prevailing in several of the countries which have developed these educational models.

It seems to me that the educational language choices facing Europe and other countries can in a simplified way be placed onto a continuum where the positive end implies an acceptance of multilingual plurality and diversity in deed (not only in the phraseologies of planning documents and folkloristic celebrations), and where the negative extreme can be called monolingual reductionism or monolingual stupidity/naivety. In this article, I will first discuss the ideology of monolingual reductionism/naivety/stupidity, which I see as one of the most decisive factors in preventing the adoption of educational policies leading towards multilingualism, acceptance of linguistic diversity and linguistic human rights. Then I will contrast them with some educational models which seem to succeed in supporting children to become high level multilinguals, models which support diversity and honour linguistic human rights.

2. Monolingual reductionism - the ideology of the "homogenous nation-state"

2.1 The homogenous nation-state

The ideology of monolingual reductionism/naivety/stupidity seems to me to be connected with the idea of an imagined community (Anderson 1983): the mythical, homogenous nation-state (a state with one nation and one language) which does not exist anywhere in the world).

The traditional stereotypical image of a nation-state sees the nation-state as a product of an evolutionary process starting with small tribal societies and developing via many phases towards higher forms of social organization of peoples lives together, where the nation-states was supposed to represent the currently most developed form (e.g. Hobsbawm, 1991). A nation-state was comprised of one ethnic group, one "nation", and this imagined community was, especially in the German nationalist tradition, ideally seen as united by one single language. Other nations within this Nation would then either be seen as disruptive, as an anomaly, or, if they were very small in numbers and insignificant in terms of power - as most indigenous nations/peoples have until very recently been perceived to be - they could be seen as colourful, non-threatening remnants from an earlier phase. In order not to be seen as disruptive, they had to accept that they "have no independent future" (Hobsbawm 1991: 35), that they are "small and backward" and "have everything to gain by merging into greater nations", i.e. that they and their languages are "doomed to disappear" (all Hobsbawm 1991: 34), because of "the laws of progress", because they "could not be adapted to the modern age" (Hobsbawm 1991: 35).

All these are ethnicist and/or linguistic arguments, glorifying dominant languages and groups, stigmatizing dominated languages and groups, and rationalizing the relationship between them so that the domination is made to seem beneficial to the dominated (see Preiswerk 1980 for an elaboration of these concepts in relation to racism). I define racism, ethnicism and linguicism as "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of "race" (in biologically argued racism), ethnicity/culture (in ethnicism, ethnically and culturally argued racism), or language (in linguicism, linguistically argued racism)" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988).

Since the "natural" development would be for every "nation" to have its own nation-state with its own language, the existence of **unassimilated** minority groups, of several "nations" within The Nation was/is seen as leading in a "natural" way to fragmentation: a complete or partial disintegration of the nation-state, with the formation of several new nation-states or some kind of a federal structure as a result. Since a nation-state is "indivisible" (as for instance expressed in the constitutions of Turkeyⁱⁱ or France), this cannot be allowed. Very few nation-states can be expected to voluntarily work towards this type of disintegration.

There are many different ways of avoiding this imagined threat of disintegration. One is reducing the number of potential nations. This includes preventing groups from acquiring or maintaining their own languages as one of the central prerequisites needed for nation-building. "Old" minorities who already exist on the territory of the nation-state, can be "starved" to assimilation, at the same time as

assimilationist educational and other policies attempt to prevent the creation of new "national" minorities (from immigrated, settler or refugee minorities).

2.2 Linguistic genocide

The most dramatic way of reducing the number of (potential) nations is physical genocide. The prevention and punishment of **physical genocide** is regulated by a UN Convention but physical genocide is nevertheless attempted in relation to some groups.

Another way of reducing the number of possible nation-states is to commit **linguistic genocide**, which would be (actively) **killing a language without killing the speakers** (as in physical genocide) or (through passivity) **letting a language die** (see Juan Cobarrubias taxonomy (1983) where he discusses the following policies which a state can adopt towards minority languages: 1. attempting to kill a language; 2. letting a language die; 3. unsupported coexistence; 4. partial support of specific language functions; 5. adoption as an official language. Unsupported coexistence mostly also leads to minority languages dying).

When the United Nations did preparatory work for what later became the "International convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide" (E 793, 1948), **linguistic and cultural genocide** were discussed alongside physical genocide, and were seen as serious crimes against humanity (see Capotorti 1979). When the Convention was accepted, Article 3, which covered linguistic and cultural genocide was vetoed by some nation states (the "great powers"), and it is thus *not included* in the final Convention of 1948. What remains, however, is **a definition of linguistic genocide**, which most states then in the UN were prepared to accept. Linguistic genocide is defined (in Art. 3, 1) as

"Prohibiting the use of the language of the group in daily intercourse or in schools, or the printing and circulation of publications in the language of the group".

The use of a minority language can be prohibited overtly and directly, through laws, imprisonment, torture, killings and threats, as in Turkey today vis-a-vis the Kurds (e.g. Human Rights in Kurdistan 1989; Helsinki Watch Update 1990; Besikci 1990; "Silence is killing them" 1994, Skutnabb-Kangas & Bucak 1994). The use of a minority language can also be prohibited covertly, more indirectly, via ideological and structural means, as in the educational systems of most European and North American countries.

My claim is that the use of a minority language is in fact prohibited "in daily intercourse or in schools" every time there are minority children in day care centres and schools, but no bilingual teachers who are authorized to use the languages of the minority children as the media of teaching and child care most of the time. This is the situation for most immigrant and refugee minority children in all Western European countries and in the US, Canada and Australia. Immigrant minority education in these countries is thus guilty of linguistic genocide, as defined by the UN. So is the education that most indigenous first nations have had and that many of them still have (see e.g. Hamel 1994; Jordan 1988).

Linguicism is a major factor in determining whether speakers of particular languages are allowed to enjoy their linguistic human rights. Lack of these rights, for instance the absence of these languages from school time-tables, makes minority languages invisible. Alternatively, minority mother tongues are seen as handicaps which are believed to prevent minority children from acquiring the valued resource (= the majority language), so minority children should get rid of them in their own interest. At the same time, many minorities, especially children, are in fact prevented from fully acquiring majority resources, especially the majority languages, by disabling educational structures, when their instruction is organised through the medium of the majority languages in ways which contradict most scientific evidence (see e.g. Corson 1992; Cummins 1984, 1989, 1992; Cummins & Danesi 1990; Cummins & Swain 1986; Genesee 1987; Hakuta 1986; Hernández-Chávez 1988, 1994; Padilla et al 1991; Padilla & Benavides 1992; Pattanayak 1981; Ramirez et al 1991; Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, 1988, 1990).

A covert way of making languages disappear at the same time as the state retains its legitimacy in the eyes of (most of) its citizens and the international community, seems thus to be for a state to observe (or to be seen as observing) several of the basic human rights for all its citizens, including minorities, but to deny minorities those human rights which are most central for reproducing a minority group as a distinctive group, namely linguistic and cultural human rights. This has been the preferred strategy of most Western states. It can be seen in their opposition to any binding, promotion-oriented linguistic rights, especially in education, in international and European covenants.ⁱⁱⁱ

It can also be seen in the fairly irrational and scientifically unsoundly based opposition to any type of maintenance education for minorities, especially migrant minorities, in Western states. The lack of linguistic and cultural rights has been "hoped" to lead to the assimilation of minorities and thus to a

reduction of possible nation-builders. The opposite strategy, granting (some) linguistic and cultural human rights to minorities but denying them (many) economic and political rights seems to have been used in many ex-communist or socialist countries, or, for instance, to some extent in South Africa and earlier in Namibia (see e.g. Rannut 1994, Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas & Africa 1985). This has been thought to lead to a voluntary merging of languages and cultures, with first the elites from the minority groups and later others, assimilating into the larger community in order to get access to more political power and material resources. Here also a reduction of possible nation-builders has been attempted.

The difference between the way that such countries as Turkey and for instance Sweden, the US or Canada commit linguistic genocide lies in that it is done more openly and brutally in Turkey (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Bucak 1994) whereas it is more covert and sophisticated in Sweden, the US and Canada (Skutnabb-Kangas 1991; see also Schierup 1992 and Ålund 1992 for critical accounts of Swedish multicultural policy). Covert linguicide (e.g. of the type that most Western states use in their educational systems) appears to be extremely effective, as compared with the overt version (as in Turkey). Within 2--4 generations, there are fewer speakers of most minority languages in these countries than in more openly linguistic countries. Kurds still speak Kurdish and resist linguistic oppression, whereas many former Spanish-speakers in the USA and Finnish- and Sámi-speakers in Sweden have assimilated. It is often more difficult to struggle against covert violence, against the colonization of the mind, where short-term "benefits" may obscure longer-term losses.

Monolingual reductionism/stupidity could then be characterized as an ideology which has been/is being used to rationalize the linguistic genocide (in education) committed by states which "see" the existence of (unassimilated) linguistic minorities as a threat leading to the disintegration of nation-states.

2.3 Monolingualism: normal, desirable and unavoidable?

Monolingual stupidity seems to me to be characterized by three myths. These claim or imply that monolingualism at both the **individual** level and the **societal** level is **normal, desirable and unavoidable**. I will present these myths and criticize ("dissect") them.

2.3.1. Myth 1: **Monolingualism is normal**

2.3.1.1. *The myth*

What dominant groups see as ideal for themselves has to be rationalized so that it seems ideal to everybody. This is often done by presenting it as "normal". According to the myth, the homogenous nation-state is "normal". It is an ideal formation, (one of) the most highly developed way(s) of social organisation of peoples' lives. Since the homogenous nation-state only has one nation, it is also "normally" (ideally) monolingual because there is only one ethnic group. This means that only one official language is accepted at a **societal** level. The myth also implies that most states and people are essentially monolingual (disregarding foreign languages learned at school).

At an **individual** level the myth means that a monolingual individual is seen as the norm. Of course she may learn foreign languages at school or when she visits other countries, but not in the family or the neighbourhood.

2.3.1.2. *Critique*

In fact monolingualism is **abnormal**, if we by "normal" mean the way most countries and people are. There are maybe up to 7,000 languages in the world (depending on how languages are defined), but fewer than 230 states (both "language" and "state" are difficult to define and the exact numbers are unclear - for languages, see Skutnabb-Kangas 1984: 59--65). There are extremely few countries in the world without national minorities, and every **state** in the world has speakers of more than one language. Here is one possible scenario: Even if there were an accelerated division of present states into many more states, e.g. if the number of present states were to double, and if an accelerated linguistic genocide were to occur (if, for instance, 10 additional languages were to die every year), we would need to wait until at least the year 2600 before it could be "normal" for states to be **factually monolingual** (i.e. to be "real" nation-states, with one ethnic group and one language only in each state).

It is not the granting of linguistic and educational rights to minorities that leads to the disintegration of nation-states, quite the opposite. It is more likely that the deprivation of people's human rights, including linguistic human rights (LHRs) is what leads to conflict. If the rights of minorities are respected, there is less likelihood of conflict. Linguistic diversity is in no way **causally** related to conflict, though of course

language is a major mobilising factor in contexts where an ethnic group feels itself threatened, and/or where ethnic and linguistic borders coincide with other borders along which access to power and resources is (unequally) distributed.

Despite the wealth of languages, more than half of the world's states are **officially monolingual**. English is (one of) the official language(s) in almost 60 of these states. The number of languages used as media in primary education is probably much less than 500. Speakers of more than 6,500 languages thus have to become minimally bilingual, at least to some degree, in order to have any formal education, to read, to receive any public services, to participate in the political life in their country, etc. Even if some of the remaining official or semi-official languages have many speakers (like Chinese, English, Arabic, Russian, Hindi, Spanish, Japanese, etc), there are still more multilingual than monolingual **individuals** in the world.

Thus claiming that monolingualism is normal is absurd, both at state level and at individual level.

2.3.2. Myth 2: **Monolingualism is desirable**

2.3.2.1. *The myth*

It is often claimed that monolingualism is efficient and economical and connected with and leading to rich and powerful **societies**. **Individuals** who are monolingual, can use more time than multilinguals for learning the one language really thoroughly and for learning other things. Besides, it has been claimed that bi- or multilingualism is harmful to a child: it confuses, takes time, prevents the child from learning any language properly.

2.3.2.2. *Critique*

At a **societal** level monolingualism is inefficient and uneconomic. It represents dangerous reductionism (see e.g. Pattanayak 1981, 1988). There is no **causal** connection between multilingualism and poverty, as e.g. Joshua Fishman (1989 and Fishman & Solano 1989) has shown. A monolingual state oppresses the linguistic human rights of the minorities and can often commit linguistic genocide. It prevents political participation of many of its citizens and an integration of the society. It often ruins trust and cooperation between different ethnic groups, it often breeds arrogance, ethnocentrism, racism, ethnicism and linguisticism in the majority group and bitterness, hatred and colonised consciousness in minority groups. It increases waste of talent, knowledge and experience, and prevents "free movement of goods, services, people and capital" (the goals of the European Community) (for these claims, see Skutnabb-Kangas, in press).

A monolingual **individual** may experience drawbacks, compared to a high level bi- or multilingual (i.e. someone who knows two or more languages well). **High level bilinguals** as a group have done **better than** (comparable) **monolinguals** on the following types of test:

- several types of subtest of general intelligence
- cognitive flexibility
- divergent thinking
- creativity
- sensitivity to feedback cues
- sensitivity to and interpretation of non-verbal messages
- metalinguistic awareness
- learning of further languages (faster and often better)

(for evidence, discussion, and relativizations, see e.g. Bialystok (ed.) 1991; Bossers 1991; Cummins 1984, 1991; Cummins & Swain 1986; Genesee 1987; Hakuta 1986; Padilla et al 1991; Ricciardelli 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas 1984; Swain et al 1990, and literature in them).

Thus monolingualism is not desirable for societies or individuals.

2.3.3. Myth 3: **Monolingualism is unavoidable**

2.3.3.1. *The myth*

According to the myth, bilingualism is at an **individual** level seen as a (negative) temporary phase on the way from monolingualism in one language to monolingualism in another language. According to this view, the first generation Latvian in Manitoba, Canberra or Siberia knows her mother tongue, and learns a little English (or Russian). Her children know Latvian as children, but the language of the new environment, English (Russian), becomes her main language as an adult. The third generation Latvian in Manitoba, Canberra or Siberia maybe knows some words of the grandparents' language, but is fairly monolingual for all practical purposes, and in the fourth generation nothing is left of the Latvian language (even if the national costume may still be in the cupboard). This is seen as an unavoidable (and positive) development.

At a **societal** level, it is believed that modernisation and development necessarily lead to the disappearance of many of the "lesser used languages" - having several languages is seen as uneconomical. Linguistic assimilation of groups is mostly seen as voluntary, and good for the individual and necessary for the group, if they want to participate in the economic and political life of the new environment/country. Maintaining the old language is a nice romantic dream. You must choose.

2.3.3.2. *Critique*

In fact many minorities have kept or tried to keep their old language while learning the new one. Latvians in Manitoba, Canberra and Siberia have certainly tried. There is **no need for "either-or" solutions** (*either* you "cling to" your old language, and it means you don't learn the new one, *or* you learn the new and it inevitably means losing the old). **"Both-and" is better for the individual and for society**. Both are enriched by bilingualism, intellectually, psychologically, culturally, socially, economically, politically. It is perfectly possible to become a high-level bilingual or multilingual if the educational language policy is geared towards it, as is shown in the last section of this paper.

2.4. Synthesis: monolingualism should be eradicated

At an **individual** level monolingualism is a result of a wrong educational policy and of linguisticism. The patients, i.e. those individuals who suffer from monolingual stupidity, are in need of care.

At a **societal** level monolingualism is a social construction which is unmodern, underdeveloped and primitive. It might have been seen as a necessary concomitant to the development of the first phases of a Western-type nation-state (and even that is doubtful), but now it is definitely outmoded and dangerously reductionist. It prevents political and economic global development, justice, equity, cooperation and democracy. Like cholera or leprosy, monolingualism is an illness which should be eradicated as soon as possible. It is dangerous for peace in the world.

3. How to make all children multilingual

If monolingualism is negative for the patients/victims and for the society as a whole, how can educational language planning help in getting rid of it? How should education be organised, so as to make **everybody** bilingual or multilingual at a high level? I will mention a few recent experiments which have shown relative success in this, and, on the basis of both them and additional experiments, draw tentative conclusions about principles which seem important to follow if high level multilingualism is the educational goal.

3.1. "Traditional programmes"

A common development often preceding the experiments is as follows:

The educational starting point in a monolingually oriented country is usually **monolingual instruction through the majority language to both majorities** (who stay monolingual) **and minorities** (who at a group level do not become **high level** bilinguals).

In the next phase where big societal changes have occurred, **majorities** are still taught **through the medium of their own languages**, with teaching of foreign languages as subjects (and they stay fairly monolingual).

3.2. Maintenance programmes for minorities

(Some) **(national) minorities** have succeeded in getting **maintenance or language shelter programmes**,

where they are taught through the medium of their own languages, at least during the first six years, often longer, with good teaching of the majority language as a second language, given by bilingual teachers. As we know from national minorities in several countries (Welsh in Britain, Swedish-speakers in Finland, Frisian-speakers in the Netherlands, Danish-speakers in Germany, etc), they often become high level bilinguals. This presupposes extensive contact with the majority and positive attitudes towards them and bilingualism. As Joshua Fishman (1993: 2) notes, though, "few immigrant cultures anywhere have been able to develop the diglossic arrangements that would permit participation in mainstream econopolitical processes, on the one hand, and the fostering of their own language and culture maintenance, on the other hand." It has been more difficult for immigrant minority groups to succeed in getting proper non-transitional maintenance programmes, even when research shows that these tend to achieve higher levels of proficiency in the majority language too than submersion or early exit programmes (see Ramirez et al. 1991). In my own study (1987), Finnish immigrant minority youngsters in Sweden with working class parents did, after 9 years in Finnish-medium classes, almost as well as Finnish children in Finland in a Finnish language test and slightly better in a Swedish language test than Swedish mostly middle class children in parallel classes in the same schools. In addition, their school achievement was slightly better than that of the Swedish children.

3.3. Immersion programmes for majorities

But if we are interested in how **majority** children become bilingual, we have to go further. The only type of educational programme where this has been achieved on a broad basis, is the Canadian immersion programmes (see e.g. Genesee 1985, 1987; Lambert & Tucker 1972; Swain & Lapkin 1982; see also Rannut 1992 for an Estonian-language presentation of them, Duff 1991 for a Hungarian experiment, and Baetens Beardsmore & Swain 1985 for an early comparison between immersion and European School models).

An **immersion programme** is a programme where majority language children with a high status mother tongue voluntarily choose to be instructed in a minority language, in classes with majority children only, and with a bilingual teacher who understands what the children say in their mother tongue, but speaks L2 only. There are more than 400,000 children in Canada who have gone through immersion programmes or are in them now - they are the best studied language learning programmes on a large scale in the world.

Results from early immersion programmes, the most common model, show that the children's **mother tongue competence** initially is not on a par with English-speaking children in English-medium programmes, but as soon as they start getting instruction in English (from 3rd grade), they catch up, and are at the latest in grade 5 at the national norm level in English or higher. Their **school achievement** is often higher than the mean in Canada. The **competence in French** comes up to a native or near-native level in listening and reading comprehension. In productive French skills, speaking and especially writing, the children make more mistakes, are not as fluent as native speakers and generally lag behind. Despite this, their productive French is at a much higher level than anything reached by good foreign language teaching. They are especially good in situations where they can themselves choose the topic and the level of formality of the discourse. **The attitudes** towards French language and culture and towards francophones in Canada are positive, but maybe not quite as positive as many people might hope or expect.

The majority of immersion programmes are still in French, but there are programmes in other languages too, especially in Ukrainian and Spanish but also some in Hebrew, German, Chinese and Arabic. Some trilingual programmes also exist (see Genesee 1985, 1987 and Taylor 1993). Immersion programmes have spread from Canada to the United States and, increasingly, also to other countries (Australia, Catalunya, the Basque country, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Germany, and some additional countries (e.g. Switzerland, Estonia) are investigating the possibilities of starting up.

Some of the "gaps" in immersion programmes have to do with children having little (informal or formal) contact with other children (or indeed adults) speaking the target language as their native language. Immersion programmes have mostly been located in English-speaking schools, without any French-speakers. Some of the difficulties in producing fully "correct" French may also be due to the facts that French has not been taught as a subject, it has only functioned as the medium of education, and that English language arts have only started in grade 3 (Cummins 1995 suggests an earlier start). Both these factors, in addition to a belief in the importance of cross-lingual and cross-cultural contacts for attitude formation, have influenced the development of the European school model and partly also the two-way programmes in the United States.

3.4. "European Schools"

The presentation of the European schools here is mainly based on Hugo Baetens Beardsmore's and his colleagues' writings (see bibliography). In the European Schools an attempt is made to combine good sides from maintenance programmes for minorities and immersion programmes for majorities, and to avoid the few weaknesses which these models may have.

The first European School, K-12 (Kindergarten through grade 12), was founded in Brussels in 1958 for children of European Community officials. There are presently 9 European Schools in 6 countries and the tenth will start in the autumn of 1993. There are 12-13,000 pupils. Everybody who works for the European Community can have their children in these schools: cleaners, ministers, janitors, secretaries, interpreters. If there is space, local children can attend: one of the schools has many children of former miners, another one has immigrant steel-workers' children. European Community officials' children have no fees whereas local children pay a nominal fee.

The goal is to "guarantee the development of the child's first language and cultural identity" and to "promote a European identity through instruction for all pupils in at least 2 languages, compulsory learning of a 3rd as a subject matter, and options regarding a 4th language" (Baetens Beardsmore 1993: 28), to "eliminate prejudice and nationalistic antagonisms", and "use multilingualism as a tool for both scholastic achievement and harmonious ethnolinguistic relations" (Baetens Beardsmore 1993: 28)

All or most official languages of the European Community (EC) function as the principal medium of education initially in their own subsections in every school. Normally a child attends a subsection for her own mother tongue, i.e. Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Portuguese or Spanish. There are some children from other language groups, and these attend the subsection the language of which they know best. Most Arabic-speakers are for instance in the French language subsection.

The **medium of education** is initially the child's mother tongue (= the language of the subsection), and **all** cognitively and linguistically demanding decontextualised subjects continue to be taught through the medium of the mother tongue (first language, L1) at least up to grade 8.

All lessons/periods last for 30 minutes in grades 1-2 and 45 minutes from grade 3 upwards. The **mother tongue** is taught as a subject 16 periods per week (hereafter 16p) in the first two grades, 9p in grades 3-5, 5p in grades 6-7 and 4p in grades 8-12. The **second language** (L2) also starts as a subject in grade 1 and has 5p in grades 1-7, 4p in grade 8 and 3p in grades 9-12. The pupils can choose between English, French or German as their L2 (meaning the children in these three subsections only have a choice between two languages whereas all the other children have three choices). All the teachers are native speakers of the languages which they teach, but the absolute majority of teachers are bi- or multilingual - this also applies to the other staff in the schools: the adults must be good models of multilingualism. Every child thus has adults in the school who speak their language.

From grade 3 a couple of **subjects are taught in mixed groups** and they may be taught **through the medium of L2**. The subjects chosen are always cognitively and linguistically less demanding and context-embedded, e.g. 1p physical education and 3p "European Hours" with excursions, planning of parties etc. "European Hours" could, for instance, be taught through French to 5 Italian, 3 Danish, 6 Greek, 7 German and 5 Portuguese children, and through German to 6 English, 5 French, 4 Spanish, 2 Greek and 3 German children. The medium of education is mostly an L2 for all the children, but there may also be some children present for whom the language is an L1.

From grade 6 the amount taught through L2 increases, so that e.g. music (2p), arts (2p), physical education (3p) and complementary activities (2p - handicrafts, computers, photography, electronics, typing, painting, etc) are taught in mixed groups. But **until grade 8 all subjects taught in mixed groups through the medium of L2 are cognitively and linguistically less demanding and context-embedded**.

In grade 8 a **3rd language** (L3) starts as a subject, with 4p. (in grades 9-12 3p), and the pupils can choose between every subsection's language: all are offered. If, for instance, a Greek and a Danish child have become friends, having been taught physical education together through French since grade 3, they can choose to study each other's languages from grade 8.

In **grade 8 L2 becomes the medium of instruction also in one or two cognitively demanding decontextualised subjects** (e.g. history, 3p), **often in mixed groups but without mother tongue speakers** of the medium of instruction. The teachers use multilingual dictionaries or word lists and ensure understanding in several ways. The subject matter has often been discussed earlier through the medium of the respective mother tongues of the pupils so the concepts are familiar.

In **grades 9-10**, physical education, history and geography are taught through L2, the other compulsory subjects (there are not many) through L1. Of the elective courses, only Latin and classical Greek are taught through L1, everything else through L2. The 4th language (L4) starts as an elective subject in grade 9, with 4p (in grades 11-12 3p).

In **grades 11-12**, only L1 and L2 are compulsory while L3 and L4 are optional. Philosophy and

mathematics are taught through L1, all other compulsory subjects through L2 (or L3). Of the elective subjects, Latin, classical Greek, physics, chemistry, biology and advanced courses (including one in L1 as a subject) are taught through L1, everything else through L2 (or L3 or even L4). In grades 9-12, those elective courses which are not prescribed as courses to be taught through the medium of L1, are taught in mixed groups, and the language of instruction can thus be a pupil's L2 or L3 or L4, or, as it may sometimes be, L1.

The **results** seem to show that the children learn at least **two languages at a native level, both receptively and productively, both orally and in writing**. They are supposed to be able to take content matter tests in both L1 and L2 at a native level, and many take some subjects through L2 in the European Baccalaureate. Some even do it in their L3. Many of the children reach high levels in L3, and some even in L4. The results in the final exams are above medium, with, for instance, 95,5% of the 1,002 candidates passing the European Baccalaureate in 1992 (see Baetens Beardsmore 1995, table 8).

When immersion pupils reach a near-native level in L2-reception, European School pupils seem to reach a native level in L2-reception AND production, in addition to, for many, high levels in a 3rd and sometimes also a 4th language. Research on attitudes also shows preliminary positive results.

4. Necessary principles

It is, of course, possible to make many different kinds of cautionary generalisation on the basis of experiments. I will not discuss other experimental models here, but my conclusions about general principles are drawn on the basis of several others, not presented here: **two-way programmes** (see e.g. Dolson & Lindholm 1995; Lindholm 1992), **alternate-days programmes** (e.g. Curtis 1988), **early reading** (e.g. Doman 1975; Past 1976; Söderberg 1971), **Kōhanga Reo** (see Benton 1979, 1981; Kāretu 1994; Nicholson & Garland 1992; Report of the Review of Te Kōhanga Reo 1988) and, to some extent, **International Schools** (e.g. Carder 1995).

It seems to me that the principles which have to a large extent been followed in most of those experiments which have reached the best results (i.e. high levels of bi- or multilingualism, a fair chance of success in relation to school achievement, and positive intercultural attitudes), could be formulated as 8 recommendations:

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level. This is for all minority children their own mother tongue.^{iv} Majority children can be taught through the medium of a minority language. (Here the European Schools are an exception, because they teach also majority children initially through the medium of their mother tongues (e.g. Italian for Italian-speaking children in Italy).

2. In most experiments, the children are initially grouped together with children with the same L1. Mixed groups are not positive initially, and certainly not in cognitively demanding decontextualised subjects. (Exception: two-way programmes (50% minority, 50% majority children, all taught through the medium of the minority language initially, later through both), but this may be a relevant factor in accounting for the Spanish-speaking children's sometimes relatively less impressive gains in both languages, compared to English-speaking children in the same programmes. The mere presence of majority language children in the same classroom may be to overwhelming for minority children, despite the minority language being the medium of education).

3. All children are to become high level bilinguals, not only minority children. This seems to be especially important in contexts where majority and minority children are mixed.

4. All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction and the status of their mother tongues. Nice phrases about the worth of everybody's mother tongue, the value of interculturalism, etc, do not help, unless they are followed up in how the schools are organised. Equality has to show in the demands made on the children's and the teachers' competencies in the different languages involved, so that everybody has the same demands (both minority and majority children and teachers must be or become bi- or multilingual). Equality has to show in the place the languages are accorded on the schedules and in further education, in testing and evaluation, in characters given for the languages, in the physical environment (signs, forms, letters, the school's languages of administration, the languages of meetings, assemblies, etc), in the status and salaries of the teachers, in their working conditions, career patterns, etc.

It is possible to equalize the children vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction in several different ways:

A. **All children know the language of instruction** (maintenance programmes, European Schools initially);

B. **No children know the language of instruction** or everybody is in the process of learning it

(immersion programmes, European Schools in certain subjects in a later phase);

C. **All children alternate between "knowing" and "not knowing" the language of instruction** (two-way programmes in a later phase; alternate-days-programmes (50% minority and 50% majority children, the medium of education alternates daily).

5. **All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual.** Thus they can be good models for the children, and support them (through comparing and contrasting and being metalinguistically aware) in language learning. Every child in a school has to be able to talk to an adult with the same native language.

This demand is often experienced as extremely threatening by majority group teachers, many of whom are not bilingual. Of course all minority group teachers are not high level bilinguals either. But it is often **less** important that the teacher's competence in a majority language is at top level, for instance in relation to pronunciation, because all children have ample opportunities to hear and read native models of a majority language outside the school, whereas many of them do NOT have the same opportunities to hear/read native minority language models. High levels of competence in a minority language is thus more important for a teacher than high levels of competence in a majority language.

6. **Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children's mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children's mother tongue.** No teaching in foreign languages as subjects should be given through the medium of **other** foreign languages (for instance, Turkish children in Germany should not be taught English through the medium of German, but in Turkish).

7. **All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through 1-12.** Both languages have to be studied in ways which reflect what they are for the children: mother tongues, or second or foreign languages. Many minority children are forced to study a majority language, their L2, as if it was their L1.

8. **Both languages have to be used as media of education in some phase of the children's education, but the progression seems to be different for minority and majority children.**

For MAJORITY CHILDREN the **mother tongue** must function as the medium of education at least in some cognitively demanding, decontextualized subjects, at least in grades 8-12, possibly even earlier.

MAJORITY CHILDREN can be taught **through the medium of L2** at least in some (or even all or almost all) cognitively **less** demanding context-embedded subjects from the very beginning, and L2 can also be the medium of education, at least partially, in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects, at least in grades 8-12.

For MINORITY CHILDREN the **mother tongue** must function as the medium of education in all subjects initially. At least some subjects must be taught through L1 all the way, up to grade 12, but these subjects may vary. It seems that the following development functions well:

- transfer from the known to the unknown
- transfer from teaching in a language to teaching through the medium of that language
- transfer from teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively less demanding, context-embedded subjects, to teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects. The progression in the European Schools for minority children seems close to ideal:

The progression IN RELATION TO THE MOTHER TONGUE is as follows:

1. **All subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 2 years.
2. **All important cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 7 years.
3. There is **less** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 8-10, and again **more** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 11-12, especially in the most demanding subjects, in order to ensure that the students have understood them thoroughly.
4. **The mother tongue** is taught **as a subject throughout the schooling**, from 1-12.

The progression IN RELATION TO THE SECOND LANGUAGE is as follows:

1. **The second language** is taught as a **subject throughout the schooling**, from 1-12.
2. **The second language** becomes **medium of education** already in grade 3, but only in **cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects**. The teaching can be given in mixed groups, but ideally together with other children for whom the language is also an L2.
3. Teaching in **cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects** only starts **through the medium of L2** when the children have been taught that language **as a subject for 7 years** (grades 1-7) and have been taught **through the medium of that language in cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects for 5 years** (grades 3-7). Children should not be taught demanding decontextualized subjects through L2 with other children for whom the language of instruction is their L1, before grade 8. In European Schools this is mostly not done even in grades 9-12 in compulsory subjects, only in elective courses.

5. Conclusion

One of the basic human rights of persons belonging to minorities is - or should be - to achieve high levels of bi- or multilingualism through education. Becoming at least bilingual is in most cases a necessary prerequisite for minorities to exercise other fundamental human rights.

Observing linguistic human rights (LHRs) implies at an **individual** level that everyone can identify positively with their mother tongue, and have that identification accepted and respected by others, irrespective of whether their mother tongue is a minority language or a majority language. It means the right to learn the mother tongue, orally and in writing, including at least basic education through the medium of the mother tongue, and the right to use it in many (official) contexts. It means the right to learn at least one of the official languages in one's country of residence. It should therefore be normal that teachers are bilingual. Restrictions on these rights may be considered linguistic wrongs, an infringement of fundamental LHRs.

Observing LHRs implies at a **collective** level the right of minority groups to exist (i.e. the right to be "different" - see Alfredsson 1991; Hettne 1987, 1990; Miles 1989; Stavenhagen 1990). It implies the right to enjoy and develop their languages and the right for minorities to establish and maintain schools and other training and educational institutions, with control of curricula and teaching in their own languages. It also involves guarantees of representation in the political affairs of the state, and the granting of autonomy to administer matters internal to the groups, at least in the fields of culture, education, religion, information, and social affairs, with the financial means, through taxation or grants, to fulfil these functions (see UN Human Rights Fact Sheet 18, Minority Rights; Alfredsson 1991; Leontiev 1994). Restrictions on these rights may also be considered linguistic wrongs, an infringement of fundamental LHRs. It would be perfectly feasible to grant many of these rights to minorities, without infringing on the rights of majorities (see e.g. Grin, 1994 and Fishman, 1991, 1994, for a discussion).

If all education were to follow the principles sketched above, educational linguistic human rights would be met and educational linguistic wrongs could be avoided in relation to minorities (many majorities have most LHRs anyway). In addition, high levels of multilingualism would be likely follow for both minorities and majorities, together with many of the advantages that this is likely to lead to. But today only a minute fraction of the world's children have the opportunity of enjoying an education according to these principles.

The education of both majorities and minorities in most European countries functions against most scientifically sound principles about how an education leading to high levels of multilingualism should be organised. Education participates in attempting and committing linguistic genocide in relation to minorities. Regrettably, there is little in international and regional human rights instruments to prevent this in practise (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994, for an analysis of them). In relation to linguistic majorities, education today in most cases deprives them of the possibility of gaining the benefits associated with high levels of multilingualism. Present reductionist educational language choices do not support the diversity which is necessary for the planet to have a future.

Bibliography:

Alfredsson, Gudmundur

1991 *Minority Rights: Equality and Non-Discrimination*, in: Krag, Helen & Yuhneva, Natalia (eds.) 1991 The Leningrad Minority Rights Conference. Papers, Copenhagen: The Minority Rights Group in Denmark, 19-41.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo

1990 "The Multilingual School for Mixed Populations: A Case Study", in: Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo 1990b Bilingualism in Education: Theory and Practice. Brussel/Bruxelles: Linguistic Circle of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and the Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1-51.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo

1995 "The European School Experience in Multilingual Education", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.) Multilingualism for All. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 21-68.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo & Swain, Merrill

1985 "Designing Bilingual Education: aspects of Immersion and 'European School Models'", Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 6:1, 1-15.

Benton, Richard A.

1979 The legal status of the Māori language: current reality and future prospects. Wellington: Maori Unit, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Benton, Richard A.

- 1981 The flight of the Amokura: Oceanic languages and formal education in the Pacific. Wellington: Maori Unit, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bialystok, Ellen
1991 "Metalinguistic dimensions of bilingual language proficiency", in: Bialystok, Ellen (ed.) 1991 Language Processing in Bilingual Children. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Besiki, Ismail
1990 A Nation Deprived of Identity: The Kurds, Report to Minority Rights Conference, in: Minority Rights, Policies and Practice in South-East Europe.
- Bossers, Bart
1991 "On thresholds, ceilings and short-circuits: the relation between L1 reading, L2 reading and L2 knowledge", in: Hulstijn & Matter (eds.), 45-60.
- Brock-Utne, Birgit
1993 "Language of instruction in African schools. A socio-cultural perspective", Nordisk Pedagogik, 13, 225-246.
- Capotorti, Francesco
1979 Study of the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. New York: United Nations.
- Carder, Maurice
1995 "Language(s) in International Education: a review of language issues in international schools, with reference to the International baccalaureate", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.) Multilingualism for All. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 113-158.
- Cobarrubias, Juan
1983 "Ethical issues in status planning", in: Cobarrubias, Juan & Joshua A. Fishman (eds.) 1983 Progress in language planning: international perspectives. Berlin: Mouton, 41-85.
- Corson, David
1992 "Bilingual education policy and social justice", Journal of Education Policy 7:1, 1992, 45-69.
- Cummins, Jim
1984 Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, Jim
1989 Empowering Minority Students. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, Jim
1991 "Conversational and academic language proficiency in bilingual contexts", in: Hulstijn & Matter (eds.), 75-89.
- Cummins, Jim
1992 "Knowledge, Power and Identity in Teaching English as a Second Language", in: Genesee (ed.) 1992.
- Cummins, Jim
1995 "Reflections on the European Schools model in relation to French immersion programs in Canada", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.) Multilingualism for All. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 159-168.
- Cummins, Jim & Danesi, Marcel
1990 Heritage Languages. The Development and Denial of Canada's Linguistic Resources. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Cummins, Jim & Swain, Merrill
1986 Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of theory, research and practice. London and New York: Longman.
- Curtis, Jan
1988 "Parents, schools and racism: Bilingual education in a Northern California town", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Cummins, Jim (eds.) 1988 Minority Education - from Shame to Struggle. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 278-298.
- Dolson, David & Lindholm, Kathryn
1995 "World Class Education for Children in California: A Comparison of the Bilingual/Immersion and European School Model", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (ed.) Multilingualism for All. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 69-102.
- Doman, Glenn
1975 Teach Your Baby to Read. London: Pan Books.
- Duff, Patricia A.
1991 "Innovations in Foreign Language Education: an Evaluation of Three Hungarian-English Dual-Language Schools", Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 12:6, 459-476.
- Fishman, Joshua A.

- 1989 Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
- 1991 Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
- 1993 "In praise of my language", Working papers in educational linguistics 9:2/Fall 1993 (University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education), 1-12.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
- 1994 "On the limits of ethnolinguistic democracy", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 49-61.
- Fishman, Joshua A. & Solano, R.
- 1989 "Societal factors predictive of linguistic homogeneity/heterogeneity at the inter-polity level", Cultural Dynamics 1, 414-437.
- García, Ofelia (ed.)
- 1991 Bilingual Education. Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Genesee, Fred
- 1985 "Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs", Review of Educational Research 55:4, 541-561.
- Genesee, Fred
- 1987 Learning Through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education. Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Genesee, Fred (ed.)
- 1992 The teaching of ESL. New York: Newbury House.
- Grin, François
- 1994 "Combining immigrant and autochthonous language rights: a territorial approach to multilingualism", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 31-48.
- Hakuta, Kenji
- 1986 Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism. New York: Basic Books.
- Hamel, Rainer Enrique
- 1994 "Indigenous education in Latin America: policies and legal frameworks", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 271-287.
- Helsinki Watch
- 1990 Destroying ethnic identity. The Kurds of Turkey. An update, September 1990. New York & Washington, D.C..
- Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo
- 1988 "Language policy and language rights in the United States: Issues in bilingualism", in: Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (eds.) 45-56.
- Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo
- 1994 "Language policy in the United States", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 141-158.
- Hettne, Björn
- 1987 Etniska konflikter och internationella relationer. Rapport 6 från DEIFO. Stockholm: DEIFO (Delegationen för invandrarforskning).
- Hettne, Björn
- 1990 Development Theory and the Three Worlds. Harlow: Longman.
- Hobsbawm, E.J.
- 1990 Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hulstijn, Jan H. & Matter, Johan F. (eds.)
- 1991 Reading in two languages. AILA Review 8. Amsterdam: Free University Press.
- Human Rights in Kurdistan
- 1989 Documentation of the international conference on human rights in Kurdistan, 14-16 April 1989, Hochschule Bremen. Bremen: The Initiative for Human Rights in Kurdistan.

Jordan, Deidre

1988"Rights and claims of indigenous people. Education and the reclaiming of identity: the case of the Canadian natives, the Sami and Australian Aborigines", in: Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.), 189-222

Kāretu, Timoti S.

1994"The Māori Language in New Zealand", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 209-218.

Lambert, Wallace E. & Tucker, Richard G.

1972Bilingual Education of Children. The St.Lambert Experiment. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Leontiev, Alexei A.

1994"Linguistic human rights and educational policy in Russia", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 63--70.

Lindholm, Kathryn J.

1992a"Two-way bilingual/immersion education: theory, conceptual issues, and pedagogical implications", in: Padilla & Benavides 1992, 195-220.

Lindholm, Kathryn J.

1992bThe River Glen Elementary School Bilingual Immersion Program: Student Progress after Five Years of Implementation. Evaluation Report 1990--1991. California: River Glen Elementary School.

Miles, Robert

1989Racism. London & New York: Routledge.

Minority Rights, Policies and Practice in South-East Europe

1990Reports for the Conference at Christiansborg, Copenhagen, March 30th - April 1st 1990. Copenhagen: The Danish Helsinki Committee & The Minority Rights Group.

Nicholson, Rangi & Garland, Ron

1992"New Zealanders' Attitudes to the Revitalisation of the Maori Language", Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 12:5, 1991, 393-410.

Padilla, Amado M. & Lindholm, Kathryn J. & Chen, Andrew & Durán, Richard & Hakuta, Kenji & Lambert, Wallace & Tucker, G.Richard

1991"The English-Only Movement. Myths, Reality, and Implications for Psychology", Journal of the American Psychological Association 46:2, 1991, 120-130.

Padilla, Raymond V. & Benavides, Alfredo H.

1992Critical Perspectives on Bilingual Education Research. Tempe, Arizona: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe.

Past, Al

1976Preschool Reading in Two Languages as a Factor in Bilingualism, PhD Thesis. University of Texas at Austin.

Pattanayak, Debi Prasanna

1981Multilingualism and Mother Tongue Education. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Pattanayak, Debi Prasanna

1988"Monolingual myopia and the petals of the Indian lotus: Do many languages divide or unite a nation", in: Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.) 1988, 370-389.

Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Africa, Hugh

1985"Namibian educational language planning: English for liberation or neocolonialism?" in: Mateene, Kahombo & Kalema, John & Chomba, Bernard (eds.) 1985 Linguistic liberation and unity of Africa. Kampala: OAU Inter-African Bureau of Languages, OAU/BIL Publication 6, 42-59 (also in: Spolsky, Bernard (ed.) 1986 Language and education in multilingual settings. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 77-95).

Phillipson, Robert

1992Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert & Kellerman, Eric & Selinker, Larry & Sharwood Smith, Mike & Swain, Merrill (eds.)

1991Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research. A Commemorative Volume for Claus Færch. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Plichtová, Jana (ed.)

1992Minorities in Politics - Cultural and Languages Rights. The Bratislava Symposium II/1991. Bratislava: Czechoslovak Committee of the European Cultural Foundation

Preiswerk, Roy (ed.)

1980The slant of the pen: racism in children's books. Geneva: World Council of Churches.

Ramirez, J.D. & Yuen, S.D. & Ramey, D.R.

1991 Executive Summary: Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children. Submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. San Mateo: Aguirre International.

Rannut, Mart

1994 "Beyond linguistic policy: the Soviet Union versus Estonia", in: Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut), Linguistic Human rights. Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 179-208.

Rannut, Ülle

1992 Keelekümblus. Tallinn: Keeleameti toimetised nr 3.

Report of the Review of te Kõhanga Reo, Language Is The Life Force Of The People.

1988 Wellington: Government Review Team.

Ricciardelli, L.

1989 Childhood Bilingualism: Metalinguistic awareness and creativity. University of Adelaide.

Schierup, Carl-Ulrik

1992 "Konstruktion und Krise des schwedischen Multikulturalismus", in: Kalpaka, Annita & Rätznel, Nora (red) 1992 Rassismus und Migration in Europa. Hamburg: Argument-Verlag, 163-173.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1984 Bilingualism or Not - The Education of Minorities. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1987 Are the Finns in Sweden an Ethnic Minority? Finnish Parents Talk about Finland and Sweden.

Working Paper 1, Research Project The Education of The Finnish Minority in Sweden. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetscenter.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1988 "Multilingualism and the education of minority children", in: Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.) 1988, 9-44.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1990 Language, literacy and minorities. London: The Minority Rights Group.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove

1991 "Swedish Strategies to Prevent In

i This article draws heavily on several of my earlier articles which are, though, less accessible to a wider audience, e.g. in press a, b, c). These have more detailed bibliographical references.

ii "The state of Turkey is in its state territory and state citizens an indivisible whole. Its language is Turkish." (Constitution, 1982, Article 3). Article 8, Propaganda against the indivisible unity of the State, in the Turkish Law to Fight Terrorism (3713, in force since 12 April 1991, stipulates: "Written and oral propaganda and assemblies, meetings and demonstrations aiming at damaging the indivisible unity of the State of the Turkish Republic with its territory and nation are forbidden, regardless of the method, intention and ideas behind it. Those conducting such an activity are to be punished by a sentence of between 2 and 5 years' imprisonment and a fine of between 50 million and 100 million Turkish pounds."

iii There have been numerous suggestions for including binding language-related rights in international human rights instruments (i.e. not only recommendations, like, for instance, CSCE-process documents). Thus far, this has not succeeded. It seems that it is often the same states objecting to international or regional instruments for protecting minority languages. The victorious states in the First World War who imposed clauses on language-related minority rights on the losers in the Peace Treaties, did not grant the same rights to minorities in their own countries, and voted down proposed internationally binding rights (Capotorti 1979, 16-26). The same countries vetoed Article 3 on linguistic genocide (see later) after the Second World War. Greece, Turkey and the United States, for instance, have not signed the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (with Art. 27, the best formulation for linguistic rights so far). Germany, and the United Kingdom have not ratified its Optional Protocol. At the CSCE Copenhagen meeting on the Human Dimension (June 1990) Bulgaria, France, Greece, Rumania and Turkey "did not agree with some far-reaching formulations for the benefit of minorities" (Suppan & Heubergerová 1992, 68). When the Council of Europe's European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages was accepted (June 1992), France, Turkey and United Kingdom abstained, Greece voted against (**Contact Bulletin** 9:2, 1992, 1).

iv This point has been forcefully argued by most researchers in the Symposia organised by the Scientific Commission on Language and Education in Multilingual Settings of AILA (The International Association for Applied Linguistics) at the two previous World Congresses in Thessaloniki 1990 and

Amsterdam 1993 (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (eds), in collaboration with Rannut, in press, and Skutnabb-Kangas (ed), in preparation).